

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

**Thursday September 24, 2009 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 8:35 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of August 27, 2009 continued to meeting of October 15, 2009.

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 09-12

Request to construct a 55-foot monopine wireless communications facility located at 125 East Gladstone Street (Wesleyan Church).

APN: 8392-009-060, 061 Zone: SF-7500

Maryann Harwood, Reliant Land Services, Inc., was present.

Susan Chong, Reliant Land Services, Inc., was present.

John Sorcinelli, 149 West Gladstone Street.

John Sorcinelli recused himself as a member of the board as he resides within 500' of project.

Associate Planner Grabow presented proposal. She explained that monopines have not been approved or encouraged in the past due negative visual impact. She stated that the current proposal differs from past proposals based on site, location of monopine and features of the monopine. Staff issues with proposal were the equipment enclosure which is being addressed by Condition No. 9 by requiring a trellis feature on top of the equipment structure for architectural enhancement and to screen the chainlink lid.

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Ms. Grabow stated that poor design of monopines submitted in the past were main reason for denials. She stated that public art, or as a feature on a structure, were encouraged instead. She stated that this proposal blends with surrounding area and is being considered as public art

Ms. Harwood, Reliant Land Services, Inc. for T-Mobile, handed out PowerPoint printout to the Board. She stated that there is a need for coverage in this area for T-Mobile and that this monopine design blends well with the adjacent trees at this location. In response to Mr. Coleman, she stated that she has not seen a mono-oak design available and the cost for this monopine is approximately \$500,000. A custom design such as a water tower would be significantly more. In response to Mr. Beilstein, City of San Dimas Building Official, cabling, trays and boxes will be hidden from view with the trunk tapering towards the top.

Mr. Sorcinelli, 149 West Gladstone, addressed the Board. He stated that the policy to date regarding monopines has been good and successful and considers this location to be a gateway to the City. He expressed concern with setting a precedence by allowing monopines and the visual impact of the monopine to surrounding area. He stated that he does not view the monopine as public art and requests that the DPRB deny proposal.

Mr. Coleman stated that he met with Krishna Patel, Public Works Director, prior to this meeting. He stated that they both felt that the height seemed excessive for being at the crest of a hill.

Mr. Patel arrived at 8:55 A.M.. He stated he supports public art, not monopine design for cell sites.

Donald Hudson, San Dimas Wesleyan Church, stated that the original location of northeast corner was preferred.

Ms. Harwood, Reliant Land Services, Inc., stated that a cross structure at the northeast corner of the property would have stood out more and the monopine at the proposed location blends better and has the least visual impact.

Mayor Morris stated that he has family members that are members of this church and a nephew that does pro bono work for the church. He stated that he had no prior knowledge of the proposal prior to today's meeting.

Mr. Schoonover stated that he does not support the monopine design for cell sites and is concerned with not maintaining current policy.

Mr. Michaelis stated that current cell sites such as the clock tower, water tower and windmill are more of an architectural feature than public art. He stated that we have not achieved "public art" with current cell sites. In addition, he stated that the monopine design blends better as it adds another "tree" and that there is a need for additional cell sites to support mobile phone technology.

Motion: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Scott Dilley to recommend approval of DPRB 09-12 and CUP 09-02 to Planning Commission.

Motion carried 4.2.0.1. (Patel and Schoonover against. Sorcinelli abstained)

DPRB Case No. 09-17

Continued from July 23, 2009. Request to legalize an existing retaining wall located at 784 North San Dimas Avenue. APN: 8392-009-099 Zone: SF-7500

Zack and Olga Mazraani, applicant, were present.

Raymond Ussef, 778 North San Dimas Avenue, was present.

Tim Good, architect, was present.

Mike Parker, certified arborist, was present.

John Sorcinelli recused himself as a member of the board as he resides within 500' of project.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that this item was previously continued at the request of the applicant. Ms. Grabow presented background of non-permitted construction of retaining wall. Issues of proposal are

location of wall in relation to drip line of four (4) oak trees and building permit requirements for the wall that supports a surcharge.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Mr. Beilstein, City of San Dimas Building Official, confirmed that he had personally inspected the retaining wall and slope, and taken the slope grade measurements shown on the photograph exhibits.

Mr. Beilstein, stated that wall is not exempt from building permit requirement as it supports a surcharge (slope). In order to obtain a building permit for the wall, the applicant needs to submit a copy of the soils report, block manufacturer data and copy of the recent survey. Calculations would then be reviewed for approval and/or adjusted as necessary. The calculations would have to come from an engineer as the product used is not pre-designed to support a surcharge. He pointed out that there were a couple of benefits to this type of wall in allowing for weeping (water drainage) and no footing cut is done.

Zack Mazraani, applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that wall is exempt from building permit requirement as more than 5' level behind the wall. He stated that he did not want the expense of a soils report and building permit.

Mayor Morris noted that area behind wall was measured at up to 14% which did not seem flat.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the wall is not exempt as level condition does not exist, and a new complete report was not necessary (existing soils report only).

Mr. Patel noted that it was unusual that the natural slope ended at the property line which suggests that the slope had been cut.

Mike Parker, certified arborist for applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that minimal backfill was used and is more of a benefit for the trees than not. He stated that he found no root system when he dug towards the trunk. Pea gravel was used and the wall supports the pea gravel and not the slope.

Mr. Coleman stated that he found the arborist report compelling as it states that no roots were removed and trees had not been damaged by construction of the wall.

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

Motion carried 6.0.0.1. (Sorcinelli abstained)

Rear Yard Fencing Policy

Request to establish a policy for rear yard fencing for properties on East Ghent Street that abut East Gladstone between Delancey Street and San Dimas Canyon Road.

Associate Planner Lockett presented photos of fencing along East Gladstone between Delancey and San Dimas Canyon Road. Ms. Lockett stated that a proposal from resident at 546 East Ghent Street prompted review of fencing along this section of East Gladstone. She explained that the goal is to establish a policy that would create an attractive and cohesive streetscape at the pedestrian level. It is believed that since the properties on East Ghent have large front yard setbacks, we may see more proposals to construct retaining walls in the rear yard to maximize usable areas.

The Board reviewed photos and discussed proposed policy. Ms. Lockett stated that there were four (4) of the sixteen (16) properties that would not comply with proposed policy. She stated that the policy could be applied to these properties over time as they submit proposals for improvements to the backyard.

The Board continued discussion about how City could control when walls and fences up to 6 feet high do not require a building permit. Also recommended to be added to fencing policy: Walls to return to perimeter wall of adjacent properties, two approvable colors, splitface block with cap (slump 2" or 4"). For ornamental iron fence, require ladder horizontal fence 4" on center, color black. The Board agreed that 5' setback was acceptable and consider varying heights of the retaining walls.

Discussion concluded with Staff to bring back revised policy with cross sections to Board for final review.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 a.m. to the meeting of October 15, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.