

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
June 14, 2012 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*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*

ABSENT

Emmett Badar, City Council

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

May 10, 2012 and May 24, 2012

Mr. Patel stated he had a correction to the May 10th minutes, on page 5, his comment at the bottom of the page should read "Mr. Patel responded that the intersection does not meet warrants for a signal."

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve the May 10, 2012 minutes as amended. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Badar absent, Sorcinelli abstain).

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the May 24, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Badar absent, Dilley abstain).

DPRB Case No. 11-32(R)

A request to allow a rooftop air conditioning unit on the garage located at 1539 Calle Cristina.

APN: 8448-038-055

Zone: Specific Plan No. 11

John Begin, applicant, was present.

Mr. Schoonover stated the applicant has submitted a letter requesting continuance of the item so the Board could visit the site in person.

John Begin, applicant, stated he is willing to withdraw his request and conduct the hearing now because he felt the photos provided by Staff adequately showed the conditions.

Associate Planner Rojas stated the applicant added a roof-top mounted air conditioning condenser to the garage, which was not part of the original DPRB approval or shown on the approved building plans. She stated Code Section 18.12.060.A.9 and the Board's policy adopted in 2010 require that all mechanical equipment on the site shall be appropriately screened from view, and that rooftop equipment shall be screened by architecturally integrating screening into the building design; which would prohibit it from being added as an afterthought as was done in this case. The Code also requires that accessory structures be compatible with the main residence. The applicant is asking to keep the unit as installed, and Staff is recommending denial and requesting the applicant comply with the Municipal Code.

Mr. Coleman reiterated that this unit was not on the approved construction plans.

Mr. Schoonover asked when the unit was added to the project.

Associate Planner Rojas stated Staff did not know when it was installed.

Mr. Beilstein stated the project is still under construction and has not been finalized yet.

In response to Mr. Patel, Associate Planner Rojas stated the HOA has not approved this design yet.

Mr. Coleman asked what the distance was from the garage to Calle Cristina.

John Begin, applicant, stated it is 128 feet from the curb to the front of the garage, the garage is 70 feet deep and the unit is in the rear, so it is approximately 190 feet from the curb. He stated the photos show it can be seen from Paseo Susana but he felt it was 1000 feet away across the canyon. There are trees along the street with only one break in the line, so if you were driving down the street, you wouldn't be able to see it. Using a zoom lens you can see that it doesn't fit in the well, but it didn't occur to him that it wouldn't meet code to put the condenser on the roof. He felt the condenser location was overlooked during the design phase due to the scope of the project. If it is placed on the ground, it would be out of compliance with warranty requirements of not more than a 50-foot run for the refrigerant line. He stated it is possible to create a well to place it in as the code requires, it would just be more time and money, and he felt it was shame to have to tear out the roof and re-construct it.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Associate Planner Rojas stated the applicant has not submitted any drawings showing the method of construction or screening materials he has used.

John Begin, applicant, sketched for the Board how the units are behind the main gable in the front and a parapet wall to the rear that has been shingled so if you are far enough back it looks like the roof, but if you zoom in on it, you can tell it is not the same pitch as the roof. He felt you wouldn't be able to see it with the naked eye.

Mr. Coleman stated from the photos the screen around the a/c units appears to be black and inconsistent with the roof material.

John Begin, applicant, stated it is the same material; the differentiation is from the angle of the sun and time of day the photo was taken at.

Associate Planner Rojas stated the picture taken from Paseo Susana was taken at street level without a zoom lens, and the units are visible. In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, she stated there haven't been any complaints about the a/c units, but there have been complaints about the overall size of the project. In response to Mr. Patel, she stated the HOA has not reviewed the a/c units or any plans for the addition of them to the roof.

John Begin, applicant, stated he felt the HOA did not have the experience to review plans and should not be making any construction decisions.

Mr. Coleman asked if there was any space in the attic where the units could be installed.

Mr. Beilstein stated because of exhaust requirements they cannot be installed internally. He asked if there was more than one condenser, and if the purpose of them was to condition the top floor.

John Begin, applicant, stated there are two condensers and they would be used for cooling the top floor.

Mr. Patel asked the applicant if he were a neighbor to this project, how he would feel if after looking at the approved plans and thinking you know what the plans are, now you have to look out at these units that weren't on the plan.

John Begin, applicant, stated he would look at it and see if it had any impact on him, and then he would decide. That is why he wanted the Board to come to the site to see it for themselves. He felt the distance views showed that it is not noticeable. This is his house and he wants it to be a quality project and not cut any corners, which is why they painted the roof flashing to make it less noticeable.

Mr. Patel stated he was surprised that as a professional contractor and owner of the house that he didn't come to City Hall to find out how to address the situation. Not following proper procedures did not seem to correspond with his assertions of wanting only a quality job since this is his own house.

John Begin, applicant, stated if he had known this was going to be an issue, he would have come to City Hall first. He hasn't built any properties before that needed to have roof-mounted equipment until his house, and he understands it is his fault for not checking, so if the Board wanted him to modify the roof, he would not fight them since it would only be about \$5,000 to correct. He would build an extension on the back of the roof to make the shingles come up at the correct angle and create a well.

In response to Mr. Beilstein, John Begin, applicant, stated he did not think it was visible from the south side and that the gable end will be higher than the extension to the roof. The lot also happens to be one of the higher elevations on the street and no one else can see down to the roof. He would leave a drainage opening in the new parapet and use the current drainage direction.

Mr. Coleman stated even if the screen he erected is using the same roof tiles, they do not look the same in appearance and feels there is a significant contrast. The unit interrupts the roofline and is right in front of the major roofline of the structure. The HOA has neither seen nor approved this modification at this time. He would deny this request for those reasons, along with the fact it doesn't meet the Code requirements for screening. He is not sure the correction proposed by the applicant will actually work

and felt it was best to create a depressed well, but he is willing to review any drawings the applicant submits showing how he would fix this.

Mr. Patel concurred, and felt the proposal on how to correct the problem may be difficult in complying with the policy.

Mr. Schoonover stated he has been to the site twice in the last three days and while it may not be that visible from Calle Cristina, it is very visible from Paseo Susana. There is a reason we have a policy and an ordinance regulating this type of equipment and felt the Board should adhere to that. If they are not going to follow the ordinance, then they should look at amending it as opposed to making exceptions.

Mr. Sorcinelli felt they also should uphold the ordinance. This is a high-end neighborhood and thought they would be criticized for not following the ordinance. He felt the applicant needed to submit drawings so they could see if his proposal for screening would make it worse or not. He did not think it would be that easy to screen this from a geometry perspective. There are many roof planes, and if you start extending these lines, it may interfere with the units. There may be other alternatives for roof screening, such as installation of solar panels around it, but they would need drawings to evaluate it fully.

MOTION: Moved by Blaine Michaelis, second by Dan Coleman, to support the City's ordinance and policy on screening and deny the request, and direct Staff to work with the applicant on a solution.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the proposed solution would be brought back to them to review since it wasn't on the set of plans previously reviewed by the Board.

Mr. Coleman stated if the solution was to create a depressed well like the house in compliance with the ordinance, it wouldn't need to come back. Any other option approved by the HOA should come back to the Board.

Mr. Patel clarified that if it visually changes, then this item is to come back to the Board for review.

Mr. Michaelis stated if an acceptable solution cannot be reached at Staff level, then it should come back to the Board.

Mr. Coleman stated at this time Staff has not been able to go up on the roof to inspect the construction method, and felt that should happen as there may be other issues that Staff is not aware of. By looking at the photos, if you moved the roof line, it will hit the units.

John Begin, applicant, stated the units would have to move to accommodate a roof extension.

Motion carried 6-0-1 (Badar absent).

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:08 a.m. to the meeting of July 12, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Development Plan Review Board
Planning Secretary

Approved: July 26, 2012