

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
May 10, 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  
Curtis Morris, Mayor (Arrived at 8:49 a.m.)  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission*

**ABSENT**

*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:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve the minutes of April 26, 2012. Motion carried 5.0.2.0 (Badar and Sorcinelli Absent)

**DPRB Case No. 11-05**

A request to subdivide two lots, consisting of 1.81 acres of vacant land, into a total of six (6) lots located at 301 South San Dimas Avenue. Five (5) of the lots will be developed with single-family residences and the sixth lot will have six (6) town homes, and eight (8) mixed-use residences.

Associated Cases: CUP 12-04, Tree Permit 12-24 and TTM 11-01

APN: 8390-019-037, 036

Zone: Creative Growth 3A & 3D

Ed Eckert, was present

Steve Eide, designer and applicant, was present

David Lainl, was present

Marco Madrigal, resident of 125 W Commercial St, was present

Josee Normand, resident of 316 S San Dimas Avenue, was present

Todd Seidner, was present  
Kenneth Yutz, was present

Associate Planner Grabow indicated that the lot is currently vacant and divided into two lots with the proposal to subdivide into six lots. One lot will be off of San Dimas Avenue and the other 5 lots will face Shirlmar Avenue. The applicant is proposing to construct single-family houses on Shirlmar Ave that will range from 2,040 sq. ft. to 2,270 sq. ft. The homes will feature Craftsman and Spanish architectural features including: stucco cladding with wood or Hardie board, front facing gable, shutters, exposed rafter tails and various garage door designs to create diversity. The sixth lot will face San Dimas Avenue and is proposed to have 8 mixed use townhomes facing the street with 6 townhomes that abut the single-family residences with square footages that vary. The mixed-use buildings will have architectural features similar to Grove Station located directly across the street including: various rooflines, stucco or brick used on buildings, fabric canopies, shutters, wrought iron railing and large store front windows. The proposed commercial space will be 618-626 sq. ft. To the west of the mixed-use buildings are the townhomes that range in living space and garage from 1,765-1798 sq. ft. The design features similar architectural styles as the mixed-use building with features such as: brick and stucco exterior claddings, various roof lines and awnings over the window entrances.

Staff has been working with the applicant since last year to address outstanding issues such as the required parking. The applicant is deficient 13 on-site parking spaces which were discussed at a Subdivision Committee Meeting. At the meeting it was said there were 9 street parking spaces on San Dimas Avenue which can be used as part of the calculation. She also added that the Code could waive the parking study if there were adequate public parking lots. There are two potential areas but more information is needed for the uses. She added that a parking study needs to be conducted for the surrounding area to determine availability of parking. She noted that there is public parking available for the ride and share that could be used.

Another issue is with the Fire Department. The proposal was first heard at the Subdivision/Environmental Committee on November 22, 2011. Various agencies were notified and provided feedback; however, the applicant stated they did not receive the conditions from the Fire Department. Staff also has a concern with the sidewalk at Commercial Street which was also heard at the Subdivision/Environmental Committee whom recommended the removal of the existing sidewalk and replacing with a new sidewalk that will include a pathway planter to match the neighborhood design. There is also an issue with the perimeter walls which are proposed to be 8" CMU around the single-family residences and townhomes. Staff recommends the applicant have a CMU wall with a stucco finish and decorative cap, which is a standard condition. She pointed out that sections of the tract map where the townhomes are proposed do not have walls that are high enough to meet privacy concerns. She pointed out there is also an issue with the Lot 6 of the single-family residences along the rear yard requires a 25 ft. setback and the applicant has only 15ft. The applicant is proposing to use stone veneer along the portion of the front elevation of square footage design "C" which Staff recommends continuing for the entire length of the elevation and wrap around.

Associate Planner Grabow pointed out that the single-family residences indicate on Plans A and B that the bathrooms have large windows and need to be frosted to meet privacy concerns. She also stated that on Plans B and E, the townhomes floor plan allows for fireplaces but does not illustrate that. She added that the landscape plans do

not match the parking ordinance. Thus with all these concerns, the item should be continued.

\* \* \* \* \*

Curt Morris arrived at 8:49 a.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Coleman asked if the applicant has called for a neighborhood meeting to hear concerns.

Associate Planner Grabow responded no.

Mr. Schoonover asked when the parking survey will be conducted.

Associate Planner Grabow responded prior to Planning Commission and City Council hearings.

Mr. Coleman stated that in regards to the parking spaces available on San Dimas Avenue, the applicant then be short 4 parking spaces.

Mr. Morris stated that the park and ride location is not an open parking lot but instead is dedicated as a transit lot which does not meet the definition of available parking.

Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens explained Lot 6 setbacks, 20 ft. at the front, 5 ft. and 10 ft. on each side. For Arrow Hwy it depicts 25 ft. in the code. He posed the question of how to ensure it is not treated as a rear yard and restrictions for future fencing of the area. He asked that the applicant clearly designate the front yard.

Mr. Patel asked if the 25 ft. setback is a zone change.

Mr. Coleman responded that it is not a zone change.

Mr. Stevens stated that there is another option for a setback that can be justified along Arrow Hwy, 15-20 ft. He noted that the homes on Nubia St do not have rear yards but can build to their property line if lot coverage allowed it.

Mr. Morris asked if the setback is calculated as part of the scenic easement.

Mr. Stevens replied that it is not part of the scenic easement. He stated that the updated Creative Growth Zone promotes 0 setbacks. He explained that when the map was done, it was treated as commercial and landscape versus residential and commercial.

Mr. Coleman stated that the RV standard requirement for single-family residences is that they have access on the driveway side.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that a setback of 10ft. is required for this zone versus the regular 12 ft.

Steve Eide, Designer, stated that the revised location is 20 ft. on the drawing at the rear. He noted that he will explore the idea of moving the garage forward and use the same footprint with a 29 ft. setback at the rear and 10 ft. at the side yards. He stated that he did not receive the Fire Department comments until 2 days ago and does not have a problem meeting with them about the fire hydrants. He stated that the parking issue can be addressed by reducing the square footage by 1,000 sq. ft. which will meet the 4 lost

parking spaces. He indicated that there is available parking 500 ft. away near the Park and Ride behind the Good Year business. He added that he accessed the Park and Ride location and the public parking lot nearby and there were 25-30 spaces open. He stated that the townhome designs can be addressed with Staff. He explained that as far as knowing what type of business will be in the commercial area, it is uncertain until the location is built and prospective buyers inquire thus the parking cannot be determined. He noted that the windows in the restrooms can be frosted.

Mr. Coleman asked if they know what type of fire truck will be used for services.

Mr. Eide replied that he is not sure but pointed out that everything on the project is within 150 ft. of fire hose but will find out if there are any other issues with the Fire Department.

Mr. Coleman asked if they are familiar with CAL Green recycling requirements.

Mr. Eide responded no and requested that information be provided to him.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a common trash area or is it individual pickup.

Mr. Coleman commented that if there is a restaurant use in this location then it will generate more trash than a homeowner.

Mr. Eide stated that he is not expecting to have a restaurant and will have a common trash.

Mr. Stevens stated that one solution can be if added to the CC&R's, it can prohibit and restrict restaurant use since it has more of a parking demand.

Mr. Eide stated that the sidewalk poses an issue on Commercial St and Shirlmar Ave. He inquired about the landscaping for the parkway area.

Mr. Stevens pointed out that the north side of the park has a traditional parkway.

Mr. Patel requested that the parkway landscaping be consistent with the neighborhood parkway, where there is landscaping between the sidewalk and the curb.

Mr. Coleman and Mr. Morris agreed that to combine with Commercial St property there is very little frontage and the setback issue in the Creative Growth Zone which requires 15 ft. and there is 12 ft. at the front of the building.

Associate Planner Grabow interjected and pointed out the Code reads that City Council determines setback requirements.

Mr. Patel pointed out Lot 6, Section AA and asked how a wall would be built next to an existing wall.

Mr. Eide responded that the wall needs to be entirely removed in order to build a new wall.

Mr. Stevens indicated that the removal needs to be precise in order to not have gaps with the wall.

Mr. Morris pointed out that a property owner may not want a new wall.

Josee Mormon, neighbor at 316 S San Dimas Avenue, likes the residential/commercial proposal.

Marco Madrigal, resident of 125 W Commercial St, commented that he is in attendance to represent the community. He noted that the single-family homes are a good idea; however, the residents do not favor the commercial idea. He noted that there is a pathway used by all the neighbors to get access to a nearby shopping center that will now be blocked with no access allowed. The community seems against the townhomes and mixed-use but are for the single-family homes. He asked if the residents will see an increase in taxes and added that when Grove Station was built it seemed taxes increased and wanted to confirm there will not be a financial impact. The neighbors believe they will be losing a historic piece of land in San Dimas that served as a feeding ground for birds. The concern is also for the noise and traffic that will be increased and pointed out that the new memorial built has reflected this concern due to more traffic, people cannot cross the street on S San Dimas Avenue.

Mr. Coleman stated that he encourages the neighbors to put their concerns in writing. He encouraged the applicant reach out to the neighborhood to find out their questions and concerns. He pointed out that the project is good overall but needs some modifications in certain areas.

Mr. Patel stated that the design layout is good; however, there are concerns with the parking and recommended reducing the size of the commercial unit in order to have additional parking spaces.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the applicant and Staff need to sit down to discuss issues brought forward today. He explained he understands the uniformity of the parkway to have a higher quality of landscape.

Mr. Morris asked Staff to not refer to the Park and Ride as additional or alternative offsite parking since it is built with transit funds.

Mr. Schoonover stated that the applicant needs to look at getting as much onsite parking as possible. He requested the applicant look at Lot 6 to see how it fits into the scheme of things and encouraged meeting with the local neighbors to get their input before the next public hearing.

Mr. Stevens stated that the current zoning was made to accommodate the surrounding area and needs the neighbors to understand that previously mixed-use was not permitted because it only allowed square footage; however, the zone was changed and Creative Growth Zone was created to help encourage a continuation of the Downtown area.

Mr. Coleman asked if the intersection can be signalized where the parkway island is at on S San Dimas Avenue.

Mr. Patel responded that the intersection does not meet warrants for a signal.

**MOTION:** Moved by Dan Coleman, seconded by Krishna Patel to continue this item to allow the applicant to address Staff's items of concern and requirements.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m. to the meeting of May 24, 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: June 14, 2012