

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
June 27, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

*Emmett Badar, City Council (Departed at 9:36 a.m.)  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
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 8:35 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 May 9, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-1-2 (Sorcinelli Absent and Dilley and Patal Abstained).

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the May 23, 2013 minutes. Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Sorcinelli Absent).

Mr. Schoonover stated that the items will be heard out of sequence. DPRB Case No. 13-09 will be heard first and DPRB Case No. 12-27 will be heard second.

**DPRB Case No. 13-09**

A request to replace existing wood cedar roof shingles with stone coated steel roof material on an existing retail building located at 667 West Arrow Highway (San Dimas Station North) in the Creative-Growth Zone.

APN: 8386-007-068

Zone: Creative Growth 1 (CG-1)

Craig Mackenzie, 667 W Arrow Hwy, was present.  
Steve O'Hara, O'Hara Financial Services Inc., was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the request is to re-roof an existing retail building located at 667 West Arrow Highway. One of the three pad buildings that is located at the southwest corner of the San Dimas Station North. The primary roof material in the commercial center is wood-shake tile, while 99¢ Plus World has a standing seam metal roof. The existing building is roofed with wood cedar fish-scale shingles and is painted red. The applicant is proposing to replace the material with a stone coated steel roof material and added that the tile was the other option looked at. The applicant prefers to not re-roof the building with wood shake due to the ongoing maintenance issues and does not want to use the tile because of the added weight to the existing roof framing. Installation of a shake-roof tile, or similar tile, would be compatible with the existing building and the overall design theme for the center. The option to use stone coated steel for the roof comes with different styles: shingles, tile and wood shake. Therefore, the applicant is requesting approval to re-roof the building with a stone coated steel roofing material. The applicant is also requesting that all styles be approved to give the owner flexibility in selecting a design that will work best with the building.

Staff sees a concern with the different material used because it would set a precedent for future reroofs in the Creative Growth Zone. After discussing with the applicant, they have decided to install the Shake XD material. Staff also has concern with the installation process and the final appearance of the steel roof on the building's high pitched turrets which are small and complex. Staff thinks that steel shingle is not an appropriate style for the building since it is a style mostly used on residential structures. This item was brought here for the Board to discuss and to provide direction to see if it will be the appropriate material.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Larry Stevens asked what color is being proposed.

Steve O'Hara, O'Hara Financial Services Inc., responded Shake XD in the color Antique Chestnut. He added that it is similar to the materials used on the roof of the main building of the shopping center.

Craig Mackenzie, contractor, stated that it is a regular shake material that will be installed horizontally for the hip detail on the spires and will have a batten installed that will keep water from overflowing on the side. The tiles will be fastened through the tile into the batten and every piece will be fastened through the metal. He stated that when you get to the smaller detail, there will be less to fasten than with concrete. Also, the Building Department is less inclined to approve tile on this building and added that the material used was not made to stand the full weight of a concrete tile and would not fasten.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, asked if the spires can be trimmed.

Mr. Mackenzie replied that the hip design on the spire will be a raised batten with the fastening of the trimmed pieces going through the top where there is a hidden fastening system through. He added that the top cap piece is fabricated of the same material.

Associate Planner Torrico noted that at 225 S San Dimas Canyon Road a property was developed with a multi-family apartment complex that was roofed with the same stone coated steel roof material with a wood-shake style. The request to replace existing wood shake with steel roof material on this apartment complex was reviewed and approved by DPRB in July 2008

Mr. Patel asked what blend will be used for the Shake XD.

Mr. Mackenzie responded that they are looking at Antique Chestnut.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the color availability between Shake and Shake XD. He asked if there were only two colors available for Shake XD. He stated that there is no difference between textures and added that they are similar. After looking at the brochure, he noticed that all the examples are for residential. He asked if the product is appropriate for commercial or are there different specifications for that. He also asked if they have installed on commercial locations in the past.

Mr. Mackenzie responded that there are only two colors available for Shake XD: Antique Chestnut and Pinnacle Grey. He noted that Shake has more color options available. He also clarified that he has not installed on a commercial property but added it is used as a mansard materiel. He stated that all the materials used in the San Dimas Station are done in pitch sections and noted that the facades are done for a residential setting. He noted that the pitched roofs in San Dimas Station are decorative but do not serve as a waterproofing function to the interior of the building. A mansard roof at the location is a decorative design and covers a portion of the interior.

Mr. Stevens asked about the method of attaching all the elements.

Mr. Mackenzie replied that there is a hip and ridge cap that goes over the junction.

Mr. Stevens expressed his concern with the color of the existing, the red. There were many complaints of the dark color and added that the wood exterior appearance makes the shopping center less leasable. He added that people want the softer tones and lighter colors. He stated the Shake XD works but it is a very gray brown color and is leaning towards the Garnet example in the Shake. He asked if it was only available in tile though.

Mr. Mackenzie responded the Garnet is only available in the Shake tile.

Mr. Stevens stated there are limited colors available and all appear dark. He asked if he prefers the Shake XD over the Shake.

Mr. Mackenzie responded that the Shake XD has a hidden fastener and is attached throughout the top and the Shake is attached with an exposed fastener. He stated that he is not in favor of the exposed fasteners but added they are not a huge water leak threat; however, on steel tile they can be problematic.

Mr. Stevens asked about the cost difference between the two.

Mr. Mackenzie responded that the Shake XD would be a 10% increase in price.

Mr. Stevens suggested using the Shake XD in Antique Chestnut

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

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

**DPRB Case No. 12-27**

**Continued from the meeting of May 9, 2013.** A request to construct a 5,783 sq. ft. multi-story, single-family residence with an attached 1,062 sq. ft. four-car garage at 1658 Gainsborough Road.

Associated Cases: DPRB Case No. 07-34 and 08-47

APN: 8426-034-020

Zone: Specific Plan No. 4

Paul and Karen Feintuch, residents of 1139 Edinburgh Rd, was present.

John Peggs, resident of 1133 Edinburgh Rd, was present.

Jim Polson, Aspen Financial Group, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that at the last DPRB meeting of May 9, 2013, the Board members discussed recommendations to change the plans that include hanging the design for the front façade of the building to add a stone veneer to the front wall planes of the house. At the meeting, the Board determined that extending the wainscot at the front façade of the house would be appropriate but not full height in certain areas, the applicant has made this modification. Another concern was the windows, the Board asked for consistency in the way they open and the applicant has complied; all windows have been revised on plans to be sliders. The Board also pointed out that the site plan and grading plan do not match; setbacks and square footage were incorrect. The applicant has tweaked and aligned the plans so that the grading and house plans are consistent. Per City Policy, a house/site model is to be submitted for review by the Board. The applicant will present a digital model/rendering at today's meeting. The model will show the house placed on the proposed topography of the lot.

As for the grading, Staff has talked with the Engineer and the calculations were confirmed. Since the original topography was incorrect and additional soils counts were never submitted, it is difficult to understand what correct topographic map is. The applicant used the City's GIS System to revise the grading plans; the GIS system provided approximate topography levels prior to the unpermitted grading. The applicant needs to remove 563 cubic yards of soil. Staff feels the site meets the intent of the Specific Plan and the design criteria and recommends approval of the project. There are still Conditions of Approval that would require installing rear landscaping and a drainage system prior to the building of the house. He pointed out that the property is currently in prosecution and the City Council has directed the applicant to remove the soil over a year ago. The applicant has had an approved grading plan for about a year. Due to the time frame and history, the City is still pursuing prosecution for the illegal grading. He emphasized that there will still be timelines that will need to be met.

Mr. Badar commented that at the last meeting, Mr. Sorcinelli requested that the applicant meet with the neighbors for storm drain connection. He asked if any discussion occurred.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that there was preliminary discussion after the meeting of May 9, 2013 but nothing was resolved.

Mr. Stevens asked if the grading plan in the Planning Department's possession is a remediation to restore the lot.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded yes.

Mr. Stevens stated that Condition No. 6 details the timeline that needs to be followed. The applicant needs to submit within 30 days to the Building & Safety Division and secure a permit within 90 days. He asked how the timeframes relate to the grading and to verify that the wording "construction plans" really means grading plans. He added the wording will be included in the conditions of approval that if the timeframes are not complied with, they will become null and void.

Mr. Beilstein replied that the grading plans are the ones that need to be submitted within 30 days.

Mr. Stevens recommended tweaking the condition that the grading plans need to be approved first within 30 days.

Jim Polson, Aspen Financial Group, presented the digital rendering of the house for the Board members.

Mr. Beilstein asked about the height of the retaining wall.

Mr. Polson responded 3 ft.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that the applicant is changing the retaining wall to a 2:1 slope.

Mr. Stevens commented that the digital rendering is acceptable versus requiring an actual model. He asked the applicant if the time frames spelled out can be complied with for submittal.

Mr. Polson stated that 30 days to submit grading and building plans should be reasonable to meet. The grading plans are near completion; however, there are a few minor details to complete.

Mr. Stevens asked what the first step will be once the permits are received.

Mr. Polson responded that grading will be done first.

Mr. Stevens asked if the house is being built as a spec.

Mr. Polson replied yes and added that the intent is to sell the house eventually.

Mr. Patel asked about the timeframe for the grading and notes on the drainage. He asked if a percolation test has been done.

Mr. Polson responded that a percolation test was done on the previous grading plan.

Mr. Beilstein commented that David Gilbertson, City Engineer, indicated a new percolation test needed to be done.

Mr. Stevens asked if a discussion has occurred with the neighbors about the drainage design either to minimize or eliminate excess flow.

Mr. Polson responded that he spoke with the Civil Engineer about the possibility but nothing has occurred.

Mr. Stevens commented that there is concern with the new MS4 permit requirements and if the system will be subject to annual inspections.

Mr. Patel replied yes.

Mr. Stevens stated that the more basins there are, the more the cost will incur in terms of insuring they are operating.

Mr. Patel stated that the lot itself is in a sump condition and within a larger chamber, 50-100 ft., needs to be installed in order to retain.

Mr. Stevens stated that the connection will reduce the future maintenance needs and minimizes if you can convey the water to a storm drain. The more you minimize the better for the future homeowner.

Paul Feintuch, resident of 1139 Edinburgh Rd, stated that there needs to be consistency with the City regulations which have not been adhered too. He posed his concern that the conditions are reassuring but asked what will be the consequences if the conditions are ignored.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant is undergoing the prosecution process and instead of voiding the approval and prolonging the process even further, Staff is trying to work with the applicant which has progressed with the project. He noted that if he does not progress within the given timeframes, the judge will give him a timeframe that will be more effective than the City's.

Karen Feintuch, resident of 1139 Edinburgh Rd, stated that the timeline set out can be ignored.

Mr. Stevens commented that he understands the timelines could be ignored and Staff can revoke the approval which will put the entire project back at square one. He emphasized he will not grant any time extensions if the applicant does not comply, they will end up in court.

Mr. Feintuch asked what will happen when the retention ponds fills up.

Mr. Stevens responded that it will be part of the design. He stated that if you require the applicant to have further discussions about the possibility of an easement and pipe in lieu of the surface drainage, is it viable.

Mr. Feintuch responded absolutely; however, a discussion needs to occur with the owner in regards to an easement versus a pipe in lieu of the surface drainage.

Emmett Badar left the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

Mr. Patel commented on the drainage design and added he would like to relocate. He noted that he wants to restate and emphasize that no encroachment is appropriate into the sewer line.

Mr. Stevens suggested and recommended changing the condition to make the proposal a 2<sup>nd</sup> choice. A condition will be added that the applicant should make a good faith effort to work with adjacent property owners to utilize a private off-site storm drain, of which the adequacy shall be at the determination of the Assistant City Manager of Community Development and the City Engineer prior to allowing plans to move forward with the current proposed alternative.

Mr. Schoonover asked if it is enough time.

Mr. Stevens asked that a condition be included that if progress is made on the solutions of getting additional time, the grading permit needs to be addressed. The alternative has viability for a one time extension and stated that he may tweak a few of the time restrictions. The offsite easement pipe is the best solution and added he does not want to give up on it, at least there has been some reasonable effort to get there. He added that he wants to make sure there is a dialogue and it is

practical. He asked if a grading permit can be issued with the drainage work being deferred while doing the site work. He stated that he wants to make every effort to install a pipe.

Mr. Polson asked if the City Engineer, Dave Gilbertson, will be taking part in a meeting.

Mr. Stevens responded yes and added there will be an agreement.

Mr. Beilstein asked who will do the negotiations and if Mr. Polson is representing the owner.

Mr. Stevens responded that either he or Dave Gilbertson will attend any meeting if necessary.

Mr. Beilstein commented that Staff needs a document verifying that Jim Polson can act on behalf of the property owner.

Mr. Polson stated that he can obtain Power of Attorney from the property owner.

John Peggs, resident of 1133 Edinburgh Rd, stated that he is not sure of the best location for the pipe.

Mr. Stevens stated that the size would need to be calculated with the inclusion of the current Engineer figures and to also the calculations will need to be verified.

Mr. Patel stated that the goal is to connect to an existing storm drain.

Mr. Stevens stated that as part of the improvement plans, the drains will be inspected and verification that what is represented in the agreement is followed through with. He noted it will be a public easement.

Mr. Patel stated that it will be a recorded easement.

Mr. Stevens stated that the City cannot be the negotiator for the neighbors; however, Staff can help. He recommended that Mr. Polson speak with the City Engineer, Dave Gilbertson, to get an understanding. The goal is to for the water to drain to the street then the gutter then to the catch basin. He stated that it will be cleaned and controlled at the release point.

Mrs. Feintuch stated that someone will need to depict what the sizes are and verify, including the access.

Mr. Feintuch stated he had one discussion with Mr. Polson about a willingness to meet to discuss options; however, the last discussion occurred after the last DPRB meeting and no contact since.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the City's preference is to see if it can be piped.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that a meeting can be setup soon and the Power of Attorney should be obtained by then as well.

Mr. Beilstein requested that the applicant look at all four sides of the house and requested they be more decorative in the east and west side. The wall plane needs more windows.

Senior Planner Espinoza pointed out there are additional windows on the walls; however, they were not called out on the elevation plans.

Mr. Stevens added a condition that the applicant work with Staff to add decorative relief such as windows along the East and West elevation.

Mr. Patel stated that based on the plan submitted, there should be a condition added that includes a drainage maintenance covenant condition.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve subject to the following: modifications to the time frame including the conditions with the grading and offsite drainage and add a condition that the approval will be null and void if the timeframes are not complied with. Reword the condition in regards to the drainage to include a maintenance covenant condition. Prior to pursuing the proposed plan, the applicant should make a good faith effort to work with adjacent property owners to utilize a private off-site storm drain, of which the adequacy shall be at the determination of the Assistant City Manager of Community Development and the City Engineer prior to allowing plans to move forward with the current proposed alternative. Work with Staff to modify the east and west elevation to include architectural relief where appropriate and relocating the swale along the South property line.

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

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:59 a.m. to the meeting of July 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: September 12, 2013