

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
May 8, 2014 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
Curtis Morris, Mayor
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 8:30 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve the April 24, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sorcinelli Absent and Morris Abstain).

DPRB Case No. 12-15

Continued from the meeting of December 12, 2013. A request to construct several accessory structures consisting of a detached bathroom, glass gazebo, patio cover, trellis colonnades, barn, horse corrals and storage sheds; concrete walkways and a stair platform in the scenic easement area; and request to install a tubular steel fence along the existing equestrian easement trail at 1136 Edinburgh Road.

APN: 8426-034-032

Zone: Specific Plan No. 4 (SP-4)

Ed Segura, designer, was present.

Ziba Arbab Moghadam, property owner of 1136 Edinburgh Road, was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the item was continued by the Board at its December 12, 2013 meeting and was continued to address the following issues: further clarification of the Scenic Easement in relation to the existing structures, the walkways in the scenic easement, storage sheds in the Equestrian use and the redesign of the barn. He addressed first the walkways. He stated that Staff conducted a site visit with the applicant and property owner to understand the height and width of the walkways. For paved walkways, the Code allows for minor walkways and minor retaining walls. He

noted that the walkways do comply with the Specific Plan No. 4 Zone. Staff recommends that the walkways be allowed; however, they need to submit plans to Building and Safety for minor retaining walls.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the wall height.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that the walls vary. At walkway #1, the walls are a foot high. At walkway #2, the walls are 3 ft. 8 inches.

Mr. Stevens asked how much of the path includes retaining walls that high.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that about a quarter of the pathway includes the 3'-6" high retaining walls.

Mr. Stevens asked if pavement will be used for the walkway.

Associate Planner Torrico concrete will be used for the walkway. He then addressed the issues of the storage sheds which are located in the Equestrian area of the property. The storage sheds were utilized to store hay and grain for horses; therefore, they are ancillary to horse keeping and could remain subject to submittal of plans for review and approval to the Building and Safety Department. He then addressed the redesign of the barn. The barn design appeared like a two-story garage and the Board requested that it have barn-like features instead. The applicant revised the design to include a tiered second story and steel paneled roof which are more characteristic of a barn versus a garage.

Mr. Stevens asked inquired about the roof material, siding material and colors will be used for the barn.

Associate Planner Torrico responded the roof material will be steel panel, the siding will be woodchip throughout the exterior and no color has been identified.

Mr. Stevens stated that the plans indicate that the siding will be white.

Ed Segura, designer, stated that the original color design will be altered and added it will be a barn type color.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the final item needing to be addressed included the location of the scenic easement. He stated that the scenic easement had been revised previously to accommodate construction onsite. He noted that attached is an aerial that indicates where the scenic easement is at in relation to the Equestrian use. He stated that it is difficult to pinpoint the location and added it follows the slope of the property. The walkways within the scenic easement comply with the requirements. The placement of the platform is in the scenic easement and does not comply. The platform has an overall height that is beyond minor. He added that the platform will have to be removed.

Mr. Stevens stated that there are three storage shed structures. He asked what the size was on those structures.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that storage sheds 1 and 2 measure a combined total of 569 sq. ft. and are stick built. Storage shed 3 is 80 sq. ft. and is a prefab structure with a height of 9 ft. 3 inches.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the determination on the minor retaining wall, 3 ft. 8 inches. He recalls a major conflict of walkways that connect to build areas in the scenic easement areas.

Mr. Espinoza stated that the Building Official, Eric Beilstein, visited the site and brought up the issue. He thought that the property was far more developed and that the scenic easement was much less than the other property.

Mr. Stevens stated that there is a balance with the Code. The access way shall be no greater than 48 inches in width. He agreed that there is an ability to exercise judgment to what is minor and questioned if this is minor.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the upper portion of the walkway walls lie outside the scenic easement.

Mr. Patel pointed out the aerial and easement of the Equestrian trail and Scenic Easement and asked if the applicants had plans on restoring the scenic easement.

Associate Planner Torrico inquired if he meant growing additional vegetation.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that there is a fence that divides the road between the trail and scenic easement.

Mr. Patel commented that based on the aerial, there seems to be walls/fencing that are encroaching and added there is nothing separating the scenic easement and trail.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that there is a fence that divides the road between the trail and scenic easement.

Associate Planner Torrico asked the applicant if there is a fence behind the stable.

Ed Segura replied yes and noted that there is a wrought iron fence, then a chain link fence that separates the scenic easement from the road. He asked how the scenic easement is determined to the neighbor's property.

Associate Planner Torrico replied that the neighbor's wall is at the top of the slope and the wall bisects the platform.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the platform is 7-8 ft. tall and is not flush with the hillside but instead it comes out of the hillside. He stated that the property owner has created a platform for the stairwell.

Ed Segura asked if there is a plan on record for the scenic easement.

Senior Planner Espinoza replied yes and added it was modified twice in the past based on structures added without a permit. He expressed his frustration with the scenic easement and added the thick line on the plans depicting the easement is subject to interpretation. He stated the applicant should be following the topography, combo of measurements and slopes which are determining factors to make an ultimate decision. He stated that Staff stated that the platform is built over a slope and the top portion of the slope lines up to the neighbor's property.

Curtis Morris stated that the scenic easement line is clearly defined on this particular property.

Ed Segura inquired about what is next for the project. He stated that he has revisited the scenic easement issue with the homeowner and they are not agreeable to the removal of the platform.

Curtis Morris stated that the last time the scenic easement change, there was a definite line of where the scenic easement was located.

Mr. Stevens stated that the amendment would need to be conducted. He stated that he will need to research the previous process that was used to amend the scenic easement. He stated that what needs to be done is the platform needs to be removed or amend the scenic easement. He added he cannot recall if it requires City Council, DPRB or Staff approval.

Ed Segura stated that he is ok with the findings and determination but not the removal of the platform, per the property owner's request.

Mr. Stevens asked if they are ok with using earth tone colors on the structures versus only using white.

Ed Segura replied yes.

Mr. Stevens stated that the only issue is to not remove the platform. From the Board's perspective today, only the removal of the platform can be approved or the item can be continued to the next DPRB meeting so that Staff can research how the scenic easement was modified previously.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to continue the item to the next regularly schedule DPRB meeting in order for Staff to investigate the previous process used to modify the scenic easement line.

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

Mr. Stevens asked Associate Planner Torrico to verify the color to be used for the barn.

DPRB Case No. 12-06

A request to rebuild a 1,074 square foot single-family residence on its existing foundation and add an additional 346 square foot to the front located at 307 W. Gladstone Street.

Associated Case: CE07-0025

APN: 8392-015-093

Zone: Single-Family Agricultural 16,000 (SFA-16,000)

Taha Alsabea, property owner of 310 W Gladstone St., was present.

Joseph Vu, applicant and property owner of 307 W. Gladstone St., was present.

Associate Planner Torrico provided background information on the property and stated that the property has an active code enforcement case that dates back to 2007. The applicant is working with Staff to correct the violations. The main issue of concern is that the unpermitted work has been open and exposed, and there is a concern about the stability of the structure. He added that the best approach would be to keep the structure that is there and rebuild the house from the existing foundation. The lot itself utilizes craftsman elements including: a gable roof with a composition shingle roof, horizontal siding, double-hung windows, stone veneer and board and batten. The remodel of the garage will match the improvements of the home and will include: the use of horizontal siding and board and batten on the gable-walls. The site is limited to build upon and will encroach into the front

yard setback. If the Board approves this project, the applicant will need to submit for a minor deviation for the encroachment in the 10 ft. setback.

Mr. Stevens asked if the minor deviation is approved at Staff level.

Associate Planner Torrico responded yes.

Mr. Stevens asked if the deviation is because it is 10% into the area of the front yard or 10% dimensionally into the setback.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded it could be either one of those reasons.

Mr. Morris asked if the house is where the foundation level is below grade level.

Mr. Patel responded a couple of feet.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that he spoke with Eric Beilstein, the Building Official, who looked up the footprint of the foundation and determined it was the minor deviation best approach for the property.

Mr. Morris inquired about the driveway and the options for reversing out of the property.

Associate Planner Torrico discussed the condition of the existing driveway and added that a condition has been added, Condition No. 36, which states the existing drive approach on the west side of the property shall be relocated to improve egress/ingress to the site. The relocation of the drive approach shall be determined by sight line analysis done by a registered engineer to be submitted by the Developer/Applicant. He noted that the site improvements include removing the chain link fence.

Mr. Morris asked if the applicant is requesting encroachment. He asked if Staff can add that landscaping will be a requirement so that they will not pour concrete.

Mr. Stevens responded that Staff is working on an amendment to limit the amount of pavement in the front yard setback. The Conditions of Approval can limit a minimal amount of landscaping or maximum amount of paving.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that there is 10 ft. of parkway behind the curb, then a property line and then another 10 ft. from curb face. He stated that there is 20 ft. until landscaping occurs.

Mr. Stevens asked if the wood fence is in the front yard setback.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that it is right on the property line. He added that they will be adding a 42 inch fence not a 6 ft. fence.

Mr. Patel asked if the sewer is connected.

Taha Alsabea, property owner of 310 W Gladstone St., replied that it is now connected to sewer but was previously on septic tank.

Mr. Stevens asked if the asphalt curb will be moved in front of the house.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that the applicant will redesign the asphalt area.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant reviewed the conditions of approval.

Joseph Vu, applicant and property owner of 307 W. Gladstone St., commented that he glanced at the conditions of approval quickly and is ok with them. He asked if the conditions require changes to the plans.

Mr. Stevens commented that the conditions reinforce there is compliance with the plans.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the only information not called out on the plans is the westerly driveway.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve subject to conditions of approval.

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

DPRB Case No. 14-03

A request to construct two new buildings; a 1,102 sq. ft. building containing two offices, break room, meeting room and restroom facilities, with a 367 sq. ft. covered porch; the second building will be 201 sq. ft. standalone restroom facility. The two buildings are proposed at the Sycamore Canyon Equestrian Facility at 1525 Sycamore Canyon.

Zone: Light Agricultural (A-L)

Don Bundrock of Everythingelse Builders, applicant, was present.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the item today is to construct two buildings located at Sycamore Canyon Equestrian Facility which is City owned but is operated by an independent operator and is under contract with the City. The City is paying for the plans, plan check and construction which the tenant will reimburse. He stated that the construction that will occur include: two standalone buildings, one of the buildings will have a meeting room, two office spaces, break room, covered porch and two restrooms. He added that the other building will have a restroom with no additional uses. He referred to the aerial. The larger of the buildings is proposed to be 1,102 sq. ft. with an attached 367 sq. ft. covered porch. The smaller building is proposed at 201 sq. ft. which will be located by the main house. Staff is concerned with sample materials provided because of their lack of long term durability and felt that they were not acceptable. He added that he has been working with the contractor and have come up with a different design that is more appropriate to match the other building designs on the site. He stated that he has researched other restroom designs and understands the cost issue but there needs to be some added elements of design. As for the roof material, the applicant is proposing galvanized metal. Also being proposed is a six-foot wide concrete walkway around the perimeter of the building for ADA compliance, in addition to providing access to an ADA parking space. He discussed the restrooms in more detail and noted that the material proposed is not similar to the other restrooms in the City. Staff has a concern with the proposed fiberglass wall board proposed for the interior of the bathrooms. This type of material is not optimum for the heavy use by the general public and routine maintenance. He added that the daily maintenance will be done by the tenants and the City will maintain major items needed for repair.

Mr. Stevens stated that the building itself is accessible but the topography and location may not be compliant access.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that Condition No. 21 states that the revised plans shall show the restrooms and the break room are compliant with all ADA complaints. He stated that the design issues need to be worked out and feels that the requirements have not been met. He pointed out that the building will have a board and batten design with added shutters for extra architectural features. He stated that some of the other issues of concern, the proposed air conditioners are wall units; however, these types of units are only allowed on a temporary basis in windows. Staff provided an alternative for the units; split unit which functions primarily the same as a wall unit but complies with development standards. He discussed the board and batten design and stated that he has asked the applicant to increase the thickness of the batten to a $\frac{3}{4}$ thickness to allow for proper contrast between the boards.

Don Bundrock, of Everythingelse Builders, applicant, stated that the material proposed is only made in 5/18 thickness batten.

Mr. Morris asked if batten is proposed to be the same thickness as the board.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded this preference is for the $\frac{3}{8}$ thickness; he wanted more dimension on the wall. He added that the City has hired Don Bundrock as the general contractor.

Mr. Morris expressed his concern with the cost of the project. He stated that Staff's recommendations can become costly.

Senior Planner Espinoza responded that for any project, Staff does not typically look at the cost but instead the quality of work being presented and how it will fit in with its surroundings. Also, Staff is concerned with the long term durability of the materials being used.

Mr. Morris asked if Staff has discussed the daily maintenance of the buildings.

Mr. Stevens stated that although items meet Code requirements, there are different requirements for maintenance. Instead of power washing the walls, maintenance would have to sponge clean them. There are different levels of maintenance. He added that it is responsibility of the Equestrian operator so they might not meet certain expectations.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the applicant needs to be responsible for the quality of work. He noted that the paint has a 30 year warranty.

Don Bundrock commented that the 30 year warranty applies to the cracking of the paint. There are minor situations where the paint fades overtime depending on the proposed color. The batten colors will be of the same color and material.

Mr. Michaelis stated that wherever there is a seam, there will be a contrasting color. The City is willing to do a board and batten if that is an appropriate design, with respect to the aesthetics alone. He stated that the applicant would like to use the standard metal because the cost would be 8-10% less.

Don Bundrock stated that the proposed powder coating adds an additional \$35,000 to the cost.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the City is happy to do what the Board approves which will be a benefit in the long term for durability.

Don Bundrock stated that the option of galvanized was originally proposed for the buildings.

Mr. Stevens asked what the cost is for the total project.

Mr. Michaelis responded over \$200,000 to \$220,000.

Mr. Stevens asked if the cost included site work.

Mr. Michaelis responded that it depends.

Mr. Morris asked if the applicant goes with the painted metal, will it need to be insulated. Or, if the applicant goes with Hardie, will it need to be mounted on something.

Don Bundrock replied that they are pre-engineered on the building and erected on site. He added that the panels are 10-12 ft. increments.

Mr. Morris asked the applicant to provide a cost comparison.

Don Bundrock responded that for the wall without powder coating it would be a difference of \$2,100.

Mr. Morris asked if that cost included painting.

Don Bundrock responded that it is not included and would be an additional \$2,500.

Mr. Morris inquired who suggested powder coating.

Don Bundrock responded that Staff suggested if all galvanized was exposed it would need to be used. The cost is an additional \$18,000, otherwise, the option to put batten would be \$1,900. The underside is that the trusses would be left exposed.

Mr. Morris pointed out that the quality of paint and how long they last nowadays and asked how often would the Hardie plank need to be painted.

Don Bundrock stated that there are bigger issues than painting such as striping the galvanized every 6-7 years; however, that wouldn't occur with the Hardie.

Mr. Stevens inquired about the cost difference for the a/c and agreed with Staff's recommendation.

Don Bundrock responded that he will investigate the suggestion; however, the cost for the a/c units is \$6,400 and is the same for a centralized system.

Senior Planner Espinoza asked when the last time the facility was painted.

Mr. Michaelis responded it has been a while and cannot remember.

Mr. Morris stated that the issue is that this is submittal is not like other building submittals, it's a stable. He stated that sometimes the Board needs to broaden their scope to see what it costs applicants to do the suggested recommendations. He stated that he is concerned with the cost and recommendations for this project.

Mr. Michaelis stated that he investigated typical pre-manufactured restrooms or block built. The tenants are the boarders. He noted that there is question why there are two restrooms. He stated that the applicant has looked at a cost effective way to construct the restrooms. He stated that if there is a

material that is best recommended by Staff, the applicant will go along with that. He added that some of the issues can be addressed during plan check such as the insulation and interior restroom details.

Senior Planner Espinoza suggested visiting the powder coating issue to reduce the cost.

Mr. Patel asked if the galvanized could be painted.

Don Bundrock responded yes but added that the paint has a tendency to wear or peel on galvanized when painted.

Mr. Patel commented that the signal lights in the City are galvanized and added that the City crew paints to sustain their colors.

Don Bundrock suggested the option of utilizing the colored battens to cover up the galvanized.

Mr. Michaelis commented that the smaller restroom is strictly for internal use and added whatever is cost effective for the galvanized is just exterior and added that the insulation is not a concern in that situation. He commented that the shutters were a great addition. He stated that the use of channels should be off color in order to bring some in-between connection points of the building. He added that color of the shutters would work well too.

Mr. Stevens asked what the exterior wall surface would be.

Mr. Michaelis replied that the exterior will have metal and will be used for the office building but the post will be galvanized and will be powder coated.

Don Bundrock commented that the panels can be metal.

Mr. Morris stated that if you match the color, you get a shadow effect. He stated that there is a risk if the paint is a contrast color.

Don Bundrock stated that there is a difference on the batten and the C channel framework.

Mr. Morris asked how to insulate the building if it is not put in the wall.

Don Bundrock responded a stud frame within the building.

Mr. Stevens stated that the interior is being worked on because of the office meeting room.

Don Bundrock stated that the stud partition wall already exists. He noted that the reason for the stud frame outside Building 1 is to hide all the utilities.

Mr. Stevens stated that the smaller restroom does not have heat or air conditioning.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the smaller restroom looks utilitarian with no batten and with unpainted galvanized. The upper building post would be galvanized and powder coated to bring color. Also, cladding where the C channels join and there will be a batten placed over them. The exterior will be metal.

Mr. Stevens stated that the exterior surface of the larger building will have metal batten channel and the surface of the wall will be painted or galvanized.

Mr. Morris stated that the surface of the wall be baked enamel.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that a certain color will need to be chosen.

Don Bundrock stated that the roof is white and the gutter fascia trim will be coco brown and the building will be tan.

Mr. Stevens stated that all exterior metal will have baked on enamel.

Mr. Michaelis added that they could also dress up the batten and shutters.

Don Bundrock stated that contrasting colors for the shutters can be used such as brown.

Mr. Stevens clarified that the suggested approaches for the building should be analyzed if they are for function or location. He added that these suggestions will be a terrible precedent if it is the function of the basis for the design.

Mr. Michaelis commented they have researched prefabricated concrete restrooms and are a good solution for smaller building; however, for the larger building, the applicant wanted additional amenities.

Mr. Stevens commented that the applicant is obligated to construct two new restrooms. He added that the offices are what they would want in addition to the restrooms. The applicant could have constructed two restrooms and let the office be handled as a separate building. Ultimately they will pay for the work being done; however, there could have been a separate request. He stated his concern is that the cost and function have become the criteria. He stated that he wants to make sure they are talking about the exterior finish be painted with a durable material as opposed to galvanized. He stated that Staff has never approved galvanized on any other building.

Mr. Michaelis commented that he has looked at the proposed larger building and noted it will be galvanized and will be covered with paint or cladding.

Mr. Morris stated that the location is amongst the stables and barns. He stated that Staff seems to be insisting on spending extra money on design which has nothing to do with function.

Mr. Michaelis commented about the a/c units. He commented that there is no issue with using smaller units.

Mr. Stevens commented that code enforcement is currently in the middle of several cases involving illegally mounted a/c units similar to what is being proposed.

Mr. Morris stated that the applicant indicated previously that the cost would be the same to install central air conditioning versus wall units.

Senior Planner Espinoza commented that he spoke with the facilities manager and she recommended building a half wall to protect the a/c if it is a wall unit. He stated that three would be installed.

Mr. Stevens asked if the sewer extension work has been done.

Mr. Michaelis responded that all the work has been done. He noted that both buildings are in position to connect to the sewer.

Mr. Stevens commented that he is reluctant to approve this project.

MOTION: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Curt Morris to approve with the following conditions: smaller restrooms use batten and unpainted galvanized metal; larger building post would be galvanized powder coated post only to add color, the addition of shutters and cladding where the C channels join-place batten placed over them and be the same color of the building, the exterior will be metal, baked on enamel and the a/c units can be addressed to either be central air or mounted into the wall with a half wall to protect the wall unit.

Motion carried 5-1-1-0 (Stevens No and Sorcinelli Absent)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:24 a.m. to the meeting of May 22, 2014 at 8:30 a.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Jessica Mejia
Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: June 12, 2014