

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
September 11, 2014 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

Emmett Badar, City Council  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large  
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

**CALL TO ORDER**

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve the June 12, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 7-0.

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve the July 10, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 6-0-0-1. (Badar Abstain)

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve the August 14, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Badar Abstain).

**DPRB Case No. 14-27**

**Continued from the meetings of July 10, 2014, July 24, 2014 and August 14, 2014.** 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

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the item was added to the agenda because he was not sure if the issues would be resolved prior to the meeting. At the previous DPRB meeting of August 14, 2014, the Board approved the project to have a historic storefront; however, the applicant returned with revisions that did not incorporate enough to call historic. The City assistance program is going to take longer than expected and the applicant does not want to wait. He noted that he met with the applicant on Monday, September 8, 2014, to let them know that there may or may not be City assistance. Per a conversation that took place Wednesday, September 10, 2014, the applicants had tentative changes and were not

sure if they could make all the improvements. He added that they could not be in attendance at today's meeting and recommended returning to the Board in two weeks. He concluded that no action is required.

**DPRB Case No. 14-25, Precise Plan No. 14-01 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-28**

Associated Case: Conditional Use Permit No. 14-05 and Lot Line Adjustment 14-03

A request to construct two multi-tenant commercial buildings located at 1022 – 1048 W. Gladstone Street at the Citrus Station commercial center.

APN's: 8383-009-077 – 080

Zone: Specific Plan No. 24, Area 1

Alex Gonzalez of Evergreen, 2390 S. Camelback Rd., Phoenix AZ, was present.

Stephen A. Rittner of RMCA Architects, 1541 Wilshire Blvd #110, Los Angeles CA 90017, was present.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the request is to construct two multi-tenant commercial buildings located off of Gladstone St. These are the last two vacant parcels that measure 2.8 acres. DPRB will approve the Precise Plan and Tree Removal applications, Planning Commission will review for Conditional Use Permit 14-05 for the two restaurant drive-thru's and by the City Council for the final review of the Precise Plan No. 14-01 and Lot Line Adjustment 14-03. The project will complete the development of the center. The two vacant parcels will require approval of a Lot Line Adjustment to reconfigure the parcels into the desired configuration. Each building will sit on each parcel. Building No. 1 will measure 11,234 sq. ft. and will accommodate four tenant spaces ranging from 1,495 sq. ft. to 4,407 sq. ft. Building No. 2 will measure 6,296 sq. ft. and will accommodate three tenant spaces ranging from 1,632 sq. ft. to 2,772 sq. ft. Each building will accommodate one restaurant with a drive-thru and the remaining spaces will be retail based. In the future, the retail spaces may be occupied by restaurants as they are a permitted use in SP-24 zone. Building No. 1 will have a decorative wall that measures no more than 42 inches in height and will be constructed along the portions of the drive-thru to screen glare from the headlights for vehicles travelling east on Gladstone Street and vehicles entering the center. Building No. 2 will have the same decorative wall screening the drive-thru for Building No. 1, which will extend eastward to screen headlight glare from vehicles in Building No. 2's drive-thru.

He stated that both restaurants will include outdoor dining. Building No. 1's restaurant will provide a covered patio for outdoor dining while Building No. 2 will provide an outdoor area with tables and umbrellas. In addition, two of the retail spaces in Building No. 1 will provide a covered patio which may serve as outdoor dining should the spaces be occupied by restaurants in the future. Condition No. 18 has been added to require that the outdoor furniture and umbrellas are compatible with the existing developments.

The development will require 141 parking spaces; however, Section 18.152.050 allows restaurants with drive-thru facilities that provide a minimum of eight queuing spaces to reduce their parking requirement for four spaces. Both drive-thru's meet the requirements; therefore the project is eligible for a reduction of eight spaces and will only require 133 spaces. The shared parking provides the subject development and the existing developments in the center access to Costco's 167 surplus parking spaces. Therefore, should one of the retail spaces be occupied by a restaurant in the future, parking will not be a concern as there are sufficient surplus parking spaces in the center.

In regards to the design, the applicant worked with Staff to comply with the architectural standards of the Specific Plan No. 24 Zone and Center's Guidelines. Included will be elements to match the existing buildings in the center. The buildings will incorporate an Early California architecture theme and will be compatible with the existing buildings in the center. The buildings will provide various planes and will vary in height by providing rooflines with decorative cornices that will vary from 24 to 31 ft. and decorative tower elements measuring up to 33 ft. The Code allows a maximum height of 35 ft. He noted some of the design features incorporated design elements consistent with the Costco design. The features will include: façade with various finishes to include stucco in varying colors, buff colored split-face block, metal cladding and a buff colored split-face wainscot, column pop-outs and patio columns with gray colored split-face block and gray colored smooth block accents, metal trusses with tan colored standing seam metal roofs and decorative gable roof with metal truss and frosted glass. Throughout the building, canvas awnings will be used over certain windows and doors. There will be decorative lighting to match existing lightings in the center, a metal trellis over drive-thru in Building No. 1, tile murals depicting images of the citrus industry and metal lattices with climbing vines.

The applicant is requesting a tree removal approval for an Oak tree that is located at the center of the development parcel. The applicant submitted an arborist report that indicated the tree is in poor health and is dying. The arborist indicated that there is no guarantee that the tree will respond positively to efforts of preservation and that it is not viable for relocation. It is recommended by Staff that the tree be removed and replaced with four 24" box Coast Live Oak trees as replacement trees. Staff recommends approval to the Planning Commission and City Council.

**Mr. Badar** asked if the City Arborist, Deborah Day, examined the Oak tree.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied that Deborah Day had previously examined the tree and agreed that it's in poor health.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that the Oak tree is in poor health because it was not taken care of even though Staff advised the property owner that they should. He expressed his disappointment.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if it was in their conditions of approval.

**Mr. Stevens** responded yes that it was part of the original approval. The developer was to retain six or seven large Oak trees on the project with the intention of preserving the pad development areas. As we moved forward, all the trees have been proposed for removal as they were in poor health.

**Mr. Patel** commented that some trees could not be removed because of soil conditions.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the applicant did consider moving some trees; however, the problem was when they tried to dig around the roots and box them up. He noted that there was no viable soil left in the roots to accommodate the boxing of the trees.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the applicant will also need to update their Master Sign Program. He noted that the sign program does call out for signage but will need to update to correctly reflect the locations on the building. He pointed out that Condition No. 11 will need to be revised to reflect that the sign program can be reviewed by Staff and not need to return to the Board. He emphasized that only the site plan needs to be updated for the location of the building and not the criteria. If there is anything additional to be proposed beyond that, then it will need to return to DPRB. The applicant has been working with Staff and they have addressed all concerns. He noted that there is one outstanding area that needs to be discussed; trash enclosures. There will be two trash enclosures that will have a total of 10 bins. He stated that there is a concern with the high amount of

trash bins, for example: Panda Express has one trash bin and the Shoppes Building has three trash bins. The applicant anticipates having retail spaces and wants to make sure they have enough space for trash bins in the event additional restaurants occupy the retail spaces. The applicant stated that they will not be requesting additional trash bins and emphasized that Staff will not be in favor of any additional bins.

**Mr. Badar** commented that he is also not in favor of increasing the number of trash enclosures.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** commented that more trash bins means less trash pickups.

**Associate Planner Torrico** added that Panda Express has pickups six days a week.

**Mr. Stevens** recollected that the original proposal for the project was a lot larger; however, it is significantly less square footage than the original plan. He noted that different types of retail uses will generate different types of traffic. Since the proposed project is less intense than what was originally approved, Environmental is not necessary.

**Associate Planner Torrico** commented that the lot lines will be reconfigured.

**Mr. Stevens** inquired about the size of the Citrus Labels that will be used.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded they are 4x3.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the label designs have been chosen.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that they have not been chosen yet and added he will be working with the applicant on which ones are appropriate to use.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how many Citrus labels are on the Costco gas station wall.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded three Citrus labels.

**Mr. Michaelis** added that there are also three Citrus labels on the Bank of the West building. He asked for an explanation on the tree replacement locations.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that Staff is requiring that they plant four 24" Oak trees.

**Mr. Michaelis** recommended that one of the tree replacements be planted at the northeast corner in the round planter.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked about the other three replacement tree locations.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that he will work with the applicant on the locations for the replacement trees. He asked if the Board had any suggestions.

**Mr. Stevens** responded that you have to be careful when planting Oak trees. He noted that some materials planted underneath, do not work very well. He pointed out that you have to be sensitive with Oak tree drip lines.

**Mr. Patel** commented that he would like to see a larger tree planted in the raised planter.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** commented that he does not want to see a reduction in the number of replacement trees. He stated that the applicant needs to design a plan to replace four Oak trees, especially, when there is a surplus of parking. He added that he would like to see an effort on the plan to reduce parking spaces and make a larger area for the replacement trees.

**Associate Planner Torrico** commented that the applicant will work with Staff in regards to the locations of the replacement trees. He noted that in their defense, the design presented is just conceptual.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that if you look at the site plan, there is no other place to plant an Oak tree.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** commented that the benefit is that there is a surplus of parking; however, he questioned the additional parking spaces to be added near the railroad tracks.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that the applicant is adding 11 parking spaces to service the project.

**Mr. Schoonover** asked if Building No. 1 will only have three patios only if there are restaurants.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that the applicant will provide the patio areas regardless of what type of use is at the Building.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the patios will be fenced.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** suggested removing the fences and only allowing if additional restaurants are included.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he is inclined to think it should be designated as a future patio but fencing can be added later if there is an additional restaurant tenant.

**Eric Beilstein, Building Official,** asked if the potential restaurants have grease interceptors.

**Mr. Patel** responded they are on the plans on page C3.

**Mr. Stevens** added that the drainage improvements were done under the prior MS4 permit. He stated that the parking lot will drain into the existing system.

**Mr. Patel** pointed out the lights at the back of the buildings facing Gladstone St. and asked if Staff has distribution on those.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that Staff will review the applicant's photometric plans and added that the fixtures have been submitted for review.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if Costco has signed off on the 11 additional parking spaces because the trucks have used that entrance off of Gladstone St. as their designated truck route.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** clarified that the additional parking spaces to be provided by the applicant is six and not the 11, five are existing.

**Mr. Beilstein** inquired about the canvas awnings. He noted that Panda Express has canvas awnings and as part of their approval, they were to maintain their appearance. He added that the canvases appear to not have been maintained. He suggested using metal instead of canvas.

**Alex Gonzalez of Evergreen, 2390 S. Camelback Rd., Phoenix AZ**, he stated that he has been working on this project for about nine months and has been received by the community well. He addressed the trash enclosures that have been discussed intensely. He stated that Panera Bread is one of the proposed tenants and they would like three trash bins. He has contacted Waste Management to see the feasibility of that and added the trash pickup is expensive. He has discussed with the tenants and managed to reduce the number of containers. He stated that some of the tenants to be in Building 1 are: Panera Bread, Pacific Fish Grill, Jamba Juice would be an ideal tenant and Café Rio. In Building 2: Krispy Kreme, Pizza Rev and a burger place. He addressed the guardrails and fences and stated that fences will go where there is a restaurant. He addressed the concerns of the tree replacement locations and noted the comments were valid; however, he would like flexibility so that it is not a conflict with blocking tenant signage, etc.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the next site plan will show the proposed trees.

**Mr. Gonzalez** responded yes.

**Mr. Badar** commented that he is ok with four replacement trees but the applicant should look at a larger size for the replacement trees.

**Mr. Gonzalez** commented that they will follow Staff's direction for the tree sizes. He stated that in regards to the additional parking spaces, Costco wants to make sure their spaces are not threatened thus they are adding six additional spaces. They have executed a parking agreement with Costco to reflect this. These additional parking spaces will be intended more so for the new employees of the new buildings.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if those six parking spaces can be considered in the future as additional parking instead.

**Mr. Gonzalez** responded that Costco wants to have them now.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that by including those six parking spaces, the path of travel has become narrower for the truck route.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that Costco has approved the site plan with the six additional parking spaces so they are aware.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the applicant will keep the parcels or sell off.

**Mr. Gonzalez** responded he is unsure if they want to keep or sell or if they want to sell as a whole or in parts.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated that the transformers are proposed inside the property. He stated that it may not happen and may need to be in front and one per building.

**Mr. Gonzalez** stated that he will work with Edison.

**Mr. Beilstein** stated that the transformer is not allowed on the landscaped berm. He commented that his concern is the design and conductor size. He added that if it is inside, Edison will oppose.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** questioned the location of Pacific Fish Grill. He added that his experience with outdoor dining is that it is usually popular. He stated that the tenant space they are considering is not an appropriate location and not enough space for outdoor dining. He recommended the tenant space at the end be utilized instead because they have more frontage.

**Mr. Gonzalez** commented that no lease has been executed yet so changes could be made.

**Mr. Dilley** commented that there is the opportunity to relocate the trash enclosures and make an additional patio area.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** inquired about bike racks.

**Mr. Gonzalez** responded that at some point there will be additional bike racks.

**Associate Planner Torrico** added that at one point, bike lockers were discussed.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** inquired about the colors to be used on the buildings. He pointed out the tangerine and asked if the color could be relooked at. He recommended looking at another palette scheme.

**Mr. Gonzalez** commented that the colors selected are based on what is currently out there. Panda Express uses Orange and Bank of the West uses yellow.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that he does not mind the brightness but the combination does not mesh well. He recommended more earth tones.

**Mr. Beilstein** pointed out that Bank of the West's paint colors were approved but was flipped during final because the color scheme did not come out as they thought it would.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that paint samples are always different than the colors that print on the plans.

**Stephen A. Rittner of RMCA Architects, 1541 Wilshire Blvd #110, Los Angeles CA 90017**, stated that they can look at alternative tones and colors.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if Adventure Orange is used on the site.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded it is used on the Bank of the West tower.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the ADA path of travel is connected to the Costco path of travel.

**Mr. Beilstein** responded an ADA path is encouraged; however, there is connectivity on Lone Hill Ave.

**Mr. Gonzalez** commented that they have looked at previously; however, it is outside their control and has tried working with Costco.

**Mr. Beilstein** stated that there is pedestrian access but per the Code, there should be interconnectivity between buildings. He added that it is strongly encouraged.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli with the following modifications: update Condition No. 11 to reflect that Staff will review the Master Sign Program and will not need to be reviewed by the Development Plan Review Board, evaluate bike racks, work with Staff to assess appropriateness of colors prior to plan check submittal, revise site plan to ensure sufficient space for the required four (4) replacement trees, patio fencing not to be installed if tenant space not occupied by a restaurant use and try to maximize outdoor seating areas.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:14 a.m. to the meeting of September 25, 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 25, 2014