

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
May 24, 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
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission*

ABSENT

*Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:31 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

DPRB Case No. 12-12

A request to demolish a single-family residence which has been identified as historic by the City's Historic Resources Inventory; the house is located at 300 N Walnut Avenue.

APN: 8390-009-013

Zone: Single-Family 16,000

Mark Bailey, resident of 216 N Walnut Ave, was present
Curt Duulap, applicant of 300 N Walnut Ave, was present
Terry Glasburner, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant approached the City about demolishing the existing house and constructing a new one. The home is listed under the City's historical list which requires approval from the Development Plan Review Board in order to demolish. Staff requested a third party evaluation and hired ONYX Architects who executed an extensive on and off-site review to see if the demolition would create a negative impact to the City's historical resources. The report indicated there was unidentified additions and added that much of the work was done without thinking of the integrity of the structure and lifespan. Alterations that had been done included: enclosure of front porch with a front door, two types of materials used for siding at porch, front door replaced with contemporary door, enclosed eaves, the house has been texture coated, plumbing and electrical on the exterior of the rear of the building and no proper foundation. The ONYX report provided two conclusions that Staff agrees with: repair the structure and to restore to its original size which would require the removal of about half the structure. The second option would be if the Board approves the request to demo, a photographic record to be made of the structure for the City to keep and the applicant is required to file a notice of gifting the structure in the San Gabriel Tribune for a total of 30 days.

Mr. Badar asked why the City needs to be the contact agency if the property is gifted.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that Staff needs to make sure that the individual who is gifted the home is aware of all the issues and provide them with information about preserving the home.

Mr. Badar asked if at the end of 30 days, the home can be demolished.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied yes, but the applicant would need to first submit comprehensive plans for a single-family residences.

Mr. Badar asked why Staff is concerned if the home is demolished.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied since it is a historic home, Staff is trying to preserve and not permit a demo just to demo. Staff would like to preserve this resource if possible.

Mr. Coleman commented that the property has been extensively modified and ONYX concurred that the home has lost its historic character. He posed the question if the home is even worth offering up and relocating.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded yes and pointed out that there may be some prospective buyers interested in reconstructing the home to its original historic state.

Mr. Badar commented that he understands; however, the home is already not in its original historic state. He added that he would approve for the tearing down the home.

Associate Planner Espinoza pointed out that the applicants are going through some personal issues and want to plan for a new house. He noted that there is no rush to demolish and start construction.

Mr. Schoonover asked what assurance the City will have if they demolish and construct a new home that the conditions will be maintained.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that Code Enforcement could get involved. He added that if approved, the long term goal will be to design the home and apply for a Lot Line Adjustment.

Mr. Coleman asked how long will it take for the applicant to submit plans for a new home.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded as soon as next year.

Terry Glasburner stated that the property is going to be transferred. The Lot Line Adjustment will occur when the property is development and split between family members. He emphasized that they will obtain all the needed criteria and stay within the Town Core Design.

Curt Duulap, resident and applicant of 300 N Walnut Ave, stated that he prefers the older Craftsman Style homes and wants to maintain its historic history and not modernize it.

Mr. Badar asked what the proposed square footage will be for the new home.

Mr. Duulap responded 1,900 – 2,000 sq. ft. and added it will not be overwhelming.

Mr. Coleman stated that CEQA requires that a demolition process be recorded.

Associate Planner Espinoza added that they will need to have a Notice of Intent to Adopt Negative Declaration filed.

Mr. Coleman stated that the Notice needs to be published and continued for 30 days per CEQA or else no action can be taken for this project.

Mark Bailey, resident of 216 N Walnut Ave, stated his concern with this home is the rodent and goffer problem. He asked if anything can be done to prevent this from happening.

Mr. Coleman pointed out that rodents and goffers arise more so when construction starts.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, stated he has come across 2 projects that had significant grading and were taken care of by the applicant; however, since this is a small single-family project, it is ultimately the property owner's responsibility.

Mr. Coleman stated that ONYX did a good job in their analysis and added that because of the changes made, the home has truly lost its historic significance. He commented he has no issue with the demolition and added that a 21 day public review and a 30 day waiting period should be sufficient for CEQA. He noted that they cannot advertise the structure as a gift until Staff approves the demolition and the 14 day appeal period passes.

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Emmett Badar to continue this item until the DPRB meeting of June 28, 2012 in order to file a Notice of Intent to Adopt Negative Declaration.

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

Tree Permit No. 12-18

A request to remove four (4) trees within the Charter Glen Homeowners Association.

Zone: Single-Family 7,500 (RPD 8.5)

Assistant Planner Concepcion stated Charter Glen Homeowners Association are requesting to remove four (4) Flowering Plum trees in the front yards of 863, 879, 887 and 895 El Paso Court. At 863 El Paso Ct, due to the uplift of the concrete and damage to the water meter, Staff recommends approval. At 879 El Paso Ct, due to uplift and damage of the concrete, Staff recommends approval. At 887 and 895 El Paso Ct, removal of trees were requested due to uplifting of the concrete; however, Staff visited the site and the damage was minimal thus Staff could not make the findings to recommend approval to remove trees. Crape Myrtle trees are the proposed replacement trees at a 1:1 replacement ratio. Staff believes it is a reasonable replacement since only 1 tree can fit in the same location. Staff recommends approval for the removal of trees at 863 and 879 El Paso Ct and denial for the removal of trees at 887 and 895 El Paso Court with a 1:1 replacement ratio.

Mr. Badar asked about the difference between Flowering Plums versus Crape Myrtles.

Assistant Planner Concepcion responded Crape Myrtles are more of a slow growing tree compared to Flowering Plums. Both are relatively small trees.

Mr. Patel asked what size the Crape Myrtles will be.

Assistant Planner Concepcion responded 15-gallon, which is the standard replacement size.

Mr. Badar asked if the sidewalk is on private property.

Mr. Patel responded yes.

Mr. Coleman asked if Staff spoke with the applicant about Staff's recommendation, especially since there is no representative in attendance today.

Assistant Planner Concepcion replied that a voice message was left and a Staff Report was mailed to the applicant with no reply. A letter will be sent out at the conclusion of this meeting regarding the outcome.

Mr. Michaelis stated his concern that if we deny the removal of the two trees at 887 and 895 El Paso Ct, if in the future the trees' root systems cause more damage to the concrete, would they be able to come back to request a tree removal.

Assistant Planner Concepcion replied yes, they would be able to come back within a new tree removal application.

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve the removal of trees at 863 & 879 El Paso Court, deny the removal of trees at 887 & 895 El Paso Court and replace the trees at a ratio of 1:1.

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

DPRB Case No. 12-05D

A request to construct one monument sign at Citrus Station and amend the master sign program to revise the original approved location of the sign from in front of Panda Express to in front of Olive Garden on the east side of Lone Hill Avenue.

APN: 8383-009-073

Zone: Specific Plan No. 24

Shawn, was present

Art Eggleston, resident of 1017 W Gladstone St, was present

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is requesting to construct one monument sign with an additional sign being tentatively approved on the south side of Gladstone Street. The design concept was approved as part of the master sign program and the monument signs as approved in front of Panda Express. The applicant would like to change the location of the sign to in front of Olive Garden. It is being designed to fit the actual location as well as be proportionate in scale to the site. Staff requested a full scale model to be built on-site to determine the height, width and proportion. The sign does not pose any line-of-sight issues and will be 160 ft. from any entrance and/or exit to the site.

Mr. Coleman stated that since the monument sign is at a different location, the plans will need to be amended.

Mr. Patel commented that the proposed monument sign poses line of sight concern. He recommended reviewing the plans and looking at the curvature pulling out of the gas station since there are issues with existing landscaping, transformer and line of sight issues. He recommended for liability reasons, to have a Traffic Engineer prepare a line of sight profile.

Mr. Schoonover agreed with Mr. Patel especially since the speed coming down Lone Hill Avenue is average 40 MPH.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the landscape is a big concern.

Mr. Patel stated that the owners will need to maintain the landscape that is causing the line of sight issues and recommended it be 30 inches at all time.

Mr. Michaelis asked if there will be only one monument sign on Lone Hill Avenue.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Mr. Beilstein pointed out looking at the size of the truss plates because they are out of scale and should be reduced. He emphasized they should be smaller cause they overwhelm the open space and added that from a structural standpoint, it takes away from the appearance.

Associate Planner Espinoza agreed and added that the lower pitch is correct.

Shawn, stated that the line of sight is not an issue and presented photos. He commented that he noticed the speed of traffic and how erratically drivers go up and down the street. He stated that if the line of sight profile is a condition of approval, he will oblige. He addressed the maintenance of the landscaped area and added he will need to discuss with Costco.

Mr. Patel stated that the line of sight needs to have a 15 ft. clearance from the curb. He added that the sign may be fine; however a line of sight profile will serve as protection for future liability.

Shawn stated that the monument sign was designed for future businesses. One side will include a major tenant and one minor tenant. He noted that Panda Express may or may not be on the sign and added that it still needs to be approved conceptually.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that all tenants will have equal distribution per the Master Sign Program.

Shawn stated that with the rate of speed of the drivers, the three panels work better than the multiple smaller signs.

Mr. Coleman asked if the applicant will need to bring this item back to the Board with a line of sight profile.

Mr. Patel commented that the location determines the line of sight.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the approval can be made pending until the submittal of the line of sight profile. He added that the sign design has already been approved.

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve with added condition that the applicant submit a line of sight profile prepared by a Traffic Engineer prior to approval.

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

Tree Permit No. 12-29

A request to receive approval for the unpermitted removal of four Eucalyptus trees within the front yard of the property at 606 S. Walnut Avenue.

APN: 8382-011-048

Zone: Single-Family Hillside (SF-H(PH))

Mr. Schoonover stated that Item #4, Tree Permit No. 12-29, will be continued until the meeting of June 28, 2012 at the request of the applicant.

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue this item, at the request of the applicant, until the DPRB meeting of June 28, 2012.

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 a.m. to the meeting of June 14, 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: June 14, 2012