

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
July 10, 2014 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

Emmett Badar, City Council (*Departed at 11:03 a.m.*)
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce (*Departed at 11:21 a.m.*)
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curtis Morris, Mayor (*Arrived at 11:03 a.m.*)
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works (*Departed at 12:30 p.m.*)
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission (*Departed at 11:22 a.m.*)
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 8:32 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

Tree Removal Permit No. 14-27

A request to remove forty-one (41) trees, twenty-five (25) of which are considered mature significant trees, to accommodate the installation of water-efficient landscaping at the Edison site at 800 W. Cienega Avenue. Seventy-four (74) trees are proposed as replacements.

APN: 8385-006-813

Zone: Light Manufacturing (M-1)

**Joe McNicoll of Site Design Studio, Inc., applicant and landscape architect, was present.
Kaly Trezos, Southern California Edison, was present.**

Associate Planner Williams stated Site Design Studio has submitted a proposal on Edison's behalf to completely re-landscape the site frontage that currently consists of trees, shrubs, and turf with a drought-tolerant pallet for the facility at 800 W. Cienega Avenue. There are other improvements occurring at the site that include: rehabilitation of the parking lot, remodeling of restrooms and a break room, and demolition of an existing hazardous material facility to allow the construction of a new 5,850 sq. ft. replacement facility. Edison will also be constructing a new ADA ramp on Cienega venue as well as providing a new path of travel from the public sidewalk which is proposed to be incorporated into the landscaping plan as a decorative bridge element. In order to accommodate the proposed landscape redesign, the landscape plans call for the removal of all the trees, shrubs, and turf along the project frontage as well as in some pocket areas behind the front walls of the site. This will result in forty-one (41) trees, twenty-five (25) of which are considered mature significant trees being removed. The applicant will be replacing with seventy-four (74) trees. These numbers will exceed the required replacement ratio of 2:1, which would have only required 50 trees to be planted as replacement for the mature significant trees. The removal of the trees is warranted in the context of the re-landscaping project for the site frontage. The finding can be made that it is reasonable to remove the trees because

their continued existence at the location would prevent the redevelopment of the site with an exemplary drought-tolerant, water efficient landscaping project. Staff recommends approval, subject to submitted landscape plans.

Larry Stevens noted the species of trees being removed, Chinese Flame and Carrotwood. He indicated that 25 to 30 of those trees are subject to the Ordinance.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the applicant is switching to the drought tolerant approach.

Larry Stevens inquired about the species selected for replacement and asked why those were chosen.

Associate Planner Williams replied that based on water use, the replacement trees are more water efficient.

Larry Stevens commented that Coast Live Oak are more tolerant trees and appreciates the replacement trees are larger box trees. He commented that he is not convinced every tree needs to be removed.

John Sorcinelli commented that the landscape architect would determine the type of trees to be replaced.

Associate Planner Williams commented that once the item is approved, the plans would go through plan check. At that time, civil plans will be requested and input from the landscape architect will be included if some of the trees can be retained.

Krishna Patel agreed that he would like to see more trees preserved.

Joe McNicoll of Site Design Studio, Inc., applicant and landscape architect, stated that he has worked on several renovations for Southern California Edison. He stated that they will be creating a bioswale to retain the storm water onsite and by doing so, it would ruin the root system of any existing trees thus removal is necessary. He stated that a lot of the trees are not Oak trees and have been on the property a while and are not in good shape. The trees are poorly pruned and are running towards the end of their life span and can become a liability.

Larry Stevens asked if the bioswale was a requirement of the parking rehabilitation changes or something Edison is choosing to do on their own.

Joe McNicoll responded that it was not required.

Larry Stevens asked if any of the changes trigger NPDES requirements.

Krishna Patel responded that they have a chamber at the back of their property.

Larry Stevens stated that the poor pruning was a self-created problem from Edison and added that Edison's approach of trimming was executed incorrectly.

Joe McNicoll informed the Board that a maintenance manual will be provided to Edison that provides tree species information and includes proper practices for maintaining of the trees.

John Sorcinelli asked how the applicant knows that the landscape will be sustainable and maintainable.

Joe McNicoll agreed with the Board's concerns about the maintenance of the landscape; however, the installing contractor is the long term maintenance contractor, which is Mariposa. He stated that they will be installing the plants per a manual that will be provided to Edison. He added that they are familiar with the upkeep for the long term.

Larry Stevens inquired about the tree replacement ratio.

Associate Planner Williams responded that it exceeds the 2:1 ratio since they are replacing with 74 trees.

Joe McNicoll added that it is almost a 3:1 ratio.

Larry Stevens pointed out Condition No. 6 and inquired about the timeframe of grading and bridge construction.

Associate Planner Williams responded that the paths of travel are currently in plan check.

Larry Stevens asked if the bridge will be going over the bioswale.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, responded that by lowering the grade 2 ft., the bridge is needed for a walkway.

Emmett Badar commended that the applicant is trying to move along with the times and being more water conservative.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve, subject to Conditions of Approval.

Motion carried 7-0

John Sorcinelli recused himself from the DPRB Case No. 14-19 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-26.

DPRB Case No. 14-19 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-26

A request to construct a 3,960 square foot two-story single-family residence with an attached 671 square foot three-car garage and remove nine mature trees located at 215 W. Gladstone Street.

APN: 8393-014-038

Zone: Single-Family Agricultural 16,000 (SFA-16,000)

M. Biscan, Upland, was present.

Marty Crowley of 229 W. Gladstone St., property owner, was present.

Vincent Hall, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the applicant is requesting approval to construct a 3,960 square foot single-family residence with an attached 671 square foot three-car garage located at 215 W. Gladstone Street. The property measures 16,042 sq. ft. in lot area. The subject site is proposed on a vacant lot which has site constraints including that it sits 20 ft. below street level. He discussed the site improvements which include the construction of a new driveway and vehicular access as there is no existing access. There is an existing catch basin that is located at the east end of the property line which drains onto the subject site and to the adjacent site below. As part of the development, the applicant will be required to complete drainage improvements to ensure the water runoff from the catch basin does not impact the proposed development. Access to the site will be provided via a new stamped and colored concrete driveway along the west property line. The driveway will measure 12 feet in width and will lead to a three car garage. A turn-out will be provided at the bottom/rear of the driveway to provide sufficient maneuvering space to allow vehicles to drive forward as they exit the property. He noted that there is an existing chain link fence along the east and north property lines with no fencing along the front or west property lines. The applicant will be required to replace the existing chain link fence with a wrought iron fence no more than six feet in height and no more than 42 inches in height within the front yard setback. The applicant is proposing a slump-stone retaining wall along the west property line to allow construction of the driveway. The retaining wall will range from one to five feet in height and include a five foot high wood fence to provide privacy from the existing residence to the west.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the house will be designed in a Spanish Mediterranean style that is appropriate for the Town Core. The applicant provided color swatches of the stucco to be used. The house design will include: stucco exterior with a sand finish, Spanish style concrete S-type tile roof, Vinyl single-hung, casement and fixed windows in a tan color, stucco-covered foam window and door surrounds measuring six inches wide and three inches in depth, stucco-covered foam moldings throughout the structure, decorative wood corbels underneath the staircase window railing and under certain roof eaves, decorative wrought-iron elements over the entryway and on the chimney and decorative wrought iron balcony railings throughout the structure. The applicant is also requesting to remove nine mature Oak trees. There are currently 25 existing Oak trees on site. The applicant originally identified seven Oak trees to be removed but upon a site visit, it was determined that there were an additional two trees that were not included and are located in the path of the driveway. The City has a Tree Preservation Ordinance and allows for the tree removal if it is associated to a development of a property. Of the seven trees being removed, five are located in or adjacent to the footprint of the proposed residence and two are located within the proposed driveway. In total, the applicant is requesting nine trees to be removed and the remaining 13 Oak trees will be preserved and protected in place. He concluded that Staff recommends approval, subjects to Conditions of Approval.

Krishna Patel inquired about the fence property line at the east side.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that currently there is a chain link fence; however, Staff is recommending that the applicant install a wrought iron fence.

Larry Stevens stated the existing driveway is at the west property line on the parcel and the applicant will be making a cut for a new driveway to service this property. He asked if there is a difference in grade created by the cut and, could vary from 0-5 ft.

Associate Planner Torrico replied that the front of the property is close to 0 ft. and starts to drop which is where the separation begins.

Larry Stevens inquired about the wood fence to be installed on top of the retaining wall. He asked if it wood fence would obscure views and posed his concern for the durability of the fence. He stated that a wood fence makes a good property line fence between the neighbor's properties. He pointed out that there is an 11 ft. grade difference and suggested that the applicant to look at other types of fencing. He questioned what would happen with the wood over the course of time.

Associate Planner Torrico agreed that the wood fence is not the best choice of material to use and pointed out that this was discussed with the applicant.

Larry Stevens stated that he did not see on the grading plans the quantity being removed.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that he does not have the quantities; however, in order to create a driveway, there will be some grading along the eastern end to create a berm and bioswale. The grading for the structure will be minimal.

Larry Stevens asked if the quantities are in the four figures.

Vincent Hall, applicant replied that it will be minimum grading and balances itself out in the end.

Larry Stevens pointed out that by looking at the aerial; it's difficult to believe that the tree count provided is accurate. He commented that it looks like there are more trees being removed.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that there are a lot of small trees and large canopy trees. He stated he has visited the site on several occasions and the correct trees have been identified. He suggested that the aerial appears misleading; it is just that the canopy trees provide a large coverage.

Larry Stevens asked how the property will drain since he does not see anything on the grading plan.

Associate Planner Torrico replied that the applicant met with the Public Works Department. He noted that the catch basin is by the property line. He noted that the applicant is creating a bioswale to run along the Eastern property line that will wrap around at the back of the property.

Larry Stevens verified that the draining is not going onto Gladstone St but instead is draining to the east property line. He stated that they will be collecting an increase of drainage that was created by the improvements and should store onsite.

Krishna Patel commented that it will have to be held onsite.

Larry Stevens stated that the natural flow can continue to occur to the north or south western direction.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that he has discussed this with the applicant and the majority of the run off occurs on the adjacent property.

Larry Stevens commented that there is an increase in the drainage in the area and pointed out that there is a historic flow from the properties to the east that goes onto the property.

Krishna Patel verified that on the east side of the property, there is an open channel.

Larry Stevens stated that a drainage analysis should be conducted on a property like this prior to approval. He expressed his concern with dealing with drainage in an area without improvements and no formal agreement with property owners.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that a hydrology report was submitted which included a drainage analysis.

Larry Stevens asked what if the applicant does not agree with the Condition No. 35.

Krishna Patel responded that the water would then stay onsite.

Larry Stevens asked if consideration has been made to reduce the amount of the drainage by making the driveway pervious or by reducing the amount of paved surfaces capturing the water. He asked if they are connected to sewer or septic.

Associate Planner Torrico responded sewer and noted it is off of Gladstone St. He added that they will need to have a pump.

Vincent Hall pointed out the drains on the plans and bioswale.

Larry Stevens inquired if the City is asking for an easement.

Krishna Patel responded that as part of the drainage, they will need to accept water from the street.

Vincent Hall concluded that he has addressed all of Staff's concerns and believes he has submitted a well designed project.

MOTION: Emmett Badar moved, second by Jim Schoonover to approve, subject to Conditions of Approval.

Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Sorcinelli Abstain)

DPRB Case No. 14-27

A request to modify the front entrance doors at 168 W. Bonita Avenue at the Johnstone Building to allow for the unit to be subdivided into two separate suites. Each of the units will have their own entrance door that will be similar to the existing glass pane doors.

APN: 8390-023-011

Zone: Creative Growth 2 (CG-2) – Frontier Village

Homero Flores, was present.

David Housh of 210 W. Bonita Ave., was present.

Pat Meyers of 163 W. Bonita Ave., was present.

Leanne Otine, applicant, was present.

Steve Nut of 156 W. Bonita Ave., was present.

John Rimpau, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the Johnstone Building was built in 1911 with commercial on the first floor and residential on the second floor. Currently the location services a Beauty Supply and Salon. There is one entrance and the front entrance was altered from what it used to be. The proposed use would be to split the property into two businesses: barber shop and a beauty salon which would have two separate entrances. Each of the suites would have their own entrance which would be side by side in the same general location of the existing double-door entrance. The building has had a number of visual modifications to north, south and west elevations. Per photos provided, all the storefronts have been slightly or significantly altered. Unit 168 was modified into one storefront with a recessed entrance. A steel cross brace was also installed in the recessed entry and none of the modifications are considered historically appropriate. He questioned if the steel cross brace is structurally needed.

As shown on the plans, the new doors would be glass pane doors similar to the existing ones, painted green to match the existing building. Between each of the doors, the applicant is proposing to install grooved wood paneling to match the building also painted green to match the doors. The applicant discussed with Staff the possibility of restoring the storefront back to its original design or in the same design as the adjacent unit, "Roady's Restaurant." Since then, the applicant has decided not to pursue a complete restoration due to the cost and time and is only looking to make the proposed modifications. Staff feels that the proposed modifications do nothing to help the needed restoration of the front façade. Staff feels that if any modifications are to be done to the building, they should be to restore the building back to its original form or similar to Roady's façade. Staff recommends approval or for the Board to recommend other design modifications that would facilitate the applicant's needs in addition to the restoration of the building façade. He discussed the rear of the building and the property owner is willing to remove the storage area. Staff is working with them on a separate time frame.

Larry Stevens stated that the area proposed for change is the exterior on the portion of the building on the brick planter and alcove. The intention was to reframe for separate doors to two spaces. He expressed his concern with the creation of a small tenant space in an area where retail is encouraged on the ground floor. He questioned that if a tenant changes over time, then there will be, a tenant space that is too small.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that there is a partition wall that is non-barring. He stated that it would be easy to remove and have access to both areas.

Larry Stevens reiterated his concern with the exterior changes and the question if they should be allowed to install a door. He emphasized that the applicant should work on obtaining more of a historic storefront.

Senior Planner Espinoza discussed with the applicant to remove the panel but thought it would be odd to have recessed windows 2 ft. backed into the building.

Emmett Badar asked Mr. Sorcinelli about the history of the storefront of the building.

John Sorcinelli responded that the storefronts at Roady's are not historically accurate; however, the intent was to sufficiently in keeping with the original design intents.

Larry Stevens commented that he has approached City Council in regards to assistance and added there is interest in having an assistance program but at a smaller scale. He expressed the possibility of approaching the tenants and helping with their financial burden. He inquired about the cost for changing the doors.

John Rimpau responded about \$1,000 and added it is not much of a modification to the building.

Larry Stevens stated that there are ways to break up the stages, tenant improvement and exterior work, to see if the City comes up with an assistance program.

Emmett Badar inquired about the doors.

Larry Stevens suggested approving and not changing the door but instead taking out the partition wall by the entry. A lobby can be temporarily allowed with the tenant improvement. He added that by the time the work is completed, we can see if an assistance program is available. The applicant can minimize the changes to the front temporarily. He added that the Staff needs to determine if City assistance will be available; however, it does not need to be agreed on today.

Emmett Badar added that the discussion of City assistance is in the preliminary stages with City Council and there is not a definitive answer.

Larry Stevens stated that Council is aware that the proposed project exists and that the location is a historic storefront and needs City assistance. He stated that the Board supports their decision to proceed on the interior tenant improvements without changing the door and reexamining where we are if the façade program. He added that at that point they will be in the middle of their tenant improvement.

John Sorcinelli asked if the façade program goes ahead, what will that mean for the tenant improvement. He asked if it will change the plans.

Leanne Otine, applicant, interjected that the door locations make a difference and posed her concern of being closed during the remodel.

Larry Stevens commented that the storefronts across the street were open for business during the façade change.

Leanne Otine discussed leaving the existing design and added that she does not want to spend double the money waiting to see if the City provides an assistance program.

John Sorcinelli recommended to the applicant not spend any money now but look at an overall plan if there is a historic restoration of the façade with the City's assistance.

Larry Stevens suggested to Mr. Sorcinelli to create a Plan B to overlay with Plan A and see where the incompatibilities are.

Leanne Otine commented that they will comply with Staff's recommendation.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the tenant improvement plans are currently in plan check.

Larry Stevens stated that he is certain that the City Council will have an assistance program. He advised they can still work on their tenant improvement; however, there needs to be a Plan B. He added that they can see how it will affect their tenant improvement in terms of the interior layout. He stated that Mr. Sorcinelli can provide his architectural services to create a Plan B. He advised that Mr. Sorcinelli will abstain from the vote due to a financial benefit.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to continue the item until the DPRB meeting of July 24, 2014 to allow the City consultant to develop a Plan B which will accommodate refurbishing the entire storefront in a similar design to the adjacent storefront (Roady's Restaurant) and both Plan A (applicant's proposal) and Plan B shall be reviewed for appropriateness. The City is currently assessing the possibility of providing financial assistance for façade remodels which Plan B will facilitate. Plan A may be plan checked; however, a permit may not be issued until the financial assistance option is determined.

Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Sorcinelli Abstain)

DPRB Case No. 13-02

Continued from the meeting of May 22, 2014. A request to construct a new approximately 6,962 square foot single-family residence with an 888 square foot veranda, 105 square foot front entry porch, two balconies totaling 403 square feet, and an attached 905 square foot garage as well as site improvements including an infinity pool, perimeter walls, and retaining walls within Specific Plan No. 12, Area 1 located at 1006 Via Romales.

APN: 8448-056-008

Zone: Specific Plan No. 12, Area 1

Marvin L. Barriga, Century Heritage Builders, was present.
Gisel Lepe, Century Heritage Builders, was present.
Hugo Lepe of Century Heritage Builders, applicant, was present.
Domingo Martinez, was present.
Bryan Rockwell of Century 21 Masters was present.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the request was previously presented to the Board on May 22, 2014. The Board expressed concerns that the design was plain, basic, and not in keeping with the quality of architecture within the neighborhood. The Board stated that the design should be modified to create a defined architectural style. The Board also expressed concerns with massing and scale. The Board agreed that they were not prepared to take action because they wanted to see an improved design. The Board continued the item and directed the applicant to make changes and report back at a future date. Staff communicated the Board's concerns to the applicant who has since responded that the design is Contemporary-Transitional and has since submitted various minor revisions of the plans for Staff review and comment. When reviewing the revisions to the plans, Staff had expressed concerns to the applicant that the design was substantially similar to the plans that had previously been submitted. Staff acknowledges that the applicant has made some changes and is supportive of some of these, including creation of additional wall plane variation, reducing hardscape, and increasing landscape. Staff recommends that the Board provide feedback to the applicant and Staff on the revisions.

She pointed out the changes that were made in response to the Board's concerns. In order to create more dimensions, the front porch has been extended an additional 3' from the adjacent building walls. The prior porch extended 3'; the current extends 6.' The stone laminate used on the porch and entry way has been incorporated under the windows flanking the front porch. The stone molding has been incorporated at the corners of the building. An additional wall plane has been created on the front elevation by recessing the front guest bedroom wall 2' from the front-most walls. The recess resulted in the creation of a roof between the garage and main entry. The garage was pushed back to allow another 3' recess in wall plane from the adjacent plane. The roof over the cantilevered portion of the master retreat was raised at the southeast area of the building. A water feature was added to the front walkway approach. The steps serving as the front walkway approach were modified. The amount of driveway paving has been reduced and landscaping has been increased. Staff expressed concerns that the plans submitted are similar to what was previously submitted. She explained that she is supportive of the variation of the building walls but expressed to the applicant that the Board would not think that is enough changes.

She described the new issues Staff recognizes. The change to the roof being raised over the cantilevered portion of the master bedroom appears awkward in the elevations and should be revised back to the prior roof design. The decorative corbels or some other treatment should be used so that the cantilever appears to be supported. Staff has concerns that the incorporation of additional stone at

the windows may add too much weight to the upper portions of the residence. The front most walls give a vertical impression directly adjacent to the new roof which emphasizes a horizontal element. Staff has concerns that the incorporation of stone at the building corners and the balcony is inconsistent with other modern elements used. Staff recommends the 1' 6" overhang should be modified to be flush above the garage. The posts on the rear veranda can be thickened to be more in scale with the scale of the veranda. She described the rendering and noted that there is a steep lot that and requested minimizing retaining walls where possible and added it has not been modified since the last meeting.

Hugo Lepe of Century Heritage Builders, applicant, apologized for not being in attendance for the last DPRB meeting. He discussed in detail the houses he designed in the past and the amounts they were sold for. He explained that the stucco is good for climate. He explained that he will be using a natural Rivera stone for all the windows on all elevations of the house. He stated that he previously wanted to do a contemporary house with an Asian flare and it was interpreted that he wanted to create a modern Japanese house which is incorrect. He pointed out the flat molding for the main entry and larger molding for the larger doors. He noted that the windows are wood clad and not vinyl and added he does short on quality. He handed out photos of the surrounding neighborhood of the houses to justify that his house appears in better quality or equal to.

Emmett Badar interjected and commented that he appreciates the detailed submittal but needs to understand what the applicant is actually proposing and emphasized he has not gotten to the point of what the Board would like to hear.

Hugo Lepe stated that the quality of the house is very detailed and exquisite. He stated that he did address some of the concerns of the Board. He pointed out that he increased the deck 6 ft. and added a roof. He concluded that he is extremely confident in the design of the house.

Emmett Badar asked the applicant if he had the opportunity to sit with Staff to go over the items the Board requested and did Staff provide you feedback.

Hugo Lepe responded that he worked with Associate Planner Williams and added that he disagrees with the Board's comments and believes the house is of excellent quality and added he included more depth. He pointed out that he redesigned the front yard that was previously presented as massive. He added he does not have a problem making additional changes.

Emmett Badar commented that since this was discussed with Staff, what was the outcome.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the applicant worked with Staff and added he did modify and address the points. She added that the applicant made an effort to make the changes to the wall planes and created additional depth and incorporated additional architectural designs and materials.

Larry Stevens recommended that the applicant meet with Senior Planner Espinoza, since Associate Planner Williams will be out of the office next week, to discuss the five outstanding points stated in the Staff Report and address each one of those for the next DPRB meeting. He recommended continuing the item in order to better go over the outstanding issues. He added that item will be first on the agenda.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to continue the item until the DPRB meeting of July 24, 2014 to address, and discuss the outstanding issues, #1-5, addressed in the Staff Report.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 14-23

A request for approval of a phased plan for portions of San Dimas Shopping Center as well as adoption of a master paint color scheme for San Dimas Station Shopping Center (North and South) in the Creative-Growth Zone.

APN's: 8386-007-063, 064, 070 & 075

Zone: Creative Growth 1 (CG-1)

Jennifer Yang of Meiloon Management, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the applicant, Meiloon Valley, is requesting approval of a phased painting plan and color changes for the buildings within San Dimas Station Shopping Center which is under its ownership. San Dimas Station North consists of four pad buildings and one primary building with multiple in-line units. San Dimas Station South consists of three pad buildings and one primary building with multiple in-line units. The applicant has also expressed a willingness as the majority owner of the shopping center, to adopt the proposed colors as the master paint color scheme for the Center should other building owners wish to re-paint in a different paint scheme than their existing colors in the future. The buildings under Meiloon's control are currently in hues of browns, creams, reds and greens. The colors to be utilized in the repainting included "Caramel Apple" for the building tops and storefronts, "Deer Path" beige for the "pop-outs" and "Clinton Brown" for all trim and railings. The applicant has proposed three phases to be completed over three calendar years due to annual budget constraints: Phase A – to be completed in 2014 – would consist of painting four (4) building "pop-outs" at San Dimas Station North and one (1) building "pop-out" at San Dimas Station South. North: Sola Salons, Furniture Depot, Vacant – Future Rockin' Jump and Zendejas Pad. South: VN Cuisine/Las Palmas. Phase B – to be completed in 2015 – would consist of re-painting the building tops which serve as the sign areas for many of the tenants in "Caramel Apple." Phase C – to be completed in 2016 – would consist of re-painting the store fronts in "Caramel Apple" and painting the window trim, doors, balcony posts and railings, stair railings, and patio railings "Clinton Brown."

She stated that the outstanding issues include: lack of coordination in between phases, lack of internal coordination and lack of coordination with other buildings in the center. Staff has concerns that there will be a lack of coordination in between phases, for example, when the pop-out on the South side is repainted in 2014, the trim will be changed to "Clinton Brown" while the trim on the buildings surrounding will be in the existing green hue until Phase C is undertaken in 2016. Also, painting all of the pop-outs except for the two on the South side that are in better condition is not optimal from an architectural perspective. Also, there is a proliferation of varying paint colors and finishes throughout both sides of the Shopping Center. While some of the buildings are in a similar color scheme and do not necessarily clash, there are some obvious variations throughout North to South and even throughout the same in-line buildings. Staff recommends approval.

Larry Stevens inquired about the storefront windows.

Associate Planner Williams responded Phase C is the front portion and Phase A will be the trim and painted in Clinton Brown.

Emmett Badar asked if there is a general understanding with the adjoining properties that are not under Meiloon's jurisdiction.

Jennifer Yang of Meiloon Management, applicant, responded that they have not collaborated with adjoining properties yet. She noted that in regards to a timeframe, in August, Phase A can be done.

John Sorcinelli recollected that the building was painted about 7 years ago by STG under the direction of Craig Hensley. He recalled that the entire site was painted. He added that all wood should be painted as part of the first phase.

Jennifer Yang commented that she can try and squeeze the phases into the budget.

Larry Stevens asked if she has been approached by any of the pads to make changes.

Jennifer Yang responded that Red Robin and Applebee's both wanted to do tenant improvement work which included some exterior changes; however, at the time, they did not want to spend any additional funding so they did not do the work.

Larry Stevens expressed his concerns with the phasing and added it will not be attractive until it is completely done. He asked how Meiloon would get the property owners to conform to the new color scheme. He added that the CC&R's can be looked at; however, Meiloon does not have authority to paint their buildings; however, Meiloon has the ability to exert architectural approval over the color scheme to use.

Jennifer Yang commented that any changes made should be per the CC&R's.

Larry Stevens expressed his concerns with approving a new color scheme. He asked if the inline buildings apply to the entire center and recommend Meiloon advise them that they need to give notice to the other property owners when they want to repaint there location, they will need to follow the approved color scheme. He stated that he does not have a problem changing the color scheme; however, emphasized that at some point, everyone needs to be in the same color scheme with the exception of some pads.

John Sorcinelli commented that he was involved with the previous color scheme and noted that the idea was that the major facades matched and are highlighted with the colors. He commented that if the concept changes, will it change all the facades at the front edge or will it change the project. He noted that the colors seem to be monochrome and the only factor that identifies the change is the shapes of the larger facades. He recommended that there should be more of a contrast between the colors.

Emmett Badar departed at 11:03 a.m.

Curtis Morris arrived at 11:03 a.m.

Larry Stevens suggested that it would benefit the Board if a test sample for the tone was painted on an existing piece of the property. This will determine if the applicant should go darker or lighter.

John Sorcinelli commented that Phase A and Phase B will be first and Phase C will be second.

Larry Stevens stated that in 2014, Phase A will be finished around the Fall during the months of August and September.

Eric Beilstein agreed with Mr. Sorcinelli's comment about the colors being monochromatic and that they blend with the rest.

Larry Stevens reiterated his recommendation that the applicant paint a sample on a piece of the wall in order to fully see the representation of the color.

John Sorcinelli recommended adding an additional color to the scheme because it will provide more of a variety of color and will not look monochromatic.

Larry Stevens stated that he is ok with a variety but not too much. He added that perimeters can be set for one color scheme so that there is a general uniformity.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to conceptually approve and arrange to do the following: that the applicant paint a test sample on the actual building for review in order to make a final determination, work on the phase implementation and work with the City to provide notice of adoption of the master paint color scheme to the property owners and tenants within San Dimas Station prior to final approval.

Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Morris Abstain)

DPRB Case No. 14-22

A request to approve a Master Sign Program for Chaparral Lanes located at 400 W. Bonita Avenue.

Associated Case: CE13-3546

APN: 8386-017-028

Zone: Creative Growth 2 (CG-2)

Mr. Schoonover advised that item #5 – DPRB Case No. 14-22 – 400 W. Bonita Avenue will be continued until a date uncertain. He advised the Board that the applicant requested continuance.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue the item, per the applicant's request, to the DPRB meeting to a date uncertain.

Motion carried 7-0

Scott Dilley departed at 11:21 a.m.

Jim Schoonover departed at 11:22 a.m. and designated Curtis Morris as DPRB Chairman.

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

Continued from the meetings of June 12, 2014 and June 26, 2014. 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 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.

Diana Galin, Color Consultant – 40368 Sage Rd., Hemet CA, 92544, 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.

Steve Rudy of 264 E. Foothill Blvd., was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated at the June 12, 2014 DPRB meeting. Staff presented the project and addressed a number of issues of concerns that they had regarding the project. After hearing presentations from Staff and the applicant and input from the one resident in attendance, the Board determined that a site visit to some of the applicant's development projects would help them understand the type of project and quality type they are proposing.

The Board expressed the following concerns:

- Neighbor-to-neighbor window alignment - The Board requested that there be no windows that look directly into another window, alternative individual trash bin location – The Board is concerned with the location of some of the trash bins being too close to the neighbor's front door (5 to 8 feet) and alternative layout and design of Plan 2
- Side yard front door entry – The Board was concerned that the access to the front door was along the side of the house with no visible acknowledgement of its location or logical access.

On June 26, 2014, the Board visited the following three sites, two of which are development projects of the applicant and one that is by a different developer (Standard Pacific Homes).

- 1) Oakgrove Walk – Dover Avenue & Dune Lane, La Verne (applicant's recommendation)
- 2) Avenida at La Floresta – 3525 E. Imperial Hwy., Brea (applicant's recommendation)
- 3) Sausalito Walk – 10572 Sausalito, Los Alamitos (Staff's recommendation)

The Board visited each of the sites and out of the three sites; No. 3 was most representative of the proposed project as it had the same features:

1. Two of the proposed Plan 1 front elevations are the same as the Foothill site.
2. 18-foot driveways in front of the garages
3. Five-foot side yard setbacks
4. 10-foot rear yard setbacks
5. Exterior finished materials
6. Massing and scale
7. Linear alignment of the placement of the residences

The Board at the conclusion of the meeting discussed the following recommendations that were later discussed with the applicant:

1. Trash bin access and placement needs to be addressed for all units.
2. The neighbor-to-neighbor window alignment is reaffirmed as a concern.
3. An attached shade structure designed in the same materials as the house should be incorporated in the rear of most of the homes if not all.
4. The rear yards should be increased from 10 feet to a minimum of 15 feet to allow for a useable area.
5. Additional accent materials (i.e. brick) should be applied to the residences.
6. The color of the proposed windows should be tan and not white.
7. There should be a mixture of the Plan 1 and Plan 2 front elevations along the extension of Walnut Avenue and not all Plan 1's.
8. Enhanced landscaping should be planted along the four-foot wide planter along the way to provide a positive visual affect when seen from Foothill Blvd. and also help in providing shade for some of the homes.
9. Consider a mix of single homes and duplex units in order to break-up the monotony of the two plans and to allow for increased useable yard area.

There is concern with the bulk and massing of the project and added there is not enough architectural variation in the front elevations of the homes, such as:

- The massing is too square and front elevations are too plain. All of the plans seem to be the same with minor modifications. For example, a pot shelf was added to the sides of the buildings. He emphasized only two out of the six provide other materials other than stucco and the amount of accent materials are very limited by the front entrance. The setbacks were increased to 10 ft.

The site visit gave the Board a better understanding of the lack of details and amount of materials applied, including the setbacks and driveway approach depth. If the shade structures for the rear of the property are included, there should be one consistent style which would provide relief to the rear of the properties. He pointed out that the La Floresta project had integrated patios and it helped reduce massing at the rear. The setbacks were increased to 10 ft.; however, a 15 ft. setback is more appropriate. The color of the windows proposed are white vinyl but Staff would like to see a tan or

almond color used. There is a concern with the monotony of the square box and linear alignment for the placement of the homes. He suggested maybe duplexes can be used versus single-family residences. Staff requested that the Board continue the items to allow the applicant time to address the issues of concern presented by Staff and other issues that may arise at the DPRB meeting.

John Sorcinelli commented on the duplex comment. He stated that there is a way to break in the lengthy street façade to create a landscape feature. He noted that a unit can be eliminated or a duplex type of unit can be created or increase the size of the units and reduce the quantity.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant has returned revised portions of the project. In regards to the window alignment, the applicant conducted a study to observe any windows that had a direct view into any neighboring windows and changed the window placements. The applicant accomplished not having any window to window placement on a majority of the homes except for four. Some of the windows align closely but some buildings were setback further and since there is a grade change, it is not necessarily directly view into other properties windows. The other issue addressed was the alternative to the front doors placed on the side of the house. The doors have been left at the same location but there are three different concepts to accentuate where the front door is located. Some will include a portico design which the Board originally favored and added that it provides more variation to the house. The pilasters option would be towards the front entrance between the walkway entrances which leads to the front door. The last option is to have low walls and gates.

Larry Stevens commented that a pilaster and a low wall is a very similar concept but there is no gate.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes; however, the placements are different and have a small wall portion.

Larry Stevens asked if the porticos are built to the property line or a few inches away from the property line. He asked if they are covered and have 5 – 6 ft. depth.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded the porticos are six inches from the property line and it appears to be closer to their neighbors than before. He added there is no way to avoid the closeness.

Eric Beilstein commented that sometimes, in order to solve one problem, another one may arise. For example, the issue with being able to find the front door with the portico now pushes the house closer to the adjacent neighbors creating visual issues

John Sorcinelli asked about the trash bin location.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that trash cans are in the side yard. The setbacks in some lots have been reduced from 5 ft. to 4 ft. in order to increase the separation of the buildings. Some of the lots will have a 6 ft. setback and a 4 ft. setback on the other side. He commented that he does not believe 1 ft. is positive an alternative nor provides sufficient separation of the trash bin from the adjacent neighbors front door.

Larry Stevens pointed out that there is a walkway and pedestrian gate that leads to the trash area.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the final walkway design has not been determined. He noted that the square footage can be removed from the interior which would accommodate the 64 gallon trash bin in the garage saving the trash bins outside in the side yards.

John Reekstin, The Olson Company, stated that a landscaper can take care of the front yard by reducing the amount of green waste produced.

Sandi Gottlieb, The Olson Company, commented that it was supposed to be Olson Company installing the landscaping but maintained by the homeowner.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that there are still issues with the trash bins at the side yard and the issue of a trash bin adjacent to your front door. He addressed the additional landscaping proposed on the south side of the south property line. The concern is the planter is 4 ft. deep and if there is a 2 ft. V ditch within the planter which leaves 2 ft. for planting. He added that they would consult with the City Arborist to discuss the use of a root barrier. He expressed his concern with the space for long term maintenance. He added that Staff would like to see trees but do not know if a 4 ft. planter is enough.

Larry Stevens asked what the V ditch serves as.

Sandi Gottlieb replied that the V ditch drains all the adjacent properties.

Larry Stevens inquired about the County chain link fence.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the Flood Control will not let the applicant remove the chain link fence along the south property line.

Larry Stevens and John Sorcinelli asked if a V ditch is necessary to handle water coming from the project, especially since there is a slump stone wall on the property.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the rear of the property is being drained.

Larry Stevens stated that the south wall property line should be 4 ft. further to the south of the property line versus in the proposed location. He recommended that if the applicant anticipates a lot of drainage to come down, then a pipe can be added to the backyard and if it is undergrounded, it would be a better circumstance than putting a 4 ft. gap. He asked if the Board would have a concern with a 7 ft. wall at back of the property if the wall was moved back 4 ft.

John Sorcinelli responded that it will be a visibility problem since it is visible from Foothill Blvd.

Curtis Morris commented that the wall will blend well with the existing commercial building.

Larry Stevens asked how much of the wall is shown and how much will it retain.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the south wall to the right varies in height.

John Reekstin commented that he was able to speak to the Civil Engineer recently and the wall can be moved 4 ft. back. He noted that all that is being drained is to the channel wall and noted that a V ditch is not needed.

Larry Stevens stated that it makes more sense to put the wall on the property line. He stated that the lots at the south drain to the street versus the rear.

Curtis Morris asked if the V ditch is draining to the Flood Control right-of-way.

Larry Stevens replied that there is a short distance of wall and recommended doing some pilasters to break it up, if it is visible from the street. He added that an appropriate tree at the back of the property would help alleviate the problem. He discussed alternatives for the back yard and suggested making it a requirement in the CC&R's to suggest rear yard landscaping. He expressed his concern with the

houses near the South property line since they are very close; however, if additional feet can be obtained, it would be best for the project.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that Staff's concern with such a condition, is that the City does not enforce CC&R's.

Larry Stevens suggested making it a DPRB condition rather than include in the CC&R's so that the City can enforce and monitor.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the solution could be to get rid of the V ditch.

Krishna Patel stated that the water generated will slope towards Walnut Avenue and by the time it gets to the channel, it will percolate.

Curtis Morris stated that it is a different elevation of the channel and added if there is a lot of water it would flow to the channel.

Krishna Patel departed at 12:30 p.m.

Larry Stevens inquired about the rear yard block walls of the property to the west.

Allison K. Kunz, The Olson Company, replied that it is a mix of material used for the wall.

Larry Stevens stated that it is more exposed. He noted that it is important to have a good streetscape and make all the fencing consistent.

Sandi Gottlieb stated that the existing block wall along the west property line are not on the property line and pointed out that they are proposing about 4 ft. of landscaping between the multi-use trail and the curb.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that there is a parabolic window which the applicant will be adding decorative tiles to the bottom as an accent feature and added it is an appropriate feature. He discussed the cabana with the canvas top and stated that they are now proposing a wood trellis, which is a better product. Another feature the applicant proposed is the pot shelf; however, at the site visits, all but one, the original model house, had empty pot shelves. Another difficulty with pot shelves is that you have to remove the window screen in order to water your plants. He added that another architectural feature should be provided. He stated that Staff is still concerned with the lack of detail, wall angulation and lack of accent materials used. He expressed his concern if this project is approved, it will set an inappropriate standard. He recommended redesigning the homes and changing home placement as well as reducing square footages.

Eric Beilstein inquired about the lighting standards.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there are issues with the architectural features. The same doors and light fixtures are being used for all the homes and added there needs to be more variation and detail to an acceptable level.

Curtis Morris pointed out the project at Walnut Ave and Allen Ave, within the HOA of Village at San Dimas, and expressed that those units are large duplexes and appear ok.

Larry Stevens stated that there is a different way to approach concerns of lack of materials and ornamentation on the windows. He stated that the applicant does not have to resolve all the concerns

before the remainder of the associated applications are heard before the Planning Commission and City Council.

John Reekstin stated that if the Board moves forward and decides the layout still needs work, they are willing to work with Staff to solve outstanding issues.

Sandi Gottlieb emphasized that one item they focused on was to have community support. She noted that they will be having their 9th community meeting tonight to hear any other issues they may have.

Denise Ashton, WHA – 2805 Red Hill Ave, Suite 200, pointed out that the project will include over an enormous recreation area. She stated that they are confident about the front door entries and have provided three solutions.

Allison K. Kunz addressed the placement of the windows and suggested they could provide opaque glass as well. She noted that they heard the Board's concerns and addressed them as best as they could; however, there were circumstances where there was entry to entry, entry to side garage and a side where it appeared to be the front. From those concerns, solutions were made. There are nine new elevations. She noted that the trash cans and gate to the side yard was pulled back 8 ft. from the garage door. The garage is recessed and the side yard gate is 8 ft. back and will not be a conflict.

Denise Ashton stated that they have looked at secondary windows and noted that there is a change and they have worked on mitigating all the window conflicts.

Allison K. Kunz commented that the porticos have been added to address the front entries.

Denise Ashton added that there are adjustments to the porticos and pointed out there are 24 color schemes. She pointed out the parabolic windows that will be used that also add decorative elements to the project.

Curtis Morris commented that in the long run, the gate is better than a portico. He stated that the gate keeps the openness and provides the same purpose as a portico.

Ron Nestor, WHA, stated that none of the front doors have a cover and all the front doors are recessed and have a soffit roof gutter and no water will drain onto the front doors. He noted that some houses do not have porticos because of the street frontage.

Curtis Morris stated that he is reluctant to require the shelf pot for the project.

Allison K. Kunz commented that tile samples have been provided for the windows. She noted that it is not just an 8 color scheme but 24 color schemes with no repetition. There is now a 15 ft. rear yard setback and they have agreed to open to the South property line and move the wall out and include vines on the wall. She stated that this is not like the Los Alamitos project because it is over two times the number of units. She pointed out the lots were not intended to have larger yards.

Eric Beilstein compared this project to the one in La Verne. He expressed that the best feature there were the trees interspersed into the walkway that ran between the homes. It provided open space in the center.

Allison K. Kunz stated that the Sausalito Walk in Los Alamitos is not comparable because there is no continuous sidewalk and no parking on the street. She added that the open space on that property is very different than this project.

John Sorcinelli stated that the La Verne project has ideas that can be incorporated into this project which may include losing approximately three units and in the end, can make a huge difference on the overall project. It can solve the problem of making density feel less dense.

Denise Ashton asked if the recreation area is shrunk and the homes can move to the East, would that suffice.

John Sorcinelli responded that finding a way to get more open space is a great option. He stated that he would enjoy seeing at each turn corner green space. He suggested having duplexes on the street side.

Denise Ashton stated that the duplexes save 5 – 10 ft. on the sideward.

Larry Stevens asked if there is a reason why there are only two floor plans.

John Reekstin stated that they felt there was enough variety in the color schemes to provide that variation. He noted that the La Verne project dictated that the Oak trees need to be preserved. He stated that they are working with Staff and different elements to make the units attractive.

John Sorcinelli stated that they do not have a problem with the La Verne vision but with creating open space then creating them everywhere. He suggested if house #21 and #25 on the plans are removed, it would help solve the problems of the linier line of sight issues of concern.

John Reekstin stated that there is an acre of open space which is more than enough.

Senior Planner Espinoza pointed out where the cell tower and front gate are and added that is included with their open space but not usable thereby reducing their usable open space.

Peter A. Duarte, Landscape Architect, addressed the open space. He noted that in La Verne, there were 100 Oak trees and pointed out the maintenance cost and added that it did not give them a recreation area. He stated that this allows for private amenities for this particular project.

John Sorcinelli argued that house #'s 21 and 25 can be moved over. Also, he noted that the project should include covered patios with roof balconies. He added that the location allows for a great covered patio area with a roof balcony. He noted that this design makes sense on the south side of the San Dimas project to help screen the sun.

Eric Beilstein expressed his concern with the south rear walls being in close proximity to the channel.

John Sorcinelli expressed his concern with the patio cover and the issue of buyer preference.

Allison K. Kunz commented that it will be the buyer's preference for the option of a patio.

John Reekstin stated that there is a desire for the rear houses to have patios and it is something that can be worked on.

Curtis Morris stated that he is comfortable with the patio idea.

Larry Stevens expressed that there needs to be enough room and added another approach can be taken. He provided options for the rear lots. He noted setbacks can be adjusted since it is a new zone within a Specific Plan.

Allison K. Kunz stated that they receive buyer feedback and the buyers prefer a smaller rear yard in order to have a larger interior.

Curtis Morris inquired about the distance between houses at the back of the channel.

Allison K. Kunz responded 14 ft. if the wall is pushed backed to the property line.

Curtis Morris suggested moving the wall back then 3 – 4 ft.

John Sorcinelli stated that the existence of the trees will make a livability difference.

Larry Stevens inquired about the operator of the cell site.

John Reekstin responded that there was a one-time payment made with the understanding that there are no ongoing revenues, forever, but they will be able to receive access onto the site in order to do maintenance updates.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second John Sorcinelli to move forward with the other components of the application: the Tentative Tract Map, Zone Change, Specific Plan No. 27 and General Plan Amendment, Mitigated Negative Declaration and Development Agreement with the City to the Planning Commission and City Council. Coincided with that will be a direction of comments from the Board and Staff relative to the outstanding design issues. The design issues will include general concerns of site layout that will focus on the architectural design details such as a reduction to the number of units proposed and the possibility of a third floor plan to be reviewed.

The Board is not requesting that the applicant work formally on resolving those details any more than they already have but understanding there are still outstanding concerns. If there is a favorable overall decision at the Planning Commission and City Council then the item will return to DPRB to finalize the design details. However, there may be overriding issues such as if a lot is removed which will affect the layout of the Tract Map and that issues is what will take precedent in the discussion, not the design details.

Motion carried 4-0-3-0 (Dilley, Schoonover and Patel Absent)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m. to the meeting of July 24, 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