

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
February 23, 2012 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

*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*

**ABSENT**

*Emmett Badar, City Council*

**CALL TO ORDER**

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve the minutes of December 9, 2010. Motion carried 5.0.1.1 (Badar Absent and Patel Abstain)

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve the minutes of January 13, 2011. Motion carried 5.0.1.1 (Badar Absent and Sorcinelli Abstain)

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve the minutes of January 26, 2012. Motion carried 6.0.1.0 (Badar Absent)

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve the minutes of February 9, 2012. Motion carried 5.0.1.1 (Badar Absent and Sorcinelli Abstain)

**DPRB Case No. 11-42**

A request to build 67 townhomes within the undeveloped portion of the Grove Station project located on the east side of San Dimas Avenue just south of the railroad tracks.

Zone: Creative Growth (CG-3B)

Allison Kunz, applicant, Olson Company, was present

John Reekstin, Vice-President of Olson Company, was present  
Alan Scales, Architect of KTG Group, was present  
Peter Duarte, Landscape Architect of Studio Pad, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that this item was previously heard as a preliminary review by the Board on January 26, 2012. At that meeting the Board requested the applicant work on a number of issues with Staff. One concern is with the design of the trash enclosures which should comply with City standards. He noted that Staff visited the Covina site that uses the proposed trash enclosures and discovered they were: difficult to open, they are not designed to open from the sides, one is forced to overextend themselves to open the bin if not placed against the enclosure wall and they do not meet the intent of the City Standard. Staff is working with the applicant to revise the drawings to allow for better pedestrian circulation and providing screen walls to meet the City standards. The 2<sup>nd</sup> issue was direct accessibility from Building 2 and 3 to the street level along the main driveway. The applicant feels the current design is the best solution. This would pose a buyer concern with regard to livability of this unit. Buildings 2 and 3 provide ground level living area and the benefit of that living space is attributed to the direct access to the garage and entry all on one level. The 3<sup>rd</sup> issue was to consider an alternative to the finish materials to replace the use of Hardie Board siding on Buildings 5 and 6. The applicant stated that the other material option to use would be stucco or brick which is already being proposed on the building currently. The applicant feels by using Hardie Board, it adds a different architectural element; however, they are proposing to use stucco on the first floor with decorative columns and Hardie Board above on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors, which Staff approves of. The 4<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise the renderings so they depict the streetscape from Building 2 to 3. The applicant revised the plans to show where the streetscape would be in relation to Building 2.

The 5<sup>th</sup> issue was to identify the proposed street light fixtures on the plans. The applicant proposed using the same street light design which is currently being used at the project and provided photos for the Board. The 6<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise the plans to provide screening of the parking stalls along the main driveway from Buildings 2 and 3, to prevent the glare from vehicle headlights to shine into the units. The applicant has provided landscape plans providing proper screening and Condition No. 53 will reflect this. The 7<sup>th</sup> issue was to provide a variety of garage door designs on the larger building pods to break up the monotony of the same door design and the applicant has provided a variety of garage doors. The 8<sup>th</sup> issue was to provide a 2D rendering and/or cross-section depicting each entry door with stoops and rails to better understand the extent of the area, which the applicant provided. The 9<sup>th</sup> issue was to reduce or increase the driveways for the units to three feet or 19 feet deep. In order to address this without redesigning some buildings, a Lot Line Adjustment Application has been filed to move Buildings 2 and 3 to reduce their driveway depths to three feet. The 10<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise parking stall No. 44 to 11 feet wide which the applicant has complied with. The 11<sup>th</sup> issue was to provide cross-sections of the perimeter walls at different intervals of the project; focusing on the North, South and East walls to screen the City Yard which the applicant has provided on the Conceptual Grading Plan. The 12<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise the CC&R's to note that the tenants are required to maintain the interior of their garages to be free and clear of any obstructions that would prohibit the parking of two vehicles, which has been added as a Condition of Approval, Condition No. 18. The 13<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise the CC&R's to mention the future building of the Gold Line Extension, which has been added as a Condition of Approval, Condition No. 17. The 14<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise the Conditions of Approval to reflect the Quimby Fees, which has been added in

Condition No. 80 and 81. The 15<sup>th</sup> issue was to revise the Conditions of Approval to note the required building improvements required by the noise study, which has been added in Condition 43, 44 and 45. The last issue was to create a condition to provide for any vacant building pads to be fully landscaped (ground cover) and irrigated if the building pads not developed within three years of DPRB and PC approval, which has been added in Condition No. 46. Staff feels that the applicant has addressed all the issues except the trash enclosure and landscaping and recommends approval.

Mr. Coleman inquired about the material used for the walls around the stoop areas.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that it will be similar to the retaining walls.

Ms. Kunz added that the individual patio walls will have stucco.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, asked if the moving of Building 2 and 3 are within the existing pad with no reduction of the current paved area.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied yes and added there will be sufficient space for vehicles to maneuver in and out. He added that the applicant is filing for a Lot Line Adjustment application for the additional 5 ft. needed.

Mr. Beilstein asked if the paved area has been reduced.

Ms. Kunz replied that they are increasing the drive aprons within the same pad.

Mr. Patel asked if Buildings 9-11 are the only ones that have a driveway and asked if the building could move north to allow for additional parking.

Mr. Coleman replied that there is a problem with parking at the north ends and if you shift to the north, you end up losing parking. Also, the trash enclosures are located to the North so there is no additional room thus the building cannot be moved to the north.

Mr. Patel stated that on the North side of the property there is a sewer easement and inquired if Building 5 will be moved.

Ms. Kunz replied yes and added it is reflected within the plans.

Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager, requested a condition be added that a LEED certification be submitted.

Mr. Coleman added that the certification can only occur once the project is complete. He noted that the LEED score sheet can be included on the construction plans.

Associate Planner Espinoza confirmed that those two conditions can be added to the Conditions of Approval. He noted that Condition No. 41 will also be removed.

Ms. Kunz commented that they have addressed many of the Board's concerns including: providing the streetscape renderings; however the trash enclosure is still an outstanding issue that needs to be remedied. The 3-foot deep parking approaches have been met and noted that a Lot Line Adjustment application has been submitted. This would reduce the concern for parking in the driveway aprons.

Mr. Schoonover inquired about the phasing stages.

Ms. Kunz responded that there are 6 construction phases but added it is based on the responses from the public and obtaining the Certificate of Occupancy's.

Mr. Schoonover asked if 50% of the sales need to be met prior to moving from phase to phase.

Ms. Kunz replied yes and added that presales will begin when the sales trailer goes up.

Mr. Coleman inquired when the phasing would take place for the community open space area.

Ms. Kunz responded in the lateral phases.

Mr. Coleman commented that he is not thrilled with that occurring in the later stages and requested that the phase be moved up if possible.

Ms. Kunz responded that she will have to talk to the operations team.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant has contacted Waste Management to service the trash enclosures and if the applicant has met the recycling requirements.

Ms. Kunz replied yes and added that it is a condition of approval.

Mr. Coleman asked what the phasing dates will be like from start to finish.

Ms. Kunz responded 18 months, depending on sales. The time frame could be from March 2012 through April 2014.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed his concern with the Hardie Board used on the siding on the ground floor for Building 8 and added it should be eliminated. He noted that Grove Station currently uses Hardie board at the back and side of the property but not on the façade.

Mr. Patel suggested that on Building 5 and 6 the Hardie panels convey a lower quality standard when there are high quality finishes at Grove Station. Condition No. 17 should note the bridge or connector that connects the right-of-way to the proposed Gold Line parking structure.

Mr. Stevens stated that the mechanics to address the easement is that they would need to go through a formal vacation since it cannot be address in a Lot Line Adjustment.

Mr. Coleman asked where the easement discussion is at in the Staff Report.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded it is not in the Staff Report but in the CUP application.

Mr. Michaelis commented he understands the Hardie board may not be an appealing material to some; however, the key colors do blend well together. He added that if the

applicant is meeting the standard requirements imposed by the City then it should be a recommendation for the type material to use for the siding versus a condition to impose.

**MOTION:** Moved by Blaine Michaelis, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve with the following conditions: include the LEED score sheet on plans, submit a verification of LEED certification and removal of Condition No. 41.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that Hardie panel is not the material that should be for this project but instead it's used for Single-Family Residential projects and not in the Downtown area. He requested an amendment to the motion to include the applicant remove the Hardie panel from the ground floor.

Mr. Patel 2<sup>nd</sup> the amendment.

Mr. Schoonover interjected informing the Board that the amendment is void because it needs to be made by the original motioned member.

Ms. Kunz emphasized that the Hardie material adds another element to the project but added they are willing to take off the siding at the entry levels; however it will remain at the top of the building.

John Reekstin, Vice-President of Olson Company, requested that the Board approve what is currently being proposed.

The original Motion made by Blaine Michaelis carried 4-2-1-0 (Patel and Sorcinelli No and Badar Absent)

#### **DPRB Case No. 12-04**

A request to construct a 499 sq. ft. rear addition to an existing 1,080 sq. ft. house, listed on the City's Historic Survey at 525 N San Dimas Avenue.

APN: 8387-002-021

Zone: Single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Steve Eide, applicant, was present

Ray and Jenni Schwach, property owners of 525 N San Dimas Ave, were present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that this home is listed on the City's Historic Survey and is 100 years old. The house was constructed in 1912 as a one-story California Bungalow with clap board siding. The applicant is proposing a 499 sq. ft. rear addition which will match the architectural style of the house. It will feature: a five-inch exposed wood clapboard siding, knee brackets, wood trim around the windows, lattice style gable and vents, 2 x 6 fascia board and an extended eave overhang. The applicant has discussed the option of using Hardie board siding for the rear addition. In addition, Staff requested a break in the siding to differentiate the original home from the new addition. The wood windows are a concern and noted that the applicant is looking at vinyl windows as an option; however, wood trim would still be used.

Steve Eide, applicant, explained that the applicant would like to use Hardie board siding on the South elevation of the original home since the sun beats down excessively and causes visible damage to the existing wood siding.

Associate Planner Espinoza commented that Staff can look more closely at the Hardie board proposal and will return to the Board for review.

Mr. Coleman asked if Hardie board comes in 5-inches exposure.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied he will investigate the Hardie board options.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there are any proposed changes to the existing siding.

Associate Planner Espinoza asked the applicant if the issue is only on the South elevation of the house or also on the north and east elevations as well.

Jenni Schwach, property owner of 525 N San Dimas Ave, explained that the sun beats on the enclosed porch area on the East side of the property but isn't as much as a concern as the south side of the property.

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that house across the street from this property removed all the siding due to termites. He posed the question, could the applicant remove all the siding since it is historic. He answered maybe; however, asked the applicant to take a closer look at their options and return to the Board if it will all be removed.

Mr. Coleman commented that he is not opposed to using Hardie board on the new addition.

**MOTION:** Moved by Dan Coleman, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve with standard conditions.

Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Badar Absent)

### **DPRB Case No. 12-03**

A request to modify an existing stealth wireless facility designed as a chimney top and construct a new one in the same design. The new facility will also be atop the existing two-story office building (Century 21) on the opposite side. The office building is located at 1100 Via Verde and is part of the Vons shopping center.

APN: 8448-022-026

Zone: Commercial-Highway (C-N)

Lynda Hernandez, applicant, was present

Dick McClelland, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the originally approved cell site was approved by the Board on December 10, 2009 as a chimney top on the North side of the building with a mechanical room enclosure. He added that they were architecturally compatible with the Spanish architectural details of the existing building and the shopping center. The applicant is proposing to modify the existing facility internally with no exterior

modifications in order to increase the service. The new chimney top proposed will be located on the South corner of the second-story roof, the top of the chimney will be eight feet above the existing height of the roof ridge to match existing, the chimney will be 10 feet wide facing Puente Street and 8'-8" feet wide facing the parking lot, the chimney is square in shape with a stucco trim molding at the top to match existing and the chimney will be stucco to match the existing building.

Mr. Schoonover asked what the distance is between the two chimneys.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied 30 feet.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if they are proposing another equipment enclosure.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied no.

**MOTION:** Moved by Blaine Michaelis, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve with standard conditions.

Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Badar Absent)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 a.m. to the meeting of March 8, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.

---

Jim Schoonover, Chairman  
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

---

Jessica Mejia  
Development Plan Review Board  
Departmental Assistant

Approved: March 22, 2012