

**CITY OF SAN DIMAS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES**

**October 12, 2006 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

PRESENT

*Scott Dilley
Sandy McHenry
Blaine Michaelis
Krishna Patel
Jim Schoonover
Larry Stevens*

ABSENT

John Sorcinelli

CALL TO ORDER

Councilman McHenry called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:35 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of September 28, 2006 was continued to meeting of October 26, 2006.

HEARING ITEMS

Case No. 06-48

Associate Planner Laura Lockett presented request, continued from July 13, 2006, to add 737 s.f. to the first floor, 737 s.f. to a new basement floor and expand the second story balcony to the rear of the existing 3,804 s.f. home located at 1603 Calle Cristina in Specific Plan 11.

Steve Eide, architect, and Joseph D'angelo, property owner, were present.

Associate Planner Lockett stated that brick and wood had been added to be more consistent with the front elevation. Only remaining issue was the lack of interior access to new game room. Mr. Eide explained that exterior access for this space was for pool house and equipment room only.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that the first time this item was heard by the Board the request for a fence in the slope portion of the property and a proposed second garage for RV use was denied. The fencing, because of its style and location on the slope and the garage, because of its mass and proposed grading that exceeded the maximum allowed. The applicant's options were either to submit a revised plan that addresses Staff and Board issues or resubmit new plan in one year.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve subject to standard conditions. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

Case No.06-60

Associate Planner Laura Lockett presented request to construct a new 3,337 sq. ft. Single Family Residence located adjacent to 1619 N. San Dimas Canyon Road, APN# 8665-010-063.

Steve Eide, architect, was present.

Associate Planner Lockett stated that this item was before the Board to provide Staff and the applicant direction and that no final action would be taken. The site contains a locally significant historical house. The house has been condemned by the City and considered a safety hazard. It has a zero setback on the southern property line adjacent to Los Angeles County San Dimas Canyon Park. The applicant is proposing to preserve the structure by removing the existing roof and interior improvements while maintaining three of the rock façade walls to create an open courtyard. Historical assessment was done by Onyx Associates in 2002 which indicated that development of the structure would most likely influence the response to CEQA checklist items Aesthetic and Cultural. In addition, she stated that Staff had questions as to how the existing house would relate to the new structure. Discussion was opened up to the Board. No action can be taken today by the Board because CEQA requires a 20 day public notice of the project.

Commissioner Schoonover stated that in the Onyx report under Building Conditions, #6, the structure is described as an unreinforced masonry seismic hazard. He questioned how this structure could be safely attached to a new structure.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that the walls of the house would have different standards than those of the new structure. He asked the Board to consider what the mitigations might be, such as a photo survey or record of materials removed and reuse.

Councilman McHenry asked how will setback issues be handled for the rock structure as it sits on the property line.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens replied that the property line that the rock structure is on is public property which makes it more of a technical issue. A variance may be needed if the rock structure is reconstructed for

habitable space so it is in compliance. He inquired why approach to incorporate the rock structure as habitable space instead of a courtyard was not presented.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that the Planning Department's standard response to inquiries made on the development of this property in the past few years has been to incorporate the rock structure with any new construction in order to preserve it.

In response to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens, Associate Planner Lockett stated that there was not a requirement in the Parcel Map to preserve the rock structure, it just has been in discussions.

Public Works Director Patel stated that he supports request for courtyard with any removed material to be used in project.

Photos of the rock structure were circulated to the Board.

Associate Planner Lockett pointed out bump out on the rock structure on the east elevation and how it emphasizes two different structures.

City Manager Michaelis commented on wall height of proposed courtyard and if it was an appropriate height.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that historic structures sometimes have their impracticalities, but that is the nature of such structures. The idea being to keep the integrity of the structure and alter it as little as possible, so the wall height would not be lowered for a courtyard. Partially retaining some of the roof or an open beam trellis with same pitch of the previous roof would better represent the original structure. Rafter tail elements have historical value. He also added that he would prefer to see it used as a habitable room over a courtyard.

Associate Planner Lockett stated that there was not a restriction to single story for this zone.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that there should be a separation of the new development from the existing structure. A preservation strategy should be in place for the rock structure.

City Manager Michaelis and Councilman McHenry suggested that materials of the rock structure and theme be used in a new structure.

Public Works Director Patel was in support of preserving the rock structure and suggested using it as a carport.

In response to City Manager Michaelis, Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that the structure could be used as a detached second unit. Applicant was encouraged to look at creative ways to develop property while maintaining integrity of rock structure.

Discussion concluded with general directions as follows:

- Every attempt to save the rock structure either as a habitable space or outdoor living area;
- Details on new structure should emulate details on rock structure.

Case No. 06-38

Request for Face Change of an existing Monument Sign at 1790 South San Dimas Avenue (76 Gas Station) was continued per request made by Juan at A&S Engineering because they were unable to make today's meeting.

Tree Removal Case No. 06-44

Associate Planner Laura Lockett presented request for removal of six trees located at 510 East Arrow Highway.

Larry Sweeden, Landscape Contractor, was present.

Associate Planner Lockett stated that trees were removed without permits and applicant received notice from Code Enforcement. The Board is to review replacement plan today.

Aerial photos and proposed replacement trees were reviewed by the Board.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve replacement of six trees of which should be a variety of California Natives. Applicant to work with Staff on tree selection. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

Case No. 05-77

Assistant Michael Concepcion presented request for installation of fencing and gates located at 1139 Edinburgh Road.

Paul Feintuch, property owner, was present.

VertiGate gate is proposed. It was explained that this kind of gate would be new to this neighborhood. The gate is unique in that it folds upwards, instead of the swing or roll gates that more commonly seen.

In response to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens, Mr. Feintuch stated that a punch code and clicker will be used to access gate and that this kind of gate is desired because of the terrain.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley, to approve fencing with standard conditions. Motion carried 6.0.0.

Case No. 06-69

Assistant Planner Michael Concepcion presented request to construct a new parking lot to an existing industrial complex located at Amelia Avenue just south of the 210 Freeway (APN # 8392-017-054).

Guy Williams, Environment Control Systems, Inc., applicant, was present.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that no documentation was found that prohibited parking within the common area/easement.

In response to Public Works Director Patel, Mr. Williams stated that a second gate at south end of the project is to keep unauthorized persons out of parking lot that use it for "park and ride". Also any proposed trees will meet Department of Water and Power's approval.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens felt that two spaces for stacking at Amelia was insufficient. He recommended that the gate be moved inwards to create more stacking space.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis, to approve with Standard Conditions and move the gate at Amelia in to increase stacking space. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

Case No. 06-41

Associate Planner Marco Espinoza presented request to construct addition of 246 square feet to the first floor of a single family house located at 326 Via Blanca.

Rob Hitchcock, architect, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that Specific Plan 5 allows for the DPRB and Planning Commission to determine varying front yard setbacks according to topographic conditions. Nine of the eleven lots developed have an average front yard setback of 20'.

In response to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens, Mr. Hitchcock stated that the addition will function as a pool house; therefore, not requiring access from inside the house.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve subject to standard conditions and any future requests for a reduction in setback must be brought back to the DPRB for review. Motion carried 6.0.0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:29 A.M. to the meeting of October 26, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.