

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

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
186 VILLAGE COURT
PUBLIC CONFERENCE ROOM, TEMPORARY CITY HALL

PRESENT

Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works (arrived 8:47 a.m.)
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

ABSENT

Emmett Badar, City Council

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Public Conference Room

HEARING

1. DPRB Case No. 10-35 and Tree Removal Application 11-06

A request to construct a new 6,428 sq. ft. single-family residence with a three-car garage, including the removal of nine (9) mature trees, located at 416 E. De Anza Heights Drive

APN: 8382-011-017

Zone: Single-Family Hillside, Private Horse Overlay

Steve Eide, Applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Kristi Grabow stated this is a request to build a new two-story house with a basement and three-car garage on a 1.3 acre parcel on De Anza Heights Drive. The proposed architectural style is Tuscan as outlined in the fact sheet. In the rear yard the applicant is proposing an exterior fireplace with a chimney that will be taller than 10 feet, which requires approval by DPRB. It will be located by the cabana, and the chimney will be 14 feet, 8 inches tall. Construction of the house and accessory buildings will require the removal of eight oak trees and one avocado tree, but a large oak grove will be preserved. The applicant is proposing to plant the replacement trees in the rear of the property. Staff recommends the Board recommend to the Planning Commission approval of DRPB Case No. 10-35 and approve Tree Removal Application 11-06.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Associate Planer Grabow stated the cabana will be located eight feet from the property line.

Steve Eide, Applicant, stated they designed the house without windows on the west side to provide privacy to the neighbor, and they will work around the oak trees as best they can to preserve them.

Mr. Beilstein stated he did not see anything in the fact sheet or conditions about the type of fuel to be used in the fireplace, but if it is going to be wood burning, there may be issues with SCAQMD.

Steve Eide, Applicant, thought it would be a gas fireplace.

Motion: Jim Schoonover moved, Blaine Michaelis seconded to recommend approval of DPRB Case No. 10-35 to the Planning Commission and approve Tree Removal Application 11-06. Motion carried 5-0-2 (Badar, Patel absent).

2. DPRB Case No. 10-36

A request to demolish and reconfigure the majority of an existing 1858 sq. ft. single-family residence and add 1,409 sq. ft. of living space for a total of 3,268 sq. ft., located at 1408 Windsor Drive.

APN: 8385-021-027

Zone: Single-Family 7500

Glen Salcedo, Architect, was present

Bill Sink, Neighbor, was present

Associate Planner Kristi Grabow stated the applicant had experienced fire damage to the house and wanted to add living space when addressing the needed repairs. The additional space will significantly change the appearance of the house, which is designed to have Spanish architectural features. The only concern Staff has is that the design features are only on the front elevation and it was felt they should be continued to all the other elevations.

Glen Salcedo, Architect, stated they did not have a problem with adding more architectural features around the house, it was that they were trying to focus the budget on the interior modifications and also didn't want to overpower the surrounding houses which did not have many details. He inquired about the necessity for a soils report since this was a remodel.

Mr. Beilstein stated that because this is beyond a small remodel and more like constructing a new house, a soils report is required.

Bill Sink, 1402 Windsor, stated he was in support of the proposed design and felt it would improve the neighborhood.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, Blaine Michaelis seconded, to approve DPRB Case No. 10-36 with the submitted conditions. Motion carried 5-0-2 (Badar, Patel absent).

* * * * *

Mr. Patel arrived at 8:47 a.m.

* * * * *

3. DPRB Case No. 10-37

A request to construct a 2,498 sq. ft. two-story addition to a single-family residence, located at 309 West Fifth Street.

APN: 8386-001-034

Zone: Specific Plan No. 3

Lolita Santiago, Owner, was present

Omar Marroquin, Architect, was present

Assistant Planner Michael Concepcion stated the request is to build a large addition to an existing one-story Craftsman style home located in the Town Core area and Specific Plan No. 3, and outlined the location for the addition, new garage and driveway area. He stated that while this house was constructed in 1921, it is not currently on the City's Historic Survey, probably due to past exterior modifications. The original horizontal siding was changed to board and batten by the previous owner, along with an unpermitted addition to the rear which is proposed for removal with this addition. The massing of the addition is consistent with the Town Core Design Guidelines.

He stated the applicant would like to continue with a board and batten design, with the battens spaced at 16 inches on both the existing house and scaling the two-story addition. However, Staff feels that since this is a Craftsman home, which emphasizes horizontal lines through the use of eave extensions, horizontal siding and low roof lines, the vertical battens scaling the height of the two-story addition is inconsistent with the original house. Also, since the proposed addition would more than triple the size of the house, Staff feels it should be reviewed comprehensively and consistency maintained around the whole structure.

Another issue concerns the windows. The current windows were changed to sliders (originally without permits, but retrofit in 2007 with permits) but Staff is recommending the windows be casement or hung windows, which is consistent with the Craftsman style and the Town Core Design Guidelines. Staff is also recommending minor relocation of the proposed retaining walls to ensure that they are built inside of the property line and prevent any drainage onto the neighboring property. It is also recommended that the proposed six-foot retaining wall in the rear be increased to eight feet to better fit the topography. This will help to reduce massing of the two-story structure and blend it into the hill. He presented an e-mail from the Barragans, who live at 313 W. Fifth Street, as part of the record, expressing their concerns over the height of the addition and grading, and the relocation of the driveway to the west side. He stated Staff is recommending approval subject to the conditions that horizontal siding be used on the whole structure, new windows be casement or hung style, and relocating the west retaining wall.

In response to Mr. Dilley, Assistant Planner Concepcion stated if the retaining wall was relocated as suggested, there might be areas that shrubs could be planted along the driveway, and there will be a landscape buffer area near the south end of the driveway.

Mr. Coleman added that if the neighbor does not allow the footings for the six-foot tall retaining wall to cross the property line, it could impact the viability for a planter, but the neighbor could always plant landscaping on their property for screening.

Mr. Beilstein stated since the neighbor's driveway would be right next to the new driveway, the retaining wall has to be designed to carry the vehicular load from the neighbor's surcharge. There also needs to be a rail on top of the retaining wall for the change of elevation at the property line.

In response to Mr. Patel, Mr. Beilstein stated it is a requirement on all grading plans to have a survey done five feet beyond the property line, though the conditions just say to comply with the Residential Code. Also, since this property does not have an existing garage and the new garage will be attached to the house, it will have to have fire sprinklers to comply with the new Residential Code.

In response to Mr. Patel, Mr. Coleman stated that the wording for Condition No. 28 is right out of the Municipal Code, and Mr. Beilstein concurred that it would be good to have this as a standard condition.

Mr. Patel stated the previous item had a condition under Parks and Recreation for a property development tax and asked if this project needed that as well.

Mr. Coleman concurred that condition should be added.

Lolita Santiago, Applicant, asked the Board to allow her to continue using board and batten, as it was the appearance of the house that influenced her decision to purchase it. She stated that board and batten was used on some Craftsman-style homes, though it is rare.

In response to Mr. Coleman's question regarding appropriate materials for Craftsman-style homes, Mr. Sorcinelli stated it would depend on how they wanted to view the original house. It appears the existing house did not qualify for status on the Historic Survey because of modifications so felt it may be difficult to return it to a status that it did not have. He stated he has a problem with the design and that it seemed rather crudely done. He felt that battens should be spaced at 12 inches, and should be $\frac{3}{4}$ inch thick, not a lath batten which is about $\frac{1}{4}$ inch in dimension. He was also concerned about the windows and thought the design seemed really busy and may be inappropriate.

Mr. Coleman stated the elevation drawings make it seem like they are proposing replacement of the existing windows.

Omar Marroquin, Architect, stated the two windows in the front have mullions, but the Planning Department wanted something different. Originally they asked to stucco the house but were told that would not be appropriate. They wanted the battens at 16 inches so they could nail them into the studs.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated the two front windows have mullions but were replacement windows. The windows on the side are plain glass.

Mr. Beilstein concurred with Mr. Sorcinelli that historically on board and batten the spacing would be at 12 inches. He stated that if the windows are to be hung windows in the addition, in order to achieve egress from the bedrooms they will need to be 4-1/2 to 5 feet tall.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated hung windows would have a totally different proportion than was shown on the elevation drawings and provide a completely different look to the house. He thinks the

elevations should be redrawn using the actual dimensions of the hung windows so the Board could evaluate the appearance.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that even though the house was modified to such an extent that it didn't qualify for the 1991 Historic Survey, at one time it was a Craftsman house and still exhibits that style. The issue for Staff is how much do you try to bring it back to how it was originally constructed, as well as staying consistent with the requirements of the Town Core Design Guidelines. Staff also considers how the Town Core Design Guidelines have been applied in the past and they try to meet as many of the requirements as possible. Staff's perspective on this application was to try and bring it back closer to how it was originally built.

Mr. Beilstein pointed out that new houses constructed within the Town Core area, such as on Commercial Street, have been required to be designed in historic styles such as Craftsman. He pointed out that the addition will be triple the size of the existing house, which is almost like building a new home.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the intended material when this was designed was to be Hardi-board.

Omar Marroquin, Architect, stated originally they wanted to use stucco because the owner was concerned about fire, but it was suggested that siding would be more appropriate so they wanted to use Hardi-board.

Mr. Beilstein was concerned that there may not be a smooth Hardi product in sheets, and that batten board should be a smooth texture with the batts over it, and not wood grain. He referred to the problems they had with Cinnamon Creek with the siding change-out and that the battens were added because it looked so poorly, which it still does if you get up close to it. That was only approved with the grained paneling because the contractor had already installed it without permits and it was a compromise. He stated that from a structural standpoint, they will be using plywood for the sheer walls, so adding Hardi-board would create a double cladding. Usually you could use the plywood as the sheer wall and apply the battens over it.

Mr. Coleman and Mr. Patel stated they would not object to the battens being placed at 16 inch intervals.

Mr. Coleman stated in response to the concerns expressed by the neighbors, the height of the new addition at 26 feet is nine feet less than is allowed by the zone. The structure is also set back quite a bit from the property line for the majority of the structure, and the neighbor does not have a recorded view easement. He stated that leaving the floor level at the same height as the existing floor and cutting into the hill helps to reduce the height and mass. He also felt the relocation of the driveway was not an issue because not only does it back up to the neighbors existing driveway, if it were left on the east side of the property, it would push the house closer to the neighbor's property.

Mr. Sorcinelli felt there is a question in regards to the appearance of the material and felt the applicant should provide the Board with a mock-up using the Hardi-board since there is concern there may not be a smooth Hardi product available. He would like to see that before moving forward. He was also concerned that if they are going to use hung windows, they should explore what they would look like with the battens as the windows would be taller and narrower than shown on the drawings. He would also recommend looking more carefully at the building details such as the use of gable vents rather than metal roof vents. Possibly they could design

an architectural feature with the gable vents similar to the ones on the existing house. He felt the garage door could be more attractive and wanted to really consider the windows in terms of how they are divided and with their placement relative to the doors, and evaluate that further.

Motion: Mr. Sorcinelli moved, Mr. Coleman seconded to bring back revised drawings showing the actual dimensions of using hung windows, gable vents incorporating some type of architectural detail instead of roof mounted vents, a mock-up showing the Hardi product to be used, and drawings showing the battens placed at 12 inches and at 16 inches and how they relate to other features on the building such as windows and doors. Motion carried 6-0-1 (Badar absent).

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a.m. to the meeting of February 2, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.