

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

**July 12, 2007 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

---

**PRESENT**

Dan Coleman  
Scott Dilley  
Blaine Michaelis  
Curtis Morris  
Krishna Patel  
Jim Schoonover

**ABSENT**

John Sorcinelli

**CALL TO ORDER**

Commissioner Jim Schoonover 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**

**MOTION:** Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve minutes of June 28, 2007 with additional comment to page 2, DPRB Case No. 07-31: "Director of Public Works Patel made the applicant aware that as part of approval, installation of streetlight and modification to existing wheelchair ramp will be required." Motion carried 5.0.1.

**HEARING ITEMS**

**DPRB Case No. 07-38 (formerly 05-88)**

Request to install vinyl siding over existing texture-coated asbestos shingles on a residence at 158 N. San Dimas Avenue. (APN: 8387-017-043) ZONE: A-P Administrative Professional

Alan & Elizabeth Anderson, applicants, were present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that applicant is requesting to install vinyl siding and wrap vinyl on the soffit, fascia and exterior trim of all the doors and windows on a one story, single family home within the town core. House is located within lower San Dimas Avenue historic district, but is not listed in the city's historic resource survey. It may have

been overlooked when survey was completed or may have been omitted due to its condition. The house is an historic resource and should have been on the list. Vinyl siding has not been considered an appropriate siding material city wide, especially in the town core with an alternative to wood being composite material such as hardie siding.

Issues presented by Mr. Espinoza:

Town Core design guidelines discourages new siding material such as aluminum or plastic;

Vinyl not considered appropriate building material based on its fake wood grain appearance;

Overlapping of vinyl does not give wood appearance;

Vinyl is too pliable and can be easily dented;

Staff finds it difficulty in making findings per Municipal Code section 18.12.060 Findings – Standards of Review (1) & (3), (B)(3).

Mr. Anderson addressed the Board. He stated that the house was originally a shed that over time became a residence. It was run down when he purchased it and he has fixed it up over time. Vinyl is his choice because of its affordability and weight. He stated that he did not think the house could stand the weight of Hardiplank. Also Hardiplank is out of their price range.

Mayor Curtis suggested that vinyl be looked at again by the City Council. He commented that during his travels to New England he noticed that on old homes vinyl was being used with wood on the windows and trim. He stated that the installation of the vinyl is critical to ensure pleasing appearance.

The Board further discussed concerns with vinyl as presented by Mr. Espinoza and examined samples or vinyl siding, Hardiplank and similar materials.

**Motion:** Jim Schoonover moved, second by Krishna Patel to refer back to City Council for review of vinyl siding policy and how it relates to the Town Core Design Guidelines. Staff to provide City Council with additional information about vinyl siding.

Motion carried 5.0.1.1 (Morris abstained)

**DPRB Case No. 07-02D**

Revise Director Review Approval for a 2,157 sq. ft. addition to a request to construct a new 7,445 sq. ft., two-story, single-family residence at 526 Gladstone Avenue within the Town Core. (APN: 8386-005-051) ZONE: Specific Plan 3

Christianne Maramba, designer, was present.

Fred Tagudar, structural engineer, was present.

Rod M. Alvar, developer, was present.

Mayor Morris recused himself as he has property near subject property.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the proposed architectural style is a Spanish Colonial Revival. Additional design modifications and architectural features are recommended. Original submittal was for a 1,515 sq. ft. addition to the second floor and 642 sq. ft. to first floor. During demolition process as part of original approval, it was determined that portions of the existing house and foundation did not meet current Building Code. The remaining foundation appeared to be structurally unsound and a soils report was requested of the applicant which was submitted today. Staff has not had the opportunity to review the report yet. All of the existing structure except two walls of the garage and its roof, and the foundation slab were demolished.

Manager Hensley stated that substantial construction on uncompacted soil has occurred on this property over time. Much of the house did not have permits with a significant area not compacted fill. Would mostly likely have to overexcavate and recompact for new construction.

In response to Director Coleman, Mr. Espinoza stated that previously approved setback on west property line was 8'. Proposal is for 14'. In Specific Plan 3, all setbacks are determined by the Board. A minimum of 25' on both sides of the property is recommended because of the proposed house size and visibility on the hill.

In response to Director Patel, Mr. Tagndar, structural engineer for applicant, stated that his recommendation is to pour a new slab over existing.

Jim Schoonover asked for clarification of scope of work.

Manager Hensley stated that there have been a previous plans approved for this site. When Randy Argo owned the property, he processed plans to bring the existing building up to Code, since much of it did not have permits. Those plans proposed no building addition and were permit ready. When the current owner acquired the property, the plans were revised and submitted for plan check. Through the first three plan checks, only minor changes to the building were proposed. On the fourth plan check the proposed 1,515 square foot addition appeared. That addition received a Director Review approval with conditions and findings. The permit was issued to start construction of that plan and during the construction process it was determined that a vast majority of the house had been demolished. This demo was probably because of the poor soil condition. This is a situation where what was approved can't be built and because so much is being done, the proposal should be viewed as a new house. This means meeting the Town Core Design Guidelines and notice to neighbors.

Christianne Maramba said that they did not understand why they needed DPRB review again and that their desire was to build per the approved plans and re-use the existing slab.

Director Coleman stated that staff met with applicant to answer any questions applicant and designer had on how to proceed with request. Previously approved plans for an addition are no longer valid as house has been demolished. Current request is to build a new house on an existing slab and is required to go through plan check again.

Manager Hensley stated that although similar form, request is for a new house as there is no longer a structure to add to.

Ms. Maramba stated that she had a completed soils report dated June 26; however, had not submitted the report to the Building & Safety Division for review.

Director Coleman stated that the soils report will have to be reviewed by the Building and Safety Department. He added that the soils report affects the DPRB review, as it will determine whether or not remaining slab can be used which relates to the location of the house.

**Motion:** Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Krishna Patel to continue to uncertain date for review of soils report.

Motion carried 5.0.1.1 (Mayor Morris recused)

### **DPRB Case No. 07-40D**

Request to convert a street facing second-story balcony into livable space (79 sq. ft.) at a single-family residence located at 1654 Grasscreek Drive. (APN: 8665-010-018)  
ZONE: SF-A 16,000

David Tait, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant proposed to enclose a second story balcony and remove the full size brick veneer from the front of the garage and front entrance and remove wood siding and shutters from the front of the house.

Issued for the Board to consider were:

Top heavy effect of the balcony enclosure on the house;  
Future request to enclose front entrance; therefore, creating a massive box effect on the front elevation;  
Stucco pop-out trim not compatible with the neighborhood;  
Proposed columns at front entry become focal point instead of the front door;  
Width of column adjacent to garage.  
Removing the enhanced building materials (stone, brick and wood siding) is discouraged.

Mr. Tait addressed the Board. Regarding the entry, he stated that he would replace the brick with stackstone and had no intention of enclosing the entry.

In response to Mayor Morris, Director Patel stated that load for a bedroom is less than for a deck, so footings would probably be ok. Structural review would be done during plan check.

Director Coleman added that it would be a nice enhancement and updates house.

**Motion:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve.

Motion carried 5.0.1.

**DPRB Case No. 07-23**

Request to construct a 5,695 sq. ft. two-story, single-family residence at 1608 Calle Cristina. (APN: 8448-038-047) ZONE: Specific Plan 11

Alex Mustapha, applicant, was present.

Par Sjoblom, architect, was present.

Stuart Grant, resident at 1602 Calle Cristina, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza presented facts and stated that although the home has Spanish-Mediterranean architectural design elements, it lacks proper proportion, scale and architectural design. There are problems with too many different styles of windows, especially on the front elevation. Decks with exposed pilasters have been denied on other projects in the area. Front Elevation appears massive. Suggest wall angulations to minimize effect. Also to decrease massing issues, suggest increasing front wall setback and setting back portions of the second floor. Rear deck is massive in scale and height, with 17' its highest point. A pool is proposed 12' from front property line with a 6' high block wall at 9' from property line. This fencing on the east elevation adds to massing.

In response to Director Coleman, Mr. Espinoza stated that house is fairly visible from Paseo Lucinda. Photos taken of the site were distributed to the Board for review.

In response to Mr. Schoonover, Manager Hensley stated that front yard fencing does not exist on this street. He added that these lots are limited in their shape and the amount of useable outdoor space. The Board needs to determine if this proposal has too much impact to the surrounding area.

Mr. Mustapha addressed the Board. He stated that he was flexible regarding pool location and was willing to work with Staff on revisions suggested by the Board. Mr. Sjoblom, architect for applicant, also stated that he would work with Staff on revisions to windows as it relates to size and placement.

Mr. Grant stated that he had some concerns about the proposed retaining wall near his property line. He also stated that the hillside needs access so it can be disced and asked whether applicant would be allowing access to Los Angeles County for this purpose. Mr. Mustapha stated that the wall would be approximately 2' from his neighbor's wall. He also stated that he was not required to allow access to the hillside for discing.

Director Patel stated that if the pool was relocated to rear of property, house could be re-centered on site. Mr. Mustapha replied that proposed siting is at preferred location based on house design and topography.

Director Coleman stated that the rear elevation needed revision to break up the plane and add movement. He added that the house will be very visible and acknowledged that the lot is limited with only a shallow area for the house.

Mayor Morris stated that these were approved lots despite being limited. It is not reasonable to not allow a deck as there is limited to no useable outdoor living area. He would leave the pool at its proposed location.

Director Patel suggested that the pool be lowered. He stated that the deck did not appear to be too large as long as it's consistent with other construction in the area. He stated that he had concerns with the height of the retaining wall on the south side and that the building department will have to review.

Mr. Schoonover stated that he had concerns about the proposed location of the pool essentially in the front yard and setting precedence. In response, Mr. Sjoblom stated that he could move the pool back so that it is located more in the side yard.

**Motion:** Krishna Patel moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to continue to date uncertain so applicant could work with Staff on revisions based on comments made by the Board.

Director Coleman asked the DPRB to discuss the Staff comments regarding the rear deck and to give applicant direction on deck and walls.

Mayor Morris stated that he preferred posts instead of wall for deck. Mr. Coleman agreed. Mr. Patel indicated that landscaping would soften deck's appearance.

Motion carried 5.0.1.

### **DPRB Case No. 07-36**

Request to construct a 1,067 square foot second unit on a 48,581 square foot lot, located at 1775 San Dimas Canyon Road. (APN: 8665-021-045) ZONE: SF-A 10,000

Holly Ornelas, property owner, was present.

Steve Eide, of Drafting and Design, was present.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that the development site is constrained because of a Department of Water and Power easement that runs through the entire property. The roof will be somewhat visible from San Dimas Canyon Road northeast bound. Also property may be a good candidate for a minor deviation to deal with the cut-off ridge on the back of the unit.

In response to Board questions, Manager Hensley stated that the front elevation of the second unit is architecturally compatible with the main house and that this is a unique easement situation that allows for some outdoor access/use.

**Motion:** Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Mayor Morris to approve as proposed and process a minor deviation if applicant chooses to apply for one.

Motion carried 5.0.1.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 a.m. to the meeting of July 26, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.