

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
February 14, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

*Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Curtis Morris, Mayor  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large  
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development*

**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**

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the January 10, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Michaelis and Morris abstained).

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the January 24, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Morris and Sorcinelli abstained).

**DPRB Case No. 12-31 and Precise Plan No. 12-06**

A request to construct a new 8,416 sq. ft. multi-tenant shop building located at 462 North Lone Hill Avenue at the Citrus Station.

Addresses: 462, 464, 466, 468 and 470 North Lone Hill Avenue

APN's: 8383-009-082, 088 & 094

Zone: Specific Plan No. 24, Area 1 (SP-24, Area 1)

Tyler Holst, Civil Engineer, was present.

Bob Lewis, was present.

Dave Powell, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the proposal is to conduct a new 8,416 sq. ft. multi-tenant shop building intended to accommodate 5 tenant spaces ranging in size from approximately 1,000 sq. ft. to 2,500 sq. ft. at the Costco Shopping Center. No tenants have been secured; however, the applicant anticipates food and retail uses. Pedestrians will have direct access from Lone Hill Avenue and vehicles can access through Gladstone and Lone Hill Avenue. The architectural style of the building fits the "Early California" theme matches the surrounding buildings and complies with Citrus Station

Design Guidelines. The materials include: a split face block with precision accents, façade that consists of metal siding, stucco in variety of paint colors, tiled accents depicting images of the citrus industry, decorative lighting and metal truss accent features within the front-facing gables and along all elevations of the building. She noted that the tile accents will be determined then reviewed during plan check. The project complies with the development standards, zoning and meets parking requirements and access. The applicant made modifications to the original proposals and currently there are no concerns at this time. She pointed out that on the north side of the building there will be a landscape buffer with anticipated outdoor seating in the future. She noted that Condition No. 28 requests additional landscaping than what is currently being proposed. At the front of Lone Hill Avenue there are trees planted; however, Staff would like to see additional trees planted since it appears sparse in some areas. The proposed construction will need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council, with final approval from the City Council, due to the Precise Plan process.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a connection off the street to the sidewalk.

Associate Planner Williams responded yes and noted there is an existing ramp. She noted that it is reflected on the plans with a dotted line.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the trees preserved from the original demolition are now being affected.

Associate Planner Williams responded that no trees are proposed to be removed or relocated as there are none existing on-site.

Mr. Stevens expressed his concern, in general, with the building elevations that are facing a street. He commented those elevations end up appearing plain. Although it is uncertain what businesses will be included, some of the businesses will have access from the front and some will have their access at the rear, depending on the layout. He stated that the rear elevations can be reviewed at time of plan check. He stated the goal is to have a building appear as though there are two frontages versus having a front and a back.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the rear of the elevation was originally all stucco and stated that split face block at the bottom and painted doors were added features recommended by Staff.

Mr. Stevens stated that the best way to address the visibility of the rear of the building is with additional landscaping. He commented that Condition No. 5 can be deleted from the Conditions of Approval. He asked if there will be preferred parking spaces for hybrid and low emission vehicles.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, replied the preferred parking spaces will be reviewed during plan check and will need to comply with the Green Building Code.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is an option where the parking spots need to be located on the property.

Tyler Holst, Civil Engineer, replied that the Code does not specify where those parking spots need to be located.

Mr. Patel pointed out the trash enclosure and asked if that is the best location near the front of the building. He recommended that the trash enclosure be located at the back of the property like the one at Panda Express. He inquired if there are enough parking spaces.

Mr. Stevens commented that Staff won't require the trash enclosure be moved. He noted that the parking spaces will not be an issue because of the shared parking with Costco.

Mr. Beilstein commented that if the trash enclosure is moved to mimic the location at Panda Express, it may pose a line of sight issue.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant can consider moving the trash enclosure; however, the proposed location suffices. He asked whether grease interceptors would be installed as required by the Health Department.

Associate Planner Williams responded that they plan on installing grease interceptors and that they would be shown during plan check.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked where the grease interceptors will be located at.

Mr. Patel responded in the front parking lot area.

Mr. Holst clarified, north of the accessible stalls.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that it is not a great location and requested seeing the grease interceptors moved to a location that is at more of a distance away from the parking stalls.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the grease interceptors can be looked at during plan check.

Dave Powell, applicant, commented that the appearance of the back of a building is usually a concern especially when facing a street. He acknowledges the concern Staff has and added it may be treated with landscaping such as with a hedge that is 4 to 5 ft. that can run along the back of the building which will allow only the upper portion of the doors to be seen. The other alternatives could be the addition of masonry walls; however, landscaping is more attractive. He commented that the proposed location of the trash enclosure works well with the wide radius and fits well. He added it is also a good spot for Waste Management when they make their pickups. He noted that they are not opposed to moving to another location.

Mr. Stevens asked what percentage of the rear of the building will need to have a service door.

Mr. Powell stated that if a door is not provided, the tenant will eventually request for one. He commented that he has yet to develop a multitenant building that does not have a back door. He noted that the end caps of the buildings will also have a side door.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant should work on landscaping. He requested they look at the existing landscaping and recommended not doing a continuous wall but instead tile pieces which will make the rear appear less like a back wall.

Mr. Morris stated that screened landscaping can make a big difference.

Mr. Stevens stated that landscaping is part of the original Costco maintenance requirement. He asked how they feel about modifying the existing planting.

Mr. Powell replied it will not be a problem.

Mr. Stevens commented he is comfortable with adding landscaping. He emphasized the goal is to make the back of the property that faces the street more aesthetic.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that there were trees on the property that fell during the windstorm last year and were never replaced. He stated those trees can be included in the additional landscaping request.

Mr. Michaelis asked if all the proposed signs are under the approved master sign program.

Mr. Powell replied yes.

Associate Planner Williams stated that Staff will need to make sure that the signs on corrugated metal are replaced in order to ensure proper aesthetic maintenance.

Mr. Stevens asked if the master sign program allows for front and back signage.

Bob Lewis stated that the current sign program addresses multitenant signs and does allow for that.

Associate Planner Williams stated that Condition No. 24 addresses the sign program and added it can be amended to read signs can be reviewed at Staff level versus being reviewed by DPRB.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to approve subject to the following conditions: deletion of Condition No. 5, modification to Condition No. 24 to allow Staff to look at exhibit and add language where appropriate, add or replace a condition encouraging the applicant to work on additional treatment in the form of landscaping or walls or other adjustments relative to rear elevations.

Motion carried 7-0

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 a.m. to the meeting of February 28, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.

---

Jim Schoonover, Chairman  
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

---

Jessica Mejia  
Development Plan Review Board  
Departmental Assistant

Approved: February 28, 2013