

CITY OF SAN DIMAS PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Thursday, January 7, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.
245 East Bonita Avenue, Council Chambers

Present

Chairman David Bratt
Commissioner John Davis
Commissioner Margie Green
Commissioner Tomas Molina
Commissioner Ted Ross
Assistant City Manager Comm. Dev. Larry Stevens
Planning Manager Fabiola Wong
Senior Planner Marco Espinoza
Associate Planner Jennifer Williams
Planning Secretary Jan Sutton

CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Chairman Bratt called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and Commissioner Davis led the flag salute.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **CONSIDERATION OF REVISION TO PARCEL MAP 90-1 (21554)** – A request to delete Planning Condition No. 4 of Resolution 91-10 relating to recordation of a notice of non-conforming status of the existing residence and restrictions on expansion and/or substantial modification of the residence, located at 1623 N. San Dimas Canyon Road. (APN: 8665-010-063)

Staff report presented by *Associate Planner Jennifer Williams*, who stated this request was to remove Planning Condition No. 4 of Resolution 91-10 approving Tentative Parcel Map 90-1 (21554) requiring the recordation of a notice of non-conforming status for Lot 3 containing the existing historic rock house and setting restrictions on expansion or substantial modification due to the near zero existing side yard setback on the southern side. She stated if the Council eventually waives this condition, any future additions to the home would need to comply with existing setback standards and the architectural design would be reviewed by the DPRB.

She stated both Staff and the Applicant have been unable to locate a recorded notice of non-conforming status. A courtesy notice with the conceptual site plan was sent to the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation, and they did not have any objection to the removal of the condition. She went over the historical assessment of the structure conducted by Onyx Architects in 2002 which used as reference when an application was processed for a new

house on the lot in 2006, and the four possible scenarios and the appropriate CEQA review required in those instances. At that time the DPRB expressed a strong preference in the reuse and preservation of the historic rock structure. Removal of this condition will allow the Applicant the ability to pursue the structure's restoration and viability as a residence, though he will still be required to process other applications for the site and architectural design for any expansion or modification. Staff and the Subdivision Review committee are recommending the Planning Commission recommend approval of this revision to the City Council.

Commissioner Molina clarified that all other conditions of the Parcel Map will remain intact.

Associate Planner Williams stated that is correct that all other conditions of approval and the map will remain the same.

Commissioner Green asked when the Grasscreek area was constructed. She asked if this house might have been an outbuilding of the Lariat Ranch that was located in that area before development and was taken down when they built Fernridge, Grasscreek and the other streets because they had a lot of rock structures up there. She stated she was in support of saving this home.

Associate Planner Williams stated the Grasscreek neighborhood was built approximately 1964, but the Historic Resources Inventory form did not mention the ranch. She stated this house is considered significant because it is one of the few remaining rock structures in the area and was built in 1923 for Earl Gillette.

Commissioner Davis stated according to the archivist for the Historical Society, Gillette married into the Lariat family that owned the ranch, which was sold off to construct the subdivision north of this location.

Commissioner Davis asked if the Commission approves this item, would this be the only time they see anything regarding the proposed additions to the house. If the Commission and Council approve this request, then we are giving the Applicant the opportunity to expand the residence as shown on the plan in the packet.

Associate Planner Williams stated the DPRB application would not come back to the Commission, but if it is determined a variance would be needed, then that would come back to the Commission for review. Approval of this item would allow the Applicant to submit an application for expansion.

Commissioner Ross asked if there is something in place now that if a condition requires a document to be recorded, there is follow-up to see that it is done.

Associate Planner Williams stated under our current process the Planner checks all the conditions during the plan check process between approval of the Tentative Map and the Final Map.

Commissioner Ross stated in Exhibit E the seismic reinforcement recommendation is basic life safety and asked what that involves.

Associate Planner Williams stated it is basically building a shell within the existing building. The Building Official was there at the Subdivision Committee meeting, and the architect's firm has worked on several stone structures in other cities so they are familiar with how to address that.

Chairman Bratt stated in regards to her comments earlier about whether this would need a variance or not, it seemed to him that it would require one since the property would not have the required setback.

Associate Planner Williams stated the existing structure obviously does not meet the required setbacks but any new construction would have to. It wouldn't be the addition itself that needs the variance, but they need to review the proposal against the code for expansion or modification of non-conforming uses to determine if one is needed.

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza stated part of Staff's review on whether this needs a variance or not is that while the existing structure basically has a zero setback on the south, the question is would it be considered legal non-conforming, or would it need a variance once you consider making the structure habitable again along with the modifications.

Chairman Bratt opened the meeting for public hearing. Addressing the Commission was:

Alan Brookman, Architect, Hartman Baldwin Design/Build, Applicant, stated the Historic Resources Survey was conducted several months after this condition was placed on the lot so it is not clear if the City Council realized the historical significance of this structure. These stone grove houses are made using the stones cleared from the fields in order to plant the trees and there are only a handful of these along the length of the foothill cities. They are very excited to be able to work on preserving this structure. He went over some of the construction methods that would be used to stabilize the house, which can be costly but the homeowner was supportive of saving the building. The intent of the project is not to make this a modern house but to just add a small amount of useable space to the north side to make it a three bedroom, two bath house with a detached garage and detached studio. The addition will meet the Secretary of Interior's guidelines for additions to historic structures using different materials to differentiate the original from the addition.

There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Davis felt it was wonderful that the owner wanted to preserve the house and hired a reputable architect to expand it slightly, and was in support of this.

RESOLUTION PC-1556

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF A REVISION TO TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 90-1 (21554) IN THE FORM OF THE REMOVAL OF A CONDITION OF APPROVAL AFFECTING THE PROPERTY AT 1623 N. SAN DIMAS CANYON ROAD (APN: 8665-008-016)

MOTION: Moved by Davis, seconded by Green to adopt Resolution PC-1556 recommending the City Council revise Tentative Parcel Map 90-1 (21554) by deleting Planning Condition No. 4 of City Council Resolution 91-10. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

2. Community Development Department

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza introduced the new Planning Manager Fabiola Wong, who shared her background with the Commission.

Assistant City Manager Larry Stevens stated in regards to the email sent to the Commissioners asking for names of people who might want to participate on the three planning groups for the Downtown Specific Plan they can be people who are interested in the Downtown and in providing the City direction; they do not necessarily have to be residents if they have some other type of connection, such as a local business owner. The Commissioners do not need to ascertain a nominee's interest, Staff will handle that part.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated they expect to have the code amendment for microbreweries ready for the February 4th meeting.

3. Members of the Audience

No communications were made.

4. Planning Commission

No communications were made.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Moved by Green, seconded by Davis to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously, 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m. to the regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 2016, at 7:00 p.m.

John Davis, Vice-Chairman
San Dimas Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Jan Sutton
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: February 4, 2016