# CITY OF SAN DIMAS
# PLANNING COMMISSION
# MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Wednesday, January 23, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

---

**Present**
Chairman Jim Schoonover
Commissioner David Bratt
Commissioner Stephen Ensberg
Commissioner M. Yunus Rahi
Assistant City Manager of Comm. Dev. Larry Stevens
Planning Commission Secretary Jan Sutton

**Absent**
Commissioner John Davis

## CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairman Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and Commissioner Bratt led the flag salute.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes: January 9, 2013

**MOTION:** Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

## COMMISSION BUSINESS

* * * * * * * * * * * *
Items 2 and 3 were discussed at the same time.
* * * * * * * * * * * *

2. **CONSIDERATION OF PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-03** – A request to recommend approval of the Conceptual Grading Plans for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

Staff report presented by ***Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens*** who stated the information they were reviewing tonight was contained in the Architectural Guidelines book, the Grading Plan package, and a series of exhibits for the site plans. He indicated there was one change in the conditions approved by DPRB, which was a modification of Condition 9E. He passed out for review two pieces of correspondence from the Dalepark residents which were presented to the Board at their January 10, 2013 meeting.

When Tentative Tract Map 70583 was approved, there were a series of conditions associated with grading, as well as mitigation measures in the EIR and conditions in Specific Plan 25. The intention of the plan is to demonstrate compliance with the approved TTM, the Specific Plan and the mitigation measures of the EIR. In large part the submitted plans do comply, but there are some changes in the grading plans from what was presented in 2010. These changes are summarized in the DPRB Fact Sheet. There has been a significant increase in the total amount of grading, which has basically doubled; however, some of that has to do with changes to the hydrology drainage plan relative to the size, location and number of proposed drainage basins in order to comply with the condition that they design a system that the County would want to take over and maintain. The second reason is that in the original proposal they did not calculate the additional grading needed to remove adverse soil, etc., which is also relatively consistent with the approved TTM.

The applicant has also submitted a revised design of the lower retention basin facilities to remove it from the jurisdiction of the State Division of Dam Safety. There is also an increase in the number of basins, in part trying to balance where the water is coming from and preserving more natural areas, and the water tank has been relocated. There have also been several changes to lot sizes, and while they may seem dramatic, in essence instead of including a large portion of non-buildable open space on each lot, the lots have been reduced to be consistent with the pad area, and the open space is being included in the common area. A couple of lots were also shifted in location due to water quality and hydrology basins. After review by Staff and the City Engineer, it was concluded that most of the changes were generally positive and consistent with the Specific Plan and the approved Tract Map.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated issues of concern were identified on pages 3 and 4 of the Staff Report. One issue was that more contour grading was appropriate instead of engineered grading. Overall Staff and the applicant have agreed on the intent of the modifications. He went over the proposed changes to the retention basins, and how the large one was being relocated to approximately 18 feet from the rear property line of the Dalepark residents, but it would also reduce the height of the basin. He stated a community meeting was held with the residents of Dalepark, and several appeared at the DPRB meeting and expressed comments, but one of their biggest concerns, which has been referred to Public Works, was their desire to have a traffic signal installed at Cataract and Foothill.

They also expressed concern that relocating the lower retention basin might impact their views of the mountains, but the DPRB ultimately concluded that it would be no worse and possibly even better than the original proposal. Staff has requested additional cross-section submittals, but they have not come in yet. Dalepark itself increases in grade from west to east, so the western-most lots will be impacted the greatest by the berm. There was also discussion about what to do with the 18 feet between the back property line and the toe of the berm. He felt the residents want some type of access, but it is still unresolved who would control and maintain it if it was accessible. Condition 9E in the resolution reflects the DPRB's determination. While they did not want to make a recommendation on who should maintain that area, the Board set basic parameters for width and landscaping. They also required a condition to work with L.A. County to add landscaping on the face of the 23-foot tall berm itself, which is a 2:1 slope for 46 feet. The County's normal policy is no landscaping, but Staff feels that because it is such a visible location it should be landscaped and will work with the County to see if they can come up with an acceptable maintenance arrangement.

He stated there are some changes in the retaining walls, and a proposal for some of the walls to be "soil-nail" walls. Staff would like to know how and where they are going to be used rather than suitability as both soil-nail and MSE walls can be landscaped to minimize impact. The

resolution contains the same conditions that went to DPRB with the exception of Condition 9E which was modified as stated above.

Chairman Schoonover opened the meeting for public comment. Addressing the Commission was:

**Stan Stringfellow, 2011 E. Financial Way #203, Glendora, Applicant,** explained the difference between a soil-nail wall and an MSE wall, and stated the reason they wanted to use that is it has less impact on the grading. He showed the Commission pictures looking south towards the Dalepark properties from where the retention basin would be, as well as a cross-section showing the new location compared to the original location. At the highest point it is 23 feet high, but descends to a point where it is lower than Dalepark. He feels this location will have less impact on the residents and meets the hydrology requirements of the County.

As far as the trail improvements behind the homes, NJD is willing to build a trail that is 6-8 feet maximum width as they did not want vehicular access in that area. If the City does not want to accept maintenance of the trail, then they will be happy to landscape that entire area. In response to conditioning they landscape the face of the berm, they would be happy to do so but the County might not allow it. They will make every effort to get the County to agree but the County has the ultimate decision.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated they do have the option of planting more landscaping on the flat area in front of the berm, but they have to remember that if they plant more trees, they will grow and block the views people didn't want the berm to impede.

There being no further remarks the public comments were closed.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** stated after the presentation he is not concerned about the increased amount of grading as it appears this will be better than the prior plan. He would like to see a trail installed to accommodate horses, and would recommend the City Council consider undertaking the maintenance of the trail.

***Commissioner Bratt*** concurred that he would like it to be specified that the developer install the trail, and to turn it over to the City to maintain.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated they could add a condition that the trail be installed subject to City standards to be turned over to the City for maintenance. He clarified that the Commission wanted the trail to be narrow enough to prohibit vehicular access. He thought there were some residents that did want it wide enough for vehicular access to reach the rear of their properties. The standard equestrian trail is eight feet wide.

***Chairman Schoonover*** stated there was a woman who spoke at DPRB that said she would like access from the rear.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** stated the residents bought these houses with the existing access constraints. He would like to support the equestrian community by having a trail for horses, and that is all.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated Condition 9E could be amended to say provide a trail with a minimum 8-foot width, and take out any reference to vehicular access.

***Commissioner Rahi*** felt instead of conditioning landscaping on the berm, he was comfortable with having Staff work with the County on installing landscaping.

RESOLUTION PC-1474

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-03, CONCEPTUAL GRADING PLANS FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 70583 (BRASADA)

**MOTION:** Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adopt Resolution PC-1474 subject to revisions as discussed and instruct Assistant City Manager Stevens to incorporate findings consistent with the discussion. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

3. **CONSIDERATION OF TREE REMOVAL PERMIT NO. 12-48** – A request to recommend approval of 468 mature trees in preparation for grading for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

Staff report presented by ***Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens*** who stated when the TTM was revised it was understood that a large number of trees would be removed in conjunction with the project. Because of the changes made to the project, the proposed number for removal has increased to 468. Previously in the natural undisturbed areas there was only an estimated tree count because they weren't going to be impacted. There are actually 4,900 trees on the property, not 3,900 as originally indicated. There were a series of mitigation measures in the original approval and the intent is that they will be followed to be consistent with the EIR.

Staff does not view the increase as significant. The applicant has requested that some of the replacement trees be used in future front yards and be 24- or 36-inch box trees. This would account for 183 of the required 936 replacement trees, and Staff is not opposed to this proposal, even though it could extend over several years dependent upon when the custom homes are constructed. The Board also agreed with the applicant's request to count these as two replacement trees each due to the box size, which will bring the total to count as 366 replacement trees. The conditions of approval reflect that adjustment and will be consistent with the submitted Guidelines.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated the applicant would also like to relocate some of the on-site trees and keep them within the project. To address their request for additional off-set for those trees, Staff added Condition #12 which recognizes there may be this consideration but that it would need to come back to DPRB for a designated formula rather than a Staff negotiated replacement amount. Since the removal of the trees was linked to the grading, this was brought to the Planning Commission for review. The only tree removals will be where grading occurs.

***Commissioner Rahi*** asked about Condition #11.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated this was added because Staff did not want them to start removing trees and then have the project come to a standstill. This requires that the applicant will be ready for grading before any trees are removed from the hillsides. He stated Staff is recommending approval of Resolution PC-1474, and Tree Removal Permit No. 12-48 subject to conditions No. 1-12 contained in the report.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** asked what the benefit of having the toe of the retention basin berm 25 feet from the rear property of the Dalepark homes versus 18 feet was.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated Staff felt 25 feet was a better distance and gave them 22 feet of flat area versus 15 feet of flat area, which allows more to be done. The applicant indicated that moving it further away would have a major impact on their hydrology and would reduce the capacity in the lower basin, which would require changing the upper basins. The Board agreed to leave it where the applicant proposed and either landscape the area or have limited use there.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** asked about the success rate of relocating mature trees, and would there be a condition in place that if the tree did not survive, it would need to be replaced. He also asked if the lower retention basin was going to be under the control of the L.A. County Flood Control District.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated the Flood Control District has done a preliminary conceptual review and they are confortable that it is in their general guidelines and parameters. The formal meetings will be held in a few weeks where there could be some adjustments, but in principle they are in agreement and would accept all of the basins as we wanted at the Tract Map approval. He stated the basins are needed because the lower flood control is through a pipe that can only move about a third of the volume of a 100 year storm, so the water needs to be held and conveyed downstream slowly.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** stated one of the letters was to the Director in Glendora and asked if we have been communicating with them on this project. There was also a reference to the Army Corp of Engineers. He also asked about the horse trail behind the houses.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated the reason the City of Glendora was addressed on the one letter is because it was regarding the desire for a traffic signal, and Glendora owns one of the corners at the intersection. It is beyond the point where a traffic signal can be made a requirement of the development. It was reviewed at the time of the EIR and did not meet warrants. Glendora reviewed it again when they planned the condominium project and it still did not meet warrants. In regards to the Army Corp of Engineers, they are responsible for natural blue stream areas, as well as State and Federal agencies that have to issue permits as well. The applicant has been working with all the appropriate entities to secure approvals.

In regards to the trail, the Board recommended it should be a trail or at least provide some type of access so that it could be improved with decomposed granite, and that there be some additional landscaping in the form of trees in the 15 foot area not affected by the interceptor drain. However, the Board did not address who will own and maintain that 15 feet; should it be the City, should it be the HOA who maintains it but allow the Dalepark residents to use it, or should it be conveyed to the Dalepark residents. If the Commission has a recommendation, it will be sent to the City Council for consideration. If the HOA had their way, they would give it to the County and not build a trail with any access.

***Commissioner Bratt*** was concerned about the amount of soil being moved. He felt it was a large amount originally, and now it is being increased in an area known for slides and slippage. Have Staff and the City Engineer taken into consideration how that will impact the mountain.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated that was their first reaction, and that being such a large amount they would need to go back through the tract map approval process. But after looking at it in detail, about half of the increased amount is remediation that wasn't called out in the EIR. Most of the additional 600,000 yards are related to the hydrology changes to design a system the County would accept. The Dalepark residents didn't express much concern about the new location of the berm other than to say they would like it landscaped. So while the

numbers seem significant, when Staff looked at how and why the increase occurred, they were less concerned.

***Commissioner Bratt*** stated he had an issue with not being precise in the conditions, and felt it was important that the Commission should indicate the desire to have the basin wall landscaped and that it should specifically be set as a condition of approval. He also felt a specific entity should be identified for maintaining the trail, and was not opposed to recommending the City take on that function. He felt things should be in the conditions so that everyone was clear on the expectations.

***Commissioner Bratt*** asked about the trunk size of a box tree, and that he didn't see anything in the conditions specifying the species to be used as replacement trees. He felt if an oak was removed, it should be replaced with an oak. He did not want to see 936 eucalyptus trees planted and felt they should indicate the replacement trees should be like for like.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated typically the applicant will submit a landscape plan that will show the species and the City typically requires California natives. More than half the trees being removed will be oaks, and they could say there needs to be a similar proportion replaced with oaks. One problem is that some of the replacement trees will be in the front yard areas, and an oak may not fit in with the other proposed landscaping palette, as well as they should not be planted in areas with permanent irrigation. In the front yard area you typically want more lawn than native landscaping and that works against certain tree species.

***Commissioner Bratt*** felt it should at least be specified in the conditions that the replacement trees should be California natives.

***Commissioner Rahi*** asked if there would be a time in the future to review the request for a traffic signal.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated not through the development process for this project; that time has long passed. The residents are making a safety argument, so the process they would follow would be to submit for Traffic Safety Committee review to determine if those non-warrant arguments would require a signal. If so, then it would go through the City budget process. The same would apply to Glendora since it is a shared intersection and they would share in the cost of installation.

Chairman Schoonover opened the meeting for public comment. Addressing the Commission was:

**Stan Stringfellow, 2011 E. Financial Way #203, Glendora, Applicant,** stated they have consulted with Valley Crest Landscaping, who has the best success rate with relocating mature trees. Typically if a tree is being moved, the new location is a strategic spot in the landscaping plan so if it doesn't survive, it will have to be replaced to maintain the landscape scheme. In regards to their landscape plan, they have created tree zones within the community. Primarily the trees being used are walnut, coastal oak and sycamore and will be used in areas where these same species are being removed. They have also established areas where they want to limit the height of the trees planted to maintain views and will choose species that will stay within those limits. He added he is comfortable working with Staff on determining a replacement value of the trees.

There being no further remarks, the public comments were closed.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** felt the applicant has clarified the tree issue but concurred with Commissioner Bratt that a condition should be added requiring that the replacement trees be California natives.

**MOTION:** Moved by Bratt, seconded by Rahi to approve the twelve conditions in Exhibit A, and to add in an appropriate place an emphasis that the replacement trees be primarily California native species. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

* * * * * * * *

Chairman Schoonover called a recess at 8:35. The meeting was called back to order at 8:40 p.m.

* * * * * * * *

* * * * * * * *

Items 4 – 6 were discussed at the same time.

* * * * * * * *

4. **CONSIDERATION OF PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-05** – A request to recommend approval of Conceptual Fencing Plans for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

5. **CONSIDERATION OF PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-04** – A request to recommend approval of Conceptual Landscape Plans for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

6. **CONSIDERATION OF PRECISE PLAN 12-02** – A request to recommend approval of Architectural Guidelines for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

Staff report presented by ***Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens*** who stated the details for the Conceptual Fencing Plans, Landscaping Plans, and Architectural Guidelines were contained in one document. The intent of approving the Guidelines is to set consistent standards and streamline the approval process.

He stated there were some issues with the Fencing Plan. On pages 3-92 and 3-93 of the Guidelines booklet, a concrete post with a cable rail is shown for the equestrian fencing. The Tract Map required an east-west trail that would be along a private street but was publicly accessed. This particular style of fence does not meet City standards for fencing adjacent to equestrian property due to liability concerns, so they cannot accept the concrete post and cable system. The applicant has indicated they will discuss this issue with the City Council. The Commission should also be aware there are current discussions that would eliminate the east-west trail in favor of another trail alternative. If that option is approved, then this issue moot.

The other issue is there needs to be some minor changes made to the equestrian fencing on an equestrian parcel. They need to allow different materials for these parcels that would not be allowed in the rest of the tract. They also have not addressed swimming pool fencing so there need to be some other minor technical changes. Other than that, Staff is satisfied with the rest of the Conceptual Fencing Guidelines.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated Staff has identified a number of issues with the Conceptual Landscape Plan, some of which were covered in the previous presentation. On page 64 of the Guidelines, there are marked reddish brown areas where the replacement trees will be limited in height. Staff is concerned trees planted in those areas may be inappropriately topped or trimmed due to some nebulous idea of a guaranteed view. His suggestion was if they want to have a height limitation, then they need to plant trees that will grow no more than that

height, so Staff has asked them to amend their palette to accommodate that. He felt the applicant was in concurrence with that concept. He also felt that the no-build areas that still exist should be marked on the lots that have them and the text should reflect it.

In regards to street lighting, there was no set direction from the Board because there is no clear conclusion on who will maintain the lights. One option is that the HOA will maintain their own street lights, and if they do that, the standard in the Guidelines is fine. However, if they want Edison to maintain them, Edison has a standard that is different. If they want the City to maintain the lights, then there is a different standard for that as well. Once the applicant makes a decision on which option they will use, then that standard will be inserted into the Guidelines.

There is one additional issue with the street lights on the public portion of Cataract Avenue. The applicant would like to use whichever street light they choose for their project. Since this area is maintained by the City, the question arises that if they choose an option other than the City's standard, would we allow them to use a different street light standard on a public street.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated there are a few minor adjustments to the landscaping on the equestrian lots, where they would like to see a more user friendly plant palette used. There potentially is an issue with the relocated water tank. Originally it was partially below grade and landscaped; now they want it above grade. He felt they should wait on establishing standards until they get the tank plans. There are also continuing discussions because the Regional Water Control Board just issued new MS4 permit requirements regarding water that gets into storm drains, etc., which encourages more impervious surfaces, biofilters and biorention which may need modifications to comply with those guidelines and the new standards will apply when processing the plans. With these minor changes, Staff is recommending approval of the Conceptual Landscape Guidelines.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated in regards to the Conceptual Architectural Guidelines there are some areas Staff feels need to be verified so there may be some technical adjustments needed. One area, however, may involve more modification. On page 2-7 is a request that the 45 one-story lots be permitted to have a second-story component up to 950 square feet that is currently not consistent with the Specific Plan. The applicant has made a request that the Specific Plan be amended to allow that adjustment. The City Council said they will review the request but it still has to go through the public hearing process. Based on the outcome of that hearing, the guidelines may need to be amended from what has been submitted. So the approval tonight for this area would be contingent upon them getting that amendment from the City Council, or else they would need to change the Guidelines to the original standards.

The second area of concern is on page 2-9 regarding standards for the size and height of various accessory structures. In Staff's experience, if someone wanted to build a garage to house their various recreational vehicles, which are not allowed to be parked outside, the standards do not allow a garage large enough for RV's, so they may need to be amended to add some standards for that type of structure.

The third area is that there is a requirement that at least 30% of the lots have solar orientation to accommodate possible solar installations. He stated the applicant has indicated that they have satisfied that standard, but he felt the document needs to better address those parcels so future developers can include that consideration in their design. The other thing is that they have had residents who wanted free-standing solar installations on their slopes and the Guidelines aren't clear on if that is allowable or not. The applicant would prefer to not permit them on slopes, so he felt the Guidelines should be clear on that matter. Since they have more discretion through the CC&R's than the City has, Staff would like the guidelines to be specific.

He also identified some areas where he would like to review detailed County Fire and Building requirements and the Green Building requirements so that what is in the Guidelines is consistent with the codes and reflects the codes can change over the course of time. He also felt that for the eight or nine equestrian lots that it needed to be made clearer in the format that these lots had different standards than other lots for things like accessory structures, etc.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated the Board discussed at length the six different architectural styles proposed, in part due to the one-story versus two-story, and that there weren't enough building types that gave enough flexibility for one-story structures. That adjustment may have to be made after they know the outcome of the proposed Specific Plan amendment. If the applicant can only have 45 one-story houses, they probably will need to amend the Guidelines. Staff is comfortable with letting the process take its course and then making amendments later if necessary.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** asked if it was possible to separate the issues because he did not have any issues with the fencing and landscaping, but it sounds like there are too many unknowns on the Architectural Guidelines, and he wasn't comfortable with it other than agreeing in principal we agree with the Guideline process.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated they could excise a condition, or state the portion associated with the Architectural Guidelines needs to be revised, if that is what the Commission would want to do. He stated the first four conditions were standard and refer back to prior approvals. Condition #5 should be changed to read, "Landscape Guidelines are approved but shall be modified…" and Condition #6 shall be changed similarly to read "Fencing Guidelines are approved but shall be…"

He stated Condition #7 does the same for the Architectural Guidelines and are consistent with what he outlined in the report. Condition #8 states this will replace the Precise Plan process in the future as long as submittals comply with the Guidelines; Condition #9 states the Staff and Applicant will work together on the adjustments and would only come back if Staff feels the changes are significant, and Condition #10 states they will revise the Guidelines prior to the first phase of the Tract Map. They can modify the conditions as they deem necessary or condition that they come back to the Board and Commission before they are finalized.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** stated he would be in favor of bringing Condition #7 back for further review.

Chairman Schoonover opened the meeting for public comment. Addressing the Commission were:

**Stan Stringfellow, 2011 E. Financial Way #203, Glendora, Applicant,** stated this is just a draft of a very complicated document. He felt there were areas where the language will be improved, and that overall Staff is saying this is a pretty complete document and that they are in basic agreement with Staff. He stated the house details were only meant to be illustrative of the type of details common to each style, not that this is the exact house that will be constructed. He thinks they will be making minor changes right up to the time of the final version and would encourage the Commission to approve this tonight. In regards to the street lights, he stated they were trying to keep consistency throughout the development and that the EIR required them to have a dark sky environment, and the standards from the City or Edison do not meet that requirement. They are hoping to keep that same style of lighting all the way down to Foothill Boulevard. In response to Commissioner Bratt, he stated they have not assigned any particular style of home to any of the lots. The Architectural Committee would be looking for variation in the style of homes, and that the document states there needs to be a mixture of

architectural styles so it wouldn't only be one style used in the whole development. He foresees any changes to be a refinement of the document.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated the recommendation is to give them conceptual approval as there will be a high level of detail to get from the draft to the final version. It may even go back to DPRB to deal with some of these details.

***Commissioner Bratt*** stated while overall he did not have a lot of problem with what has been presented, he did not want to approve something that is incomplete and felt he could approve it in principal but may want it brought back when the details in Conditions 5-7 are resolved.

***Chairman Schoonover*** stated he shared the concerns of Commissioner Bratt in regards to the illustrations. He asked what the requirements were for sports court lighting.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated that type of lighting was prohibited.

**Stan Stringfellow, Applicant,** stated all lighting is required to be contained within the lot itself to maintain the dark sky environment.

**Kim Scott, NJD, 3300 E. First Street, #510, Denver, CO 80206,** confirmed that in the Landscape Design Guidelines there would be no eucalyptus trees planted.

***Commissioner Ensberg*** felt in regards to the Architectural Guidelines, if there is a real change made to them, it should be brought back to the Commission to review.

***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated he could add to Condition #7 in the intro something to the effect that after the first round of revisions after the Specific Plan Amendment is done, the Staff will present an update to the DPRB and the Planning Commission on the status of any changes and the Board or Commission may decide at that point in time to look at the guidelines in toto before they become final.

***Commissioner Bratt*** stated he was comfortable with that but felt it should also apply to Conditions #5 and #6.

**Kim Scott, NJD,** stated this has been a collaborative effort with Staff and thinks they will be able to get to finalizing the details once it is determined if they can have the two-story element or not on certain types of architecture.

There being no further remarks, the public comments section was closed.

RESOLUTION PC-1475

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-05, CONCEPTUAL FENCING PLAN; PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-04, CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLANS; AND PRECISE PLAN NO. 12-02, ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES FOR TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 70583 (BRASADA)

**MOTION:** Moved by Bratt, seconded by Ensberg to approve Resolution PC-1475 directing Staff to prepare the appropriate findings and insert modifications to Conditions #5, #6 and #7 in some form that allows the Planning Commission to be updated and determine if any of the revisions

warrant further DPRB and/or Planning Commission review. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent).

## ORAL COMMUNICATION

7. **Assistant City Manager for Community Development**
***Assistant City Manager Stevens*** stated the joint meeting with the City Council to discuss the upcoming Housing Element cycle has been scheduled for March 11, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers Conference Room. He stated the Council adopted the two Code Amendments and two Zone Changes as recommended by the Commission. Next Tuesday the City will be participating in the annual homeless count. Village Walk is grading for the rear 43 units and preparing to pull the building permits. Bonita Canyon Gateway is re-working their transaction with Avalon Bay and intend to close sometime the first part of May. He will be bringing the amendment to the carports in the Specific Plan probably the second meeting in February.

8. **Members of the Audience**
No communications were made.

9. **Planning Commission**
No communications were made.

## ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION:** Moved by Ensberg, seconded by Bratt to adjourn. Motion carried 4-0-1 (Davis absent). The meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for February 6, 2013, at 7:00 p.m.

_____
Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

_____
Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: February 6, 2013