

**CITY OF SAN DIMAS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
March 10, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
186 VILLAGE COURT
PUBLIC CONFERENCE ROOM, TEMPORARY CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Emmett Badar, City Council
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Ken Duran, Assistant City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager*

ABSENT

Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission

CALL TO ORDER

Emmett Badar 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 Public Conference room.

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 10-04 – Preliminary Review

Applicant has requested continuance until the March 24, 2011 meeting.

Request to add a 5,200 sq. ft. auto repair shop to the existing main storage/office building and enclose portions of the north and south elevation of the building and enclose portions of the north and south elevation of the building, in addition to adding 1,500 sq. ft. of open storage to another existing building. The additions and enclosures have already been constructed without City approval and permits located at 155 N Eucla Avenue.

Related Case: Conditional Use Permit 10-03

APN: 8386-006-010

Zone: Specific Plan No. 23

MOTION: Moved by Larry Stevens, seconded by Krishna Patel to continue the item until a date uncertain.

Motion carried 6-0-1 (Schoonover, Absent)

John Sorcinelli excused himself from participating in the following item, DPRB Case No. 11-01, since he is participating as the architect for the applicant.

DPRB Case No. 11-01

Request to revise an existing Master Sign Program for San Dimas Station at 515-670 West Arrow Highway.

APN(s): 8386-007-070, 8386-007-064, 8386-007-073, 8386-007-069, 8386-007-068, 8386-007-063, 8386-007-065, 8386-007-066, 8386-007-075, 8386-007-076, 8386-007-077, 8386-007-078, 8386-007-080, and 8386-007-074

Zone: CG-1 (Creative Growth)

Brad Umansky, Applicant, was present
John Sorcinelli, Architect was present

Associate Planner Kristi Grabow presented facts about the master sign program for the San Dimas Station. She noted that the existing sign program was recently revised and approved by the Development Plan Review Board in August 2010. She explained that the master sign program is being revised to include revision and editing of language used. She noted that the wall signs installed on the rear elevations of the buildings lack visibility to the freeway due to the lack of landscape trimming. She added that even if the approval is granted for the removal of trees, it still does not address the lack of architectural detail and unaesthetic appearance from the public view of the rear elevation. She noted that the applicant agreed not to pursue adding signage on the rear elevation until Caltrans trims or removes the trees along the freeway to improve the visibility. She also pointed out the issue with the new location of the proposed monument signs and the option to install signs at the rear elevation of building Unit 677, which poses a dilemma because the Shell Gas Station building has a setback very close to the neighboring building. She added that it would be difficult to allow signage on the elevation because it could be blocked by any future development to the Shell Gas Station, whom has approached Staff regarding potential modifications to the site. She pointed out Staff's confusion on materials used for the pylon sign and noted that Staff requested that the ledgestone remain until there was concrete information that having that material at the base would cause corrosion and reminded the applicant that any changes to the materials should be approved at Staff level. She concluded that Staff has allowed the Zendejas sign to remain on the rear elevation; however, the sign will become nonconforming. She noted that the nonconforming status will allow the existing sign to stay but will not be allowed to be replaced or modified.

Mr. Duran asked if all the changes conform to the City's Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Stevens replied that it does conform to the Sign Ordinance but noted that a Master Sign Program is created to ensure architectural compatibility for a unified shopping center.

Mr. Duran asked if the Target Shopping Center has a sign that faces the freeway. Associate Planner Grabow responded that they have three signs at the back but they have more decorative detail on the buildings and added that some parts of the center are not visible to the freeway.

Mr. Duran asked if the sign program allows rear elevation signs based on the size of the tenant space.

Mr. Stevens responded that Staff did not have much control in creating Target's sign program. He noted the Ralph's Center is similar and has a condition prohibiting signs.

Mr. Patel stated his concerns with the rear elevation signs at San Dimas Station South, the number of pylon signs, as well as the removal of trees, recommended adding a condition to obtain an encroachment permit from the Public Works Department for removing the pylon sign in San Dimas Station North, and the height of the monument signs in regards to possible line-of-sight issues.

Mr. Stevens responded that they will need a demolition and encroachment permit. He noted that all of the signs need to have a line-of-sight clearance. He noted that the Master Sign Program is appearing before the Development Plan Review Board because of concerns which include: the original monument signs approved are smaller than permitted by code, the decision to make a larger monument signs, the use of ledgestone on pylon signs, and the rear facing signs on the south facing the freeway and on Building 677.

Brad Umansky, Applicant, stated that he was hired by STG Realty Ventures Inc. as the management company. He explained that he has worked with John Sorcinelli, architect, and STG to make the monument sign more eye-catching. He explained that he has read through the Master Sign Program and has found many inconsistencies including signs that are currently at the location which would have not been allowed through the existing guidelines.

Mr. Umansky noted Staff's issue is with the material used for the pylon sign. He commented that the intention is to use metal roofing material versus concrete material since it weighs less and the method of attachment is safer. He stated they would like the base of the sign to have faux ledgestone to allow for building of a hatch for maintenance of the base. He recommended that the language for pylon sign requirements be revised within the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Stevens commented that there is some flexibility within the Master Sign Program regarding the use of materials, given the location and appropriateness of the change; however, it would not be approved on a monument sign due to the exposure because it will not have structure issues. He noted that ledgestone needs to be used on the base; however Staff is open to consider other design options. He added that Staff will be less flexible for the use of faux ledgestone on monuments at the front because of their visibility and exposure.

Mr. Umansky pointed out Page 14 in the Master Sign Program, which discusses pylon signs and noted that the pylon drawing that was submitted showed more panels than allowed in the program and added that Staff came back indicated they need to replicate the drawing. He noted that it was previously approved allowing six to eleven names on each side of the pylon sign; however they are too small and defeat the purpose of having them. He noted they are proposing a cabinet and will determine what businesses are going to be included on it. Mr. Umansky stated the Zendejas monument sign will be removed when the new monument signs are installed. He noted that the Bonita Avenue

monument sign will need to be relocated so to not impede visibility and noted he will work with the Public Works division on those type of issues.

Mr. Umansky commented on the issue with the freeway elevation and noted that taking down the trees is not an option, but maintenance such as thinning out the branches can be accomplished. He also did not object to adding architectural detail to the rear of the building; however, if he did not have support from the City for rear elevation signs, there was no point in contacting Caltrans for maintenance or making changes to the building. He noted the value of the pad buildings is the ability to identify who the tenants are, and if they are not allowed signs on the rear of the 677 building, they will lose value. He stated there is no guarantee on when the gas station may want to expand and would like to have the rear elevation signs now, and could disclose to potential tenants that their sign may be blocked in the future if the Shell station expands.

Mr. Umansky wanted to clarify that he would still be allowed to have the monument signs even though Staff is requiring a condition for a Landscape Maintenance Agreement. His concern was if he were to clean up the appearance of the trees, Staff would say the tenant spaces were no visible and the center did not require monument signs.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that Condition No. 8 requires a landscape agreement to be finalized with the property owner which makes them responsible for the maintenance of common areas within the San Dimas Station.

Mr. Stevens stated the intent of the requirement is that they don't want to grant approval for the monument signs based on lack of visibility caused by the trees, and then have all the trees topped. The purpose of the agreement is to ensure proper pruning and maintenance techniques, or replacement of trees per an approved plan. He noted the Ralph's Center has a landscape agreement and monument signs due to the setback of the buildings and difference in elevation from street.

Mr. Duran asked if the landscaping agreement is submitted to the City, are they entitled to monument signs based on Condition 8.

Mr. Umansky added that he is not familiar with landscape agreements and asked if the City could provide an example for him. He went through the conditions and requested eliminating Condition No. 6 and asked for clarification of Condition No. 7.

Mr. Stevens replied that routine maintenance is acceptable such as replacing letters that have fallen out or replacing discolored plastic but replacing the Zendejas sign with a new business sign is not permitted.

Mr. Patel requested that Condition No. 9 be eliminated.

Mr. Umansky stated that he would like Condition No. 13 amended to allow signs for new tenants prior to approval of the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Duran asked if the current Master Sign Program applies until the revisions are approved.

Mr. Stevens felt if a new tenant submitted for a sign and was not affected by any of the proposed revisions, then a permit could be issued using the existing Sign Program.

Mr. Duran asked if all the property owners reviewed the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Stevens replied that the majority owner is responsible for the common area and they can impose requirements. He noted that most of the pad buildings will not be affected because they have their signs.

Mr. Umansky stated the CC&Rs allow the majority owner the right to modify the Master Sign Program without full approval of the other owners.

Mr. Beilstein commented that Condition No. 2 covers maintenance of the signs but inquired what will cover the Shell Gas Station signage.

Mr. Stevens responded that there is no sign program for that location as they are an individual user.

Mr. Duran commented that he agrees with Staff on the freeway facing signs and felt they needed more information from Caltrans before approving.

Mr. Stevens pointed out a secondary sign is permitted by Code but that the concern was with the lack of aesthetic architectural details on the rear of the building.

Mr. Duran noted that he supports the Zendejas sign and Mr. Dilley felt the rear elevations signs should be allowed on the 677 Building due to its irregular shape.

Mr. Stevens stated it appears that a portion of the 677 Building hangs over the property line, and asked if someone were to come in to pull a sign permit for the rear elevation, would the City ask to see permission for access from the neighboring property owner.

Mr. Beilstein stated it may be possible to install a sign from the roof, but if they saw a truck on the Shell property, they would assume the contractor was given permission.

Brad Umansky, applicant, stated if Zendejas were to leave, the space would be subdivided and he would like the ability to add signs.

Mr. Stevens noted that there are only 2 tenants near Zendejas and added that before Zendejas expanded, the location had 4 tenant spaces.

Associate Planner Grabow noted that there are currently 4 addresses onsite and added that Zendejas cannot have additional signs because they have the maximum allowed 3 signs.

Mr. Duran recollected and confirmed with Associate Planner Grabow that Zendejas is not divided and they are entitled to 2 signs but if subdivided they are allowed a maximum of 3 signs.

Mr. Patel felt that the signage on back of the building facing Bonita Avenue was appropriate.

Mr. Stevens stated Staff can write a condition stating if and when the space is subdivided and if the Code allows a secondary wall sign, they can amend the Master Sign Program.

Mr. Beilstein stated if the building is subdivided to accommodate smaller tenants, having signs for all the businesses on the rear elevation could make it appear cluttered.

Brad Umansky, Applicant, asked if there can be signs on the rear of the building facing Cienega Avenue where the pizza restaurant is located, and Mr. Sorcinelli confirmed that it was not part of the original Master Sign Program for signs to be located there.

Associate Planner Grabow stated the pizza restaurant has three signs already, two facing the front and one on the side.

Mr. Duran felt the building along Cienega Avenue was not a major building and did not think rear elevation signs would be appropriate there, and Mr. Patel confirmed that Cienega Avenue has 70% less traffic than Bonita Avenue.

Mr. Badar asked for clarification of the complications with the Zendejas sign.

Mr. Stevens felt the rear elevation sign was inappropriate because part of the building appears to hang over the property line, and the location could be blocked if Shell were to build another building.

Mr. Sorcinelli, Architect, stated the extension of the roofline on the monument signs makes it difficult to finish the corners because of the tight dimensions.

Mr. Stevens stated they were designed to mimic the freeway signs, but if they maintained consistency with that look, minor modifications could be considered to make it easier to construct them.

MOTION: Moved by Ken Duran, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve amending the Master Sign Program to allow rear elevation signs on Building 677 as shown in the exhibits, remove the rear facing wall signs on Cienega Avenue and elevations facing the 57/210 freeway, amend the language of Condition No. 9 to allow flexibility in the placement of all the monument signs as long as they do not impede line-of-sight, add a requirement to obtain an encroachment permit prior to removing pylon sign located in San Dimas Station North, and amend Condition No. 13 to allow issuance of permits for signs that are not affected by the proposed amendments to the Master Sign Program.

Motion carried 4-1-1-1 (Stevens No, Schoonover Absent, and Sorcinelli Abstained, participating with applicant as architect)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:07 a.m. to the meeting of March 24, 2011, at 8:30 a.m.