

**CITY OF SAN DIMAS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES**

**June 22, 2006 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

PRESENT

*Eric Beilstein
Scott Dilley
Craig Hensley
Sandy McHenry
Blaine Michaelis
Jim Schoonover
John Sorcinelli (arrived at 8:38 A.M.)*

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

Jim Schoonover moved, second by Eric Beilstein, to approve the Minutes of June 8, 2006 with addition to page three, "gas meters will not be ganged" under comments from Jide Alade Motion carried 5.0.1. (Sandy McHenry abstained)

HEARING ITEMS

Case No. 05-83

Planning Manager Craig Hensley presented request to revise Sign Program for the Arrow Highway Corporate Center located at 160 East Arrow Highway.

Richard Benson, Ad Art Sign Company, was present.

Sign Program reviewed by the Board.

John Sorcinelli moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve revised sign program.

Motion Carried Unanimously

Case No. 06-07

Associate Planner Laura Lockett presented request to construct a 27,800 s.f. single story office building and a 16,900 s.f. two story building located at southwest corner of Via Verde and Puente.

Stan Stringfellow, applicant, was present.

Ken Nichols, project architect, was present.

Gary Enderle, representing Via Verde Home Owners Association, was present.

Associate Planner Lockett outlined issues:

- Single Story Buildings:
 - Pop outs are too shallow;
 - Columns appear to be “plant ons” and serve no structural purpose;
 - Entry out of scale and too contemporary;
 - Elevations appear too busy in regards to materials proposed.

- Two Story Building:
 - Front entrance out of scale;
 - Second floor same size as first floor;
 - Pop out too shallow;
 - Issues with mansard roof pop outs;
 - Second story inconsistent with first story.

- Both Buildings:
 - Flat concrete S tile proposed;
 - Rough sand stucco proposed;
 - Front entrances face interior driveways;
 - Rock placement;
 - Shallow details.

Associate Planner Lockett added that the buildings appear like a combination of several design elements that were taken from recently constructed buildings in the City without creating a project that is unique and appropriate for this site. She also stated that it is parked for office use.

Building Official Beilstein expressed concerns with driveway off of Via Verde as it relates to driveway to adjacent school.

Mr. Stringfellow addressed the Board. Lighter color palette preferred. His clients want an institutional style look.

Mr. Nichols commented on columns being used to create shadow and depth and that 3' was adequate. He felt that the two entries were in scale. Glass entry used to create a professional office look building. The desire is to tie in City theme with modern building.

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Mr. Nichols stated that the window material would be colored aluminum and clear low E glass.

Building Official Beilstein asked about the band below the second floor windows. Mr. Nichols replied that the band can be pre-cast or part of efface system. Mr. Beilstein also added that the stucco finish should be smooth. He expressed concerns with the mansards and stated that the project location provides for better architectural opportunities than what is presented.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that the buildings should be intergrated in a better way. Appearance needs improvement as it is too complex and should be be more simple. The depth of the arcade is an issue. Architectural authenticity is important. Roof material must be clay barrel tile. Full elevations should be submitted.

Building Official Beilstein agreed that the elevations were lacking and a streetscape should be submitted. The band under the second floor windows is a problem architecturally.

Mr. Sorcinelli, in agreement with Board comments, stated that in design terms there is nothing driving the building architecturally. There are concerns with the efface and building materials. There should be a fifth elevation of the roof to address equipment screening. The elevations presented do not show relationship of buildings to the street and adjacent properties. Opportunities are being missed on building 1.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that the Simison project on Foothill Boulevard was a good example of tying buildings together that are not identical. A blended theme.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the issue of the mansard needed to be addressed. A mansard should undermine impression of a roof. He added that there should be a campus plan to explain how the buildings relate to each other. Applicant should look at transition from inside to outside of buildings.

Craig Hensley moved, second by John Sorcinelli to continue to a date uncertain. Applicant to work with Staff on making changes suggested by the Board and possibly seek City sponsored design assistance.

Motion Carried Unanimously.

Case No. 06-47

Associate Planner Laura Lockett presented request for policy determination on window material in town core at San Dimas Community Church located at 216 North San Dimas Avenue.

Mark Winkelman, Windows Etc., was present.

Sample of window material on display for the Board.

Board discussed Secretary of Interior requirements as it relates to materials used on historic structures.

Upon review of photos of existing windows, Mr. Sorcinelli felt that the window could be restored instead of having them replaced. A building that is historically and culturally significant should have higher standard than residential property. In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Mr. Winkelman confirmed that exact measurements of the existing windows can not be replicated with proposed replacement windows.

Planning Manager Hensley suggested that City Council look at this product and similar as an alternative to 100% wood windows for historically significant structures in the Town Core.

The Board further discussed how product relates to historic buildings and setting precedence for future requests.

Craig Hensley moved, second by John Sorcinelli to deny with the following:

- As it relates to residential structures that are listed as “contributing structures”, Staff to find out if this type of window material would be acceptable by the National Trust for Historic Preservation;
- This public building is a community significant structure;
- Applicant encouraged to restore windows following guidelines per Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Historic Structures.

Motion Carried 5.1.1. (Scott Dilley against, Sandy McHenry abstained).

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 A.M. to the meeting of July 13, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.