

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
April 24, 2014 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works (*Departed at 10:14 a.m.*)  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large  
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development  
Jeff Templeman, City Council (*Departed at 9:47 a.m.*)

**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 Jim Schoonover to approve the April 10, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-1-2 (Badar Absent and Patel and Sorcinelli Abstained).

**DPRB Case No. 13-12**

A request to construct a proposed approximately 9,400 – square foot single-story inpatient facility and approximately 1,650 – 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)

Jim Ashby, CEO of Care Meridian, was present.  
Gary Enderle, resident of 2044 Via Esperanza, was present.  
Ron Panich, Care Meridian, was present.  
Darris Peterson, EV&A Architects, was present.  
Stan Stringfellow, F & S Land Development Corp. 2011 E Financial Way Suite 203, Glendora, was present.  
Keith Underwood, applicant, was present.  
Ed Vance, EV&A Architects, was present

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that this case was previously heard at the DPRB meeting of November 21, 2013. The project was reviewed in terms of: site design, layout and architecture. The Board accepted the site building placement as proposed but gave specific recommendations for revisions on the architecture of the buildings and on site amenities, furniture and patio areas. Property line walls and fencing were discussed including the ability to forego a solid masonry wall along the whole zone boundary, and the potential elimination of some parking spaces was also discussed; however, both the alternative perimeter fencing and elimination of parking spaces required a conditional use permit and therefore consideration of the Planning Commission. The Board advised the applicant to make revisions to the Development Plan but allowed the related applications, CUP 13-01 and Precise Plan 13-01, to move forward for review by the Planning Commission and City Council. At the meeting of January 14, 2014 the City Council approved CUP 13-01 and PP 13-01 for the use itself, possible elimination of solid walls at a zone boundary, and waiver of 7 parking spaces with a condition that the project come back to the City Council after the DPRB concludes its review for site plan details, rear fencing details, and building architecture details.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that that are a few changes to the project. The inpatient building has been reduced by 600 sq. ft. and the outpatient building has been reduced by 900 sq. ft. The buildings have been pushed back an additional approximately 12 ft. from the front property line to allow for a free-standing entry feature, which was requested at the DPRB meeting. An arched entry with tile accents indicated the pass-through area to access both the inpatient and outpatient buildings. The Council also granted a parking waiver through CUP 13-01 of seven (7) spaces to bring the total parking spaces down from 42 to 35. This allowed the elimination of a parking pocket on the northwestern most portion of the development and the incorporation of additional landscaping and a bio swale retention area. She noted that the mechanical equipment to be installed on the roof has been moved to the ground and will be screened by solid walls. The skylights were proposed to run the ridge of the roofline have been removed and replaced with smaller bulb skylights. More details have been provided for the proposed doors and windows. The windows will be recessed on the outpatient building and are popped out on the patient rooms. Light fixtures have been selected for the building and parking lot. She stated that the Board requested more architectural details and Staff believes the applicant has made the necessary changes. City Council granted a waiver of solid masonry walls at a zone boundary, with the final property line fencing design to be reviewed and approved by the DPRB and come back to the City Council for final review. A 5 ft. tall black wrought iron fence with 6 ft. tall stucco-finished pilasters with brick cap are proposed for approximately 400 lineal feet along the property line on the southwest, fronting the adjacent hillside. The pilasters are proposed at 25 ft. on center and the fence would climb with the hillside.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that there are also a few outstanding issues including the use of wainscot and/or other alternative materials revolve around the architectural style. Staff feels that the wainscot is not appropriate. Tile squares have been added as an accent around the entry way. A colorful tile could be inlaid to match the tile around the arched entry, rather than tiles that match the stucco. Clay pipes are also an alternative and a decorative/enhanced railing could be incorporated. There is also the entry component in some form that needs to be included either between the buildings, from the parking lot of some combination thereof. There is currently a free-standing arched entry way with tile accents and a gable tile roof what has been incorporated to provide guidance to the entry of both buildings. Another issue includes, the revision of the scale of the building with appropriate adjustments such as roof overhang and light and shadow. The buildings feature deep eave overhangs of approximately 3 ft. with decorative exposed rafters. The Board suggested that improvements could be made to the relationship between the buildings and courtyard. The Board has discussed the potential addition of an arcade or other roof overhang to provide additional indoor/outdoor space, or revision of the relation of the inpatient building to the patio, but has not been incorporated. Another issue is in regards to the incorporation of decorative paving. Decorative pavers are proposed at each drive aisle entry. The incorporation of additional decorative hardscape would add architectural interest

to the site; however, smooth surfaces are also desired by the applicant. Staff recommends a band of pavers be used on the edges of colored concrete walkways to provide texture. There is also the issue of the outpatient building needing more architectural interest on the north and west elevations, which face Puente Street and Via Palomares. She noted that this could be improved by adding additional architectural treatment such as arched trellises.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** asked if a landscaping plan has been submitted.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied yes.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that the Board discussed pedestrian amenities and furniture. Benches that face south have been added next to the entry for both buildings. They would not be facing vehicles coming to the drop-off/pick-up area. Additional coverings/patios and amenities could be provided for the outdoor area facing the hillside. Seat walls and planters that have been eliminated from the original submittal could be incorporated back into the development. She added that the applicant prefers the flexibility of movable furniture to fixed site furniture for the rear patio areas. The applicant prefers to not have permanent furniture at the back patio. She added that there are a few blank wall spaces that could benefit from additional architectural interest, she recommended tile murals. She indicated that the applicant has addressed the items of concern and Staff recommends approval to the City Council. She added for the record that Dr. Ersher submitted an email with comments and concerns since he was unable to attend the meeting.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked if the brick banding will be laid out on certain areas.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied that it could be done throughout the property including on the pathways going towards the site. She added that it is most beneficial to focus on the areas at the entry point and added it could be an aesthetic benefit.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked if the driveway entrances have pavers.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied yes, approximately 20 ft. into the development.

**Mr. Stevens** pointed out page 4 of the plans and asked if there are details for the terracing and retaining wall.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied there are two retaining walls proposed at the rear of the site.

**Mr. Stevens** asked about the perimeter fencing and pilasters if they are the same along the West and South property line.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied yes and added the wall goes up until the fire station wall.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the blocks of the base between the pilasters are open or closed.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded open.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that on Page 7 of the plans, the conceptual landscaping depicts a large area adjacent to Puente St. near Via Palomares. He asked if the bio swale retention basin will be fully landscaped.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied yes. She added that they plan on doing a thorough landscaping plan check to ensure appropriate plant materials are selected and do not intend for the area to be a barren area.

**Mr. Stevens** recommended that the applicant verify there is appropriate spacing of plant materials so that it does not become a dirt area. He added that it's possible to have a nice landscaped area when it functions as a bio swale. He questioned the exterior elevations and the details on the trellis.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that there are a lot of things to be done including the arch trellis near the windows that are recessed.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the arch trellis can be done to mimic. He added that tile would be preferred over the trellis. He asked how many patios are at the location.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded there are two separate patio areas and one includes a trellis cover.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the entry is fully covered.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that there are standing pillars with an open area for the inpatients and outpatients.

**Mr. Stevens** pointed out the columns and suggested that they come out more.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that there are standing pillars with an open area for the inpatients and outpatients.

**Mr. Stevens** suggested that the covering be larger to provide sun and rain protection.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked for an explanation of the windows.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that single hung windows are used throughout with a grid pattern. She added that the windows are operable.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** pointed out that the size of the windows on the plans seems large. He asked what color and material are being used.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied vinyl windows in a dark chocolate finish.

**Keith Underwood, applicant**, stated that the patients windows are all the same, single hung with the bottom capable of sliding up and there will be pop out windows. He stated that all the windows are intended to be operational but are grounded windows. He commented that based on the manufacture information, all the windows have single hung capacity, even for the sizes proposed. The windows can be opened from the bottom to the top or side slider and come with a grid pattern as shown on the plans.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the windows are inset from exterior wall surface.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded yes, four (4) inches.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked what material will be used for the windows.

**Mr. Underwood** responded the windows are all vinyl, one panned and clipped on.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** commented that for new homes, Staff requests windows that are an inch or wider.

**Mr. Underwood** commented that they plan on using the 2500 Vinyl series.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** commented that another series would need to be selected. He recommended windows that have dimension both inside and outside. He questioned the building and asked if the lights are compliant with the Building Code.

**Building Official Eric Beilstein** stated that the light fixtures and lighting would need to comply.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the configuration presented is compliant. He commented that he does not believe they will comply.

**Building Official Eric Beilstein** commented that he cannot determine without a cut sheet of the light specifications.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that the decorative element can be lost if it is not in compliance.

**Building Official Eric Beilstein** stated that there are energy code requirements; however, you are discussing Cal Green codes.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** suggested that the model or series number for the lighting be determined soon because if the applicant waits too long, the series may not be available for purchase. He recommended resolving the issue at Staff level to speed up the process.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** recommended that for future plan submittals, lighting should be looked at more closely and that it complies with the California Building Code.

**Building Official Eric Beilstein** stated that based on looking at the proposed fixtures, the light is only 13 watts. This fixture is meant to provide some architectural enhancements and not used for photometric guidelines for Cal Green.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** recommended that the Building Official look at the fixtures closely and make a determination.

**Building Official Eric Beilstein** stated the light fixtures are not designed to enhance the photometric, just the aesthetics.

**Mr. Underwood** commented that the floor plan has changed and the square footage has been reduced. He explained that the reduction of square footage is minimal; the physical therapy area was reduced. Originally, the mechanical equipment was rooftop but the Board determined that it should be grounded. He added that instead of a tower element it will be housed. He pointed out there was a skylight on the ridge; however, it does not blend with the Spanish motif. The trellis was added at the front of the new entry way and the addition of covered patio trellis for a shaded area. He pointed out the entryway and asked if it is enough for patient overhead coverage. The inpatient facility will have low traffic volume. 15 to 20 patients will come and go to the outpatient facility on a daily basis.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** asked over the course of the month, how many patients are transferred.

**Jim Ashby, CEO of Care Meridian**, replied two to three at most.

**Mr. Patel** asked how many patients would be in the outpatient facility at a time.

**Mr. Ashby** responded 10 to 15 patients are in and out all day. He commented that a covered entry way is really not needed.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked how the patients will arrive at the facility.

**Mr. Ashby** responded the patients will be transferred by van or dropped off.

**Mr. Underwood** pointed out the floor plan and site plan. He pointed out the drop off and pick up lane and noted it is 6 ft. wide not for volume purposes but for ease of access. He added that the roof covers are 6 ft. and are a sizable area where people can walk in. He explained that the roof and overhang at the entrance of the inpatient facility are very close. He stated that they wanted to provide a focal entryway and provided archways to try and make it aesthetically appealing.

**Mr. Underwood** explained he tried selecting accent lights to match the Spanish Colonial theme. He added that in regards to parking, he felt they were "over parked" per the original standards and agrees with the reduced parking spaces.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** commented that the applicant needs to show the changes when they return to Council including the landscaping material proposed.

**Mr. Stevens** recommended that the applicant provide photos of the bio swale of plants as well.

**Mr. Patel** stated that there are different types of soils that may not be conducive to the bio swale. He asked if a percolation test has been done.

**Mr. Underwood** replied yes.

**Building Official Eric Beilstein** stated that based on soils reports, a fill is required.

**Ed Vance, EV&A Architects**, commented that the soil is percolated.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the bio swale is intended to be irrigated.

**Mr. Stevens** responded yes and commented that it is best to use materials that will work correctly and have purpose. He added that you have to be careful with trees and retention requirements because the trees end up having less ornamental value. For example, you cannot use California natives because they won't stand in water.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** commented that there are close to 200 plants in the bio swale and will need irrigation.

**Mr. Underwood** stated that the perimeter of the fence is continuous along the property line. The theme of the building originally started off as a craftsman fit in the early California theme. He stated that they took classic styles of different areas to match the features and preserve functionality of the site. He added that sometimes too much of a certain theme can be unappealing. He noted that the trellises do not appear fantastic; however, the intent is to have the landscape with it. He added that he cannot show the final product without the landscaping included.

**Mr. Stevens** asked what material is being used for the trellis and how will it be attached.

**Mr. Underwood** responded iron and that the trellis will be physically attached with a stand off the wall and have vine features integrated.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked if the intent is to have a landscape features.

**Mr. Stevens** responded that if that is the intent, the submitted plans do not depict that and needs to be included for future plan submittals.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** asked if there could be an explanation on Condition No. 15 in regards to parking circulation. He commented that it doesn't seem fair to request a change on the plans each time the Board meets.

**Mr. Stevens** responded that the intention is to not have the applicant make every single change and look at every single detail right away when the plans will also be plan checked. During the plan check process, those additional components will be reviewed. The changes discussed at the meetings are relatively minor and allows for minor adjustments.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** asked if the parking circulation is an issue.

**Mr. Stevens** responded that the ADA path of travel is not shown at this stage in the plans, which will be added at time of plan check. He added slight adjustments can be made for the circulation.

**Councilman Jeff Templeman** inquired about Condition No. 7 and asked if it has already been approved, why Staff is asking for compliance with certain features and specifications.

**Mr. Stevens** replied that depending on other features such as mailbox location, etc... it is not something that is asked for at the design approval stage but is something that can be included at final plan submittal. He added that on the flipside of the coin, the applicant could come in later wanting to make changes to the approval that is not consistent with the original submittal design thus conditions have to be inflicted.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** commented that the design element is not only looked at but the plans need to meet additional requirements during plan check. He noted that sometimes all the little details not provided would be looked at during plan check because they are more intricate.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** questioned Condition No. 19 and added that the lighting needs to be addressed and meet concerns of the Board. He asked if the Cal Green Code requires bike racks based on occupancy.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that the Parking Code requires bike racks and that bike racks are included in the plans on Page 7.

Councilman Jeff Templeman departed at 9:57 a.m.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked the Board to come to a decision but review all the key points one by one. He asked about the use of clay pipe versus the existing design of the eaves. He pointed out the clay pipes under the gable and asked if the Board would like to see decorative features.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that currently, Staff would like the tile to match the color of the building or use clay pipes.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the applicant is currently proposing tile.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded on Page 15 of the plans depicts wrought iron as a decorative element.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** commented that accent tile would make more sense.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that the size for the arch entry way is appropriate.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** pointed out that the elevations reflect that the windows are different in size.

**Mr. Vance** replied that they can make them all the same size or reduce the larger windows.

**Mr. Stevens** suggested working with Staff on sizes and that the accent tiles be incorporated around the arched entry way and under gable accents.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** agreed on the accent tile used for the entryway.

**Mr. Michaelis** commented that the extended entrance for the patient drop off does not seem necessary for the operation of the facility. He added that it appears acceptable as is.

**Mr. Patel** commented that the addition of the focal entry point adds to the facility design.

**Mr. Michaelis** opened the discussion of the preference for the trellis as rectangular versus the arched design and added that he hopes it works with the landscaping.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that he is not convinced on the detail of the landscaping at this point.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that if there is an arch, it needs to be more than an arch. The use of landscaping to sell that component of the building needs to be shown on the plans.

**Mr. Vance** asked how the Board would like to see that depicted on the plans.

**Mr. Stevens** responded that it needs to be made clear with a note on the landscaping plan or elevation plan to clearly represent the proposed trellis with landscaping.

**Mr. Michaelis** talked about the brick banding and noted that there is a brick banding at the entrance.

**Associate Planner Williams** recommended the brick banding be incorporated at the entryway and selected locations to enhance the decorative hardscape.

**Mr. Underwood** stated that when the planters are included, they can be lined with the pavers to match the driveway. He added that they are open to suggestions but prefers to not do the entire site because it will be an additional cost. He stated that they will put decorative pavers but not on many areas of the property.

Mr. Patel departed at 10:14 a.m.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that he is ok with the selected locations for the entryway but the pavers are not necessary to be throughout.

**Mr. Michaelis** inquired about the seating and pickup area of the benches facing the building.

**Mr. Underwood** commented that they are using decorative wrought iron benches and added that there is not a lot of foot traffic.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** commented that the benches can be moved around.

**Mr. Michaelis** stated that if the bench goes against the building, it will have the benefit of the overhang.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that the applicant is better off with the benches against the building and not the use of wrought iron benches. He stated that he is convinced there will be visitors and the benches will be useful. He recommended having the bench accessible and convenient.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked if there is movable furniture at the back area. He stated that one trellis is fine; however, if the applicant sees the benefit of having two trellises, that would also be fine.

**Associate Planner Williams** addressed the windows. She stated that the window styles are single hung. The details either have inset or have dimensioned pop out. She noted that the contour grilles will be available. The minimum thickness of 1 1/8 is acceptable; the line shows the flat grill is available. She added that it is not inset on the glass but protruded out and needs to be made clear by the applicant. She added that the windows are to be inset instead of popped-out at South elevation of Building A (Inpatient Building), window grilles style and width to simulate divide light panels and to be exterior, with final details to be submitted for approval of and to the satisfaction of the Planning Department during plan check.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that the way the windows are shown, the details are different than the elevations.

**Mr. Underwood** stated that the pop out windows are recessed.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that he is ok with the selected locations for the entryway but the pavers are not necessary to be throughout.

**Associate Planner Williams** verified that the Board wants recessed versus pop out windows on the inpatient building.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the item will be heard at City Council on May 13, 2014. He noted that the same individuals will be notified as today's meeting: adjacent property owners, individuals who attended the previous Planning Commission and City Council meetings and residents who requested to be notified.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover to recommend approval to the City Council subject to the conditions included with the staff report and added conditions. The added conditions include: accent tiles be incorporated around the arched entry way and under gable accents, brink banding be incorporated at the entryway and selected locations to enhance the decorative hardscape, windows to be inset instead of popped-out at South elevation of Building A (Inpatient Building), window grilles style and width to simulate divide light panels and to be exterior, with final details to be submitted for approval of and to the satisfaction of the Planning Department during plan check and appropriate landscaping to be incorporated especially at the bio swale area, to the satisfaction of the Planning Department during plan check.

Motion carried 5-0-2-0 (Patel and Templeman Absent)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:39 a.m. to the meeting of May 8, 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: May 8, 2014