CITY OF SAN DIMAS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES

April 27, 2006 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM

PRESENT

Eric Beilstein
Scott Dilley
Ken Duran
Sandy McHenry (left at 11:55 a.m.)
Jim Schoonover
John Sorcinelli
Larry Stevens

ABSENT

CALL TO ORDER

Councilman McHenry called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:35 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Larry Stevens moved, second by Ken Duran to approve the Minutes of April 13, 2006. Motion carried 7.0.0.

HEARING ITEMS

Case No.'s 06-24,25,26

Planning Manager Hensley presented request for Conditional Use Permit 06-03; Off-Site and Shared Parking for 9,000 s.f. Commercial/Office Building, Conditional Use Permit 05-04; 14 Unit Live/Work Unit Project, Conditional Use Permit 06-02; 96 Unit Residential Project. The project is located at east side of San Dimas Avenue, south of railroad tracks and north of Arrow Highway at Commercial Street.

Greg Martin, Williams Fox Homes, and Bryce Hall and Ron Nestor, architects, were present.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that the City hired a consultant, Downtown Solutions, to review project as well.

He added that a Conditional Use Permit would be required to cover a variety of levels of maintenance such as awnings and the clock tower. The project meets fire department turn-around and the architecture is well above minimum. Community room and open areas provide for community enjoyment. There are landscape limitations at parking lot to the south on San Dimas Avenue (nearest gas station). There will only be emergency access off of Arrow Highway. An eight foot wall is recommended on the east side of the property next to the mini-storage facility.

The Board reviewed the site plan and discussed access off of San Dimas Avenue, garages and subterranean parking. A guest parking space is called for every three units. Southern most building along San Dimas Avenue will be widened which will create area for new off-site public parking.

The Board further discussed street parking on San Dimas Avenue and current overnight policy on City streets. The Board felt that the applicant needs to be clear on what is allowed overflow parking. A traffic plan to be submitted to City Council at a later date. Guest parking locations clarified.

Community Development Director Stevens encouraged an adequate landscape strip on San Dimas Avenue. He also added that the Homeowners Association will have to have a parking management plan in regards to guest parking.

In response to Community Development Director Stevens, Planning Manager Hensley stated that there was nothing in the DDA about occupancy of live/work units in regards to owner occupied or rental. There is not a limit in the current zoning ordinance either. Regarding the lofts, residential use only with Home Occupation permitted.

Materials for the exterior were reviewed.

Trash pick-up issues still need to be worked out.

In response to Community Development Director Stevens, Planning Manager Hensley stated that in the DDA, access to Gold Line Station would be only on north property line. There would have to be a significant re-design to incorporate Gold Line access if a station was created at this location. This project was designed prior to any Gold Line discussion east of San Dimas Avenue.

Roof mounted equipment will be screened per architect.

In response to Planning Commissioner Schoonover, Planning Manager Hensley stated that the sign requirements would be the same as for downtown.

Ron Nestor addressed the Board:

- Design is reflective of old town character with warehouse style building commonly adjacent to rail roads.
- Designed to look as though built over time.
- Veneer brick proposed with an aged/old appearance.
- Clock tower to have two faces – front and one side.

- Handicap parking for commercial units on San Dimas Avenue. State requirements met for elevator access as well.
- Ladera Ranch in Orange County is an example of similar planned development.

In response to Mr. Beilstein, Planning Manager Hensley stated that commercial units not precluded from being subdivided, but unlikely as access to living spaces are from these units.

Community Development Director Stevens stated that he felt that the project was positive and unique. The Board asked for an explanation of the proposed street plan for San Dimas Avenue. Mr. Hensley explained that there was an original street plan that was developed by RKA, a consultant to the City. The City Council reviewed that plan and approved it in concept. It was a plan for one lane in each direction on San Dimas Avenue with a 6 foot raised median separating the angled parking area from travel lanes. It was specifically designed to allow a future expansion to two lanes in the future. Since the time a second plan was developed as an alternative that reduced the median to, and provided space for two lanes but striping for only one lane. The Council will be asked to choose between the two plans.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that he felt that the project was good, but would like to see a key plan, explanatory sections, to make it easier for the layperson to understand the project better. He found it difficult to understand the grades and how units are accessed and relate to each other. He would like to see a pavement plan for pedestrian and vehicle traffic within the project. He suggested reducing some of the garages for the commercial units along San Dimas Avenue to increase commercial space and swing the end unit around the corner of the building. Landscape plan very important and should have been on the elevations. A downtown plan that shows relationship of this project and the downtown and how it relates to parking and scale is desired – an urban plan.

Community Development Director Stevens suggested that the clock tower have three faces instead of two as proposed.

Assistant City Manager Duran stated that this was a good opportunity to design a good recycling system for this project. Also an on-site parking plan will be very important.

Community Development Director Stevens replied that a stand alone parking document separate from the CC & R's will need to be developed.

Councilman McHenry stated that the architect has done a good job architecturally, but agrees with Mr. Sorcinelli on problems with site plan and elevations. He also added that there seems to be a lack of internal community and has questions about relationship to Gold Line.

The Board recommended that applicant continue to work with staff and that the two proposed San Dimas Avenue street plans be brought to the next meeting so the Board can consider a recommendation to City Council.

Case No. 06-02

Assistant Planner Concepcion presented request to construct a 972 s.f. two story addition located at 455 Balboa Court.

Property owner, Biman and Srabani Ghosh, and Kent Tsen, TNK Construction, were present.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that basically this was same design with reduced square footage. Staff conducted an in depth review of the plans and determined that applicant may have miscalculated the lot coverage. The City Council referred the case back to the Board so that the applicant could address lot coverage and design issues. The property has a two car garage and RV parking area.

The Board discussed outcome of City Council meeting regarding this item and mansionization concerns and how an ordinance could address those concerns.

Section from ordinance regarding mansionization was circulated to the Board for review.

Community Development Director Stevens recommended that Board comment and then send request back to City Council. Paving should be shown for RV parking on site plan. The request appears to meet minimum standards regarding lot coverage. Architectural design is issue main issue for the Board.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that there are many inaccuracies on plans. He stated that the Board can not design the addition for the applicant. Lacks integration with existing house.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the project fails to meet the requirements stated in the mansionization ordinance, in particular section 5,6, and 9. Plans do not illustrate many details structurally.

Mr. Ghosh stated that he did not understand how to integrate the addition with the existing house.

Community Development Director Stevens stated that a review of what areas can not have two story additions and if single story, look at amending the code to increase allowed lot coverage. He felt that there were three options to consider:

1. Amend code to increase allowed lot coverage for single story additions to discourage second story additions;
2. Project should be re-designed to integrate addition with existing house;
3. Approve project as it meets existing code.

Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to forward request back to the City Council with a list of facts showing changes made by applicant and to identify three alternatives:

Option 1 - The addition be redesigned to be better integrated with the existing house. The design should be substantially different from the current proposal.

Option 2 - To encourage single story additions, increase the maximum lot coverage from 35% to 40% for lots under 8,000 square feet in single family residential zones. This option would require a Code Amendment. The applicant would then redesign the proposal to be substantially different from the current proposal, with an increased first floor.

Option 3 – The proposal meets the minimum zoning standards. This option would allow approval subject to standard conditions but may not fully be in keeping with some of the Standards of Review for development review cases.

Motion Carried 6.0.1. (Sandy McHenry abstained)

Case No. 06-39

Associate Planner Lockett presented request to modify master sign program for Via Verde Corporate Plaza located at the southeast corner of San Dimas Avenue and Via Verde.

Steve Hutchinson, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Lockett stated that existing sign program exhibits and text conflict.

Community Development Director Stevens stated that the signs relate to how the tenant spaces are divided. When only one tenant occupies a building, multiple signs are not necessary. One tenant should not have more than three signs on a single tenant building. No signs should be on west elevation of 140 and 160 building and no signs on south elevations of all buildings.

Assistant City Manager Duran suggested that only eyebrow signs be allowed on east and west elevations.

The Board reviewed the elevations and impact on adjacent residences.

Community Development Director Stevens concluded that further review is necessary. Applicant needs to bring back to the Board the following:

- Elevations of all sides;
- Show existing signs in one color and additional signs in another color.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Eric Beilstein to continue to uncertain date. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:14 P.M. to the meeting of May 11, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.