

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
April 11, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Emmett Badar, City Council
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
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: Scott Dilley moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the March 14, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Michaelis and Sorcinelli Abstained).

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the March 28, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Sorcinelli Abstain).

DPRB Case No. 12-07

Continued from the meeting of September 13, 2012. A request to construct a 95,455 sq. ft. enclosed RV storage facility consisting of eight structures on a 4.39 acre site located at the southwest corner of Baseline Road and San Dimas Canyon Road.

Associated Cases: Conditional Use Permit 12-05, Modification of Development Standards 12-01 and Lot Combination 12-01

APN's: 8661-016-004, 030, 031 & 032

Zone: Light Agricultural (AL)

Ariel Valli, of Valli Architectural Group, 12 Journey, Suite # 270, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656, was present. James Witt, resident of 541 Cheyenne Dr., was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that this item was continued from the DPRB meeting of September 13, 2013 due to the following issues of concern that the Board felt needed to be addressed. Based on some of the revisions the total square footage of the project has increased from 94,862 sq. ft. to 95,455 sq. ft., an increase of 593 sq. ft. The items of concern are as follows: street side yard setback, storefront windows, overall design of Building B, office/manager unit, reduction of height Building E,

corner area, reduction of side yard setback (west), dump/wash station, concrete vs. asphalt paving, 10-ft. wide parkway, increased gate width and required parking. The street side yard setback on San Dimas Canyon can be increased; ideally to 20 ft. but 15 ft. would suffice, which the applicant has shown as the setback. Staff and the Board agreed that the two storefront windows were designed in a standard storefront design be redesigned in the same nine-light pattern as all the other windows, which the applicant has complied with. Staff had concern with the overall design of Building B, which is the corner building at the intersection of Baseline Road and San Dimas Canyon Road. Staff and the Board concurred that the building should be redesigned as a subtle focal point and the applicant has redesigned the building to appear as three separate buildings. The Board requested that the office/manager unit be redesigned with separating between the adjacent storage unit and the office which the applicant has redesigned and separated them five feet from each other. The Board requested that the reduction of height from Building E, corner area be reduced to minimize the visual effects on the residential properties to the west, which the applicant has reduced the height from 20 ft. to 12'-2".

The Board was concerned with the maintenance and potential crime activity in the 12 ft. wide strip of land along the west property line and there were several options discussed with the intent that the applicant would discuss with adjacent property owners. The revised plans show the building 3 ft. from the west property line removing the 12 ft. wide landscaped setback, "No man's Land." The applicant stated that the adjacent property owners agreed to an easement for maintenance of the building and with the revised design. There are three residential properties that's grade decrease from north to south. 1088 Kiowa Way will be the same elevation as the proposed project. The applicant is proposing a new 6 ft. high decorative block wall along the west property line. For 1080 and 1076 Kiowa Way, the applicant is proposing removing the existing property line fence and allowing the RV building wall to function as the new wall. There will be a maintenance agreement with 1080 and 1076 Kiowa way. Access to the 3 ft. easement will be via a pedestrian gate between each of the properties.

The Board requested the applicant consider a dump and/or wash station for the site to avoid inappropriate dumping into the storm drain system, which the applicant has revised plans to show a dump/wash station adjacent to the south wall plane of Building B. The applicant has confirmed and will revise plans to show all internal drive aisles to be constructed of concrete and not asphalt which was a concern of the Board. The 10 ft. wide parkway, the Board requested the applicant revise the plans to show a 10 ft. parkway in a reverse pattern to what has been established on adjacent properties. The Board requested the applicant have a sidewalk against the curb and the 4 ½ ft. landscape planter be installed next to the 20 ft. landscape setback to create a 24 ½ ft. deep green area, which the applicant has depicted in the revised site plan. The main entrance gates were increased from 15 ft. to 20 ft. to meet Fire Department requirements. The applicant submitted a parking study by a traffic engineer indicating that the 10 parking spaces proposed are sufficient for the project; the study will be presented to Planning Commission for approval. Staff recommends the Board submit a recommendation for the overall design, not the project, to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Stevens asked for an explanation of how far back the 6 ft. wall will be from the property line for 1088 Kiowa Way. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza responded it will be on the property line.

Mr. Stevens asked if the gates are accessible to all the residents. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied there will be access to the 3 ft. easement that will have a pedestrian gate between each of the two properties, 1080 and 1076 Kiowa way.

Mr. Stevens asked if the area between the planter area and the proposed building wall will be maintained for 1080 and 1076 Kiowa Way. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes.

Mr. Stevens asked how the strip of land along the west property line will be improved. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza responded funds will be allocated for the property owner to add additional landscaping, which will be included in the maintenance agreement, including restrictions for the type of trees to be planted.

Mr. Stevens commented there is not much space to plant trees. He noted that it can be looked at during the landscaping plan check process. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza stated it can be added as a condition.

Mr. Stevens asked if the two southerly property owners wanted the three extra feet and the northern property owners did not. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza responded no and added that due to the existing conditions and grade change, the two southern properties would be suited better with an extended planter. The northern property is at about the same elevation as the proposed site and there was no need to incorporate into the project.

Mr. Stevens commented that he is not convinced the revised plans showing the building 3 ft. from the west property line and removing the 12 ft. wide landscaped setback is a better solution. He inquired about the setback requirements.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the applicant asked for a deviation from the Code, which is permitted in the Light Agricultural Zone. He explained the additional deviations are for: the lot coverage, setback and parking

Mr. Stevens asked if the other two deviations: lot coverage and parking requirements were previously identified and are there additional findings that Planning Commission needs to make. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes, they need to make findings that the project has gone above the normal standards for the overall design.

Mr. Michaelis stated that in regards to the difference in the grade, is the option to have a garden wall then the building. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes and stated the applicant first decided to put a 6 ft. wall/perimeter fence; however, there would create a double wall system and there would be a height difference of 3-4 ft. each wall. He added it seemed better to make the building wall.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that there is not enough outdoor space for the caretakers unit and added that it was discussed at the previous meeting to include additional space.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the rear portion of the caretaker unit has space available for a patio; the size is about 10 ft. wide.

Ariel Valli, of Valli Architectural Group, also, stated that the paved patio area at the rear has 10 ft. space available.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that it still does not seem to be enough space.

Mr. Patel asked what is the setback for Building D. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza responded on the property line, in that case the applicant would have to obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans and for drainage purposes they may require installation of a concrete swale, and applicant explained that they are aware of the need to obtain the easement and maintenance agreement from Caltrans.

Mr. Patel requested that it be included as a condition. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza indicated it is already a condition included, Condition No. 30.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, inquired about the chain link fence.

Mr. Valli responded that the fence will be removed, with the approval from Caltrans.

Mr. Patel asked if the applicant has obtained improvement approvals from the Water Co. for the vacant parcel that is between the properties located at the street frontage. In response, Mr. Valli responded that they are aware an encroachment is needed from the City. He also added that all work will be completed in the public right-of-way, including the work in front of the Water Co parcel.

Mr. Patel noted that the dump/wash station is connected to the storm drain system and asked how the connection to the sewer would occur.

Mr. Stevens commented that waste, dump and wash cannot go down into the storm drain. He noted that the waste needs to go to the sewer and the wash water goes to the storm drain as long as it is filtered and meets NPDES requirements.

Mr. Valli stated that there were two major items discussed at the last meeting: setbacks 15 ft. on San Dimas Canyon Rd. and the redesigning of the corner building. He noted all other items are minor and all items have been addressed.

Mr. Sorcinelli questioned if the side of the building has been enlarged where the caretaker unit is located. In response, Mr. Valli responded no that it has not been changed.

James Witt, resident of 541 Cheyenne Dr., stated that he resides across the street from the three residents that backup to the subject property. He stated that he has been involved with the process when first proposed and added the project was not widely accepted with residents initially. He stated that the developer was agreeable to modify original plans to make the proposal appear more attractive; however, the initial agreement made with the homeowners was that the setback in "No Man's Land" be 10 ft. He added that it was a tentative agreement with the developer but since then, changes have come up and the City prefers a larger area on the east side of San Dimas Canyon Rd. be moved towards the property owners. He questioned the architect and the concerns he has for the height of the rear building, especially the west side, Building E. He noted that he was told 11 ft.; however, now, there seems to be a great change. He noted that in actuality it is a 14 ft. difference that will affect the property owner's elevation.

Mr. Valli pointed out and referenced the cross section.

Mr. Witt stated that the developer has contacted the residents.

Mr. Stevens explained that he did not instruct the applicant with a solution and posed a concern since there was no discussion with the immediate adjacent property owners. He suggested having discussions to come up with an acceptable approach with the residential area and proposed project.

Mr. Witt commented that he is not in favor of waiving the standard 10 ft. required by the Code. His concern not only is with the height and how it affects the three properties but the other properties.

Mr. Stevens asked if the houses in the area re one- story or two-story. In response, Mr. Witt stated some are split levels and single-story.

Mr. Valli stated that the elevations were taken off the topographic survey. There is a 16 ft. total lateral wall which minimizes the effect of a tall wall. All three properties, 1088, 1080 and 1076 Kiowa Way, agreed to a small setback and opposed to a 6 ft. wall.

Mr. Stevens asked if there was direct contact with the property owners from Staff or are we relying the applicant to contact the owners.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that a condition can be added that a maintenance agreement be obtained from the three property owners prior to issuance of building permits.

Mr. Valli stated that the developer's agent, Bud Wheeler, has spoken to the property owners.

Mr. Stevens expressed his point of view and stated that the project has not changed much since last heard even though different zoning strategies were attempted. He stated that it is fair to say the residents have come over to the developer's side and are supportive of the project. He noted his reservations of the use appropriate for this specific area. The project seems more industrial than residential and is being squeezed into an interpretation of the Light Agricultural Zone. He pointed out that west of the site has more residential character and to the North is the Water Co. He explained that the houses will start to become isolated and added that this property would be better off as a residential type of use but could be used in the interim as the proposal but would be better for residential in the long run. He added it is a wrong use for the property.

Mr. Badar emphasized that the Board is voting today for the design issues of the property not the type of use.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the maintenance agreement required from the property owners is helpful so that issues are resolved and noted that the applicant has been responsive to what the Board had wanted since the last meeting.

Senior Planner Espinoza explained the conditions that will be added to the recommendation to the design to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Patel agreed with Mr. Stevens in regards to the type of use for the property; however, today's review is for the design of the project only, a project that was reviewed previously. He stated that he will be voting in favor of the project.

Mr. Schoonover expressed his concern with the west property line. He also agreed with the maintenance agreement and asked what happens when the current three properties under the agreement move away.

Mr. Stevens responded that the maintenance agreement would need to be recorded and will run with the land.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed his concern with the west property line and added that it is evident that at the last meeting comments were made to make the area near caretaker's unit larger, were not addressed. He added that he will be voting against the project.

Mr. Badar reiterated that today's vote is only for the design of the project.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed that his opposition to the project is a design based argument. He stated that the applicant is not giving up units for additional space and noted it is not a lot to ask for.

MOTION: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Scott Dilley to recommend approval of the design to the Planning Commission subject to a revision to Condition No. 14 to include a requirement that the maintenance agreements are submitted prior to issuance of a Building Permit, a modification to Condition No. 57 to include improvements in front of the water facility and add a condition for connections to the sewer for the waste and storm drain for the wash station.

Motion carried 5-2-0-0 (Sorcinelli and Stevens No)

Mr. Stevens stated that the item will be heard at Planning Commission at the second meeting in May. He added that notices will be mailed to residents to inform them of the meeting and will only be heard by City Council if appealed. He added that if the applicant makes design based changes, it will return to the Board otherwise it will not.

Mr. Badar asked if Staff has had any conversation with the three properties that are in discussions for the maintenance agreement.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the property owners discussed the maintenance agreement with applicant which was to be submitted to the Board prior to today's meeting. He noted that if the maintenance agreements are not signed by the adjoining residents or the project will not move forward.

Mr. Stevens stated that between now and the Planning Commission Hearing, Staff should send a letter to the three property owners asking if they have reviewed and seen the plans for this project and ask if they are made aware of the changes. He stated that Staff will need to see if a response is given from those property owners. Staff can include with the letter the site plan and cross sections

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that he will send out the letter next week.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 a.m. to the meeting of April 25, 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: April 25, 2013