

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

**February 14, 2008 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

PRESENT

*Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curtis Morris, Mayor
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works*

ABSENT

*Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

CALL TO ORDER

Curtis Morris 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

MOTION: Krishna Patel moved, second by Scott Dilley, to approve minutes of January 24, 2008. Motion carried 5.0.2.0. (Sorcinelli and Schoonover absent)

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No 05-12

Request to review revisions to entry canopy of Costco located at 520 North Lone Hill, southeast corner of Lone Hill and Gladstone.
Zone: SP-24

Michael Okuma, Costco, was present.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development, Larry Stevens, stated that applicant has submitted a request to revise entry canopy to address

inadequate protection from rain. Mr. Stevens stated that Staff indicated to applicant that enclosing the rear portion of the canopy was allowable, but enclosing the front portion would need to be reviewed by the Board as the open truss design would be compromised, resulting in a loss of visual quality.

Director of Development Services, Dan Coleman, stated that there did not appear to be a difference as it relates to rain protection with open or enclosed entry canopy because the roof extends 24 feet out from building entry.

Mr. Okuma presented the Board with color sample boards and elevations. In response to Mr. Coleman, he stated that Costco is dealing with rain and wind dynamic of the open entry canopy. Rain came into the building during the recent storm and has caused concern with slip and fall conditions at entry. Also of concern were unsafe conditions for Costco greeters. He suggested creating a back drop shadow effect by enclosing the entry canopy with a solid arch element. In response to the Board, Mr. Okuma stated that rain water would be redirected away from the front as to not create a waterfall effect at entry and that he is in discussion internally regarding lighting.

Mr. Patel stated that he prefers the open entry canopy.

Mr. Dille expressed concerns with enclosing the back, thus creating a tunnel effect.

Mr. Michaelis stated that he understands the need for enclosing the entry due to the weather that comes from the west, though some of the architectural element will be lost by enclosing the entry canopy.

The Board concurred that the Terra Brown color would aid in highlighting the truss if enclosed.

Motion: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Dan Coleman to approve enclosing entry canopy with the Terra Brown color scheme.

Motion carried 5.0.2.0.

DPRB Case No. 06-17

Request to construct a new 4,729 sq. ft. commercial/office building located at 217 West Bonita. APN: 8387-014-033. Zone: CG-2

Jonnothan Muresan, applicant, was present.

Doug Schultz, architect, was present.

Ted Powl, Chamber of Commerce, was present.

Paul Kirby, 213 West Bonita Avenue, was present.

Planning Manager Hensley presented facts and issues of request. Parking proposed does not meet the minimum required by Code. Possible ways to address parking could be in the form of off-site parking arrangement, deferral, variance or a program for parking in-lieu fees. This section of the downtown does not have a parking district. Developing this section of the downtown to meet the current parking requirements will be a challenge.

He stated that this item was heard by the Board in 2006. Plans have been revised to reflect a style more typical for the downtown. Staff recommends that approval and building permits be subject to parking deficit situation being addressed.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Mr. Hensley indicated that the Zoning Code requirement for 1) a landscape planter along west edge of parking lot, 2) landscape planters at ends or parking rows, and 3) trees to shade parking spaces do not apply to properties within the historic downtown; therefore, no variances were required.

The Board concurred that there were a number of ideas and issues to consider for parking such as:

- Acquire parking and where;
- In-lieu parking fees;
- What will City Council support;
- Construct a parking lot and the location of;
- Create new parking district;
- Parking assessments;

Mr. Coleman stated that the building was attractive. He indicated he would not support allowing this building to be built without sufficient parking being provided concurrently. He suggested a mural on west elevation and landscape fingers and buffers with shade trees. In addition, remove Condition No. 9. as it is unrelated text.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve with revision of Condition No. 7 to require that the parking issue be resolved prior to issuance of building permits.

Motion carried 5.0.2.0.

No Case No.

Consideration of a policy for exterior fireplaces.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that a number of inquiries regarding development of detached exterior fireplaces have prompted Staff to consider a development policy. Currently a proposal for an exterior fireplace located at 814 Avenida Bernardo in SP-7 is being reviewed. The Building Department has been consulted. The building regulation for exterior fireplaces is that chimney must be two feet above anything within ten feet.

The Board reviewed suggested policy:

“The intention of this policy is to create a set of development standards only for exterior fireplaces city-wide. A fireplace is an architectural element consisting of a space designed to contain a fire for warmth or decorative purposes with a chimney. There are two types of fireplaces – wood burning and non-wood burning, which requires an electrical or gas line to work.”

- Minimum setback: Five feet from the fireplace structure to any property line and ten feet to any structure.
- Maximum height of chimney: Ten feet.

The Board suggested adding:

- DPRB review required if proposal is for chimney higher than ten feet.
- All building code requirements must be met.

The Board concurred to approve policy for exterior fireplaces with the addition of:

- DPRB review required if proposal is for chimney higher than ten feet.
- All building code requirements must be met.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a.m. to the meeting of February 28, 2008 at 8:30 a.m.