

**CITY OF SAN DIMAS  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
February 10, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.  
186 VILLAGE COURT  
PUBLIC CONFERENCE ROOM, TEMPORARY CITY HALL**

---

---

**PRESENT**

*Emmett Badar, City Council  
Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Ken Duran, Assistant City Manager  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

**CALL TO ORDER**

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:37 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Public Conference room.

**HEARING ITEMS**

**DPRB Case No. 10-39**

Request to build a 471 square foot addition and a 460 square foot detached garage at 225 North Iglesia Street.

APN: 8387-013-001 Zone: Single Family-7500

Shaunt Yemenjian, Spacio Design, representing the applicant, was present.

Assistant Planner Michael Concepcion stated the applicant is proposing to construct a 471 sq. ft. addition on the north side of the existing 1901 Colonial Revival house located on the southwest corner of Third and Iglesia Street, with a new detached garage taking access from the alley. The current rear setback of the existing house is two feet. In the SF-7500 zone there are no zoning standards for rear setbacks; however, there are Building Code standards that need to be met. The applicant wishes to continue the rear wall with a two-foot setback which would require one-hour fire-rated construction. The applicant submitted revised plans two days ago to Staff to address comments in the staff report. The garage now has a 20 x 20 foot interior clear space so it meets zoning code requirements, along with revised wall and soffit details on the house.

He stated Staff cannot support the current proposal from the applicant because not only are there issues with meeting the one-hour fire-rated construction at the two-foot setback, but the eave projection is only one foot away from the property line and the Residential Building Code requires all projections to be a minimum two feet away. There is also the issue of not having enough space for construction or maintenance of the addition if it is only two feet away from the rear property line. Staff recommends at least three feet of clearance from the property line for access to the addition.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated Staff prefers Option A which has the wall located five feet from property line and the eave projection at four feet. This option meets Building Code requirements and would not need one-hour fire-rated construction, thus allowing compatible construction materials, i.e., wood siding and open eaves. The drawback is that the interior layout would need to be modified. Option B places the wall at three feet from property line and eave projection at two feet. This would require one-hour fire-rated construction, but that can be accomplished by using Hardie products and enclosing the eave projection. It would also allow enough space for construction and maintenance. The applicant's proposal at two feet would also require a recorded access easement from the neighbor for construction and maintenance.

In response to Chairman Schoonover, Assistant Planner Concepcion stated all the options have been discussed with the applicant, and while the applicant would prefer their original proposal, if they cannot have that, they would prefer Option B over Staff's recommended Option A.

Mr. Duran wanted to clarify that the Board could not approve the applicant's proposal because it did not meet the Building Code.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that is correct; thus the applicant would prefer Option B. In response to Mr. Patel, both Option A and Option B meet the required 20 foot front yard setback.

Mr. Coleman stated the new wall details show the transition from the wood siding to the Hardie board, which address his concerns about transition between the two materials.

Shaunt Yemenjian, applicant, stated there will be a contoured edge to transition the materials. His clients would prefer their proposal as it would make the addition match the existing house. He also expressed concerns that moving the wall would create issues for the ridgeline of the roof and aesthetically impact the design.

Mr. Coleman stated the problem is the proposal does not meet the Building Code for the eave projection and felt that having a zero eave would be worse than a one-foot offset.

Assistant Planner Concepcion added that the Secretary of Interior Standards for additions to historic properties stated while additions should be compatible, they should not match the existing house precisely so that it can be seen where an addition has occurred. Options A or B would meet those standards.

Building Official Eric Beilstein presented options for construction that would preserve the ridgeline, and in response to Mr. Sorcinelli stated the Historic Building Code was to address issues regarding items that are part of the historic fabric of a building, such as window sizes. It would be difficult to use that code to circumvent a fire code

requirement. The overlying fact is that per the Building Code no structure can be closer than two feet to the property line, and applicant's proposal would have the eave projection at one foot.

Mr. Coleman felt a two-foot setback was insufficient to access for the homeowners, inspectors, firefighters, etc. Having a three-foot setback would be more functional.

Mr. Beilstein discussed other projects that have used a "no-build" easement when the buildings were located in the required setback area, which could be an option here. Mr. Coleman stated while that is an option, they would have to review it further and see how this might impact the neighboring property.

Shaunt Yemenjian stated he would be willing to do a massing study showing the new elevation and how it would appear with the fascia adjusted. He didn't think it would be aesthetically pleasing, but would be willing to submit it to move the project forward.

**MOTION:** Moved by Mr. Coleman, seconded by Mr. Patel to direct the applicant to pursue Option B and resubmit revised plans for the Board to review.

Mr. Badar asked if Option A was Staff's preferred choice, why was Mr. Coleman supportive of Option B.

Mr. Coleman stated Option A would allow the applicant to use wood siding, and originally he had concerns about the transition to the Hardie board based on the information available at the time the report was written. The new drawings were submitted after distribution of the agenda packets. After seeing the revisions with the proposed material transition, he felt that Option B could be an acceptable option.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated from a historical perspective, Option A was preferred because they could continue to use wood products on the exterior of the addition but it would have an impact on the floor plan. Option B is the middle ground between the applicant's proposal and Staff's recommendation.

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Assistant Planner Concepcion stated the front yard setback on Third Street is 20 feet, but because this house faces Iglesia, Third Street is the side yard and there is only a 10-foot setback required.

Mr. Sorcinelli presented options regarding stepping back the portion of the addition that was next to the neighboring structure and pushing it out again once they reached the neighbor's 20-foot setback area because he felt that was effectively the same as a "no-build" zone.

Shaunt Yemenjian stated that while that was an interesting idea, he would still want to keep the fascia in a continuous plane.

Mr. Coleman felt they still need an access easement from the neighbor for that area.

Mr. Beilstein stated the setback is a zoning requirement, not a building code requirement, and it could not be guaranteed to always remain the same. Without some type of recorded document such as an access easement, you cannot guarantee that clear area, and you may be taking rights from the neighbor.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated he would like Staff to consult with the City Attorney to see if the front setback requirement would insure a “no-build” zone for the purpose of building closer to the property line.

Mr. Beilstein stated he could support Option B and encourage the applicant to move the front building plane six inches to the east to minimize lost interior space.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked to have the motion amended to approve Option B and direct Staff to review the revised drawings, and only bring back to the Board if they have concerns.

Mr. Coleman did not approve amending his original motion.

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:36 a.m. to the meeting of February 24, 2011, at 8:30 a.m.