

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
October 10, 2013 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Denis Bertone, City Council
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Shari Garwick, Senior Engineer
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development*

ABSENT

Blaine Michaelis, City Manager

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

MOTION: The minutes for September 26, 2013 could not be approved due to the lack of quorum to vote. Minutes approval will be postponed until the next regularly scheduled DPRB meeting.

DPRB Case No. 13-24

A request to construct a 2,088 square foot single-family residence with a 480 square foot attached two-car garage located at 429 N. Lone Hill Avenue.

APN: 8383-008-039

Zone: Single-Family (SF-7500)

John Andrade, property owner of 429 N. Lone Hill Avenue, was present.
Tom Robinette, applicant, was present.
Bob and Anita Tunstall, residents of 433 N Lone Hill Ave, were present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the applicant is requesting to construct a 2,088 square foot single-family residence with a 480 square foot attached two-car garage. The subject property measures 9,579 square feet. The property was previously developed with a single-family home which was damaged in a fire and has since been demolished and added that the property is currently vacant. The proposed one-story structure and attached garage will be designed to include: gable roof, cement tile roof, stucco exterior and decorative columns with fieldstone veneer. The site improvements will include: new concrete driveway, new landscaping, removal of all dilapidated chain link fencing and new wood fence. The Municipal Code requires a minimum of 26-feet of

maneuvering space for ingress and egress. The garage is situated in a manner that access is perpendicular to the driveway and due to the 50 foot lot width, only 24-feet four-inches of garage back-up space is available. The applicant has depicted sufficient amount of maneuvering space on the plans and Staff believes the intent of the Code has been met.

Staff has worked with the applicant on the design and layout of the proposed development. The street façade includes a full-gable wall with four fixed windows and two decorative columns with a stone veneer. The majority of the façade is stucco with no articulation. The introduction of a wainscot along the entire street façade would help to break up the stucco and provide more articulation. In addition, the wainscot design will be keeping in character with the other residential structures located on Lone Hill Avenue. Staff has asked the applicant to revise the plans to include additional architectural features; however, the applicant has chosen to move forward with the design as submitted.

Senior Engineer Garwick questioned the driveway being moved to the South.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that a condition has been added to install a 3 ft. planter along the north property line. He also noted that there is a separate condition which requires that after installation of the planter, if the bottom driveway does not measure 12 ft. in width, it will need to comply with the requirement. If it does not comply, then the driveway will need to remain at the location.

Mrs. Garwick pointed out that the bottom of X is at the property line but asked if the bottom of X is going into the planter.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that the bottom of X measures 15 ft. but with planter it will be 12 ft.

Mr. Stevens asked why the planter is necessary.

Associate Planner Torrico responded it is a requirement in the conditions of approval to add additional landscaping.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented the intent of the landscaping requirement was to avoid having driveways side by side.

Mr. Stevens commented that he would prefer to eliminate the planter and leave the condition the way it reads. The retaining walls exist on both sides and drops down from the street. He asked where the lot drains to.

Associate Planner Torrico responded at the bottom of the slope towards the west.

Mr. Stevens asked about NPDES requirements.

Mrs. Garwick responded that NPDES requirements are not required on Single-Family residences if the addition is less than 5,000 sq. ft. She added that they do not need to provide a water quality management plan. If there is an increase in impervious area the applicant would have to try and infiltrate.

Mr. Stevens commented that they are under the square footage NPDES requirements; however, they will need to demonstrate they are not increasing their flow.

Mrs. Garwick stated that they would have to maintain the historic flow and a pump could be added at the back.

Mr. Bertone asked what the size of the house was before the fire.

Associate Planner Torrico responded between 2,000 sq. ft. – 2,500 sq. ft.

Mrs. Garwick stated that since the backyard is larger, there will be better percolation to the property at the West.

Mr. Stevens pointed out the columns on the garage and house and asked if it was originally on the house or added after the discussion with Staff.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that it was originally on the house but stone veneer was added.

Mr. Stevens asked if there was a lot of front yard landscaping or has it been redone.

Tom Robinette, applicant, responded that the landscaping will be redone and that there will be additional landscaping by the sidewalk. He noted that the slope will be landscaped with some sort of groundcover material. He addressed the issue of adding wainscot to the house and noted that it does not seem necessary since the house is lower than the street, thus it will not be seen. He also added that he does not have a problem adding the wainscot if it is Staff's request. He stated that there is some articulation on the house. He added that the stone is a good idea and there are columns that are visible from the front. He concluded that he will not fight on including the wainscot but added he is not sure how necessary it is.

John Andrade, property owner of 429 N. Lone Hill Avenue, asked if the planter on the driveway is necessary since it is not separating the driveways.

Mr. Robinette also asked if the planter at the driveway can be negotiated.

Mr. Stevens recommended removing the 3 ft. planter from the conditions of approval. He explained that it is not a requirement in this circumstance. He added he does not believe that the columns are compatible and does not see a benefit of wainscot due to the site topography. He noted that he would be okay if the columns are removed and another feature is used. He pointed out the rounded columns and added they are not architecturally appealing. He asked what material will be used.

Mr. Robinette responded the upper columns are stucco and the lower columns are stone veneer.

Mr. Stevens questioned the perimeter fencing on the north property line; he asked if it is wood or chain link.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded chain link.

Mr. Stevens asked about the fencing at the rear property line.

Associate Planner Torrico responded block wall.

Mr. Stevens asked about the fencing at the south property line.

Associate Planner Torrico responded chain link.

Mr. Stevens asked if all the fencing was going to be wood.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, responded chain link and added that it was an interim and noted that wood fence was used before.

Mr. Stevens stated that when wood fencing is used on property lines, it is usually not a good idea in the long term. He noted that wood fencing has the tendency to deteriorate and becomes a maintenance headache. He explained he understands the difficulty working with neighbors to make it equitable; however, if the neighbors are contacted, coordination can be made with the north and south property owners so that a wood fence does not have to be used. He recommended eliminating the 3 ft. planter and not requiring wainscot.

Mr. Sorcinelli recommended adding a feature that defines a planter area at the bottom of the wall.

Mr. Stevens asked if a raised planter wall would suffice.

Mr. Sorcinelli responded yes. He noted that you can see that area will not drain well during the heavy rain. He noted that the issue is of protecting the wall and long term sustainability.

Mr. Stevens stated that an 18-inch planter would work.

Mr. Robinette stated that the garage has to be 8 inches above the frame. He noted that if there is a raised planter, Staff would go against raising the soil adjacent to the ground.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated for the record that he was not recommending raising the planter.

Mr. Robinette asked about a concrete mowing edge to define the planter in order to keep the grade low and plants be included adjacent to the wall that will soften the base of the wall.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the elimination of the 3 ft. planter will provide the ability to control the visual quality of the driveway so that the applicant does not need to rely on the neighbor and their additions.

Mr. Robinette stated that instead of coming up to the property line, they could feather the radius and widen the driveway at the edge. He stated that he would rather have it cleared.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that you cannot rely on what your neighbors will do and by having a planter; it will make the property more appealing. He stated that he is offering these ideas to the applicant if interested.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve, subject to: the conditions of approval, adjust the wording so that the recommended 3 ft. planter is an option and not a requirement, include a defined planter in front of the garage, recommend that the applicant work with the neighbors to consider an alternative other than a wood fence, preferably a block wall on the north and south side, but emphasized it is not a requirement.

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

DPRB Case No. 13-25

A request to construct an 846 square foot two-story second unit with an attached 250 square foot one-car garage located at 941 S. Walnut Ave in the Single-Family Hillside with a Private Horse Overlay Zone.

APN: 8382-011-030

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

Antonieta and Ron Myers, property owners, were present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the proposed detached second unit is proposed to be built on a lot that measures 59,228 square feet in area and is developed with an existing 1,512 square feet single-family home and attached garage. The proposed second unit will include two bedrooms and one bath and complies with the maximum size requirements of 850 sq. ft. of floor area set forth in the Second Unit Ordinance. The 250 sq. ft. one-car garage will comply with the minimum parking requirements. The second unit will be designed to include: hip roof with concrete S-tile roof, stucco finish exterior, Flat English Rubble Stone veneer wainscot and a covered patio and deck. Per the Private Horse Overlay zone, corrals shall not be closer than 35 feet from any habitable space on the same parcel and at least 80 feet from any habitable space located on an adjacent parcel. The proposed second unit will be situated in a manner where it will not impede adjacent properties from keeping horses and will also provide sufficient space to provide a corral on-site. Given that the property is located in the SF-H zone, the request must also be reviewed by the Planning Commission. He pointed out that the current property is connected to a septic tank and the second unit will be served by a new septic tank. He added that due to the adjacent slope, a condition has been added so that the applicant secures approval from the Los Angeles County Health Department prior to inspections for foundation forms.

The outstanding issue is that second unit ordinance requires that all second units be designed to be compatible with the existing or proposed single-family residence located on the same property. The applicant is proposing to remodel the existing house in the future and reassures Staff that the design will match the features of the second unit in order to be compatible. He noted that a condition has been added to require the applicant to submit building plans for the remodel of the existing home prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the second unit.

Mr. Bertone asked if the house is connected to the sewer.

Associate Planner Torrico responded no.

Mr. Stevens asked if there have been any percolation tests done.

Associate Planner Torrico responded no.

Mr. Stevens asked what type of materials are used on the existing house and noted that it would be reevaluated when remodeling in the future.

Associate Planner Torrico replied the main house has a flat roof and the proposed second unit has a hip roof. The stucco exterior is used on both and added there is no stone used on the main house.

Mr. Stevens stated that the roof covering on the existing house is flat and asked the age of the house.

Antonieta Myers, applicant and property owner of 941 S. Walnut Ave., responded over 80 years old.

Mr. Stevens asked if the house is listed on the Historic Survey List.

Mr. Sorcinelli responded that it is not on the Historic Survey List and added that most of those houses were located in the downtown area.

Mr. Stevens asked if the driveway is all concrete.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that a new concrete slab has been added in front of the one car garage.

Mr. Stevens asked Senior Engineer Garwick if the site plan is a correct interpretation of Walnut Avenue.

Mrs. Garwick responded yes because it is a paper street.

Mr. Stevens commented that he is aware of the issues of having a septic tank on a leach field and asked where the applicant would prefer to have the septic tank.

Mrs. Myers responded that they would like to have the septic tank closer to the road.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the proposed garage will accommodate four vehicles.

Mrs. Myers responded that the garage is not shown on the plans and pointed out on the plans for the Board.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked what will happen with the current garage if a new garage is being proposed.

Mrs. Myers responded that she will convert the current garage and incorporate it into remodel of the existing house.

Mr. Stevens asked if Staff would see the house plans if submitted for the remodel of the house.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that it depends. He added it could be reviewed at Staff level or by the Board.

Mr. Stevens pointed out the aerial of the property and the property lines and asked if there are two separate parcel numbers for the lots.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that there is only one parcel and added that a lot combination had been done and was approved.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the existing septic infiltration is going to be terminated.

Mr. Beilstein responded that the second unit has their own system; however, it is dependent on Health Department and Staff approval.

Mrs. Garwick stated that the nearest sewer is on Puddingstone Dr.

Mr. Stevens commented that it seems to be a technical issue and added they need to resolve the location based on the soils characteristics.

Mrs. Garwick stated that since they have had an existing septic system that has functioned for 80 years; it shows it has worked well.

Mrs. Myers stated that this request was initiated about a year ago. The reason for the application is due to health issues. The second unit will provide better living conditions and added that there is

currently no air conditioning or heater at the main house. She stated that a letter was included with the Staff Report reflecting that information.

Mr. Stevens asked who will live in the second unit.

Mrs. Myers responded that they will be moving into the second unit once complete and then begin remodeling the main house.

Mr. Stevens asked if they will be moving back home after the remodel.

Mrs. Myers responded yes and added that the second unit will then be for the nurses.

Mr. Stevens stated that he wants to make sure they understand the second unit occupancy requirements. He emphasized that the second unit needs to either be occupied by family members or someone of low income. An annual report is required to be submitted every year for verification to the City.

Mr. Beilstein asked if a caregiver would comply with the occupancy requirements.

Mr. Stevens responded a caregiver would also need to meet low income requirements or needs to be a family member. He added that he may tweak that slightly when updating the Housing Element. He explained to Staff that enforcing the remodel to match the second unit is not practical. Although Staff has the best intentions, once the applicant has a permit for the second unit, we cannot hold up occupancy. He emphasized that Staff cannot enforce it; however, Staff can encourage and demonstrate what their preferences are. In the end we cannot withhold permits. He added that the main house and second unit should look compatible.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked what will happen if the application/plans depict the main house and second unit not designed as compatible.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that Staff can have the applicant revise the plans so that they are compatible with the second unit.

Mr. Stevens stated that the whole house is flat roofed and noted that it is not practical to say they must remodel the existing house within a year. Staff will not withhold the certificate of occupancy.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that Staff has had issues with this project from the beginning. He stated that the concern with the compatibility of both structures was the main issue Staff wanted to present to the Board for discussion and direction.

Mrs. Myers stated that they will work on matching the house with the second unit such as making the trims darker on the existing house, currently they are a light finished.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the existing house has high ceilings and added that when the remodel takes place, it will be a second story addition to the existing home and will be made to be as compatible to the main house as possible.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that the plans do not look achievable. The intent of the decision today is that they move forward with the project; however, the plans need to be workable and need to be studied closer.

Mr. Beilstein stated that from a street view, it can be treated as a brand new house since it is visible from the hill.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that by adding detail to the main house, it will make the second unit appear compatible. He recommended simplifying the design in order to match the existing house.

Mr. Stevens stated that the end goal is to substantially remodel the existing house to be like the proposed second unit. In the end, you cannot compel compliance to the best of everybody's intentions and desires.

Mr. Beilstein stated that there are details on the second unit to replicate the main house. He agreed that the second unit design could be simplified.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that if a simplified remodel of the house is done, the second unit can be added later. The conflict is that this is a good example of projects not appearing compatible even though it is a requirement of the Code.

Mr. Stevens asked Mr. Sorcinelli if the design is simplified, then what would it entail.

Mr. Sorcinelli responded window and trim details. He noted that the roof edge could be simplified and asked if the applicant could return to the Board with a different design.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the boxed stucco eaves may be more compatible with the flat roof. He noted that it would be easier to replicate in the future. He stated that conceptually it is ok.

Mr. Stevens stated that he agrees that it needs to be compatible and asked the Board if they would like the item to return or work with Staff to simplify the design.

Mr. Bertone replied that it should go through Staff since they know what they are looking for.

Mr. Schoonover asked if these changes will be accomplished before the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Stevens asked why the second unit is being built prior to the changes being made to the main house.

Mrs. Myers replied that they would like to construct the second unit first because the main house has other issues that need to be addressed including corroded pipes. She added that in their eyes, the second unit is like having a new home.

Mr. Stevens asked if the future remodel of the main house is something that is achievable based on their existing financial resources.

Mrs. Myers replied they cannot tell how they will be in the future financially; however, at the moment, the construction business, which is her field of work, is doing well enough to proceed with construction.

Mr. Stevens asked the Board if they will take the risk of accepting the plans submitted in front of Staff and asked if they believe it is a fair chance that the main house remodel will occur over the next several years and be compatible. He also suggested that the current plans could be simplified. He added that the applicant could always return to do minor tweaks. He asked the applicant if they are ok with the options.

Mrs. Myers responded that she will comply with the requests made by the Board.

Mr. Dilley recommended moving forward with the item.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the project appears to be in a fire zone and added it does not have the same protection and will need to have sprinklers.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that if they simplify the plans then they will also save money.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the applicant will need to return to the Board.

Mr. Stevens replied that he will let Staff handle any issues that arise. He stated if they go to Planning Commission, they would not be required to simplify the plans before the meeting.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to approve, subject to: the revising of Condition No. 16 to make it not a mandatory submittal but a requirement to encourage the remodeling of the main house to be compatible with the proposed 2nd unit, work with Staff to simplify the design of the 2nd unit pursuant to the Board's comments and suggestions, and noted that the plans do not need to reflect those changes for the Planning Commission meeting. Also, the plans may be reviewed by Staff and do not need to return to DPRB.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Michaelis Absent and Schoonover Abstain)

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the applicant needs to simplify their design but added they have features and qualities that are readily achievable but not pronounced as presented.

Mr. Stevens stated that if there are questions or concerns when Staff reviews it then it can return to the Board.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked the applicant to add some other features that are more practical and easily implemented.

Mr. Dilley stated that if they are building a 2nd story to the main house, it will be substantial.

Mr. Stevens commented that he wants to make sure that the proposed construction does not stand out; however, if going to Planning Commission, Staff will need to make it as a calendar consent item.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:47 a.m. to the meeting of October 24, 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: October 24, 2013