

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
May 12, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Denis Bertone, City Council
Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Shari Garwick, Senior Engineer
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
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 8:34 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Scott Dilley, to approve minutes of March 24, 2011. Motion carried 4.0.0.3 (Bertone, Garwick and Sorcinelli Abstained)

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 11-10

A request to construct a 1,424 square foot rear addition located at 528 North San Dimas Avenue.

APN: 8387-005-008

Zone: Single Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Ted Lambros, Applicant, was present
Jason & Michelle Ritz, Resident, were present
Jenni & Raymond Schwach, Neighbors, were present

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the applicant is proposing a 1,424 sq. ft. rear addition to a historic home that is zoned Single Family Downtown Residential. She pointed out the key features of the home: low pitched front gabled roof that is supported by river rock piers topped with square wood columns, wood shingle siding and wood sash windows. She stated that the applicant is proposing to demolish the existing service porch because it does not match the current housing features. She added that the proposed addition is designed to match the architectural style of the residence with the use of: hung vinyl windows with wood trim, exterior cladding of Hardie shingle siding, stone veneer fireplace, gable detail on rear porch to match the front porch, and exposed rafter tails. She pointed out that the applicant is proposing a plywood column skirt to be used on the porch but noted that Staff recommends river rock material to be used in order to be consistent throughout the structure. She noted that the minimum driveway width is 12 feet, per Zoning Code; however currently the shared driveway is 10 feet. She recommended that the driveway be widened in order to comply with the code regulation.

Mr. Bertone asked if the applicant had any problems with Staff's recommendations.

Associate Planner Grabow responded that the applicant accepts all the recommendations.

Mr. Coleman asked if the Hardie matches the existing siding.

Associate Planner Grabow replied that the applicant and Staff will work together to find matching Hardie and added that when plans are submitted to plan check, they will reflect these changes.

Denis Bertone asked the square footage of the house.

Associate Planner Grabow responded 1,096 sq. ft.

Mr. Beilstein asked if the applicant has been made aware of the Mills Act.

Associate Planner Grabow replied that the applicant could still do the Mills Act aside from this addition.

Ms. Garwick asked stated any addition over 600 sq. ft. needs conditions from Public Works and asked for the following condition be added: for existing improvements within the limits of the development, such as streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, shall be repaired as determined by the Director of Public Works. All work adjacent to or within the right-of-way must meet the requirements specified in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (the Greenbook) with Los Angeles County Amendments and shall be subject to review and approval of Director of Public Works.

Mr. Coleman asked in reference to Condition No. 15, if it applies for the applicant, would the existing service need to be relocated.

Associate Planner Grabow replied that the condition is normally applied to new homes, but since this is a large addition, it is included as a standard condition.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the applicant is served only by the drop or are the neighbors also served by the drop.

Resident, Jason Ritz replied that he was not sure, but he thought it was only to his house.

Mr. Coleman briefly explained the Mills Act. He stated the home first needs to be listed as historical. He explained that the Mills Act is a state law that enables a homeowner of a structure to enter into an agreement with the City to preserve and maintain the home or structure. He noted that in the return, the homeowner receives a reduction in their property taxes. He noted that this would require the homeowner to spend their tax savings on preserving and/or restoring the historic structure.

Mr. Michaelis added that for the Mills Act, the homeowner needs to come up with a project list over a 10 year period. He noted that it can be expensive and that there are limits and restrictions.

Mr. Beilstein noted that there are restrictions and penalties too.

Jenni Schwach, neighbor, asked if the repairs can be done inside and outside of the home.

Mr. Coleman responded that the Mills Act applies to repairs inside or outside of the home and provided the example of repairing a roof or replacing built-in cabinets that have been removed in order to return house to original condition.

Mr. Michaelis added that the repairs are primarily for the exterior of the home.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked why vinyl windows were chosen.

Ted Lambros, applicant, replied that they cost less.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that windows are an important feature and are a major element on a home. He recommended the applicant not use vinyl windows and suggested looking at other options to offer a different ambience to the building. He recommended adding a condition to evaluate different options for window materials to be used with an emphasis on using wood-framed windows if financially feasible. He noted that siding and shingles can be replicated with Hardie materials.

Mr. Bertone commented that requiring underground utilities seems expensive and asked if it needs to be a requirement.

Associate Planner Grabow replied that for new homes, wires usually are underground. She noted that it seems expensive; however this addition is larger than the original house so Staff felt it should be added and reviewed by the Board.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that if the drop is moved, the meter box will need to be on an external wall.

Mr. Beilstein noted that the meter box location is determined by Edison.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the meter cannot be inside the home panel.

Michelle Ritz, resident, stated that the meter is located on the north side of the home.

Mr. Beilstein stated that in the past, requiring utilities to be undergrounded is discretionary based on a variety of factors.

Mr. Dilley agreed with Mr. Bertone that the expense would be great for the applicant.

MOTION: Moved by Denis Bertone, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve with conditions as follows: add new Condition No. 26, existing improvements within the limits of the development, such as streets, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, shall be repaired as determined by the Director of Public Works. All work adjacent to or within the public right-of-way must meet the requirements specified in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (the Greenbook) with Los Angeles County Amendments and shall be subject to review and approval of Director of Public Works; remove Condition No. 15; and new Condition No. 16, evaluate different options for window materials to be used with an emphasis on using wood-framed windows if financially feasible.

Motion carried 7.0

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:56 a.m. to the meeting of May 26, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.