

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

**October 26, 2006 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

---

**PRESENT**

*Eric Beilstein  
Scott Dilley  
Sandy McHenry  
Blaine Michaelis  
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 9:00 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve the Minutes of September 28, 2006 4.0.2. (Eric Beilstein and Sandy McHenry abstained).

Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve the Minutes of October 12, 2006 Motion Carried 5.0.1. (Eric Beilstein abstained)

**HEARING ITEMS**

**Tree Removal No. 06-45**

Associate Planner Marco Espinoza presented request to remove eight (8) dead trees within the Hillview town home complex.

Applicant was not present.

In response to Councilman McHenry, Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the 2:1 replacement requirement should not create a problem in the future as there is adequate space for the new tree's.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Sandy McHenry to approve removal of eight trees with replacement of 2:1 ratio with the following species:

- 5 Alders;
- 5 Carrotwood;
- 6 Liquidambar.

Motion Carried 6.0.0.

### **Case No. N/A**

Associate Planner Marco Espinoza presented request to amend approved plans in regards to siding and window material of historic home located at 316 West Third Street.

Applicants Cesar and Carlos Castro were present.

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that the applicant installed siding material and windows that do not match existing. Nailed on vinyl windows and masonite siding have been installed. The siding on the addition does not match the wood siding on the older portion of the house. The nailed on windows do not appear similar to historic wooden windows as they are set at the exterior wall face as opposed to “boxed” windows that would be more compatible. No case number is assigned to this request because director review was not required as the addition was under 600 s.f. and single story. Request went directly into plan check.

In response to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza replied that according to the applicant the materials used differed from the plans because they could not find materials to match. The applicant contacted Staff after the installation was done. The existing windows were previously changed out to aluminum prior to town core design guidelines by a previous owner.

Cesar Castro addressed the Board. He stated that the plans did not say “boxed-in” windows. He said that he and his brother have been in litigation for two years with seller of house. Photos of the windows were circulated that show existing and new. He also added that the siding on the addition is not visible from the street. The applicant handed out information obtained from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings: Overview of New Additions to Historic Buildings. Applicant also stated that he and his brother have nearly exhausted their budget for rehabilitating house.

Councilman McHenry explained to applicant that town core design guidelines are mandated by the City Council. He stated that siding is available for historic homes as are boxed windows. It was unclear to Councilman McHenry how approval to match existing was confusing to applicant.

Building Official Beilstein stated that in the plan check process a correction was made that the siding be wood. In regards to the windows, approved plans say to match existing, so in order to get the same look the windows on the addition would have to be boxed.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that clarity of "match existing" seems to be the problem. He added that the photo's show a variety of different materials on the existing house and that staff relies on plans to accurately show what is existing.

In response to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens, Mr. Castro stated that the kinds of materials were not factored into his budget.

In response to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens, Planning Manager Hensley stated that masonite siding in the town core has not been approved in the last five years or more. Hardiplank or other composite material has been approved with masonite being on the "do not use" list.

In response to Building Official Beilstein, Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the existing aluminum windows will not be changed out as part of this request.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens added that perhaps all town core home requests should go to DPRB for review.

Building Official Beilstein noted that where the new siding and the existing siding meet, it clearly does not match. The windows on the addition do not match existing. They lack the depth of boxed in windows.

Commissioner Schoonover stated that he did not have any major problems with the new windows, but could not approve the siding on the new addition as proposed.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to deny masonite siding, allow applicant to work with Staff on alternate material and allow windows to not be boxed on new addition. Motion carried 5.0.1. (Sandy McHenry abstained.)

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens explained to applicant that letter would be sent out on Wednesday to allow for appeal to City Council. Applicant can file an appeal regardless of what City Council decides if he so chooses.

### **Case No. 06-38**

Planning Manager Craig Hensley presented continued request from October 12, 2006 for Face Change of an existing Monument Sign at 1790 South San Dimas Avenue (76 Gas Station).

Juan Sandoval of A & S Engineering was present.

Planning Manager Craig Hensley explained that having 1/3 of the sign for non-gasoline advertising was an issue. In addition, it was not uncommon for gas station signs to have "ATM", "Snack Shop" or "Self Serve" on monument sign. It is the proposed size of advertising space that is an issue.

After reviewing the elevation, the Board suggested that there be two panels as per original approval.

Mr. Sandoval stated that they would just like to reface existing if they can not have a new monument sign with three panels.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Eric Beilstein to approve 2/3 of sign, two panels with a total sign face of 18 s.f., 6' x 3', with colors indicated. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

### **Case No. 06-70**

Planning Manager Craig Hensley presented request to construct a 5,766 sq. ft. house and three-car garage at 549 Puddingstone Drive.

Applicant was not present.

This project was approved by the Board in 2003 and went through the building plan check process. Permits were issued, but were held up due to conflicting information Los Angeles County regarding the location of the property lines. The original approval has lapsed and the applicant is requesting to change the siting of the house.

The elevations and site plan were reviewed and it was determined that the house and reasonable circulation for the garage would not fit as proposed on revised grading plan. Re-siting the house creates a ripple effect with revision becoming substantial.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that more grading on this site would create a better over all design.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to continue to allow for applicant to consider reducing house elevation and possibly width in attempt to resolve re-siting issues, reduce driveway slope, create turnaround opportunities, work with Staff on how siting might effect roofline, particularly the garage area. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

### **Case No. 05-92**

Planning Manager Craig Hensley requested that request to construct a 22,877 sq. ft. Industrial Building, located at 302 Covina Boulevard previously reviewed by Board on September 14, 2006 be continued.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to continue. Motion Carried 6.0.0.

**Case No. PP 06-02**

Planning Manager Craig Hensley presented preliminary review of request to construct two (2) 7,837 sq. ft. single-story office buildings and one (1) 16,173 sq. ft. two-story office, located on the southwest corner of Via Verde Avenue and Puente Street.

Stan Stringfellow, developer, was present.

A design consultant, Roger Cantrell, was hired to provide design assistance to applicant. Revised elevations have been submitted that address a majority of the architectural issues brought up by Staff and the Board.

Issues:

- Staff feels that a smooth trowel stucco finish is more appropriate;
- Clay roof tile is encouraged on new commercial buildings of this style;
- Roof overhang on the front gable should be extended to cover the first floor;
- Trellis on east elevation encroaches into 20' landscape setback per scenic overlay zone;
- Majority of building is 32' in height. Maximum height allowed is 30'.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens inquired on whether street improvements and equestrian fencing done. He added that standard conditions would require a master sign program be created. Recommended decorative paving. Landscape plan should come back to the Board for review. In reviewing zoning requirements, he added that there may be a problem at property line adjacent to specific plan in regards to landscape setback requirement when AP zone adjacent to residential zone. Also the way scenic highway overlay is written, the trellis can not be allowed for building C unless the trellis is interpreted as a landscape element. He emphasized that we comply clearly with that section.

Planning Manager Hensley replied to Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens that there is no common area for the three lots. There will be a shared parking lot, maintenance agreement and trash enclosure.

Building Official Beilstein stated that infrastructure done, but drainage still needs to be addressed. He suggested that trellis' be used in various locations to create a campus feel in order to tie the buildings together. Trellises could also be used to breakup the parking lot.

Mr. Stingfellow stated that smooth stucco finish and clay tile roof would not be a problem. He inquired on where building height was measured. Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens stated that generally measured from finished grade to peak. With a conditional use permit, building height may exceed 30'. In regards to comments made by design consultant, Mr. Stringfellow added that symmetry issues were addressed with grades, treatments and elevations. Footprint mirrors, but elevations differ. In response to Building Official Beilstein, he thought that the grass area was to act as a buffer.

Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve preliminary review of revised plans subject to standard conditions with the following:

- Height of building to not exceed 30' or by Conditional Use Permit;
- Landscape and sign program to be brought back to the Board;
- Landscape plan to include decorative paving;
- Smooth stucco finish;
- Clay barrel tile roof;
- Review opportunities for trellis and compliance with Scenic Highway Overlay;
- Establish an access parking and maintenance agreement;
- Verify setback along northwest property line;
- Revise trellis to meet Scenic Highway Overlay Zone.

Motion Carried 6.0.0.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:35 A.M. to the meeting of November 9, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.