

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
August 14, 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 (*Arrived at 8:40 a.m.*)
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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve the July 24, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Badar Absent).

Mr. Schoonover advised that that DPRB Case No. 14-29 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-34 will be continued to a future DPRB meeting date. He added that the neighbors who were notified about today's meeting will be re-notified for the future meeting.

DPRB Case No. 14-27

Continued from the meetings of July 10, 2014 and July 24, 2014. A request to modify the front entrance doors at 168 W. Bonita Avenue at the Johnstone Building to allow for the unit to be subdivided into two separate suites. Each of the units will have their own entrance door that will be similar to the existing glass pane doors.

APN: 8390-023-011

Zone: Creative Growth 2 (CG-2) – Frontier Village

**Leanne Otine, applicant, was present.
John Rimpau, was present.**

Mr. Stevens stated that the Board members were provided the staff report from the last two meetings. He stated that Mr. Sorcinelli was hired to draw up alternative storefront plans. The primary issue of concern is what approach is appropriate for the storefront. There are three existing storefront conditions:

1. Exemplified by the Jeweler and Barber storefronts. The clerestory windows are 2 to 3 ft. or so inset from exterior brick façade and there is no kickplate. Although, the storefront inset is

parallel to the street, the Barber and Jeweler are the same. He concluded that the inset, materials, orientation and storefront are the same.

2. Roady's has clerestory windows that are slightly inset, 6 inches to 1 ft. just behind the brick kickplate. The clerestory runs parallel to the street but the storefront angles. He added that there is a ledge above the entry.
3. The clerestory windows are covered by wood fascia and the storefront is brought up all the way out to the edge with an inset for entryway.

In Staff's perspective, the applicant's tenant improvement to change the use to a beauty salon, allowed them to keep the existing storefront and add a door or change to a more historic storefront. If allowed to keep the storefront and add a door, there is still the potential for a façade program which is voluntary of the applicant as opposed to being a requirement for the tenant improvement. He posed the question, if a historic storefront is desired then which of the two existing models should be followed for a new storefront: leaving the clerestory where it is or matching Condition No. 1 or move the clerestory forward to replication Condition No. 2. Then there is the question of having an angled or parallel storefront. If the clerestory is parallel, then what type of kickplate should be used. The geometry of this creates challenges and questions such as which storefront is desired to be replicated. He noted that there are issues of where to place the proposed two doors. The other details include the door placement. Staff is concerned with the openness of the storefront window. He added that they are trying to have the storefront windows appear more commercial versus closed off and covered. In regards to the interior setup, there is a salon space that is immediately adjacent to the front window.

Curt Morris arrived at 8:40 a.m.

Mr. Stevens expressed his concern with the windows being covered all the time versus having an open storefront. There are alternatives for the open space in the front such as creating a waiting area or an area to sell and display supplies. The applicant says that neither of those options work for their models and added that they do not need a waiting area. The applicant is willing to keep the storefront open with no shades or coverings. He expressed his concern about introducing an interior wall because it would connect to the storefront. He noted that if you do not line them up to match the storefront braces, then you have changed the visible appearance of the storefront.

In regards to the façade program update, downtown merchants were invited to a special meeting with City Council to discuss these ideas. The façade program will be presented at the August 26, 2014 City Council meeting. He expressed his confidence that a program will result but the exact figures are uncertain. There is a preference to follow the Roady's model which has the clerestory brought to the front with an angled storefront. He asked the Board if they would like to see the building as historic and to make that a requirement.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that there is an issue with the inset and mimicking Roady's and the Jeweler's store. He stated that there cannot be doors opening to the street and sidewalk space. He explained that he is trying to create a space for the door. The Jeweler store is set back to create a foyer. Roady's model creates a maximum interior space while allowing for the door to be setback from the street location and the clerestory gives a historically relevant appearance. The drawings provided show a setback with the anticipation that there could be a graphics wall to provide screening of the clients behind that wall.

Mr. Stevens posed the question if there is a reintroduction of the column element, will it support the parallel or angled storefront.

Mr. Sorcinelli replied that it does not make a difference. He recommended restoring the column first.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the historic alternative is an option, is it viable for the applicant.

Mr. Stevens responded that the viability of the option depends on the cost. If the cost were on the lower end of the spectrum, the property owner is willing to participate but the willingness is enhanced if there is a façade program.

Mr. Michaelis asked what would happen if it is decided to move towards a historic approach.

Mr. Stevens replied it would return back to DPRB and be approved as a requirement but if it is not a requirement, then they can make their own decision.

Mr. Michaelis asked what is historic and which is the best option.

Mr. Stevens replied that we decide what we think is historic. He recommended leaving the clerestory where it is with an angled storefront and brick kickplate to match the brick column. He added that how it is angled determines where the doors are to be located at.

Mr. Morris asked if the column behind the window serves as a front brace.

Mr. Sorcinelli responded that the low barring steel work behind the beam carries half the load and pointed out what is being stripped away is the brick.

Mr. Stevens commented that the desire would be to remove the beam but we need to make sure it is structurally capable.

John Rimpau commented that the patrons of the salon do not mind having their salon chairs by the windows.

Leanne Otine, applicant, stated that the window coverings serve to reduce the heat that shines through the window. She pointed out that the sun does not hit the building as much but added that aesthetically, they would like to have natural light come through.

Mr. Stevens commented that the applicant has promised to have no window coverings.

Eric Beilstein, Building Official, commented that those inclusions would be more appropriate when the tenant improvement kicks in.

Mr. Patel stated that the model is already there, it just needs to replicate Roady's.

Mr. Stevens commented that it will not completely replicate Roady's and pointed out that the ledge will be different.

John Rimpau stated that the clerestory over the Beauty salon is exactly the same as today's materials and quality.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Jeweler's and Barber storefronts have the original clerestory.

John Rimpau responded that they are functional arches.

MOTION: Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Jim Schoonover to move forward with the historic concept which includes: the clerestory to remain, an angled storefront, brick kickplate to match and brick column.

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

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover to approve DPRB Case No. 14-27 subject to standard conditions of approval and requirements for historic storefronts with the option to return to the Board if the façade program does not go through. The approval includes: angled storefront, brick kickplate, brick columns, and interior walls to tie into the front façade and door locations to be worked out with Staff. Also, the storefront windows will be kept open at all times.

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

DPRB Case No. 14-22

Continued from the meeting of July 10, 2014. A request to approve a Master Sign Program for Chaparral Lanes located at 400 W. Bonita Avenue.

Associated Case: CE13-3546

APN: 8386-017-028

Zone: Creative Growth 2 (CG-2)

Bobby Patel, 400 W. Bonita Ave, was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated the applicant is requesting approval for a master sign program. The application was initiated because of a code enforcement case for an unpermitted monument sign. The applicant has been working with Staff to correct the violation and has submitted a Master Sign Program. The subject property is occupied by Chaparral Lanes, which was approved in 1987 through Conditional Use Permit No. 85-12 as a bowling center with the following ancillary uses: a restaurant with a bar area, banquet hall, conference facilities, and two retail spaces located at the west end of the building. Since approval of CUP 85-12, there have been additional applications to amend the bowling center's operation and signage:

DPRB 89-184 – October 1989 - Master Sign Program was reviewed and continued by the Board to address their concerns and to remove existing illegal signs as part of the Board's reconsideration of the matter. Staff cannot confirm if the illegal signs were removed at the time. The item was not resubmitted to the Board, therefore, it was not approved and there is no existing sign program for the subject property.

Conditional Use Permit No. 90-7 – July 1990 – The Planning Commission reviewed and approved a request to establish a video arcade as an ancillary use to the bowling center to allow up to 18 gaming machines.

DPRB 09-35 – November 2009 – The Development Plan Review Board (DPRB) reviewed and approved a request to construct a 341 sq. ft. outdoor patio in associated with CUP 09-10.

CE10-1485 – December 2010 – Code enforcement issued a Notice of Violation for an unpermitted monument sign. The applicant has been working with Staff on correcting violation and has submitted a master sign program for a review and consideration by the DPRB.

CE13-3546 – October 2013 – Code Enforcement issued a Notice of Violation for an unpermitted monument sign. The applicant has been working with Staff on correcting the violation and has submitted a master sign program for review and consideration by the Development Plan Review Board.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the Sign Ordinance requires that all multiple tenant centers have a Master Sign Program in place to provide a comprehensive sign design policy and plan for the center. While the property was developed with two retail spaces in addition to the bowling center, they have not been occupied by additional tenants nor have requests for additional tenant signs have been submitted. The signage for the property consists of a wall sign and monument sign for Chaparral Lanes, a single tenant; therefore, a Master Sign Program has not been required for the subject site. Staff has expressed to the applicant that the billiards, bar and restaurant are ancillary uses to the bowling center, the applicant had disagreed with Staff and has decided to move forward with the monument sign as proposed.

In regards to tenant classification, the Sign Ordinance requires all multiple tenant centers to have a master sign program to regulate signage. The proposed sign program does not specify the number of tenants but provides for five wall signs, including the existing Chaparral Lanes sign, and a monument sign which lists billiards and bar, in addition to three tenant spaces. It's been the practice of City Staff to only permit signage for primary tenants and not for ancillary uses. The subject site was developed as a multi-tenant center; however, Staff understands that it has not been operated as one, as the bowling center has utilized the additional tenant spaces. Originally, the Conditional Use Permit approved the bowling alley with accessory uses with the parking criteria meeting the requirements; however, if there was a restaurant approved as a primary use, the parking requirements would not have been met. The Sign Ordinance permits only one primary wall sign per frontage and up to two secondary wall signs per business on other wall planes when facing or be visible to either a public right-of-way or a parking area.

The proposed monument sign complies with the size requirements; however, Staff expressed concerns with the design and content. The Sign Ordinance permits tenant names and the property address to be included on the monument sign. Additional content on the proposed monument sign such as bowling pins and bowling ball are not permitted by the Sign Ordinance and need to be removed. It has been the practice of Staff to approve signs with appropriate durable materials such as: aluminum or acrylic letters, aluminum tenant panels with pushed-through or routed-out letters, textured aluminum frames and concrete or stone bases. The monument sign consists of painted aluminum frame with an appearance of foam or wood letters. The materials do not have the same durability as aluminum or acrylic letters and eventually become a maintenance issue, as visible from the pictures provided. The proposed Master Sign Program does not specify a font type or color but allows the tenant to select both their font type and color, subject to City approval. Since the sign is located within the Town Core, the design guidelines would permit walls signs to be internally illuminated; however for the Town Core it is discouraged and recommends that the lights be externally illuminated. Staff recommends that the item be continued and direction be provided to the applicant to revise the Master Sign Program to permit.

1. One primary sign for the bowling center frontage (north/front elevation)
2. One secondary sign for the bowling center on the east (side) elevation
3. One primary sign for tenant #2 frontage (north/front elevation)
4. One primary sign for tenant #3 frontage (north/front elevation)
5. One secondary sign for tenant #3 on the west (side) elevation
6. One monument sign for each street frontage to include the following tenants:
 - a. Bowling center
 - b. Tenant #2
 - c. Tenant #3
7. Other miscellaneous revisions.

Mr. Stevens pointed out the tenant spaces and signage indicated on the staff report and asked if there is a demising wall separate and on the outside entrances from the other tenant spaces.

Bobby Patel, 400 W. Bonita Ave, responded yes and added that he wants to eventually remodel and remove some of the bowling alley lanes.

Mr. Stevens asked if the tenant spaces interior walls make spaces 2 and 3 separate from the rest of the bowling alley.

Bobby Patel responded yes.

Mr. Stevens asked if there are current tenants in tenant spaces #2 and #3.

Bobby Patel responded that they are vacant and have been vacant for a long time.

Mr. Stevens asked who operates the bar and grill and what were the hours of operation.

Bobby Patel replied Chaparral Lanes does and added they are looking to lease out the bar and grill and added that it is opened longer than the bowling alley on Thursday's.

Mr. Stevens stated that the existing monument sign size depends on if the center is to be considered a multi-tenant center. The existing sign exceeds the size for a single monument sign and needs to be characterized as a multi-tenant center.

Bobby Patel stated that he plans on removing the monument sign; however, cannot submit new drawings for a sign, unless he knows if the property will be considered a multi-tenant center. He stated that when the building was built in 1990, a sign program was submitted based on the location being characterized as a multi-tenant center. He addressed an outstanding concern with the lights on the sign flashing. He noted that the bulbs were changed to an LED bulb and they had the options to flash or remain one color. The setting was set on multiple colors but could easily be stopped on the white color. He addressed the concerns with having additional tenant's means additional parking is needed. He stated that a parking study can be done to address those concerns. He noted he is aware that the current sign needs to be removed. He presented a future idea of having a trampoline business as an additional tenant.

Mr. Morris responded that in order to have a future trampoline business, the Conditional Use Permit would need to be amended. There is a concern about the limitations for gaming machines and changing to a recreation center may not be that easy and there may be additional changes required to your current permit.

Bobby Patel commented that the bowling alley has 48 lanes whereas most bowling alleys have 30 lanes. He added that the Pro Shop may be leaving and that is where the new tenant would be located. He said he is starting to prepare for the future transitions.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the additional tenant spaces are already set up for future changes since they have their own entrances aside from the Bowling Alley's main entrance.

Bobby Patel asked the Board how to create a sign today that would meet code during the interim. He is aware that the sign needs to be removed but would like the center to be considered a multi-tenant center.

Mr. Stevens asked Staff if it is two or three tenant spaces that would allow a larger monument sign.

Associate Planner Torrico responded there would need to be two tenant spaces.

Mr. Stevens stated that it is fair to consider the location as a multi-tenant center. The two spaces at the North West corner have been occupied. The existing monument sign is not close to being approved; however, if the applicant is removing the sign, it will eliminate the bulk of the discussion. Staff can work with the applicant on a new design. He commented that he is not convinced that the bar and grill is a separate tenant from the bowling alley. The sign program should consider how the spaces are assigned.

Mr. Morris commented that since there is a food service inside the bowling alley, it would be helpful to the public to have a sign visible indicating there is a restaurant inside the center. He added that even though the food service is ancillary to the bowling alley it fits the multi-tenant center. He noted that parking will be a different issue.

Mr. Patel stated that due to the shape of the property it would be best to consider the location as a multi-tenant center.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to consider the subject location as a multi-tenant center for the purpose of the sizing of a monument sign and establishing eligibility for a Master Sign Program. The Master Sign Program will be continued to a date uncertain, to allow the applicant time to work with Staff on an appropriate sign program. The applicant needs to remove the existing non-permitted sign within 45 days.

Motion carried 7-0

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the examples provided in the staff report is what Staff is recommending.

Mr. Stevens responded no and added that Staff needs to see the design first.

DPRB Case No. 14-29 and Tree Removal Permit No. 14-34

A request to construct a 400 square foot detached patio cover with an exterior fire place and a 714 square foot deck, and remove one mature Ficus tree at the rear yard of 2006 Scarborough Ln.

APN: 84726-032-011

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

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue to a future DPRB meeting.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 14-33

A request for a Master Sign Program for a multi-tenant office complex located at 1057 – 1087 Via Verde.

APN: 8395-025-024

Zone: Administrative Professional (AP)

Joe Silva, Inland Signs – 10783 Bell Ct, Rancho Cucamonga CA 91730, was present.

Associate Planner Torrico stated that the applicant is requesting approval for a Master Sign Program for a multi-tenant office complex located at 1057 – 1087 Via Verde Ave. The property is located in the Administrative Professional Zone and requires a master sign program for multiple-tenant complexes. The building has existing wall signs which will remain in place as part of the request. The applicant has proposed to install a multi-tenant monument sign, which requires approval of the Master Sign Program.

The sign program will provide approval procedures and general design standards for the property. The sign program will allow the existing wall signs to remain in place but provides criteria for new signs. The new criteria will provide for consistency in the center through the requirement of a uniform font color and type, sign type and spacing requirements.

The sign code allows up to two monument designs, however, due to site constraints, only one is allowed/proposed under the proposed sign program. The monument sign will be located at the southwest corner of the subject site and will include the following design criteria:

- A maximum of 20 sq. ft. tenant identification area
- Maximum height of four feet, exclusive of architectural projections
- Maximum number of businesses identified on the sign shall not exceed ten
- Tenant individual panels must all be compatible in size
- White acrylic or similar background materials are not permitted to be utilized for sign faces. If internally illuminated, tenant individual panels must have an opaque background with illuminated letters routed out or be individual letters
- Minimum letter height shall be eight (8) inches
- Property address(es) shall be incorporated into the sign
- Replacement of tenant panels shall require City of San Dimas approval
- Location of the sign shall also require review and approval by the Public Works Department

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve, subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried 7-0

Mr. Sorcinelli asked where the monument sign will be located.

Associate Planner Torrico responded that the sign will be facing Via Verde and Puente St. He added that it will be reviewed by the Public Works Department for line of sight issues. He reiterated that there will only be one monument sign.

Mr. Stevens stated that there will be only one monument sign and will be double faced.

John Sorcinelli recused himself as a voting member from the DPRB Case No. 14-30 – 624 N. Monte Vista Ave. due to the proximity of the project location.

DPRB Case No. 14-30

A request to demolish an existing 360 square foot single-family residence and to construct a proposed 1,972 square foot single-story single-family residence with a detached 441 square foot alley accessed garage at 624 N. Monte Vista Ave.

APN: 8387-002-054

Zone: Single-Family 7500 (SF-7500)

Steven Kyne, 610 N. Monte Vista Ave., was present.
Carlos Fernandez, 624 N. Monte Vista Ave., was present.
John Sorcinelli, 149 W. Gladstone St., was present.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the applicant is requesting approval to demolish an existing 360 sq. ft. residence and to construct a proposed 1,972 sq. ft. single-story single-family residence with a detached 411 sq. ft. two-car alley accessed garage at 624 N. Monte Vista Avenue. The lot is 7,991 sq. ft. in area. She stated that there is currently no garage on-site. A two-car garage is proposed that will take access to the site from the alley. The utilities are already provided to the site with the exception of sewer. The existing house is on a septic system that will be abandoned and the new residence will be connected to the public sanitary sewer and all utilities will be undergrounded.

There is an existing chain link fence along the project perimeter that will be removed in its entirety and is proposed to be replaced with a wood fence in certain portions as indicated on the plans. The existing house on-site was built in 1950. The house design will be designed in a Colonial Revival style which is an approved architectural style for the Town Core. It is simple in design but architecturally appropriate for the Town Core. The house design will include:

- Symmetrical presentation to the street with balanced windows flanking a center door and central dormer providing decorative vent
- Covered porch with 8" by 8" supporting columns and wood railing
- Hardie Plank siding with a wood grain finish and 6 inch exposure
- 3 Dimensional composition shingle roofing "Weathered Look"
- Vinyl double-hung windows with divided light panels in "Swiss Coffee" with 4 inch trim in "Swiss Coffee" and shutters in "Swiss Coffee"
- Used brick veneer on foundation
- 18" eave overhangs

Associate Planner Williams pointed out the issues of Staff's concern:

- Walls/fencing. A solid decorative wall with a decorative cap would be a more permanent and durable improvement than a wood fence as is currently shown on the rear and eastern portions of the site. A stone wall, brick wall, or split face wall with decorative cap could be utilized; Condition No. 15 addresses this concern.
- Shutters. Staff recommends the use of shutters; however, shutters that coordinate with the size of the windows should be used. Shutters should also be incorporated on the windows on the garage to coordinate with the house. Condition No. 16 addresses this concern.

- Garage siting. Typically garages that take alley access are sited either 3' off of the alley or at least 20' off the alley. The garage can be re-sited 3' closer to the alley during plan check as reflected in Condition No. 16.

Associate Planner Williams informed the Board that Steven Kyne who lives at 610 N. Monte Vista Ave. submitted a letter of concern in regards to the subject property. A copy of the letter has been provided to the Board members. His concern is with the siting of the garage which he would prefer to be more to the east. He also would like to see the alley pushed back 20 ft. She pointed out that Staff does not think it needs to be pushed back.

Mr. Stevens stated that the setback is generally increased.

Associate Planner Williams stated that the garage is setback 10 ft. from Monte Vista Ave. She added that it would require a dedication and a corner to be cut off. The fence at the garage will be at a 45 degree angle for visibility.

Carlos Fernandez, 624 N. Monte Vista Ave, commented that he does not see a problem with where the garage is situated. He added that the garage was placed at the proposed location in order to give the homeowners a private backyard and added if it is situated further east; it would make the back yard more visible to the public.

Steven Kyne, 610 N. Monte Vista Ave., stated that he owns the house to the south and is delighted to see that the little house is being demolished and a larger house is being built in its place. There is a concern with the garage location and rear alley setback. The proposed 441 sq. ft. garage location sets the structure just 3 ft. off the existing rear alley and only 10 ft. off Monte Vista Ave. This layout allows only a 23 ft. of rear back up space behind the garage doors. The tight turning radius will make a difficult garage access, especially for a second car to fit. Another issue is the location is just 10 ft. off of Monte Vista Ave. The street is very narrow with no parking along the East side curb. The trash truck can barely make the turn into the alley and the proposed 3 ft. alley setback will put the garage eaves only 18 inches off the alley on a tight corner. A 10 ft. high trash truck will hit the eaves that are only about 7 ½ ft. off the pavement. He noted that his home faces Monte Vista Ave. in a reverse corner style, with a 21 ft. driveway setback to the garage. The proposed garage will stick out 11 ft. beyond the garage towards Monte Vista Ave. He added by having the garage set 3 ft. off the alley will be an eyesore for the entire neighborhood. He concluded that Staff should recommend that the garage be moved as far back as possible toward the interior lot side. The City should consider a larger drive approach. He provided sample plans to the Board on how the garage should be laid out and drawn.

Associate Planner Williams stated that in the Single-Family Residence Zone, there is no designated setback.

Mr. Stevens stated that the problem is that 3 ft. does not give an adequate turning radius.

Associate Planner Williams commented that the applicant was ok with a 3 ft. or 6 ft. setback. She noted that if the garage needs to be shifted to the east or west, it would pose a concern to the applicant.

Carlos Fernandez, 624 N. Monte Vista Ave, asked the Board what the setback of the garage on Monte Vista Ave. should be.

Steven Kyne, 610 N. Monte Vista Ave., responded that the garage should be pushed back to the original 6 ft.

John Sorcinelli, 149 W. Gladstone St., commented that adding another driveway on Monte Vista Ave is a mistake. He added that it becomes a tight corner to a location that is already short on parking. He recommended that the west of Monte Vista Ave should also have a no parking regulation.

Mr. Stevens commented that the 3 ft. setback does not work but 5 – 6 ft. setback would.

Steven Kyne, 610 N. Monte Vista Ave., agreed that the garage should be pushed back within 5 ft. of the side property and added that the other garages in the neighborhood have been done that way.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Code would not prohibit the property owner to take access off of Monte Vista Ave.

Carlos Fernandez, 624 N. Monte Vista Ave, expressed his concern with the trash truck pick up if the garage is moved to the east and added then the that specific corner would get a fence.

Steven Kyne, 610 N. Monte Vista Ave., added that it would work if the fence is 5 ft. high with no overhang or eaves.

Mr. Morris added that the fence can be directly on the property line.

Mr. Stevens recommended moving the garage within 5 ft. of the property line.

Mr. Patel inquired about the line-of-sight distance.

Carlos Fernandez, 624 N. Monte Vista Ave, suggested that the garage be moved up in order to make room for the RV option in the future.

Mr. Stevens suggested that they come up with the best design with a 5 – 6 ft. setback from the alley. He pointed out that it would change the shape of the yard slightly.

John Sorcinelli, 149 W. Gladstone St., commented that by leaving the garage at the proposed location, there would be more usable yardage.

Mr. Stevens suggested three options that meet the Code:

1. Applicant has a 6 ft. setback from the alley and a 10 ft. setback from Monte Vista Ave.
2. Staff's recommendation – move the garage 3 ft. from the alley and 10 ft. from Monte Vista Ave.
3. Push the garage to the east and have 6 ft. from the alley. Under this scenario, the 6 ft. fence has to be behind the 10 ft. sideyard setback.

John Sorcinelli, 149 W. Gladstone St., asked if there could be a 42 inch high wall at the property line.

Mr. Stevens stated that prior to 2005, some residences had an existing condition that their fence could be 6 ft. high in the setback of the sideyard; however, after 2005, the fence has to comply with the 42 inches in height regulation.

John Sorcinelli, 149 W. Gladstone St., commented that by having the garage further out, it helps screen the backyard.

MOTION: Krishna Patel moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve the plan as submitted, subject to conditions of approval.

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

John Sorcinelli, 149 W. Gladstone St., commented that it is important to make arrangements to put in the backyard off of the alleyway. He added that river rock stone should be used versus ledgestone. The split face with decorative cap should stay with a slump stone and decorative cap.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:51 a.m. to the meeting of August 28, 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: September 11, 2014