SPECIAL MEETING
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
November 21, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

PRESENT

Emmett Badar, City Council
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

Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the special meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:35 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the October 24, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-1-2 (Dilley Absent and Badar and Patel Abstained).

DPRB Case No. 13-12 Conditional Use Permit No. 13-01 and Precise Plan No. 13-01

A request to construct an approximately 10,000 – square foot single-story inpatient facility and approximately 2,400 – square foot single-story outpatient facility and associated site improvements on a vacant site of approximately 1.8 acres at 1136 and 1148 W. Puente Street, near the intersection of Puente Street and Via Verde in the Office/Professional Land Use Designation, Administrative Professional (A-P) Zone, and Scenic Highway Overlay (SHO).

APN's: 8448-020-069 & 8448-020-070

Zone: Administrative Professional (A-P)

Keith Underwood, applicant, was present.
Richard Denzer, was present.
Jim Ashby, CEO of Care Meridian, was present.
Marvin Ersher, resident of 1312 Paseo Alamos, was present.
Gary Enderle, resident of 2044 Via Esperanza, was present.
Stan Stringfellow, F & S Land Development Corp. 2011 E Financial Way Suite 203, Glendora, was present.

Mr. Schoonover emphasized that the item being presented today will be in regards to the design and landscaping and not the use.

Associate Planner Williams stated that there are two buildings being proposed: a larger size building that is 10,000 sq. ft. single-story inpatient facility (Building A) and a smaller building that is 2,400 sq. ft. single-story outpatient facility (Building B). Building A is 22 ft. high and Building B is 18 ft. high. The buildings will include Spanish architecture, materials were provided for review. Building A features oriel windows to serve the patient rooms and will have two front facing gables and a Dutch gable at the rear. Building B has a side facing gable and a squared entry-way to accommodate roof-top equipment within a well. Both Building A and B will have decorative rafter tails. The site complies with the development standards for the Administrative Professional (A-P) Zone and the Scenic Highway Overlay Zone. This project includes a Precise Plan and Conditional Use Permit that requires review by: Planning Commission and City Council. As for fencing, when adjacent to a residential zone, the Code requires a solid masonry wall be provided and the applicant is requesting an open work fence be installed. The issues Staff is facing is with the architectural design which includes: the elevations lacking detail, for example, on the north elevation, Building B shows a blank wall facing the street and does not have much variations. The massing is not ideal and there are no decorative features such as recesses or pop outs for Spanish style architecture. She noted that it is typical to see arcades, tile work or natural materials used. She stated that she requested that the applicant and architect provide these elements. Staff does not feel that the current design integrates to the building and requests that they revise and modify the design to be more consistent with the architecture theme.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the lack of details provided on the plans makes it difficult to understand how the windows and doors function. For example, the door and window types are not specified; however, they have a major impact on the architecture and appearance. She noted that the light fixtures and styles are also not shown on the elevations. The skylights shown on the floor and roof plan depict inconsistency on the west elevation at the ridge and other portions there are separations and it is unknown how it will integrate with the tile roof. She pointed out the aerial view of the site design provided in the staff report shows the adjacent building line and proposed building line. Staff noted that the applicant has provided two alternative site plans that depict different parking lot locations and drive aisles. She noted that there are some issues with the design of the parking circulation. The west parking lot has an awkward turning area and in order to keep with the current design, the design would need to be rotated to be parallel with the parking at the frontage. The walls and fences with pilasters are at the southwest property line. Staff is ok with open work fencing, due to a 200 sq. ft. separation and grade change, and because the design would facility keeping from the nearest residence the natural drainage of the slope. However, Staff has issues with the wall proposed on the Southeast portion of the lot. She noted that instead of having a 5-6 ft. wall, the applicant is proposing a step down from the vacant lot and subject site all meet which leaves an awkward open area between the place the wall daylights and the corner of the site and recommended that a continuous wall be used instead. The pilasters for an open work fence would be for a stucco finish with decorative brick cap. The solid wall should keep with the architecture. She recommended that Staff continue the item to a date uncertain and direct the applicant to address the site design, architectural, and perimeter wall issues to create a more favorable site design and building elevations prior to returning to the DPRB for review and recommendation.

Mr. Stevens asked Associate Planner Williams to show on the proposed plans if there are any wall courtyard areas that are proposed as part of the project.

Associate Planner Williams pointed out that the outdoor courtyard is west of the inpatient building where the vegetable garden and seat walls are which will be amenities to the residents.

Mr. Stevens stated that the same component is featured on the site plan on Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

Mr. Badar noted the area where the patient rooms are located in Alternative 1 and asked if there will be a view or just a view of the berm.

Associate Planner Williams responded that it depends on the distance from the street because the berm would serve as a screen.

Mr. Badar inquired about deliveries, and what types of trucks or vans would be making deliveries.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the deliveries would be made by a van.

Mr. Stevens asked what information Staff had in regards to the skylights. He noted that his concern is that they seem to be a relatively prominent component of the roofline and emphasized he is not satisfied with it. He asked if there is more detail to the skylights.

Associate Planner Williams replied that there is some detail for the skylights; she referenced Sheets 25 – 27.

Mr. Stevens stated that the purpose of skylights is to provide natural light to the interior of the building. He asked what portion of the interior of the building is benefiting the exposure and natural light.

Associate Planner Williams replied the center of the building from the entryway of the building from the back toward the patient's rooms.

Mr. Stevens stated that the skylights are in the middle of the peaks of the roofs. The function is to provide natural light to the interior service aspects of the building opposed to the outskirts.

Richard Denzer, architect, stated that the skylights will serve the rehabilitation rooms.

Mr. Stevens referenced the floor plan and added he did not see the label for the rehabilitation area that would benefit from the skylights but the following areas appeared to benefit are: the corridor, storage area and offices. .

Mr. Schoonover addressed the parking counts. He stated that there are 42 parking spaces available and asked how many employees are they to have onsite and how many would be for visitors.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the parking counts included the inpatient and outpatient facility. She indicated that they will have a maximum of 12 – 15 employees during the day which will be reduced at night. She noted that the applicant has the potential to look at other ratios to reduce the parking ratio. The applicant could have more landscaping; however, the applicant did not want to pursue. The concern posed by the neighbors is vehicles parking on the street or in their neighborhood.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant can reduce their parking. He noted that they are qualified for that reduction which can be added and reviewed as an additional Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Patel asked how many parking spaces could be reduced.

Associate Planner Williams responded an analysis would need to be conducted.

Mr. Stevens asked how much an analysis would yield and still provide the 90% of required parking.

Mr. Patel mentioned the proposed plans, to rotate the spaces on the north side 6 – 7 spaces and you could lose 2 – 3 spaces.

Mr. Stevens stated that another option is to allow some of it to be pervious pavement material versus standard asphalt to be more available for other functions if not in demand for parking. Parking would be less desired and used for something else. The option can employ as part of the site plan approval and count as required parking spaces.

Mr. Schoonover asked how far the buildings are from residential. He pointed out that Alternative 1 is closer to the residences than the original proposed site plan.

Associate Planner Williams stated that without dimensions and a detailed plan, it does not seem that much further.

Mr. Schoonover inquired about the mechanical equipment on top of the building.

Associate Planner Williams referenced the screening. She pointed out that they are called out as mechanical on the larger building but not called out the smaller building.

Mr. Stevens commented that it is not shown on the elevations.

Associate Planner Williams stated that it is depicted as a tower component.

Mr. Stevens asked if the tower component needs to be taller. He noted that it does not look like it will fit on the elevation. Most of the pieces of equipment will be 40 inches. He stated he does not see how that will be the right size to have mechanical equipment.

Mr. Denzer stated that there is a mechanical wall on the delivery side.

Keith Underwood, applicant, stated that originally when he approached the City, the plan was for an inpatient/outpatient facility and selected the Puente site. At that time, a similar site plan was submitted with a Craftsman building theme to fit with Early California theme. After discussion with Staff and neighbors, the Spanish theme seemed more preferred, thus the themes were switched.

Mr. Denzer stated that the site plan has skylights over the center of the building. The center of the building focuses on the rehabilitation where the natural light goes which is part of the healing process. He emphasized that the architecture is Spanish style and will include: clay tile, archways and recessed windows. He addressed the referenced blank wall at Building B and stated that it has landscape in order to have the building be a more “park-like” setting. He stated that it is typical in large estates with Spanish Colonial features to have details such as exposed roof rafters.

Mr. Stevens pointed out the outpatient room and noted that the physical therapy room appears larger and asked what types of equipment would be in there.

Jim Ashby, CEO of Care Meridian, replied that the room will be equipped with parallel bars and bicycles.

Mr. Stevens asked what was located on the other half of Building B that appears to have no windows.

Mr. Denzer replied that there are restrooms and storage areas.

Mr. Underwood stated that the skylights within the building benefit the patient congregated area/social area for the interaction with family and serves as a dining area. This will benefit patients outside of their room. The light is designed to filter into the patient's rooms and through the open doors. The focus is on the larger area where the patients exit from.

Mr. Michaelis asked that the applicant point out the exterior building lights and the material being used for the doors.

Mr. Denzer responded that the doors are 8 ft. in height. The doors are wood stained on the outside door which is the same as the window color. He stated that the exterior lights on the columns have not been identified yet.

Mr. Underwood added that the general locations of the lighting will be finalized with the electrical engineer.

Mr. Denzer noted that the mechanical plan will also be reviewed for the wood trellis or fabric trellis so you cannot see the mechanical equipment. He expressed they would be fine with adding the trellis.

Mr. Stevens asked if Building B has smaller mechanical equipment.

Mr. Denzer replied yes.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked who could see the courtyard from inside the building.

Mr. Denzer replied it can be seen by the patients in the rooms of Building A.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked how long the patients are inpatients.

Mr. Ashby responded months, especially those more medically involved.

Mr. Denzer stated that some patients are wheelchair bound and can be brought outside onto the courtyard.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that if the building is more open to that side, there is more of a courtyard view. He added that it does not seem that the building has a strong relationship to the courtyard.

Mr. Underwood stated that every room will not have a view of the patio area.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that there may be a way to arrange a better common area.

Mr. Underwood commented that the current floor plan works with the clinical staff.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if this site plan has been used for other sites.

Mr. Underwood responded there are components that are similar but there are also modifications and enhancements.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that this is a simple plan that has been submitted; however, it can be changed to benefit the area. There are ways to enhance the building and relationship to the site.

Mr. Schoonover asked how many outpatients are there at a time.

Mr. Underwood responded 20; throughout the day however, it is not at the same time. He added there may be 3 – 5 patients at the same time.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the patients are mobile and wheelchair bound.

Mr. Ashby responded both.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the patients drive themselves or does a van pick them up.

Mr. Ashby responded that there are patients that are dropped off and others that are picked up by the van.

Mr. Schoonover pointed out the handicap spaces on Page 4 and commented that they are not conducive to the building.

Mr. Denzer commented that the patients are usually dropped off.

Mr. Schoonover commented that the handicap spaces are not close to the door. He asked if they were included to reduce parking and increase landscaping.

Mr. Underwood stated that the parking given was the highest level of parking with 15 beds which requires two per bed. Currently there are 42 parking spaces proposed which is over parked for their use and not necessary. He noted that the other option is to go through the Conditional Use Permit process to reduce the requirement. He added that it does not seem like a great idea; however, they are happy to entertain removing the parking and the extra 7 spaces are not necessary.

Mr. Schoonover stated that since they will be going through the Conditional Use Permit process, they should just include the parking reduction for review.

Mr. Michaelis asked the applicant to describe in detail the site plan.

Mr. Underwood replied that going down Puente St towards Via Verde, Staff has recommended Alternative 1 as the site plan preferred because it is on the street and features landscaping around versus the offset of the building. He commented that Puente St is pretty diverse residential area and commented he does not feel that by bringing the building closer to the street is beneficial. He noted that as you drive down Puente you see more landscaping and the parking lot is invisible. The landscaping is setback 20 ft. along Puente St. and the landscaping flows a lot better than seeing the back of the building. Alternative Building 1 has the fire station adjacent and does not flow as a nice continue green belt as original proposed.

Mr. Patel commented that the lot is 4 ft. higher than the street and if an additional 4 ft. will be added on top of that or will the grade remain.

Mr. Denzer stated that it will remain and added there is a berm.

Mr. Patel pointed out that the cross section shows 4 ft. of berm.

Mr. Denzer stated that he could see that the parking is a lot higher than the street. He noted that all the proposed changes were made due to the comments from the community meetings with the neighbors. They had indicated they wanted to continue with the “park like” setting.

Mr. Stevens stated that on the site plan, there is an intended connection to the remaining vacant parcel that fronts on Via Verde.

Mr. Underwood stated that it is not an intended connection; however, there was a discussion based on access. In the end, it does not need to be that connectivity.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is an intention to be a fence separation or grade.

Mr. Underwood responded that it will be a solid wall with a step down near the hillside. He noted that the reason for this is to maintain a view versus having a masonry wall visible. He stated that they can do a pilaster with an iron fence and maintain the view but will still have 5 – 6 ft. of fencing separating the properties.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a Lot Line Adjustment occurring with the adjacent vacant properties.

Mr. Underwood replied no. He stated that the original fire access had the Lot Line Adjustment trimmed down so the fire access lane was not needed.

Mr. Stevens confirmed that this is two of the three parcels.

Mr. Badar asked if with the step down, it blocks view from the day care center. The concern is if the day care center can view this type of facility.

Mr. Denzer recommended turning the wall to block the children's view from the facility.

Associate Planner Williams commented that Kinder Care currently has a block wall. Staff suggests a full length solid and to not have it step down and have an open section of pilaster anchoring.

Mr. Underwood stated that a solid wall works well.

Mr. Stevens commented on the likelihood of the adjacent third parcel against this portion of the subject site being parking or landscaping.

Mr. Underwood responded that the parking lot would be hidden and the raised berm would be visible. Alternative 1 has the homes looking down on the parking area versus the nice split parking area. The split parking has the main visitor patient entry and exit for either facility.

Mr. Patel asked for an explanation on the parking circulation for patient drop offs.

Mr. Underwood replied that the patients can be dropped off or the driver can park and walk the patients to the door.

Mr. Schoonover asked if there will be sitting available outside for patients being dropped off so that they are not waiting in front.

Mr. Denzer replied that there is a waiting room in the building.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that there would be a benefit in having a covered area outside where the patients are dropped off.

Mr. Underwood stated that there is a patio overhanging at the right off the entrance and noted that there is minimal traffic.

Mr. Sorcinelli pointed out the entrance of the building and added that a covered outdoor area would be beneficial. He added that as a visitor of this facility, the location of the entrance is not readily noticeable because there is a lack of architectural features. He added that every building needs to have an entrance that is obvious.

Mr. Underwood stated that the reason for the entrance not being as noticeable is because the intention was to be like a home as possible. The idea was to not be so institutional. He stated that he is trying to get away from a hospital institutional feel.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the entrance could be designed appropriately based on the residential scale.

Mr. Underwood stated that numerous hours were spent on the site plan and Alternative 1 was gravitated towards. Staff asked to explore different alternatives, thus Alternative 1 and 2 was created. Staff mentioned they liked the features of Alternative 1. Aesthetically, there are issues with having the building on the street and a large parking lot.

Mr. Stevens asked what type of deliveries and the general frequency of deliveries occur.

Mr. Underwood responded medical supplies and oxygen are delivered.

Mr. Ashby added that the deliveries occur about twice a month.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about onsite cooking.

Mr. Ashby added that some of the patients do not eat but are on formula meals. The will be a cook onsite that goes out and buys the fresh food.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is a kitchen.

Associate Planner Williams responded yes. She added that she visited another location and the kitchen functioned as a normal kitchen. The only difference is a larger pantry but emphasized it is not like a commercial kitchen.

Mr. Underwood stated that the proposed site design is the most functional and addresses Staff's concerns. He noted it is compatible with the surroundings and is an enhancement to Puente Street. By having landscaping over the covered parking area, it will reduce the impact of residences view by going with the original site plan.

Mr. Ashby agreed with the site plan proposed. He noted that the site is ideal to take care of catastrophic patients since they are sensitive to light and noise. He stated that noise can trigger episodes and it is best to get away from heavy noise. He added that light also can have an effect and lead to seizures. He emphasized that is why the rooms are as far off to the side as possible.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the nearby fire station will present a noise issue.

Mr. Ashby replied that the noise is infrequent. He added that some of their facilities are near fire stations and posed no issues.

Stan Stringfellow, F & S Land Development Corp. 2011 E Financial Way Suite 203, Glendora, stated that he is representing the trust, current owner of the adjacent vacant parcel. He requested that there would be some type of retaining wall built in order to be as consistent as possible for future developments. He added he would prefer the wall not be masonry but retaining with fencing on top.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that the drainage issues also need to be addressed including having a drainage agreement in order for the sewer and water can be accessed through the rear of the site for future developments. He commented as a resident, he supports the elimination of the parking and additional landscaping. He asked that the Board move the item forward to Planning Commission and City Council and not return to DPRB.

Mr. Patel commented that the storm drain can only be projected and only existing conditions can be applied.

Mr. Stringfellow explained that he is working with the applicant to add easements.

Mr. Patel stated that there is no sewer connection in terms of the run off and it will need to be added to the plans.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that to his understanding, the water will be treated onsite. The MS4 permit requires any water be treated onsite. He added that it is treated under the parking lot and directly into the storm drain system.

Mr. Stevens stated that there are currently no easements, sewer water or storm drain in place. He added that the intention of today's meeting is to not negotiate but to finalize the land transaction.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that these points are part of the future purchase agreement.

Mr. Stevens stated that unless it is shown on the plans, he is unaware if it is intended to occur. He stated that it is better to express correctly on the plans.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that the conceptual plans do not show an easement.

Mr. Stevens added that a note can be added on the plan that there is a clear intention of an easement. He noted that this information could have been provided earlier.

Gary Enderle, resident of 2044 Via Esperanza, stated that he is the president of the Homeowners Association. He mentioned that the Board looked at the original plans and had concerns for: parking at the front and noted it is preferred at the rear and the lighting for the residents located above and noise. The reason why the parking is best at the front is the concern with vandalism. He added that the discussion of A/C units on the roof is not visible to homeowners so it is not a big issue. He stated that the architectural design is supposed to fit into the existing neighborhood and not stand out and added that some of the alternatives now make it stand out. He noted that if the applicant eliminates one of the driveways, it will not be a good idea. By having two driveways, you would not have a turnaround and enter and exit the same drive aisle. He stated that the adjacent building, medical/office building, would not have been approved previously, and by having parking in front makes it more practical. He noted that the applicant is willing to make the changes.

Marvin Ersher, resident of 1312 Paseo Alamos, stated that Staff he agrees with the applicant that the proposed site plan is the best for many reasons: keeping the parking as far back as possible to reduce the view to the roofline with the berm which is why City Council adopted the Precise Plan and Scenic Highway. He noted that this is the first development proposed at this location. He noted that he supports the present site plan. He stated his concern is with the view shed and the amount of berm needed to create maximum coverage. He does not understand why 6 ft. is preferred versus 4 ft. He is in agreement with the Board that there is too much parking and does not understand why a Conditional Use Permit is not filed to reduce it. He pointed out the traffic circulation, the ingress/egress at Via Palomares. He suggested reviewing traffic information in house. He stated

that there is signage that makes people aware that they need to slow down. He stated that he agrees with Mr. Sorcinelli that the entrance is confusing to locate. He agreed that there should be some type of coverage located at the outside of the building especially when transferring patient from ambulance to the facility. He recommended using a light overhang or canopy to provide coverage. He stated that by having areas to wait outdoors, it is conducive to the environment. He encouraged more architectural features be added. He stated he hopes that the zone does not become a hospital zone if this project is approved. He asked that the applicant explore why there is no easement for the driveway going through the parcel. He agrees that if all the issues are resolved today, it should go to Planning Commission.
Mr. Stevens recommended breaking the discussion into two categories: preference on the site plan and figuring out adjustments for the building architecture.

Mr. Badar stated that he has reviewed all three site plans and the original site plan works best. He commented he is happy with the parking lot and recommended eliminating the seven parking spaces.

Mr. Patel stated that the current site plan provides better circulation, two exits and two entrances. The setback for the building is 85 ft. from the street. He noted that Alternative 1 and 2 are too close to the fire station and concluded that the current site plan works better.

Mr. Stevens noted that the advantage of Alternative 1 versus Alternative 2 is that it pushes the driveway further from the Fire Department and minimizes conflict. He stated that there is not a substantial difference on circulation between Alternative 1 and original site plan. He stated that he is looking at the parking lots in proximity to the building, the northeast corner has a parking lot in front of the building and one at the northwest corner has a building at the street and parking at the rear. He noted that Staff has looked at how to get the building to the street. With that, you run into the functionality issue either force back of the building to be at street or entrance to store front on the street. The pros and cons are to either use neither and the question presented is what provides a better streetscape and viewable parking lot/building. Staff prefers the building and do not see why the parking is hidden behind the berm. There is no advantage to have a 3 ft. high berm if the original plan is chosen. Either portions of Alternative 1 and 2 have paved parking and need to be replaced by permeable pavement or have other enhancements. Working on either of the two plans will have some impact to reduce parking. The parking lot at the northerly end of the property could be completely improved. He stated he is leaning towards Alternative 1 versus the original site plan because it provides a better street presentation than a view of a parking lot.

Mr. Badar commented that he respect's Mr. Steven's opinion; however, every day he drives down the street and views the back of a building. He added that he prefers to see landscaping.

Mr. Schoonover stated that he prefers the original site plan. The issue is the view of a parking lot versus a building. He noted that at first he was hesitant on the rehab center on Gladstone St. because there is no design to the building and right now there is the opportunity to put more landscaping and obtain a better design. The parking lot works better and the parking reduction would work best. He stated his preference has changed from Alternative 1 to the original site plan.

Mr. Michaelis stated that by looking at the site plan there are pros and cons. The presentation by the applicant was very helpful and added he understands the applicant's original plan.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that he was first drawn to the street side of the building. Alternative 1 reinforces the street frontage. The building's current design does not add to the streetscape and there are no architectural qualities. He stated that it is not designed to work on the street. He added that he does not want to see the building on the street and the original plan puts everything in its best context. He stated that he is leaning towards the original site plan.

Mr. Schoonover stated that, overall; the original site plan is favored by the majority.

Mr. Stevens stated that the discussion is about the building's architectural consideration. He stated his concern is with the skylights, entry elements and the simplicity of the architecture. He noted that the mechanical equipment should be on the ground and not on the roof.

Mr. Badar stated that the mechanical equipment on the larger building would work on the ground.

Mr. Denzer commented that it does not work on the ground equipment because the cost increases of the different system. He stated that the equipment is contained and cannot see them from the adjacent surroundings.

Mr. Stevens stated that the architecture can take two approaches. Changes can be tweaked and more detail is needed on the windows. The screening for the equipment needs to be verified and those details need to be resolved today. The benefit of moving the item forward is that comments can be heard from the Planning Commission and City Council and then return back to the DPRB. He noted that it is unfortunate that all the details are not included because now there is an additional review process that has to occur. He noted that the approval of the use should not be held up, thus, he recommended separating the site plan and architectural discussion.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that changes will be made eventually. He noted that the issue is the scale and the realization and desire for a building to have residential character. He noted that everything seems a little small and does not have a presence. There needs to be a greater scale. He stated that the roof tile adds to the texture. He added that there are the light and shade elements and how it plays against one another. He noted that the roof overhangs and asked how that will create shelter along the edge of the building. He recommended adding a tower feature to create a shelter area which will announce an entrance area. The canopy element can connect both buildings assists during weather conditions.

Mr. Schoonover agrees with Mr. Sorcinelli about the items that need to be addressed to brighten up the building. He noted that the parking at front is not a bad idea.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that once you add texture to a building, you then have a place to put higher lighting around the building.

Mr. Stevens asked Staff if they made a determination on separating the conditions of approval.

Associate Planner Williams replied the conditions of approval will be the same for both.

Mr. Stevens stated that there may be an overlap and the conditions of approval for the use and set for the Precise Plan and are part of the design but is not a full design.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the perimeter walls and fencing area a portion of the Precise Plan Review. She asked that Staff provide opinions and direction. She added that it does not require a Conditional Use Permit if it is a solid wall.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a requirement for a wall at the property line.

Associate Planner Williams replied only if it is abutting residential.

Mr. Stevens stated that he does not see benefit for a solid wall but added maybe a seat wall.

Mr. Patel stated that there needs to be something there to take care of the slope drainage.

Mr. Stevens commented that you run into issues of landscape maintenance. He stated that it does not need to be continuous but segmented. He stated that Staff is working on a use permit in a way that refers to the Board's final decision on the design. He stated that some property delineation of open fencing with pilasters is best. He stated that the reduction of parking would need some basis by Code. In theory, a reduction would require an analysis.

Mr. Schoonover asked if a study would be needed.

Mr. Stevens replied there are options available such as waivers in the parking requirements of SDMC 18.156.150. He stated that parking may be waived up to 50% per the Conditional Use Permit subject to approval process outlined. When parking requirements are waived, findings need to be made relatively. It can be added as part of the Conditional Use Permit and can waive up to 20 of the parking spaces and must demonstrate enough land.

MOTION: John Sorcinelli moved, second by Jim Schoonover to move forward with the Precise Plan and Conditional Use Permit to the Planning Commission and City Council. Advised that the project be revised and return to DPRB for review at the conclusion of those two meetings after addressing the following concerns:

1. Provide full architectural details on all items.
2. Final property line fencing.
3. Modification of the pavement in the parking areas to permeable materials to reduce the appearance of paved parking (up to 15 parking spaces).
4. Consideration of comments made in regards to the use of wainscot and/or other alternative materials.
5. Inclusion of an entry component in some form either between the buildings, from the parking lot or some combination thereof.
6. Consideration of a parking waiver to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
7. Revision of the scale of the building and appropriate adjustments such as: roof overhang and light and shadow.
8. Incorporation of decorative paving.
9. Provision of pedestrian amenities/site furniture.

Motion carried 5-1-1-0 (Badar, Michaelis, Patel, Schoonover and Sorcinelli Yes, Stevens No and Dilley Absent)

Mr. Patel stated that he would rather see the details worked out earlier than later.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant's main concern is the property transaction needs to be approved before entitlements. If the item reaches City Council in early January, it can return to DPRB January/February.

Mr. Badar commented that he is disappointed these items were not addressed earlier. He recommended Staff and the applicant be on the same page and have better cooperation.

Mr. Stevens stated that the next step is to be heard at Planning Commission in December.

Mr. Ersher recommended having the Planning Commission meet in January versus in December.

Mr. Underwood suggested meeting on the normal Planning Commission, December 19. He added it will be a detriment to push back to January.

Mr. Stevens stated that notices can be sent out early, prior to the staff report. From Staff's point of view, the December meeting can be met.

Mr. Ersher asked if the Conditional Use Permit is appealable.

Mr. Stevens responded both the Conditional Use Permit and Precise Plan are appealable.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m. to the meeting of December 12, 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: December 12, 2013