

**CITY OF SAN DIMAS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES**

**January 12, 2006 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

PRESENT

*Eric Beilstein
Denis Bertone
Scott Dilley
Ken Duran
Jim Schoonover
Larry Stevens*

ABSENT

John Sorcinelli

CALL TO ORDER

City Councilman Bertone called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:35 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Larry Stevens moved, second by Eric Beilstein to approve the Minutes of December 20, 2005. Motion carried 4.0.2. (Scott Dilley and Denis Bertone abstained)

HEARING ITEMS

Case No. 05-87

Craig Hensley presented request continued from December 8, 2005 for demolition of historic house and construction of a new 2,059 s.f. home located at 125 West Commercial Street.

Robert Graciano, architect, was present.

Mark Madrigal, son of homeowner, and Ms. Madrigal, homeowner, were present.

Mr. Hensley listed positive changes made:

- Dormer: additional detail on windows
- Bell cast roof added

- Railing on rear changed. Front railing clarified
- Increased detail on pillars

Mr. Hensley pointed out that plans have been revised though applicant has not chosen to use wood clapboard siding or wood windows on side and rear elevations which

In addition, two elements that were not in keeping with the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration were:

- Front yard wall: Removal of front yard pink cinderblock wall as it is not compatible with Town Core Design Guidelines
- Detached Garage: Existing garage is in poor condition and made out of cinderblock of which is partially unpainted. Also the roof material is not compatible with the main house.

Material for soffit is not historically correct. Mr. Hensley suggested that a historic architect be consulted on this material at the applicant's expense.

In response to Councilman Bertone, Mr. Hensley stated that the garage was probably not constructed at the same time the house was built. It may have been built somewhere between 1940 and 1960. Also, the house was occupied prior to demolition.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Mr. Hensley stated that currently the detached garage does not comply with setback requirements, but may have been acceptable at time of construction through the county. If it were removed and rebuilt it would have to be moved to comply with current setback requirements.

In response to Mr. Duran, Mr. Hensley stated that the Board approved all the Mitigated Negative Declaration recommendations in the report by JAG.

Mr. Graciano addressed the Board. He stated that the material proposed, hardiplank siding, is more durable. In the JAG report it is unclear what size narrow clapboard is. In regards to the windows, modern material is better performance-wise.

The Board further discussed clapboard vs. hardiplank. Clarification was made that historically reference to clapboard means wood clapboard.

In response to Mr. Stevens, Mr. Hensley stated that vinyl clad windows would be permitted on the side of the house.

Mr. Graciano stated that the only thing historic about this house was its age and pointed out that in JAG's report the house had lost its historic integrity prior to being demolished. He added that the addition that was approved prior to demolition was significant.

Councilman Bertone stated that building over 2,000 s.f. was an issue for one of the Councilmen.

Mr. Hensley explained that lot coverage maximum for this zone was to discourage the construction of two story additions. Comments made by Mr. Looney at the council meeting that the s.f. was going to be triple for this house were incorrect.

The Board further discussed the size of the house in comparison to homes on Railway, Commercial and Second Street's.

Mr. Stevens pointed out that to reduce the size of the bedrooms would not really accomplish anything in regards to lot coverage concerns that have been raised.

In response to Councilman Bertone, Mr. Hensley stated that the size of the house is not a problem for staff.

Mr. Stevens pointed out that by maxing out lot coverage, there could never be any more additions made to this property.

Mr. Hensley recommended that a historic architect review architectural details at the expense of the applicant.

Mr. Beilstein added that leaving the garage as is would be inappropriate. To side it with hardiplank would be ok.

Mr. Schoonover stated that he had problems with the size and compatibility of the house. He added that the property has not been cleaned up since the demo.

Larry Steven moved, second by Ken Duran, to approve subject to standard conditions and the following:

1. Full compliance with JAG recommendation;
2. 3" wood clapboard siding;
3. Wood windows on front elevation, wood clad windows on side and rear elevations;
4. Block wall in front yard to comply with Town Core Design Guidelines;
5. Reside detached garage with hardiplank and install new door;
6. Applicant to pay for any additional JAG consulting services necessary during plan check process.

In response to Mr. Dilley, Mr. Stevens replied that 3" wood clapboard is to be installed on house and 4" hardiplank on detached garage.

Motion carried 4.1.1. (Jim Schoonover against, Denis Bertone abstained) It will be appealed to City Council and probably heard on February 14, 2006.

Case No. 05-63

Mr. Hensley stated that this was a request to reconsider denial of new commercial-office building located at 1301 West Arrow Highway.

The reconsideration requires that one of the Board members that voted to deny must move to have the case reheard and the Board must concur.

Some of the significant revisions made were as follows:

- The building has been reduced from 6,424 s.f. to 5,400 s.f.;
- Setback from the east and west property line has been increased;
- An arcade area and store front area was added along Rennell;
- The storefronts have been redesigned;
- The number of tenant spaces has been reduced to three or less;
- The materials placement as been revised.

Ken Duran moved, second by Jim Schoonover, to reconsider request based on significant revisions made to plans as submitted to Staff. Motion carried 5.1.0. (Larry Stevens against)

Case No. 05-12

Request to revise certain conditions related to approval of 148,000 sq.ft. Costco warehouse and retail facility with tire center and gas station located at southeast corner of Gladstone and Lone Hill.

This item was continued to January 26, 2006 so applicant can prepare additional plans.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:39 a.m. to the meeting of January 26, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.