

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

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 2011 at 8:30 A.M.
186 VILLAGE COURT
PUBLIC CONFERENCE ROOM, TEMPORARY 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*

ABSENT

John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:35 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Public Conference Room

HEARING

1. DPRB Case No. 10-38

A Request to Determine the Front Yard Setback at zero in order to construct a six-foot high fence along the front yard property line at 1945 Scarborough Road. **(Previously approved as DPRB Case No. 03-56)**

APN: 8426-033-026

Zone: Specific Plan No. 4, Area 1

Applicant: Lloyd Parry

Staff report presented by Associate Planner Marco Espinoza, who stated this item was previously approved in July 2003, but the fence was never built and the approval has expired. This zone requires the Board to determine the front-yard setback, and the applicant is requesting the Board allow a zero setback so a six-foot tall fence can be installed along the front yard property line. The applicant is requesting a tubular steel fence with river rock pilasters along 150 feet of the front property line, with the remaining portion constructed of chain link. The lights on the pilasters will be a maximum of 15 watts, per the Board's direction on the previous approval, and the chain link should be a non-shiny material, but there was no specific indication on how the Board wanted that done.

The applicant is concerned about cost, and is proposing to construct the 150 foot tubular steel portion now, but would like to have a four-year extension for installing the chain link portion.

Mr. Coleman asked if the Board approves a zero setback, would that allow structures to be built at the property line.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated they have been able to control that with design standards for massing and scale, and the location of the fence is consistent with the neighborhood.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, stated while the proposed lights will be low wattage, he asked if they are also low voltage.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated he did not know.

Lloyd Parry, owner, stated in regards to the lighting, the fence is located 150 feet away from the house and he has approved 110 volt conduit to the front. He doesn't have neighbors to the front of his property as it fronts onto the County area and he didn't think the lights will be a problem. He stated Condition No. 12 indicated the tubular steel should be painted black, but would like to paint it dark brown to match the trim on the structures on the property. He felt it would also blend better with the natural surroundings and keep with the rustic theme of the area.

In response to Mr. Dilley, Mr. Parry indicated the pilasters would be covered in the same river rock that was used on his driveway and will be used on a future retaining wall. In response to Mr. Coleman, he stated the south side of his property borders County property and there is a six-foot tall fence installed by the County. After the original plan was approved in 2003, he installed along the back of his property an 80 foot long dog run using six-foot tall chain link fencing, which he intends to continue in both directions around the property.

Mr. Badar asked why the code says the tubular steel fence needs to be black, and wondered if they can make an exception since the property is located away from everyone else, and Mr. Michaelis asked what would be the process to approve a different color.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated a color was designated in the code to maintain consistency throughout the development. Because the color is called out in the code, the typical way to change the color would be through a code amendment.

Mr. Coleman asked if the Specific Plan allows chain link fencing, and noted that the previous approval didn't require the tubular fence to be black.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated the code does not address chain link one way or the other, and in re-reviewing the code, the requirement for black fence is within the Scenic Easement area, and this would not be in the easement.

Mr. Coleman suggested they strike the word "black" and replace with "painted" as per the Specific Plan. This lot is unique and is isolated away from the other lots on Scarborough, and he did not have any problems with the zero setback.

Motion: Dan Coleman moved, Emmett Badar seconded to approve as submitted but striking the word "black" from Condition No. 12, and replace with "paint."

Mr. Patel asked what color the chain link fence would be.

Lloyd Parry stated it was just standard galvanized chain link and it wouldn't be seen from the front of the property. Previously he was told he couldn't use shiny metal, but was told by a Boardmember that it would fade in a few months anyway.

Mr. Patel stated he would prefer that a vinyl fence in a similar color to the tubular fence be used, especially since they were looking at the chain link being installed in four years. He stated this would maintain consistency as the homeowner had indicated earlier with the trim color of the structures and the tubular fence.

Mr. Parry stated the chain link would be approximately 120-130 feet along the front and 500 feet in the back. If he were to use vinyl coated fencing, it would not blend with the existing 275 feet of fence belonging to the County and the 80 foot dog run. He stated the chain link will be blocked from view once he constructs his new wall.

Motion carried 5-1-1 (Patel no, Sorcinelli absent).

2. DPRB Case No. 10-33

A Request to Construct two 25-foot Monocypress Wireless Communication Facilities, located at 1057-1087 Via Verde.

APN: 8395-025-024

Zone: AP – Administrative/Professional

Applicant: Brian Young, Delta Groups Engineering

Staff report presented by Associate Planner Kristi Grabow, who stated this request was to construct two 25-foot monocypress wireless facilities in the AP zone. In 2009 the Board approved a 50-foot tall monopine on a different parcel based on the number of mature trees on the site, but that project was never built. These would be much smaller than the one previously approved, and they would also be in a landscaped area. The applicant will also be planting four mature cypress trees to help them blend in with the existing 23 trees on the site. The equipment cabinet will have a stucco wall around it and be located near the trash enclosure. Staff is recommending a planter wall to break up the massing and a lattice cover on top to make it more decorative to the street view. This project will also be going to City Council for review as a public art piece.

In response to Mr. Patel, Associate Planner Grabow stated notices of the meeting were mailed to residents within a 350 foot radius from the property.

In response to Mr. Badar, Associate Planner Espinoza stated the reason the facility at the Century 21 Building did not go to City Council is because it was attached and incorporated into the existing building, while this is considered a free-standing piece of public art.

Brian Young, Applicant, stated they are excited to be able to improve service in this area, and felt the design worked well. He went over previous proposals to locate a facility in this area and how the monocypress design seemed to be the most compatible with the center and least obtrusive since the equipment would be in a separate facility. The improvement in technology allows them to construct this type of structure where the antennas will be completely hidden, and using two smaller structures allows them to have the same coverage but be less imposing.

In response to Mr. Patel and Mr. Badar, Brian Young stated the diameter of the tree would be four feet and it would only be for a single-user as the height of the structure does not allow them to have collocation.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Brian Young stated they will be constructing the facilities in a vacant area and would not be removing any of the existing trees, as well as adding natural cypress trees around them. They will be using a 24-inch box tree which will provide some height but not be so mature that the roots won't establish themselves in the ground. In response to Mr. Badar, he stated the cabling at the base will be installed underground to the equipment facility.

Mr. Badar stated they have needed service in this area for a long time and was in support of the project.

Mr. Patel felt they were moving in the right direction by approving something other than a water tower.

Mr. Schoonover felt this looked better than the monopines and he also felt they needed something other than a water tower.

Motion: Blaine Michaelis moved, Krishna Patel seconded to approve as submitted. Motion carried 6-0-1 (Sorcinelli absent).

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m. to the meeting of January 27, 2011 at 8:30 a.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Jessica Mejia
Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: February 23, 2012