

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

**February 22, 2007 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

---

**PRESENT**

*Dan Coleman  
Scott Dilley  
Sandy McHenry  
Blaine Michaelis (arrive at 8:33 A.M.)  
Krishna Patel  
Jim Schoonover  
John Sorcinelli*

**ABSENT**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Councilman McHenry 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 Council Chambers Conference room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, second by Krishna Patel, to approve minutes of February 8, 2007. Motion carried 5.0.1. (Sandy McHenry abstained)

**HEARING ITEMS**

**DPRB Case No. 07-08**

Preliminary Review of 18 new single family houses located at 309 North Lone Hill Avenue. (APN 8383-012-019)

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

Everett Hughes, developer, was present.

Planning Manager Hensley presented proposal for 18 new single family homes averaging 4,213 square feet including garage. Three floor plans are proposed in three architectural styles: Craftsman, Traditional and Spanish. Issues for discussion were:

- Size of houses: Proposed houses are significantly larger than surround neighborhood;
- Front setback: Lots 1,4,6,7,8,10,13,15 & 16 do not meet minimum 20' front setback, though may have been an engineering error on the plans. Applicant intends on correcting this. Plan 2 is a side entry garage with a 15' front setback permitted. A deed restriction will be needed to require that the garage remain a garage because of the 15' setback;
- Side yard setback: The proposed houses max out side to side building envelope;
- Rear yard setback: SF zone does not require rear yards, but DPRB has the ability to make recommendations based on its design review authority. Consider available rear yard area on all lots, especially lots 8 &9;
- Tree removal: A total of 167 trees on-site with 136 proposed to be removed (north property line of project);
- Gated Entry: Planning Commission heard Tentative Tract Map 04-01 (060865) on February 21, 2007 and approved gate.

Mr. Williams replied to the Board that the most of the retaining walls will be split face, interlocking block. It is the same kind of wall approved for Creek project is proposed. An interlocking wall allows for planting. Along the property lines, a split face block wall with pilasters and a cap is proposed.

Planning Manager Hensley added that this type of wall does not have the negative aesthetic concerns of a crib wall. The Homeowners Association and CC&R's will address common area and landscape maintenance.

Mr. Williams replied to the Board that access to the common areas are being worked out. He added that the landscape plan before the board today shows 287 replacement trees. Mr. Hughes added that the replacement trees would be at least as high as the retaining walls.

Marcus Tabak of 1139 St.George stated that he was in favor of the project, but wished that lot 16, directly behind his property, was a smaller floor plan.

Planning Manager Hensley replied to the Board that the chimney material for each style will match house. Mr. Hughes added that materials are carried around all four sides of each home.

Mr. Williams replied to the Board that he would be working with Public Works on the entry gate and median.

Mr. Desy of 1132 West Juanita expressed concern for the welfare of the wildlife on Lone Hill that will spill out to adjacent properties once grading begins and the stability of the slope/hillside behind his home.

Mr. Hughes replied that one month prior to grading, rodent poison will be used to target mostly rats. Larger animals should not be affected. Also underbrush will be cleaned out. In response to the Board, he talked about drainage off of the property.

Drains that they will be installing will carry 90% or more water off of the property. He was reminded by the Board that NPDES requirements will need to be met during construction.

Mr. Williams added that all lots will drain to the street.

Development Services Director Coleman suggested that the floor plan on lot 13 be switched with floor plan on lot 18 to increase available yard area for lot 13. He commented that the homes were beautifully designed with exceptional articulation and wrapping architectural details around all four sides.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that compared to other new construction in the city and surrounding areas, the size of the proposed homes were not too big.

The Board reviewed elevations and site plans and, in general, were in support of the project at this point.

No action taken.

### **DPRB Case No. 06-81**

Request to create a new architectural secondary main entrance located at 955 Overland Court. (APN 8383-010-060) **Continued from December 14, 2006.**

Rafael Garay of Kamus & Keller Architects, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Lockett informed the Board of the revision made since last meeting:

- Six new parking spaces have been created adjacent to existing trash enclosure with new landscaping;
- Relocated trash enclosure doors;
- Removed five parking spaces to extend the new concrete walkway out to the parking lot;
- Created a path of travel to meet ADA requirements;
- Revised landscaping plan;
- Changed finish on front pillar to match the finish of the existing building.

Development Services Director Coleman expressed that the triangle feature did not seem to create any interest or purpose. Associate Planner Lockett explained that it was an architectural feature from inside the building, tying the inside with the outside.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that items of concern seem to have been addressed and supports the triangle feature as a way to tie the inside and outside.

In response to staff questions about the size of the building Mr. Garay explained that the storage mezzanine (3,600-3,800 s.f.) has been demolished which resulted in a smaller floor area.

**Motion:** John Sorcinelli moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to approve new entry and work with Staff on parking, subject to standard conditions.

Motion carried 7.0.0.

**DPRB Case No. 07-11**

Request to construct three new two-story single family residences located at 121, 125 and 129 Puddingstone Drive. (APN: 8382-013-047,048,058 and 8382-013 041,042 and 8382-013-056)

Mary Helen Soto and Otis Lacy of Pom-L, Inc., applicant was present.

Associate Planner Laura Lockett explained to the Board that this was previously approved in 2004 under DPRB Case No. 03-25. An extension was granted in 2005 in order to secure building permits. The project is still in plan check and the extension has expired. The plans have not changed since original review and approval.

**Motion:** Dan Coleman moved, second by John Sorcinelli, to approve previously approved request (DPRB Case No. 03-25) which had expired, subject to standard conditions.

Motion carried 7.0.0.

**DPRB Case No. 07-05**

Request to construct a 5,435 sq. ft. two-story single family residence located at 1416 Manchester Road (APN 8426-038-006)

Paul Adragna & Keith Lam, applicants, were not present.

Associate Planner Marco A. Espinoza explained to the Board that this request was previously heard under DPRB Case No. 04-08. This case has since expired. Issues from previous application still exist with new application:

- The mass and bulk of the proposed two story house with minimum setbacks, coupled with the house's unique siting, overwhelms the property.
- The proposed house is located entirely within the existing buildable envelope of the property and may impact the existing neighboring residences due to garage location.
- The front concrete driveway is excessive in the amount of paving. The use of turf block or pervious paving would soften this area by allowing for more natural landscape materials.
- There were some trees removed on this property without an approved tree removal permit. Replacement trees shall be required with the landscape plans associated with this project if it were approved.
- The landscaping plan mixes drought tolerant and water thirsty plant materials.
- There is a sewer easement located at the rear of the lot, no construction is allowed over the easement area.

- The property's zoning allows for horse keeping.

Development Services Director Coleman said that in reviewing the approved plans for the house next door that is under construction, the proposed house would have a 23 foot building separation which is far more than is typical for this zone. He felt that the proposal was reasonable given that the lot is severely constrained by its triangular shape and easement.

**Motion:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Scott Dilley, to approve.

Motion carried 7.0.0.

### **DPRB Case No. 07-12**

Request to appeal denial for a rear yard fence for a single family residence at 1810 Avenida Monte Vista. (APN: 8395-031-027)

Mike Sargent, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Marco A. Espinoza explained to the Board that historically Staff has not approved fences within the sloped areas adjacent to the golf course due to the desire to maintain a uniformed fence line and CC&R's prohibition of fences with the slope areas for some of the lots. In attached photo's, he pointed out that the fences on the properties immediately adjacent to the subject property were all aligned at the top of slope. He distributed copies of the CC&R's.

The Board discussed how fencing could be designed to meet building code for pools, increase seating area and not encroach into the slope. Mr. Sorcinelli suggested a bench idea to be considered by applicant and building department.

Development Services Director Coleman commented on the section of the CC&R's regarding fences. It did not indicate that encroaching into the slope was permitted.

Councilman McHenry stated that he would be abstaining from the vote because he would be bringing this issue to the attention of the City Council for policy determination.

**Motion:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to continue to next DPRB meeting after next City Council meeting.

Motion carried 6.0.1. (Sandy McHenry abstained)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m. to the meeting of March 8, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.