

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

**Thursday, April 22, 2010 at 8:30 A.M.
186 VILLAGE COURT
PUBLIC CONFERENCE ROOM, TEMPORARY CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Emmett Badar, City Council
Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent
Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
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

Quorum not met.

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 10-07

Request to grade the rear portion of a single-family residence into terraces, approximately 190 feet long by 90 feet wide, for the purpose of planting fruit trees located at 523 Puddingstone Drive.

APN: 8382-017-007 Zone: Specific Plan No. 8

Perry Youssefy, applicant/property owner, was present.

Terry Connelly, landscape designer for applicant, was present.

Residents directly north of subject property present:

Gil Aguirre, 476 Cannon Avenue.

Cheryl Smola, 488 Cannon Avenue.

Associate Planner, Marco Espinoza, stated that grading of the rear portion of the lot began without building permits. Applicant has proposed six (6) flat terraces that would be accessed via a decomposed granite walkway on the flat portions of the terraces with concrete stairs on the slopes. He continued, stating that the proposed terraces would modify a large portion of the lot and change the characteristic of the hillside from natural to engineered. The proposed grading does not meet the intent and purpose of the Specific Plan nor the grading design sections of the code. In addition, he stated that Staff was not aware of any other properties within this Specific Plan that have similar approved grading.

Mr. Youssefy addressed the Board. He stated that he thought he did not need a permit for the grading. He explained that the purpose of the grading was to plant trees and a garden that would be easy for he and his wife to use in retirement.

Mr. Connelly addressed the Board. He stated that lessening the terracing would not improve visual impact of hillside. He stated that he would plant accordingly, rustic in appearance instead of the commercial look that is presented.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Mr. Connelly stated that he was not a licensed landscape architect, but one could be arranged.

Mr. Coleman explained that this project requires that plans be drawn up by a licensed landscape architect to meet State of California's new Model Water Efficiency Ordinance requirements.

Ms. Smola, 488 Cannon Avenue, stated that since the recent rains, the large holes that were dug by applicant have filled up with water. She believes that this has contributed to a proliferation of mosquitoes. She made it clear that she did not call in any complaints regarding the grading work done. The visual and environmental impact to her property is of great concern to her.

Mr. Aguirre, 476 Cannon Avenue, stated that work continued at subject property even after stop work notice was given. He is opposed to the

proposal and it does not comply with the intent of Specific Plan No. 8. He stated that terracing does not exist anywhere else in this zone and that the hillside needs to be protected. The “family garden” that applicant is proposing should be built on existing flat area and not on hillside. He felt that any grading undermines his property which is anchored to subject property. He also wanted run-off problems to be addressed.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the following needed to be done to obtain approvals, permits and certification:

1. Survey report.
2. Soils compaction report.
3. Grading permit and certification.
4. Access Agreement for approval of equipment encroachment on adjacent properties.

He stated that the amount of work proposed and already done exceeds threshold of code.

Mr. Coleman stated that it will be very difficult to get equipment up on hillside with the existing holes that have been dug to achieve what applicant proposes to do.

Mr. Patel stated that the hillside is bedrock and slide conditions exist when applying soil onto the top of bedrock. The property is too steep to contour. Illegal grading has triggered need for surveys and certified reports.

In response to Mr. Michaelis, Mr. Coleman explained that due to the amount of unpermitted work already done, planting tree’s without terracing is not an option at this point.

Mr. Badar stated that he felt that this item was before the Board prematurely and that applicant should have worked with Staff more to come up with proposal that was compatible with the specific plan.

Motion: Emmett moved to deny, second by Dan Coleman.

Motion carried 6.1.0.0. (Sorcinelli against)

Appeal process was explained to applicant. Code Enforcement action would commence next requiring that applicant restore hillside.

DPRB Case No. 10-06

Request to construct a 65-foot high stealth wireless telecommunication facility resembling a water tower that includes a block wall enclosure to house the mechanical equipment located at 186 Village Court.

APN: 8386-008-057 Zone: Creative Growth, Area 1

Joe Spieler, Avila for T-Mobile West Corporation, was present.

Associate Planner Marco Espinoza presented proposal. He stated that the proposed project meets the intent of the design guidelines sections of the code with some issues to work out with Staff and the Board.

He explained that the angle of the support legs should be more angled, but due to existing easements on the property, alternative locations were not feasible. The diameter of the water pipe is out of scale and needs to be reviewed. The Board also needs to discuss appropriate city identification logo on the water tower.

Mr. Spieler addressed the Board. He stated that they have been working with Staff on possible sites, this this site ultimately meeting their requirements. In considering the Lowe's freeway sign, it was determined that they would not be able to transmit due to electrical interference. The current mass and height of proposed water tower is required to meet the needs of two carriers.

Mr. Espinoza handed out crate label art examples to the Board to consider for the water tower.

Mr. Patel encouraged the Board to consider something else than water tower design as the City already has three.

Mr. Sorcinelli suggested that the Board consider transportation logo/art. He also suggested that applicant consider adding horizontal bands on the tank to break up the visual scale. He suggested, via sketch, angling the tower legs by tapering the tower legs near the top and then widening to keep the water tank platform at its current size.

Motion: John Sorcinelli moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve with the following:

1. Minimize the diameter of the pipe, with option of two pipes if necessary;
2. Add horizontal bands to the water tank to reduce visual scale;
3. Applicant to work with Staff on design that incorporates splayed legs

- as suggested by the Board;
4. Graphic concept to come back to the Board for final review.

Motion Carried 7.0.0.0.

DPRB Case No. 09-28

Request to change equipment enclosure material located at 299 East Foothill Boulevard (San Dimas Equestrian Center.)

APN: 8665-008-017 Zone: Light Agricultural

Susan Chong, T-Mobile, was present.

Associate Planner, Laura Lockett, explained that during the plan check process, the approved material of high pressure foam could not be used as an all weather material for the equipment enclosure. The applicant is requesting to use a composite material called "Trex". Issues of Staff are that Trex can only be painted once it has faded. This would be an issue if enclosure was subject to graffiti as well. The long term viability of Trex is another issue based on 2004 Class Action Law Suit against Trex regarding warping, fading, mold and rot. This suit was settled out of court.

Mr. Beilstein stated that Trex was not consistent with the existing tower material and that wood would be the most appropriate to match existing legs of the tower.

Mr. Sorcinelli felt did not like the vinyl appearance of Trex and was concerned that it would not match existing.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve change of material for the equipment enclosure to a 2" x 8" or greater wood board with appropriate staining and weathering to match legs of the existing water tower.

Motion carried 7.0.0.0.

Town Core Design Guidelines

Establishing new guidelines for Fences & Walls within the Town Core Design Guidelines.

Assistant Planner, Michael Concepcion explained that fencing and walls are significant contributors to the Town Core's streetscape. Currently there are many different kinds of fencing and walls ranging from chain link and wood fencing to river rock stone walls in the Town Core. Staff felt it necessary to introduce guidelines to specifically address fencing walls that are appropriate for the Town Core.

The Board viewed types of fencing and walls and possible guidelines.

Vinyl Fencing

Mr. Coleman stated that he did not support mixing vinyl fencing with wood fencing in the Town Core.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that vinyl fencing is typically prohibited in historic neighborhoods. Vinyl fences are not neighbor friendly as they are highly reflective due to their smooth, shiny surface. Emphasis should be to encourage a natural palette to retain the character that exists in the Town Core.

Mr. Michaelis stated that there have been marked improvements in vinyl fencing and that these improvements should be considered.

The consensus of the Board was to prohibit smooth, shiny white vinyl fencing.

Concrete Block Walls

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that precision block was used in the early 1900's. Suggested to add wording to address existing conditions of precision block walls.

Mr. Beilstein suggested that design approval be required for all types of fences and walls.

Chainlink Fencing

If existing condition, allow for repairs. Not allow for new fences.

In response to Mr. Patel, Mr. Coleman stated that with alley encroachments, the City may replace like for like.

Issues to be further considered by Staff and brought back to the Board:

- Cost
- Code Enforcement
- Special Circumstances
- Review requirements
- City-wide vs. Town Core
- Glass walls
- City-wide noticing: e-blast, newsletter, website

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m. to the meeting of May 13, 2010 at 8:30 a.m.