DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
March 22, 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
Shari Garwick, Senior Engineer (Arrived at 8:41 a.m.)
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curt Morris, Mayor
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 8:38 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve the minutes of February 23, 2012. Motion carried 5.0.1.1 (Garwick Absent and Morris Abstain)

DPRB Case No. 11-26

A request to revise the site plan for the construction of 156 apartments on 6.28 acres of land located at the northwest corner of Bonita Avenue and San Dimas Canyon Road. The proposed revision would shift Podium Building B, further east and south, to approximately 85 feet from the west and north property lines to enhance fire access.

Related Cases: DPRB 09-21, Precise Plan Case No. 09-01, Tentative Tract Map 69609

APN: 8390-013-19, 20

Zone: Specific Plan No. 2

Marilyn Ponte, applicant, VCH, was present
Mary Silleit, resident, was present

Director of Development Services Dan Coleman stated that this project was approved by the City Council on August 11, 2009, and reapproved in August of 2011. The Loma Bonita Residences are the residential component of the mixed use Bonita Canyon project. The retail component finished construction in 2011. The apartment site has

been rough graded, street improvements were completed, and the final tract map was recorded. The developer is currently in plan check for construction of four 3-story apartment buildings with 13 1-, 2-bedroom floor plans ranging in size from 737 to 1,246 gross square feet. The site plan revision is necessary to comply with fire access standards of the 2010 California Fire Code and only affects Podium Building B. It was originally approved in the northwest corner of the apartment complex at the minimum 20 foot setback from the west and north property lines. LA County Fire Department indicated they would not authorize an exception as allowed by Fire Code, therefore, Podium Building B lacked sufficient paved fire access.

Mr. Coleman explained that the proposal would shift the 3-story Podium Building to the southeast to provide full driveway access around the building. The concept was reviewed and accepted by LA County Fire on January 17, 2012. This is a much more efficient layout to the site. The building will have an increased setback from the neighbor to the west from 20 feet to 84 feet and from the neighbor to the north 20 feet to 86 feet. This will also eliminate the isolation of Podium Building B from the rest of the project.

Mr. Coleman stated that the benefit of shifting the Podium Building B includes: eliminating the isolation from the rest of the projects, connects and expands the open space area and now opens onto the central open space corridor. He pointed out that there are 4 parking spaces that are shifted but an additional 3 parking spaces are picked up elsewhere. There is now a 28 ft. wide fire lane, concrete walkways, planter areas that are flushed with concrete sidewalk and ground cover, turf block, with many open cells to grow plants.

Mr. Morris asked if the standards are to use turn block.

Mr. Coleman responded that LA County standards are based on the weight of the truck.

Mr. Morris explained that there is another building in town that uses plastic versus the block concrete which will also support the weight of a fire truck and suggested it would work better.

Mr. Coleman stated that he will suggest this recommendation to LA County Fire. He noted that the elevations are approved.

MOTION: Moved by John Sorcinelli, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve with standard conditions.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 11-51 & CUP 11-11

A request to construct a new multi-purpose building for Holy Name of Mary Church located at 724 East Bonita Avenue.

APN: 8391-023-046, 47

Zone: Public/Semi-Public (PS)

Jim, JVC Architects, was present

Ron Hale, applicant, was present
Sharon Hueckel, Holy Name of Mary, was present
Tim Lopez, Holy Name of Mary, was present
Ralph Man, Stonemark Construction Management, was present

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the request is to construct a 25,663 sq. ft. multi-purpose building at Holy Name of Mary Catholic Church. In 2002, the church presented and received approval for the construction of the 27,457 sq. ft. sanctuary with offices and a 19,000 sq. ft. multi-purpose building. At that time, it would be developed in various phases due to funding for construction. The phases include (1) Construct the southern parking lot; (2) demolish the existing building on-site (the multi-purpose building, the youth hall and the parish offices) and construct the new sanctuary; (3) construct a new multi-purpose building (current phase); and (4) rehabilitation of the two existing classroom buildings match style of bldg. The original approval for the multi-purpose building has expired and is required to go back through the development process; however, the applicant has submitted altered plans from original approval including a second level, additional 6,000 sq. ft. and a shorter overall height on the building and broke up the massing of walls with creating additional roofs. There are some issues with parking that needs to be addressed by the applicant.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the multi-purpose building and sanctuary are assumed to not be used at the same time, which is a condition that was given in 2002 and a condition that is still currently in place. Currently, there is significant parking deficiency on-site; however, coupled with the overflow agreement with Damien High School in La Verne, it will not have a negative impact on the neighborhood. There is a current piece of land owned by LA County that the Church is currently working on purchasing. There is an open Code Enforcement case for this piece of property due to unpermitted storage sheds and cargo containers, a total of six. Standard Planning Department protocol would not allow this application to be processed with open code enforcement issues; however, Staff believes it will not hinder the construction process. Prior to pulling permits, the applicant will need to address these issues. The applicant as well as Staff has reached out to LA County inquiring about purchasing the property and have yet to receive a response.

Mr. Coleman asked if there is an existing trash enclosure on the property.

Associate Planner Grabow responded no and added that in 2002, a trash enclosure was proposed next to the multi-purpose building but it would have been seen from the public right-of-way. She added that the current proposed trash enclosure would comply with City standards.

Mr. Coleman asked if all the proposed materials and colors match the buildings.

Associate Planner Grabow responded yes.

Mr. Morris asked if the Religious Liberty Protection Act (RLPA) could limit how much power to dictate to this project.

Mr. Coleman responded it would not affect the Conditional Use Permit process but might amend the standard conditions of approval.

Mr. Schoonover stated that since there is a significant shortage on parking, is there a written agreement with Damien High School to use their site.

Associate Planner Grabow replied she not see one in the file and it was from the Los Angeles Archdiocese stating that they were approved the use of Damien High School's parking lot for overflow.

Jim Van Compernolle of JVC Architects commented that there are a few questions about the Conditions of Approval. Condition No. 5 states that the building permits need to be issued within one year from date approved, which is not realistic for the Church and requested to have an approval of this project for five years.

Mr. Coleman replied that there is one year after Planning Commission approval and then an extension request can be made for one additional year; however, after that, there can be no more additional extensions. The item would then need to be resubmitted and presented to the Board, and fees taken in like a new project. He emphasized that this is a Code made by the City and added it cannot be changed without amending the code.

Mr. Compernolle expressed his concern with Condition No. 14 and added that it should read "All non-permitted storage structures, sheds and cargo containers shall be removed prior to issuance of an occupancy permit" versus obtaining "a building permit." He explained that he has no idea how long it will take to negotiate for the County property and added that the Church is aware that the containers will need to be removed from the property. He also requested more clarification to Condition No. 39 and added new sewers should be installed just for the proposed building not the entire site. He noted that when the Church was built, a new sewer line was installed.

Mr. Michaelis asked if all the other buildings are connected to the sewer.

Mr. Compernolle replied yes. He pointed out Condition No. 44 which reads that the developer should be responsible for repairs and asked if it could read not required to do any upgrades. He added that they have repaved San Dimas Canyon Road previously and they need to know what exactly to budget.

Mrs. Garwick interjected and stated it should read "only repairs" because no upgrades are required.

Mr. Coleman agreed that Condition No. 14 could be reworded and explained that when it comes down to final occupancy, there is still a concern with the Church being ready for occupancy. He added the concern is that there was unpermitted construction without a permit on another person's land. He added that Condition No. 39 can be changed to read sewers be installed for the proposed building and Condition No. 44 should read only repairs and not upgrades.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed his concern with Condition No. 15 and asked if there are lighting restrictions imposed on this project such as CALGreen.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, replied yes. He added that some fixtures need to meet certain standards.

Mr. Sorcinelli recommended adding a condition that the Building Department and Planning Department need to review the exterior lighting. He also pointed out that the location of the storage containers do not affect anyone and additional space is needed for construction, it is presumed they will need to use the parking lot for storage until the Building can move forward. He added that it doesn't seem practical or necessary to enforce the condition at time of issuance of a permit until the building is finished. He agreed with going forth with the occupancy permit language.

MOTION: Moved by John Sorcinelli, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve with the following modifications: Condition No. 14 reads that all non-permitted storage structures, sheds and cargo containers shall be removed prior to issuance of an occupancy permit instead of issuance of a building permit, Condition No.15 include that the Building Department and Planning Department review the exterior light fixtures prior to installation approval, Condition No. 39 indicate sanitary sewers only be installed for the new proposed building and not the entire site and Condition No. 44 read that the developer is responsible for any repairs but not required to do upgrades.

Motion carried 7-0

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:07 a.m. to the meeting of April 12, 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: April 12, 2012