

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
July 28, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Emmett Badar, City Council
Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:32 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Development Plan Review Board

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve the minutes of July 14, 2011. Motion carried 5.0.0.2 (Badar and Dilley Abstain)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – License and Permit Hearing Board

MOTION: Jim Schoonover moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve the minutes of July 14, 2011. Motion carried 6.0.0.2 (Badar and Dilley Abstain)

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 10-39

Continued from February 10, 2011. A request to build a 471 square foot addition and 504 square foot detached garage at 225 North Iglesia Street.

APN: 8387-013-001

Zone: Single-Family-7500

Mike Lancy, Applicant, was present

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that the applicant is requesting a 471 sq. ft. addition as well as a 504 sq. ft. detached garage which was continued from the DPRB meeting of February 10, 2011. He explained that the Board's recommendation at the time was for the applicant to return to the Board with plans consistent with Option B. He noted that Option B was comprised of the following: 3-foot wall setback from rear property line P.L., minimum 2-foot eave setback from rear P.L., 1-Hour fire-rated construction within 5 ft. from rear P.L. and roof slope and eave depth to match existing. He added that the proposed Hardie-Board is compatible with the historic house and transitions well from the existing wood siding. He concluded that the proposal is consistent with Option B.

Mr. Patel asked if the garage was setback 3 feet from the alley.

Assistant Planner Concepcion replied that it is 5 feet from the rear and 5 feet from the alley.

Mr. Patel commented that the photo shows an existing lodge pole fence located in the public right-of-way off of Iglesia St. and added that it should not encroach in the right-of-way and should be relocated away from the public right-of-way.

MOTION: Moved by Dan Coleman, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve and add the condition to relocate the lodge pole fence away from the public right-of-way.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 11-34

A request to approve the "Citrus Station" (previously known as the Costco Center) Design Guidelines.

Zone: Specific Plan No. 24 Area 1

Jennifer Murillo, applicant, was present
Michael Okuma, applicant, was present
Steve Rodela, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the request is to approve the "Citrus Station" (previously known as the Costco Center) Design Guidelines. He indicated that the Citrus Station is zoned Specific Plan No. 24, Area 1 – Regional Commercial. He explained that the Design Guidelines were submitted but not completed and is here today for input. He added that the Design Guidelines are currently in final draft form and need to be formatted with additional items and corrections relating to site circulations, colors, materials, etc. He noted that the intent of the Guidelines is to ensure a cohesive design with the pad buildings at the center which include down spouts be located inside the walls so as not to be seen by the public. He added that wall pack lighting is similar to the staff report where it shines downward and not outward. He added that the updated verbage will include text taken from the Specific Plan and include revisions to the pedestrian plan so that there is more access from pad to pad and are ADA accessible. He recommended that Staff work with the applicant on the minor revisions and if changes cannot be agreed upon, then they will return back to the Board.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the lighting fixtures comply with the California Green Building Code.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, replied that it is automatically subject to comply.

Mr. Schoonover asked if a Californian theme is mandatory or optional.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that it is a guideline and code requirement for non-residential projects and added that corporate designs are allowed.

Mr. Schoonover commented that Tucson is not early Californian and added that it would fit better under the corporate definition.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that the Guidelines allow for flexibility with corporate design.

Mr. Michaelis asked for examples of outstanding issues in the Design Guidelines.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the formatting, verbage and the incorporation of additional photos.

Jennifer Murrillo, Applicant, asked what kind of revisions would be required of the pedestrian plan.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that they are trying to create a cohesive path between pads for example, from Pad A to Pad B. He noted that there is an existing walkway through the parking lot and added that the pedestrian paths is within the site should meet ADA accessibility from Lone Hill Avenue and Gladstone St.

Assistant City Manager, Larry Stevens, explained that there is an existing Path B that goes from Costco. He noted that they should be linked all the way to Path B in the future and added that most of these paths already exist.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that all pads along Lone Hill Ave require pedestrian access and the A, B and C pads are not shown to have that access.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that Panda Express has a pedestrian access off of the main driveway.

Mr. Coleman stated that it is required and will be discussed when this item moves forward at future meetings.

Mr. Murrillo concluded that she will work with Staff.

MOTION: Moved by Blaine Michaelis, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve and to add the condition that the lighting fixtures be in compliance with the California Green Building Code.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 11-14, Precise Plan No. 11-02 and Tree Permit 11-25

A request to construct a new Olive Garden restaurant to be located near the Southeast corner of Lone Hill Avenue and Gladstone Street.

Associated Case: CUP 11-03

Zone: Specific Plan No. 24

John Keen, applicant, was present
Tyler Holst, was present
Kimley Horn, was present

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the applicant is requesting to construct a new restaurant, Olive Garden at the Citrus Station. She noted that the architectural design is a Tuscan farmhouse style which is under the corporate guidelines. She added that the Olive Garden will share a parking lot with a retail space, not being developed as of right now, but will construct the shared lot and it's improvements. She stated that the applicant will remove 4 mature Oak trees and replace those with twenty-six 36" box Oak trees. She pointed out that there were issues with the removing of the Oak trees and noted that Staff would like to preserve and relocate instead of removing them; however she explained that Staff is open to the idea for the removal. She stated that there is no proposed walkway access to connect with Lone Hill Avenue. She noted that according to the ADA requirements, there must be a pedestrian accessible pathway from the City sidewalk to the restaurant; thus a condition will be added. She stated that the downspouts of the building need to be incorporated into the architecture. She pointed out that the proposed plans shows a jog around an existing curb cut which will be removed and replaced with landscaping.

Assistant City Manager, Larry Stevens, commented that the action made today will serve as a preliminary approval; thus the conditions of approval are stamped draft. He explained that this item will be treated as a Precise Plan and be presented at Planning Commission, City Council and return to DPRB for final design approval.

Associate Planner Grabow responded that the trees have the potential to be saved and added they would like to preserve, but the likely hood is slim.

Mr. Badar commented that he understands Staff's concern with preserving the Oak trees because a plant transplant does not last. He added that in lieu of that, the applicant is proposing plenty more trees and emphasized that it's an obstacle that does not need to be addressed.

Mr. Stevens stated that it would depend on the size of the drip line and noted that if it is large it can be compromised. He explained that it can be further evaluated and can be a part of the conditions of approval with the final approval. He commented that there were 300 trees for the Costco project and a bulk of them were removed primarily because the site grading indicated they were not mostly Oak trees. He added that the Oak trees were not left to preserve but were intended to evaluate them feasibly because they were not in the way.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that the tree provide shade for the Pad building and added that it would reduce energy costs. He noted that by keeping the tree, 2 or 3 parking spaces will be lost. He stated that the size of that tree can never be replaced and added that it also provides streetscape along Lone Hill Avenue.

Mr. Patel stated that there is a driveway entrance near the stop sign and commented that near Lone Hill Avenue it is a busier intersection. Mr. Patel asked if the driveway off Lone Hill Avenue can have a better internal circulation that serves Pad B and Olive Garden

Mr. Stevens stated that the internal linkage street is different. He pointed out that the driveways can be looked at before final approval. He also noted that the Oak tree can be addressed and added that clearly the number of parking spaces is not an overall issue.

Mr. Badar asked if the 1 Oak tree is the concern in regards to losing parking spaces.

Mr. Coleman asked about the way the southerly driveway's appearance at the stop limit line and noted that one vehicle will change out and block the exit of the driveway. He added that he doesn't want a dead end parking lot to be created.

Mr. Stevens commented that it is a logical solution for a reoriented parking lot which would include a drive aisle and noted that it can be determined how it affects the parking space. He added that Staff will take a look at circulation.

John Keen, Applicant, stated that the plans include the driveway to accommodate truck deliveries and if it is taken out, it will damage curbs and landscaping.

Mr. Keen stated that if the Oak tree remains, Olive Garden would lose more than 2 spaces thus more people would park at Costco.

Mr. Badar noted that after Costco took over, there was a concern for parking and meeting Code requirements.

Mr. Stevens commented that from Costco's perspective, Costco is under parked by normal corporate standards, but over parked for our parking code standards.

Michael Okuma, on behalf of Costco, stated that on the original master plan was envisioned to be shared parking. He noted that if it is not, it will restrict free movement between the two. He added that trees have been studied and noted much effort was made to try and save them. They have tried to relocate Oak trees during Costco's construction but found that the trees had shallow roots and sandy/rocky dirt, so when they went to box the trees, there was significant damage and the trees couldn't be saved. He noted that it was a less than 20% survival rate and added that arborist studies produced then can identify this problem.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Oak tree was a part of the residential development. Staff can re-evaluate the tree survival if relocated or saved.

Mr. Sorcinelli agreed that it should be reevaluated and added that the parking spaces where the Oak tree is located has been designated for handicap accessibility.

Mr. Coleman stated that parking activity is always an issue when going to restaurants and posed his concern when the retail pad is utilized how the hours of operations would work for parking.

Mr. Michaelis referenced to the Staff Report and asked if internalizing down spouts will be an issue.

Mr. Keen replied that no down spouts will be used.

Mr. Holst stated that it will consist of a flat roof and the drains will be internalized.

Mr. Michaelis asked if there are any other issues that need to be worked out.

Mr. Coleman asked about the path of the delivery truck to Olive Garden.

Mr. Keen responded that the path of the delivery truck enters from Lone Hill Ave, loops through the parking lot and exits onto Gladstone St.

Mr. Badar inquired about amount of deliveries.

Mr. Keen responded that they occur 2 times a week prior to operation hours.

Mr. Holst added that a discussion about right turn restrictions from the parking lot can be discussed.

MOTION: Moved by Blaine Michaelis, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve as a preliminary review and recommend to Planning Commission, City Council and back to Development Plan Review Board and consider all comments made to include them with final review.

Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Badar and Schoonover Abstain)

Mr. Stevens added that no conditions can be added at this meeting but can be incorporated for review. He noted that those minor changes will be reflected on the conditions of approval when the item returns to DPRB.

DPRB Case No. 11-19 and Precise Plan No. 11-03

A request to construct a new Panda Express drive-thru restaurant within the Citrus Station (previously known as the Costco Center) to be located near the Southeast corner of Lone Hill Avenue and Gladstone Street.

Associated Case: CUP 11-05

Zone: Specific Plan No. 24

Roger Su, architect, was present
Susan Wong was present
Brian Kan, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is requesting to construct a new 2,448 sq. ft. Panda Express drive-thru restaurant. He noted that the main entrance to

the restaurant will be South of Olive Garden off of Lone Hill Avenue. He added that the applicant is proposing outdoor sitting and noted that the menu board will be facing the main driveway entrance. The building will have parapet walls to screen the mechanical equipment. He emphasized that the design features incorporate elements from the Costco Site including split-face with cornice features, metal trellis features and gooseneck lighting. He noted that the applicant has done a lot to meet the Design Guidelines in order to be cohesive with the center. He explained that the signage is not being approved currently and will be taken care of during the Master Sign Program approval. He added that the project has minor corrections which Staff has worked with the applicant on. He noted that one concern with the project is a Panda tile located on the two sides of the building which will constitute as additional signage that exceeds the Code requirements. He added that an additional 5 foot wide planter would be required. He pointed out the other concern which is the open metal awnings. He stated that Staff would like a finished look where the ends of the awnings are enclosed because at the moment they appear unfinished. He stated that there is a 42-inch split-face block wall near the menu board that will help minimize the noise and light glare for surrounding neighbors. He stated that the columns will be split-face all the way down to the bottom and the corner of the buildings will be continued down to avoid a floating effect. He pointed out an issue where the electrical room will be located and noted they are proposing on the exterior of the building at the rear.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked who uses the entrance to the North that leads to the drive-thru on the side of the building.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that it is mostly be used by the patrons that eat outside and noted that the driveway on the east will be the one used primarily. He noted that Panda Express will use digital speakers versus analogue.

Mr. Badar asked if the speaker from the drive-thru will disturb the neighbors.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that issue will be further discussed when brought to Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked how far back the wall will be to the East.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that it shall be is setback at least 3 feet from the curb so additional landscape can be installed.

Mr. Badar commented that the additional signage on the side of the wall does not look bad and without it, the building appears to look like a box.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that signage is currently being discussed and noted that changes may occur; however this sign serves as additional advertisement at this time.

Mr. Stevens stated that if the applicant wanted to incorporate their logo in their signs and they may have an alternative sign options.

Mr. Sorcinelli discussed the electrical room being internal and added that it can be put into a tower element since it would be visible from the street as currently proposed.

Mr. Coleman inquired about the hours of operation.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied not passed 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Patel inquired about the hours that deliveries will occur.

Roger Su, Architect, commented that the wall tile was originally decorative with the idea that it would not be considered signage. He noted the concern by Staff in regards to the awning and noted that it complies with the design guidelines of a metal standing seam awning. He noted that the awning provides light transfer from canvas inside windows during the day time and if changed to metal, the shade will not come thru anymore. He noted that he will comply with Staff's request for a 42-inch high split face block wall as well as having split-face columns all the way down.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that the applicant should work with Staff on the 5-foot deep planter in front at the building.

Mr. Coleman commented the idea of a planter makes sense; however, there should be a half wall in front of the outdoor seating to block fumes from the vehicles.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that if a wall is built some views will be lost.

Mr. Coleman stated that any wall 30 to 42 inches in height would do the trick.

Mr. Sorcinelli commended Staff's recommendations and asked if the Design Guidelines called out the use of metal awnings only.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that it is not a requirement and noted that the applicant can use metal awnings which isn't uncommon; however it would tie in with Costco's site. He emphasized that Staff's concern is closed off awnings.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that it is essential to go with canvas and not metal awnings because it does not soften the building and is also a maintenance issue. He stated that if there is an awning, it should be opened on both sides whereas boxed awnings give the wrong architectural message.

Mr. Stevens stated that in discussions with the applicant, there was an original proposal for canvas/cloth awnings and Staff leaned toward metal awnings because of the components on the existing Costco building. He emphasized that these comments will be taken and incorporated into the final decision.

Mr. Coleman expressed his concern with the proximity of the trash enclosure to the restaurant.

Susan Wong, Applicant, pointed out that it is not acceptable to leave trash near the door and noted that it will always be disposed. She added that the trash enclosure is far away from the restaurant because they don't want the odor to reach patrons.

Mr. Stevens asked what the hours of operation are.

Ms. Wong replied that they will close at 10:00 p.m. or 10:30 p.m. and pointed out that some areas open and close at different times and noted it is based on demographics.

Jennifer Murillo, on behalf of Costco, commended Panda Express's incorporation of Costco's architectural features.

Mr. Michaelis inquired about the applicant's thoughts of the electrical room being enclosed.

Mr. Su stated that it will most likely be enclosed.

Mr. Badar stated that he hopes Staff and the applicant work out the signage issues and that something can be reasonably worked out.

MOTION: Moved by John Sorcinelli, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve as a preliminary review and recommend to Planning Commission, City Council and back to Development Plan Review Board and consider all comments made to include them with final review.

Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Badar and Schoonover Abstain)

Mr. Stevens provided estimated dates for when this item will be heard: Planning Commission meeting August 18, City Council September 13 and DPRB September 22.

DPRB Submittal Requirements

A request to establish a policy to require 3D renderings or model of larger homes.

Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services, stated that in response to the Board's request for 3D models submittals. He noted that Staff is recommending that a scaled model be required for all homes of 5,000 sq. ft. or larger floor area in a zone.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that he appreciates Staff reviewing this policy. He recommended that the language point out that the model isn't small either and added to refine it so that a size is required with a minimum scale size like 1/8 per foot or appropriately scaled to the conditions.

Mr. Badar asked if this requirement will be an economic burden for the homeowner. Mr. Sorcinelli encouraged Staff to look at 3D renderings as a design tool.

Mr. Coleman stated that rendering colors and material have the ability to change quickly whereas 3D models would need to start over from scratch again.

Mr. Badar stated that he supports renderings.

Mr. Stevens stated that in the early 90's a model requirement did not have computer design capability. He added there is flexibility for a computer design to be equivalent to a model. He emphasized that the applicant should have the option of a model to submit; however computerized is encouraged.

Associate Planner Espinoza asked if the renderings policy will state that the rendering/3D model include entire site and if not, it should be included in the written policy.

Mr. Stevens stated that it may force the engineer to talk to the architect to make sure they are working under the same perimeters.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that 1/8 or perspective rendering should suffice. He added that the language in the policy should reflect 3D models to depict all sides of the property.

Mr. Coleman stated that he will incorporate these comments and apply them within the policy.

Associate Planner Espinoza added that it should apply to accessory structures as well.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:29 a.m. to the meeting of August 11, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.