DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
March 28, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT

Emmett Badar, City Council
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works (Arrived at 8:37 a.m.)
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

ABSENT

John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:31 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the February 28, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-2-1 (Patel and Sorcinelli Absent and Badar Abstain).

DPRB Case No. 13-05

Continued from the meeting of March 14, 2013. A request to construct a 700 sq. ft. second unit with attached one-car 250 sq. ft. garage and a 328 sq. ft. rear patio on a property that is 30,780 sq. ft. in size and is currently developed with a single-family residence located at 20740 Mesarica Road.

APN: 8426-028-016

Zone: Single-Family 15,000 (SF-15,000)

Steve Eide, applicant, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that this item was heard at the last DPRB meeting of March 14, 2013. At that meeting, the Board had two issues of concern that needed further review and voted to continue the item to allow Staff and the applicant time to rectify the issues. The Board wanted to confirm if any street improvements and/or dedications would be required as part of the project. The City Engineer determined that all the dedications have already been performed and determined the project did not warrant any street improvements at this time. The Board also had a concern with the location of the proposed driveway that runs parallel to the front yard within the 20-foot setback. The driveway would occupy 12 feet of the width of the 20-foot setback, leaving only six feet of landscaping. The applicant does not wish to relocate the driveway because they feel the new location would occupy too much of

their yard. There was an additional issue that came up since the printing of the final staff report. The Public Works Department is requiring that the applicant construct an 8-10 ft. pave out in front of the property. The pave out is requested because during the rainy season, storm water flows over this area and carries debris into the street and Staff believes this situation can become an NPDES violation. Staff recommends that the pave out start at the driveway and continue to the fire hydrant. The pave out will have a small swale at the edge.

Mr. Badar asked if Staff spoke with the applicant about the pave out. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied no, the requirement was discussed and determined yesterday.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented on the driveway issue and noted that it is within the front yard setback. He discussed with the property owner and architect and they do not wish to change the location of the driveway. The property owners reasoned that if the house is relocated and the garage is readjusted, it will break up the front yard landscaping area. Staff suggested flipping the orientation of the house and noted that it will be at the same location and a small driveway can be created and there could still be a front yard and back yard for the 2nd unit. Staff recommends approving the project with modifications that they remove the driveway and adjust somewhere else on the lot.

Mr. Dilley asked if the 2nd unit has to have an attached garage. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza responded no.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that there is currently a three-car garage attached to the house. He noted that the three car garage could suffice for the parking space needed for the 2nd unit. He added that if in the future, if the 2nd unit is rented out to a non-family member, the three car garage will not work because, more than likely neither the property owner nor the tenant would not want to share a common garage space. Staff is trying to foresee any issues.

Mr. Stevens stated that the garage could be detached and shifted 10-15 ft. from the house to minimize the driveway cost.

Mr. Patel arrived at 8:37 a.m.

Mr. Stevens commented that the garage is barely attached and provided alternatives for the relocation of the driveway.

Mr. Badar commented that the driveway is not visible as long as the hedge is there.

Mr. Michaelis stated that he does not know how Turf Block compares to asphalt and if it will make a difference but advised that it will give the appearance of grass.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the Turf Block is used on a daily basis versus occasionally. He noted that it may not grow as much. The applicant suggested two strips of concrete; the code requires a 12 ft. wide driveway. He stated that the question at hand is how much can a property owner pave their front yard and how much needs to be landscape versus hardscape.

Mr. Badar agreed that if the 2nd unit is utilized by a non-family member, sharing a garage would not be ideal for neither the property owner nor the tenant.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that there are many options for the applicant and property owner to choose from due to the size of the lot.

Mr. Stevens inquired why the entire house is not moved near the existing driveway. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied that the property owners do not want the landscaping area damaged or lessened.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant has comments in regards to the requirements for paving.

Steve Eide, applicant, replied he will discuss the options with the property owners in regards to the pave out.

Mr. Stevens explained to Mr. Eide that the pave out is encouraged because dirt will runoff into the public street due to the unpaved shoulder. He noted that the first 700 ft. belongs to the City and the rest belongs to the County.

Mr. Dilley asked if there is a way to justify putting in a 2nd driveway. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied no because it is against the Code.

Mr. Stevens stated that there needs to be a 100 ft. of frontage to have a circular driveway.

Mr. Dilley recommended that it the driveway is circular, and then Turf Block can be used. In response, Mr. Stevens reiterated there needs to be a 100 ft. of frontage to have a circular driveway. He advised that by having a 2nd driveway, sight distance can become an issue. He stated the preference is the pave out rather than a 2nd driveway.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that the house would need to be realigned to have a circular driveway.

Mr. Stevens asked if Staff suggested using Turf Block and then retracted the option. In response, Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes.

Mr. Stevens stated that two strips of concrete can be used; however, it cannot be asphalt but instead has to be concrete.

Senior Planner Espinoza recommended moving the house driveway back 6 ft. and noted that would reduce the encroachment into the front yard by 6 ft. rather than the proposed 12 ft. He noted that the garage can be moved up to reduce the amount of paving.

Mr. Stevens stated there can be a compromise with the property owners.

Mr. Eide stated that all of these options have been discussed previously; however, the owner wants to save as much grass area in the front yard. The original design had the driveway at a different location, Turf Block was an option. He noted it can be shifted and split ½ and ½ as proposed by Staff.

Mr. Patel stated that Staff has been accommodating; however, the property owners seem very specific in what they want.

Mr. Stevens stated that there is a design aesthetic preference of Staff. At times, an amendment was thought to be included to limit the hardscape in the front setback; however, more of a design approach was decided versus following a specific code requirement.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve subject to recommendations discussed and added condition for a 8-10 ft. deep street pave out with a swale in front of the property from the driveway up to the fire hydrant and a requirement that the driveway be readjusted to not

encroach more than 6 ft. into the front yard setback. The use of Turf Block is not a requirement; however, the applicant will need to maintain landscaping if used.

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

Mr. Eide stated that a compromise can be worked out with the property owners and Staff.

Mr. Badar asked how much will the house be changed. In response, Mr. Stevens replied that it depends; the applicant can shift the whole house 6 ft. or rotate the house.

Mr. Badar asked if it will cause a problem with the slope at the rear of the property. In response, Mr. Stevens replied no and added that the garage can slide up a bit and be attached to more of the house versus the way it is proposed.

ICI BUILDING FAÇADE RENOVATIONS OVERVIEW

Review the proposed building colors for the façade remodel located at 175 W Bonita Avenue.

APN: 8387-011-037

Zone: Creative Growth 2, Area 2 Frontier Village (CG-2)

Mr. Stevens stated that two weeks ago, there was a façade remodel of the ICI building where the front cover was demolished and removed the wood siding at the front and on the side facing Monte Vista Ave. The wood siding was left on the addition at the back of the property. The question was what colors to use when there is no ability to determine the historic colors. Of the photos provided, there were two shades of paint used: lighter along the window band and lighter underneath the text, whereas the rest is a slightly darker color variation. Staff would like to revert back to the historic painting pattern of a lighter band on the window, lighter tan color and darker accent colors across the top. In the far back corner, at front of the building, there was a 12 ft. wood fence surrounding the equipment; however, it was removed. Staff is looking at using a wrought iron gate that is 6-8 ft. Staff has gone back and forth on the type of material, but the use of perforated versus solid flat type finish is preferred. The awnings will be back on the building and will match the existing color, Pacific Blue, and requested Staff's recommendation in regards to awnings.

Mr. Badar asked if the awnings are split. In response, Mr. Stevens replied they are split into two pieces because one continuous piece could not be located.

Mr. Dilley asked if the wrought iron fence will be painted to match the building. In response, Mr. Stevens replied probably not. Mr. Dilley recommended it be painted or powder coated to match the building.

Mr. Stevens stated there is wood at back of the property that will remain and be a continuation. He noted that the wood was in poor shape and discovered there were windows underneath. The windows had been covered from the inside and outside but are in good condition. He also noted a discovery was made of a survey marker located at the front of the building. Some discussions can occur on the window patterns, Staff wants to match another building but that is still under discussion.

Mr. Michaelis asked when the ICI building was constructed. In response, Mr. Stevens replied 1911.

Mr. Michaelis asked when the survey marker was attached to the building. In response, Mr. Stevens replied that the date indicated on the marker was 1923.

Mr. Patel commented that the survey marker could have been a part of a water line project.

COMMENTS: Discussion occurred about proposed colors and feedback was provided.

DPRB Case No. 11-26 *(Loma Bonita Residences)*

A request to review the proposed carport design and changes of the building colors throughout the project on 6.28 acres of land located at the northwest corner of Bonita Avenue and San Dimas Canyon Road.

Related Case: Precise Plan Case No. 09-01

APN's: 8390-013-019, 20

Zone: Specific Plan No. 26

Mr. Stevens stated that the developer is in the process of selling the property and noted that the intended buyer is aware of issues with the property. Mr. Stevens explained that the plans for this project were last reviewed and approved by the DPRB on March 22, 2012. The approval then was necessitated by substantial project changes to the site plan affected by County Fire Department requirements. The proposed carports were identified on the site plan but no architectural or other design details were provided. After the approval, it was discovered that the carports were located in a required property line setback and a Specific Plan application is pending to allow encroachment of carports into those setback areas. Staff posed the question on how to address the problem. To remedy the situation, a Code Amendment for the carports in the rear and side yard property lines needs to be processed. He explained it is the only solution with the existing site plan. Staff has asked the applicant to look at various color palettes, the use of lighter tones versus darker tones. The use of a different color on the roof material, to a more reddish brown is recommended. He noted the applicant has revised their proposed color and materials for the project. Another concern is that the carports themselves have gone back and forth from a pitched roof approached, which is reflected in the plans; however, since it is a prefabricated steel product. He noted that it would be better if there were two posts versus a cantilever design. The pitch can be added a metal product can still be used, but the colors are to be lighter tones so that the roof color matches the main building. If color changes and carport designs are approved today, the approval will be with the understanding that it will not take effect until the Code Amendments is processed which will allow for the approved carports in the setback areas.

Mr. Badar asked how long the Code Amendment process will take. In response, Mr. Stevens replied 2 ½ months. He explained it is not a difficult change to make; however, there has been a hold up and discussion about the City's contribution to affordable housing. He explained there is an affordable requirement in the Specific Plan with the City, which has been able to preserve the money. He added if the housing for this project is not affordable, then a new problem will arise with required affordable parking for State regulations. There has been detailed discussion with the applicant, whom understands the affordability requirements, palette color change and carports presented today.

Mr. Michaelis commented that the transition of the project has been difficult.

Mr. Stevens stated the carports have to be made of a non-combustible product and be next to the property line. Under the Building Code, it works and there needs to be a 5 ft. partial overhang as long as non-combustible material is used. He noted that block or steel can be used and explained that the carports previously have exposed conduits.

Mr. Badar expressed he had no concern with the changes.

Mr. Michaelis commended the change of the originally proposed roof.

MOTION: Emmett Badar moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve the color changes and carport design. The conditions of approval are the same that were initially approved.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sorcinelli Absent and Stevens Abstain)

Mr. Badar stated he has heard the project will begin construction as early as June.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant has a desire to start construction in June. He noted the Code Amendment will first need to be heard before City Council and the Ordinance would take effect later thus the carport permits could not be pulled at first. He noted construction will not be halted because of the carports since they do not need to be constructed first.

Mr. Michaelis explained to the Board that the hold up with construction is due to the $2.6 million needed to make the project affordable housing. The developer wants to ensure the money is still there before moving forward. The condition is to make sure the money is available and not taken from the City by the State. He noted that the applicant is looking for a parallel approval.

Mr. Stevens stated the new builder is well established and has bought a few properties within San Dimas. The properties have been kept by the same owners and not sold off which shows longevity. He added that the plan checks are complete but Staff is working through grading issues with the property line walls and how to coordinate with the property owners.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the transfer agreement needs to be completed to Avalon Bay.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:24 a.m. to the meeting of April 11, 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: April 11, 2013