

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

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

PRESENT

*Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curtis Morris, Mayor
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works (Arrived at 8:40 A.M.)
M. Yunus Rahi, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

ABSENT

Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce

CALL TO ORDER

Curtis Morris 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, 2009. Motion carried 3.0.2.2. (Patel and Dilley absent and Rahi and Morris abstained)

Quorum not met for approval of minutes. Re-vote at next meeting on March 12, 2009.

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 09-04 (Previously 07-53)

Request to demolish and reconfigure a large portion of an existing 1,785 sq. ft. single family residence and add 1,315 sq. ft. of living space for a total of 3,100 sq. ft., an 800 sq. ft. attached garage and a 430 sq. ft. porch/patio, located at 745 North Walnut Road.

APN: 8392-009-102 Zone: Single Family 8,000 (SF)

Mark Pellegrino, applicant, was not present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that Case No. 07-53 was approved on November 20, 2007. The approval has expired and applicant is seeking re-approval. Mr. Espinoza stated no changes are proposed.

No questions from the Board.

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

Motion carried 5.0.2.0. (Patel and Dilley absent.)

DPRB Case No. 09-03, Tree Removal Permit No. 08-43

Request to remove 21 Eucalyptus trees along the west property line in order to construct a retaining wall which will support a block wall above with installation of barbed wire on the interior of the block wall, located at 800 West Cienega Avenue.

APN: 8685-006-813 Zone: Light Manufacturing (M-1)

Ms. Donna Lee, Southern California Regional Manager, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is requesting to construct a block wall along three sides of their property, install barbed wire and remove 21 Eucalyptus trees. Subject site has had a number of burglaries this past year and is looking to secure the property to prevent further break-in's.

Mr. Espinoza presented request to the Board. Site plan and photos were reviewed. He added that the allowance of barbed wire is not mentioned in the Code, but historically Staff has not allowed it in the City under Findings – Standard of Review, Code Sec. 18.12.060. Historically, fencing material for projects has been of a decorative material. Mr. Espinoza contacted four surrounding cities, City of La Verne, City of Glendora, City of Pomona and City of Covina, regarding their policy on the use of barbed wire to provide some comparison. Only City of La Verne and City of Covina allows barbed wire with condition that it not be seen from public right of way and in a specific zone or industrial zone only.

In response to Mr. Morris, Mr. Espinoza stated that the barbed wire would be barely visible to the public as it would be installed below the top of the wall.

Ms. Lee addressed the Board. She stated that the request is due to many thefts this past year. Facility is a service yard where materials and vehicles are stored. Copper wire has been stolen and vehicles have been broken into. Perpetrators have been cutting through existing chainlink fence. There is no full-time staff on property to monitor and secure the property. In response to Board questions, Ms. Lee added that barbed wire is not proposed on northerly property line and existing barbed wire was installed at a date unknown and without approvals.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed concerns with creating dead space between wall and adjacent buildings as it relates to maintenance and possible loitering and/or trespassing.

Also discussed was the v-ditch and ensuring adequate drainage for planters. The Board suggested a plan that could include incorporating the adjacent building wall while not negatively impacting it and eliminate the dead space.

Mr. Espinoza stated that the neighbor to the west came in and spoke to him this week. The neighbor did not express any objections to the proposal and supported the tree removal request in hopes of reduced amount of leaves to clean up.

In response to Board questions about replacement trees, Mr. Espinoza explained location and type of new trees on replacement plan.

Mr. Morris suggested that the appropriate number of trees be planted on property and not necessarily 2 for 1 if property could not handle that many trees. He added that he would like to see trees along the street instead in back of property.

Clarification was made by the Board in regards to planting along street. Only trees were suggested and not any additional landscaping.

Mr. Michaelis stated that barbed wire below the top of the wall was acceptable to him.

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Mr. Coleman stated that there is no prohibition in the code for barbed wire.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that perimeter trees soften industrial park feel and encouraged applicant to have perimeter trees as part of replacement plan.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, second by Krishna Patel to continue with applicant to work with Staff on revisions to the wall and tree replacement plan.

Motion carried 5.0.1.0. (Dilley absent)

DPRB Case No. 07-03

Request to remodel an existing single family residence and add 2,002 sq. ft., located at 237 West Baseline Road.

APN: 8661-010-004 Zone: Single Family Agricultural (SFA)

Dr. Kumar, property owner, was not present.
Jerry Fobio, project manager, was present.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that proposal for remodel and an addition were approved by the DPRB in February 2007. Construction has been completed, however, not in accordance with the approved plans. She added that based on the amount of alterations made, Staff felt it necessary to bring request to the

DPRB for further review. Alterations were made to front, rear and side elevations. Architectural details from original approval have been eliminated.

Mr. Fobrio addressed the Board. He stated that most of the changes were done at the request of the homeowner, Dr. Kumar, on a regular basis. He added that Dr. Kumar would not let him talk to planning. They originally had some windows with mullions, but Dr. Kumar had them take them out. He stated that there were some discrepancies on the plans, for example, he could not build the bay window per elevation as structural plans were different.

Associate Planner Lockett stated that she was the original planner on this project. Fred Diaz, architect, was original designer of plans. She stated that extensive preliminary review was done with Mr. Diaz in regards to architectural details and design.

Mr. Morris stated that he did not support project being built not per plan and applicant coming after the fact for approval. The DPRB authority has been undetermined. He felt that the original approval should mean something, otherwise what was the point of DPRB review? He suggested a stamp for approved plans that clearly states that no changes can be made prior to City approval, be considered for use by the Planning Department on approved plans.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that property is outside of the town core and not subject to the same kind of architectural guidelines. He added that he does not see the DPRB requiring applicant to go by original plans. He would be willing to review what is out there now and make a new approval.

In response to Mr. Rahi, Mr. Sorcinelli stated that DPRB should look at each feature to determine architectural faults. The photos are revealing, showing that alterations done were not to avoid cost, simply difference in taste. It appears that features were installed and then removed.

Mr. Coleman stated that he was in agreement with the Mayors comments and can not support request due to the number of alterations made. In response to Mr. Rahi, he stated that Staff has met with applicant prior to today's meeting.

Mr. Patel stated that the licensed contractor shares responsibility for what occurred and they should have talked to the City before making changes.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved to deny, second by Krishna Patel.

Motion carried 4.2.1.0. (Michaelis and Sorcinelli against. Dilley absent)

Mr. Michaelis suggested that findings for denial be included in denial.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that some of the changes were willful, but some were due to discrepancy on plans.

Mr. Patel stated he would like builder to respond to Staff's list of inconsistent items.

Motion: John Sorcinelli moved, second by Blaine Michaelis, for applicant to review and respond to Staff's list of inconsistent items as DPRB does not approve request as submitted.

Motion carried 6.0.1.0. (Dilley absent)

Mayor Morris stated that he could support Mr. Sorcinelli's motion and look at only things that can not be changed on the new plans. He added that the contractor had no right to build what ever they wanted without approval.

Discussion concluded with no further motions.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m. to the meeting of March 12, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.