CALL TO ORDER

1. DPRB Case No. 15-38
   Associated Case: CUP 15-09
   A request to construct and operate an 11,121 square foot gymnasium that will house several offices, a service kitchen, restrooms and a 1,577 square foot living quarters for the Clergy on the second floor. The new building will be attached to the exiting west elevation of the church by a 1,299 square foot entry hall. The new gymnasium building will an accessory use to the existing church located at 1404 W. Gladstone Street.
   Applicant: Abraham Tekin  APN: 8383-001-030 & -019
   Planner: Marco Espinoza  Zone: SF 7,500

2. DPRB Case No. 18-0027
   Associated Cases: PROJ-18-0085
                    DPRB Case No. 15-41
   A request to change the paint scheme on the Mercantile Building located at 138 W. Bonita Avenue within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2 – Frontier Village.
   Applicant: Shari Nign  APN: 8390-023-014
   Planner: Anne Nguyen  Zone: CG2

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Members of the audience are invited to address the Board on any item not on the agenda. Under the provisions of the Brown Act, the Board is prohibited from taking or engaging in discussion on any item not appearing on the posted agenda. However, your concerns may be referred to staff or set for discussion at a later date. The Public Comment period is limited to 30 minutes. Each speaker shall be limited to three (3) minutes.)

Adjournment

Copies of staff reports and/or other written documentation pertaining to the items on the agenda are on file in the Planning Department and are available for public inspection during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.
Notice Regarding Americans with Disabilities Act: In compliance with the ADA, if you need assistance to participate in a city meeting, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at (909) 394-6216. Early notification before the meeting you wish to attend will make it possible for the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting [28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II].

Copies of documents distributed for the meeting are available in alternative formats upon request.
DATE: September 27, 2018

TO: Development Plan Review Board

FROM: Marco A. Espinoza, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: DPRB Case No. 15-38
Associated Case: CUP 15-09
A request to construct a two-story 9,822 square foot building at an existing church, St. Peter, which is owned by the Syrian Orthodox Church. The proposal includes a gymnasium, several offices, a service kitchen, and restrooms on the ground floor. Included in the square footage is a 1,577 square foot accessory living quarter for the church Clergy on the second floor of the building. The proposed building will be attached to the west elevation of the existing church by a new 1,299 square foot entry hall. The new building and proposed uses will be an incidental use to the existing church located at 1404 W. Gladstone Street (APNs: 8383-001-030 & -019) within the Single-Family 7,500 zone

FACTS:
In 2007 the Development Plan Review Board and the Planning Commission both reviewed and approved a 7,166 square foot gymnasium at the subject site. Construction of the gymnasium started and stopped in 2008. The foundation of the building was poured and several steel beams were erected. No further construction has occurred on the site since then. The subject site was sold in 2011 and the new owners inquired about continuing the construction of the gymnasium.

The new proposal is different from the previous project. The proposed building would be a two-story gymnasium with a different layout of the building, uses, and size. The previous building was at the same height of 28'-5" but did not have an actual second floor component. In addition, the proposed project includes living quarters on the proposed second story for the church Clergy.

ANALYSIS:
The applicant is proposing to use the existing poured foundation and I-beams as long as they can meet current Building Code requirements. The building will be sited on the in the same location as the previously approved building.
The current proposal consists of an 11,121 square foot building that will be connected to the church on the west elevation of the existing church. The building will consist of the following uses as shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Uses</th>
<th>Proposed Sizes (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Previously Approved Project Size (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>5,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Area</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Hall (N)</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Space (2nd Floor (N))</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,166</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elevations**

The proposed building mimics the previous building's design, massing, layout and exterior materials. The building is designed with Craftsman architectural influences using horizontal siding, board and batten and river rock for its exterior finish materials. The applicant is proposing to wrap the building with a river rock wainscot at a height of 4'-6". Above the river rock a board and batten siding will be applied on the ground floor. The second story exterior elevations will be wrapped with an 8” exposed horizontal siding. The roof has been designed as a gable roof with several side facing gables to reduce the massing, scale, and provide roof articulation. A 24-inch roof eave overhang is proposed in addition to false knee-brace supports under the gable ends. The proposed roofing material will be a light-weight shake tile.

The applicant is connecting the existing church building with the proposed gymnasium with an entry hall that runs the depth of the building. The proposed roof over this entry hall has been integrated with the existing roof for a seamless connection. The entry hall will be the main access to the gymnasium. The hall has two entrances; one on the north elevation and one on the south elevation.

The building's north elevation facing Gladstone Street provides a total of three entrances. Two entrances leading to an interior foyer have been designed with 10-foot high wood trellises supported by four (4) 4” x 4” wood posts and Craftsman tapered columns with a river rock base. The entrance to the hall on the north and south elevations have been designed with a gable roof cover supported by four (4) 4”x4” wood posts, Craftsman tapered columns with a river rock base. The window design for the building is Craftsman influenced with a 9-light grid pattern; the windows will be white vinyl. All the exterior doors will also have the same glass 9-light grid pattern.

No exterior changes are proposed to the existing cafeteria building and the church other than connecting the church to the new building.
Mass and Scale
The existing church building is at height of 24’-8”. The gymnasium building proposes a height of 28’-5”, which is the same height of the previously approved building. The massing and scale of the current proposal is similar as the previously approved building. However, the proposed project incorporates a second-story component along the west elevation.

Since the proposed building is larger, the new building will be set back 7’ from west property line and 25’-4” from the adjacent single-family residence that is one-story (1436 E. Gladstone St.). The previously approved building was set back 20’ from the west property line and 38’ from the single-family residence. The applicant has provided side-by-side elevations of the proposed building and the existing house for the Board’s review (see Plans Page A-6). On the south property line of the subject site the proposed building will be set back 5’ and 9’-6” from the adjacent single-family residence that is one-story (630 N. Darwood Ave.) The previously approved building was set back 17’ from the south property line and 22’ from the single-family residence.

Site Improvements
As with the previous project, site improvements are proposed as part of this project. The existing parking lot located at the southeast portion of the lot will be resurfaced with new asphalt pavement, landscaping and a new trash enclosure will be constructed. When completed, this parking area will provide parking for 29 vehicles. A new parking lot area will be constructed at the northeast portion of the property. The new parking lot will accommodate 11 regular stalls and two (2) handicap stalls. The existing turf will be removed and a new drought tolerant landscape palate will be installed.

As part of the project the applicant will be required to underground the existing telecommunication and cable lines that currently run overhead through the center of the property in a north/south direction. The overhead lines come from the utility poles along Gladstone Street and connect to an on-site utility pole located near the northwest corner of the church building; the lines run south to another pole off-site on private property.

The subject site’s north property line abuts the City of Glendora. A portion of the Parkway that accommodates the utility and streetlight poles is under the City of Glendora’s jurisdiction. City Staff contacted the City of Glendora for any proposed street improvement and/or undergrounding requirements. The Principle Engineer for Glendora responded that the City did not have any street improvement requirements. Along Shellman Avenue, the applicant will be required to underground the existing overhead power line for the streetlight poles. They will also be required to replace one of the marblite streetlight poles with a metal light pole.

Parking and Maximum Occupancy
Based on the previous approval the parking and maximum occupancy for the subject site was calculated based on the number of parking spaces provided. The total of parking spaces provided on-site would be 42 stalls; therefore, the maximum occupancy
of the property would be 126 persons (one (1) parking space per three (3) persons). Conditions of Approval for the Conditional Use Permit would limit the occupancy and would not allow multiple events on the property that would exceed the maximum occupancy during anytime.

The church has entered into a shared parking agreement with the Bonita School District to use the parking lot at Gladstone School. The church has been able to obtain an annual shared parking agreement from the School District to use the parking lot off of Shellman Avenue that provides 48 parking stalls. The school can use the church’s parking lot on evenings and weekends when no events are being conducted at the school site. Since this agreement is renewed on an annual basis and it might not be available in perpetuity, a condition requiring the excess parking would not be included in the Conditional Use Permit. However; a condition of approval will be included in the Conditional Use Permit requiring the Church to continue to seek renewal of the shared parking agreement with the school district since it would mitigate any potential parking impacts within the existing neighborhood.

Even though Staff discussed some concerns with the amount of parking proposed for the project, Staff will condition the room capacity based on the number of on-site parking spaces. It will be under the Planning Commission’s purview to approve the project as proposed.

**Current and Proposed Uses**

The church currently has two services a week, which are as follows;

- **Friday**  8:00 PM to 10:00 PM (+/- 50 people); and
- **Sunday**  11:00 AM to 1:00 PM (+/- 100 people)

They also have Sunday school during the same time as the services for approximately 25 children.

The parish office is open seven days a week from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM by appointment. When the office is open, it is typically occupied by the parish Priest, one or two staff members and the person(s) requesting the office visit. Most of the office visits are to arrange a wedding, christening or other religious ceremony that typically last an hour.

With the completion of the gymnasium, the church is proposing to house the Sunday school class in this building. Food would be served after the services in the building for their parishioners. The gymnasium will be open Sunday through Friday from 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM and from 10:00 AM to 10:00 PM on Saturday based on scheduled practices and games set up by the youth basketball league associated with the church. It is expected that there would be approximately 20 to 30 youth plus spectators at the practices and games.
ISSUES:
The applicant is proposing white vinyl windows for the new building. Staff thinks the color of the windows should be tan or a bark brown color to be more compatible with the proposed color scheme of the building. White vinyl windows tend to be appropriate for single-family residential projects and not non-residential building. Staff has added Condition No. 27 requiring the window color be changed to a tan or dark brown color during the plan check process.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Development Plan Review Board recommend approval to the Planning Commission of DPRB Case No. 15-38 subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Marco A. Espinoza
Senior Planner

EXHIBITS:
A. Conditions of Approval
B. Applicant’s Statement
C. Aerial Photo of Gladstone School Parking Lot
D. Church Activities Time Table
E. Shared Parking Agreement
F. Color Material Board

Attached:
Previously Approved Plans
Proposed Plans
Exhibit A

Conditions of Approval for
DPRB Case No. 15-38
Associated Case: CUP 15-09

A request to construct a two-story 9,822 square foot building at an existing church, St. Peter, which is owned by the Syrian Orthodox Church. The proposal includes a gymnasium, several offices, a service kitchen, and restrooms on the ground floor. Included in the square footage is a 1,577 square foot accessory living quarter for the church Clergy on the second floor of the building. The proposed building will be attached to the west elevation of the existing church by a new 1,299 square foot entry hall. The new building and proposed uses will be an incidental use to the existing church located at 1404 W. Gladstone Street (APNs: 8383-001-030 & -019) within the Single-Family 7,500 zone.

PLANNING DIVISION - (909) 394-6250

GENERAL

1. The Applicant/Developer shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers or employees because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers or employees for any Court costs and attorney’s fees which the City, its agents, officers or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition.

2. The Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for any City Attorney costs incurred by the City for the project, including, but not limited to, consultations, and the preparation and/or review of legal documents. The applicant shall deposit funds with the City to cover these costs in an amount to be determined by the City.

3. Copies of the signed Planning Commission Resolution with attached Conditions of Approval approving DPRB Case No. 15-38 shall be included on the plans (full size). The sheet(s) are for information only to all parties involved in the construction/grading activities and are not required to be wet sealed/stamped by a licensed Engineer/Architect.

4. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with all requirements of the Single-Family 7,500 zone.

5. The building permits for this project must be issued within one year from the date of approval or the approval will become invalid. A time extension may be granted under the provisions set forth in Chapter 18.12.070.
6. The Applicant/Developer shall sign an affidavit accepting all Conditions and all Standard Conditions before issuance of building permits.

7. All parking provided shall meet the requirements of Section 18.156 (et. seq.) of the San Dimas Municipal Code.

8. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with all City of San Dimas Business License requirements and shall provide a list of all contractors and subcontractors that are subject to business license requirements.

9. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with all Conditions of Approval as approved by the Development Plan Review Board on September 27, 2018 and Planning Commission on XXX, 2018.

10. Graffiti shall be removed within 72 hours.

11. The entire site shall be kept free from trash and debris at all times and in no event shall trash and debris remain for more than 24 hours.

12. The Applicant/Developer shall submit a construction access plan and schedule for the development of all lots for Directors of Development Services and Public Works approval; including, but not limited to, public notice requirements, special street posting, phone listing for community concerns, hours of construction activity, dust control measures, and security fencing.

13. Six-foot decorative block walls shall be constructed along the project perimeter. If a double wall condition would result, the developer shall make a good faith effort to work with the adjoining property owners to provide a single wall. Applicant/Developer shall notify, by mail, all contiguous property owners at least 30 days prior to the removal of any existing walls/fences along the project's perimeter.

14. During grading and construction phases, the construction manager shall serve as the contact person in the event that dust or noise levels become disruptive to local residents. A sign shall be posted at the project site with the contact phone number.

15. Businesses and public entities that dispose of 4 cubic yards/week of solid waste, and residential projects of five or more units shall comply with the state Model Ordinance adopted pursuant to the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991. This shall include adequate, accessible, and convenient areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials. Recycling programs shall be implemented in coordination with the trash company. Program shall include weekly collection of recyclable material using any combination of bins or 96-gallon waste containers (residential) in sufficient numbers to contain recyclables generated each week.
DESIGN

16. Building architecture and site plan shall be consistent with plans presented to the Development Plan Review Board on September 27, 2018 and the Planning Commission on XXX, 2018, provided that the Director of Development Services is authorized to make revisions consistent with the San Dimas Municipal Code and to facilitate improved parking lot circulation.

17. Plans for all exterior design features, including, but not limited to, doors, windows, and architectural treatments, shall be submitted to the Planning Division for review and approval before issuance of building permits.

18. The lighting fixture design shall compliment the architectural program. Location and type of exterior lighting fixtures shall be submitted by the developer to the Planning Division for review and approval prior to installation.

19. The Applicant/Developer shall install the parking lot lighting in accordance with a lighting plan showing illumination levels and lighting distribution, as approved by the Planning Division. Shielding shall be implemented where appropriate to reduce light emissions onto adjoining properties. A lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval, in addition to a $1,500 deposit for review of the plans.

20. Trash/Recycling enclosure(s) shall be constructed by the Applicant/Developer per City of San Dimas standard plan and shown on the construction plans. The exact location of the trash/recycling enclosure(s) shall be approved by the Planning Division and the Trash Company.

21. Gas meters, backflow prevention devices and other ground-mounted mechanical or electrical equipment installed by the Applicant/Developer shall be inconspicuously located and screened, as approved by the Director of Development Services. Location of this equipment shall be clearly noted on landscape construction documents.

22. The Applicant/Developer shall submit a detailed fencing plan for review and approval by the Development Plan Review Board. All fencing shall be installed before a Certificate of Occupancy will be issued.

23. Downspout pipes shall be placed on the inside of the buildings or concealed within architectural features of the building. When downspout pipes exit the building within the landscaped area, a splash pad shall be provided subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

24. All exterior building colors shall match the color and material board on file with the Planning Division. Any revision to the approved building colors shall be submitted to the Planning Division for review and approval.
25. Electrical and other service facilities shall be located within an interior electrical room or approved comparable location. All electrical service facilities shall be totally screened from public view, as approved by the Planning Division.

26. The Applicant/Developer shall underground all new on-site utilities, and utility drops, and shall underground all existing overhead utilities to the closest power pole off-site. The utility pole at the northwest corner of the church building shall be removed and the telecommunication/cabal lines underground.

27. The Applicant/Developer shall revise the plans during the plan check process to show all the proposed windows in a tan or dark brown color; white colored windows are not allowed on this project.

LANDSCAPE

28. The Applicant/Developer shall submit to the Planning Division, prior to the issuance of building permits, detailed landscaping and automatic irrigation plans prepared by a California Licensed Landscape Professional, in addition to a $2,500 deposit for review of the plans. Water efficient landscapes shall be implemented in all new and rehabilitated landscaping in single-family and multi-family projects, and in private development projects that require a grading permit, building permit or use permit, as required by Chapter 18.14 of the San Dimas Municipal Code.

29. All landscaping and automatic irrigation shall be installed and functional prior to occupancy of the building(s), in accordance with the plans approved by the Planning Division.

30. The Applicant/Developer shall show all proposed transformers on the landscape plan. All transformers shall be screened with landscape treatment such as trellis work or block walls with climbing vines or City approved substitute.

BUILDING DIVISION – (909) 394-6260


32. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with the latest California Title 24 Energy requirements for all new lighting, insulation, and mechanical equipment and submit calculations at time of initial plan review.

33. The Applicant/Developer shall submit to the Building Division of the City of San Dimas plans to be forwarded for review by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Plans may include access, fire sprinklers, mechanical ventilation, and any other applicable items regulated under the Fire Code.
34. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with the latest disabled access regulations as found in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Accessible items shall include, but not be limited to: parking, accessible pedestrian routes, accessible/adaptable units, public/common use areas, stage etc.

35. Phased occupancy shall not be granted until all improvements required as part of the approval have been completed in full for each phase, and approved or finalized by the appropriate department. A phasing plan shall be submitted for approval by the Director of Development Services prior to issuance of building permits.

36. The Applicant/Developer shall submit a Precise Grading Plan for the proposed development to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and the Director of Development Services. Plan shall include utility locations, and a paving and striping plan.

37. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, the Applicant/Developer shall submit an updated Engineering Geology/Soils Report that includes an accurate description of the geology of the site and conclusions and recommendations regarding the effect of the geologic conditions on the proposed development and include a discussion of the expansiveness of the soils and recommended measures for foundations and slabs on grade to resist volumetric changes of the soil. This report shall also include recommendations for surcharge setback requirements in the area of ungraded slopes steeper than five horizontal to one vertical.

38. Building foundation inspections shall not be performed until a rough grading certification, survey stakes in place, and a final soils report has been filed with the City and approved. All drainage facilities must be operable.

39. Construction calculations, including lateral analysis, shall be required at the time plans are submitted for plan check. Electrical schematic and load list and plumbing (drainage, water, gas) schematics will be required before issuance of electrical or plumbing permits.

40. Fees shall be paid to Bonita School District in compliance with Government Code Section 65995.

41. The Applicant/Developer shall Contact the Los Angeles County Public Works Department, Environmental Program Division for any required permit on clearance of industrial and hazardous waste disposal.

42. Construction hours shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., and shall be prohibited at any time on Sundays or public holidays, per San Dimas Municipal Code Section 8.36.100.

43. Prior to removing the existing structure on the property, the Applicant/Developer shall obtain a Demolition Permit from the Building and Safety Division.
44. The Applicant/Developer shall submit an Edison plan for all proposed switchgear or transformers to the City for review as soon as possible.

ENGINEERING DIVISION – (909) 394-6240

45. The Applicant/Developer shall provide a signed copy of the City’s certification statement declaring that the contractor will comply with Minimum Best Management Practices (BMPs) required by the MS4 permit for Los Angeles County as mandated by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

46. The Applicant/Developer shall install sanitary sewer to serve the church facilities to the specifications of the City Engineer. If existing sewer lateral is to be used, it shall be video inspected (CCTV) to verify condition. Replace if necessary.

47. The Applicant/Developer shall provide drainage improvements to carry runoff of storm waters in the area proposed to be developed, and for contributory drainage from adjoining properties to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The Applicant/Developer shall make a good faith effort to negotiate with the downstream property owner for all required downstream storm drain improvements. The proposed drainage improvements shall be based on a detailed Hydrology Study conforming to the current Los Angeles County methodology. The developed flows outletting into the existing downstream system(s) from this project cannot exceed the pre-existing storm flows.

48. For all projects which disturb less than one (1) acre of soil, Applicant/Developer shall submit a temporary erosion control plan to be approved by the City Engineer and filed with the City and shall be installed and operable at all times.
49. The Applicant/Developer shall provide right of way improvements within the limits of the development. Improvements to include curbs and gutters, sidewalks, and paving according to City standards, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Curb &amp; Gutter</th>
<th>A.C. Pavement</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Drive Approach</th>
<th>Street Lights</th>
<th>Street Trees</th>
<th>Multi-use Island</th>
<th>Median Island</th>
<th>Bike Trail</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shellman Ave</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone St</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* 2” deep grind & pave of A.C. to centerline (limits of property)

** Remove & replace approx. 43 lf of concrete sidewalk to match existing adjacent

*** Remove existing most southerly drive approach, replace curb & gutter, and re-establish parkway to match existing adjacent

**** Remove existing drive approach, replace curb & gutter and re-establish concrete sidewalk to match existing adjacent

***** Remove existing street light just south of Gladstone. Replace and underground existing street light approx. 200’ south of Gladstone St.

50. The Applicant/Developer shall submit water plans to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

51. The Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for any repairs within the limits of the development, including but not limited to streets and paving, curbs and gutters, sidewalks, and street lights as determined by the City Engineer and Public Works Director.

52. All work adjacent to or within the public right-of-way shall be subject to review and approval of the Public Works Director and the work shall be in accordance with applicable standards of the City of San Dimas; i.e. Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Green Book) and the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), and further that the construction equipment ingress and egress be controlled by a plan approved by Public Works.
53. Projects is subject to Low Impact Development (LID) regulations, Applicant/Developer must submit a site-specific drainage concept and stormwater quality plan to implement LID design principles.

54. A fully executed “Maintenance Covenant for LID Requirements” shall be recorded with the L.A. County Registrar/Recorder and submitted to the Public Works Department prior to the Certificate of Occupancy. Covenant documents shall be required to include an exhibit that details the installed treatment control devices as well as any site design or source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) for post construction. The information to be provided on this exhibit shall include, but not be limited to:
   i. 8 1/2” x 11” exhibits with record property owner information.
   ii. Types of BMPs (i.e., site design, source control and/or treatment control) to ensure modifications to the site are not conducted without the property owner being aware of the ramifications to BMP implementation.
   iii. Clear depiction of location of BMPs, especially those located below ground.
   iv. A matrix depicting the types of BMPs, frequency of inspection, type of maintenance required, and if proprietary BMPs, the company information to perform the necessary maintenance.
   v. Calculations to support the sizing of the BMPs employed on the project shall be included in the report. These calculations shall correlate directly with the minimum treatment requirements of the current MS4 permit. In the case of implementing infiltration BMPs, a percolation test of the affected soil shall be performed and submitted for review by the City Engineer.
   vi. This document shall be reviewed by and concurred with Public Works to ensure the covenant complies with the MS4 Permit.

55. All site, grading, landscape & irrigation, and street improvement plans shall be coordinated for consistency prior to the issuance of any permits.

56. Construction parking and material storage to be confined to the site. No construction related parking or material storage will be allowed on the surrounding streets.

PARKS & RECREATION – (909) 394-6230

57. The Applicant/Developer shall provide street trees, with permanent irrigation system, throughout the development. The species, container size and location shall be designated by the City, as approved by the City Arborist.

58. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with City regulations regarding payment of Park, Recreation and Open Space Development Fee per SDMC Chapter 3.26. Fees shall be paid prior to issuance of building permits.

End of Conditions
November 16, 2015

Mr. Marco A Espinoza  
Senior Planner, City of San Dimas  
245 East Bonita Avenue  
San Dimas CA  91773-3002

Dear Mr. Espinoza:

This is in response to the communication we received regarding our application for the construction of a 2 story gymnasium.

We see this structure as a multi-use/multi-functional facility. Aside from various indoor sports activities like basketball, volleyball, badminton, etc. for our church youth, we see this gym as a supplemental location for some of our other after church activities.

That is why we opted to include a stage for our Sunday School presentations/programs and where spectator seating will be folding chairs that can be arranged as needed.

The classrooms are for Sunday School use only. The living quarters are meant as guest facilities for any visiting clergy. The offices spaces are primarily allocated as a place where volunteers and staff can meet and work on the various church projects.

If you need more information, please don’t hesitate to let us know. We appreciate your attention and assistance on this matter.

Yours truly,

John Kerim Allaf  
St. Peter Syriac Orthodox Church  
Parish Council
48 Extra Parking Space at Gladstone School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH</td>
<td>11:00 AM to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 PM to</td>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holy Mass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>4:00 PM to</td>
<td>4:00 PM to</td>
<td>4:00 PM to</td>
<td>4:00 PM to</td>
<td>4:00 PM to</td>
<td>4:00 PM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
<td>Youth activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
<td>20 to 30 youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
<td>10:00 AM to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
<td>Open as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
<td>Parish Priest or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
<td>A Staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Youth Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 PM to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to 20 People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>11:00 AM to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONITA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
APPLICATION AND AGREEMENT FOR THE USE OF FACILITIES

Date of Application: Dec 2017
FACILITY: Gladstone Elementary

Multi-Purpose Room Kitchen/Cafeteria Classroom(s):
FACILITY: 

Stadium Stadium with Lights Playfields
Month: Day(s) of Month: Time(s):
Facility will be furnished “AS IS” unless requests for furniture and equipment are indicated below. If equipment is available, a fee for its use may be assessed by the Business Office according to the Bonita Unified School District (District) Fee Schedule.

Equipment or Furniture Needed:

1. What is the purpose of the meeting? Overflow parking for church activities
2. Is admission charged? Yes If so, how much? NA
3. Will contributions be solicited or accepted? NA
4. Membership dues? Yes If so, how much? NA
5. If yes on 2, 3, or 4 above, for what purpose will the net proceeds be used? NA
6. Is supervision by school personnel necessary? No If yes, indicate positions and number of hours:

CONDITIONS FOR USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES: FACILITY USER agrees that the District makes no representations or warranties as to the condition of the facilities which the FACILITY USER is entitled to use, and FACILITY USER agrees to take such property and facilities “AS IS.” FACILITY USER acknowledges that it shall be FACILITY USER’s responsibility and obligation to assure that the property and facilities are in proper and salable condition to be used for the purpose anticipated; and FACILITY USER acknowledges that it shall be obligated to inspect such property and facilities before they are used and to take affirmative steps where necessary to warn users or rectify hazards in order to prevent injuries to property and persons. FACILITY USER agrees to request a copy of the District’s RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR USE OF FACILITIES. By the Applicant’s signature below the FACILITY USER agrees to abide by all rules and regulations governing the use of the District’s facilities and the conduct of all meetings. FACILITY USER further acknowledges that the District has the sole discretion to make all decisions regarding the purpose and condition of the facilities. All decisions shall be final and binding on the FACILITY USER.

ALL PERMISSIVE USERS, WHOSE USE IS NOT MANDATED BY THE CIVIC CENTER ACT, AGREE TO THEIR SIGNATURE BELOW TO HOLD THE Bonita Unified School District, its governing board, and the individual members thereof and all District officers, agents and employees FREE AND HARMLESS FROM ANY LOSS, DAMAGE, LIABILITY, OR EXPENSE THAT MAY ARISE OUT OF OR IN ANY WAY BE CONNECTED WITH THIS FACILITY USE AGREEMENT. HOWEVER, THIS AGREEMENT DOES NOT PERTAIN TO LOSSES OR INJURIES WHICH ARE THE RESULT OF THE SOLE NEGLIGENCE OF THE DISTRICT.

Applicant must submit this form to the Site Administrator forty-five (45) working days prior to the date of use to insource time for processing. Applicant acknowledges that the District’s willingness to rent this facility is contingent upon approval by the Site Administrator and by the District’s Business Services Department. PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED UNTIL ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS SUCH AS CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE ARE RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT (ATTACH CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE TO THIS APPLICATION.) User will be mailed a copy of the Agreement for the Use of School Facilities when permission is granted and this copy of the Agreement should be carried by the user as proof of permission for facility use. Additional insured: Bonita Unified School District, its Board of Education, employees, agents, and volunteers.

NOTIFICATION OF TAXABILITY OF POSSESSORY INTEREST: Pursuant to California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 107 et. seq., the right of possession of the property leased may subject the lessee to property taxation.

Name of FACILITY USER’s Organization: St. Peter Church
Name of Representative/Agent (please print): John Allar
Signature of Representative: [Signature]
Address: 1404 West Greenbook St, San Dimas, CA 91773
Work Phone: ( ) Other Phone: ( )

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

TO THE SITE ADMINISTRATOR: This request must be submitted to Business Services thirty (30) working days prior to event to ensure that necessary processing may be completed. Your signature indicates that the above request will not conflict with the education program and that the facility is available at the time requested.

Administrator’s Signature
Date

Administrator’s Comment or Conditions: (optional): If so, number of pages: NA

DATE APPLICATION RECEIVED BY BUSINESS OFFICE: APPROVED NOT APPROVED

Fee Charged Receipt # Exempt Date Received Amount Received By
Date Adopted: 5/96. Date Revised: 12/13
White/Business Office Canary/Applicant Pink/Facilities & Grounds
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EXHIBIT E
STUCCO (SMOOTH) – PAINT FIN. "WESTERN RED" DE6090 BY DUNN EDWARDS PAINT

PAINT FINISH – (SMOOTH) "CHOCOLATE PUDDING" DE6390 BY DUNN EDWARDS PAINT

STUCCO (SMOOTH) – PAINT FIN. "TAN PLAN" DE6137 BY DUNN EDWARDS PAINT

LIGHTWEIGHT TILE ROOFING TO BE APPROVED BY PLANNING

MICHIGAN RIVER ROCK CSV-2060 WITH BACK GROUT BY CULTURED STONE
Trash enclosures must be constructed of decorative brick at a maximum height of 6 feet, 8 inches. The brick shall be a minimum of 2 inches thick and shall be installed on the exterior wall of the structure. A landscape or decorative rail around the trash enclosure is recommended. Additional rails may be used on the walls for added security.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAMB</th>
<th>STILE</th>
<th>RAIL</th>
<th>TO Treat</th>
<th>GLASS</th>
<th>RAIL SIMPLE</th>
<th>CROWN</th>
<th>SKIN</th>
<th>JAMB SIMPLE</th>
<th>PULL</th>
<th>POCKET</th>
<th>CARD</th>
<th>ALUMINUM</th>
<th>MODERN</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWP</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWP</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWP</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td>2.1/2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A** - SIMPLE BRICK DOOR WITH TRIMMED HEADER

**B** - COLUMNS OF LINE

**C** - SIMPLE BRICK DOOR

**D** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER

**E** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER

**F** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER

**G** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER

**H** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER

**I** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER

**J** - DOOR DESIGN WITH MIDDLE LEAF & CROWN CORNER
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
FACT SHEET

DATE: September 27, 2018
TO: Development Plan Review Board
FROM: Anne Nguyen, Associate Planner
SUBJECT: DPRB Case No. 18-0027
        PROJ-18-0085
        Associated Cases: DPRB Case No. 15-41

A request to change the paint scheme on the Mercantile Building located at 138 W. Bonita Avenue within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2 – Frontier Village.
(APN 8390-023-014)

FACTS:

This item first came before the Board under DPRB Case No. 15-41 at its October 22, 2015 meeting. Subsequent meetings followed on January 28, 2016 and on August 23, 2018, which consisted of Board approval on the roofing material for the rear and front of the building, respectively. For the prior reports, minutes of the meetings, and approval letters, see Exhibits A-I.

The item before the Board today specifically involves the fulfillment of Condition No. 9c, “the Applicant shall work with Staff to make proper paint choices and bring back to the Board for review and approval at a later date.” The Applicant has provided paint color samples for the Board’s review and approval. The proposed paint scheme incorporates a total of four colors. The main body of the building will be painted “Vintage Ephemera”, with the entry doors and tower elements on both the front and rear building elevations painted “Deepest Sea.” Architectural elements such as handrails, wrought iron, overhang and gutters, and stairs will be painted “Grange Hall” with wood trim throughout the building to be painted “Trite White.”

Attachment 2 contains current photos of the existing building whereas Attachment 3 contains photo simulations of the proposed paint colors on the Mercantile Building.

ANALYSIS:

At the October 22, 2015 DPRB meeting, the Board directed the Applicant to return to the Board at a later date with a more appropriate paint scheme for the Mercantile Building. Therefore, the new paint scheme is before the Board for approval.
The proposal should be evaluated in light of the Town Core Design Guidelines (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>Discourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The coordinated and tasteful use of color is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of a building or a grouping of buildings. It remains in the memory when many other features are forgotten. In the case of Bonita Avenue, brown is the prevailing color. Brown lends itself to many of the wood frontages, as the wood appears to be somewhat unfinished, and adds to the western theme. Other brighter colors should be considered for non-wood elements. These accent or highlight colors can add significantly to the overall impact of the Bonita townscape, and add interest and excitement to the commercial district. Colors should be selected carefully so that the results of repainting appear coordinated and tasteful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paint colors should relate to the natural material colors on the facade of the building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To accent details, entrances, and awnings, choose coordinated contrasting colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider the color schemes on neighboring buildings when deciding on a color scheme for your project then choose colors which relate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The number of colors on any one facade should not exceed four.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large buildings and expansive flat building facades should be painted with subtle colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detailed buildings can be painted with brighter and contrasting coordinated colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider the orientation of the building facades when selecting colors. Colors used on north facing facades will appear warmer when used on south and west facing facades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historic buildings often have detailed cornices and intricate architectural elements which should not be painted with many contrasting paint colors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid painting the main body of a building facade different colors when the building surface forms a continuous plane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not select a highlight color from outside the color palette used on the main building and storefront. (e.g. on a building which is primarily a brown wood tone, choose forest green as a highlight color not a bright orange or pink)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not use colors which obviously conflict with the colors used on neighboring buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an effort to lighten the building to make the currently dark atrium area bright and welcoming, the Applicant has provided a lighter tan/beige hue than originally proposed on the main body of the building. The proposed “Deepest Sea” paint color for the tower elements on both the front and rear façade of the building complements the light brown hues used throughout the rest of the building and helps to accentuate the main entry area. The new paint scheme blends with the color schemes of the adjacent properties, which provides architectural compatibility.

ISSUES:

None.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Development Plan Review Board approve Development Plan Review Board Case No. 18-0027.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Nguyen
Associate Planner
ATTACHMENTS:
1. Vicinity Map
2. Photos of Subject Site
3. Photo Simulations of Proposed Paint Scheme

EXHIBITS:
A. October 22, 2015 DPRB Report
B. October 22, 2015 DPRB Minutes
C. Approval Letter Dated October 23, 2015
D. January 28, 2016 DPRB Report
E. January 28, 2016 DPRB Minutes
F. Approval Letter Dated February 17, 2016
G. Extension Letter Dated February 16, 2017
H. August 23, 2018 DPRB Report
I. August 23, 2018 DPRB Minutes
Attachment 2

Photos of Subject Site

View looking south at the subject site (front elevation).

View looking northeast from within the atrium.
View looking north at the subject site (rear elevation).
Attachment 3

Photo Simulations of Proposed Paint Scheme
DATE:          October 22, 2015
TO:            Development Plan Review Board
FROM:          Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner
SUBJECT:       DPRB Case No. 15-40; 120 W. Bonita Ave
                APN 8390-23-019
                A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood
                shake to composition shingle.

                DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building)
                APN 8390-023-014
                A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood
                shake to composition shingle. Prior to re-roof, the Applicant is also
                requesting approval to demolish the pedestrian coverings in
                anticipation the City downtown sidewalk project. The Applicant is
                additionally requesting to cut the roof back and to add fascia board
                and eliminate the look of the exposed rafter tails.

                Both proposals are located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area
                2- Frontier Village and are subject to the Town Core Design
                Guidelines

FACTS:

The Applicant is the property manager for both 120 and 138 W. Bonita Avenue and is
requesting approval to change the paint schemes and roof materials from wood shake
to composition shingle on both buildings. The Applicant is additionally proposing to
demolish the pedestrian coverings on the property at 138 W. Bonita Avenue (Mercantile
Building) prior to re-roof in anticipation of the City’s upcoming downtown sidewalk
project and, in doing so, cut the roof back and add fascia board which will eliminate the
look of the exposed rafter tails.

The following sheet contains photos of and a proposed material & color listing for each
of the buildings:
Existing roof material & color: Wood Shake, Brown
Proposed roof material & color: Comp Shingle, “Shadow Gray”
 CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Shingles
Proposed paint colors:
Body- SW 6150 “Universal Khaki”
Trim- SW 6147 “Panda White”
Doors/Accents- No change to door, accents to match body
Interior Railings- SW 6151 “Quiver Tan”
120 W. Bonita Avenue
Existing roof material & color: Wood Shake, Brown
Proposed roof material & color: Comp Shingle, “Autumn Blend”
CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Shingles

Proposed paint colors:
Body- SW 6120 “Believable Buff”
Trim- SW 7005 “Pure White”
Doors/Accents- SW 6124 “Cardboard”
Interior Railings- SW 6124 “Cardboard”
138 W. Bonita Avenue (Mercantile Building)
138 W. Bonita Avenue (Mercantile Building)
ANALYSIS:

The proposal should be evaluated in light of the Town Core Design Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>Discourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The coordinated and tasteful use of color is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of a building or a grouping of buildings. It remains in the memory when many other features are forgotten. In the case of Bonita Avenue, brown is the prevailing color. Brown lends itself to many of the wood frontages, as the wood appears to be somewhat unfinished, and adds to the western theme. Other brighter colors should be considered for non-wood elements. These accent or highlight colors can add significantly to the overall impact of the Bonita townscape, and acid interest and excitement to the commercial district. Colors should be selected carefully so that the results of repainting appear coordinated and tasteful. | - Paint colors should relate to the natural material colors on the facade of the building.  
- To accent details, entrances, and awnings, choose coordinated contrasting colors.  
- Consider the color schemes on neighboring buildings when deciding on a color scheme for your project then choose colors which relate.  
- The number of colors on any one facade should not exceed four.  
- Large buildings and expansive flat building facades should be painted with subtle colors.  
- Detailed buildings can be painted with brighter and contrasting coordinated colors.  
- Consider the orientation of the building facades when selecting colors. Colors used on north facing facades will appear warmer when used on south and west facing facades. | - Historic buildings often have detailed cornices and intricate architectural elements which should not be painted with many contrasting paint colors.  
- Avoid painting the main body of a building facade different colors when the building surface forms a continuous plane.  
- Do not select a highlight color from outside the color palette used on the main building and storefront. (e.g. on a building which is primarily a brown wood tone, choose forest green as a highlight color not a bright orange or pink)  
- Do not use colors which obviously conflict with the colors used on neighboring buildings. |

Sidewalk Coverings

In many cases, sidewalk coverings and porches have replaced the traditional awnings along Bonita Avenue. These sidewalk coverings are usually made of wood with rough detailing, and, together with the wooden sidewalk surfaces, are the primary elements which give San Dimas its western image. Sidewalk coverings and awnings have a significant visual impact on the facade of a building and are one of the primary elements that bind the different storefronts and building facades together. Sidewalk coverings have practical advantages in that they shelter pedestrians from rain and sun, protect display-window merchandise from solar damage. They also help to moderate solar gain and reduce air conditioning costs while reinforcing the identity of the town.

Encourage

- The continued use of sidewalk coverings or porches should be encouraged on new buildings along Bonita Avenue.  
- Historically significant buildings which undergo accurate historical restoration should be required to install cloth awnings.  
- South-facing frontages should be required to incorporate sidewalk coverings or awnings.  
- All types of sidewalk shading devices should be properly maintained.  
- Breaks in the sidewalk covering should occur at significant building entrances or pedestrian pass through areas along the facade.  
- In the design of sidewalk coverings consideration should be given to the cumulative effect of adjacent coverings on neighboring buildings.  
- Vertical supports for sidewalk coverings should not be less than 6x6 timbers if single and 4x4 timbers if multiple.  
- Details currently used on the existing coverings are simple and new coverings should employ similar details.

Discourage

- The removal of existing sidewalk coverings except in the case of accurate historical rehabilitation.  
- The introduction of sidewalk coverings of different historical styles.
ISSUES:

Issues for consideration include:

1. Is composition shingle an appropriate/acceptable material for commercial buildings, as opposed to flat tile or other materials, especially on Bonita Avenue on two prominent buildings in the Town Core / Bonita Avenue corridor?
2. Are the color schemes appropriate?
3. Do the selected colors and their implementation appropriately highlight the architectural features of each building?
4. Is a modification from exposed rafter tails to a boxed fascia acceptable for the Mercantile Building? (138 W. Bonita Avenue)
5. What amount of eave overhang is acceptable into the public right-of-way? What is the appropriate architectural finish?

RECOMMENDATION:

Discussion. Staff has included conditions of approval should the Board find the proposal acceptable.

EXHIBITS:

A. Conditions of Approval
B. Paint Scheme for 120 W. Bonita Avenue
C. Paint Scheme for 138 W. Bonita Avenue
D. Photos of Building Provided by Applicant
E. Renderings of Building Provided by Applicant
General Conditions of Approval for DPRB Case Nos. 15-40 & 15-41

1. The Owner/Applicant shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers or employees because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers or employees for any Court costs and attorney’s fees which the City, its agents, officers or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition.

2. The Owner/Applicant shall be responsible for any City Attorney costs incurred by the City for the project, including, but not limited to, consultations, and the preparation and/or review of legal documents. The applicant shall deposit with the City to cover these costs in an amount to be determined by the City.

3. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with all Conditions of Approval as approved by the Development Plan Review Board on October 22, 2015. The Owner/Applicant shall sign an affidavit accepting all conditions prior to commencement of any work.

4. This approval is for paint color changes and the use of composition shingle roof material for the buildings located at 120 and 138 W. Bonita Avenue as well as façade changes to the building at 138 W. Bonita Avenue in association with removal of the pedestrian sidewalk coverings. The colors, materials, and designs incorporated shall match those presented to the Development Plan Review Board on October 22, 2015. Any variation shall be subject to Planning Department review and approval and may be subject to Development Plan Review Board review and approval at the discretion of the Community Development Director:

5. Any damaged wood encountered during the painting process shall be appropriately treated or replaced. The applicant shall consult with the Building Department based on the extent of the necessary work to determine if permits are necessary.

6. All conditions are final unless appealed to the City Council within 14 days of the issuance of the Conditions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 18.212 of the San Dimas Zoning Code.
7. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with all City of San Dimas Business License requirements in ensuring that all contractors and subcontractors meet the City's business license requirements.

BUILDING DIVISION – (909) 394-6260

8. The Developer/Applicant shall comply with the 2013 edition of the codes as adopted by reference by the City of San Dimas: California Green Building Standards Code, California Building Code, California Mechanical Code, California Plumbing Code, and California Electrical Code.

9. The Developer/Applicant shall comply with the latest California Title 24 Energy requirements where applicable.

10. The Developer/Applicant shall comply with the latest disabled access regulations as found in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

11. Construction hours shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., and shall be prohibited at any time on Sundays or public holiday, per San Dimas Municipal Code Section 8.36.100.

End of Conditions
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
October 22, 2015 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development
John Davis, Planning Commission
Curtis Morris, Mayor

STAFF
Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
Luis Torrico, Associate Planner
Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER
John Davis called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:30 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve the September 10, 2015 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-0-3 (abstain Davis, Morris and Sorcinelli)

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve the September 24, 2015 minutes. Motion carried 3-0-0-4 (abstain Davis, Michaelis, Morris and Sorcinelli)

DPRB Case No. 15-40 & 15-41

DPRB Case No. 15-40; 120 W. Bonita Ave
APN 8390-23-019

A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle.

DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building)
APN 8390-023-014

A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle. Prior to re-roof, the Applicant is also requesting approval to demolish the pedestrian coverings in anticipation the City downtown sidewalk project. The Applicant is additionally requesting to cut the roof back and to add fascia board and eliminate the look of the exposed rafter tails.

Both proposals are located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2- Frontier Village and are subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines

Shari Nign, applicant, was present.

**Associate Planner Jennifer Williams** stated the Applicant is the property manager for both 120 and 138 W. Bonita Avenue and is requesting approval to change the paint schemes and roof materials from wood shake to composition shingle on both buildings. The Applicant is additionally proposing to demolish the pedestrian coverings on the property at 138 W. Bonita Avenue (Mercantile Building) prior to re-roof in anticipation of the City's upcoming downtown sidewalk project and, in doing so, cut the roof back and add fascia board which will eliminate the look of the exposed rafter tails.

The issues for consideration include if composite shingles are appropriate/acceptable material for commercial buildings, as opposed to tile or other materials on Bonita Ave. Are the selected colors appropriate and do they properly highlight the architectural features of each building? Is a modification from exposed rafter tails to a boxed fascia acceptable for the Mercantile Building (138 W. Bonita Avenue) And lastly, what amount of eave overhang is acceptable into the public right-of-way and what would be the appropriate architectural finish?

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the back awnings are being removed.

**Associate Planner Williams** answered no, she was speaking of the front awnings on the north side of the building to possibly be removed.

**Associate Planner Williams** continues that the 183 building (Mercantile) is proposing to cut back the overhang to the property line for pedestrian overhang. The rounded top is not being proposed, it is simply and artist rendering but it does show the proposed cut back of the eaves. It is noted that both of these buildings are in the Bonita Downtown and are subject to the Town Core Guidelines.

Staff recommends a discussion of the Board prior to the approval of this project. Staff also recommends a tile roof for both buildings.

Also, the applicant is the property manager and she is here to answer any questions the Board may have regarding these items.

Shari Nign, applicant stated that tile roofing is not an option due to the weight of the product.

**Mr. Stevens** asked to understand the paint scheme better. He asked about the trim being "Panda White" and the rest of the building to be "Universal Khaki".
**Associate Planner Williams** stated yes, across the whole building, the main color will be "Universal Khaki".

**Mr. Stevens** asked if all railings and doors are to be "Quiver Tan".

**Shari Nign, applicant** stated she would like to do all the windows in the "Panda White" and outer trim of the windows in the "Universal Khaki".

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that the current color pallet on the building is light and dark and that would go away for a solid color on the building.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the tower element in the back is to be "Universal Khaki" as well.

**Shari Nign, applicant** stated yes, she would like it to be "Universal Khaki".

**Mr. Stevens** states that he does not believe that one color for the body of the 120 building is appropriate. He thinks the way the elements are painted currently, makes more sense. His second concern is with the composite shingle. He is not sure if the composite shingle will give the same effect as the wood shingles.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if metal had been considered as it would fit with the building and the theme. He goes on to state that he believes metal would be the obvious choice, a standing seam metal roof.

**Shari Nign, applicant** stated she did try to get a price for the metal. She does not believe metal would work for the 138 building but felt it was a possibility for the 120 building. She noted she would like to keep some sort of consistency between the two buildings.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that the dark wood areas used to be open balconies. The balconies were later enclosed due to rain intrusion issues. He noted that the wood over the balconies will take paint differently than the finished wood on the rest of the building. He agrees that the color blocking paint scheme would be more fitting of the building. He feels the paint colors may look the same for a couple years but over time the wood over the balcony areas will start to show knots and dirt due to the grooves in the wood.

**Mr. Patel** stated he feels the two colors give character of the building.

**Mr. Stevens** asked the other Board members for their opinion of "Panda White".

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated he believes it is too much of a contrast. He notes that the glass on the building appears nearly black and feels that using darker trim colors may be a better option. He goes on to mention that this building should be treated as a color block design rather than trying out trim colors as he feels that approach is not suited for this building.

**Mr. Davis** asked when the blue tile was applied to the building.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated the blue tile has always been with the building.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he believes the shed roofs will be replaced with awnings.
Mr. Davis asked why the applicant doesn't do that now.

Mr. Stevens stated the City does not currently have any Downtown façade monies to assist business owners with such improvements.

Mr. Davis asked if the applicant is waiting for the City to pay.

Mr. Stevens stated the City may help eventually, but currently the City does not have a program. We need to assume that there will be a covering and it should match other side of the street.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated the covers on the north side of the street had to be removed due to their condition. The buildings at 120 and 138 have perfectly serviceable covers. He believes they fit the design, more so than a fabric awning.

Shari Nign, applicant noted that if the covers come off, it then needs to be decided if new covers need to go back up.

Mr. Stevens stated it may be decided that the building doesn't need anything.

Mr. Morris stated he believes the 120 building will need more than a couple paint colors.

Mr. Sorcinelli noted when you start painting rough wood in a light color, it will not look nice. Rough wood is grainy and it will start collecting dirt in the crevices. He notes that in this case one is almost forced to sand it and smooth it to change the texture or use a darker color.

Mr. Davis asked if the new color needs to be as dark as the current color.

Mr. Sorcinelli answered no, it does not. The new color should just be considerably darker than the current paint choice of "Universal Khaki".

Mr. Stevens asked the applicant if the colors where chosen with a designer.

Shari Nign, applicant stated no, the colors were not chosen with a designer. She noted that she is not opposed to changing the color pallet. She stated her main concern is the predicted El Nino for the coming winter season. She stated both buildings have roof leaks so she needs to get the roofs done sooner rather than later.

Mr. Stevens asked when she plans to paint the buildings.

Shari Nign, applicant stated she plans to paint both buildings after the Downtown Sidewalk Project is completed.

Mr. Patel stated the Downtown Project should be completed in her area about this time next year.

Mr. Stevens stated he believes the standing seam metal roof would work for the 120 building.

Shari Nign, applicant stated she needs to find a roofer that can give her a decent price and complete the project in a reasonable amount of time.
Mr. Stevens asked how standing seam metal is in regards to cost and weight.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated the weight is fine but in general it is more costly.

Mr. Stevens suggests that due to the large angled roof, the metal roof would need to be an earth tone of some sort.

Mr. Dilley asked aesthetically, does the Board agree the seams on the roof will not interfere with the slats on the building.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated he did not see that being a problem.

Mr. Stevens asked the Board; everything visible on the 120 building will be metal and none visible areas can be composition shingles.

Mr. Sorcinelli agreed with Mr. Stevens and suggested the monies be put into the metal and saved in less visible areas.

Motion for DPRB Case No. 15-40: Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to approve a portion of the project subject to conditions of approval and modifications including:

1) Applicant to work with Staff to make proper paint choices that reflect and maintain the current color blocking scheme of the building and bring back to the Board at a later date.

2) Applicant is to find a suitable metal roofing material for the more visible areas of the building including the tower element and the rear coverings while using CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Composition Shingles on the top and front of the building in brown earth tone colors; to be reviewed by the Board at a later date.

3) The existing overhangs will be left as is until other alternatives can be explored in anticipation of the Downtown sidewalk project.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building)

APN 8390-023-014

A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle. Prior to re-roof, the Applicant is also requesting approval to demolish the pedestrian coverings in anticipation the City downtown sidewalk project. The Applicant is additionally requesting to cut the roof back and to add fascia board and eliminate the look of the exposed rafter tails.

Both proposals are located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2- Frontier Village and are subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines

Mr. Stevens pointed out that the paint colors are not the same for the 138 building as the 120 building. He mentioned the most important part of this building is the cut off of the overhang. It appears the rendering shows the correct proportions.
Associate Planner Williams stated the applicant would like to cut back the overhang and box in the rafter tails.

Shari Nign, applicant stated the problem with the 138 building is that the inside is very dark and uninviting due to the covered outdoor area.

Mr. Stevens stated the applicant will have the same problem with the wood if she chooses a light paint pallet.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked the Board if they can just agree to have the applicant return at a later date with a new paint pallet and just worry about the roof and overhangs at this moment.

Mr. Davis asked if the very top of the building was a flat roof.

Shari Nign, applicant stated yes, the very top is a flat rolled roof that we will also be redoing.

Mr. Davis asked if the only roofing options that need to be discussed are the front and rear of this building.

Associate Planner Williams stated yes, that is correct. She added the back side of the building has rafter tails on the upper portion.

Mr. Morris asked the Board if they had a problem with boxing in the rafter tails on this building.

Mr. Beilstein stated that boxed rafter tails are optimal as they provide a proper drip edge.

Associate Planner Williams stated the only component left to discuss on the 138 building is the cut back of the overhang on the front of the building.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant is intending to do the front work without any City assistance.

Shari Nign, applicant stated City assistance is not necessary for the overhang cut back.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked how do we know if the roof is engineered to cantilever.

Shari Nign, applicant stated the engineer that did the renderings said a three foot cantilever would be sturdy.

Associate Planner Williams asked if the Board felt the bottom overhang should be slightly longer to balance out the building.

Mr. Davis stated yes, the bottoms should be longer.

Mr. Beilstein noted the other thing to think about with boxed rafter tails is that gutters should be added as now the overhang will end over the sidewalk. He feels gutters should be required. Buildings to the north have surface mount gutters.

Mr. Sorcinelli suggested that an exterior rounded gutter be installed, possibly a design where the hangers are not visible.
Mr. Beilstein stated those details would be checked in the plan check process.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that he believes that any longer than three feet, there may be problems with the overhang in the future.

Associate Planner Williams stated the applicant has proposed an autumn blend in brown hues for this 138 building.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if anyone thought about a standing seam metal roof for the 138 buidling.

Associate Planner Williams stated it was brought up in the same conversation regarding the 120 building.

Shari Nign, applicant noted that if the 138 building did façade improvements, she does not believe the standing seam metal roof would flow visually.

Mr. Stevens asked if more roof leaks occur under the main roof or in the back where the roof is shake.

Shari Nign, applicant stated there are a lot of leaks in the back with the shake roof. She adds during high winds the shakes fly off into the parking lot.

Mr. Stevens asked if there are metal roofs that look like shake.

Mr. Beilstein stated yes there are. Metal shake roofs provide multiple colors and spacing.

Senior Planner Espinoza pointed out that Dairy Queen on Arrow Highway did metal shake for their new roof. He did not feel that product would provide the proper visual impact.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that it comes back to using composition shingle product on the main street. He noted that composition shingle feels more like a residential choice.

Mr. Davis asked if composition shingle in the back was alright.

Mr. Stevens stated the back roof is not nearly as dominant.

Shari Nign, applicant stated CertainTeed Presidential Shake product is used on many commercial buildings.

Mr. Morris notes that he believes this is a great composition product.

Mr. Stevens started that if the Board was to allow composition shingle downtown, then this would be the best product. He noted the Board seems to be leaning towards standard seam metal roofing with the composition shingles on the back.

Mr. Davis asked the Board if composition shingle on the back and standard seam metal on the front was good.

Mr. Stevens stated that if the Board did not want to decide now, that Staff could make a decision in the plan check process.
Shari Nign, applicant stated her only problem is finding a roofer that is not booked as El Nino is approaching.

Mr. Stevens stated he believes the paint should be approved by staff.

Mr. Davis asked if the applicant understands and has any further questions or comments for the Board.

Shari Nign, applicant stated yes, she understands and she will discuss items further with Jennifer.

Motion: Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to approve a portion of the project subject to conditions of approval and modifications including:

1) The roof material for the front of the building shall be standing seam metal or flat tile, with the color and shape to be reviewed by the Board at a later date.
2) CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Composition Shingles in a medium earth tone may be used on the back of the building, color to be approved by Staff
3) Applicant to work with Staff to make proper paint choices and bring back to the Board at a later date.
4) The pedestrian overhang is to be cut back to 3' in total length, a boxed fascia shall be added to the upper and lower roofs on both sides of the building, and a decorative water conveyance system (gutters) shall be added.

Motion carried 7-0

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:59 a.m. to the meeting of November 12, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.

David Bratt, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Departmental Assistant

Approved: 1/14/2016
October 23, 2015

Shari Nign
Rader Realty
384 E. Rowland Street
Covina, CA 91723

RE: DPRB Case Nos. 15-40 & 15-41 - Approval Letter

DPRB Case No. 15-40; 120 W. Bonita Ave APN 8390-023-019
A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle.

DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building)
APN 8390-023-014
A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle. Prior to re-roof, the Applicant is also requesting approval to demolish the pedestrian coverings in anticipation the City downtown sidewalk project. The Applicant is additionally requesting to cut the roof back and to add fascia board and eliminate the look of the exposed rafter tails.

Both proposals are located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2- Frontier Village and are subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines

Dear Applicant,

Your request for the abovementioned requests for property located at 120 & 138 W. Bonita Avenue area was reviewed and partially approved subject to modifications on October 22, 2015, by the Development Plan Review Board. This approval is based on the following findings and is subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit A.

Development Plan Review Board (DPRB) Findings

1. The development of the site in accordance with the development plan is suitable for the use or development intended.
120 W. Bonita Avenue- DPRB Case No. 15-40

The subject site is located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2, and is developed with an existing commercial/office building which houses permitted uses in the subject zone. It is also located within the Town Core and as such is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines. It is a prominent and highly visible building on the Bonita Avenue corridor. As such, the Development Plan Review Board found alternative paint choices would be necessary that reflect and maintain the current color blocking scheme of the building and will review alternative proposals at a later date. The Board also found that the use of composition shingle on the building would only be appropriate with the use of a top quality product in limited amounts in less visible areas and deemed CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Composition Shingles or equivalent quality on the top and front of the building in brown earth tone colors as appropriate. The Board found that a standing seam metal roofing material for the more visible areas of the building, including the tower element and the rear coverings, would be appropriate and that composition shingle was not an acceptable material for those more visible areas. The material, shape, and color shall be brought back the Board for review and approval at a later date prior to installation. The Board also agreed with the Applicant’s position that the existing pedestrian overhangs on the front of the buildings be left as is until other alternatives can be explored in anticipation of the Downtown sidewalk project.

138 W. Bonita Avenue- DPRB Case No. 15-41

The subject site is located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2, and is developed with an existing commercial/office building which houses permitted uses in the subject zone. It is also located within the Town Core and as such is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines. It is a prominent and highly visible building on the Bonita Avenue corridor. As such, the Development Plan Review Board found alternative paint choices would be necessary and will review alternative proposals at a later date. The Board also found that the use of composition shingle on the building would only be appropriate at the rear of the building and only with the use of a top quality product such as CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Composition Shingles or equivalent quality. The Board found that a standing seam metal or flat tile roofing material would be appropriate for the front of the building and that the material, shape, and color should be brought back the Board for review and approval at a later date prior to installation. The Board found the Applicant’s request to cut the pedestrian overhang back to approximately 3’ in length and to use a boxed fascia rather than exposed rafter tails on both the upper and lower and front and back of the building to be acceptable as long as drainage / runoff was accounted for through the incorporation of a high quality gutter system.
2. The total development is so arranged as to avoid traffic congestion, ensure public health, safety, general welfare and prevent adverse effects on neighboring property.

The Board's approval at this time is limited to specifying roof materials and minor façade changes. The improvements will not impact traffic circulation or create traffic congestion. The Board's specification and Applicant's use of high quality materials suitable for a commercial project will protect the general welfare and prevent adverse effects on neighboring properties.

3. The development is consistent with all elements of the general plan and is in compliance with other applicable provisions of the zoning code and other ordinances and regulations of the city.

The proposed improvements will enhance existing permitted buildings and will and will be consistent with all the elements of the General Plan, the Creative Growth Zone, the Town Core Design Guidelines, and all other ordinances and regulations of the City.

Any decision, determination or action by the Development Plan Review Board may be appealed to the City Council provided that such appeal is filed within 14 days from the date of this letter of approval, which is issuing the determination or action by the Development Plan Review Board. An appeal may be filed by you or any other interested party. Any appeal must include an appeal fee of $109 and be accompanied by a written letter stating the reason(s) for the appeal. If you have any questions about the appeal process, the decision of the Board and/or any other inquiry, please contact me at (909) 394-6255.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Williams
Associate Planner

Attached: Exhibit A - Conditions of Approval
Acceptance of Conditions Affidavit
EXHIBIT A

Conditions of Approval for
Development Plan Review Board Case Nos. 15-40 & 15-41

DPRB Case No. 15-40; 120 W. Bonita Ave APN 8390-023-019
A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle.

DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building) APN 8390-023-014
A request to change the paint scheme and roof material from wood shake to composition shingle. Prior to re-roof, the Applicant is also requesting approval to demolish the pedestrian coverings in anticipation the City downtown sidewalk project. The Applicant is additionally requesting to cut the roof back and to add fascia board and eliminate the look of the exposed rafter tails.

PLANNING DIVISION - (909) 394-6250

GENERAL

1. The Owner/Applicant shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers or employees because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers or employees for any Court costs and attorney's fees which the City, its agents, officers or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition.

2. The Owner/Applicant shall be responsible for any City Attorney costs incurred by the City for the project, including, but not limited to, consultations, and the preparation and/or review of legal documents. The applicant shall deposit with the City to cover these costs in an amount to be determined by the City.

3. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with all Conditions of Approval as approved by the Development Plan Review Board on October 22, 2015. The Owner/Applicant shall sign an affidavit accepting all conditions prior to commencement of any work.
4. This approval is for paint color changes and the use of composition shingle roof material for the buildings located at 120 and 138 W. Bonita Avenue as well as façade changes to the building at 138 W. Bonita Avenue in association with removal of the pedestrian sidewalk coverings. The colors, materials, and designs incorporated shall match those presented to the Development Plan Review Board on October 22, 2015. Any variation shall be subject to Planning Department review and approval and may be subject to Development Plan Review Board review and approval at the discretion of the Community Development Director:

5. Any damaged wood encountered during the painting process shall be appropriately treated or replaced. The applicant shall consult with the Building Department based on the extent of the necessary work to determine if permits are necessary.

6. All conditions are final unless appealed to the City Council within 14 days of the issuance of the Conditions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 18.212 of the San Dimas Zoning Code.

7. The Owner/Applicant shall comply with all City of San Dimas Business License requirements in ensuring that all contractors and subcontractors meet the City's business license requirements.

**DESIGN**

8. For the building located at 120 W. Bonita Avenue:

   a. The Applicant shall work with Staff to make proper paint choices that reflect and maintain the current color blocking scheme of the building and direction of the Board and bring back to the Board for review and approval at a later date.

   b. The use of composition shingle on the building shall be limited to CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Composition Shingles or equivalent quality on the top and front of the building in brown earth tone colors. The Applicant shall utilize a suitable standing seam metal roofing material for the more visible areas of the building including the tower element and the rear coverings in a coordinating color. The material, shape, and color shall be brought back the Board for review and approval at a later date prior to installation.
c. The existing overhangs shall be left as is until other alternatives can be explored in anticipation of the Downtown sidewalk project.

9. For the building located at 138 W. Bonita Avenue:
   a. The roof material for the front of the building shall be standing seam metal or flat tile, with the color and shape to be reviewed and approved by the Board at a later date prior to installation.
   b. CertainTeed Presidential Shake Luxury Composition Shingles in a medium earth tone may be used on the back of the building, color to be approved by Staff.
   c. The Applicant shall work with Staff to make proper paint choices and bring back to the Board for review and approval at a later date.
   d. The pedestrian overhang shall be cut back to 3’ in total length, a boxed fascia shall be added to the upper and lower roofs on both sides of the building, and a decorative water conveyance system (gutters) shall be added.

BUILDING DIVISION – (909) 394-6260


11. The Developer/Applicant shall comply with the latest California Title 24 Energy requirements where applicable.

12. The Developer/Applicant shall comply with the latest disabled access regulations as found in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

13. Construction hours shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., and shall be prohibited at any time on Sundays or public holiday, per San Dimas Municipal Code Section 8.36.100.

End of Conditions
DATE: January 28, 2016
TO: Development Plan Review Board
FROM: Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner
SUBJECT: DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building) APN 8390-023-014
A request to change the roof material from wood shake to flat tile.

The site is located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2-Frontier Village and is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines

FACTS:

This item came before the Board at its October 22, 2015 meeting. The Board approved a portion of the Applicant’s request as listed in the Conditions of Approval. For the prior report, minutes of the meeting, and approval letter, see Exhibits A, B, & C.

The item before the Board today specifically deals with the fulfillment of Condition No. 9a, “the roof material for the front of the building shall be standing seam metal or flat tile, with the color and shape to be reviewed and approved by the Board at a later date prior to installation,” the Applicant has provided a sample of the selected concrete flat “Boral” tile in “Camouflage” for the Board’s review and approval.

ANALYSIS:

The tile selected is of a sufficient quality and the proposed color is of a natural blend. Staff has no issues with the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

EXHIBITS:

A. October 22, 2015 DPRB Report
B. October 22, 2015 DPRB Minutes
C. Approval Letter for DPRB Case No.’s 15-40 & 15-41
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
January 28, 2016 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Margie Green, Planning Commission
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

STAFF
Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
Luis Torrico, Associate Planner
Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner
Fabiola Wong, Planning Manager

ABSENT
Emmett Badar, Council Member
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

CALL TO ORDER
Scott Dilley called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:30 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Not enough of a quorum to approve the minutes.

DPRB Case No. 15-41 continued from October 22, 2015

A request to change the roof material from wood shake to flat tile at 138 W. Bonita Ave. (Mercantile Building).

Shari Nign, Applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Jennifer Williams This item came before the Board at its October 22, 2015 meeting. The Board approved a portion of the Applicant’s request as listed in the Conditions of Approval. For the prior report, minutes of the meeting, and approval letter, see Exhibits A, B, & C.
The item before the Board today specifically deals with the fulfillment of Condition No. 9a, “the roof material for the front of the building shall be standing seam metal or flat tile, with the color and shape to be reviewed and approved by the Board at a later date prior to installation,” the Applicant has provided a sample of the selected concrete flat “Boral” tile in “Camouflage” for the Board’s review and approval.

**Mr. Stevens** questioned the standard size of this particular roofing tile.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated this particular roofing tile is 13"x17".

**Mr. Stevens** asked what portion of the building is to be done at this moment in time

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that at this moment in time, only the back portion of the building is to be done. The applicant would like to wait until after the sidewalk project is completed to paint.

**Mr. Beilstein** asked for the weight of the tile.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated the tile is 570lbs per square. She asked if that weight would require engineering calculations.

**Mr. Beilstein** stated the weight is calculated using a 10x10 area. Engineering calculations are not needed on anything weighing less than 600lbs.

**Mr. Stevens** stated this is a light-weight product. He then asked if the flat roof portion had been completed.

**Associate Planner Williams** answered that no, the flat portion has not been completed yet.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he approves of this tile for the 138 building. He asked if this is the building that is intending to have the awnings cut back and if so, can the structure handle the weight of these tiles.

**Shari Nign, Applicant** stated they have not yet had the engineering calculated but the architect informed her that the weight should not be a problem.

**Mr. Stevens** asked the applicant if she is going to paint the whole building.

**Shari Nign, Applicant** answered that she would like to paint after the sidewalk project is complete.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the applicant is going to paint the rear of the building at this time.

**Shari Nign, Applicant** stated no, they will paint the entire building at one time.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if there was a reason that only the back will be done at this point in time.

**Shari Nign, Applicant** stated the back of the building leaks and the wood shake blow off during high winds.
Mr. Stevens asked the applicant if she had a planned paint scheme.

Shari Nign, Applicant replied yes she does. She explained that she intends to lighten the building to make the currently dark atrium area bright and welcoming.

Mr. Michaelis asked the applicant to explain what is to be done with the awnings at the front of the building.

Shari Nign, Applicant stated she would like to cut the awnings back so they no longer encroach into the sidewalk. In cutting back the awnings she would add fascia boards to finish the edges. She explained that she feels it would help to open up the front of the building.

Associate Planner Jennifer Williams stated when this item originally came to the Board in October a condition was written regarding the cutback of the awnings. Condition number 9d states: The pedestrian overhang shall be cut back to 3’ in total length, a boxed fascia shall be added to the upper and lower roofs on both sides of the building, and a decorative water conveyance system ( gutters) shall be added.

Motion: Larry Stevens moved, second by Margie Green to approve Boral “Saxony Split Shake” light weight tile in either Buckskin or Camouflage on the rear of the building only. The Development Plan Review Board will review the installation on the rear prior to approval or installation on the front of the building.

Motion carried 4-0-3 (Badar, Patel and Sorcinelli absent)

DPRB Case No. 15-25

A request to install electric vehicle charging equipment to occupy one parking stall located within the San Dimas Plaza parking lot located at 939 W. Arrow Highway.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo, was present.

Associate Planner Luis Torrico stated Solarrus Corporation, on behalf of NRG Electronic Vehicle Charging Solutions (EVgo) is requesting approval to install an electric vehicle charging station within the parking lot of San Dimas Plaza shopping center, located at 939 W. Arrow Hwy. The subject site is located within Area I of Specific Plan No. 18. The charging station will consist of two chargers, one communication/payment cabinet, one meter/distribution cabinet and one electrical transformer cabinet. Installation of the equipment will require removal of one parking space.

The use requires a Conditional Use Permit which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission to ensure there are no impacts to adjacent uses; however the Development Plan Review Board’s review will be limited to the design of the equipment and the location as it relates to site access and circulation.

The charging equipment will be located in the middle of the center north of the Burger King restaurant. The chargers are self-serving and no attendant is required. The chargers serve all electric vehicles and plug in hybrids and are available 24 hours. Anyone can access the
chargers using a credit card to pay and there is also a monthly subscription. Additionally, Nissan Leaf drivers get 2 years of free charging and BMW i3 drivers get one year of free charging.

There will be a total of five pieces of equipment; two chargers, one communication/payment cabinet and two equipment cabinets. They will range in height from 3'-2" to 6'-3".

The chargers and communication/payment cabinet will be located within the landscaped area of a center island and the equipment cabinet will be located on a separate landscaped island, southeast of the chargers. As part of the installation, the applicant will provide a handicap ramp and parking stall, as required by the building code. One parking space will be eliminated to provide the handicap parking stall. Three parking spaces will be identified as electric vehicle charging parking; however they will still be available for use by other vehicles when not in use by electric vehicles.

The center includes 921 existing parking spaces. The installation of the charging equipment will result in the loss of one parking space; therefore resulting in 920 spaces. Three additional parking spaces will be reserved for electric vehicles but may be used by other vehicles when not in use. The shopping center consists of 195,588 square feet of floor area and with a parking ratio of 1:222 (4.5/1,000); the center requires 881 parking spaces. With the amount of existing parking and shared parking throughout the center, there will be no impact on parking.

As previously mentioned, one parking space will be eliminated to provide a handicap parking space and the equipment will be located within existing landscaped planters; therefore, vehicle parking or circulation will not be impacted. The charging station will be required to comply with ADA handicap access and path of travel requirements, which will be reviewed by the Building Department during plan check.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how much of the median will be left for landscaping.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated there will be room for shrubs and the trees will not be affected.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if this system will be able to support more stations at a later date.

**Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo** stated they can plan for future upgrades. They can lay larger conduit in preparation for possible future expansion.

**Mr. Stevens** asked the applicant what the plans are for future expansion

**Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo** stated expansion for this parking lot is unlikely.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how long it takes to achieve a full charge.

**Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo** stated 15-20 minutes for a full charge. He goes on to say the San Francisco area gets about 500 charges a month. Busy stations in Southern California are getting 250-300 charges a month. Drivers use the app “PlugShare” to help drivers find the nearest charging station.
Associate Planner Torrico stated the applicant is proposing three charging spaces while the City's CUP allows for up to five charging spaces.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo stated they would like to do two fast chargers with two cords each; this will serve the two types of connections being utilized. He mentioned level two chargers are universal for all cars but for fast charging, there are two types of connectors.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked how much does it cost to charge a vehicle.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo states that currently Nissan Leaf drivers get 2 years of free charging and BMW i3 drivers get one year of free charging. He goes on to mention that 50% of their users are the Nissan and BMW drivers. Vehicles that are not covered under the plan can be charged for about eight to ten dollars a charge. The host property can set their own rates or a driver can pay a monthly fee to charge as often as they need.

Mr. Stevens asked if this is a use that will require signage along City streets or in the parking lot.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo stated no, the station is on the universal locator app “PlugShare”. The app will assist drivers in finding the charging station.

Mr. Stevens asked that verbiage be added to the conditions stating there is to be no additional signage.

Mr. Michaelis asked if there is ever a problem where a driver plugs their vehicle in, then leaves for the day.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo stated they have not had that type of abuse with fast chargers. If they find there is abuse, they may add signage informing drivers of a 30 minute time limit while charging.

Mr. Stevens states he does not believe that can be enforceable unless a local ordinance is added to the sign. He believes people will use the charging time to shop in the shopping center.

Ms. Green asked the applicant to explain the different levels of charging.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo stated a level one is eight hours to charge. A level two takes between four and five hours to charge. A level three is a fast charge; it takes about 20 minutes.

Mr. Stevens asked how does NRG EVgo evaluate demand and the number of stations needed.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo stated they get numbers every day when a driver does a search on the “PlugShare” app.

Mr. Stevens asked currently where is the nearest charging facility to San Dimas.

Thomas Folam, NRG EVgo stated there is a station at Ontario Mills near Nordstrom’s; there is also one in the Country Fair Shopping Center in Chino.
Associate Planner Torrico to conclude, Staff recommends that the Board recommends approval to the Planning Commission of DPRB Case No. 15-25 subject to the attached conditions. Staff can rewrite the conditions to fit the signage concern.

Motion: Larry Stevens moved, second by Margie Green to approve, subject to conditions of approval with the addition that there is to be no additional signage in regards to directing residents to the charging station, or associated with pricing.

Motion carried 4-0-3 (Badar, Patel and Sorcinelli absent)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 a.m. to the meeting of February 11, 2016 at 8:30 a.m.

ATTEST:

San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: 2/25/2016
February 17, 2016

Shari Nign
Rader Really
384 E. Rowland Street
Covina, CA 91723

RE: DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building)
APN 8390-023-014
A request to change the roof material from wood shake to flat tile.

The site is located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2-Frontier Village and is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines

Dear Applicant,

This letter is in follow-up to the approval letter for DPRB Case No.’s 15-40 and 15-41 which was sent on October 23, 2015 and the subsequent review of the proposed flat tile by the Development Plan Review Board at its January 28, 2016 meeting. At its meeting, the Board reviewed the proposed material sample (Boral Duralite Lightweight Saxony Split Shake Roof Tiles in Buckskin and Camouflage) and approved its installation on the rear of the building. The Board determined that the approved tile installation on the back of the building be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to installation on the front of the building.

Any decision, determination or action by the Development Plan Review Board may be appealed to the City Council provided that such appeal is filed within 14 days from the date of this letter of approval, which is issuing the determination or action by the Development Plan Review Board. An appeal may be filed by you or any other interested party. Any appeal must include an appeal fee of $109 and be accompanied by a written letter stating the reason(s) for the appeal. If you have any questions about the appeal process, the decision of the Board and/or any other inquiry, please contact me at (909) 394-6254.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Williams
Associate Planner
February 16, 2017

Shari Nign
Rader Realty
384 E. Rowland Street
Covina, CA 91723

SUBJECT: Time Extension for Development Plan Review Board Case No’s 15-40 and 15-41

Dear Ms. Nign,

The Planning Department has received your letter dated February 14, 2017, requesting a one-year extension of time for DPRB Case Nos. 15-40 and 15-41. The approvals for these cases are set to expire after today. The Director of Community Development has granted your request for a one-year extension. The approval for the abovementioned cases is now valid for an additional 12 months subject to the stated conditions of approval of each case.

Please be advised that building permits for the approved projects must be issued on or before the new expiration date of February 16, 2018.

If you have any further questions, please contact me at (909) 394-6254.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Williams
Associate Planner
DATE: August 23, 2018

TO: Development Plan Review Board

FROM: Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: DPRB Case No. 15-41; 138 W. Bonita Ave (Mercantile Building) APN 8390-023-014

A request to change the roof material from wood shake to flat tile.

The site is located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2-Frontier Village and is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines

FACTS:

This item came before the Board at its October 22, 2015 meeting and subsequently at its January 28, 2016 meeting. The Board approved a portion of the Applicant’s request as listed in the Conditions of Approval. For the prior reports, minutes of the meetings, and approval letters, see Exhibits A, B, & C.

The item before the Board today specifically deals with the fulfillment of Condition No. 9a, "the roof material for the front of the building shall be standing seam metal or flat tile, with the color and shape to be reviewed and approved by the Board at a later date prior to installation." At the January 28, 2016 DPRB meeting, the Board authorized the Applicant to install Boral Duralite Lightweight Saxony Split Shake Roof Tiles in Buckskin or Camouflage on the rear of the building for review and approval by the Board prior to installation on the front of the building.

According to the manufacturer, this type of roof provides a design feature with random patterns of coarse and smooth textures that simulates the appearance of a natural cedar shake roof.

The tile has now been installed (in Camouflage color) and the Applicant is seeking the Board’s authorization to install the material on the front portion of the building.

Please see the photo included on the following page.
ANALYSIS:

The tile selected is of an A-rated tile roof material that meets the City's standards and the proposed color is of a natural blend. Staff has no issues with the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval.

EXHIBITS:

A. Extension Letter Dated February 16, 2017
B. January 28, 2016 DPRB Report
C. January 28, 2016 DPRB Minutes
D. Approval Letter Dated February 17, 2016
E. October 22, 2015 DPRB Report
F. October 22, 2015 DPRB Minutes
G. Approval Letter Dated October 23, 2015
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
AUGUST 23, 2018 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT

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

STAFF

Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
Hector Kistemann, Director of Parks and Recreation
Anne Nguyen, Associate Planner
Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER

Scott Dilley 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.

Minutes

Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve the August 9, 2018 minutes

DPRB 15-41

A request to change the roof material from wood shake to flat tile.

The site is located within the Creative Growth Zone, Area 2 — Frontier Village and is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines. 138 W Bonita Ave. (Mercantile Building)

Shari Nign, Applicant was present

Associate Planner Jennifer Williams presented the staff report with recommendation of approval.
Mr. Badar asked what a “natural blend” of roofing means.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated most roofing is applied with a natural blend. It is done so a roof is not one continuous color.

Building Superintendent Eric Beilstein added on a historic building it is best to use a natural blend.

Shari Nign, Applicant asked if she needed a new permit.

Mr. Stevens stated she needs to amend the permit to reflect work being done on the upper and lower portions of the roof. He added he would like the work to be completed before the permit expires.

Motion DPRB Case No. 15-41: Emmett Badar moved, second by Scott Diley to approve subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried: 7-0

Oral Communications

Mr. Stevens stated Staff has decided to bring Max’s back to the Board as the Applicant has made substantial changes to the project. He notes the changes as the facility has been reduced to 4,000 square feet and all parking will be held onsite. This new project proposal is straightforward and all Planning Commission would need to look at valet parking and the use of alcohol onsite. He just wanted the Board to be aware of the change.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 a.m. to the meeting of September 13, 2018 at 8:30 a.m.

David Bratt, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Approved: 09/13/18