

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
December 13, 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 8:32 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve the October 11, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Badar absent, Dilley abstain).

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve the amended November 8, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Badar absent, Michaelis abstain).

Mr. Schoonover stated that Item 3, Reasonable Accommodation Request 12-01, will be continued until January 10, 2013.

**DPRB Case No. 11-43**

A request to construct two, one-story single-family residences on two of the four lots approved for development at 405 W. Gladstone Street. The lots proposed for development are Lots 3 & 4 which are on the flat portion of the development closest to Cody Road. Lot 3 will consist of a 3,624 sq. ft. single-story house with a 674 sq. ft. attached garage on a 42,140 sq. ft. lot. Lot 4 will consist of a 3,600 sq. ft. single-story house with a 720 sq. ft. attached garage on a 42,140 sq. ft. lot (APN: 8392-015-029). Access to both homes will be by a private driveway located at the intersection of Cody and Chaparral Road.

APN: 8392-015-029

Zone: Single-Family Agricultural (SF-A16000)

Stan Stringfellow, applicant, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the request is part of the development of four single-family residences from the approved Parcel Map No. 65790, which was the subdivision of one lot into four. At this time, the applicant would like to develop Lots 3 and 4 which are closest to Cody and Chaparral Road.

The east side yard of Lot 4 will be used by Lots 1 and 2 for access via a private driveway. Lot 3 is proposed to be a 3,624 sq. ft. single-story house with a 674 sq. ft. attached garage on a 42,140 sq. ft. lot. The garage will accommodate three cars. Lot 4 is proposed to be 3,600 sq. ft. single-story house with a 720 sq. ft. attached garage on a 42,140 sq. ft. lot. The garage will also accommodate three cars. He noted that there are no issues with the architectural design of the homes. Some features of Lots 3 and 4 are: stone material and decorative garage doors. The staff report included sample material boards for review. He noted that there is an issue with the horse keeping setback requirements. The original parcel map submitted was in compliance and allowed for horse keeping. Within a horse keeping property, any corrals are to be 80 ft. away from adjacent living space and 35 ft. away from the home onsite to avoid conflict with the Code. A condition will be added requiring the corral setback requirements. In addition, uncertified soil was dumped onto the property. The applicant tried getting the issue taken care of with code enforcement; however, to date has not. A Public Nuisance was filed in July of 2011 against the property. City Council ordered the applicant to submit plans for the house within 30 days. On August of 2011 the applicant was ordered to obtain approval of the houses and map within six months. He has still not received approval. A 6 month extension would be granted if the construction was in progress and would end in January of 2013. Based on where the applicant is at currently, it may need to go back to City Council until abatement of the unpermitted soil. A condition to the staff report reflects that a building permit will not be issued for the homes until the map is finalized.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the plan check status of the map.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded they are currently on their third plan check with corrections which was returned three weeks ago.

Mr. Stevens asked where the access will be for the two parcels and undeveloped parcels.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the access to Lot 3 and Lot 4 will be through a private driveway which will be widened from 20 ft. The upper lots will have a private driveway along the ease property line at Lot 3.

Mr. Stevens asked if the northerly access that serves the two parcels also serve the properties to the west.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Mr. Stevens asked where the horse keeping is on the property.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded at the rear of the property.

Mr. Patel pointed out that Parcel 3 will need to have a lot of grading done. The bulk of the grading will be done on the South side hillside on Lots 1 & 2. He asked how it would impact the development of Parcel 3.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that the grading will be done on all 4 lots and added that it is a part of the overall grading plan and will be done as part of the original approval. First grading will occur, then the house will be built and then improvements can be addressed after.

Mr. Stevens asked how the grading plan will be approved and which lots will be looked out.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied that all lots will be graded.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there will be improvements made on Gladstone St.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes, a curb to cut off access from Gladstone and removal at the existing driveway.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a designated "no build" portion to Gladstone St and the slope area.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Mr. Stevens suggested that if the map expires, then the approval will expire.

Senior Planner Espinoza noted that Condition 24 does not apply to the project and can be removed. He noted that Condition No. 25 and 26 are similar and one can be removed.

Stan Stringfellow, applicant, stated that he was not the property owner in 2006 and added he did not authorize the dumping of dirt on the property. In April of 2012, he stated he took title to the property and has been trying to comply with abatement requirements including processing the application and map; however, there have been significant delays. Currently the plans are on the third revision. He noted he has no objection to moving the house 5-10 ft. There would be mass grading and 15,000 cubic yards of fill to import required which is one reason City Council agreed to leave the dirt to be processed and compacted. He stated he would like to start construction around March 2013, assuming the third plan check for grading will all be resubmitted sometime next week. Along Gladstone Street in regards to cutting off the road, there is already an asphalt berm to cut off the driveway; the map originally approved this with an access out on Gladstone Street which was a difficult access. He noted that the level of traffic has increased and public safety views it better to not have access off of Gladstone Street.

He added that there will be landscaping on that slope and a landscaping plan will be submitted as soon as final approval is received for the design of the homes. He had questions about some of the Conditions of Approval. He pointed out Condition No. 10 and asked if the access plan applies to all 4 lots or just 2. He pointed out Condition No. 18 and asked if a detailed landscaping plan needs to be submitted for the front yards only or a whole acre. He reiterated that Condition No. 24 is not applicable and that Condition 25 and 26 are duplicates and one can be removed. He pointed out Condition No. 33 and stated that they will comply with water requirements. He noted that for the improvements that go to the easement access through Lot 3 and added that they are not proposing to put concrete for the driveway until construction is complete of Lots 1 and 2. He added that there is a sewer line which they are not proposing to put sewer lateral until the homes are actually built. He emphasized only laterals will be installed. He pointed out Condition No. 35 and stated he would like the condition removed since there is no drainage acceptance letters or infrastructure requirements. He pointed out Condition No. 39 and added that there are no public improvements and is not applicable. He pointed out Condition No. 43 and added that it will be executed as soon as RKA has approved the maintenance covenant.

Senior Planner Espinoza clarified that Condition No. 10 requests a construction access plan for all 4 lots, which is helpful to point out truck deliveries. Condition No. 18 requests a detailed landscaping plan for the front yards since there is a tree replacement plan associated with this project.

Mr. Stevens asked where the tree replacement requirement is included with.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that it is part of the Tract Map.

Mr. Patel stated that Condition No. 33 needs to meet City standards for backfill for the County. He stated that Condition No. 35 could be modified since it is not lateral to the house.

Mr. Stevens stated that he is not sure the water will be contained and will turn out as part of the hydrology and grading.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that Condition No. 33 can read at the beginning, "If determined by the City Engineer." He noted that Condition No. 39 is a standard condition and cannot be changed and also that Condition No. 44 will have to remain.

Eric Beilstein, building official, asked where the 15,000 cubic yards of fill are.

Mr. Stringfellow replied on Lots 3 and 4.

Mr. Stevens stated that the flow of drainage is at a northeasterly direction towards Cody Rd.

Mr. Patel commented it is towards the South.

Mr. Stevens stated that there are historic flows that need to be addressed as well as where the water drains. He asked if there is any property line density proposed.

Senior Planner Espinoza discussed where the water drains. He pointed out that between the two lots will be Equestrian fencing.

Mr. Stevens asked if fencing is proposed, should it be shown on the landscaping plans.

Mr. Beilstein stated that if there is Equestrian fencing, it will not comply with any future construction for a swimming pool.

Mr. Patel stated that the property lines at Lot 2 and the lot to the east will screen the wall. He asked if it will be a block wall.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded it will be a solid decorative block wall.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve the two homes, subject to conditions of approval, address the house pad placement to accommodate neighboring horse keeping, modification to the landscaping condition on fencing plan and other changes discussed during the meeting.

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

**DPRB Case No. 12-26D**

A request to construct a 2,845 sq. ft. RV garage towards the rear of the property located at 1160 N Iglesia Street. The height of the garage will be 22'-6" feet.

APN: 8661-014-032

Zone: Open Space (OS)

Scott Coolman, applicant, was present.  
Tom and Kimberly Gaetano, property owners, were present.  
Jeannie VuKovich, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the property was developed in 2006 with a 2,264 sq. ft. single-story residence with an attached garage, in addition to an 825 sq. ft. second unit with an attached garage on a 44,656 sq. ft. lot (66 wide x 650 deep; lot is not a perfect rectangle). The applicant would like to construct a 2,845 sq. ft. RV garage towards the rear of the lot. The garage would be 22'-6" high, which would be a foot higher than the existing house. The RV garage will architecturally match the existing structures on the property with the following features: Class "A" lightweight flat tile, stacked stone wainscot, foam moldings around the garage doors and attic vents, false knee braces, pedestrian entry porch and carriage style exterior lighting. The subject lot is considered a "through-lot" because it fronts two streets: Iglesia to the West and Walnut Avenue to the East. The primary access to the RV garage will be off Iglesia Street. The applicant is proposing to extend the existing 12-foot wide driveway that runs along the north property line back to the new garage. The proposed project would still allow for the keeping of horses on the property as required by code. The lot also has legal access through a portion of the property to the north that is owned by the Department of Water that takes access of Walnut Avenue.

The applicant is proposing a 2,845 sq. ft. RV garage; the existing main house is 2,290 sq. ft. The RV garage would be 555 sq. ft. larger than the house. The proposed height is 22'-6," the main house is 21'6." The garage will be one-foot higher than the house. The main issue Staff is faced with is the overall size, height and compatibility. He explained that in the past 15 years there have been similar types of structures proposed with sizes varying from 1,600 sq. ft. The code currently does not have a limitation to size of an accessory structure, only for lot coverage which should not exceed 35%. The concern Staff has is with the size. Staff has conducted a survey of surrounding cities and how they regulate accessory structures. Most cities limit accessory structures size to 1,000 sq. ft., based on lot size and no higher than one-story high. The question becomes when an RV structure is proposed at a larger size than the existing home. Staff wants to determine how to best evaluate these requests. The issues include the overall massing and scale for the garage doors including if they are roll up metal doors. He added each request needs to be determined and approved case by case. In addition, if the Board feels that a policy should be established for reviewing these types of structures, Staff will commence the process and bring it back to the Board for review and approval at a later date.

Senior Planner Espinoza noted that there are two storage sheds on the property that are unpermitted and need to be permitted or removed. The applicant will keep these on the property during construction; however, will remove prior to final of the RV garage.

Mr. Stevens asked what the storage sheds were used for.

Tom Gaetano, property owner, responded material storage. He added that it would not be a problem to remove.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the concern is with compatibility, massing, scaling and if it accommodate the main structure. He asked the Board to look at this particular proposal and also provide feedback for future requirements.

Mr. Stevens asked where the two sets of overhead doors are located.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there are three sets of overhead doors, two at the east side and one at the northerly sides.

Scott Coolman, applicant, stated that anywhere from three to four RV's can fit inside the proposed garage.

Mr. Stevens asked what type of workshop activity will take place in the RV garage.

Mr. Coolman responded that the RV garage will serve as storage and covered protection for an RV and/or boat. Most of the storage will contain vacation orientated materials. He emphasized that there will be no business taking place.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the proposed  $\frac{3}{4}$  bathroom inside the RV garage.

Mr. Coolman replied that the  $\frac{3}{4}$  bathroom is proposed since the restroom at the house is farther away thus is for convenience. He added that in the future they will construct a swimming pool and this restroom will be suited for that.

Mr. Stevens asked about the location of the sewer.

Mr. Coolman responded it is off of Iglesia St and added that there is already a sewer line going to the 2<sup>nd</sup> structure.

Mr. Stevens asked about the proposed patio.

Mr. Coolman responded that the dwelling currently has a patio and the proposed patio will break up the massing of the RV garage.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is access to the RV garage thru the paved driveway.

Mr. Coolman responded yes. He noted that the Department of Water and Power had no issue with the 40 ft. easement.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the Department of Water and Power have provided the documentation to verify this.

Mr. Stevens asked if this application could have been approved at Director's level but was presented due to concern of sizing for accessory structures.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes that it could have been approved at Director's level.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if this landscaping is required near the major street entrance off of Walnut Ave.

Mr. Stevens responded yes and added it seems reasonable to improve that.

Mr. Coolman added that there currently some landscaping including an existing large tree on the property.

Mr. Patel stated that the driveway will be paved from Walnut Ave. He noted that the easement belongs to Metropolitan Water District.

Mr. Coolman stated that for the driveway, they propose concrete; however, they will do what Staff recommends.

Mr. Stevens asked if Mr. Coolman is the current owner of the property.

Mr. Coolman responded no; however, would like to buy the property but wants to verify it will accommodate all items proposed today. He noted that the property owners are in attendance today.

Mr. Stevens asked about the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit of the property and if it will be used for a family member. He emphasized Staff needs to make sure they are up to date with the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit covenant agreement prior to moving forward.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented on the architectural features including stack stone on residences and capped windows that sit atop. He recommended moving them up and putting the movers on the vents of the house.

Mr. Stevens discussed accessory structures in the City. He noted that a policy can be adopted for Director's review but it will ultimately be an amendment to the DPRB ordinance for the Board's review versus over the counter or Director's review. He added that it would be best for the Board to review and find a way to formalize it. He stated that he is not concerned with the proposal today; the size will not impact the surrounding neighborhood due to unique location of the property. The structure is appropriate; however there are times in the future where circumstances may change.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the project proposed today seems to be in context and is acceptable. Staff should propose the height of the doors and accessory structure be compared to the main house and look at visibility from the street. He noted that this project serves as a good example for future concerns with accessory structures.

Mr. Schoonover commented that when an accessory structure is larger than the home, it poses concern. He noted his concern is when the garage door designs look barn like and added he is not in favor of those designs.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the roofing is not shown on the elevations.

Mr. Coolman stated that the roof will match the existing building.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that on previous approvals of accessory structures and recommended the height needs to be looked at in relation to the roof. He recommended Staff return to the Board with a list for review and feedback.

Mr. Patel asked if the material of the driveway is concrete or AC.

Mr. Coolman responded concrete.

Mr. Patel stated that plans indicated AC.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that they will make the change on the plan to reflect concrete is being used and not AC.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to approve, subject to consideration of staff report with modifications to roof material, window treatment and adding a requirement for landscaping to be approved by Staff at the Walnut Ave entrance and adding a driveway.

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

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to have Staff prepare for discussion a policy for accessory structures for a future date.

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

**Reasonable Accommodation Request 12-01**

A request for an accommodation from Zoning Code Section 18.156.100.B.4.b to store a non-motorized trailer on the front driveway of 633 North Billow Drive.

APN: 8386-023-027

Zone: Single-Family-7500 (SF-7500)

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue to the DPRB meeting of January 10, 2013.

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

**DPRB Case No. 11-05**

**Continued from the meeting of May 10, 2012.** A request to subdivide two lots, consisting of 1.81 acres of vacant land, into a total of six (6) lots located at 301 South San Dimas Avenue. Five (5) of the lots will be developed with single-family residences and the sixth lot will have six (6) town homes, and eight (8) mixed-use residences.

Associated Cases: CUP 12-04, Tree Permit 12-24 and TTM 11-01

APN: 8390-019-037,036

Zone: Creative Growth 3A & 3D

Fred M Diaz, was present.  
Steve Eide, applicant, was present.  
Todd Seidner, was present.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that this item was continued from the DPRB meeting of May 10, 2012 so that the applicant can work with Staff on additional items and contact surrounding neighbors to hear their concerns. The applicant held a community meeting on June 5, 2012, where four residents attended. Their concerns were in regards to the noise from construction that include the trucks that come in and out of the project area. The overall feedback from the residents were positive. Five (5) of the proposed lots will face Shirlmar Avenue; the applicant is proposing to construct single-family

houses that range from 2,040 sq. ft. to 2,270 sq. ft. The main concern was the rear yard setback, which the applicant did not comply with the 25' minimum rear yard setback that has since been changed. They are proposing eight (8) mixed-use townhomes with six (6) townhomes that abut the single-family residences and face San Dimas Avenue. The mixed town homes range from 1,647 sq. ft. to 1,880 sq. ft. and the townhomes range from 1,765 sq. ft. to 1,798 sq. ft. Since the DPRB meeting, the applicant has incorporated various garage door designs that helps to break the monotonous design the mixed use townhomes previously proposed. Staff would still like to see additional materials on the rear and side elevations of the mixed use buildings because there is too much stucco - especially when comparing the new elevation designs on the townhomes that include additional windows and materials.

She discussed the parking requirements. The applicant is required to provide 54 parking spaces. The applicant has provided 50 parking spaces with 10 of those off-site on San Dimas Avenue. Per the Creative Growth 3, Area 3 Zone, it allows to waive commercial requirements along with the review of the traffic study, which was reviewed by RKA. The additional four spots are located at Grove Station and the public parking lot north of the railway tracks. There was discussion of the perimeter wall to add an additional wall to be built to provide privacy between townhome and commercial building, which a condition can be added. She noted that the landscape in the parking lot had issues and were not consistent with the Parking Ordinance. Staff has included a condition to make it comply by making one loading area on 8' and extending the landscape finger to its required width of 7'. Also the applicant needs to clear the Tentative Tract Map for the public hearing because they require redesign to comply with fire access. Staff recommends approval to move forward to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Stevens asked if the off-site parking spaces are within the public parking lot. He asked if the option of off-site parking is not approved and considered appropriate, would there be an option to increase garage sizes and reduce square footage.

Associate Planner Rojas replied yes and added that according to the application, they did not get feedback from Waste Management

Mr. Stevens recalled that there was a previous discussion about trash storage and if they were capable of being used for recycling purposes because of increasing insistence. He noted there may be a multi-family recycling program and asked if Waste Management has been contacted.

Associate Planner Rojas replied yes and added they would consider if they need to.

Stevie Eide, applicant, stated that they have followed the guidelines provided from Waste Management. He added that the space has been made larger than required in case guidelines change.

Mr. Stevens asked that the applicant to double check with Waste Management to address recycling standards. He recommended adding a condition that further reviews with Waste Management to ensure facilities are efficient to accommodate recycling programs. He added we cannot directly say we need more than required; however, if not finalized by the time heard at Planning Commission, then it can be finalized by DPRB after it is heard by City Council.

Mr. Patel stated that the off street parking on San Dimas Ave would need to be dedicated. He asked if there was a condition on reimbursement.

Mr. Stevens responded that it can be added on the Tract Map.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the parking spaces the applicant is short on are primarily designated for retail spaces.

Associate Planner Rojas responded yes, due to Creative Growth 3 Zone, that is the only parking that can be waived, not residential.

Mr. Schoonover asked what spaces were being referenced.

Associate Planner Rojas responded at Arrow Hwy and Bonita Ave.

Mr. Beilstein inquired about the number of spaces. He noted that the commercial building at Grove Station was under parked and were spaces borrowed from another location. He asked how wide the sidewalk is in front of the mixed-use building.

Associate Planner Rojas responded 10.5 ft. She noted that the CC&R's will reference that no restaurant/food uses will be allowed due to limited parking.

Mr. Stevens discussed the commercial location at Grove Station.

Mr. Patel stated that Lot 6 has an open space area, which indicates that the front cannot be used for RV.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that it can be identified on the Tract Map especially for lots where the front yards need to be identified.

Steve Eide, applicant, pointed out that the original drawings depict nine spaces and when recounted it was actually ten. He added that technically they are short three spaces and not four.

Mr. Beilstein asked to describe the wall heights between the single-family residences, multi-family and commercial.

Mr. Eide replied that there are standard wall heights, 6 ft. for single family and added that the tallest walls are for the commercial and residential properties. He noted that they wanted one wall to not be staggered; however, the property owners to the nearby shopping area have not been cooperative in discussing that option.

Mr. Beilstein discussed the wall height at the back of the property.

Associate Planner Rojas pointed out that the plans had incorrect figures of wall heights.

Mr. Stevens noted that the double walls are not favorable.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked if the material should be changed from stucco to a finish decorative cap.

Mr. Stevens responded that if decorative block is used, it will be easier for maintenance.

Mr. Beilstein inquired about roof access for residences and buildings.

Mr. Eide responded that the roof access will be from inside, no exterior ladders. He added that they will provide more definite information at a later date.

Mr. Sorcinelli expressed his concern with the project. He pointed out that San Dimas Avenue is a very important site in the City since it sits in the Town Core. He expressed his worry if the project is

approved. He noted that the project has many Disneyesque features. The appearance is very old fashion and the homes do not mimic the Downtown Town Core. The scale is small which makes the retail spaces appear residential. There are a variety of awnings with stucco finishes and emphasized there is no commercial scale. The residences appear to be from the 60's. The commercial has no theme and are pastiche because of the change of texture and color.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve the conceptual approval to move forward to: Planning Commission, City Council and return to the Development Plan Review Board for final approval.

Motion carried 5-1-1-0 (Sorcinelli No, Badar Absent)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m. to the meeting of December 20, 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: January 10, 2013