

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
February 9, 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*

**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 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Scott Dilley moved, second by Krishna Patel, to approve the minutes of January 12, 2012. Motion carried 6.0.1.0 (Sorcinelli Absent)

**DPRB Case No. 11-52**

A request to construct a new 700 sq. ft. second residential unit with 249 sq. ft. attached garage and 530 sq. ft. wraparound porch/patio at 947 W Cienega Ave.

APN: 8383-022-023

Zone: Single Family Agriculture (SF-A7500)

Richard Mena, applicant, was present  
Alma Whitsell, neighbor at 949 W Cienega Ave, was present

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a 700 sq. ft. second residential unit with: 249 sq. ft. attached one-car garage, 387 sq. ft. wraparound porch and a 143 sq. ft. covered patio. The proposed siding will be a combination of brick, stucco and cement fiber board horizontal lap siding, consistent with the existing main house, a California Ranch House. There is a one-story 2,077 sq. ft.

addition to the main house currently being reviewed by the City under a separate plan check. The property complies with horse keeping setbacks for the Single-Family Agriculture Zone and the siting of the second unit does not preclude any neighboring properties from keeping horses and complies with horse keeping setbacks. The proposed square footages for the second unit are the maximum allowed by the Code, thus the applicant cannot have additions in the future or enclose the proposed porch and patio. Staff recommends revising the porch column posts to a style and detailing consistent with a California Ranch House style, such as wood posts. He noted that this modification can be done during plan check. He pointed out that the proposed stucco with brick base columns is acceptable; however, a simple wood post would be more in keeping with the California Ranch style.

Mr. Michaelis asked if there are columns on the main house.

Assistant Planner Concepcion replied no.

Mr. Badar commented that if the home is not visible from the public right-of-way, why is there an aesthetic preference for the column.

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that the Board should consider not only if you can see it from the street, but the overall design of the new second unit, especially the front exterior, and that it is consistent with and visually harmonious with the main house, a California Ranch House style.

Mr. Patel inquired if any changes were going to be made to the driveway.

Assistant Planner Concepcion replied that there is an existing circular driveway that will remain as is, but a new 12 ft. wide driveway will branch off of it leading to the second unit's garage.

Mr. Dilley asked if the addition for the main house is currently taking place.

Assistant Planner Concepcion responded that it is currently in plan check.

Mr. Coleman added that Associate Planner Marco Espinoza has approved the addition to the new home on this lot.

Mr. Patel asked if the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit meets the setback requirements.

Assistant Planner Concepcion replied yes.

Mr. Coleman commented that in the aerial photo, there are perhaps contractors or property owners vehicles parked on the lot. He asked if that amount of vehicles are usually on the lot.

Richard Mena, applicant, stated that the owner has not owned the property that long and added that the trucks in the aerial photo belonged to contractors that were doing work on the property.

Mr. Patel asked where the horse keeping area would be on the property.

Assistant Planner Concepcion responded there is a possible location for horse keeping behind the front yard setback.

Mr. Dilley asked if there is RV parking available.

Assistant Planner Concepcion responded yes and that RV's may be parked behind the main building line in the side or rear yards.

Alma Whitsell, neighbor, asked: 1) Do property owners need to live on the property when they have a second unit; 2) What does categorically exempt mean? and 3) Can her property be subdivided?

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated that under the second unit ordinance, the property owner is required to live in one of the residences on the property where a second dwelling unit was approved. The other unit may be occupied by a relative or the property owner or by a person who qualifies as low-income status.

Mr. Badar asked why it would be designated low income housing.

Mr. Michaelis replied it's mandated by the State, to further increase housing resources and reduce barriers to provisions for affordable housing within the community.

Mr. Coleman also added that the property is categorically exempt, which means that the proposed project does not significantly affect the environment therefore not requiring further environmental review. He added that today's discussion is on the current item and by continuing discussion regarding subdividing the neighbor's property, it would be in violation of the Brown Act. He recommended speaking with Staff after the meeting to discuss further options for the resident.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the applicant had comments on the wood post recommendation.

Mr. Mena responded stucco columns can be longer lasting and more practical in the long run. They might consider working with Staff on column designs.

Assistant Planner Concepcion commented that another possibility is that since the proposed second unit has cement fiber board siding, that his material be wrapped around the columns for a similar look to wood posts.

Mr. Michaelis replied if the existing house has a stucco finish.

Mr. Mena replied that the existing house has a stucco finish along with wood horizontal siding and brick along the base.

Mr. Schoonover pointed out that Condition No. 11 reflects today's discussion and recommendations discussed, which states when submitting plans, columns should be consistent with the California Ranch House style.

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

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:58 a.m. to the meeting of February 23, 2012 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