

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
August 23, 2012 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*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
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development*

ABSENT

Emmett Badar, City Council

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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the July 26, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-2-1 (Badar and Coleman absent, Patel abstain).

Tree Permit No. 12-28

A request to remove ten (10) trees from the Wayhill Village Planned Unit Development located at the end of North Eucla Avenue on the north side of Fifth Street.

Zone: Specific Plan No. 3

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is requesting to remove ten trees from the common area of the development: seven (7) Sycamore trees, two (2) Locust trees and one (1) Aleppo Pine. All of the Sycamore and Locust trees are diseased and have significant die-back; the applicant has submitted a letter from their arborist identifying these health conditions. The Pine tree is the only tree not diseased but is in poor health and is unbalanced and the applicant is concerned with failure. Staff did visit the site and observed the condition of the trees and concurs with the arborist. The replacement trees will consist of 15-gallon Chinese Pistache. The applicant requested a reduction in the tree replacement ratio requirement of 2:1 due to the amount of existing trees in the development. The applicant would like to replace four trees; Staff recommends a total of 6 trees to be replaced.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development, Larry Stevens, asked for clarification of the replacement tree locations.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the chart indicates the 1st and 2nd priority of the applicant and the locations Staff prefers. He added that since there is no irrigation in some locations, Staff has provided alternatives.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the applicant is aware of Staff's request to plant two additional trees.

In response to Mr. Michaelis, Associate Planner Espinoza replied yes.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if a tree can be located near Unit 462 so that the replacement trees are evenly distributed.

Associate Planner Espinoza recalled that the applicant had previously proposed a tree at that approximate location; however, Staff discovered that there was not sufficient amount of space. Staff made this decision based on future tree removal and growth of new trees.

MOTION: Moved by Larry Stevens, second by Scott Dilley, to approve with conditions of approval requiring the planting of six replacement trees on-site.

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

DPRB Case No. 12-17

A request to construct nine (9) two-story single-family residences within the Estate Area of Bel Vintage.

Zone: Specific Plan No. 5

Chris Barlow, was present.

Vince De Rosa, president of HOA, was present.

Max Frank on behalf of Watt Companies was present.

Julie Gonzales, resident of 417 Calle Canela, was present.

Efrem Joelson on behalf of Watt Companies, applicant, was present.

Don and Kathy Loffelman, residents of 489 Calle Canela, were present.

Rick Marshall, HOA Board for Architectural Review, was present.

Linda Massett, resident of 340 Calle Morena, was present.

Wayne McNutt, resident of 150 Calle Colorado, was present.

Bill Yong, resident of 2226 Calle Escarlata, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza indicated that the applicant is proposing to construct nine two-story single-family residences on the last remaining lots within the Estate Area of the Bel Vintage Community. The overall project has been reviewed and approved by the Homeowners Association. The applicant is proposing two floor plans: Floor Plan 1 is 3,727 sq. ft. two-story residence that has a one-story appearance from the street and a second-story appearance on the downhill portion of the lot. There are three different architectural variations in Plan 1, Spanish/Tuscan style. Floor Plan 2 is 3,990 sq. ft. two-story residence; the floor plan will be developed on flat lots allowing for full two-stories to be visible from the street. There are two different architectural variations in the Plan 2, Spanish/Tuscan style.

The residences proposed are under the maximum allowable size for Specific Plan No. 5 Zone of 4,400 sq. ft. in Group One Lots (23, 24, 25, 26, 40, 41, & 43) and 4,800 sq. ft. in Group Two Lots (30 & 35). All garages are under the allowable maximum of 850 sq. ft. with proposed garages ranging from 684 to 752 sq. ft. There is a total of five different floor plan/architectural styles and nine lots. The applicant will be using the same design twice except for Plan 2-A which will be used once. To further individualize the residences, the applicant is proposing five different color schemes; therefore, none of the houses will be exactly the same.

The architecture will feature: S-tile roof, stone veneer, brick, cast stone trim that surrounds windows and doors, stucco fascia, decorative wrought iron railing and gates, arches, earth tone colored vinyl windows with grids, decorative false beam supports, decorative chimney and sand stucco finish. As for grading, the lots were previously rough graded but are proposing minor grading which will not alter the existing lots. The applicant is proposing an average of a 20-foot setback for most of the lots. The side yard setback is 10 and 12 feet, in addition to the 40-foot separation between residences. He noted the parking and stated that the residences are required to have a two car garage and they have a three car garage with additional visitor parking onsite. All homes feature a motorcourt driveway in front of the garage and can fit two vehicles.

Mr. Stevens asked for a description of the grading of Lot 43 near San Dimas Avenue and if the pad will extend down.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the grading will drop down and fill and replied no that it will not extend down towards San Dimas Avenue. He noted that the pad drops down with the house and the total fill will be 2,830 cubic yards.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is a steep incline.

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Mr. Stevens stated that it is relatively steep from San Dimas Avenue. He added that previously it was landscaped and the views are like the homes in Via Verde, where you will not see everything.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if swimming pools have been added to other homes in the Bel Vintage Estates

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Associate Planner Espinoza stated yes and noted that for future swimming pool installations, the grading is limited.

Associate Planner Espinoza pointed out there are outstanding issues which include: grading, landscaping and fencing. The applicant has worked with Staff to create a contour grading design for Lots 24, 25 and 43. The grading design needs minor adjustments in order to meet the intent of the Code. The applicant will work with Staff to address a final contour design for the retaining walls as part of the plan check process. The applicant should also redesign the single ten-foot high retaining wall on Lot 43 into two smaller walls. As for landscaping, the applicant is only proposing to landscape the front yards. Staff has added a condition requesting that portions of the rear yards (Lots 23-26, 30 & 35) be landscaped with natural vegetation. The applicant will also establish "Natural Areas" that will be left in their current condition and no further development allowed. In regards to fencing, Staff would like to modify the placement of some of the fences to help establish the "Natural Areas" boundaries. The lots in question are 23-26. Staff has added a condition to require the applicant to work with Staff on establishing an exact fencing location based on final review. The CC&R's will note this information.

Mr. Stevens stated that since the streets around this estate are narrow, how will parking be accommodated, he also inquired about the fencing plan.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza replied there will be additional guest parking on the property itself and within the lots. He noted that the fencing plan will be consistent with the development and in-line with original fencing plan. The fencing design will include tubular wrought iron and slump stone wall with the retaining walls being a split-face block with a decorative cap.

Mr. Stevens asked how much of the slope areas are maintained by the HOA.

Efrem Joelson, on behalf of Watt Companies, indicated that Lot 43 by Via Amarilla is maintained by the HOA and pointed out that the properties that have slopes near the freeway are maintained by the property owner.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that it will be noted in the CC&R's that the other lots need to be established and have designated natural areas.

Mr. Stevens asked if any of the natural areas are in jurisdiction of the Fire Department.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza stated that he will need to confirm that and make sure when the lots are established for the natural areas, the Fire Department's boundaries are established as well.

Mr. Stevens added that when the landscaping plan is done, Staff is aware of where the boundaries of the Fire Department are and that they are adequately accessible for maintenance.

Vince De Rosa, president of HOA, noted that the fence line will delineate what the homeowner and what the Fire Department is responsible for and added it needs to be clearly called out. He added that the project does not have formal approval from the Board; however, they will meet tonight. Associate Planner Espinoza pointed out the issues with fencing. He indicated that the applicant submitted a fencing plan and Staff would like to relocate some of the fences to go down near the V-ditch. He added that the Fire Zones will be looked at more clearly. He noted that the properties should be surveyed in order to pin point where property lines start and stop. He added that markers would assist in establishing the property lines. He explained that today's approval is needed so that the project can move forward to Planning Commission for final approval.

Mr. Stevens stated that since these are the last nine lots to be built, he asked if the homes were originally planned to be custom homes.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza stated yes but explained the homes are now semicustom since they feature different color schemes to prevent monotony.

Mr. Stevens asked if any of the homes proximate to the County communication towers.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza pointed out that Lot 30 is the closest to those communication towers.

Mr. Stevens stated that there are two towers: Fire and County. He asked if there is anyway landscaping can be added to Lot 30 to buffer the side yard of the property so that they are not visible.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza stated yes that the landscape plans are conceptual and the applicant is proposing three trees at that location.

Mr. Stevens stated that Staff should encourage Italian Cypress trees.

Rick Marshall, HOA Board for Architectural Review, stated that the tower lot has had a block wall around it and that the hillside near the main driveway has been landscaped in order to block the tower. He noted that they have done a good job trying to mask it and noted that the South side of the private tower has Pepper trees too. It has been a joint partnership and there are palm trees and a wall that has vines to conceal as well.

Don and Kathy Loffelman, residents of 489 Calle Canela, stated that their home had a remarkable view of the lake and mountains for the past 11 years and explained their frustration with the proposal. He expressed his concern for the drainage of the water when it rains especially the impact of where the water will eventually end up.

Associate Planner Espinoza indicated that it is unfortunate that the residents will lose their view; however the City does not have a view obstruction ordinance. He added that these vacant lots were always planned on becoming a residential development. He indicated that the HOA could buy the properties and preserve them in order to preserve the views for the residences. He addressed the drainage issue and stated that water will drain into the existing V-ditches on the lower portions of the property.

Mr. Stevens indicated that Condition No. 46 details a hydrology study and added that it should conform to meteorology on infill lots. He asked if they are required to add filters to storm drains.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Mr. Patel responded no.

Mr. Stevens asked if Condition No. 46 reflects this information as an overstatement.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza stated yes and added that the homes are within the 20 ft. setback which is a standard City requirement; however, it could be pushed closer per the Board's recommendation.

Mr. De Rosa indicated that there is no parking on Calle Canela. He addressed the statement of the view being lost and added that the HOA and residents were aware that at one point there would be homes built on the vacant lots. On a committee level, HOA members walked every point of the neighborhood to speak with residents to ensure everyone is ok with the construction. As for the drainage issue, the hillside area near Lots 23 through 26 will flow correctively.

Mr. Joelson indicated that Lots 23 through 26 feature a one-story residence that will be set down from the street. Motorcourts are valuable so vehicles will not need to back up on Calle Canela which will reduce safety issues.

Linda Massett, resident of 340 Calle Morena, pointed out that her home looks down onto these proposed residences. She emphasized that she will be losing her view of the valley, Puddingstone Lake and horse trails. She commented that no one from the HOA has approached her. She explained that she supports the construction of the new homes; however, at the same time does not want to have the view lost and it should have been taken into consideration. Calle Canela is a main street and

emphasized that if parking is permitted there, it will become a privacy issue for her. She asked for a better explanation of how much of her view would be lost.

Mr. Stevens asked about the four lots on Calle Canela and inquired what the highest point is.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Associate Planner Espinoza stated 18 ft.

In response to Ms. Massett, Mr. De Rosa stated that on a committee level, every lot was looked at including her property. From a vantage point, you will see roof tops from the line of sight from the back of the property.

Mr. Marshall expressed he walked near Ms. Massett's property and the elevation is much higher, thus you could subtract 5 to 8 ft. He added that the view loss will have a minimal impact.

Wayne McNutt, resident of 150 Calle Colorado, pointed out that each lot tiers down from Ms. Massett's property.

Mr. Patel added that there is about a 10 ft. elevation difference.

Mr. De Rosa noted that the original developer proposed all the homes to be two stories at the street level; however, that developer did not continue and Watt Communities was the new buyer whom was able to create and met the requirements of the HOA to provide homes that appear one story from the front but are two stories.

Ms. Massett asked if the City or HOA Board can implement that the construction not start until 8:00 a.m.

In response to Ms. Massett, Mr. De Rosa responded that there are items to be finalized at the HOA meeting tonight and added she should be in attendance. The hours of construction is from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and no work to be done on Sunday and holidays per the HOA. The Board is considering extending the hours to 7:00 a.m. so that they can prepare and organize prior to beginning the physical construction.

Ms. Massett asked how long the project will last and when the start date is.

In response to Ms. Massett, Mr. Joelson responded grading will begin later this year and the construction of homes will not occur until 2013 and can last 6 to 7 months and will be done in two phases.

Mr. Stevens stated that the construction hours can be enforced by Bel Vintage whom can also apply restrictive hours or can abide by the City of San Dimas normal construction hours; however, it will be up to Bel Vintage HOA to enforce the hours if different than the City's. The City permits construction from 7:00 a.m. to dusk Monday through Saturday and no construction Sunday and holidays.

Max Frank on behalf of Watt Companies stated the drainage and water flow for Lots 23-26 will drain to a V-ditch and there will be no impact from Calle Canela.

Mr. McNutt stated his concern is with the curve at Calle Canela. The motorcourts were designed to allow cars to turn around and come out face forward and emphasized parking should not be permitted on Calle Canela.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked what today's vote is for.

In response to Mr. Sorcinelli, Associate Planner Espinoza stated that today's vote is to recommend approval to move forward to Planning Commission. He indicated that it is not a public hearing nor a consent item thus it will not need to return to DPRB and will be officially approved at Planning Commission.

Mr. Stevens added that the project will not need to return to DPRB, unless there are big changes made at Planning Commission.

MOTION: Moved by Larry Stevens, second by John Sorcinelli to approve and recommend approval to the Planning Commission and will only need to return back to the Development Plan Review Board if substantial changes arise.

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

Mr. Schoonover asked if this will be a consent item on the Planning Commission agenda.

In response to Mr. Schoonover, Mr. Stevens stated that it will be put as a business item. A consent item is for construction of one home at a time and added that today's approval is with the understanding that it will returned to DPRB if issues arise at the HOA or Planning Commission meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:54 a.m. to the meeting of September 13, 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: September 13, 2012