

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
June 12, 2014 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

Emmett Badar, City Council (*Departed at 12:00 p.m.*)
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 8:33 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 May 8, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Sorcinelli and Badar Abstained).

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the May 22, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Badar Abstain).

DPRB Case No. 14-20

A request to allow outdoor seating within the Public Right-Of-Way for Rail Side Café located at 322 S. San Dimas Avenue (Grove Station).

APN: 8390-018-090

Zone: Creative Growth 3 (CG-3)

Josee Norman, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the applicant is requesting approval to establish outdoor seating for Rail Side Café. The café is a live/work unit located in the Grove Station development. The City's Outdoor Dining policy allows outdoor dining as an incidental use to an established restaurant, coffee house, or other food service business, subject to a Director's Review. Typically outdoor seating is located adjacent to the building; however, given that the applicant is requesting to locate the tables away from the building, Staff is asking the Development Plan Review Board to consider the request. The applicant is requesting to locate three tables outside of the café within the public right-of-way. The table's measure 28 inches square and will include two chairs and an umbrella. The applicant explored locating tables adjacent to the building but due to the umbrella, their placement would extend further

into the sidewalk and create conflict with the pedestrian path of travel and handicap access. Therefore, the applicant is requesting that the tables be placed further away from the building where there is more ample space to accommodate the tables. Placing the tables in an area away from the building, will provide for more clearance and will not obstruct the pedestrian path of travel. If the Board approves the request, the applicant shall be required to receive approval for an encroachment permit from the Public Works Department. He concluded that Staff recommends approval of the location of the tables.

Emmett Badar asked if the applicant can put additional tables by the front windows of the business.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that in the future, the applicant can have additional tables without the umbrellas; however, they would need to return to the Planning Staff for approval.

Krishna Patel commented that the ADA pathway and grade would need to be looked at.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, added that it is within 2% of cross slope adjacent to the building.

Krishna Patel stated that there is no ADA pathway would be blocked if the tables are placed against the building.

Larry Stevens stated that if you put the tables adjacent to the building and it is in the designated path of travel, then it would not be approved.

Associate Planner Torrico commented that any additional tables at other locations would need to be reviewed by the Public Works Department as well.

Larry Stevens asked about size of the work unit.

Josee Normand, applicant, responded 800 sq. ft.

Larry Stevens commented that the unit is one of the larger ones. He asked if there is an entrance to the live work unit on the west and north side.

Associate Planner Torrico responded yes.

John Sorcinelli commented that outdoor dining with tables and benches is a great idea.

Larry Stevens asked if the tables and chairs will be brought in every night.

Josee Normand responded that they could be brought in every night if requested.

Larry Stevens stated that, for now, it will be the best approach to bring in the tables and chairs at the conclusion of each day. He added that if situation changes, the idea can be reconsidered.

John Sorcinelli commented that the area appears to have additional room to include more tables and chairs and requested that additional tables be considered instead of only the requested three tables.

Emmett Badar asked if it would be ok for the applicant to use larger tables in the future if they requested.

Larry Stevens replied that they are not limited for table size; however, they have to ensure the path of travel is not blocked.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve with a modification to Condition No. 7 to allow seating for up to five tables with chairs versus the initial three tables requested and added Condition No. 8, "The tables and chairs shall be required to be brought indoors at the close of each business day. In the future, if the applicant requests that the tables and chairs be left outside at the close of each business day, it will be subject to review by Planning Staff."

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 13-31 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-05

A request to develop 47 two- and three- story townhomes on approximately 3.65 acres in a gated community located at 155 N. Eucla Avenue. The residential units will range in size from 1,315 sq. ft. to 1,838 sq. ft. Each unit will have a two – car garage (totaling 94 parking spaces) and an additional 48 on-site parking stalls for residents and visitors; 52,800 sq. ft. of open space including a private community garden, green space and recreational activities, a horseshoe pit and bocce ball court at the west side of the project.

Associated Case: Tentative Tract Map 72590 (TTM 13-02), Amendment to Specific Plan No. 23, General Plan Amendment 14-01, Municipal Code Text Amendment 13-06 and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

APN's: 8386-006-010, 025 – 029

Zone: Specific Plan No. 23

Jeffrey Addison, was present.

Nancy S. Andrade, 506 W. 4th St., property owner, was present.

Denise Ashton, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, was present.

Alice Barreras, 523 W. 4th St., property owner, was present.

Ben Besley, City Ventures – 1900 Quail St., Newport Beach CA 92660, was present.

Scott Burkett, 512 W. 3rd St., property owner, was present.

Tony Carbone, 221 N Eucla Ave, property owner, was present.

Peter A. Duarte, Landscape Architect – Studio Pad, 92 Argonaut, Aliso Viejo CA 92656, was present.

Larry Fator, 209 N. Eucla Ave, property owner, was present.

Louisa Felettom, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, was present.

Gilbert and Martha Gamboa, property owners of 414 W 3rd St., were present.

Jim Johnson, 540 W 3rd St., property owner was present.

Delia G. Lee, 524 W. 3rd St., property owner, was present.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures – 1900 Quail St., Newport Beach CA 92660, was present.

JG Martinez, 513 W. 3rd St., property owner, was present.

Resident/Property Owner, 444 W. 3rd St., was present.

Angel and Rosa Torres, 530 W. 3rd St., property owners, were present.

Emma Sullivan, 531 W. 4th St., property owner, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza started off by stating that there will be additional meetings after today's DPRB meeting including: Planning Commission and City Council. Those hearings will be reviewing the overall site whereas DPRB reviews the architectural design. He emphasized that the individuals noticed today will be noticed again for those meetings.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the number of neighbor notifications that were mailed for today's meeting.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that 328 neighbors were notified about the meeting.

Mr. Stevens commented that for this type of meeting, a neighbor notification is not required. As a courtesy, Staff notifies adjacent neighbor's to the subject property.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that the mailing buffer for the neighbor notification was about 1,000 sq. ft. but the standard for these types of projects is 300 ft.

Senior Planner Espinoza presented his Staff report and stated that property (east) faces Eucla Avenue, the northern portion runs along the rear of the single-family residences that face Third Street, all of which are one-story in height. The remaining north portion of the property runs along the pole portion of the property that is behind the apartment buildings on Amelia Avenue. The South portion of the site runs parallel to the A.T. and S.F. Railroad track. The property is currently occupied by LA Signal which is a contractor's storage yard for a signal light company. LA Signal is looking at selling the property and City Ventures is interested in purchasing the property to develop two and three story townhomes. The total units being proposed are 47 – (14) two – bedroom and (33) three – bedroom. The units vary in square footage – 1,315 – 1838 sq. ft. and will have a two car garage. There will be 143 parking spaces provided: 94 spaces in garage, 22 spaces in driveways and 26 spaces within the site itself. There is one main vehicular gated entrance with pedestrian access at the northeast corner of the site. He stated that there will be two, two-story buildings with four units each facing Eucla Avenue. One of the buildings, No. 1, is side-facing with the front door entrances facing the gate entrance. There is also a four-unit building (No. 3) that is a combination of two and three stories. Along the north property line are the remaining six (6) buildings located perpendicular to the property line. The units closest to the north property line are two-story with the remaining designed in a three-story height and added that these buildings contain four (4) to seven (7) units each. The common green space is along the south property line and there is additional green space all along the pole section of the site.

He discussed the landscaping and amenities. He stated that the project will be fully landscaped and meet the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance. There will be two patio areas and gas BBQ's. Adjacent to the patio area is an open lawn area for group or individual activities. The area will be fenced to adjacent properties and added there will be trails and activities. He stated that the project is in the Town Core and there are design standards that need to be followed which include preserving the architecture. The units will feature Craftsman architectural details. He stated that the applicant originally came in with a three story design with no Craftsman features. The applicant has since changed the overall architecture and layout. Some of the units were reduced to two stories with the architectural features such as: cement-fiber siding, craftsman style doors, false knee braces under most gable roofs double wood post supports and concrete shingle roof tiles. He added that all the windows and doors will have a Craftsman style trim. He stated that the oversized eaves emphasize the Craftsman style. There are hung windows to go along with the Design Guidelines of the Town Core. He explained that the architectural features are on all four sides of the building and not just the front. He stated that there was previous concern with the windows on the 3rd story of the unit since it faces the properties to the North. For privacy concerns, the windows were removed from the 3rd story and the 2nd story windows were minimized.

He discussed parking and stated that each unit will have a two-car garage for a total of 94 enclosed parking spaces. There is also an additional 22 parking spaces in 20-foot deep driveways. The project will also have another 26 open parking spaces along the main drive aisle and will be used by residents and their guests. He stated that the setbacks are consistent with other properties in the Town Core. He discussed setbacks and stated that there is a 20 ft. setback for the front yard and 10 ft. for the side and rear yards. The applicant is proposing a height of 28 ft. for the two-story structures. The three-story building component is proposed at 39 ft. which is four feet higher than typically allowed in the single-family zone.

He discussed the Tree Removal component of the submittal. The applicant is requesting to remove 58 trees; however, not all the trees are considered mature. As part of the landscaping plan, the applicant will be replacing with 296 trees onsite. The trees range from 15 – 36 inch gallon box. In regards to fencing, the applicant is proposing a 6 ft. high stucco wall along the south property line of the project. The stucco will only be applied to the interior side of the wall and the other side of the wall facing the railroad will be painted in an earth tone color. Staff has a concern with the appearance of the wall along the railroad and has conditioned that the wall is constructed with a minimum 6" x 6" opening at the base at regular intervals to allow for a Boston Ivy plant to grow on the wall to deter graffiti. He stated that the applicant has also proposed a number of wood fences for the main vehicular entry gate and individual private patio areas; however, Staff has expressed their concern with the durability and maintenance issues of the wood fences with the applicant. Staff is inclined to support the wrought iron option for the gates vs. the wood material. Along the North property line fence adjacent to the single-family residents will be stucco on both sides and will have a decorative cap. The remaining north wall along the pole portion of the project will consist of 100-foot long sections of the same stucco wall followed by 100-foot long sections of six (6) foot high wrought iron fence. He stated that some of the locations, due to drainage issues, will be higher. This will help break-up the tunnel affect in the pole section of the lot. Vines will be proposed on these walls to break-up their monotonous appearance.

He discussed street and parkway improvements along Eucla Ave. He stated that the applicant will be providing a new curb and gutter along the front of the project site. He stated that there will also be a six foot wide parkway with the installation of six parkway trees followed by a four foot wide walkway. The applicant will also be required to extend the walkway on the west side of Eucla Avenue, south, past the railroad tracks to connect to the existing walkway; street widening may be required as part of this requirement, final determination will be made during plan check. He stated that a lighting plan has been prepared for the development that includes street lights that will be a nostalgic design to match the other lights in the Town Core.

He discussed the issues of concern. He stated that there are several units in the development that Staff is concerned with the amount of private patio area that has been granted. The concern is that the units are primarily along Eucla Avenue and the amount of space may be too much for them to maintain. Staff is recommending that Building No. 2 reduce the private patio area by moving the 5'6" wood fence 10 ft. to the east, Building No. 1, reduce the private patio area by moving the 6-foot high stucco/wrought iron wall 10 ft. to the North. Staff recommends that the applicant be required to install some kind of ground cover with mulch within all the patio areas that are along Eucla Avenue. Staff also conditioned that any private patio areas that are parallel to any walkways shall be separated by a minimum of a three feet to allow for appropriate landscaping and irrigation installation. Also, the applicant is proposing to construct a stucco wall along the south property line but the stucco will only be on the inside of the project and the outside wall facing the railroad will be painted. Plain block walls have not been approved by Staff and decorative walls have always been required. In order to rectify the issue and long term maintenance issues, Staff recommends the applicant change all the stucco walls to a tan, split face wall with a brick cap. Staff has a concern with the graffiti. By having an opening of 6x6 size at the lower portion of the wall which will allow for vines to grow. He returned to the issue of the wood gates vs. wrought iron. He added that Staff is concerned with the long-term maintenance and durability of these fences and recommend the Board approve the wrought iron gate designs since it is designed in a Craftsman theme.

He concluded that Staff has received four emails in response to the mailing notification of the project and the majority of concerns were in regards to the time of the meeting today. Brad Johnson of 425 W 2nd St. requested a bike trail along the railroad. Carol Higgins of 413 W. 4th St. was concerned with the density level of 47 condos in the neighborhood. He stated that he had a phone call with Alice Barreras of 523 W. 4th St. to discuss her concerns. Staff recommends approval with the attached conditions of

approval and that the final approval will be considered after the conclusion of the Planning Commission and City Council Hearings.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Staff Report indicates that there are 10 two bedroom units, totaling 37; however, the plans submitted show 14 two bedroom units. He asked which one was correct.

Adam Lunzer, City Ventures – 1900 Quail St., Newport Beach CA 92660, responded that there are 14 two bedroom units.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant complied with all the parking requirements.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Mr. Stevens asked if this project was the originally submitted project or has there been additional units added.

Adam Lunzer responded that the proposal was originally for 54 units but since has been decreased to 47 units.

Mr. Stevens commented that the reduction to the units makes the plan work better. He asked if the zone, Specific Plan No. 23, Area 3, is being amended or is a new Specific Plan being created.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there will be an additional area created, Area 3, to the Specific Plan No. 23.

Mr. Badar inquired if there is a swimming pool being proposed for the project.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded no and added that there are: BBQ's area, patio and open green space.

Mr. Badar asked if the applicant can submit for a swimming pool in the future.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded it would not require much but would need to meet ADA requirements.

Mr. Badar asked about the patio areas and agreed with Staff's concern that there is too much space for the resident to maintain. He asked if the HOA would take care of the common space.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Mr. Stevens commented on the air space condo. He asked if the patios at the front of the buildings are intended to be common area or part of the purchased air space.

Adam Lunzer replied that it is exclusive common area.

Mr. Stevens stated that it will be the Homeowner's Association versus the homeowner's responsibility. He pointed out that if wood is used for the patios, it tends to discolor.

Mr. Badar commented that since this is a gated community, would the City's RV parking restrictions apply.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the restrictions will be determined in the CC&R's. He stated this type of project will most likely prohibit RV storage.

Mr. Stevens asked if there will be any improvements on Amelia Ave.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there will be drainage improvements at the end of the street.

Mr. Patel commented that it will be improved with a wall.

Mr. Stevens stated that Amelia has a permitted gate that is accessible for residents.

Mr. Patel stated that it ends at the right-of-way.

Mr. Stevens commented that Staff has suggested vines on the wall to make it less visible so then it is less striking to receive graffiti.

Mr. Badar commented that North of the project, the backyard seems large. He added that avoiding peering windows will be beneficial.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that there is a privacy issue and added the applicant has addressed that concern and reduced the two story height and included no windows on the third story.

Mr. Stevens commented that the applicant has made a number of changes and added that even with the changes made; however, everybody in the community will not be happy. He commended the applicant for including the neighbor's input. He expressed his concern with the three story units.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that Staff has encouraged the applicant from the beginning to have the units two story and not three. He added that the Town Core allows for two story units; however, Staff just wants to be in line with the surrounding neighborhood including meeting the 20 ft. setback.

Mr. Schoonover asked what the development standards are for the heights of the building units.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied that the height limit of the building is 35 ft. for single-family residences; however, they are proposing an additional 4 ft. higher but providing 3-stories. He stated that the height can be lowered and noted that the applicant is in attendance to discuss that matter.

Mr. Stevens commented that with the reduction of the ceiling height, there is no benefit and added that 39 ft. does not change anything.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about the parking outside of the garages for Buildings 1 and 2.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied that Buildings 1 and 2 have 19-20 ft. deep driveways which can be used by residents and guests and added there is additional parking available at the front of the property.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked what will happen if the parking available at the front of the properties becomes permanent.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied that the CC&R's will determine that. He stated that wording can be added that parking needs to be made available in their garages.

Mr. Badar asked if the streets are private and if residents can still call and complain to the City.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that it is a civil matter and the City will not and do not enforce CC&R's.

Mr. Stevens added that some situations are enforceable such as fire lanes. He stated that designated parking spaces will not be the City's responsibility.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked for Staff to explain the tandem garages and noted that it appears 7 units will have tandem parking.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied that tandem parking is not conducive for parking; however, it is used more often and works for some people. He added that Staff does not have an issue with the parking.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if a studied has been conducted for the reversing distance.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there is 26 ft. of space available. He added that a similar project in the City, Village Walk, using tandem parking and there have been no issues.

Mr. Patel inquired about trash pickup.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there will be individual trash pickup. He stated that the trucks will come into the area and the residents will put on one side of the alleyway.

Mr. Stevens stated that the trash receptacles will be stored within the garages and added that tandem parking will be a little tighter; however, the spaces are workable.

Mr. Badar asked if a secondary entrance is required.

Mr. Stevens replied that a turnaround is required per the Fire Department.

Adam Lunzer commented that the driveways are 28 ft. and not the standard 26 ft. He stated that from building to building there is 34 ft.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, pointed out the fences and inquired about the various sizes within the gated community.

Mr. Stevens stated that the north fence drops down to 42 inches per the Code.

Adam Lunzer stated that the driveway is 28 ft. which is required for three story buildings. He added that there is plenty of turnaround space. He explained that the CC&R's will reflect development and enforcement for parking in driveways. There is a wall on the southern boundary that will be painted on the outside. He stated that his experience with the split face wall is that graffiti becomes deterrent and the color cannot be maintained and overall, is not very effective. He stated that during the first year there will be no landscaping on the wall but eventually the vines will grow and cover up the wall.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant has discussed with Metro about the proposed vining on the wall.

Adam Lunzer responded no. He addressed the fencing concern and noted that the wood fencing proposed by Staff is subject to future issues with maintenance. He stated that they have provided an alternative for the front yards. He added that durable wood material exists and added it will be

maintained by the HOA. He stated that he does not have an issue with the wrought iron design. He noted that the design of the project at front meets the Town Core Guidelines. He stated that the 39 ft. height is a little higher than permitted; however, with the Craftsman architecture it is necessary.

Mr. Schoonover pointed out that since there is no HOA in the beginning and asked how the phasing out of the project will be effected.

Mr. Stevens responded that, at first, the HOA is controlled by the developer, until most of the project is complete. He added that the developer will try to remain on the Board before the project is finished.

Mr. Stevens asked if any of the proposed features are for Green House Gas Emissions.

Adam Lunzer responded that the materials are recycled and match Title 24.

Mr. Stevens commented that the project is 15% above for energy conservation. He added that some cities require some projects to exceed that percentage. He stated that tile roofs can be coated to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 8%.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is a requirement for there to have ADA units.

Adam Lunzer responded that five of the units are ADA compliant.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if affordable units are required.

Mr. Stevens responded no and added that since the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, we do not had affordable requirements.

Mr. Sorcinelli inquired about the pricing of the units.

Adam Lunzer replied the units will be in the mid \$400,000.

Scott Burkett, 512 W. 3rd St., property owner, stated that his property abuts the proposed project. He inquired about the massing of the structures and the mitigated steps taken. He stated that he has not seen a massing study and added there are line of sight issues.

Mr. Stevens responded that Staff has the ability to request a massing study; however, Staff has not asked for that. He recommended referencing a cross section.

Scott Burkett discussed the Craftsman style. He stated he appreciates the developers design; however, he has a concern with the features. He asked if the features will be presented to the Historical Architecture Committee.

Mr. Stevens responded that the Development Plan Review Board (DPRB) is the Board that reviews the design and ensures it has the appropriate architectural features. He stated that there is an architect on DPRB who also created the Town Core Guidelines that this project is following

Scott Burkett questioned the windows and window mullions and if they are representative of the Town Core. He stated he is aware that the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be brought up at Planning Commission.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Planning Commission hearing in July will be reviewing the Mitigated Negative Declaration, Tract Map, Zone Change and General Plan Amendment. He explained that the

Planning Commission does not look at architecture but instead land use and zoning. He concluded that City Council will have the final say.

Scott Burkett asked if the environmental documents are available for review.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Jim Johnson, 540 W. 3rd St., property owner, stated that the height of the fence at the north side is 6 ft. He stated that the fence separates from the apartment complex. He added that five to ten people a day hop the wall to cut the corner to get to the complex. He expressed his concern is for safety and privacy. He requested that a 7 – 8 ft. wall be considered to provide more privacy and safety.

Alice Barreras, 523 W. 4th St., property owner, asked if the Board has approved the project to be built. She stated she does not want this project built at this location because they will be too close to the tracks.

Mr. Schoonover emphasized that today's approval is for the design only.

Alice Barreras commented that she thought San Dimas did not want high density. She stated that there is too much traffic from the apartments already. She reiterated that she does not want the project to be built.

Martha Gamboa, property owner of 414 W. 3rd St., inquired about the green space. She stated that she understands 58 trees are being removed and 200 plus trees will be planted but she emphasized there is still not enough green space. She commented that she was not allowed to add more in the front yard because she would not have enough green space. She commented that this project does not have enough green space. She stated that not only will the future Gold Line bring a lot of traffic but now there will be more traffic trying to cut across. She asked about the approval of satellite dishes on rooftops. She concluded that this project will bring more traffic and more density.

Angel Torres, 530 W. 3rd St., property owners, inquired about the notice and timing of the meeting.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied that the DPRB meeting is a standard meeting that is held on the 2nd and 4th Thursday of the month at 8:30 a.m. He emphasized that this has always been the standard days and times for this meeting. He stated that it is standard to send the notifications out a week before the meeting and emphasized that the noticing is not a requirement for DPRB but instead is done as a courtesy.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Planning Commission and City Council meetings notice 20 days prior which is required by law. He noted that the meetings are held at night, whereas, DPRB, has always been conducted during the day. He explained that the concerned neighbors can come in at any time to discuss the project and are not restricted to meeting days.

Angel Torres asked what meeting is the most important to attend.

Mr. Stevens replied all meetings are important to attend if you want more information on the project; however, DPRB reviews the details and architecture. He stated that Planning Commission and City Council review the land use.

Angel Torres inquired about the fence height options.

Mr. Stevens replied that there is noise mitigation and added that he is trying to have no more than 7 ft. for a fence. He stated that the wall itself becomes a dominate point. He recommended discussing these issues with Staff.

Senior Planner Espinoza added that the property itself will have a Public Notice Hearing Board on display indicating meetings days and times.

Resident/Property Owner, 444 W. 3rd St., expressed the confusion of the project units being considered condos or townhomes.

Senior Planner Espinoza clarified that it called a condominium for map purposes but in real estate terms, townhome is used as the description.

Resident/Property Owner, 444 W. 3rd St., expressed his concern with the density and how many new residences will be moving into town.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that it depends on the buyer and how many residents move into the unit.

Resident/Property Owner, 444 W. 3rd St., asked the applicant what is the typical number of individuals to move into these type of units.

Adam Lunzer replied that the target market is for singles and young couples which can have 2 – 4 individuals per unit.

Resident/Property Owner, 444 W. 3rd St., asked why the parking spaces fit 140 vehicles; he added that the number seems high.

Mr. Stevens replied that the reason that is done is to make sure there is sufficient parking to accommodate guests. He added that he is comfortable with the 1:3 ratio for parking.

Resident/Property Owner, 444 W. 3rd St., stated that he is not in support of the project. He stated that he likes single family units and to have soo many additional people is worrisome.

Mr. Stevens advised the residents that from the beginning of the project, Staff has expressed to the applicant that there would be a risk moving forward with the project due to the high density and that they should expect strong opposition. He stated that at the community meetings, the applicant heard what the neighbors had to say about the project and the majority of the concerns were high density. He noted that the majority of projects submitted have been for higher density.

Martha Gamboa asked what type of extra revenue the City will acquire, besides taxes.

Mr. Stevens responded that the City obtains from projects includes permit revenues and park revenues which include Quimby fees which goes into the park fund for park improvements. He added that the City gets a portion of the property tax.

Martha Gamboa asked what the difference is between this project and a single-family residence. She asked if there is more revenue coming in.

Mr. Stevens responded that the decision is not made based on revenue. He added that density is the issue and reiterated that the City will not make a decision based on revenue.

Mr. Michaelis stated that residential approvals do not make money for the City. He emphasized that the City needs more commercial and retail to obtain revenue. He expressed that it is not a key factor in making the decision for this project. He added that the City is a low property tax City.

Mr. Stevens commented that the submittal today is an option to build something on the property for sale or it can be left the way it is because it is assumed that the land use there currently would be better. He stated that it needs to be decided if the proposal is appropriate for the neighborhood. He stated that Staff cannot tell the applicants they cannot submit their application.

Jim Johnson, 540 W 3rd St., property owner asked if LA Signal is selling regardless if City Venture's project is approved.

Mr. Stevens responded yes and added that part of the issue is that the property is in code enforcement.

Jim Johnson inquired about the time frame of the project. He asked if the project is approved, what would be the estimated construction start and completion.

Adam Lunzer replied the estimated construction start date could be March/April 2015, depending on approvals and construction could start three months after.

Larry Fator, 209 N. Eucla Ave, property owner, inquired about parking.

Mr. Stevens responded that each unit has a two car garage and an additional 48 parking spaces onsite. He added that based on averages, it is adequate parking.

Larry Fator commented that it appears there is enough parking for the residents but not guests. He questioned where the guest will park, such as in front of the house.

Mr. Stevens responded that they will most likely be subject to overnight parking permits if they park on the street.

Delia G. Lee, 524 W. 3rd St., property owner, stated that her property backs up to project and her concern is about the wall and strangers jumping over the wall. She expressed that there is currently a noise problem off of Eucla due to traffic; however, there will now have more noise and traffic. She added that she has tried addressing the traffic by requesting speed bumps.

Mr. Stevens recommended that the neighborhood start a small petition and submit to the Public Works Department's Traffic Safety Committee. They would be able to address those traffic concerns.

Mr. Sorcinelli inquired how the satellite dishes will be addressed.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that he needs to find out what cable company will be used.

Adam Lunzer commented that he is unaware of who the cable provider but added that they cannot tell the buyers they cannot put satellite dishes on their houses; however, the location can be reviewed by the HOA.

Mr. Stevens stated that the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) rules can be subject to the design standards of the HOA.

Mr. Beilstein recommended prewiring the cables into the houses.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that prewiring can be cost effective because it is a bulk service. He inquired about the patio doors.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that sliding doors are proposed that go onto the patio area.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that double hung windows are a precedent in the Town Core.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that they are looking at the design. He noted that vinyl windows have been allowed in the Town Core and the applicant has upgraded by using a tan color versus white. He stated that the mullions are sculpted and Staff is recommending they be larger. He clarified that there are single hung windows being used.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that there should not be an additional cost depending on the mullions itself. He inquired about the poor quality doors.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the door material is vinyl to match the windows.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that it is misleading the way the buildings are depicted in the elevations.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that a cross section could depict the real density.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the corner treatment is not depicted on some of the plans.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that Staff and the applicant can go page by page and make sure that is included.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed his concern with tandem parking. He stated that if some of the buildings are adjusted it would be better off to not have tandem parking, even if that means removing one unit and going with standard parking. He stated that in terms of density, the applicant has done a good job with bringing down the impact. He explained that most of the impact can be screened with landscaping such as adding additional trees in the backyard. He inquired about the reserve budget for the project.

Adam Lunzer responded that they have a consultant that works with the budget.

Mr. Stevens commented that the Department of Real Estate does that. He expressed that he is not in favor of wood patio fencing and preferred wrought iron or block. He added that he does not have an opinion on the patio sizes yet. He noted his concern with the railroad wall and added he is open-minded on obtaining more information.

Mr. Beilstein inquired about the electrical panels and noted they are not on the floor plans.

Adam Lunzer responded they will be located in the utility closet.

Mr. Beilstein asked about the ac condensers.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the ac condensers will be in the front patios within the patio unit. He added that they were on the roof previously; however, it did not go with the Craftsman style.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to preliminary approve DPRB Case No. 13-31 & Tree Removal Permit 14-05 subject to Conditions of Approval and with the understanding that the final approval will be considered after the conclusion of the Planning Commission and City Council Hearings.

Motion carried 4-1-0-2 (Sorcinelli No and Badar and Schoonover Abstained)

Mr. Sorcinelli commented on the overuse of tandem parking.

Mr. Stevens stated that Staff intended to discuss tandem parking in more detail with the Code Amendment application at Planning Commission and City Council hearings.

Mr. Badar commented if they remove the tandem parking they will lose units.

DPRB Case No. 13-20, Precise Plan No. 13-03 and Tree Removal Permit No. 13-27

A request to develop 48 two-story, single-family detached residences on approximately 6.4 acres in a gated community located at 299 E. Foothill Boulevard. The homes will range in size from 1,620 sq. ft. to 1,953 sq. ft. on lots ranging in size from 2,560 sq. ft. to 2,816 sq. ft. The project will also provide for a 24,928 sq. ft. of central neighborhood recreation area at the east end of the site consisting of a swimming pool, children's play area, bocce ball and horseshoes. Walnut Avenue will provide access to the project from Foothill Boulevard and continue north onto the site.

Associated Case: Tentative Tract Map 72368 (TTM 13-01), Zone Change 13-01, Specific Plan No. 27, General Plan Amendment 13-01, a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Development Agreement with the City.

APN's: 8665-008-016 and 017

Zone: Light Agricultural (A-L)

Denise Ashton, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, was present.

Mike Barnett, Foothill Vineyard Church – 100 E Foothill Blvd, was present.

Randy Bell, 216 Rodeo Ct., property owner, was present.

Mike Carhull, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, was present.

Peter A. Duarte, Landscape Architect – Studio Pad, 92 Argonaut, Aliso Viejo CA 92656, was present.

Louisa Felettom, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, was present.

Sandi Gottlieb, The Olson Company – 3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100, Seal Beach CA, was present.

Allison K. Kunz, The Olson Company – 3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100, Seal Beach CA, was present.

Tom Moore, The Olson Company – 3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100, Seal Beach CA, was present.

Ron Nestor, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, was present.

John Reekstin, The Olson Company – 3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100, Seal Beach CA, was present.

Collin Wahab, 373 W. 3rd St., property owner, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that due to the length of the previous item, the architect would like to say some words about the project prior to Staff's presentation because he needed to catch a flight.

John Reekstin, The Olson Company – 3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100, Seal Beach CA, stated that the project will include 48 two-story single-family detached residences that will mimic Spanish type homes with 15% open space. He added that there will be amenities including a swimming pool. He stated that the smaller lots are becoming more ideal and are in high demand.

He added that he disagrees with some of the comments made in Staff's Report in regards to the massing and architectural style.

Ron Nestor, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, introduced himself as the Senior Principal Architect whose company assisted with San Dimas's City Hall renovation. He stated that he was taken aback by some of the comments in the Staff Report. He stated that the intent of the design was to create a small Spanish type village. He added that the design was modeled after neighboring properties. He stated that every design was made to fit a narrow architectural design palette. He stated that the homes have individuality. He added that the color palette is harmonious.

Denise Ashton, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, commented that the site itself has an interesting shape. She stated the site is surrounded by a few residential properties, Los Angeles County Flood Control and Horsethief Canyon which is an ideal situation because the project would only impact three homes. She stated the project will be a private gated community. She added that the road would add an additional buffer to the residences to the west. She stated that smaller homes target young homebuyers. The proposed designs include side by side garages and private rear yards and added they are consistent with what is happening with adjacent properties. She stated that they faced some challenges which include the cell tower facility that is currently on the property. She noted that there are some houses outside of the community gate but once inside, the streets become private. She stated that the residents will have a short distance to walk to amenities such as the swimming pool. She added that there should be no noise impacts from the recreation area or swimming pool because it is away from the residences. She addressed the massing and bulkiness. She stated that the homes will be a small glimpse off of Foothill Blvd since they are behind Canyon Trail Plaza, which is a two-story building. She added that the project will be nestled within the hillside.

Ron Nestor stated that there is significant architectural feature for such a small community. He addressed the staff report in regards to issues with the quality of the design and detail. He explained that they have submitted high quality designs including a lot of three dimensional features. He added that there are not tunnels between the buildings and that the side yards are typical 5 ft.

Denise Ashton stated that they have submitted two different plans for the design of the homes which depict architectural diversity. She stated that there are 48 homes with two plans, three elevation options and eight color schemes for each elevation style. She added that it's complicated to show the diversity happening between the buildings. She stated that the six plans may look similar; however, between the style and plan types, the color schemes, roof tile and stone brick, in total creates a diverse street scheme.

Emmett Badar departed at 12:00 p.m.

Mike Carhull, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, Santa Ana CA, stated that the original submittal was to feature a village concept. He explained that it is difficult to make multiple styles and added that the project is located in a high fire zone which dictated a lot of the design features. There are arched elements such as S tile roof and gable accents. He pointed out the Juliet style balcony, arched soffits at garages, porches in front of the garage and shaped cornices. He pointed out that the cornices are boxed in due to the high fire zone. He stated that Elevation B features hip roof, shaped eaves and different massing. He stated Elevation C will have a flat boxed eave and provide a variety including brick elements to the porch. He noted that the homes will feature Spanish themed architecture. He suggested adding siding; however, they are trying to keep the design simple.

Ron Nestor added they have provided a variety of brick options.

Denise Ashton noted that there will be elevation change between the pads. She stated that the designs were intended to match the surrounding development and added they seem to be compatible since they are single-family detached homes. She explained that these types of homes are a target that San Dimas needs.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked for an explanation on the entrances on Plan 2 and added that they are understated.

Mike Carhull replied that there is a side entrance along the side. He noted that there is 7 ft. of side yard and at some point there will be 12 ft. from the adjacent unit.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that there will always be a garage and asked how the entrance would be identified. He added that the entrance seems to be a part of the streetscape and emphasized it is understated.

Ron Nestor he added that there are gate posts and light post features to assist in identifying the entrances.

Mike Carhull stated that by having the entrances where they are, it helps achieve an additional bedroom.

Mr. Sorcinelli pointed out that the layout can be flipped to address a different entrance for the property.

Ron Nestor commented that pilasters will be a base element.

Allison K. Kunz, The Olson Company – 3010 Old Ranch Parkway, Suite 100, Seal Beach CA, stated that side entries add a prominence and noted that different elements are featured for each courtyard.

Mr. Sorcinelli addressed the use of landscape and added that paving can guide individuals through the neighborhood.

Allison K. Kunz, agreed with adding a layering effect.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the application has recently been filed to subdivide the project at 299 E. Foothill Boulevard for the development of 48 two-story, single-family detached residences within a gated community. As part of the Zone Change Application, the applicant will be creating a new Specific Plan No. 27 Zone. The total site area is 6.4 acres with a total of 48 proposed units. The units vary in sizes: 1,620 sq. ft. – Plan 1 and 1,953 sq. ft. – Plan 2. There will be 220 parking spaces provided: 96 in garages, 96 in driveways and 29 within the site. He stated that each lot will have a two car garage. He noted that the single family development does not require visitor parking; however, since it is a gated community, parking allows for street parking and overnight parking per their CC&R's. He stated that each house will have a driveway which can fit up to two vehicles. The site itself is correctly an Equestrian Facility with an entrance off Foothill Blvd. He noted that west of the property is Single-Family residences. There is a cell tower onsite that will stay. The homes will be within a gated community within cul-de-sacs. Seven of the homes will be outside of the community. He noted that there is a public street dedicated and a multi-use trail that unofficially currently exists.

He emphasized that the building architecture concerns. He pointed out that the two plans submitted are generally the same. He noted that there are three different styles submitted; however, 1A and 1B have elevations that are mimicked with no change in architectural features and there is a similar continuous design on each elevation including the rear of the building. He recommended having a shutter detail and having the massing reduced. He added that the materials are repetitive. He stated that there are two plans with six elevations and they all look the same. He noted that the front entry for Plan A and B use stucco and Plan C uses brick for the front entry. Looking at Plan 1 shows an overall roof plan with the massing and scale, it appears to have a little pop out. Plan 2 is the same. He added that the issue was brought up at previous Staff meetings. He expressed his concern with what has been submitted which in essence a two-story box building with stucco. He stated that Staff wants to see more articulation and setbacks in the wall planes and accented features. He stated that Staff approved stucco for Spanish style home; however, additional architectural features are needed for these homes. He stated that the applicant has made minor modifications by adding shutters and accented side elevations and wrought iron planter box. He stated that there are enhanced elevations on some elevations but not all. He expressed that he would like to see more redesign in order to do a comprehensive review. He discussed the color palettes and provided color schemes. He stated that his concern is with the gray scale appearing as unfinished smooth stucco. He stated that a new zone is being created, Specific Plan No. 27. There will be a setback of 18-20 ft. at the front of the property and the heights of the building are 30-32 ft. which complies with the standard 35 ft. single-family homes.

He stated that this project will be a gated community. He stated that at the south and north portion of the property there will slump stone with brick cap. He stated that the applicant is proposing to remove 53 trees and added that some of the trees are outside of their boundaries and belong to LA County Flood Control. He stated that only 17 trees are mature but Staff will be reviewing all 53 trees. He stated that the applicant will be saving three trees and pointed out two of those are Oak trees that are significant in size. He stated that the applicant will be required to do street improvements such as gutters and street lights. He expressed his concern with the lack of architectural features. He recommended adding to the site plan the trash pickup locations. He stated that there are double walls proposed that will go along the west property line. He noted that the V ditch belongs to the properties to the west. He noted that he is looking at the standard horse trail to border the V gutter instead of the double wall proposed. The applicant is proposing a slump stone wall and added his concern with the 6 ft. slump stone wall.

He discussed the use of artificial turf and added that Staff is not in favor of the material for this project. He stated that natural turf is better outside near the pool and recreation area. He added that making sure the turf is usable during hot weather is important. He stated that the applicant is proposing a cabana near the pool area; however, they are proposing to use a metal cabana with canvas tops that will wear over time. He recommended they use something more solid and in line with metal or alumawood versus canvas tops. He stated that overall, the site layout is different for San Dimas, these homes are not the standard single-family 7,500 nor multi-family, instead it is a little of both. Staff's concern is that if the architectural design is approved, then this is the standard that other projects will submit in the future. He asked the Board to focus on the massing and scale and added the issue with visibility of the project from the street. He recommended continuing the items to allow the applicant time to address the issues of concern presented by Staff and any other issues that may have arisen at the DPRB meeting.

Mr. Stevens stated that some portions of the City property are in the boundary of the proposed project and that the City is preparing a development agreement with the applicant for the property. He pointed out that the proposed recreation area location is on part of the City's storm drain. He stated these fees need to be conveyed to Olson with retention to the storm drain easement. He noted Staff's concern with future request for improvements and landscaping at the slope near Horsethief Canyon. He emphasized he wants the developer to be made aware that the slope is not something people will be

able to access easily. He added that he supports the public street to allow direct access to Horsethief Canyon. He stated the project was reviewed by the Equestrian Committee, they agreed that the horse trail should be part of the project. They did not have a concern with the loss of the Agricultural Zone property.

The Parks committee reviewed access to Horsethief Canyon Park and believed that the public street to the park will be beneficial to the public. He agreed with Senior Planner Espinoza that there is capability to do more with the elevations that include more articulation and variety.

Randy Bell, 216 Rodeo Ct., property owner, stated that the Equestrian center has been at the current location for a long time. He stated he liked the idea of a new residential community. He acknowledged that The Olson Company has kept the residents in the loop of what is going on since the very beginning. He noted that the residents have one major concern which is the extension of the road to Horsethief Canyon which the residents strongly oppose. He stated he is in attendance today representing himself and his neighbors. He noted that traffic is unbearable and would rather see one entry and exit to Horsethief Canyon. He stated that the individuals that would be entering the park live outside of the community. He stated his other concern is the accessibility of the front door. He noted that as someone with a law enforcement background, he understands how difficult it could be to find and locate a front entrance especially with the type of proposal submitted. He indicated that the some of the front doors are at the side of the house and can be difficult to identify. He pointed out the Juliet balcony and disapproves of that feature because he has been witness to kids falling off balconies.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that the extension of the road to Horsethief Canyon will be better identified and addressed at Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Sorcinelli addressed the front entrances on Plan Type A. He stated it does not seem possible to make connections to the garage site. He recommended it be revised and the front element should be shifted over and tucked in. He recommended the applicant look at in relation to the overall site plan. He expressed his concern with the narrowness of the site. He understands the privacy of neighbors and the distance between the two walls. He stated he would like to see a study on the property edges which would point out proximities such as if the windows that are directly opposite of one another. He posed his concern with the size of the yards and the treatment to the South property line. He inquired about how the windows will be screened. He added that trees could be placed to screen the those elevations.

Mr. Stevens pointed out that the conceptual landscaping does not show any trees. He stated that there was an earlier discussion about where the trash bins are to be located. He referenced the landscaping plans sheet 3 and noted that there on one side of the house there is a wall parallel to the street. He expressed that it needs to be more thought out and added there could be some flipping and adjusting. He noted that the only location for the trash cans is near the neighbor and that will not work.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if Waste Management will be entering the community.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes.

Mr. Stevens inquired about a similar project designed by the Olson Company in La Verne. He asked if that project is similar in design as what is being proposed.

Allison K. Kunz responded that the project in La Verne is a little different. There is an alley where the trash bins are picked up from. She pointed out there are stepping stones at the rear. She stated that the square footages are similar.

Mr. Stevens stated that the density is similar.

Allison K. Kunz agreed that the density is similar; however, there is no common open space area like La Verne.

Senior Planner Espinoza added that the trees dictated the project design.

Allison K. Kunz stated that La Verne has similar simple architecture. She added that color schemes have an impact especially when there is a variety. She added that the architectural style is simple and added a color palette makes the diversity. She pointed out that all the elevations presented do not have the same color palette which makes them different.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant has designed any other projects similar to what is being presented.

Allison K. Kunz responded La Verne has similar features but added that the City of Los Alamitos has the brick treatment at the entry way and the garages at the front of the property. She stated that they can provide various options for standard rear yard setbacks and they can also provide window conflict studies. She added that tile detail can be done successfully and added the tile used for the swimming pools can be incorporated into the windows of the homes. She explained they are trying to keep the design cohesive.

Senior Planner Espinoza requested more definition to the wall plans showing the squareness.

Mr. Stevens stated that in regards to the layout of the building and noted there is an issue with the side windows and how they relate to each other. He asked how much can be minimized.

Denise Ashton replied that it can be done.

Allison K. Kunz inquired about the grade change and asked if there will be a height variation of where the windows will fall.

Mike Carhull added that most of the windows are secondary and not egress windows.

Denise Ashton added that the details used today are seen on more expensive homes.

Allison K. Kunz stated that they have done work in Fullerton that has small lots with simple Spanish details. She recommended that the Board visit other sites The Olson Company has worked on.

John Reekstin stated that they could provide the transportation to visit those locations.

Mr. Stevens commented that it is helpful to do a site visit for the next DPRB scheduled meeting.

Mr. Patel stated that there needs to be more of a variety along Walnut Avenue and added that the extension is monotonous.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked if landscaping can be added at the rear of the yard.

Allison K. Kunz responded they can plant at the rear of the properties if required.

Senior Planner Espinoza recommended doing an analysis of how many solar panels can be installed on the roof.

Allison K. Kunz responded that all the homes will have them.

John Reekstin commented they have not conducted a placement analysis.

Senior Planner Espinoza added that it is important for the Board to see a placement analysis.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second John Sorcinelli to continue the item to a future DPRB meeting and arrange a site visit to look at similar projects that the applicant has developed in order to provide comprehensive comments of the project and request that the applicant work on including additional architectural details already discussed to the plans in addition to addressing Staff's concerns with the evaluation of the entrances issue in regards to the site plans and window layout.

Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Badar Absent)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 1:24 p.m. to the meeting of June 26, 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: September 11, 2014