

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
June 23, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Emmett Badar, City Council
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*

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:36 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve the minutes of April 28, 2011. Motion carried 5.0.0.2 (Badar and Patel Abstain)

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve the minutes of June 9, 2011. Motion carried 6.0.0.1 (Badar Abstain)

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 11-27

A request to construct a 10,176 sq. ft., two-story office-warehouse building to be used as a contractor storage yard located at 627 W Allen Ave.

Previously Approved Cases: CUP 08-03 and Tree Permit 08-37

APN: 8392-017-033

Zone: Manufacturing (M-1)

Norm Pulliam, Construction Manager of Grigolla & Sons Construction, was present
Colleen River, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that this project was previously reviewed and approved on May 14, 2009. He noted that the applicant is proposing to construct a 10,176 sq. ft. office building which will be used as a warehouse, and he explained that the applicant faced issues during the plan check process and needs another approval. He noted that south of the subject site the properties are zoned residential thus the building is setback further in order to prevent any issues with the neighbors and he emphasized that nothing has changed in the plans. He pointed out that the building is split face and the front has ledge stone and faux glazing on the west to break up the massing.

Norm Pulliam, applicant, stated that he would like the project to be approved.

Mr. Patel commented that Condition No. 48 does not emphasize that the applicant will need to contact the County in order to hook up to the public sewer and requested that it be added as Condition No. 57. He also noted that the applicant should provide street trees throughout the development.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied the new conditions can be added.

MOTION: Moved by Emmett Badar seconded by Scott Dilley to approve the following conditions: add Condition No. 57, "Applicant shall connect to public sewer", add Condition No. 58 "Applicant shall provide street trees as designated by City Arborist" and remove the word "existing" from Condition No. 48 and replace it with "County."

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0

John Sorcinelli and Emmett Badar recused themselves from participating in the following item, Tree Permit No. 11-18.

Tree Permit No. 11-18

A request to remove 64 mature trees (42 healthy, 14 diseased, and 8 dead or dying) in order to install tracking solar arrays at McKinley Children's Center located 762 W Cypress Street.

APN: 8385-013-016

Zone: Public/Semi-Public (PS)

Ross Wood, Developer, was present
Roy Wood, was present
Gregg Eastman, was present
Eyloe Norman, was present
Tami Morrison, resident representing HOA, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is requesting to remove 64 trees (42 healthy, 14 diseased, and 8 dead or dying) to install solar arrays at the south side of San Dimas High School. He pointed out that the solar arrays will be located in 3 different locations: along the 57 Fwy, at the main campus area and at the rear of the campus. He noted that the Board needs to make the findings for removal of the trees. He explained that the applicant would like

to forgo the required 2:1 replacement plan and instead request a 1:1 replacement plan which will be appropriate based on the finding that there are an adequate amount of trees on the property. He explained that a replacement plan has not been submitted thus the location of where the trees will be relocated is undetermined. He pointed out that there is an issue with an Oak tree that stands in the way of the progression of the project and added that they would like to preserve and relocate it near the chapel. He stated that Staff notified neighbors via mail about this meeting and project and received a number of phone calls and emails from residents on Canterbury Lane. He noted that there was a concern with the removal of trees since they help protect from the dust and minimize noise volume. He stated that one of the neighbors, who is representing their HOA, requested that the applicant plant trees along the property line or outside the easement to mitigate their concerns. He noted that pictures were submitted yesterday depicting trees being removed already. He verified that the trees being removed were not the mature trees but instead smaller trees that would not require a permit. He stated that the HOA would like to request more time per the adjacent residents to review the project and determined what rights and options they have.

Mr. Coleman asked if this project is time sensitive.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the applicant is trying to receive funding from the State to off-set the cost of the solar panels.

Mr. Coleman asked if the applicant has been made aware of the concerns from the HOA.

Ross Wood, Applicant, replied that he has not spoken to the HOA yet but noted he is willing to work with them. He stated that they plan to clean up the backside of the property where all the mature trees are located at. He noted that the trees are dying due to an infestation of Lerp Psyllids on the trees. He stated receiving the rebates is very important to the school. They started this project almost 18 months ago with different technology, and had donors to fund it. With the change in the economy, those donations are no longer available. They have updated their technology to qualify for the state rebates. This was a five-year program offered by the state, and is due to expire in six months, so time is of the essence. The school will receive \$1.6 million in rebates which is necessary for them to be able to build the project. He explained that he would like to transfer the Oak tree near the chapel and setback 10-30 feet from the property line. He stated that he would ask Edison to drop their power line for one day in order to relocate the Oak tree. He emphasized that the approval is time sensitive in order to prevent a 1.6 million dollar loss for the school.

Mr. Coleman asked if Area B, row of arrays conflicts with the existing parking lot.

Mr. Wood replied that the arrays near the cafeteria are designed for vehicles to park underneath with a 7 foot overhead clearance and noted that picnic tables will also be located there for a shaded area.

Associate Planner Espinoza noted that neighbors questioned the process of approving solar arrays. He added that the City does not review solar arrays because the State law prohibits any Design Review. He noted that the City will only check that the solar arrays meet City Building Code. Condition No. 10 was added based on concerns expressed by Mr. Sorcinelli on a previous case that if they allow tree removal prior to the issuance of building permits, you run the risk of the project being abandoned and never built, but the trees have already been removed. The applicant is requesting that this condition be removed, but that would be at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Patel asked the applicant to take a look at the west property line where the solar arrays are to be located and noted that since there is a new stadium seating is being built, at the High School, they may cast a shadow on the arrays.

Mr. Wood replied that they do not foresee an issue with the new stadium. He added that he was unaware of the stadium being built and just learned of it a few days ago. He stated that they haven't calculated any loss of sun from the bleachers in the stadium and added that it would only be affected if the bleachers were 20 feet in height.

Tami Morrison, resident at 865 Canterbury Lane, representing the Cypress HOA, expressed that she is here on behalf of all the neighbors and would like to meet with the applicant and school about the removal of the trees. She added that the trees assisted with minimizing the dust and noise. She questioned if the trees were going to be replaced with trees of equal height.

Mr. Wood responded that the arrays are affixed and added that the Eucalyptus that are currently there will die soon because they are not treated properly and added there will be another loss of additional trees.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the re-placement of trees is an issue before proceeding with their application submittal. He added that a condition should be implemented for the applicant to meet with the HOA prior to beginning work.

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that the conditions of approval can include the applicant meet with the HOA prior to the 14 day appeal period to address their concerns.

Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development, asked if the solar arrays require plan check.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, replied yes and added the applicant has submitted recently.

Mr. Stevens recommended deleting the first sentence in Condition No. 10 and include a time frame for the tree mitigation plan. He noted that the neighbors do not object to this project but they want to know the replacement plan. He noted that this would allow the project to move forward.

Mr. Stevens stated that one option could be to bring a tree mitigation plan back to the Board if they cannot reach agreement with the neighbors.

Tami Morrison stated that she will contact the president of the HOA to schedule a meeting with the applicant.

Associate Planner Espinoza provided Ms. Morrison with plans for the project.

Motion: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve the tree removal project, strike the first sentence in Condition No. 10 and establish a condition that a tree replacement plan be prepared for the project, and that a tree mitigation plan would only come back to the Board if agreement cannot be reached with the neighboring HOA; otherwise, the project will go forward, with the applicant to meet with the HOA prior to the end of the 14-day appeal period.

Motion carried 5-0-0-2 (Badar and Sorcinelli Abstained)

DPRB Case No. 11-28

The review of the fence and wall plan for the development of 18 single-family residential properties at 309 N Lone Hill Avenue. The request also includes all interior walls within the development which include wrought-iron fences, slump stone walls and planted segmental walls.

Previously Approved Cases: TTM 04-01 (Tract No. 60865)

APN: 8383-012-019

Zone: Single Family 7500 (SF-7500)

Aamir Raze, was present
Ted Handel, was present
Edward Ashton, was present
William Raymond Sr., was present
Bill Raymond, was present

Associate Planner Marco provided background information on the project and noted that it was approved by the City Council for a residential gated community consisting of 18 single-family homes. He stated that the applicant is requesting a review of the fence and wall plan, which includes all interior walls within the development, including the wrought-iron fences, slump stone walls and planted segmental walls. He indicated this project will be approved in several parts. He explained that the applicant is proposing 4 types of fences and walls for the project which include: Wrought-Iron Fences (Dark brown color), Slump Stone Walls (Doe skin color), Slump Stone Retaining Walls (Doe skin color), Verdura Segmental Retaining Wall (Landscaped Doe skin color) or Anchor Planter Block Retaining Wall (Doe skin color). He pointed out that the applicant brought in samples of these materials for the Board's review. He stated that the applicant sent notices to the neighbors informing them about the removal of the fences and noted that most neighbors said it would be reasonable to remove the chain link fence and replace with a perimeter site wall. The material will be slump stone block with a decorative cap. He noted that the applicant has also chosen two different types of segmental walls for the project which include: Anchor Planter Block Retaining Wall and Verdura Segmental Retaining Wall. He noted that the walls proposed will also have Creeping Jenny planted that will cascade and cover the wall. He pointed out that the height of the walls will range in height from six feet to 14.3 feet (exposed). He stated the applicant is proposing a vehicular entrance gate at Lone Hill and community entry signs, one on each side. He informed the Board that notifications were sent to adjacent neighbors for a community meeting to answer additional questions prior to today's meeting and out of the 27 notified, 4 were in attendance. He explained that privacy issues were a concern of the neighbors in regards to visibility over the wall but he expressed that right now the review is for the walls, and the houses will be down the line. He noted that for the meeting today, the neighbor notification was extended to 98 homeowners. He concluded that this is the same project that was previously approved and nothing has changed.

Mr. Coleman inquired about Condition No. 15 and emphasized that the HOA will be in charge of maintaining the area of segmental walls. He asked how the HOA would get past barriers on the properties.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the landscape plan depicts the new easements that will be created which will allow access to the properties.

Mr. Coleman stated an access needs to be planned on the north side of the property because there are isolated areas.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the tract map has changed since approved set.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that it appears the same; however as part of the review, a request for a new site plan outline of the home will be submitted.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there will be a landscape plan and inquired if traffic issues will be a part of the review.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that those concerns will be addressed during plan check.

Mr. Patel interjected and stated that the traffic concerns were addressed back in 2007.

Associate Planner Espinoza in the past in other projects, homeowners with view lots have come to the City to see if they can have a Plexiglas fence, or some other type of material, to not obscure the view. Thus, Staff is asking the Board to consider if they would like to approve an option for the use of Plexiglas in the future. Staff would like to keep it limited to just two choices, and it would be full height, not a mix of block and Plexi. He noted that due to the segmental walls, the fence cannot be moved down the slope and eventually a resident will want to remove the wrought iron fence.

Mr. Coleman added that Plexiglas is used to reduce noise levels and noted that the applicant will need to come up with a standard detail that all the HOA residents will use.

Mr. Patel inquired about pool construction and wondered if it would be an issue for the segmental liner and requested that the applicant create a map to include in plans the restrictions and limitations on requesting a swimming pool.

Mr. Coleman asked if there can be a condition added requiring them to include in plans, restrictions and limitations for swimming pool construction.

Associate Planner Espinoza indicated that it can be a part of their revisions. He added that the homes are connected to the public sewer.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated if Plexiglas is going to be discussed; the idea for ½ slump stone and ½ Plexipanel should be included. He noted that there are issues with water marks on the 100% Plexiglas. He added that it is very noisy because of the nearby fwy and the Plexiglas would reduce noise. He stated there is nothing worse than a poorly maintained Plexi fence. Noise mitigation might be the only reason for it to be appropriated; otherwise, he was not in favor of using Plexi.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated he can discuss this option with the applicant, but because of the segmental wall, the footings for the block wall will have to be set back several feet.

Amar Raze, applicant, agreed with the appearance of the Plexiglas. He indicated that the wrought-iron is maintained by the HOA and added that it cannot be swapped out without approval. He requested that the idea of Plexiglas not be included. He explained that there is an

accessible walkway and noted that there is a V-ditch. He added that there are easements at many locations on the property to allow access for maintenance from the pads only the wrought-iron fences are seen and not segmental walls.

Mr. Patel requested that for any swimming pool additions, there should be restrictions added on their deed.

Bill Raymond, applicant, replied that there are restrictions to build a swimming pool and added that it needs to be structurally designed with caution.

Mr. Raze indicated that there are notes within the property disclosures and CC&R's.

Mr. Raymond added that they will be included in the documents for the HOA and added that the wall plans, precise grading, will be included in all plan submittals.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, indicated that Staff can tag these homes in the Permits Plus system so that when that address is opened a message will appear that swimming pools will need limitations to meet the appropriate setbacks based on the segmental wall.

Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager, asked in regards to the perimeter wall, how many homeowners cooperated with the proposed removal of chain link fences.

Mr. Raze replied a majority approved the removal of the chain link fence and added that it will be removed once the wall is built.

Mr. Raymond added that a temporary fence will be put in place while the chain link fence is being removed.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that there are two neighbors that do not agree or approve of the removal of the chain link fence.

Mr. Raymond informed the Board that they will be sending out new letters to neighbors indicating all proposals.

Mr. Badar asked if there has been Plexiglas used for other developments.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated no, Staff was just thinking ahead.

Mr. Badar replied that he appreciates Staff looking ahead but would not be in favor of Plexi.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve with the condition that the HOA is responsible for the segmental walls and landscaping.

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0

Preliminary Review

A request to alter the existing architectural style of a residence, enclose two second floor balconies at the front elevation and add 147 square feet for attic storage located at 1539 Calle Cristina.

APN: 8448-038-055
Zone: Specific Plan No. 11

John Begin, Applicant, was present
Cathi Begin, was present

Associate Planner Grabow informed the Board that this item is being presented in order to receive feedback so that the applicant may apply necessary adjustments prior to submittal. She pointed out that the house has a Tudor architectural style with features such as: decorative half-timbering, brick cladding, steeply pitched hipped roof, and wood corbels. She noted that the applicant would like to modernize the style of the home; therefore, the applicant will be removing the half-timbering, cover the brick cladding and wood corbels with stucco and add cement precast trims around existing windows. She stated that the applicant has submitted photos for the Board to review. She noted that the applicant is proposing to install new windows to be energy efficient and dual-glazed. She stated that the applicant would also like to enclose two second-floor balconies at the front elevation because it leaks when it rains. She added that there will also be an addition of 147 sq. ft. for attic storage.

Mr. Beilstein asked if the HOA needs to review these items.

John Begin, Applicant, stated that the HOA has not approved anything yet and added that their main concern is that the work is tasteful. He added that they cannot repair the decks that leak and added that they have made several attempts but it cannot remedy the problem. He stated that the wood on the home is 20 years old and noted that it has not been maintained well. He added that he would like to modernize with a smooth stucco finish and pointed out that it would add value to the property. He stated that he is here today to hear comments before submitting elevations that will not be approved.

Mr. Beilstein asked if the changes will coordinate with the current RV garage that was recently constructed.

Mr. Begin stated that he has not built any exterior elements of the garage or framed the arch window and replied that it would change if approved.

Cathi Begin, Applicant, commented that surrounding neighbors have similar features that they are requesting today.

Mr. Sorcinelli inquired about existing corbels and asked if they can be pulled off.

Mr. Begin replied that they are fake corbels and do not support the overhang.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is a problem with the wainscote.

Mr. Begin replied that he did not want a mixture of architectural features.

Mr. Stevens commented that Tudor style architecture is not a requirement and emphasized that this is a preliminary review. He commented that if the existing Tudor style changes, the plans will need to be brought back and include finalized details.

Mr. Patel complimented the Tudor style and asked if the gray roof blends with the stucco finish.

Mr. Begin replied yes and added that it resembles a French chateau.

Mr. Coleman commented that the photos depict a charcoal color.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the applicant should proceed with the changes on the property. He commented on his concern with removing the brick at the front of the property.

Mr. Begin commented that the brick ribbons are sunk and indicated that brick is more expensive to use versus stucco.

Mrs. Begin indicated that there is a lot of mold on the brick.

Mr. Sorcinelli indicated that there are no technical problems with the proposals.

Mr. Coleman complimented the modifications indicating that the home appears to be a very attractive redesign.

Recommendation: The Board agreed that the applicant move forward with the proposed changes.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m. to the meeting of July 14, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.