

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

**July 10, 2008 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

PRESENT

*Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curtis Morris, Mayor
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

ABSENT

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Curtis Morris, to approve minutes of June 26, 2008 with revision to page 4 provided by Associate Planner Espinoza. Motion carried 7.0.0.0.

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 08-32

Continued from June 12, 2008 and June 26, 2008. Request for exterior alteration on apartment structures located at 225 South San Dimas Canyon Road. APN: 8390-015-029 Zone: MF-15

Kim Smith, JN Davis Roofing, was present.

Stephen Reed, attorney for property owner, was present.

Associate Planner Grabow presented facts and issues. Ms. Grabow conducted a site visit to evaluate proposed metal roof material. The proposed material was notably different than the existing wood shingles. Installation appeared to be substandard with corners not connecting and metal roof material being folded over portions of the fascia boards. Photos were provided to the Board for review and discussion.

Mr. Smith addressed the Board. He stated that he thought that appearance and not installation was the issue. He shared with the Board his photo album of properties with metal roofs installed by JN Davis Roofing.

Mr. Hensley stated that the request was for the Board to determine whether the metal roof material was an acceptable material in place of wood shingles.

Mr. Reed addressed the Board. He stated that application of any roof material other than existing will alter appearance of the roof. He did not understand why the Board was focusing on application over appearance as the metal roof material gives the appearance of wood shingles from a distance. He stated that with half of California burning, it would be odd to use wood shingles.

In response to Mr. Michaelis, Mr. Smith explained the installation and how the edge would look compared to the photo's staff took. He again referred to his photo album that showed photos of completed installs taken from a distance.

Mr. Sorcinelli had concerns that the metal roof did not appear to have edge metal, but was instead "folded" over the fascia. He stated that typically shake or tile roofs have separate edge piece of at least 1 ½ ".

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Mr. Smith stated that the metal roof would be almost identical to a comp roof as it is a "high end, expensive" roof and does have edge metal.

Mr. Coleman stated that there are no rakes on this project's roofs; therefore, there would be no areas where metal roof was folded over fascia.

Mr. Patel expressed concerns with the metal roof material proposed and the number of cuts required for installation on the multiple mansards at the property.

Mr. Smith stated that there would not be any problems with the mansards.

Mr. Michaelis asked what the property owner thought about the folded edge appearance of the metal roof. Mr. Reed stated that his client would find it unacceptable and expects installation to be done correctly. His client chose metal roof to reduce maintenance costs and reduce fire risk.

Mr. Coleman stated that he grew up in a house that had wood shake; however, despite his fondness for the material does not believe that wood shake should be used anymore due to its flammability. He stated that the application cannot be separated from appearance. Application does affect appearance for all exterior materials be it paint, or wood, or roofing. He noted that Mr. Smith admitted that

some of the photos showed poor application. He also noted that Mr. Reed too had stated he thought certain photos showed an application that would not be acceptable to his client, the property owner. He is not opposed to the metal roof as the application is not visible from the street.

The Board concurred that from the street the quality of application was not visible. Mr. Schoonover stated that he also conducted a site visit and concluded that from a distance the material appeared acceptable, but up close the quality was poor.

Mr. Patel stated that he supports the use of new materials, especially since wood shake has outlived its use. He expressed concerns with the number of mansards and many hips. He felt that this material was not ready to deal with this kind of architecture and workmanship would be a problem.

Mr. Michaelis stated that he is willing to try this material as was done with vinyl siding – to use this project as a test case for metal roofing.

Mr. Sorcinelli reminded the Board that vinyl siding was brought to the Board because it was in the Town Core and on a historic house; therefore, not a valid comparison. He stated that he has looked at many products out in the market to replace wood shake and none have been able to recreate the richness and beauty of wood shake. He added that the experience of the installers makes a big difference in dealing with complicated roofs. He concluded that the property owner saw fit to send his attorney to the meeting, and the attorney expressed a strong and positive opinion regarding the workmanship issues raised by the board, and stated that he would insure that the quality of the installation would be maintained by his oversight. Given the strong and positive opinion expressed by the applicant regarding this material he concluded that he would vote to let them make an attempt to achieve an acceptable installation which could be evaluated as a possible solution (or not) to similar future shake replacement projects. He viewed this material as replacement of wood shake and not setting a policy regarding metal roofing.

Motion: Curtis Morris moved, second by Dan Coleman to approve.

Motion carried 6.1.0.0. (Patel against.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m. to the meeting of July 24, 2008 at 8:30 a.m.