

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
May 22, 2014 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce (*Arrived at 8:41 a.m.*)  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Curtis Morris, Mayor  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large  
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

**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.

**DPRB Case No. 12-15**

**Continued from the meetings of December 12, 2013 and May 8, 2014.** 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)

**Ziba Arbab and Mike Moghadam, property owners of 1136 Edinburgh Road, were present.**

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the item was continued by the Board at its May 8, 2014 meeting. The item was continued to allow Staff to research the previous process used to modify the Scenic Easement line. In 2002, the Scenic Easement line on the subject property was modified through a Municipal Code Text Amendment reviewed by the Planning Commission with final approval granted by the City Council. He added that it was done to allow the applicant to keep the unpermitted construction at the south end of the property. He noted that portions of the stairs need to be removed because they do not comply with scenic easement requirements. In regards to the color choices, the applicant has proposed the following colors for the barn: barn/siding color – Weathered Saddle and the roof color – Woodlawn Green. The Board suggested that earth tone colors be used for the color of the barn. The designer is okay with the proposal and noted the applicant is okay with keeping the scenic easement as is with no adjustments but redesigning the stairs and platform to comply with the scenic easement requirements.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked what could be done if it is redesigned.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied that the height exceeds the scenic easement requirements as it extends into the slope and added that if the platform is removed, that would be the best solution.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if there was a color swatch provided for the Board to review.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied no. He added that the colors submitted were submitted as is via email.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how many walkways there were. He stated that one of them seems to be in the development portion of the lot.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied that there are two walkways. He noted that walkway No. 2 is in the scenic easement.

**Mr. Stevens** asked which photo depicts the 2<sup>nd</sup> walkway.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied Page 6 on Fact Sheet for December 12, 2013.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the walkway No. 1 encroaches into the development area and if walkway No. 2 encroaches into the scenic easement area.

**Associate Planner Torrico** responded that walkway #1 is in the scenic easement.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that the platform overhangs into the slope and added that the top of the slope is perceived as the permitted edge of the scenic easement. The stairs go into the scenic easement.

**Associate Planner Torrico** confirmed that the stairs go into the scenic easement.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the terms of the scenic easement area has limitations on the walkways. The standard sizes for walkways are no greater than 48 inches wide and may have minor retaining walls subject to City approval. He added that the standard also applies to the platform.

**Scott Dilley arrived at 8:41 a.m.**

**Mr. Stevens** asked if those standards apply to the platform and walkway No. 1.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied yes.

**Ziba Arbab Moghadam, property owner of 1136 Edinburgh Road**, commented that the neighbor's property has their scenic easements that hang over. He added that he does not understand how Staff defines scenic easement.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** explained that the designer understood what the changes would need to be and asked if she is having a conflict with the designer.

**Ziba Arbab** replied no.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if Ordinance 1123 and Ordinance 1124 were available to look at. He understands that the applicant is willing to adjust the platform and associated stairways from the current location so that it is not in the scenic easement.

**Associate Planner Torrico** commented that he understood that as well.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that it is fair to characterize the location as the scenic easement line. Staff's view is that the perimeter edge of the scenic easement is at the top of the natural slope that lines up on the aerial photograph. He added that this would require that the platform be moved 10-12 ft. to the North and different sets of stairways be developed from the revised location.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that he spoke with designer, Ed Segura, who met with the property owners over the past weekend and determined they would not seek to adjust the scenic easement line but would work with Staff to redesign the stairs and platform.

**Mr. Dilley** verified that the stairway needs to be reduced. He stated that the height of the retaining wall will vary.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that Staff is happy to hear there is no desire to amend the scenic easement area and would be problematic and would not happen again. He verified that scenic easements are generally viewed at top of the natural/graded slope. He commented that the wall of the property is to the east and it is really unclear where the top of the slope is located. He stated that the only thing to approve today is to completely removal the platform and stairway; however, the applicant has the choice to come in and attempt to receive approval of the modified platform and stairway and added they have the right to do that. He stated that there were discussions with the colors presented for the barn and added that they need to be earth tones. He provided the sample and stated that it appears like a pink color; however it is not exactly the right color and the applicant needs to work with Staff to soften the color. He stated that the Board is okay with the roof color and all other conditions with the understanding that since there is unpermitted work, there needs to be a time frame that is quicker than the normal standard. He asked if a condition has been added to reflect this.

**Mr. Beilstein** stated that he was not in attendance at the last meeting and questioned the recommendation to remove the unpermitted stairs. He stated that he is unclear if the storage sheds were rectified. He asked if they are to be removed or not.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied that the storage sheds are outside of the scenic easement line and added the sheds are used for horsekeeping. He explained that Planning is okay with the storage sheds subject to Building and Safety approval.

**Mr. Beilstein** asked if one of the storage sheds is made up of retaining walls.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that there is a condition to secure building permits within 60 days of approval.

**Mr. Beilstein** stated that since the last code adoption an amendment was added that any code enforcement cases, such as this item, will now have 6 months to complete construction; however, an extension can be requested by the property owner.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that Staff had a requirement to remove platform.

**Mike Moghadam, property owner of 1136 Edinburgh Rd.,** apologized for his tardiness. He stated that he understands the issues with the platform and earnestly wants to work with DPRB and

resolve issues the best way possible. He stated that he is not aware of the changes made to the scenic easement line. He stated that he understands that some structures are built on a no build area. He stated that if they have to remove and tear down, it's upsetting because so much time was invested.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that there are issues with the color samples submitted. He stated that the applicant should have provided color swatches. He added that he cannot vote without an accurate color sample.

**Mr. Michaelis** added that the motion for approval included that Staff will look at obtaining a color sample from the applicant and find a color that is more earth tone.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if Mr. Sorcinelli would prefer having the color samples and return to the Board.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** responded that the color of the roof barn works for him and the only concern is the color sample which can be brought back on it's own to a future meeting, and voted on within 5 minutes.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the platform and associated stairway are in the scenic easement and explained to the property owner is very clear where the scenic easement area is located. He added that the original exhibit depicting the scenic easement lines do allow for some interpretation or misinterpretation. There has always been a fairly clear indication that the majority of the platform deck extend over the slope. Staff is happy to work with the applicant to make adjustments to preserve a component of the platform; however, the question would be could it be cut back and made to work. A condition could be added to require removal but an alternative plan can be submitted and reviewed.

**Mr. Moghadam** commented that he does not want to waste the Board's time. He added that he has spoken with the designer and would like to resolve any outstanding issues.

**Mr. Patel** commented that the applicant and designer can work with Staff on the design and scenic easement concerns.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve subject to Staff's recommendation and conditions of approval and noted that Staff discuss with the applicant the color to be used for the barn siding and soften the color from a pinkish component to a more earth tone.

Motion carried 7-0

**Mr. Sorcinelli** recommended that the applicant submit a color sample to Staff so that it can be brought back to a future DPRB meeting for review. He added he cannot approve a color based off of a printed copy.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that Staff has discretion for the color for the barn siding and recommended more of an earth tone be used than the submitted pinkish color.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** added that if the color is brought back to a future meeting, it would take 5 minutes to review and approve.

**DPRB Case No. 13-02**

A request to construct a new approximately 6,902 square foot single-family residence with an 888 square foot veranda, 105 square foot front entry porch, two balconies totaling 403 square feet, and an attached 905 square foot garage as well as site improvements including an infinity pool, perimeter walls, and retaining walls within Specific Plan No. 12, Area 1 located at 1006 Via Romales.

APN: 8448-056-008

Zone: Specific Plan No. 12, Area 1

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that Specific Plan No. 12, Area 1 permits single-family detached custom homes subject to DPRB and Planning Commission consideration. The applicant is proposing a modern architectural style which incorporates a variety of high-quality materials and elements including: variegated double barrel clay tile roof, smooth stucco finish, Riviera/Cantera natural stone molding around all windows and doors, eave moldings in a dark brown smooth stucco finish, wood interior, aluminum-clad exterior windows and doors in a dark brown finish, custom metal entry door with glass inserts in a dark brown finish, modern garage door in a dark brown finish, decorative light fixtures, custom iron guard rail in a dark brown powder-coat finish and custom iron chimney caps in a dark brown powder-coat finish. The proposal complies with the zoning in terms of height, setbacks and lot coverage.

The proposed residence is consistent with the existing neighborhood in terms of mass and bulk. The design presents as simple in the elevations; however, the quality of the materials contributes to the design and assists in the presentation of the building to the street. The residence incorporates the same stone molding around the windows and doors and the same smooth stucco finish in the same light color. The darker bronze eave moldings and the darker bronze windows and doors complement each other.

Specific Plan No. 12 encourages development that is contoured and blended to harmonize with natural slopes. It sets the maximum vertical height of cuts and fills exposed or retained by walls from toe to top to not exceed twelve feet whenever possible and the maximum steepness of exposed cuts and fills to not exceed 2:1, and preferably 3:1 for fills, except when authorized to be exceeded by the DPRB for "difficult lots." This lot has a 31% slope. The applicant has worked with Staff to make these revisions to the original proposal to step the southern portion of the house down approximately 4' and to lower the proposed retaining wall on the southern portion of the lot from 6' to 4.' Staff has suggested minimizing the amount of paving in the front by reducing the size of the driveway and included this as Condition No. 17. Staff recommends approval and forward to the Planning Commission which will be heard as a consent item. She added that the applicant/owner is not in attendance today to answer questions.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if this is the last lot to be built on that cul-de-sac.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded there are still some vacant lots.

**Mr. Stevens** asked Homeowners Association (HOA) approval was received.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded no.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that reason the HOA approval was not obtained is because Lot 15 there is no active HOA. He added that the Fire Department attempts to have the City clean up Lot 15. He stated that CC&R's do exist. He added that the applicant/property owner should be made aware that there is

no active HOA. He questioned when the project was originally submitted based off the Case No., was it submitted in 2013.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that the project was submitted back in 2013; however, the applicant/property owner has been preoccupied with other projects and it was delayed.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** pointed out that the front door shown on the plans is different than the rendering.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that the single door is recessed and 7 ft. and clarified that the purpose of the model is for grading representation rather than architectural design.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the cover extends out over the porch steps.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that there is 7 ft. of cover.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that the scale of the house needs to be considered and added that it is relatively flat. He noted that it is mostly stucco with tile roof with natural stone elements at the entrance and around the doors and windows.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that the applicant/property owner discussed adding wainscot material.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that the design is very basic. He stated that if you look around the neighborhood, it appears to have the plainest architectural design. He stated that since there is no HOA to conduct an architectural review, there is no option for feedback from the neighbors. He expressed his concern with the architecture and its plainness.

**Mr. Schoonover** asked if this item will be heard at Planning Commission.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded it will be heard as a consent item.

**Mr. Schoonover** agreed that the design is plain.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the building is at the minimum setback.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded the side yards are 5 ft. and 12 ft., with the 12 ft. being for the driveway side. She stated that the front yards vary on topography issues. She added that for this property, a 48 ft. setback feels comfortable. She stated that the maximum lot coverage is 35% and they are currently at 20%.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if Staff has discussed with the applicant/property owner that the design is plain.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded that when the applicant originally came in, they wanted a modern Japanese style; however, they have moved towards the direction that is submitted. She discussed with the applicant the materials being used and has pushed since day 1 to use additional alternative materials and to define the architectural style. She added that they can have simple buildings with other details done very nicely.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that he does not see how the details work in reality. He added that he is not prepared at this point to take action and would like to see a better design.

**Mr. Michaelis** asked if the pictures provided are from houses the applicant has previously designed. He commented that the designs are good and added that the applicant uses materials that are not typically used.

**Mr. Morris** commented that the use of single front doors, versus double doors, is something he has noticed lately at open houses. He added that double doors are not being used anymore.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** commented that it is an odd mixture. He stated that with the topography in the neighborhood, a lot more can be done to the design.

**Mr. Stevens** commented that Staff can let the applicant know that there is a consensus from the Board for the concern of the lack of architectural design.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that the applicant/property owner can look at the plans again and make necessary modifications and return to the Board when changes are made.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue the item and ask that the applicant make revisions to the plans and return to the Board at a future date.

Motion carried 7-0

#### **DPRB Case No. 14-17**

A request to construct an approximately 260 – square foot deck, 302 – square foot trellis patio, and 1,201 – square foot addition to an existing 7,502 – square foot house with 1,225 – square foot garage within Specific Plan No. 8 at 273 Rebecca Drive.

APN: 8382-018-018

Zone: Specific Plan No. 8 (SP-8)

**Dan Casciato, Design and Construction, was present.**

**Eli Noor, property owner of 273 Rebecca Dr., was present.**

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that Specific Plan No. 8 permits single-family detached residential units and permits certain accessory structures subject to DPRB review. Accessory structures subject to DPRB review include the following: greenhouses, workshops, and storage sheds, when less than 600 sq. ft. in floor area, gazebos not in excess of 200 sq. ft., and enclosed or covered patios when less than 600 sq. ft. in floor area, room additions, when less than 600 sq. ft. in floor area, and other accessory uses of a similar nature which the Development Plan Review Board finds to be consistent with the spirit and intent of this Specific Plan.

The proposal includes a 1,201 square foot addition consisting of a new bedroom, new theater, new game room with half bath and wet bar, and a storage room accessible from the rear yard. A 260 – square foot balcony and 360 – square foot trellis patio are also proposed. The proposal originally came in for plan check in October 2012 and permit is ready to be issued in November 2012. Staff notified the applicant that the permit was ready to be issued but was told by the architect in July 2013 that the project was not moving forward. Since the plans have returned, the proposal is being presented to the Board. The addition incorporates the same concrete roof tile, stucco finish in a horizontal band pattern, precast concrete trim molding around the windows, and patio columns to match the existing residence. It features an octagonal roof element above the proposed game room with a 12:12 pitch. The remainder of the addition will be a hip roof with a 4:12 pitch.

There are some issues including: lowering the pitch of the octagonal roof, lowering the plate height of the octagonal tower a few feet, utilizing arched windows over the doors vs. rectangular in keeping with the style of the existing house, incorporating the same stone above and below the doors and windows used elsewhere on the house and incorporating the same balcony railing that is used elsewhere on the house and adding a window to the north elevation. She added that the designer has stated that the owner does not wish to lower the roof pitch or the height of the structure. Staff recommends that the Board approve the item subject to conditions of approval.

**Dan Casciato, of Design and Construction**, commented that he does not wish to lower the plate height and roof pitch because it serves as an accent structure. He stated that in his opinion, the height balances the courtyard.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if there is a height limit for structures in the Specific Plan.

**Associate Planner Williams** responded the maximum height is 28 ft.

**Mr. Casciato** stated that the windows do not match the pictures and added there are other square top doors on the house. He stated that he wants the doors to be separate and different from the main house.

**Mr. Stevens** discussed the arching for the doors. He stated it is shown on the three doors on the east elevation.

**Associate Planner Williams** commented that she would like the height of the structure to be lowered and commented it seems to be an extreme accent to the house.

**Mr. Casciato** commented that this project was previously approved at the end of 2012 and a building permit was ready to be issued; however, the homeowner did not pull the permit at the time. He explained that the item did not go to the Development Plan Review Board but instead was reviewed as a Director Review, Case Planner Marco Espinoza. He stated that when he returned to pull the permits, the plans did not meet the new 2013 Building Code. He expressed his confusion on why the item now has to be heard by the Board and is no longer a Director's Review. He added that at the time, the review only took about a week.

**Mr. Stevens** interjected and asked if it was a Staff level plan check or a Director's Review.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded it was done as Staff level plan check.

**Mr. Casciato** commented that they have lowered the heights of the walls. He expressed that he does not want to lower the pitch of the roof and does not want to go back to the structural engineer to redesign plans that were originally reviewed and approved.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** commented that he agreed with Associate Planner Williams new findings that were missed during the previous plan check.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that based on the plans submitted originally, the Board will approve based on the originally submitted plans.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second Krishna Patel to approve as submitted subject to conditions of approval with the elimination of items A-F in conditions.

Motion carried 7-0

**DPRB Case No. 14-14**

A request to construct two new decks totaling 912 sq. ft. which will be on the lower level and attached to the rear of the house; the request also includes the addition of a 438 sq. ft. family room to the lower level at the rear of the house, the roof of which will be utilized as an additional deck accessed off of the upper floor. The project is located at 1620 Calle Cristina.

APN: 8448-008-046

Zone: Specific Plan No. 11 (SP-11)

**Zahirul H and Salma Ansari, property owners of 1620 Calle Cristina, were present.**

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated that the existing house was built in 2002 and is in need of maintenance when it comes to the existing deck and access pathways. The applicant would like to perform the repairs and add additional deck space and living area in addition to rectifying the heights of some retaining walls that were installed in 2003 and were never finalized. Deck No. 1 – the applicant is proposing to construct two decks, one on each side of the existing deck which is accessed off the lower elevation. The larger of the decks will be on the south side of the existing deck at 780 sq. ft. and will be aligned with the side yard setback of the house at 12 feet. Deck No. 2 – the second deck is smaller in size at 182 sq. ft. and proposed between the existing deck and the new family room addition. There is a 108 sq. ft. walkway that runs along the new addition that connects the existing and new decks. The family room addition/upper deck – the 438 sq. ft. room addition will be off the lower level at the rear of the house. The room is proposed as one large room with exterior access to the existing deck. The applicant is proposing interior stairs that lead down to the crawlspace. The exterior of the room addition will be stucco to match the existing house. The roof of the addition will serve as an additional deck that will be accessed from the upper level. The applicant is also looking at repairing and finalizing the existing retaining walls. The existing retaining walls on the downhill slope were approved and built in 2003 but due to conflict with the actual height of the walls (too high) they were never finalized. He added that the final grading calculation for these walls will be 110 cubic yards which is within the allowable 200 cubic yards of cut and fill for uses outside of the driveway and house foundation. The proposed decks will not require any grading (cut or fill).

**Mr. Stevens** commented that the area where the retaining wall is estimated is 110 cubic yards. He asked how many cubic yards of the 200 cubic yards was used for the original construction of the house.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded that based on the house plans, they did not expand beyond the footing of the house and nothing was calculated beyond the allowed. He added that no calculations were found on the original house plans.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that based on the changes, how much did the original pad extend out.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded 21 ft.

**Mr. Stevens** asked about the status of the lower portion below the retaining wall.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded that it was removed and one wall will remain and be reduced.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that when the outer retaining wall was removed, was there any landscaping that would need to be done. He added that the slope appears to be disturbed.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded that Condition No. 17 has been included that states “all slopes disturbed and/or over three (3) feet in vertical height shall be landscaped and irrigated as approved by the Planning Division.”

**Mr. Stevens** inquired if there is a scenic easement.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** responded yes.

**Zahirul H Ansari, property owner of 1620 Calle Cristina**, stated that he does not understand Condition No. 21 in regards to submitted an Engineering Geology/Soils Report.

**Mr. Beilstein** clarified that Staff would like an updated soils report, not a new soils report. He emphasized that Staff needs just an updated soils report.

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

Motion carried 7-0

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:24 a.m. to the meeting of June 12, 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