

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
January 12, 2012 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 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve the minutes of October 27, 2011. Motion carried 4.0.0.3 (Badar, Michaelis and Patel Abstain)

**MOTION:** Emmett Badar moved, second by Dan Coleman, to approve the minutes of November 22, 2011. Motion carried 6.0.0.1 (Schoonover Abstain)

Scott Dilley recused himself from participating in the following item, DPRB Case No. 11-53.

**DPRB Case No. 11-53**

A request to add a 495 sq. ft. rear addition to an existing 1,398 sq. ft. single-story residence, listed on the City's Historic Survey. The applicant is also proposing to remove all the existing dilapidated wood shingle siding and replace with horizontal Hardie-Board siding located at 516 N San Dimas Avenue.

APN: 8387-002-011

Zone: Single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Chris and Mayra Galvez, applicants, were present  
Lordes Galvan, relative/sister of Chris Galvez, was present  
Ron and Alline Kranzer, property owners of 508 N San Dimas Ave, were present

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that the applicant is proposing an addition with exterior modifications. The applicant is proposing to demo an unpermitted 120 sq. ft. rear patio and a permitted 65 sq. ft. washroom in order to construct a 560 sq. ft. rear addition. He pointed out that some of the calculations were incorrect in the Staff Report; the request for addition should be 495 sq. ft. versus the 560 sq. ft. The home was built in 1919 and is in of the City's historic survey. There currently is an enclosed patio with architectural features of the Craftsman home. The applicant is proposing to change out the wood windows for aluminum wood clad but the front windows would be wood windows. The applicant currently has a front door that is warped and does not lock and would like to replace the front door to help reduce energy loss and install a door with Craftsman features. When Staff initially reviewed this project, there was a concern with the proposed modifications, including the removal of the siding and replacing with horizontal siding. He noted that all other items proposed Staff has come across and approved. He emphasized that the replacement of shingle to horizontal is a first that the Planning Department has encountered and is asking for the Board's recommendation. Staff pointed out that the shingle siding has termite damage and excessive paint that is chipping and noted that to remove and replace is costly. The applicant has submitted cost figures showing that it will cause a financial burden thus prefers using horizontal Hardie-board the shingle siding has versus wood-shingles siding. The type of material is not an issue but the design is. Staff is in favor of the additions and modifications; however, there is a concern for the removal of shingle siding for horizontal siding. He added that the decision the Board makes today could reflect the decisions for future modifications on siding for historic homes.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the shingle is above the door at the west elevation.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied yes and added that it is the only area on the home left with shingle.

Mr. Coleman asked if the applicant desires horizontal siding strictly for aesthetic purposes or for cost.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that there are a variety of reasons: cost and installation. Horizontal Hardie-Board siding comes in 16 ft. versus buying individual shingles which would be more costly.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the standard protocol for historic homes is that they need to be reviewed by a historic consultant.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that if this was sent to a consultant, their response would be to use traditional material and recommend preserving as much historic qualities as possible. He added that it is a case by case situation unless it is altered significantly.

Mr. Coleman stated that there is currently no adopted historic preservation ordinance.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that Staff believes if the applicant is keeping the existing overall look, including the river rock and corbel. The changes are not significant.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the wood windows are clad aluminum.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied yes and added that the front windows will be wood.

Lourdes Galvan, sister of applicant, stated that shingle siding is currently in a dilapidated condition but noted it is used as an ornamental feature and the shingles on the gable would remain.

Alline Kranzer, property owner of 508 N San Dimas Ave, spoke in favor of the style. She appreciates all the upgrades that will be done to the house and supports the project.

Ron Kranzer, property owner of 508 N San Dimas Ave, asked if vinyl had been considered since it can be a minimal maintenance and cost less and pointed out that wood shingles are costly to maintain even at the lower level which are subject to irrigation. He added that any changes will be an improvement and appreciates being notified by Staff of this meeting.

Mayra Galvez, property owner, expressed her admiration for Craftsman style homes and explained she wants to preserve the home as much as possible; however, the material needs to be changed due to termite damage. She added that the work proposed will help maintain the home and will also add curb appeal to the neighborhood.

Mr. Patel asked if the roof will be replaced.

Mr. Galvez replied that they will be removing and replacing all the composition roofing with a Class A composition shingle. He added that they will also construct a two-car garage towards the North property line in the near future to match the architecture of the house.

Mr. Badar stated he did not have a problem with the appearance of horizontal siding from top to bottom and agreed with the neighbors that it will be an improvement to the City. He expressed he does not have a preference for vinyl versus Hardie-board.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented he does not agree with using vinyl and added he doesn't have a problem with the siding but instead with the detailing. He pointed out that where the skirt flares out, should remain and siding can be added all the way down the side.

Mr. Galvez responded if the skirt is placed at the trim of the corners, then it will not be uniform.

Mr. Sorcinelli recommended using wood in those areas.

Mr. Beilstein asked that the revised elevation plans show the skirt flare. He also recommended preserving the skirt in order to enhance the building details.

Mr. Badar asked if the applicant is going to remove the skirt or due to its historical nature maintain it.

Mr. Coleman responded that Staff will go along with all horizontal siding but would like to maintain the existing flare of the skirt trim at the base of the home. He recommended revising Condition No. 16 to reflect this.

**MOTION:** Moved by Dan Coleman, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve with the modification that Condition No. 16 reads "The applicant shall revise the plans to maintain the existing flare of the skirt trim at the base of the home. The siding shall be a horizontal, four-inch exposed Hardie-Board siding."

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 a.m. to the meeting of January 26, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.