



Monday, March 21, 2016

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Gomez at 6:00 p.m., in the City Hall Council Chambers, 6615 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera, CA.

STAFF PRESENT:

Benjamin A. Martinez, Director
Julia Gonzalez, Deputy Director
Evelyn Millare, Executive Assistant

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Commissioners Celiz, Elisaldez, Garcia, Gomez, Zermeno

ABSENT: None.

FLAG SALUTE: Led by Commissioner Garcia

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

To be approved at the next Planning Commission meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 727 AND VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 74006 – A REQUEST TO CREATE A SUBDIVISION FOR 35 RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM UNITS ON A 1.62 ACRE SITE LOCATED AT 9036 BEVERLY BOULEVARD IN THE COMMERCIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (CPD) ZONED DISTRICT AND THE MIXED-USE OVERLAY (M-U OVERLAY) ZONE

Project Location: 9036 Beverly Boulevard
Pico Rivera, CA 90660

Applicant: Joe Oftelie, Director of Development
City Ventures
3121 Michelson Drive, Suite 150
Irvine, CA 92612

Project Planner: Christina Gallagher
Associate Planner

Associate Planner Gallagher reported that the subject property is surrounded by a commercial zone to the north and west. She stated that the single family homes are to the west and east of the property. The project site is approximately 70,646 square feet. The density allowed in the current zone is 30 dwelling units per acre. The property would be allowed to develop up to 48 units, but are only proposing 35 units. In 1960 there was a 30,000 square foot commercial building constructed on the property used as a grocery store. In 1985, the use changed to general retail store. In 2008, the building was demolished and there has been no development on the property since.

Associate Planner Gallagher stated that the vesting tentative tract map is to create a subdivision and conditional use permit is for the construction of the 35 condominium units. In regards to site layout, the project site will be accessible from Arma Street only and there will be no opening from Beverly Boulevard. Pedestrian access points will be on Beverly Boulevard and Arma Street. Residents that front both streets will have direct pedestrian access to their units.

Grading plans of project shown to Planning Commission by Associate Planner Gallagher. Plans show emergency service accessibility.

Structures on the eastern border will adhere to a 10' setback requirements. The adjacent building will maintain 50' setback from proposed structure. Setbacks on Arma Street range from 5' to 19' from property line. Setbacks shared with commercial property ranges from 7' to 30' and 26' to 10.5'. Setbacks along Beverly Boulevard will be 9'.

Parking will be provided by attached two car garages for each unit. There are also 11 open, guest parking spaces proposed. The current parking code only requires four guest parking spaces (one for every eight units). A 6' block wall is proposed on the eastern project boundary. There is a proposed block wall on the western border of the project site adjacent to commercial space. The block wall and wrought iron fence will be constructed moving towards Beverly Boulevard. Private yards are indicated on plans by blue triangles. Each unit will have an enclosed private yard.

Four different floor plans are proposed. Six units will reflect floor plan 1; approximately 1,191 square feet, 2 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms and 2 car garage. 14 units will reflect floor plan 2; 3 bedroom, 3 bathroom, and tandem two car garage. One unit will reflect floor plan 3; approximately 1,588 square feet, 3 bedrooms, 3 bathrooms, and tandem 2 car garage. 14 units will reflect floor plan 4; approximately 1,711 square feet, 3 bedroom, 3 bathroom, side by side 2 car garage. Floor plan 4 provides an option for fourth bedroom and fourth bathroom.

Exterior will be white and taupe colored stucco. There will be a stone veneer surrounding the entrances of the units. A brick veneer option instead of stone veneer is also proposed. The building height is approximately 39' high. Landscaping and vegetation is proposed to mitigate any privacy issues.

The traffic letter prepared indicated that the project will generate an average of 203 daily vehicle trips. However, these vehicle trips will not be using the same route. Five outgoing routes and four incoming routes were identified. Sixteen of 203 daily vehicle trips will occur during morning peak hour, 18 will occur during evening peak hour. The letter stated there will be no significant impact to surrounding intersections.

This project is determined to be categorically exempt from the environmental review process under Class 32: Infill Development Projects. Infill development projects meet all conditions to be categorized as infill development project.

The Urban Land Institute states high-density housing developments are not significantly different from lower-density developments. The California Housing and Community Development Department indicates that the quality of project design and use of public spaces has more significant impact on crime than density or income levels. The possibility of crime observed by non-criminal bystanders could create a deterrent effect.

Associate Planner Gallagher recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council the approval of Conditional Use Permit 727 and Vesting Tentative Tract Map 74006.

Presentation concluded.

Commissioner Elisaldez asked for clarification for requesting the subdivision and if the second parcel where Norms is located is also within scope of the proposal. Associate Planner Gallagher responded that the subdivision would be for only the subject property. Associate Planner Gallagher explained the subdivision is for each condominium unit.

Commissioner Zermeno asked if residents will have their own entry gate to the complex and clarification of guest parking spaces. Associate Planner Gallagher explained that the entry will be located on Arma Street and that 11 guest parking spaces are proposed.

Commissioner Zermeno stated the area on Arma Street is primarily commercial.

Commissioner Gomez asked about how adding 35 units will affect the local school district in regards to school impact fees and how they are calculated.

Director Martinez stated the impact to schools is generally positive because schools are showing decline in enrollment numbers.

Commissioner Elisaldez asked for more details on the height of the vegetation at the time of planting. Associate Planner Gallagher stated there could be conditions placed to require specific height at the time of installation.

The applicant stated there will still be requirements to be met even if categorically exempt under infill development project.

Associate Planner Gallagher stated there were verbal communications with residents about privacy, setbacks, and ingress/egress matters of the proposed development.

Joe Offtelie, is the applicant and is the Director of Development with City Ventures and is excited to work to improve the City. Mr. Offtelie provided background of City Ventures and the environmentally friendly component of developments. Mr. Offtelie provided information on previous, successful projects. He stated that City Ventures takes into consideration the neighborhood when proposing projects.

Commissioner Garcia asked if there will be a homeowners association. The applicant confirmed there will be a homeowners association that would take care of the exterior maintenance of the complex.

Commissioner Gomez asked if there will be a common space. The applicant stated that these spaces are passive spaces. Walkways and nice trees are preferred for the population that these units would be marketed to.

Commissioner Zermeno asked for the average price per unit.

Mr. Offtelie stated they expect to sell the units at approximately \$500,000.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Steven Hernandez, a resident stated he does not approve of the project. His primary concern is that it is not compatible with the general plan. The site was not identified in the Housing Element as a housing opportunity site. The resident does not see the requirements for affordable housing being fulfilled by the developer. Mr. Hernandez would like the developer to provide opportunities to the local economy during construction. Mr. Hernandez does not believe the development matches with the existing character of the neighborhood. Mr. Hernandez is also concerned with parking and increased traffic.

Gloria Saenz, a resident expressed concerns over privacy and parking deficiencies of the development. Ms. Saenz also expressed concern about the potential increase in crime and a decrease in the quality of life the development would bring.

Fernando Hernandez a resident expressed concern of the height of the condominiums. Mr. Hernandez has concerns about the privacy of his family and the increased burden on the school districts.

Jacob Alvarez, a resident stated that this would be an invasion of privacy. Mr. Alvarez expressed concerns of vandalism and crime in the area. Mr. Alvarez would like to see

the city improve other aspects before proposing a large development that would negatively impact the neighborhood.

Juan Carlos Gonzalez, a business owner of an adjacent shopping center supports this project and thanks the developer for proposing such a development. Mr. Gonzalez believes this will benefit the neighborhood and is a much needed development for an empty lot.

Maria Aguilar, a resident would like the city to address community members' needs first. Ms. Aguilar is concerned for her children.

Nibardo Zezati, a resident would like to preserve the quiet, low-density nature of the neighborhood. Mr. Zezati expressed concern about the increase in cars and people. Mr. Zezati sees the development as a negative addition to the neighborhood.

Armando Montez, a resident is concerned with the density and height of buildings. Mr. Montez would like to suggest blending the development in with the surrounding neighborhoods and add single family homes, instead of condominiums.

Gabriela Rodriguez, a resident recently bought a house and would not have if she knew of the project. Ms. Rodriguez is concerned with the type of people that would move in to the new condominiums. Ms. Rodriguez is concerned with the character and affordability of the development.

Commissioner Elisaldez made a motion to allow a resident to speak beyond the three minute allotted time. Motion passed.

Mr. Montes expressed concerns over criminal and undesirable behavior taking place next to his house. Mr. Montes stated there is no action being taken about criminal activities. Mr. Montes would like to know if there would be space between his driveway and the driveway of the proposed development.

Mr. Offtelie stated that he wants to be respectful to community members and would like to host community meetings to further discuss the issues raised by the residents. Mr. Offtelie stated the project will raise property values. He said he is willing to remove some windows after taking into consideration neighbors' concerns. He also said he is willing to install a higher block wall and mature trees to address privacy concerns.

Commissioner Elisaldez made a motion to close public hearing. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Commissioner Zermeno expressed the need for further development in the city. The Commissioner stated the development would bring more amenities for the current residents.

Commissioner Elisaldez stated his doubt for the proposed project and understands the concerns of the residents. The commissioner showed concern about the accuracy of the traffic studies showing no significant impact. The commissioner is concerned with the target demographic of the proposed development.

Commissioner Garcia expressed opinions about the need for community meetings between the developer and residents.

Commissioner Gomez provided his experiences about a similar development in his neighborhood. The commissioner stated the increase in property value and the overall benefits of a new housing development.

Commissioner Celiz thanked the developer for trying to invest in Pico Rivera. The Commissioner stressed moving forward and investing in communities regardless of the opposition to change. The Commissioner suggested parking permits to address parking concerns.

City Attorney Lam suggested that a motion could include conditions previously discussed by the developer of setting height requirement for trees and the removal of windows and placing opaque windows on the side facing the neighbors' properties.

A motion was made to recommend approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 727 subject to the conditions and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 74006

Director Martinez clarified that if during the community meeting a taller block wall is desired by neighbors, this would be noted as a condition when submitting to the City Council and would be subject to a variance application if needed at the conditional height.

Motion passed for recommendation.

NEW BUSINESS:

Commissioner Elisaldez would like to know about construction activities on a neighbor's property. A notice was sent out about impacts of construction on 9054 Shade Lane. The Commissioner would like to confirm the nature of the construction and plans for the development.

Commissioner Celiz inquired about the new townhomes on Passons and Washington Boulevards. The Commissioner would like to bring mismatching tiles to staff's attention. The Commissioner requested further investigation into the matter.

Commissioner Gomez brought to attention the pedestrian use of the underpass on Passons Boulevard. The Commissioner suggested stairs to aid in pedestrian traffic on the underpass if feasible.

Commissioner Celiz expressed liability concerns of creating a path. Attorney Lam concurred there will be liability concerns, as well as ADA compliance issues by constructing a path.

CONTINUED/OLD BUSINESS:

Commissioner Celiz stated the banquet room at the golf course has improved and is attracting business from bicyclists passing by on the bike path. The Commissioner stated there is a lack of signs and therefore, easy for people to get lost. The Commissioner suggested increasing signage to direct traffic towards the golf course to increase business for the golf course.

Commissioner Zermeno agreed a sign would increase business and aesthetics for the city. Director Martinez agreed there is a need for more signage near the 605 Freeway and the lacking signage for the golf course.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS:

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF Tuesday, March 8, 2016 – Commissioner Garcia was unable to attend. Attorney Lam stated the primary concern of the meeting was about the panhandlers around the Rosemead medical facilities.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF Tuesday, March 22, 2016 - Commissioner Celiz confirmed to attend.

There being no further business the Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:51p.m.

Paul Gomez, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Benjamin A. Martinez, Secretary
Planning Commission
Director of Community and Economic Development