



# CITY OF POMONA

## PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

---

---

**DATE:** March 22, 2017

**TO:** Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission

**FROM:** Planning Division

**SUBJECT:** **SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT (SPA 6114-2016), TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 74696 (PARCELMAP 5850-2016) & DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW (DPR 6535-2016):** A request for a Specific Plan Amendment to allow property within the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone that is not contiguous with Pomona Corridor Specific Plan (PCSP) area property to develop under the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone development standards, Tentative Parcel Map 74696 to consolidate two lots into one, and Development Plan Review to allow construction of a 36-unit multi-family residential development at two and three stories in height on property that is approximately 2.24 acres in size. The subject site is located at 203 Myrtle Avenue in the R-2-PD (Low Density Multiple Family Planned Development) zoning district and also identified within the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend City Council approval of Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 6114-2016), Tentative Parcel Map 74696 (PARCELMAP 5850-2016), and Development Plan Review (DPR 6535-2016) ([Attachment 1-3](#)).

### PROJECT/APPLICANT INFORMATION

<b>Project Location:</b>	<b>203 Myrtle Avenue</b>
APN Information:	8348-011-024 and 025
Project Applicant:	Stephen Pincin
Property Owner:	203 Myrtle, LLC.
<b>CC District:</b>	<b>District # 1</b>
Historic/CBD:	Not Applicable
Specific Plan:	Not Applicable

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION & BACKGROUND

The subject project site is located on a property at 203 Myrtle Avenue in the Pomona Corridors Specific Plan (PCSP) Urban Neighborhood Expansion zone and also identified in the R-2-PD (Low Density Multiple Family with Plan Development Overlay) zone. The subject site is

approximately 2.24 acres in size and currently sits vacant ([Attachment 5](#)). The applicant is proposing the development of 36 multiple-family residential units. The residential units range from two to three bedrooms at 1,102 square feet and 1,366 square feet in floor area respectively. The project is providing 66 primarily surface off-street parking spaces, and 20 off-street parking spaces provided in enclosed garages for a total of 86 off-street parking spaces. The proposed project consists of four freestanding buildings (buildings A, B, C, and D) at three stories in height. Buildings A and B are oriented with frontage facing Myrtle Avenue and the first floor units have entries from Myrtle. The remaining units on the second and third floors are provided with entries that face the rear of the property. Buildings A and B are comprised of 9 units each for a total of 18 units. Buildings C and D are two stories in height and located behind buildings A and B and are oriented to a courtyard. A portion of buildings C and D are provided with enclosed garages that face the north and south property lines. Each building has 10 enclosed off-street parking spaces provided. Buildings C and D are comprised of nine units each, for a total of 18 units. The applicant is also proposing a tentative parcel map to consolidate two lots into one to comprehensively delineate the site into one lot and a specific plan amendment requesting approval to allow property within the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone but is not contiguous with PCSP area property to develop under the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone development on the subject site.

### **Applicable Code Sections**

Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section .584-J, a specific plan may be amended in the same manner that it was adopted. Specific plan amendments are subject to the same five findings as those that pertain to initial specific plan approval.

PCSP Section 2.0.5 establishes the procedure for a Development Plan Review and Parcel Map applications. The Development Services Director has the authority to approve, conditionally approve or deny a Development Plan, while the Planning Commission has the authority for approving parcel maps and the City Council has approving authority when a tentative and final subdivision map is required under the state subdivision map act. Due to the proposed project requiring a Specific Plan Amendment to be ultimately approved by the City Council, it was staff's assessment that associated applications filed in conjunction with the proposed project (DPR 6535-2016 and PARCELMAP 5850-2016) should be elevated to the City Council as the approving authority for the proposed project.

### **Surrounding Land Use Information**

The subject site is generally located on the west side of Myrtle Avenue, directly north of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, to the west of Hamilton Boulevard and to the south of Monterey Street. The subject site currently sits vacant. The properties that surround the site are developed with a combination of single and multiple-family residential developments and vacant parcels. South of the tracks are primarily industrial uses with a few nonconforming residential uses. The following table provides zoning information for the surrounding properties:

**Land Use Summary Table**

	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	<b>Zoning Designation</b>	<b>General Plan Designation</b>
<b>Subject Site (Existing)</b>	Vacant	R-2-PD and PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone	Urban Neighborhood (T4-A)
<b>North</b>	Single and Multiple Family Residential	R-2 and PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone	Urban Neighborhood (T4-A)
<b>South</b>	Industrial storage/sales	M-1-S	Urban Neighborhood (T4-A)
<b>East</b>	Multiple-Family Residential, Single-Family Residential and vacant land	R-2	Urban Neighborhood (T4-A)
<b>West</b>	Mobile Home Park	R-2	Urban Neighborhood (T4-A)

**ZONING COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS****Site Development Standards**

The applicant is proposing to construct 36 multiple-family residential units under the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone development standards and not the R-2-PD (Low Density Multiple Family with Planned Development Overlay) zone. The 36 unit multiple-family residential development is proposed to be consistent with the General Plan's maximum allowable density of 70 dwelling units per acre. The table below details the development standards of the PCSP's Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone and the project's compliance with the standards.

**Project Summary Table**

<b>Development Standard</b>	<b>PCSP Requirements</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>Compliance Determination</b>
Number of Units	None	36 units	Yes
Density (Per General Plan)	Up to 70 units/acre	16 units/acre	Yes
Building Height	2 stories minimum	Building A and B – 3 stories	Yes

Development Standard	PCSP Requirements	Proposed Project	Compliance Determination
	4 stories maximum	Building C and D – 2 stories	
Building Length	Special Building Length Limits – Limit Corner Building – Maximum 120 feet	130 feet	No
Building Massing	2L:3H to 5L:2H Length of longest volume to range from 21ft. to 78 ft. at 31'-6" height	Longest volume - Volume E 26.5 ft. length to 31'-6" height	Yes
Building Orientation to Streets and Public Open Space	Required	Provided with entry porch oriented to Myrtle Ave	Yes
Setbacks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Front</li> <li>Side</li> <li>Rear</li> </ul>	Front - 5ft min.to 15 ft. max. Side – 10 ft. min. with living space windows Rear – 10 ft. min.	15 feet 11'-6"-12 feet 55 feet	Yes Yes Yes
Frontage Coverage	70% minimum	79% proposed	Yes
Space between buildings	20 feet	46 feet (building A and B) 40 feet (Building A and B to C and D) 52'-11" Building C and D	Yes
Build to Corner	Required	Provided	Yes
Public Open Space	150 sf/unit, 5,400 sf total	6,340 sf	No
Private Open Space	60 sf unit	60-90 sf	Yes
Public Open Space Type	Courtyard – spatially defined by buildings on three sides	Courtyard with buildings on two sides and a block wall on the third side	No
Private Open Space Type	Porch, private yard, or balcony	Porch, private yard, and balcony	Yes
Setback Area landscaping types	Perimeter block sidewalk extension required Interior block setback areas – groundcover and moderate screening	Compliance to be provided during plan check process	Yes*

Development Standard	PCSP Requirements	Proposed Project	Compliance Determination
	required		
Parking	2 bedroom – 2 spaces required 3 bedroom – 2.5 spaces required 1 guest space per 4 units 89 spaces total required	86 spaces proposed	No
Parking Types	Surface Lot- Rear Rear Parking lots should be screened from the street	Surface lot – Rear with parking spaces visible from the street	No
Driveway width	12 foot per one lane driveway	20 feet entry 12 feet exit	Yes
Fences	Rear-Side: 6 foot high wall/fence	6 foot high fence/wall	Yes

**\*Condition of approval****Circulation, Access & Parking**

Access to the subject site will be provided along Myrtle Avenue ([Attachment 5](#)). There will be one vehicular driveway for entry, at 20 feet in width, and one vehicular driveway for exit, at 12 feet in width. Access to the surface parking spaces and enclosed parking lot will be provided via the main site driveways. The project will provide a total of 86 off-street parking stalls, 20 of which are provided in enclosed garages. A total of 89 spaces are required. The proposed project is deficient in meeting the required off-street parking by three spaces and is requesting a deviation.

Additionally, the parking types allowed in the Urban Neighborhood Expansion zone of the PCSP allows for rear surface parking lot, which is described as a “*parking lot where a building is located between the parking lot and the street, does not extend beyond the rear wall of the primary building into any side yard setback. Rear parking lots should be screened from the street.*” In this instance, the precise definition of a rear surface parking lot are not met in that the off-street parking spaces are visible through the entry driveway from Myrtle Avenue, between buildings A and B. The applicant maintains that the driveway entry gate will be provided and screen the parking spaces from view, however, the PCSP and the City’s General Plan discourages gated communities.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission not approve the project as designed and direct the applicant to make changes to bring the number of parking spaces into compliance with the PCSP, to not gate the project, and to modify the parking layout to meet the rear surface parking

lot requirements. However, the deviations from PCSP development standards as described above are at the discretion of the Planning Commission and City Council and the Planning Commission could accept the applicant's proposal and recommend approval with the deviations to the City Council. The proposal was also reviewed by the City of Pomona Public Works Department, who determined that the location and the proposed project did not generate enough vehicle trips to warrant a traffic study.

### **Architectural Elevations**

The proposed project is being designed in a Spanish Revival style of architecture ([Attachment 5](#)). The building features finishes that consist of a variety of color and material, including smooth plaster finish, stone veneer at the base of the building, window shutters, red tile roofing, and wood trellises. Articulation is further provided through the use of porches and balconies that project outward with roof overhangs and building walls of varying heights. Decorative wrought iron is provided along balconies and used in some window treatments. Conditions of approval have been included to ensure that the exterior doors and garage doors are consistent with the architecture of the proposed project. While the architecture of the proposed project are in substantial compliance with the PCSP, areas the project that are deficient in meeting PCSP standards will still be required through the plan check process.

### **Landscaping**

The applicant has submitted a conceptual landscape design for consideration ([Attachment 5](#)). The applicant will be providing various forms of landscaping dispersed throughout the project site to include trees, shrubs, ground cover, and other vegetation to the standards of the PCSP.

### **Public Open Space**

The applicant has designed the project to meet the minimum area required for public open space, which the PCSP defines as *"public or semi-public outdoor spaces designed to facilitate community formation, interaction, relaxation, and contemplation through public gathering, activity, recreation, and/or leisure"*. Due to the applicant proposing a gated community, the public open space proposed will not be accessible to the public. Further, the design of this open space area is designed as a courtyard plaza, which the PCSP defines for public open spaces as *"spatially defined by buildings on at least three sides"*. As proposed, the applicant is proposing a decorative block wall to account for the third side with Buildings C and D for a "courtyard plaza". The applicant has provided a response by maintaining that their project should not be subject to the public open space requirement because the location of the project is not along a major corridor and it is not their desire to encourage the public to enter into the property due to safety concerns. As proposed, the applicant feels the open space may be more fitting of the definition of a courtyard for private open space, which is defined as *"a private or privately shared internal open space enclosed by buildings on at least 2 sides, and by buildings or walls on at least three sides"*. It is staff's assessment that proposed project does not meet the precise definition of courtyard plaza for Public Open Spaces and should redesign the proposed project to

meet the definition of a courtyard for public open spaces. It is staff's recommendation for the Planning Commission to direct the applicant to redesign accordingly.

## **ISSUES ANALYSIS**

### **Issue 1: General Plan**

The proposed multiple-family residential development conforms to the General Plan with the "Urban Neighborhood" land use designation in the T4-A Transect zone as shown on the General Plan Land Use Diagram. Furthermore, the project will develop a site that has sat vacant for many years into an economically viable and aesthetically pleasing development, which is consistent with the following goals of the General Plan:

*"Establish areas that can successfully transition into mixed-use neighborhoods with a strong residential character by supporting high quality, multi-family housing" (Goal 6E.G)*

The proposed project fulfills the intent of the General Plan in that the land use is consistent with the surrounding mix of single and multiple family housing and is designed to be visually appealing and pedestrian friendly. Although the applicant is proposing the development to be a gated community, which is inconsistent with the General Plan goal 7D.P18, which states "discourage gated entrances..." it is at the discretion of the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council to have the project redesigned to meet this goal or to allow the gated development.

### **Issue 2: Zoning Ordinance Compliance**

Staff has evaluated the proposed site design and has determined that the proposed development is in substantial conformance with the development standards of the PCSP Urban Neighborhood Expansion zone with the exceptions of off-street parking and public open space requirements. Additionally, the applicant is requesting a building length of Building A and B that exceed the maximum allowable length for corner properties by 10 feet as illustrated in the development standards chart illustrated above. The applicant has worked with staff to design a project that meets the spirit and intent of the General Plan, PCSP and provides a quality development, and complies with the applicable development standards to the greatest extent practical.

### **Issue 3: Land Use Compatibility**

The proposed multi-family residential use is consistent with the surrounding single and multi-family residential uses in the immediate vicinity. The neighborhood is primarily residential and the proposed use is consistent with the surrounding uses. The project is designed as multiple-family residential is consistent with the neighboring mobile home, multiple and single-family residential developments. The project has proposed quality architecture and has proposed a mix of landscaping that will complement the neighborhood. Although the proposed project abuts the Union Pacific railroad tracks, a condition of approval has been included which requires

residential units to be provided with triple paned windows. As a result, the proposed project is designed and conditioned to be compatible with the surrounding land uses.

#### **Issue 4: Specific Plan Amendment**

In order to accommodate the subject development proposal the applicant is requesting a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 6114-2016). The PCSP states that a *“developer may submit a request for Urban Neighborhood...Expansion Zone regulation to be applied to any property that is within...the Expansion Zone and is contiguous with a property within the Plan Area”*, however *“Expansion Zone applications may be approved without a Plan Amendment”*. While the subject site is located within the Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone, it is not contiguous with the PCSP parcels. The subject site is approximately five lots away from the Downtown Gateway Segment of the PCSP. In considering the SPA for the subject site, it is staff’s assessment that the PCSP development standards of the Urban Neighborhood Expansion zone are appropriate for development of the property and the SPA is a procedural application due to the location of the subject site being noncontiguous with a Downtown Gateway Segment of the PCSP. By allowing the SPA, the City is able to use the PCSP as a tool to evaluate proposed land uses and development within the SPA Area and in so doing advance the General Plan vision for the subject site. The requirement of being contiguous to a PCSP to apply the PCSP development standards is in place to allow the orderly development of the Corridors without allowing inconsistent or incompatible developments to be interspersed throughout portions of expansion zone segments.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS/DETERMINATION**

Upon submittal of the project, staff reviewed the proposed project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines. After examining the proposed project, staff has determined that the proposed project meets the criteria for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15332, (In-Fill Development Projects) of CEQA. The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance; the proposed project site is less than five (5) acres; the project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species; the proposed project will not have any significant effects upon the environment; and the site can adequately be served by all required utilities and public services. Therefore, based on the above findings, staff is recommending that the Planning Commission adopt a Categorical Exemption for the proposed project.

#### **PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

A copy of the public hearing notice was published in the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin on March 10, 2017 and was sent to the owners of properties within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject site on March 9, 2017 ([Attachment 7](#)). The applicant also posted a public hearing notice for the proposed project on the subject site. The applicant also held a community meeting on March 11, 2017 with residents within the neighborhood. As of the date of this staff report, staff did receive one inquiry regarding the need for a traffic study for the proposed project.



## CONCLUSION

The project as proposed is mostly consistent with the General Plan and Pomona Corridors Specific Plan Urban Neighborhood Expansion Zone. Staff is supportive of the project with changes to bring the public open space, off-street parking, building length, and gated community into compliance with the PCSP. The proposed project is compatible with the existing surrounding land uses of single and multiple family developments. The Planning Division recommends that the Planning Commission direct the applicant to make changes to the project, and with those changes, recommend City Council approval of Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 6114-2016), Tentative Parcel Map 74696 (PARCELMAP 5850-2016), and Development Plan Review (DPR 6535-2016) ([Attachment 1-3](#)).

Respectfully Submitted:



Brad Johnson  
Development Services Manager

Prepared By:



Nancy Lee  
Associate Planner

## ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) [Draft PC Resolution for Specific Plan Amendment \(SPA 6114-2016\)](#)
- 2) [Draft PC Resolution for Tentative Parcel Map 74696 \(PARCELMAP 5850-2016\)](#)
- 3) [Draft PC Resolution for Development Plan Review \(DPR 6535-2016\)](#)
- 4) [Location Map and Aerial Photograph](#)
- 5) [Project Plans and additional exhibits \(reductions\)](#)
- 6) [Site Photographs](#)
- 7) [1,000' Radius Map and Public Hearing Notice](#)
- 8) [Full Size Plans \(Separate Cover\)](#)

\\STORAGE\CH-Depts\Planning\Master Planning\PLANNING COMMISSION\Staff Reports\Specific Plan Amendments\203 Myrtle Avenue (SPA 6114-2016, DPR 6535-2016, PARCELMAP 5850-2016).doc