

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
July 14, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curt Morris, Mayor (Arrived at 8:45 a.m.)
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

ABSENT

Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce

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.

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 11-23

A request to construct a new patio, retaining walls, and steps in the rear yard located at 302 Via Blanca.

APN: 8448-031-032

Zone: Specific Plan No. 5

Roy McGarrell, applicant, was present

Associate Planner Kristi stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a new 4-foot high retaining wall in the rear yard which will have a more decorative backyard layout. She added that the applicant will also build a new solid roof patio within the Specific Plan 5, Estate Area Zone. She pointed out that any new retaining walls require DPRB approval but the patio does not require DPRB approval but is included so that the Board can see the overall design of the back yard. She added that the proposed retaining wall will have stucco cladding to match the existing residence. She informed the Board that the previous owner received DPRB approval in 2007 that used retaining walls ranging in

height from 12 to 14 feet. She stated that the current issue is that the applicant is proposing a brick cap on the retaining walls and Staff would like to see the existing stucco wall have a brick cap installed to match; thus a condition has been added to reflect that.

Mr. Patel asked if landscaping plans will be presented to the Board.

Associate Planner Grabow responded that they will be reviewed at Staff level.

MOTION: Moved by Blaine Michaelis, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve with standard conditions.

Motion carried 5-0-2-0 (Morris and Dilley Absent)

* * * * *

Mr. Morris arrived at 8:45 a.m.

* * * * *

John Sorcinelli recused himself from participating in the following item, DPRB Case No. 11-22.

DPRB Case No. 11-22

A request to install a new wireless communication facility on an existing building located at 1325 W Arrow Highway.

APN: 8383-016-038

Zone: Specific Plan No. 2, Area 2

John Marshall, applicant, was present

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the proposal is to install a wireless communication facility and added that the antennas will be within the existing cupola at the front elevation of the building. She stated that the antennas will be screened with an RF-friendly material that is designed to mimic decorative tile, which will blend in with the surrounding structures. She added that the applicant is also proposing to construct a 187-sq. ft. mezzanine extension on the north side of the building to house the equipment cabinets, which will not be visible to the public right-of-way. She informed the Board that Verizon Wireless has concerns over the maintenance agreement. She pointed out that the City currently requires wireless facilities to have a maintenance agreement. She added that a maintenance agreement shall be submitted to the City of San Dimas to the satisfaction of the City Attorney; prior to receiving building permits. She noted that the applicant requested the condition state that Verizon Wireless (or subsequent facility operator) shall be responsible for maintaining the facility as approved, which includes, but is not limited to, regular cleaning of the facility, keeping the facility painted in an appropriate manner, keeping bird nests and other similar items cleared from the antenna area and all around maintenance of the facility. She pointed out that the City currently has three wireless facilities that have a maintenance agreement. She emphasized that with a maintenance agreement, it will be received and included in the title deed or else it will only be included on the construction plans. She noted that if this item is not approved, the applicant would request a continuance until it is discussed further. She

noted that the applicant initially proposed using wood; however they have decided to use an RF-friendly material.

Mr. Coleman stated that he is not too concerned with the maintenance agreement since it is not a Mono-tree or any freestanding element. He added that the proposed RF-friendly material appears durable.

Mr. Michaelis commented that it would be helpful if all wireless facilities were consistent with the implemented requirements of a maintenance agreement.

Mr. Patel reiterated and agreed with Mr. Michaelis comment. He asked if the setback is within the scenic highway easement.

Associate Planner Grabow responded that it is outside the scenic highway easement and added that the tower is existing.

John Marshall, applicant, stated that he is in agreement with all the conditions of approval except the requirement for a maintenance agreement. He added that the agreement would be appropriate if a tree was used for the facility. He commented that Verizon Wireless has looked in depth to the conditions and pointed out that it is too onerous to have double lawyer fees put on the applicant in case of a lawsuit or action. He asked if a maintenance agreement cannot be required for them. He added that he will be more than happy to record the conditions of approval on the property. He stated that he wants to maintain the wireless facility; however, there is an issue with the terms the City Attorney prefers. He reiterated that the best resolution is for a continuance so that the agreement may be worked out with the City attorney.

Mr. Patel asked why the wood element was not used like initially proposed.

Mr. Marshall responded that it would not support the signal for phone service.

Mr. Michaelis stated that Staff is not trying to be onerous but instead is open to hearing comments which fits City requirements.

Associate Planner Espinoza added that this condition is implemented because a lot of time is spent going back and forth with the City Attorney in regards to wireless facilities and added that it is a way for the City to recoup those fees.

Mr. Marshall argued that this proposed wireless facility is similar to a proposed addition to a building and added that a maintenance agreement would not be required for that.

Mr. Michaelis recommended a condition should be added that the maintenance agreement is worked out amongst the applicant and Staff.

MOTION: Moved by Blaine Michaelis, seconded by Curt Morris to approve with the condition that the maintenance agreement is worked out amongst the applicant and Staff.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Dilley Absent and Sorcinelli Abstain)

DPRB Case No. 11-20

A request to construct a new 6,104 sq. ft. single-family residence with a three-car garage located at 2263 Kingsbridge Court.

APN: 8426-038-025

Zone: Light Agricultural (AL)

Claude Gonzales, applicant, was present

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the applicant is proposing a 6,104 sq. ft. house on a 16,000 sq. ft. vacant property within the Light Agricultural Zone. She added that the proposal includes a two-story residence with 5,439 sq. ft. of living area and a 665 sq. ft. three-car garage. She described the structures design as having Spanish/Mediterranean features with an exterior cladding consisting of stucco, brick veneer, an archway entrance, Juliet balcony and faux wood garage door. She added that the applicant is also proposing to construct a large gazebo with features to match the house.

Mr. Coleman asked if there is a proposed 12 foot setback on the side of the property.

Claude Gonzales, Applicant, responded that it is a 5 foot setback on one side and a 12 foot setback on the other.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is a 3-Dimensional model of the home for a visual representation to present and commented that without one, the presentation is inadequate.

Associate Planner Grabow responded that 3-D models are only required for hillside developments whereas this home is flat.

Mr. Sorcinelli recommended that homes that are over 5,000 sq. ft. should be required to submit a 3-D model of the proposed home and added that a policy needs to be adopted.

Associate Planner Espinoza commented that previous projects that were larger in square footage including a 8,000 plus sq. ft. garage, which was an accessory and not a home, was approved and did not have to submit a 3-D model.

Mr. Michaelis commented that technology and imagery today can assist and provide a better perspective of any project in general and added that they may be costly.

Mr. Gonzales stated that he would need to talk to his architect about obtaining a 3-D model and added he is unaware of the cost.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that a 3-D model is not outside of an applicant's capability and emphasized it should have been required.

Mr. Gonzales commented that he would have done a 3-D model if it was mandatory and added that he should not be penalized for something that was not required during submittal.

Mr. Coleman commented that he compared plans and noticed that two pages conflicted with each other. He noted that one plan shows 12 feet for the retaining wall and on the grading plan it indicates 8 feet.

Associate Planner Grabow stated that the 8 feet on the grading plan is correct.

Mr. Morris stated that he is uncomfortable requiring the applicant to submit a 3-D model if it was not required when the applicant complied everything that was asked by Staff.

Associate Planner Espinoza pointed out that in the Municipal Code, Single-Family Hillside Residential properties are required to submit a profile model, at the Director of Development Services direction. He emphasized that 3-D models are geared towards hillside properties and added that the Code does not specify for other residential properties in other zones.

Mr. Sorcinelli reiterated that he is not in favor of this project and requested that at the next meeting, a policy is adopted and approved that 3-D diagrams are required for new homes that are a certain square footage, to be determined by Staff.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve with standard conditions.

Motion carried 5-1-1-0 (Sorcinelli No and Dilley Absent)

DPRB Case No. 11-24

A request to construct a 1,636 sq. ft., one story house and a 576 sq. ft. detached garage at 136 Oberg St.

APN: 8661-013-026

Zone: Single-Family (SF-7500)

La Puaca Construction, applicant, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the subject site is currently vacant, south of Foothill Blvd and outside of the Downtown Core thus the applicant is not required to incorporate historical elements into the home's design. He noted that the proposed house is 1,636 sq. ft. with a detached two-car garage that is 576 sq. ft., which will be accessed from Oberg Street and not the alley. He pointed out that the front and partial side elevations will be flanked with eight-inch exposed Hardie-Board horizontal planks; Hardie-Board staggered shingles under all the gable eaves. He noted that the remainder of the house will be stucco in a light sand float finish. He stated that all windows and exterior doors will have a rough-saw wood trim and noted that the front elevation of the home will have wood shutters and corbels. He added that a condition of approval needs to be modified because at the time the City Arborist was not available for comments. He noted that the Arborist did inspect the location which resulted in the applicant only needing to provide one street tree along the parkway which shall be a 15-gallon Lavender Trumpet tree instead of the two trees, 15-gallon London Plane trees.

Mr. Coleman pointed out that on the aerial, the structure on the neighbor's property appears close and asked the applicant if he is aware of where the property line is at.

La Puaca Construction, Applicant, responded that the structure is 3 feet away.

Mr. Morris commented that the area where this proposed property is located, use to be Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funded which transformed and improved the area. He noted that the alleys and streets were also enhanced.

Motion: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Curt Morris with the modification of Condition No 33, per the City Arborist, the applicant shall provide one street tree along the parkway which shall be a 15-gallon Lavender Trumpet tree.

Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Dilley Absent)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 a.m. to the meeting of July 28, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.