

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
November 13, 2014 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

Emmett Badar, City Council  
Eric Beilstein, Building Official  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:32 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

October 9, 2014 and October 23, 2014

**MOTION:** Moved by Schoonover, seconded by Patel to approve the October 9, 2014 minutes. Motion carried 4-0-0-3 (Beilstein, Michaelis and Sorcinelli abstain).

The October 23, 2014 minutes were continued to the next meeting due to lack of quorum for passage.

**DPRB Case No. 14-41**

APN: 8387-010-011

Zone: Single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Scott Remis, 237 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, was present

**Associate Planner Luis Torrico** stated this house is located in the Town Core and on the Historic Resources List, so the proposed addition requires the Board to review it for appropriateness. He stated the request is for a 300 square foot patio addition to the rear of the house. The house is under 900 square feet with a detached two-story garage with a second story recreation room, and both structures have two different roof pitches. The front porch and the proposed patio cover would have the 4:12 pitch, and the patio cover will be designed to comply with the development standards of the SF-DR zone. The patio will have decorative

columns with a natural rock base and concrete cap in keeping with the style of the house and the Town Core. Staff is recommending approval subject to the attached conditions.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the stone was only going to be used in the rear and why that is being required.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated it would be used only in the rear and having natural stone is compatible with other houses in the area. Staff felt it was appropriate to add it to the columns.

**Mr. Beilstein** asked if this house had a Mills Act Contract, and if not, would this addition preclude that option in the future.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated it is not a Mills Act home and that the addition fit the character of the house so he did not see that as a problem if the homeowner wanted to pursue an application.

**Scott Remis, Homeowner**, stated he has been in the house since 1988, and the original front porch posts were Mission style and he was planning to restore them back to that look. He showed a picture of what it used to look like. There was no stone on the front porch, just wood on wood which is what he was planning to reproduce. If it meets code, he would like to remove the railing on both porches. He stated the 4:12 pitch was added in the 1970's so they were just trying to work with what was there.

**MOTION:** Moved by Beilstein, seconded by Dilley to approve with submitted conditions.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated he appreciates seeing the original front porch design since it is quite different from what is there now with the slender posts. If the owner is going to restore the front porch to its original character, then he thought the rear porch should match the original design and not use stone on the base. He also felt the truss treatment in the back is out of character and that there could be a more appropriate way to span that distance. He felt the applicant should look further at the rear column design and the truss; maybe a vent detail across the top that is horizontal is more appropriate. He realizes a truss needs to be used to make the span but it might be possible to use a horizontal siding or a shingle detail along the front of it instead. He felt this was a great little house and would like to see it remain in character.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated Staff had discussed with the owner that the proposal was in character with the period but not necessarily with the house itself.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** felt the siding on the addition was well done and hoped the applicant will consider his comments on the columns on the rear patio.

**Scott Remis, Homeowner**, stated he is open-minded to the suggestions made by Mr. Sorcinelli and he will talk to his architect. The columns on the rear patio would need to be larger than on the front porch because of the mass of the structure. He would like to not replace the railing on the front porch as that was added later and was non-conforming to the original style, but he wants to try and match the original column design using a box.

**MOTION:** Moved by Badar, seconded by Dilley to amend the original motion to approve the addition of the rear patio but direct the homeowner to work with Staff on more appropriate details on the columns and truss span. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

**DPRB Case No. 14-37**

APN: 8386-015-042

Zone: Single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Luis Molina, Applicant, was present.

**Planning Aide Nicole Ellis** stated this is a request for a new 1,526 square foot single-family home on a 7,000 square foot lot in the SF-DR zone that is subject to the Town Core Design Guidelines. The detached two-car garage will take access from the alley to the north and all utilities will be placed underground. The applicant is proposing to keep the existing block walls on the east and west property lines, but will remove the chain link fence along the alley and replace it with a six-foot block wall with a stucco finish and clay wall caps. The house is designed in a Spanish Colonial Revival style and includes an elevated front courtyard. She went over the design elements of the house and garage, and stated Staff is recommending approval subject to the attached conditions.

**Luis Molina, Applicant**, stated he previously built a house in Covina in 2004 that won a beautification award, and he hopes to replicate that same quality with this project.

**MOTION:** Moved by Michelis, seconded by Dilley to approve subject to the attached conditions.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated he thinks this is a nice design that fits well with the Town Core Design Guidelines. He felt the bathroom window was underscaled for the front of the house, and thought maybe they could do some other treatment on the wall like a low level bench to help balance it, or adding a treatment over the two bedroom windows. An option might be to take a molding feature that would go around the two windows with a bench at the bottom that would give you a Spanish Colonial feature. He also felt it would be more appropriate to remove the galvanized roof vents and either have an attic vent in the gables or use a ridge vent on the s-tile roof.

**Mr. Beilstein** stated most engineers feel having roof vents with a tile roof negatively impacts the plywood and they do not recommend it.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated the type of proposed roof vents are very difficult to install with s-site and thought the applicant might be able to use fewer than the 11 shown. Another option might be to just use them at the rear of the house and utilize a front gable vent.

**Mr. Beilstein** concurred that if an eave vent is used you wouldn't need so many roof vents. He asked about the proposal to connect the new block wall with the existing walls because in the pictures it appeared that the existing walls were not block but possibly concrete panel.

**Planning Aide Ellis** stated on the west appears to be an unpermitted vinyl fence near the front property line but the walls in the back are concrete block, and they have spoken to the applicant about finishing them with stucco.

**Mr. Beilstein** did not think the applicant would want to stucco all the walls. He also asked if the garage setback was standard.

**Luis Molina, Homeowner**, stated he would be willing to paint the walls to improve their appearance.

*Associate Planner Jennifer Williams* stated the standard for the garage placement is either three feet or 20 feet from the property line, and that it was very common to have a three-foot setback in the Town Core.

*Mr. Patel* stated it also prevents people from parking in the alley.

*Mr. Michaelis* asked the applicant what he thought of Mr. Sorcinelli's suggestions.

**Luis Molina, Homeowner**, stated he had installed a similar amount of roof vents on his current home but when he eventually reduced the number the house started getting hot. He did like the suggestion regarding the front of the house and thought he could add another interior feature.

**MOTION:** Moved by Michaelis, seconded by Sorcinelli to amend his motion to include the two features as described by Mr. Sorcinelli to the front elevation. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

**DPRB Case No. 14-06**

APN: 8387-017-037

Zone: Single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR)

Doug Olbrich, Applicant, was present  
Paul Forgette, Property Owner, was present  
Afra Forgette, Property Owner, was present

*Associate Planner Jennifer Williams* stated the house in this application is on the City's historic resources list and was constructed in 1887. It is believed to be the first residence in San Dimas, occupied by members of the Walker Family. It is on a typical size lot for the Town Core, and takes access from the alley. An unpermitted service porch and the detached garage will be demolished as part of the remodel, with a new garage constructed off the alley, and various elements of the house that are in disrepair will be restored or replaced with exact replicas. Staff worked with the applicant to have a number of these details incorporated into the proposed addition, and pointed out where they would be. There are no issues in regards to the development standards and there will be many improvements.

She stated there are, however, two areas of concern with the plans. The first involves the roof design and the existing flat portion of the mansard roof that would be between the two gable roofs, and showed the proposed elevations. The other concern is that the plans lack a number of the details that are on the house, and lack measurements and sections that would communicate where the existing decorative elements are located to ensure they are repaired in kind or replaced where they cannot be preserved. There are a lot of elements on the rear that will need to be repaired and replaced with the addition, so the recommendation is approval subject to Staff's recommendation to redesign the roof plan to a more integrated design and to revise the plans and elevations to incorporate details and detail sections.

*Mr. Patel* asked if the existing pavement next to the garage will remain and what will happen with the chain link fence.

*Associate Planner Williams* stated the pavement will stay for additional parking and the chain link fence in the front yard will be replaced with white picket fence, and in the rear yard it will be replaced by a dog-eared cedar fence that matches the neighbor's fence to the west.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* asked if the applicant was planning to put a hip in the roof as it shows that way on the plan.

**Doug Olbrich, Applicant,** stated it would be a gable. He stated the new owners wished to have the addition to accommodate their growing family. The house has been in disrepair for many years and is literally rotting away, and they wish to bring it back to its original glory. He stated Staff indicated the roof gap would be visible from the east and west, but felt it would not be seen because of the neighboring houses and it cannot be seen from the street. He felt Staff's recommendation to carry the mansard roof through would be appropriate on a small addition but did not think it would enhance the home's appearance on a 168 square foot addition. They are going to match the same gable feature on the new garage which is quite an expense, but they feel it is the right thing to do. They are also proposing to match all the gable treatments to the front gables. He felt using a mansard would ruin the look of the house, and that the addition of another gable view from the street enhances the overall appearance. In regards to the issue regarding the details, they could put more measures in the plans but felt there are very few separate details as they are consistent throughout the house.

*Mr. Beilstein* concurred the house is dilapidated but it is the most historic house in town and that there should be sufficient information on the details so that they can be replicated appropriately, and not just have photographs of them. This is the only house that has the sunburst eave detail. If it got destroyed, there would be no way to replicate that because there isn't another one in town to use as a sample. He felt Staff is saying there should be some type of written dimensions so that if something is rotted out, there would be enough information to take to a mill to have a new one made. He has seen other houses in town that weren't as historic that had details destroyed in the construction process. This house is a jewel and it is because of all these features that make it stand out.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* felt it might be worthwhile to bring in a third party to facilitate a photo survey of the structure because of the value of this house to the City.

*Associate Planner Williams* stated Condition No. 18 requires photo documentation of all existing pieces, and any replacement pieces are subject to review by Planning prior to installation.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* felt it should include all the elevations, not just the small details, to provide the broad feeling of the façade.

*Mr. Beilstein* stated some documentation can be done with today's camera technology, but photos will not tell you how far something sticks out. There needs to be enough dimensional information so that something can be milled. If something is not dimensioned thoroughly enough and it has to be removed because it is rotted away, how can they replicate it.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* asked how many different features there are on the house.

**Doug Olbrich, Applicant,** stated it was probably under ten.

*Associate Planner Williams* stated this can be a condition for plan check if the Board is comfortable with that.

*Mr. Badar* wanted to be sure they did the same thing for the garage.

**Doug Olbrich, Applicant**, stated the existing garage was dangerous and in threat of falling down and they would like to demolish it as soon as they can.

*Associate Planner Williams* stated if the Board approves the addition, Staff is willing to allow the garage to be demolished before construction.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* understands the concern over the roof design and shares the concern with the up and down nature of the roof heights, but he can see the benefit of having another gable at the rear and wondered if there was a way to try to join the two styles together.

*Associate Planner Williams* stated the alternative in the staff report was a suggestion but if there is a better way to integrate the two roof planes, Staff would be open to that.

**Paul Forgette, Owner**, stated his main concern if they were to continue with a mansard roof on the addition was that it would be very plain, and they would like the gable to match the original house and enhance the rear of the property. Since they are adding a lot of detail to the garage, they would like to do the same to the house. He is also concerned about how long the house has been sitting vacant and would really like to expedite the demolition of the garage.

**Afra Forgette, Owner**, stated she is concerned about the condition of the foundation and would like to get started on the project to prevent further decay.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* felt everyone can appreciate the problems with the house and the greatness of the undertaking, but they want to be sure the roof issue is addressed properly.

*Mr. Beilstein* did not think the plan was drawn accurately with how the gables are offset, but overall he thinks the rear elevation with the detailed gable was preferable and more fitting with the original house over the mansard design.

*Mr. Sorcinelli* stated being able to see another gable from the front down the east side adds to the attractiveness of the house.

**MOTION:** Moved by Sorcinelli, seconded by Badar to approve subject to the attached conditions, with Condition No. 18 requiring photo documentation of all existing representative pieces of the historic fabric of the residence prior to permit issuance and amending Condition No. 19 that prior to plan check submittal the Applicant will work with Staff on modifying the roof plane to a more integrated gable design, and upon plan check the submittal shall include dimensioned details and sections of the architectural elements. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

No communications were made by the public.

Chairman Schoonover stated if a second meeting in November is required it would be on Tuesday, November 25<sup>th</sup>, and asked if that would be a conflict with anyone's schedule.

A quorum of the members indicated they would be available if a meeting was needed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 a.m. to the meeting of Tuesday, November 25, 2014 at 8:30 a.m.

---

Jim Schoonover, Chairman  
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

---

Jan Sutton  
Development Plan Review Board  
Administrative Secretary

Approved: January 8, 2015