

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
September 24, 2015 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

**DPRB Members**

David Bratt, Planning Commission  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

**Staff Members**

Eric Beilstein,  
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner  
Luis Torrico, Associate Planner  
Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner

**Absent**

Emmett Badar, Council Member  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

**CALL TO ORDER**

David Bratt called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:36 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve the August 13, 2015 minutes.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Krishna Patel to approve the August 27, 2015 minutes.

**Appeal of DPRB Case No. 15-31**

A request to construct a staircase and two 160 square foot cantilevered decks adjacent to the staircase on a downhill slope at property located at 1438 Martingale Court.

APN: 8385-020-025

Zone: SF-A

**Associated Case: Tree Removal Permit 15-41**

**Gordon Rounds, property owner at 1422 Martingale Ct., was present**

**Associate Planner Luis Torrico** stated the applicant is requesting approval to construct a staircase and two 160 square foot cantilevered decks adjacent to the staircase on a downhill slope within the rear yard area of a residential property located at 1438 Martingale Court. The property is located within the Single Family Agriculture (SF-A) Zone and is developed with a 2,986 square foot single family residence.

The lot measures approximately 32,646 square feet in lot area and has a depth of 269 feet. The front portion of the property lot is relatively flat and then slopes downward towards the rear to another relatively flat portion at the rear of the property. The difference in grade from the top of the slope to the bottom flat portion of the lot is approximately 30 vertical feet.

The proposed staircase and decks will be constructed on the sloped area of the site. The staircase will provide access to other proposed improvements at the bottom of the slope in the rear portion of the site. The proposed improvements include a swimming pool, utility building and modification of an existing horse stable. These improvements will be reviewed by Staff as they do not require Development Plan Review Board approval.

The rear flat portion of the site is developed with an existing horse stable and utility shed. Access to the rear of the site is provided by concrete block stairs. In addition, there is an existing two foot high retaining wall halfway down the slope. The City does not have records of building permits for any of these improvements. Staff has informed the applicant that the unpermitted improvements will have to be permitted or removed (Condition No. 11). The applicant has informed Staff that they will all be removed or replaced with permitted improvements as part of this request and other proposed improvements.

The staircase will be constructed to follow the natural grade as much as possible and no grading will be required. The staircase and decks will be constructed out of pressure treated wood. The staircase will measure six feet in width and approximately 45 feet in length. The staircase will be elevated off the ground ranging from nine inches to 2'-7". Both decks will measure eight feet by 20 feet (160 sq. ft.). The upper deck will be approximately one-fourth down the slope and the lower deck will be approximately three-fourths down the slope. The decks will be accessed directly from the staircase and will be cantilevered over the slope. The decks will cantilever eight feet over the slope, complying with City's deck policy. The upper deck will measure approximately 3'-5" from the bottom of the deck to the natural grade below. The lower deck will measure approximately 5'-9" from the bottom of the deck to the natural grade below.

Lattice will be installed under the staircase and decks to provide screening of the underside and to prevent animals from habituating underneath the staircase/decks. In addition, natural hillside vegetation will further assist in screening the underside of the staircase and decks.

As part of the proposed project, one mature Pine tree will be required to be removed. The Pine tree is located at the base of the staircase; therefore, the removal is warranted. As part of the removal the applicant will be required to replace the tree with a minimum of two (2) canopy-type

trees of a minimum 15 gallon size. Lastly, there is to be a correction to Condition 11, as the utility shed is permitted but will need a permit to be relocated.

Staff recommends that the Development Plan Review Board approve DPRB Case No. 15-31 subject to the attached conditions.

**Mr. Stevens** asked what the parcel to the south was.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the strip of land to the south is the Tzu Chi road easement.

**Mr. Stevens** stated there are numerous easements; he would like to make sure all easements are checked in the plan check process.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated he will make sure easements are not encroached upon during the plan check process.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the pool and pool house are to be future projects.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated yes, future projects will include the pool; pool house as well as the stable will be removed and replaced.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if this home is zoned SF-16000.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated yes, this home is zoned Sf-16000.

**Mr. Bratt** asked if anyone else had any comments

**Gordon Rounds, property owner at 1422 Martingale Ct.** stated he had no comments.

**Mr. Stevens** asked Associate Planner Torrico if he had discussed the conditions of approval with the applicant.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated yes he has discussed the conditions with the applicant.

**MOTION:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve, subject to Conditions of Approval with the modification to Condition 11 to remove the utility shed from the list of unpermitted structures and add a condition to verify that property improvements do not encroach onto any easements.

Motion carried 4-0-3 (Badar, Michaelis, Sorcinelli absent)

### **DPRB Case No. 15-35**

A request to construct a 3,871-square foot one-story single family residence with an attached 924-square foot four-car garage, a 242-square foot covered patio to the front, and a 1,379-square foot patio to the rear, and to remove six mature pepper trees and three mature pine trees located at 733 N. Oakway Avenue.

APN's: 8390-021-007

Zone: SF-A

**Associated Case:** Tree Removal Permit 15-23

**Patricia Sheehan, property owner at 740 N Oakway, was present**  
**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway, was present**  
**Brent Hallam, designer, was present**

*Senior Planner Marco Espinoza* stated the site is located on the west side of Oakway Avenue. The site currently features a 600-sq. ft. house, to be demolished. The existing dirt driveway will be converted into a cobble-stone entry walk, and a new concrete driveway will be constructed on the north side of the property that will lead to the proposed four-car garage. The driveway will measure 18-ft., 8-in. in width in the designated front yard, and widens to 26-ft. in the side yard behind a driveway gate. Because this portion of Oakway Avenue does not feature any curbs, the proposed driveway does not require any curb cuts.

There is an existing chain link fence along the east property line and a 5-ft. tall gray block wall with a 1-in. cap along the west property line. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing chain link fence along the east property line and install new 6-ft. tall decorative split face block walls along the north and south property lines. The walls shall be decorative split face on both sides and in a gray or tan color. The 5-ft. tall block wall along the west property line is located on the neighboring property and will remain.

In addition to the proposed house, the applicant is also proposing an attached 1,379-sq. ft. covered patio to the rear of the house, which will feature a grill island, fireplace with chimney, and outdoor seating area. The applicant is also proposing a mulch play area with a club house, as well as an orchard area surrounded by a 6-ft. high wood fence, to the rear of the property.

Lastly the subject site is located within a zone that permits horse keeping. The applicant is not proposing to keep horses or to construct a corral at this time, but has identified a location for a future corral that complies with distance requirements as required by the SF-A zone (35-ft. from the proposed residence and 80-ft from any residence located on the adjacent lot).

The single-story house will include 5 bedrooms and 3-1/2 bathrooms. An exterior-access bathroom is also proposed at the rear of the house, attached to the four-car garage. The house will include 3,871-sq. ft. of living area, and the proposed four-car garage will measure 924-sq. ft. As previously discussed, a 1,379-sq. ft. covered patio is proposed to the rear. There is also a 242-sq. ft. covered patio proposed to the front of the house. The proposed lot coverage is 26%.

The house neighbors a vacant lot on the north side and three homes to the south side. While the homes on Oakway Avenue are much smaller than the proposed house, the house as proposed is consistent in massing and size with the nearby homes on Ghent Avenue.

The house design will include HardiePlank siding, stone veneer exterior accents, composite shingle roofing, double-hung windows with wood shutters and gable end decorative medallions in a white color

The proposal complies with the development standards for the SF-A Zone in terms of maximum height: 2 stories or 35' maximum allowed; 1-story, 21'6" proposed. Setbacks: front yard: 20' minimum required; 25' proposed side yard: 5' and 12' minimum required, 5' and 16' proposed, rear yard: No stated requirement; 77 4" proposed, parking: 2 garage spaces required, 4 garage spaces proposed.

There are six mature pepper trees and three mature pine trees on the site. As part of this development, the applicant is requesting approval of Tree Removal Permit 15-23 to remove these trees. The Tree Preservation Ordinance aims to protect and preserve mature trees but also permits the removal of mature trees subject to certain findings, one of which is to allow for reasonable development of the site. Of the nine trees to be removed, five are located within the proposed driveway and proposed block wall. Three are located within the proposed front yard. All of the trees to be removed are damaged or dying. There are no other trees on the property.

The applicant is required to install at least 18 trees according to the required 2:1 replacement ratio. As part of the proposal, the applicant has submitted a landscape plan which indicates that 23 replacement trees will be planted along the perimeter of the property, in addition to other shrubs and the proposed fruit tree orchard to the rear of the property. The replacement trees include ten (10) Tuscarora Crape Myrtle trees, three (3) Dwarf Crape Myrtle trees, and three (3) Red New Zealand Tea trees, a minimum of 15 gallon size; two (2) Eastern Redbud trees, three (3) Sweetshade trees, one (1) Chinese Elm, and four (4) Carolina Cherry Laurel trees, a minimum of 24" box size. The installation of these trees exceeds the minimum required by the 2:1 replacement ratio.

Lastly, in reviewing this project there is an Oak tree at the front of the property. The Oak is in the parkway width where the curb and gutter is to be located. Staff would like to ask the Board if there is any way to preserve or save the Oak.

Staff recommends that the Development Plan Review Board approve Development Plan Review Board 15-35 and Tree Removal Permit 15-23 subject to the attached conditions.

**Mr. Patel** stated in regards to the street improvements, it is his understanding that the applicant is in favor of doing the street improvements himself.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if Oakway was a private street.

**Mr. Patel** stated Oakway is a public street.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the City has right of way in that area.

**Mr. Patel stated** yes, the City does have right of way in front of this property. He noted that the applicant does not have to improve because less than 50% of the street has been improved.

**Mr. Stevens** asked why trees five, seven, eight and nine are to be removed. He then asked if all the trees are being removed.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated that the trees on this property have seemingly never been maintained properly; therefore it is best they be removed.

**Brent Hallam, designer** noted all the trees are in terrible shape and the pepper trees on the north line are in the way of the proposed driveway.

**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway** stated the first Saturday the house was bought; landscapers came in and removed a number of trees.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the City was aware of trees being previously removed without a permit.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated he was not aware of trees being previously removed.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how long the new owner has had possession of this property.

**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway** stated approximately six months.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if this house was on sewer.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated this property is currently on septic.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the applicant was aware that they would need to pay fees to connect to the sewer. He went on to say that sewer connection fees should be in the conditions of approval.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated that condition 28 acknowledged the sewer connection.

**Mr. Stevens** stated with new development, they are required to connect

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated he could modify condition 28 and noted that condition 33 also acknowledges the sewer connection.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that if Staff has the exact sewer fees, they should be added into the conditions.

**Mr. Patel** noted this is the first development on Oakway, everything else previously existed.

**Mr. Stevens** asked about the house that recently did an addition, if they were required to provide street improvements.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated no, they were not required to provide street improvements.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he would like for the applicant to include the street improvements into their scope of work.

**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway** stated that some of the homes at the south end of the block have curbs.

**Mr. Patel** stated the curbs were added because that portion of the neighborhood had been subdivided.

**Mr. Stevens** asked the designer if he believes the applicant will be open to improving the street.

**Brent Hallam, designer** stated he is for the applicant improving the street with curb and gutter.

**Mr. Stevens** noted he is happy with the one story, he feels it fits in this neighborhood. He thinks this size will be on trend with future home projects on this street.

**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway** asked if the new larger home will make her taxes go up.

**Mr. Stevens** stated no, it will not.

**Patricia Sheehan, property owner at 740 N Oakway** asked if the applicant will build the home then sell the property.

**Brent Hallam, designer** stated no, the applicant will be moving into this home with his family.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that he noticed that there was not any grass on the landscape plans.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated he was correct, the applicant has proposed artificial turf.

**Mr. Bratt** asked for clarification about the trees; someone bought the property then cut down multiple trees.

**Patricia Sheehan, property owner at 740 N Oakway** stated the property was bought in probate, the following Saturday a landscaper came in and cut down a number of trees.

**Mr. Bratt** stated Staff should try to find out how many trees were removed and add that to the overall count on the tree removal application.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he believes Staff can evaluate the tree situation in the plan check process and come up with the proper replacement numbers.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated that the replacement trees will be 24" box trees. He felt because the applicant was removing established trees; larger replacement trees were necessary.

**Mr. Stevens** asked that Staff make sure there were an appropriate number of replacement trees.

**Mr. Bratt** asked if there is a condition for keeping the Oak tree at the front of the property.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated there is not, but one could be added dependent upon the street improvements.

**Mr. Patel** stated if the applicant does the street improvements then the Oak tree will need to be removed.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that if the oak tree can be saved, he asked that it is done appropriately. He also noted that he would like to make sure there is a replacement ratio of 1:1 with all specimens being 15 gallons or more in size. He also noted with the artificial turf, he would like to make

sure that the product chosen is permeable and follows drainage standards. He then asked about the hydrology.

**Mr. Patel** stated hydrology standards are in the conditions.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if there is a storm drain.

**Mr. Patel** stated no, there is not a storm drain. He notes that condition 42 address the drainage issues.

**Mr. Stevens** noted that with the new MS4 permit, some properties may need rain storage tanks to contain the first 24 hours of a rain event. He then asked what kind of surface the artificial turf will be laid on.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated the artificial turf will be laid on the proper sand and decomposed granite surface.

**Mr. Patel** stated this area of the City is part of the flood plains so the soil is already permeable on its own along with proper turf installation, there should not be any run off problems.

**Mr. Bratt** asked if there were any further comments.

**Brent Hallam, designer** stated the homeowner is in agreeance with everything except he would not like to change the stone height of the pillars on the front porch.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated that it was discussed, raising the stone height on the pillars to give more consistency.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if it was just a suggestion.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated yes, changing the stone height on the pillars was just a suggestion.

**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway** stated the house on Ghent took seven years to complete. She asked if this home will be completed in a timelier manner.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated the home Ghent was not drawn out by choice but by circumstance.

**Laura Smith, property owner at 730 N Oakway** asked if the RVs will stay on the property.

**Brent Hallam, designer** pointed out that the whole lot will be finished with landscaping therefore; there the RVs currently on the lot will not remain.

**MOTION DPRB 15-35:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve, subject to conditions of approval with the addition of sewer assessment fees, possible increase of replacement tree count and parkway improvements.

Motion carried 4-0-3 (Badar, Michaelis, Sorcinelli absent)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:13 a.m. to the meeting of October 8, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.



San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:



Development Plan Review Board  
LH  
Departmental Assistant

Approved: 10/22/15