

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

**Thursday March 12, 2009 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

---

**PRESENT**

*Emmett Badar, Mayor Pro Tem  
Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

**ABSENT**

*Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works*

**CALL TO ORDER**

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:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Blaine Michaelis, to approve minutes of January 22, 2008. Motion Carried 6.0.1.0. (Patel absent)

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Blaine Michaelis, to approve minutes of February 12, 2009. Patel absent. Dilley, Schoonover and Badar abstained. Quorum not met. Re-vote next meeting.

**HEARING ITEMS**

**DPRB Case No. 08-17**

**Continued from August 28, 2008.** Request to construct three (3) two-story single family homes with detached garages located at 203, 223, 237 Cannon Avenue. APN: 8382-013-053, 054, 055 Zone: SF-10,000

Jay Crawford, architect, was present.

Otis Lacy, Nancy Novak, Karl Findley, Sonya Johnston, Shawn Findley and Mary Helen Soto, Pom-L Incorporated, were present.

Associate Planner Grabow presented facts and issues of project since February 23, 2006 to present. Mass and bulk continue to be an issue. Foundation wall on the rear elevation of Lot 1 is an issue as it ranges in height from 20' to 8.5'. Traffic Safety Committee reviewed proposal at its September 17, 2008 meeting. Proposal, having met City standards, was approved by the Traffic Safety Committee at its meeting of February 18, 2009.

In response to Development Services Director Coleman, Ms. Grabow stated that proposal does not exceed 35' maximum height allowed per zoning code.

Mr. Crawford, architect, addressed the Board. He presented the Board with the following timeline:

*"March 11,2009*

#### *Puddingstone II Chronology*

*11-28-05 Meeting with Laura Lockett to review initial conceptual design. She wanted the house and garage pushed down the slope so it would not be visible from the street. We explained how that cannot be done physically with driveway grades.*

*2-23-06 DRB Meeting. Architectural drawings only were presented. The concept was a two story house with the upper level slightly above Canon for positive drainage to Cannon. DRB thought the front elevation was fine. They would like more of a split level design to bring the house closer to the slope, no drainage on to Cannon, models so they could understand the building better and it's relationship to the slope. They agreed to review one house initially so we wouldn't waste time or money doing all three houses and find they still didn't meet the boards ideas.*

*9-14-06 DRB review of lot 1 model, floor plans and rendered front and rear elevations with planting. The board thought we had listened to them and made a lot of good changes. They said the concept was fine and we should submit models of the next two houses. Because there are no flat backyards, they asked us to create as many deck areas as possible. We mentioned that it would push us to the edge of the allowable coverage, but they felt the decks were important*

*for livability. The board also requested a site plan showing our houses proximity to adjacent houses.*

*10-2-07 DRB meeting with three models and professional renderings of all three houses. The board liked all three houses. The major concern was off street parking. The Planning Department board member wanted driveways dimensioned and actual cars shown in parking spaces so that parking spaces were evident. The board wanted as many off-street spaces as possible. The board said we did not have to count the rear stairs in coverage calculations.*

*8-28-08 DRB meeting. Most of the members were new. The miscellaneous changes to parking and parking backup that the planning staff asked for were discussed. The Planning Staff board member stated that the design and massing of the houses were never approved and needed to be redesigned. He then said we should meet with the Traffic Safety Committee to discuss the car circulation and maneuvering of cars on to Cannon. This made no sense since he said we haven't been approved for the housing design but we complied and were approved."*

The Board clarified to Mr. Crawford that meeting held on October 2, 2007 was not a Development Plan Review Board (DPRB) meeting. DPRB meets on the second and fourth Thursday of each month at 8:30 A.M. with the exception of Thanksgiving and Christmas week when it meets on the fourth Tuesday. October 2, 2007 fell on the first Tuesday of that month.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Mr. Crawford stated that native landscaping, similar to existing motif, was discussed and planned with client for this project and that there were no plans for a pool at any of the three homes.

Mr. Schoonover read out aloud letter dated September 24, 2007 from Craig Hensley to Ms. Novak:

*"September 24, 2007*

*Nancy Novak  
Cameron Properties  
973 E. Badillo Avenue; Suite A  
Covina, CA 91724*

*Re: DPRB Case No. 05-08 - INCOMPLETE  
Three Houses 205,223 & 237 Cannon Drive*

*Dear Ms Novak:*

*Thank you for submitting revised plans on August 31,2007. Previously, you*

*submitted plans on July 5, 2007 that, in part, addressed the Development Plan Review Board comments at its September 14, 2006 meeting. That submittal was also deemed incomplete.*

*The plans are still not compete; however, there appears to have been an attempt to address some items. Therefore, you may wish to make additional revisions that address the following items.*

*. Lots 1 & 2 exceed the maximum lot coverage allowed by San Dimas Municipal Code of 35%.*

*. The vicinity map appears to be an aerial of the site. While this is a helpful exhibit, this is not an acceptable overall site plan for especially for Lots 2 & 3. The site plan is so limited it is totally unclear as to how access works.*

*. Retaining wall heights are not clear on the plans. The height of retaining walls is important to allow the Board to clearly understand the impact of the proposal on the neighboring properties.*

*. Provide information as to how the property will access all utilities. This information was requested by DPRB at its February 23, 2006 meeting, again requested at the September 14, 2006 DPRB meeting and requested in the July 10, 2007 letter. It has still has not been provided.*

*It appears that the plans continue to be incomplete and we hope that our communication has been clear. If it would help to have a meeting in person, we would be happy to participate in an effort to fully explain the details of the incomplete issues and to provide you with examples of complete plan sets.*

*Please contact me if you have any questions, or if you would like to set up a meeting at 909.394.6253.*

*Sincerely,*

*Craig Hensley, AICP  
Planning Manager"*

Mr. Crawford stated that utilities were not shown on plans because he wanted Board to buy off on this proposal first. He added that he thought the old Board said that they could "live" with the siting of homes.

Mr. Coleman stated that he thought the homes were attractive, but concerned with the height of the walls. He noted that two of the lots appeared screened from view from the condo's below by existing Oak trees. Overall he supports the project.

Mr. Schoonover stated that he remembers discussions about mass and bulk and concerns about the impact on the Tiburon development just below the project.

Mr. Coleman stated that he could recall several DPRB projects that had large walls due to challenging lots with steep slopes.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented on models and color renderings. He stated that some changes could be made to the roofs and decks to improve on the elevations. He added that massing as been addressed and encourages applicant to improve on rear elevations, Lot 1 in particular, with the use of vegetation and other features to break up the wall.

Mr. Michaelis asked Mr. Sorcinelli to comment on Lot 3. In response, Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the massing is broken up with horizontal elements, with house trying to readjust and conform to the hill. Lot 2 does this well. Lot 1 is not as terraced as Lot 3.

In response to Mr. Badar, Ms. Grabow stated that conclusion to deny was reached after meetings with Mr. Coleman and Mr. Hensley as nothing had changed enough to the satisfaction of Staff.

Mr. Michaelis stated that this is a difficult property. The project calls for significant stem walls. Comments have been helpful and architect has been making changes. Suggested where structures can not be setback, use landscaping to screen and or reduce size of house. Feels that project is getting closer to an approval.

Mr. Badar stated that these are difficult lots, but something definitive needs to be done and move project forward.

**Motion:** Emmett Badar moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve conceptual plans and directed staff to bring back conditions of approval.

Motion carried 6.0.0.0.

Mr. Schoonover added that the square footage increases have been in deck sizes as recommended by the Board. He still had some concerns with Lot 1, but ok with Lots 2 & 3.

Mr. Coleman stated that draft conditions will be sent to applicant for review prior to project being heard at the next DPRB meeting.

**DPRB Case No. 07-03**

Request to remodel existing single family house and add 2,002 sq. ft. located at 237 West Baseline Road. APN: 8661-010-004 Zone: Single Family Agricultural (SFA).

Dr. Kumar, applicant, was present.

Tracy & Jerry Fabio, contractors, were present.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that applicant met with Staff on February 19, 2009. A comprise for all items except one resulted. Issue to discuss today is the columns at the main entry. Applicant proposes two alternatives to Staff's recommendation of keeping the circular columns that are consistent with Spanish architecture details of the house and was a previously approved feature by the Board.

Applicant submitted a third option after agenda packet had already gone out last week. This option would keep French doors on pop-out and add ornamental iron fence in front.

Mr. Coleman stated that numerous non-approved changes were made with only archway and one window addressed. He added that the square columns were consistent with what is happening on the front elevation.

In response to Mr. Badar, Ms. Grabow stated that all the changes done were discussed with applicant since last DPRB meeting and are supported by Staff.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the shadows were not drawn well on the elevations. There are qualities that we can not see on the elevations that are visible on the photos. He favors square columns. He does not favor the grid on the window or three entrances on the front elevation. He suggested that a low stucco wall be constructed on the front elevation to screen the pop-out entrance and bedroom entrance in order to create a private area as seen in Spanish Colonial architecture.

**Motion:** John Sorcinelli moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve changes with the following:

- Applicant to work with Staff on screening the two additional entrances with a low stucco wall on the front elevation that relates to the wall on the opposite side of the main entrance;
- Columns on the main entry to be square with higher decorative capitals;
- Applicant to work with Staff on path of low wall to create a patio on the interior side and landscaping on the exterior side of the wall.

Motion carried 5.1.1.0. (Patel absent. Coleman against.)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m. to the meeting of March 26, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.