DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
February 28, 2013 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
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

ABSENT

Emmett Badar, City Council
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:30 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Sorcinelli stated for the record that he 2nd the motion for approval of the DPRB Case No. 12-31 and Precise Plan No. 12-06 not Jim Schoonover.

MOTION: John Sorcinelli moved, seconded by Scott Dilley to approve the February 14, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-2-0 (Badar and Patel Absent).

Review of Modifications to DPRB Case No. 11-33

A request to modify architectural qualities and design of a previously approved 4,489-square foot single-story residence with a 755-square foot three car garage and 380-square foot detached patio located at 1049 Via Romales.

APN's: 8448-056-015

Zone: Specific Plan No. 12

Rene Bobadilla, applicant, was present.
Guy Williams, consultant for the applicant, was present.

Associate Planner Williams stated that Staff believes that the aggregate changes, elimination of architectural features, and removal of the front courtyard detracts from the original design as was approved by the DPRB and requires reconsideration and notice to the DPRB. Staff recommends that the Board approve the following modifications: elimination of decorative arched front windows to uphold

staff's previous approval and modification of front entry porch roof style from gable to hip to uphold staff's previous approval. Provide direction to staff on the following modifications: use of flat gray tiles in place of previously approved variegated Spanish style S-tile, elimination of divided light panels from windows and elimination of 42" high decorative stone wall enclosing front yard courtyard. Advise staff of any new design requirements the Board may want to put on the project to offset the features being removed and require the project to maintain all other design features as shown on the previously approved plans. The conditions imposed on the project through the approval of DPRB Case No. 11-33 and Precise Plan 11-04 will be upheld in addition to any conditions that the DPRB may choose to put on the proposed modifications.

Associate Planner Williams noted that the most recent approval for this case was on October 27, 2011. The approval was for the construction of a new 4,489 sq. ft. single-story residence with an attached 755 sq. ft. three car garage and detached 380 sq. ft. patio on a vacant lot. Since the approval, plans have been submitted and permits have been issued. At the time of the approval, there were specific architectural features including: arched front windows, exterior cladding consisting of smooth stucco and stone veneer, column supported porch and patio, precast trim around windows and Spanish tile roof. A front courtyard was approved that consisted of a 42" high decorative garden wall enclosing a courtyard of colored concrete paving with score lines, raised planters, urn planters and colorful flowering shrubs and perennials. Since the approval, the construction has started and changes have been made. Staff has worked with the applicant to make changes; however, additional changes have been made that alter the design that was previously approved and Staff would like to bring them to the Board's attention. Two design modifications to the plans that were approved by the DPRB have already been presented to and approved by Staff.

Staff has approved the following modifications: elimination of arched windows, box windows have already been installed without arches above with Staff's approval and change of front porch from gable design to hip design – the modified porch has already been constructed with Staff's approval.

Staff has not approved the following modifications: potential elimination of divided light panels (grids) on windows – windows without divided light panels that have already been installed; Staff is still waiting on a cost estimate from the applicant. The elimination of Spanish S-Tile Roof – a gray flat tile roof has already been installed in place of the approved Spanish S-Tile. The removal of decorative lighting fixtures along street elevation – the current construction does not leave openings for electrical, and fixtures are deleted on the new elevations. The modification to previously approved decorative garage doors and use of plain brown steel garage door– shown on new elevations; Staff has not approved the deletion of decorative garage doors. The elimination of front courtyard – there is a discrepancy between the grading and building plans, which show the courtyard remaining and the landscaping plan, which does not provide for a courtyard. The applicant is proposing to eliminate the 42" high decorative garden wall creating the courtyard. The site plan calls for a stucco wall, while the approved rendering indicated that the wall would be El Dorado ledgestone veneer to match the ledgestone veneer proposed on the house. The color concrete paving and landscaping within the area are proposed to remain.

Due to the numerous changes, Staff does not feel comfortable approving the changes without hearing the Board's feedback. Staff recommends approving: the elimination of decorative arched front windows and modification of front entry porch roof style from gable to hip. Staff reiterated that certain features, such as moldings on the windows, are to be maintained. Staff would like direction in regards to the roof tile, window grids and elimination of decorative stone wall. Staff asks the Board to include any new design requirements to put on the project to offset the features being removed. Staff also recommends that the project maintain all other design features as shown on the approved plans: decorative ledgestone, decorative light fixtures, smooth stucco finish, decorative front doors and garage door and window trim.

Mr. Dilley asked if the garage door will include arched windows.

Rene Bobadilla, applicant, responded the opening is arched; however, the garage door is squared.

Mr. Stevens stated that there may have been a discussion on the fascia material on the lower portion of the front elevation as to whether they were being removed or not going to be included.

Associate Planner Williams stated that Mr. Bobadilla assured Staff that they would not remove the fascia material.

Mr. Stevens asked if there is a Homeowner's Association and noted there may be one.

Mr. Bobadilla responded no.

Mr. Michaelis asked if window molding is proposed to be installed.

Associate Planner Williams responded yes.

Mr. Bobadilla stated that the plans called for precast concrete trim at the front and side of the windows, which have been added all around the house. He noted that the windows are almost completely installed with molding.

Mr. Bobadilla pointed out that the siding has different shade alternatives and noted the roof tile was a brown tone.

Associate Planner Williams pointed out the field ledge materials and prefers the Veneto which is darker, same field ledge. Staff would be ok with modification.

Mr. Bobadilla stated that plans were submitted to Building & Safety for the courtyard which showed modifications to the landscape and emphasized the entry; however, after thinking it over, a change to make the entry with a pony wall has already been installed. The landscaping plans were approved and the grading plans have a note for hardscape. The courtyard should have been excluded but the intent is to not include one but can be included if required by the Board. He pointed out that the garage door was metal and on the renderings, it is a lot fancier and prefers what was originally approved. He noted that the entry was changed because of the trusses. He stated that the moldings and stone work are the same.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about the windows.

Mr. Bobadilla responded that the windows were called out for tempered. He noted that they were very expensive and was not called out with grids. He stated that when they started framing; there was an opportunity to put windows in.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked about the heights of the walls and noted that the back doors have some lights above them.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there were lights at the front doors as well.

Mr. Bobadilla replied they are behind the columns on the wall.

Mr. Stevens pointed out the landscaping plan and stated there is a lot of decorative paving shown. He asked if it will still be included with the project.

Mr. Stevens commented he still wants to see decorative paving and would like a revised plan.

Mr. Bobadilla stated that if the Board wants sample colors and stamping of what the concrete would look like, it can be brought in.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, asked about moving the gates.

Mr. Bobadilla stated that the double drive electronic gate was moved. The landscaping plan was very elaborate and the irrigation was very expensive. He emphasized he is still committed to putting landscaping on the property.

Mr. Stevens commented that the S tile would have been better. The courtyard appears nice when looked at in two dimensional; it's difficult to get a feel of how close things are based on samples. He pointed at the photograph and noted that the grade difference of the sidewalk and pad which does nothing for the courtyard. He stated that if there is a more traditional Spanish design with the patio courtyard entry and setback further and the pad elevation different.

Mr. Bobadilla stated that there is a 6 to 8 ft. drop from the pad elevation; he added that it is deceiving on the plans for the courtyard area.

Mr. Stevens stated that the most important consideration is if a different garage door is a good decision. and added it does not have to be an expensive one. He noted it would help to see on the plans and pointed out it's helpful that the garage door does not face the front of the property. He asked what it would take to switch the four windows at the front to a grid window.

Associate Planner Williams also mentioned the change from casement to slider windows.

Mr. Stevens stated that the windows depicted on the plans are plain in comparison to what has been presented. The windows detract more than any of the other changes made to this project.

Guy Williams, representing the applicant, commented that the windows are already installed.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that if they are sliders, the windows can be changed without changing the frames and there would be no damage to the finish.

Mr. Stevens stated that they would not have approved the elimination of the arches; however, it will be dealt with. He noted that discussion needs to take place for the changes to the decorative paving, windows and elimination of courtyard. He commented on the garage door and requested that the applicant consider having upper windows; however, there are other ways to accomplish the same thing.

Mr. Bobadilla commented that many of the neighbors have a garage door made of steel.

Mr. Stevens commented that Staff does not require a wood garage door and added it is hard to maintain.

Mr. Beilstein stated that since submittal and issuance of permits, there has been an addition of a transformer in the front yard which was fought to not have. Staff has gone through a modification of the landscaping plan to try to disguise the transformer nearby the driveway.

Mr. Bobadilla stated that he had worked with Edison eight years ago. He explained that he was ready to pour footings and asked Edison where the power could be served from; and could not get a Planner to meet out in the field. He indicated he was not sure where to get power from and Edison returned

indicating that a transformer was needed. He stated that an infrastructure should have been put in. He preferred going through an existing vault versus having a transformer. He noted he has a decorative cap and stucco wall to match and the landscaping so that the transformer can blend in. He expressed his frustration with working with Edison.

Mr. Beilstein stated that location suggestions were not an option; however, the walls will match and will be minimized with landscaping. He noted that he disagrees with Edison's decision for the location.

Mr. Stevens asked if the trim on the windows goes all the way around.

Mr. Bobadilla replied that precast concrete trims are used; however, the plans call out for foam but have been upgraded to precast.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that he is worried that the elevations were changed dramatically. He noted that the current entry and window were changed; the windows seem more acceptable now because they match the entry. He commented that the windows could have had an elliptical arch on windows with recessed space above; however, the concerns of the windows are that they are white vinyl on a large home. He noted he does not have a problem with the tile, elimination of the courtyard level change, decorative ledgestone and elimination of lighting. He agreed with the gate being moved so that the front entry court yard remains open to the street.

Mr. Stevens stated that the stucco arched is the best way to go for the windows.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked why the windows are tempered on both sides.

Mr. Beilstein replied that the Code requires the outside of windows to be tempered. He noted that the plans called out that both sides of the windows be tempered; however, due to the zone located, high severity, the outside pane is required to be tempered.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked the applicant if he could remove the window.

Mr. Bobadilla responded that every window had been tempered inside and outside. He noted that there are inserts for windows to put on the outside or the first pane can be taken out and put back in.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that the windows look like vinyl and are unpleasant to look at.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant can submit the grids and look at the sculpted versus the metal.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve modifications to DPRB Case No 11-33 including: the change of roof to flat tile as installed, the decorative lighting features as discussed, modified garage doors as to be worked out with Staff, elimination of the courtyard, change from one shade of ledgestone to another, new location for the gate, adjustments to landscape plan to depict a modified decorative hardscape, and the potential elimination of the window grids, dependent on further investigation and determination by the Assistant City Manager of Community Development. Other decorative elements including, pre-cast concrete molding for window trim, smooth stucco plaster finish and lush landscaping are to remain.

Motion carried 5-0-2-0 (Badar and Patel Absent)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 a.m. to the meeting of March 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: March 28, 2013