DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
September 26, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT

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

ABSENT

Emmett Badar, City Council
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce

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: Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve the September 12, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-2-1 (Badar and Dilley Absent and Sorcinelli Abstain).

Tree Removal Permit No. 11-31

A request to remove 29 Palm trees at the El Dorado Apartment Complex at 555 E. Bonita Avenue.

APN: 8390-013-001

Zone: Multiple-Family (MF-16)

Don Shadrick, El Dorado Apartments, was present.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the site manager, Don Shadrick, who is representing the property owner at El Dorado Apartments, is requesting to remove all 29 mature Palm trees that exist on-site. She stated that the majority of the trees are located in a cluster at the rear of the site around the pool area. She noted that there are two Palm trees located adjacent to Bonita Avenue. A number of Chinese Elm, Carrotwood, Canary Island Pine and other trees that exist on-site are proposed to remain in place. The site manager has stated that he cannot keep up with the required maintenance and fears that the trees are in danger of dropping fronds onto the residents.

Mr. Shadrick is also requesting a reduction in the required 2:1 replacement ratio to a 1:1 replacement ratio. He is proposing a combination of Chinese Elm, Brisbane Box, Sweetshade and Canary Island Pines as replacement trees. The City has a Tree Preservation Ordinance that

requires certain findings to be made for the issuance of a tree removal permit and for a reduction in the required 2:1 replacement ratio. Staff acknowledges that the replacement of the Palm trees with shade providing canopy trees will be a benefit to the site once those trees mature. The finding can be made that the tree removals are warranted as the effect of the tree removals upon enjoyment of the residents and the general public as well as the property values will be minimal and may actually be improved as a result of the replacement trees. She added that Staff believes that the mature Palm trees visible from Bonita Avenue contribute to the streetscape and are a public benefit and such are hesitant about their removal.

Associate Planner Williams concluded that due to the number existing trees on-site and the number that will be planted as replacements, Staff is comfortable with a reduced replacement ratio. Staff has asked the applicant to stake out the locations of the replacement trees. The two trees on Bonita Avenue should be preserved in order to continue with maintaining the streetscape. Staff is recommending removal of 27 of the trees and a minimum of 1:1 or maximum of 1.5:1.

Mr. Stevens asked if the replacement trees will be 15-gallon.

Associate Planner Williams responded yes.

Mr. Stevens referred to Condition No. 6 in the staff report and asked why 60 days was used as a timeframe.

Associate Planner Williams answered that it is the standard condition.

Senior Planner Espinoza added that Staff sometimes deviates from the 60 days if the applicant needs additional time.

Mr. Stevens asked if all the trees will be removed at the same time.

Associate Planner Williams responded yes. She stated that per Condition No. 7, within two weeks of the tree removal, the applicant needs to stake out where the replacement trees will be located.

Mr. Patel agreed with Staff that preserving the two trees along Bonita Ave is ideal. He commented that maybe the applicant can add more palm trees at the frontage in order to keep with the theme on Bonita Ave.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is space for an additional two trees along Bonita Ave. He asked Staff since this is an apartment complex, was the tree removal notification made known to the tenants at the complex.

Associate Planner Williams replied that the notification was sent to surrounding neighbors and that it was the applicant's responsibility to make the tree removal aware to his tenants if he chooses to.

Mr. Stevens added that for Development Plan Review Board (DPRB) items, adjacent owners are notified as a courtesy and emphasized it is not a requirement.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that all adjacent and adjoining property owners are notified for DPRB projects. He stated that sometimes for neighbor notifications, Staff has extended the mailings to include a larger area, depending on the projects. He reemphasized that there are no requirements in the Code that states notifications need to be sent, Staff has done so as a courtesy.

Associate Planner Williams stated that there were no responses/concerns from the neighbor notifications.

Don Shadrick, site manager for El Dorado Apartments, stated that there are currently three City trees at the front of the property. He added that he does not want more trees on Bonita Ave because the monument sign that identifies the complex becomes unseen from both directions.

Mr. Schoonover asked what the height of the sign is.

Mr. Shadrick responded about 3 ft. He noted that he fears the trees to be removed near the pool area will drop fronds onto the residents.

Mr. Michaelis commented that he would like to see additional trees planted along Bonita Ave.

Mr. Stevens commented that it is difficult to introduce new trees into the front setback area because they are working with their existing irrigation. He noted that he does not want a tree where the roots will not be able to handle that kind of water. He recommended doing a couple of replacement trees in the front setback area and added not palm trees.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve, subject to conditions within the Staff Report and adding to Condition No. 8 that the applicant is encouraged to plant replacement trees in the front setback area along Bonita Avenue, as appropriate.

Motion carried 5-0-2-0 (Badar and Dilley Absent)

DPRB Case No. 13-28

A request to remodel the interior and exterior of the gasoline service station attendant building which will consist of converting the existing automobile repair bays into a convenience store. The project will also be comprised of constructing a self-service automatic carwash with two vacuum stations. Mobile gas station is located at 845 W. Arrow Highway.

APN: 8383-010-045

Zone: Specific Plan No. 18

Ulises Araujo, Project Manager of ZAD Enterprises, was present.
Sean Scully, Director of Planning of NEC, was present.
Navid Zadgh, Business Owner, ZAD Enterprises, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is proposing to: remodel the interior and exterior attendant building. The two existing service bays will be converted to a convenience store, add a 30' x 60' (1,800 sq. ft.) self-service automatic car wash building, add two exterior vacuum pump stations adjacent to the car wash building and the gas pump island will not be modified and will be left in its current condition. The parking will remain the same and additional parking spaces will be added. He added that they already meet their parking requirements.

The applicant is continuing the same Spanish architectural motif on the exterior remodel of the convenience store and the car wash. The buildings will have the following features: smooth stucco, Red s-tile roof, decorative stucco foam cornice, decorative wrought-iron wall details, rough sawn wood entry trellis, precast stone columns, bronze glass mullions, large decorative pots and decorative Spanish style parking lot lights. He added that the applicant will be adding a 6 ft. wall to screen the additional electrical and trash containers with the roof atop with the same trellis feature. The applicant

is also proposing to add large pots in the building for safety issues. The carwash itself has similar features of convenience store. The carwash will have a roll up door facing Arrow Highway. The door will be closed when not in operation. The question for Staff is matching the roof tiles; however, when the applicant reaches that phase they will bring in a sample. Additional landscaping near the construction will be included which will include mostly turf and plant trees. Staff recommends approval and requests that it not return to DPRB after Planning Commission.

Mr. Stevens stated his concern for the added traffic that will affect Arrow Highway.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the applicant will need to provide a queuing study for the car wash.

Mr. Patel asked when the queuing study would be submitted.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that it will be submitted at Planning Commission when the Conditional Use Permit is reviewed.

Mr. Stevens asked if the required parking includes the number of pumps.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes. He added that they are required to have eight spaces and have ten.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is reciprocal parking within the shopping center.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied he is assuming they do since access is taken from the shopping center parking lot.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the delay in finishing the monument sign.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the sign is still incorrect.

Mr. Patel asked where the 25 ft. setback along Arrow Highway started.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the property line goes down to the parkway area of the property and shifts downward.

Mr. Stevens asked why the car wash entrance is on the south versus the north.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that after the applicant looked at queuing, it was problematic and the south side worked out better.

Mr. Stevens stated that most people enter the facility from the shopping center or directly off of Arrow Highway.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded most people enter from Arrow Highway.

Mr. Stevens stated that usually these car washes are purchased as an add-on to gas services purchased. He stated that most people are facing north and it seems that the customers are driving around on the site to enter the car wash that is on the south. He asked would the onsite circulation work better if the cars enter the car wash from the North.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that this is one of the largest sites for a gas station which allows for that convenience of doing a turnaround if needed.

Mr. Stevens commented that other than the people parking at the pump island, the parking does not seem well located as it relates to the entry. He added that he is aware there is enough parking.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the parking spaces are hardly used; however, the convenience store may change those dynamics.

Mr. Stevens stated that the convenience store is not proposing to sell alcohol since they have a moratorium on a Type 21 license.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that is correct.

Mr. Stevens asked if they could return to add alcohol to their services. He asked what convenience store would be moving into the gas station.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded they could return to add alcohol; usually that is a common scenario. He also stated that 7Eleven will be moving into the convenience mart.

Mr. Patel agreed with Mr. Stevens in regards to the circulation. He stated that customers usually enter through the south side. He commented that they should look into entering at the north side. The driveway is too sharp off of Arrow Highway. He requested that the driveway be widened on the east side to about 26 ft. He added that the driveway could also be moved over 4 ft. which would allow for a smoother turn. He stated that there also needs to be pedestrian connectivity for ADA. The applicant has also been made aware of the NPDES requirements, which includes some type of infiltration system, chamber and treatment facility to take care of the runoff.

Mr. Stevens asked what triggers NPDES requirements and stated he thought it would trigger if it disturbed a certain square footage.
Mr. Patel responded 5,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Stevens stated that most of the site is staying intact; the only area being disturbed is where the car wash is being located at, which is where the three palm trees are located.

Mr. Patel commented that the gas stations have different requirements.

Mr. Stevens stated that it may or may not trigger storage chambers and emphasized that they need to treat their runoff. He asked where the collection currently drains to.

Mr. Patel responded on the west side off of Arrow Highway.

Mr. Stevens stated that most of the sites drain to the storm drain through the driveway but there may need to be an additional filtration.

Mr. Patel stated that it could be a chamber near the landscaping area.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about the requirements for an ADA path of travel and asked how it works in relation to the gas station. He added that they need a path of travel from Arrow Highway to the door.

Mr. Patel responded yes that they need a path of travel from Arrow Highway.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if they can connect to a current path of travel and asked if it could tie into along Arrow Highway near IHOP.

Mr. Stevens replied that the center was developed before the path of travel requirements existed. He added that it can tie into that path of travel near IHOP but it will be the Building Official's final call.

Mr. Patel asked if the applicant could give an easement for a bus shelter. He stated that there is currently a bus stop at the location.

Mr. Stevens asked how long the bus stop has been at that location. He noted that the biggest problem is that the bus can change their route stops; thus there could be a bus shelter left abandoned and not in use. He asked if the busses normally like to stop at the driveway approach.

Mr. Patel replied that they stop before the signal as opposed to after.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Board wanted the applicant to provide an easement or license.

Mr. Patel responded an easement.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked if there is an existing easement on the sidewalk.

Mr. Stevens responded no.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that an easement can be acquired for the existing sidewalk also.

Mr. Stevens stated that the setback is not measured from the back of the easement but from the property line.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the bus shelter property is available. He stated that the City could construct the shelter but the ability for the City to use the property needs to be answered.

Mr. Stevens stated that the best approach is to require cooperation providing the land and if necessary, construct a bus shelter. He stated to not worry about the agreement and added that when the bus shelter is constructed, an agreement could be implemented and then the determination could be made for which side of the driveway it belongs to. He added that it could obscure the ability to enter off of Arrow Highway.

Ulises Araujo, Project Manager of ZAD Enterprises, stated that he is ok with taking care of the bus shelter. He admitted to not looking into the ADA requirements but added that they would like to apply for financial hardship exemption. He addressed the question with having the car wash entrance is at the south instead of the north and answered that they have gone through a lot of scenarios to come to that final decision which they believe is the best. He stated that queuing is a technicality; he noted that the car wash uses a conveyer and take four minutes.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the convenience store will be open 24 hours.

Mr. Araujo responded yes but added only the store. He stated that the car wash will be open for limited times.

Mr. Patel inquired about the approach, the width and the radius.

Mr. Araujo responded that they tried analyzing and could not get access to archives. He noted that in theory it would be better to get rid of the driveway; however, that is the entrance to where the fuel is delivered.

Mr. Patel stated that the driveway is 22 ft. and there is a 3 ft. radius approach.

Mr. Araujo commented that it is not a problem to make the driveway 26 ft.

Mr. Michaelis asked where the customer you pay for their car wash.

Mr. Araujo responded there is a set up for queuing at the drive-thru.

Mr. Stevens indicated that in order to apply for a financial hardship exemption for an ADA path of travel, a discussion needs to take place with the Building Official. He stated that there are limited exemptions.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated cutting across at the back of the property is another option. He stated that there are a few sketches that can be analyzed on the approach.

Mr. Stevens encouraged the applicant to have a conversation with the building official and emphasized that the Building Official has not granted an exemption for an ADA path of travel.

Mr. Michaelis stated that they may be able to cut through the berm on the Arrow Highway side. He added that he understands that cost can be an issue; however, safety is very important and ADA is a requirement and needs to be done.

Mr. Araujo stated that they do not have the funds but will look into options.
Mr. Michaelis stated that there are less expensive ways to address the ADA path of travel.

Sean Scully, Director of Planning of NEC, stated that for the last year with the existing constraints, in the Specific Plan No. 18 Zone, they have looked at how to design. The intent of the center and design is to service the local community, especially those traveling on the 57 FWY. The Mobil gas station has been trying to expand for a number of years. The tower element will help with visibility from the freeway. When the Conditional Use Permit was originally approved, a lot of the concern was with the addition of the car wash. The design enhancements will look much better aesthetically. The traffic engineer looked at all the angles to best configure and added that they will be able to configure the driveway as well. In regards to the ADA requirements, they will work with the Building Official. He noted that the additional landscaping will give the area more screening to the parking. There are many elements that are positive which will add value to the entry point for the City of San Dimas.

Mr. Stevens asked the applicant to explain why the sign is still unfinished.

Navid Zadgh, Business Owner, ZAD Enterprises, stated that there were complications with the sign. He stated that he is ready to install a sign but wanted to hold off until this process is complete. The issue with the Sign Co. is that it would be changed soon after installed because of the addition of the car wash and convenience store.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant or sign company needs to work with Staff to finalize the sign. Staff does not know how long it will take to build. He noted that he is frustrated that the sign has been unfinished for a lengthy amount of time. He stated that he is not convinced that the car wash should be the orientation it is. He asked, on average, how many cars would use the car wash at peak hours.

Mr. Scully responded that right now they are doing additional studies to determine that. He noted that in this scenario, the through rate is a determining factor. He noted that, based on experience, the accommodations of the five vehicles is adequate.

Mr. Stevens stated that the car wash is drive-thru, so no one will be controlling the number. If the car wash was reversed to the other side, there would be no stacking. The extra stacking occurs on site. He asked the applicant to relook the shopping center layout and emphasized the stacking will not create safety issues. He asked when the traffic engineer will approve the final report.

Mr. Scully responded it will be presented at Planning Commission. He stated that there could be four cars at the same time for the car wash.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about the visibility of the queuing. He stated that in his personal opinion, if there are more than three cars, he would not wait.

Mr. Patel asked what the peak days for car washes are.

Mr. Scully responded weekends.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the applicant could come up with a queuing management plan. He recommended that it be added as a condition.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that a condition can be included with the Conditional Use Permit if issues arise.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated the issues at hand include: ADA access path and the architecture. He stated that there are benefits of turning into the car wash from the left; however, the concern is of stacking. He stated from an architectural stand point, he appreciates the added features to the location because the building appears grim. He stated that there is path of travel access issue and added that the center needs a point of connection from along Arrow Highway to where the shops commence. He added that the applicant could decide to do their own path of travel on-site or off-site.

Mr. Stevens stated that there is still the question, will the plan for the car wash work or need to be changed. He stated that he is now ok with the proposed orientation of the car wash.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve subject to the addition of the following conditions: include in the CC&R's a path of travel, widen the driveway, workout language accommodating a future bus shelter within a small portion of the front setback, would like the Queuing management plan approved by Staff and work with staff on finalizing the monument sign.

Motion carried 4-0-2-1 (Badar and Dilley Absent and Schoonover Abstain)

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about ADA requirements.

Mr. Stevens responded that it is a building code requirement.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that they need to come up with a proposal.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked if this item will need to return to DPRB.

Mr. Stevens replied only if there are substantial requirements or if the ADA situation is not addressed. He added that the Building Official has the final say.

Mr. Araujo stated he did not know how much landscape to cut out which could be a factor in determining an alternative path of travel. He stated he will provide options to Staff.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:07 a.m. to the meeting of October 10, 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: October 24, 2013