DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
January 24, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT

Emmett Badar, City Council (Arrived at 8:36 a.m.)
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 (Arrived at 9:20 a.m.)
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development (Arrived at 8:42 a.m.)

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:34 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

DPRB Case No. 13-01

A request to add additional 450 sq. ft. to a previously approved 495 sq. ft. rear addition to an existing 1,398 single-story residence, listed on the City's Historic Survey at 516 N San Dimas Avenue.

APN: 8387-002-011

Zone: Single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Chris Galvez, applicant, was present.
Ron and Alline Kranzer, residents of 508 N San Dimas Ave, were present.

Mr. Badar arrived at 8:36 a.m.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the residence is listed on the City's Historic Survey. The applicant submitted a request to demolish an unpermitted 120 sq. ft. rear patio and a permitted 65 sq. ft. washroom in order to construct a 495 sq. ft. rear addition. The request was reviewed and approved by the DPRB on January 12, 2012. The applicant has started construction of the remodel addition and has decided to redesign the proposed floor plan to better suit their needs. The applicant is requesting to add 450 sq. ft. to the rear of the house. The applicant is proposing 336 sq. ft. rear patio and two trellises attached to the north side of the house. The new addition will architecturally match the same design previously approved, some of the features including: 4" exposed Hardie Board horizontal siding, flared Hardie Board shingle skirt at the base of the home, single hung aluminum-clad wood windows with Prairie style mullions and decorative wood trim around all windows and exterior doors. The applicant is proposing to remove and replace all the composition roofing with a Class S composition shingle. Staff recommends approval with conditions of approval.

Alline Kranzer, resident of 508 N San Dimas Ave, stated that this home has gone through a lot of construction and added she is in support of the project and construction.

MOTION: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve with conditions of approval.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the December 20, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-2-1 (Sorcinelli and Stevens absent, Michaelis abstain).

DPRB Case No. 12-29

A request to legalize a 698 sq. ft. detached garage conversion to a second unit and construct a new 960 sq. ft. four-car garage to meet the parking requirements for the existing single-family residence and the second unit. The request also includes the legalization of a 360 sq. ft. detached patio. The project site is located at 806 W Gladstone Street.

Associated Cases: CE09-0591

APN: 8386-023-042

Zone: Single-Family (SF-7500)

Bill Wood, representing the applicant, Arturo Lopez, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza indicated that this project was based off of a code enforcement case for an illegal garage conversion and stand-along covered patio. The applicant submitted plans for legalization of the garage conversion into a second unit and to construct a new four-car garage to meet the parking requirements of the Code. The subject site allows for a 700 sq. ft. second unit. The proposed second unit is 698 sq. ft. The second unit will match the existing house. The existing garage is 720 sq. ft., which the applicant reduced the garage by 22 sq. ft. and is now 698 sq. ft. The garage will be the same architectural style. The applicant is planning on rebuilding the 4-car garage and requesting to extend the existing driveway. The four car-garage will be detached and located adjacent to the east property line towards the rear of the property. The garage will service both of the residences by providing each of the units with two parking spaces. The patio was also an issue that should be included with the approval today.

Senior Planner Espinoza pointed out the issue with the applicant proposing asphalt for the extension of the new driveway that can be seen from the street. Staff recommends the new driveway be all concrete or for the asphalt to begin after the south wall plane of the second unit to avoid patch work of materials that can be seen from the street.

Mr. Stevens arrived at 8:42 a.m.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that since this is an ongoing and active code enforcement case, Staff has created a timeframe: the applicant shall submit construction plans to Building & Safety within 30 days of DPRB approval, obtain building permits for the second unit, four-car garage and patio within 90 days from the date of submittal for building plan check, sign and record with the Los Angeles County Recorder's Office a "Covenant and Agreement Limiting Use of Property," final of all approved buildings completed within 180 days from the date permits are issued, a one-time 45-day extension may be

granted only if determined progress has been made and the second unit shall not be occupied until it has been finaled in addition to the final of the garage. Staff recommends approval with conditions included with Staff Report.

Mr. Badar asked if the timeframes have been discussed with the applicant.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded no; however, this has been an active code enforcement case since 2009 and the timeframe is reasonable for them to follow.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the applicant has been made aware of the second unit covenant agreement requirements.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes and added the covenant agreements are renewed every year.

Mr. Patel asked if they are connected to a public sewer and added if they are not, they will need to be.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, stated that there is a condition that reflects that inquiry.

Mr. Stevens stated that if it is on a septic system, there will be a sewer available.

Mr. Beilstein stated that they cannot increase the septic if a sewer is available.

Bill Wood, representing the applicant, stated that he does not believe they are connected to a sewer.

Mr. Stevens stated that they will need to pay City fees.

Mr. Patel stated that they may have to annex because the property is older.

Mr. Badar asked how long the process will take.

Mr. Patel responded as soon as the applicant pays the fees, the paper work will be the longest part of the process. He emphasized they are already annexed when they pay so they can begin their work without delay.

Mr. Badar asked what will happen if there is a delay.

Mr. Stevens responded there should not be a delay if it needs to be annexed; however, if so, they will permit additional time. He stated that the purpose of the timelines is so that the applicant does not procrastinate.

Mr. Michaelis asked that the applicant be made aware of the timeframes.

Mr. Stevens replied that they are making a good faith effort. He noted that this is a code enforcement case that has been going on for three years; however, Staff will still be flexible in regards to delays with paper work needing to be processed.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated they are giving the applicant a total of 10 ½ months to finish the process.

MOTION: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve with conditions of approval.

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

Mr. Beilstein informed the Board that the applicant has been connected to the sewer since August of 2004.

Tree Removal Permit No. 12-54

A request for the removal of five (5) mature trees located in the common landscape area of the Canyon Hill Homeowners Association.

Zone: Specific Plan No. 9

Rob Franklin of Greenscape Maintenance, applicant, was present.
Sandy Laub, resident of 567 Canyon Hill Rd, was present.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that the request is to remove five White Alder trees that range in diameter size from 33" to 40.5." All the trees proposed for removal are within the shared common area of the Canyon Hills Homeowner Association. Per the arborist letter submitted with the application, the trees do not have viable cambium tissue which is the life of the tree. The cambium tissue on a healthy tree is green and moist, while the subject trees' cambium is brown and dry. The applicant was proposing a tree replacement of four (4) White Alder 15 gallon trees through the Canyon Hills Homeowners Association areas. After talking with Staff, it has been agreed to replace with five trees.

Staff visited the site on December 26, 2012 and appeared that the trees are deteriorating. The issues are that the applicant is requesting a reduction in the tree replacement requirement, removing four and replacing with five; however, Staff would like five trees totaled to be replaced for those removed. Staff's original issue reflected in the report has been addressed. She noted Staff recommends approval with the added condition.

Mr. Patel asked if the HOA notified the residents of the tree removal since there have been situations previously where residents are not made aware of the tree removals.

Associate Planner Rojas responded that there was a HOA meeting held discussing the tree removal and minutes recorded verifying the tree removal was presented and approved.

Mr. Schoonover asked the arborist why White Alder trees are dying.

Rob Franklin of Greenscape Maintenance responded that they are dying throughout California and it is not just White Alders trees but Liquid Ambers and Sycamore. He stated that the trees affected are the older ones between 25-30 years old and added the newer planted White Alder trees are surviving and doing great. He indicated that there are five additional White Alder trees that will need to be removed in the future because they are showing similar deteriorating symptoms.

Mr. Stevens stated that all these trees were most likely planted with the original project back in 1985. He stated that if there are an additional five White Alders that need to be removed, it should be included with the approval today. This will save time for the applicant so they do not have to return to the Board; however, the ratio will be need to be 1:1 and the applicant will still need to file and application to Staff for review and include how the trees are adversely affected.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve a total of 10 trees to be removed at a 1:1 ratio. Two phases will occur: the 5 trees will be removed as soon as possible and the additional 5 trees will be removed at a future date. The applicant will still need to submit an application for those 5 trees and demonstrate how they are adversely affected.

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

DPRB Case No. 12-21

A request to construct a new single-family residence over an existing foundation, three car garage and new horse stables located at 1046 South Cliff St.

APN: 8385-013-014

Zone: Single-Family Hillside with Private Horse Overlay (SF-H(PH))

Linda Adame, applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that the development is on a vacant 4.89-acre parcel, in 1978, there was a house constructed there. In 2009, code enforcement received a complaint of illegal construction. When inspected, the structure was completely gutted to the framing and roof. After three years in code enforcement and going through foreclosure, the bank filed a permit to demo the structure to the foundation. The property has since been purchased by another owner, who wants to construct over the existing foundation. The foundation will need to be look at by Building and Safety during plan check to see if it can be brought up to the current Building Code.

The overall architectural design of the new residence would be Craftsman style with features including: large front porch, cedar shake siding around the house, decorative front facing gable detail, wood windows, chimney, exposed roof brackets and predominately low-pitch roof. The applicant is proposing to construct a three-car garage with additional storage space attached to the residence. The subject lot is zoned Single-Family Hillside with Private Horse Overlay which allows the property owner to house up to five horses per acre. There is potential to have 24 horses; however, the applicant is only proposing to construct corrals to house six horses. She concluded that Staff did not see any issues and recommends approval.

Mr. Stevens asked if they are connected to a septic system.

Associate Planner Rojas responded yes.

Mr. Stevens asked where it is located on the site plan.

Linda Adame, applicant, replied it is a little ways past the proposed horse corrals.

Mr. Stevens stated that the design requirements for the size of the tank and leeching characteristics of the soil and size of tank are based on the number of bedrooms. He noted that unless the applicant is able to locate the original permit, a field investigation will need to be conducted in order to verify size and adequacy of the leech field. This would also need Health Department's approval.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that Condition No. 34 indicates a request for an upgrade to the septic per the approval of Building Official and LA County Health Department.

Mr. Stevens noted that an MS 4 permit has a standard to private sewage disposal system.

Mr. Patel indicated that right now they currently do not have that permit.

Mr. Stevens stated that the State agency is creating a new program to regulate private systems and annual regular fees; however, it is not in effect yet and there may be some exemptions. He asked if it is located near a water stream.

Mr. Beilstein responded that the house is not near a water stream.

Mr. Stevens noted that the standard setback from a water stream is 100 ft.

Ms. Adame reassured the Board that the property is more than 100 ft. away from a stream.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a landscape plan requirement, given the odd shape of this parcel and the size.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that she spoke with the architect and the majority of the landscaping will take place in the front yard of the property.

Mr. Stevens asked if there are any additional code enforcement issues that still have not been remedied.

Associate Planner Rojas responded it is a closed case since the demo permit was pulled and issued.

Mr. Stevens asked who pulled the demolition permit.

Mr. Beilstein responded the bank who owned the property at that time.

Mr. Patel pointed out a concern on the west side of the property. He noted that the City drain terminates at the toe of the slope where contour 720 is. He noted that lack of maintenance in the channel when heavy storms occur, and noted that all the water ends up on the tennis courts. He recommended that the conditions of approval state that the applicant extends the storm drain 150 ft. with a head wall.

Mr. Patel referenced Site Plan A1 which depicts the west side drainage easement which was constructed in 1977.

Mr. Stevens asked if it is a current improvement.

Mr. Patel responded that the improvement on the head wall ends where the chain link fence is. He restated that the lack of maintenance in the channel and overgrowth during the heavy storms leads the water to jumps the channel and ends up on the tennis courts.

Mr. Stevens asked where the water drains.

Mr. Patel responded it drains from the north.

Mr. Stevens asked what his recommendation is for.

Mr. Patel responded an extension of the storm drain by 150 ft. He asked that they look at the contour to the south of the property and pointed out that it drops 10-15 ft.

Mr. Stevens asked if the County accepts that water.

Mr. Patel responded yes with the extended pipe and noted the energy at the head wall is 0.

Mr. Stevens asked if they can get approval from the County.

Mr. Patel responded not if stopped short in terms of the head wall.

Mr. Stevens stated that virtually none of the water is coming from this property.

Mr. Patel responded that Mr. Stevens was correct that all the water being drained was from City streets.

Mr. Stevens stated that most of the water is from the City street. He asked why the system is designed at this length as opposed to taking to the property line.

Mr. Patel stated that based on the development, it makes sense.

Mr. Stevens asked if the City easement extends beyond the South property line. He recommended requiring an easement to facilitate the drainage. He stated that there needs to be a reasonable nexus to require that type of improvement and instead it may be best to require an easement to allow the expansion. He stated that a decision cannot be made today and noted Staff needs to look at the size of the pipe and the amount of drainage including the cost to determine reasonably yes or no to make a requirement. He noted that a condition can be added to study the drainage to see if improvements are warranted and if so it will need to return back to the Board. A hydrology study analysis will be conducted by mostly the City versus the applicant.

Mr. Patel stated that the properties on the west side of the tennis courts are affected.

Mr. Stevens stated that it is reasonable to look at those properties but is not warranted to require the applicant to install a pipe that is not directly associated to the hydrology arising from the property itself.

Mr. Patel noted the lack of the channel maintenance.

Mr. Stevens recommended that a maintenance agreement be located; however, back then it was not regularly thought of thoroughly. He stated that requiring an easement seems sufficient.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the solution will be part of the City's and not entirely put on the applicant.

Mr. Stevens stated that it is reasonable to require an easement or extension of the easement. He noted that if improvements are required, that portion alone will return to the Board and emphasized it will not delay the moving forward of the project. He asked what the estimated cost would be for 150 ft. of pipe.

Mr. Patel responded $ 25,000.

Mr. Stevens stated that it is a large cost for a Single-Family residential project.

Associate Planner Rojas asked how long it would take to conduct a hydrology study.

Mr. Patel responded one month.

Ms. Adame stated that $ 25,000 is costly.

Mr. Stevens asked if the driveway is improved and if it meets the requirement for distance.

Associate Planner Rojas responded that it meets current standards.

Mr. Stevens asked who controls the easement across the property.

Associate Planner Rojas responded that the applicant controls that portion.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Fire Department will ask for additional improvements.

Mr. Beilstein responded most likely a request for a Knox box at the gate and fire sprinklers.

Mr. Sorcinelli arrived at 9:20 a.m.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve subject to the applicant working with the City Engineer to evaluate the drainage circumstances associated to the drainage easement and if the evaluation determines an easement extension is warranted, that component will need to return to DPRB for determination.

Motion carried 6-0-0-1 (Sorcinelli Abstain)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m. to the meeting of February 14 2013 at 8:30 a.m.

_____
Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

_____
Jessica Mejia
Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: