DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
March 13, 2014 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 8:31 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Larry Stevens to approve the January 23, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Dilley and Sorcinelli Abstained).

DPRB Case No. 13-38 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-06

A request to construct a 3,474 square foot single-family residence with an attached 812 square foot three-car garage, and remove three mature oak trees located at 348 E. Allen Avenue in the Single-Family Agricultural SF-A (20,000) Zone.

APN: 8392-006-081

Zone: Single-Family Agricultural (SF-A 20,000)

Victor Guerra, 831 N Northcape Ave, was present.
Steve Miccicle, WF Construction, was present.
Jamie and Mark Moreno, residents of 850 N Walnut Ave, were present.
George Saravia, 832 N Northcape Ave, was present.
Jim Skinner, 850 N Walnut Ave, was present.
Norma Vargas, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the proposed project is for a single-family home on a vacant parcel in the Single-Family Agricultural which allows for horse keeping. The property measures approximately 37,000 sq. ft. The proposed house is one-story with the exception of the 2nd story above the garage. The house will have craftsman elements including: siding on pop-outs, stone wainscot along the street, decorative entry porch columns, composition shingle roof and window shutters for street facing windows. Since this is a horse keeping property, the applicant has to show on the plans

the “potential” for horse corrals. He added that the applicant does not intend to build the corrals but demonstrates on the plans that there is sufficient space for them in the future if needed. The landscaping plan does not show landscaping throughout the front yard as part of the approval. The entire front yard setback will have to be landscaped. Also, there is a tree removal request to remove three trees that are in the way of the proposed driveway.

Mr. Stevens asked what material will be used for the siding.

Associate Planner Torrico responded Hardie board.

Mr. Stevens asked if there was a color board submitted.

Associate Planner Torrico responded yes.

Mr. Stevens commented that the Hardie plank on the material board is fine.

Mr. Patel asked about the landscaping in the front setback behind the curb.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that it is 20 ft. from the property line and noted that it is typically fully landscaped.

Mr. Patel noted that the landscaping appears to be up to the sidewalk.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the right-of-way goes beyond the sidewalk.

Mr. Patel pointed out the back yard. He asked if the applicant plans on extending the back yard.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the current request does not show an extension of the back yard.

Mr. Patel stated that for the garage facing the street. He believes there should be an extension of the paved area for a turnaround to face the street when reversing out. He requested 26 ft. turnout of the driveway.

Mr. Stevens stated that there is plenty of space to turnout and recommend not adding any more additional feet.

Associate Planner Torrico noted that the code requires 26 ft. of space and the applicant is providing 40 ft.

Mr. Stevens asked if the right-of-way improvements to the sidewalk were done in conjunction with the parcel map.

Mr. Patel responded yes.

Mr. Stevens asked if the driveway approach is new or existing.

Associate Planner Torrico responded existing.

Mr. Badar asked if there have been other projects proposed at the location.

Mr. Stevens responded yes but added that he is not sure if it was this particular parcel. He noted that there was a 4 lot subdivision that occurred in the early 90's. A previous proposal was for a 9 lot subdivision.

George Saravia, 832 N Northcape Ave, posed a concern for the project. He asked if there are future plans to extend the backyard and asked if the setback is from the fence to the property line.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that there is no setback required by the Code; however, a 5' setback is recommended to comply with Building and Fire regulations.

Mr. Saravia asked if it is extended into the setback, would there be another hearing.

Mr. Stevens responded that it depends if the number of trees removed exceeds three. Staff can approve up to three in conjunction with an improvement but added it would be Staff review if it were additional.

Mr. Saravia reiterated that it depends on the length of the backyard that could trigger an additional hearing.

Mr. Stevens responded that it is a judgment call. He stated that if it is a high retaining wall with more trees being removed, then more judgment would be applied.

Mr. Saravia asked what the property line fence is to the bottom of the slope.

Associate Planner Torrico responded 64 ft., roughly 75 ft. from the bottom of the slope. He added that it varies.

Victor Guerra, 831 N Northcape Ave, stated that the previous owners removed a lot of trees and added that he spent a lot of money to put in walkways to stabilize their hill due to the tree removal. He commented that when he heard more trees were to be removed, he was concerned.

Mr. Saravia asked about the height of the pitch from the 2nd story to the ground.

Associate Planner Torrico responded 25 ft.

Mr. Guerra commented that there are no additional concerns at this point but in past, they were not given the opportunity to speak with the property owners prior to the removal of the trees and appreciate the opportunity to today.

Associate Planner Torrico reassured the neighbor that the slope will not be disturbed.

Mr. Saravia asked when construction will begin.

Associate Planner Torrico responded once the project is approved, there is a 14 day appeal period, and then the applicant can submit for plan check.

Mr. Stevens added that the approval is valid for one year and once a permit is secured a one year extension can be applied for which means they have about two years to complete. He noted that they can get through plan check in about 2 ½ months and construction could start 3 months from now.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 14-08

A request to replace an existing master sign program for San Dimas Plaza located at 1005 W. Arrow Highway.

APN's: 8383-010-024 – 034, 037, 040, 064 – 069 & 078

Zone: Specific Plan No. 18, Area

Steve Miccicle, WF Construction, was present.
Gary Yuke, of Ainor Signs, Inc. was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the original sign program was approved in 1986; however, it did not address specifications for monument signs. In 2002, the Board approved 2 monument signs along Arrow Highway; however, the sign program was not revised to include language pertaining to monument signs. The update to the program will comply with the current Sign Code. The new sign program will include: approval procedures, sign installation specifications, sign type allowances and pylon sign tenant panels. The 2 current monument signs are located along Arrow Highway and the proposed signs will be in the same location. He noted that many of the existing signs have raceways. It's been the practice of the Planning Division to approve channel letter signs or sign cabinets, directly to the wall. He added that additional language will be included that the existing raceways remains; however, when new signs are installed, the raceways need to be removed and the sign needs to be installed directly onto the wall. He noted that raceways will not be permitted anymore and added that if approved today, the monument signs will be submitted for Director's Review for approval.

Mr. Stevens asked if the sign is larger than the existing sign.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that they are slightly larger and comply.

Mr. Stevens stated that there was difficulty when the Sign Code was rewritten. He stated that a monument sign could have up to 10 tenants. He added that the current sign has 10 tenants; however, 8 tenants are preferred so that businesses have maximum visibility.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the panel lettering is 8 inches in height and the panels are 11 inches in height.

Mr. Stevens asked if the signs need to be changed due to the ADA access improvements.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that the sign is in the same location and the ADA ramp does not affect the sign.

Mr. Stevens commented that there is one sign permitted for each street frontage.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that language will be included that no additional sign can be added on Lone Hill Avenue.

Mr. Stevens stated that all the pads are included within the sign program with the exception of the gas station which has its own monument sign and price panels.

Associate Planner Torrico reiterated that the gas station is not included in the proposed sign program.

Mr. Patel inquired about the existing sign compared to the new sign. He stated that the new sign height appears to be 8 ft. with the lowest grade allowed at 6 ft. He stated that the existing sign is less than the proposed sign.

Mr. Stevens commented he thinks it is 6 ft. of the total height.

Mr. Patel inquired about the right-of-way setback.

Mr. Stevens responded there is no setback requirement and is permitted in the 20 ft. landscape setback.

Mr. Patel stated that there is a line of sight concern and added that the proposed sign will not affect the future street project.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that he has discussed this item with Senior Engineer Shari Garwick and noted that the sign will not be affected. He emphasized that today is for the approval of the sign program and emphasized the monument sign will be approved at a later date.

Mr. Michaelis commented that having the address on the monument sign is very helpful; however, since this shopping center has multiple addresses, will an address range be reflected on the sign.

Mr. Stevens stated that the address range should be shown or only the major tenant address. He added that it is not a requirement of the Sign Code to show the address range but only to include an address.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the tenants will argue which business is placed on the monument sign.

Mr. Stevens replied that the management company of the shopping center is responsible for deciding what business name goes on the sign.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the decision of what business goes on the monument sign should be the businesses that are less visible from the street since other businesses are along the street front.

Associate Planner Torrico commented that it is up to the management company to decide who gets to be displayed on the monument sign.

Mr. Stevens explained that the names included in the staff report is a sample of what the names would look like on the sign but is not the final decision. He stated that Staff is not responsible for what businesses go on the sign. He asked if the background color is white.

Associate Planner Torrico responded beige.

Mr. Stevens stated that he is trying to remember the Creative Growth Zone relative to background colors of signs. He recommended trying to get away from the white color and stated that there are examples of signs where they appear off white and noted that the program says no white acrylic.

Gary Yuke, of Ainor Signs, Inc., stated that they will be using the same cream color used for the existing signs. He stated that they will be matching the colors this morning.

Mr. Stevens commented that the color is closer to tan rather than white.

Mr. Yuke stated that the colors are very close to the building colors. He added that the shopping center is owned by one property owner, Brixmor. He stated that Brixmor has signed the application and added that they make all the decisions. As for the tenants, the larger tenants are able to use their logo colors and the smaller tenants use standard colors to allow better visibility. He addressed the concern with the address number range and added he will measure to see how much ledgestone there is in order to possibly include.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Sign Code says the address shall be identified; however, it does not specific an address range needs to be included. He added that it is helpful to the traveler.

Mr. Yuke stated that the overall height proposed is 6 ½ to 7 inches higher, than the existing sign, because of the cap on top.

Mr. Stevens stated that both signs slope into the landscaped areas. He stated that there have been issues with sign companies installing signs that do not match the approved plans. He added that it is best to coordinate with the inspector to verify it matches.

Mr. Yuke stated that the minimum setback for Smart & Final is 8 ft. from the curb to the monument sign. He referred to the provided exhibit for the easterly sign and added that it will not be installed close to the 8 ft. because the turn visibility is too close to the right-of-way. He stated that it tends to be blocked by the signal box. The sign will be 10 ft. back with a minimum of 8 ft. required.

Mr. Patel stated that both signs will require a line of sight study. He expressed his concern with Exhibit B rather than Exhibit A.

Mr. Yuke stated that it is over 100 ft. for the line of sight visibility and stated that it currently meets the requirements.

Mr. Stevens interjected that he does not see the line of sight being an issue since it is 100 ft. from the driveway.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if Smart & Final has already been added to the pylon sign visible from the freeway. He recalled that the Ralphs sign was designed to their oval shaped logo and was wondering if Smart and Final changed to shape. He asked if the final approved sign program can included a visual representation of Smart and Final on the pylon sign.

Mr. Yuke responded that the Smart & Final sign fits perfectly onto the pylon sign. He also indicated that he will include Smart and Final representation on the pylon sign within the sign program. He noted that on the pylon sign, Smart and Final has a red background and the Sign Code states that the background should be opaque, which they have followed. He added that the readability is better.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the modifications have been done on top of the cabinet where San Dimas Plaza is located. He recommended that the pylon sign be updated since it is outdated. He asked if there is some benefit to enhance the sign to bring in line with the new monument signs being proposed.

Mr. Stevens stated that Staff cannot require that the pylon signs be updated but he stated that language can be added in the sign program that if a tenant modifies their signs in the future, they need to update the pylon sign as well. He added that they would need to apply for a sign face change.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the owner would need to want to update their center. He reemphasized that the signs are outdated.

Mr. Stevens commented that Staff can tell the owner it is Staff's suggestion to update their signs but cannot require that of the property owner.

Mr. Yuke stated that he can pass this information on to Brixmor and request they look at updating their pylon sign.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried 7-0

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 a.m. to the meeting of March 27, 2014 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 10, 2014