CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 10, 2019 (Patel and Sorcinelli absent)

1. DPRB Case No. 19-0004

Associated Cases: ACCELA PROJ-18-0076

A request to approve a 280 square foot Gate House and two Casita (Guest House) plans, having 563 and 1,006 square feet of floor area. The proposed Casitas will require further Development Plan Review Board approval for site plan approvals. Both projects are part of the Brasada Housing Development located at the terminus of Cataract Avenue.

Applicant: Brasada Homes Land LLC APN: 8665-001-009
Planner: Steve Sizemore Zone: SP-25

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Members of the audience are invited to address the Board on any item not on the agenda. Under the provisions of the Brown Act, the Board is prohibited from taking or engaging in discussion on any item not appearing on the posted agenda. However, your concerns may be referred to staff or set for discussion at a later date. The Public Comment period is limited to 30 minutes. Each speaker shall be limited to three (3) minutes.)

Adjournment

Copies of staff reports and/or other written documentation pertaining to the items on the agenda are on file in the Planning Department and are available for public inspection during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Notice Regarding Americans with Disabilities Act: In compliance with the ADA, if you need assistance to participate in a city meeting, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at (909) 394-6216. Early notification before the meeting you wish to attend will make it possible for the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting [28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II].

Copies of documents distributed for the meeting are available in alternative formats upon request.
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
JANUARY 10, 2019 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager
David Bratt, Planning Commission
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Curt Morris, Mayor

STAFF
Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
Ariana Ruiz, Assistant Planner
Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner
Fabiola Wong, Planning Manager

ABSENT
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works

CALL TO ORDER
Dave Bratt 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
Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve the December 13, 2018 minutes.

DPRB Case No. 19-0001
A request to approve a mix of single hung and slider windows on an addition to a corner house located on the northeast corner of Fifth Street and Hallock Avenue. The approved plans indicated all slider type windows for the single-family project consisting of interior remodeling, a 356.5-square foot addition of habitable
space and a 55-square foot rear porch located within the Single-Family (SF 7500) Zone at 219 E. Fifth Street (APN 8387-003-051)

Bryan and Candace Rogers, Applicant/Homeowners were present

Planning Manager Fabiola Wong presented the staff report.

Mr. Stevens asked how many windows were new and how many were ordered and installed wrong.

Planning Manager Wong stated all the windows were replaced, a total of about 10. She added that four were ordered as sliders and not installed to plan. Of the four wrongly installed windows, three are along Hallock Ave. The one remaining window is in the backyard and not visible.

Mr. Stevens asked if this home is on the historical list.

Planning Manager Wong stated the home is not historical.

Mr. Bratt asked if all the windows along Hallock Ave. are bedroom windows.

Candace Rogers, Applicant stated all the windows along Hallock Ave. are bedroom windows and the small window is a bathroom. She added that all windows still meet all ingress/egress requirements.

Mr. Stevens asked if the rest of the addition was OK with the inspector.

Planning Manager Wong stated the rest of the addition was signed off by the inspector.

Candace Rogers, Applicant gave a background on her family moving to San Dimas. She noted that her and her husband walked around the neighborhood and found neighbors with a mixture of windows. She took a survey around to immediate neighbors and had them sign if they felt her windows were acceptable. She gave the survey to the Board for review.

Mr. Morris asked if the addition was built by a contractor.

Candace Rogers, Applicant stated the addition was done by a contractor but her and her husband did work where they could to save money. She added her husband purchased and installed the windows himself.

Mr. Morris stated something that is not built to plan could turn into a life safety matter. The people the Applicant hired didn’t work with the plans. The Applicant hired a contractor to build something to approved plans. In this case, it is just
windows. He adds that every time someone deviates from the plans it is a challenge for the City.

**Candace Rogers, Applicant** stated the contractor they had followed the plans. Nothing is wrong with the home

**Mr. Stevens** stated he fully understands the situation in the fact that the permit was pulled as owner/builder and the applicants did some of the work to be cost effective.

**Bryan Rogers, Applicant** stated he simply replaced the windows with new energy efficient versions of what was there.

**Mr. Stevens** states installing the same window is only OK if the Building Code does not change. Generally in the town core the Board would like to see wood framed windows to complement the older architecture. He noted that Staff felt comfortable bringing this to the Board because it deviated from already approved plans.

**Mr. Morris** stated with the trees along the side of the house he does not believe someone driving by will notice. He adds that it was right of Staff to bring this item to the Board as people should not be ignoring their building plans.

**Mr. Stevens** stated there are honest mistakes and dishonest, this instance happened to be people that were not familiar with the building process. The Board has had a discussion and have reached a conclusion that gives Staff the backing to their question regarding future window change outs.

**Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0001:** Curt Morris moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve as constructed and subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried: 5-0-2 (Patel and Sorcinelli absent)

**DPRB Case No. 17-0027**

A request to construct a one-story 4,200 square foot restaurant, a detached 423 square foot fruit stand, and the removal of 6 mature trees located at 264 E. Foothill Boulevard within the Commercial Highway (CH) and Scenic Highway Overlay Zones.

**Angelica Arteaga, Applicant was present**
**Jorge Hernandez, Architect was present**
**Jon Maurer, Pastor at Foothill Vineyard Church was present**
**Steve Rudy, owner of Starberry Farms was present**
**Holly Rodriguez, resident at 1154 N. Walnut Ave. was present**
**Karl Price, resident at 1129 N. Walnut Ave. was present**
**Carl Albers, resident at 1150 N. Walnut Ave. was present**
Heather Thomasser, resident at 1122 N. Walnut Ave. was present

Planning Manager Fabiola Wong presented the staff report noting Staff now has accurate dimensions of the parking lot. There is no change to the building but there is a change of dimension in some of the parking spaces. She added that today’s discussion will need to focus on the new parking lot only, to make a decision.

Mr. Dilley asked how much space is missing

Planning Manager Wong stated Max’s needs 44 feet per space and some spaces are missing up to 18 inches.

Mr. Stevens stated Staff does not believe the site plan to be completely accurate. Staff concludes there is 44 feet; it is deficient of up to 18 inches. The numbers are not accurate at 42-42.5 feet; over the 6 spaces the plans pick up 2 inches. He adds the two sets of plans submitted seem to have different layouts.

Jorge Hernandez, Architect stated he submitted two site plans, one was superimposed to show the land survey that was recently performed and the other showing the site without the large Oak tree.

Mr. Morris asked how much consideration had been given to keeping the Oak tree.

Planning Manager Wong stated the Applicant has an arborist report that states the tree is in failing health.

Mr. Stevens states the parking lot will most likely need to be paved in a permeable surface to allow for filtration of water for the tree.

Senior Planner Espinoza states if the building is reduced in size by 150 sq. ft. then that would eliminate two spaces needed for parking.

Mr. Stevens stated another option could be removing the driveway on Walnut and moving the trash enclosure.

Planning Manager Wong asked what size of truck is used for restaurant deliveries.

Angelica Arteaga, Applicant stated their delivery service uses a truck the size of a U-Haul truck.

Mr. Stevens stated there are options to get the project into compliance. Staff can not recommend a project that does not comply.

Mr. Morris states if a restaurant is going to be in that location than it needs to operate and be fully functioning.
**Mr. Stevens** states if the Oak is to stay then there will need to be three compact spaces around it for turning radius. If the Oak is to be removed he believes the Applicant could pick up four spaces. We need to acknowledge that two spaces are deficient by inches rather than feet.

**Mr. Morris** asked if taking 150 sq. ft. off the current restaurant is even an option.

Angelica Arteaga, Applicant states they have already reduced the size of the building substantially but she believes they could find a way to remove 150 more sq. ft.

**Mr. Stevens** suggested Staff meet with the Applicant and go over the options and decide if one is recommendable. If the board has a preference the board can make a recommendation. There are many issues that neighbors have expressed; the easiest option is to remove square footage.

**Mr. Morris** states if the Oak tree will survive then the Applicant will need to discuss options for parking around the tree.

**Mr. Stevens** stated Staff needs a 3rd party arborist to assess the Oak tree. The arborist does not need to know anything about the property, just remain neutral and provide a recommendation one way or the other.

**Mr. Morris** stated the Department of Water and Power (DWP) property to the south will provide water to the Oak tree, considering it is healthy enough to remain. The Oak tree adds appeal to the restaurant and the site.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he did not want Staff to bring this item back to the Board. He would like to have Staff move forward to Planning Commission with recommendation.

**Mr. Bratt** asked if there was still a parking agreement with Jackson and Jackson.

Angelica Arteaga, Applicant stated they do still have a parking agreement with Jackson and Jackson.

Jon Maurer, Pastor at Foothill Vineyard Church stated he is still open to working out a parking agreement.

**Mr. Stevens** noted having off-site arrangements helps.

**Mr. Dilley** asked if space for traffic to flow through would be enough to help with parking.

**Mr. Stevens** stated a few spaces from the church with a pass through would help a lot. Before this project moves forward, one of the options brought up today needs to
be decided upon. He asked where the agreement was in terms of LA County Public Works allowing the seasonal sales to take place.

*Steve Rudy, owner of Starberry Farms* stated he is in the stage of finalizing the new lease agreement for the seasonal sales.

*Mr. Stevens* asked if there will still be a year round fruit stand.

*Steve Rudy, owner of Starberry Farms* stated he will keep the fruit stand, yes. He has been in talks with Pastor Jon in regards to using the church as a pass through and for seasonal parking.

*Mr. Stevens* asked if the lease was to get cancelled, would Mr. Rudy continue with his fruit stand.

*Steve Rudy, owner of Starberry Farms* stated he would still keep his fruit stand.

*Jorge Hernandez, Architect* stated once he had the survey he tried to make all the parking work. He looked at removing the Oak tree and replacing it with two new trees that would work with parking. He noted he would like to work with Staf to get this project completed.

*Carl Albers, resident at 1150 N. Walnut Ave.* stated he believes a signal needs to be placed at the intersection of Foothill and Walnut. He states it will make make turning left out of Walnut far easier. He is not for trucks or anyone parking on Walnut. Also, he does not believe a delivery truck parking on Foothill would be a great idea either. He asked the Board to keep all line of sight issues in the back of their minds when making decisions regarding this project.

*Mr. Morris* stated the Board is aware that the residents are concerned about Walnut Ave. becoming a parking lot. He added that is why the Board is working so diligently at providing all parking on-site.

*Mr. Stevens* explained the ranking for intersections. He stated the intersection is not rated high enough to demand the new projects coming in pay for traffic signals. He noted the cost of a traffic signal and added that it could function well if traffic didn’t use Foothill as a freeway bypass. Walnut Ave. currently has a two hour parking limit, that may need to change based on the parking habits of the Max’s patrons. Staff may need to have the Sheriff patrol more for enforcement.

**Motion DPRB Case No. 17-0027:** Larry Stevens moved, second by Curt Morris to allow Staff to work with the Applicant on options. Staff to find an option that is recommendable and pass along the determination to Planning Commission.

Motion carried: 5-0-2 (Patel and Sorcinelli absent)
ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:11 a.m. to the meeting of January 24, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.

David Bratt, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant
Approved: 01/24/19
DATE: January 24, 2019

TO: Development Plan Review Board

FROM: Steve Sizemore, Brasada Project Manager

SUBJECT: A request to approve a 280 square foot Gate House and (2) Casitas (Guest House) plans, having 563 and 1,006 square feet of floor area. The proposed Casitas will require further Development Plan Review Board approval for site plan approvals. Both projects are part of the Brasada Housing Development located at the terminus of Cataract Avenue.

FACTS:

In October and December of 2018, the Development Plan Review Board reviewed and approved eight (8) House Plans and 34 site plans for the first phase of the Brasada Housing Development. The Brasada Housing Development is a 270 acre site that will be developed in three phases, as a gated community featuring 65 single family homes.

ANALYSIS:

Tentative Tract Map 70583, Revision No. 1, subdivided approximately 270 acres into 65 single-family residential lots, private open space, private roadways, and related infrastructure including entry gate, utilities, water quality control basins and water storage facilities.

Approximately 170 acres of land area will remain as permanent open space and/or habitat conservation area.

The subject property is located at the northerly terminus of Cataract Avenue, North of Foothill Boulevard. Zoning on the Subject Property is Specific Plan 25 (SP-25).
Surrounding Zones and land uses consist of City of Glendora, single family/vacant hillside to the west, Specific Plan 25 (SP-25), vacant hillside to the North, Open Space (OS), San Dimas Canyon Park to the east and Single Family Agricultural (SF-A20000), single family homes to the South. The subject property is currently under construction for the grading and infrastructure that will support the 65 single family zones.

**Gate House**

The Brasada Development will be served by a private street system that starts at the northerly terminus of Cataract Avenue. At that location, Cataract Avenue will become Brasada Lane, a 26 wide private roadway with no sidewalks and limited street lighting. Approximately 2,300 feet north of the start of Brasada Lane, there will be an area for vehicles to enter into the gated, private community and/or turnaround and exit the area. This area was approved as part of the Tract Map and Grading Plan for the project.

![Exhibit A - Entry Area and Approved Plan](image)

Central to the Entry Area will be a Gate House, which will be used to monitor entrance into and out of the Development. The idea of a Gate House was envisioned in the Architectural and Landscape Design Guidelines which state “The Brasada Gate House acts as a community marker, welcoming residents and guests alike. Its presence and
design suggests a role in the history and ownership of the land, creating an architectural touchstone of a warm and indigenous quality."

As originally envisioned, the gate house would utilize materials and architecture consistent with the land and its history. However, as the Board is aware, that concept has evolved into a community that seeks to replicate an “Old World European” influenced Community. As such, the gate house has been designed to complement the architecture of the approved house plan elevations and materials.

3.2 Brasada Gate House

The applicant’s proposal is a “French Country Design” which they feel compliments the approved homes. The gate house will have 280 square feet of enclosed space and an additional 262 square feet of covered outdoor area. The proposed Gate House will be located in the pad area that was approved in the Tract Map and Grading Plan approvals (see Exhibit A and B).

The Gate House has been designed to be used by a security guard whose role would be to monitor entrance and exit from the community. The floor plan features, a work
area and bathroom in the covered portion of the structure and a covered porch and utility closet on the exterior porting of the structure (See Exhibit C).

Exhibit C – Gate House Floor Plan

As indicated earlier, the Gate House will feature a “French Country Design” featuring the same elements utilized in the French Country house plans that were approved by the Board in 2018. These elements include steep roof pitches, flat roof tiles, wood shutters, Stucco with stone exteriors. Gables and/or dormer windows and the use of wrought iron are also prominent features of the French Country style. As shown in the following elevations, the applicant has incorporated many of these design features into their proposal.
Maximum height of the structure is 21’ – 6” which complies with the Specific Plan 25 Height limit of 25 feet. As an alternative, the applicant has submitted a variation of the front elevation to create a more dramatic effect. Below are the two proposals.
Materials

The exterior finishes for the structure will be consistent with the French Country materials that the Board reviewed and approved in October/December of this past year. The roof covering the structure will be a textured slate and the covered outdoor area will have a standing seam metal roof. The wall will be a combination of manufactured stone veneer and stucco, Wood beam posts, recessed, single hung, vinyl windows with simulated divided light grids, decorative wrought iron fixtures, precast trim/entry and louvered doors complete the materials (see Exhibit D).
The Brasada Architectural and Landscape Design Guidelines provide for the construction of a Casita, which will function as a Guest House (No Kitchen). As provided for in the Guidelines, a lot owner may construct a detached structure or Casita on his or her Lot. A Casita or detached structure shall be limited to a maximum height of twenty-five feet (25’), to the ridge, and is subject to the same setbacks as the residence.

A Casita shall match the architectural style of the main residence including massing, form, material, and overhang and shall not be closer than ten feet (10’) to the residence. A Casita may be connected to the residence by a loggias, veranda, or similar structure and have attached to it, patio covers, private courtyards, sitting area, etc. A casita’s floor area shall not exceed 1,200 square feet and no more than one (1) Casita is permitted per Lot.

The applicant is proposing the Development Plan Review Board review only the floor plans, elevations and colors/materials for each of the Casitas. In the future, should a lot owner want to build one of these standard plans, they would have to come back to DPRB for a site plan review (to address location, detached/attached configuration, courtyards, etc.), and compatibility of the Casita with the approved house plan elevations and materials. Approval of these plans will not preclude the Board from making future changes to the standard Casitas plan should the need arise during site plan review.

Proposed will be two different floor plans and an elevation for each of the approved house styles, which are Andalusian, Italianate, French Country, Spanish and Tuscan. Floor Plan 1 will be a rectangular structure measuring 20’-6” by 33 feet with a 102 square foot attached covered patio. The 563 square foot floor area space features a bedroom with walk-in closet, one (1) bathroom, private sink and living room. (See Exhibit E). Overall height for both plans ranges from 14’-6” to twenty feet.
Floor Plan 2 will be a rectangular structure measuring 20'-6" by 58 feet with a 102 square foot attached covered patio. The 563 square foot floor area space features two (2) bedrooms, each having a walk-in closet, bathroom (2 total) and private. Floor Plan two also has a living room with fireplace. (See Exhibit F).
Elevations/Materials

The applicant is proposing to match the approved house plans by offering a Casita plan for the Andalusian, Italianate, French Country, Tuscan and Spanish Style home. This would be offered for Plan 1 and Plan 2. Below are the front elevations for all of the building types in Plan 1 and 2 and attached as Exhibit B, is the full set of Elevations for all plans.

Casita 1 – Andalusian Front Elevation

Casita 1 – Italianate Front Elevation
Casita 1 – French Country Front Elevation

Casita 1 – Spanish Front Elevation
Casita 2 – French Country Front Elevation

Casita 2 – Spanish Front Elevation

Casita 2 – Tuscan Front Elevation
ISSUES:

Several concerns arise from this application. First, it is difficult to consider materials and colors without the full context of the site plan and approved housing plan. The review of Colors and /materials is not appropriate at this time because the Board is not reviewing the site plan and a particular house. To address this concern, it is recommended that a condition be added that materials and colors be approved at site plan approval and not with this application (Condition 19).

In addition, some of the design issues that were discussed in the original approval of the house plans are common with this application. In particular, the lack of details on the Andalusian plan and stucco application on the Spanish and Andalusian plans is not appropriate. Condition 19 and 22 will address this concern the Board may want to consider tweaks to the design of a Casita based upon the house plan it is being paired with.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Development Plan Review Board approve DPRB Case No. 19-0004 subject to the attached Conditions of Approval.

Respectfully submitted

Steve Sizemore
Project Manager

EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval
Exhibit B – Casita Plan Set
Exhibit C – Gate House Plans
EXHIBIT A

Conditions of Approval
for
Case No. 19-0004

PLANNING DIVISION - (909) 394-6250

GENERAL

1. The Development Plan Review Board application (DPRB-19-0004) is conditionally approved subject to the architectural plans, samples, product sheets and materials filed by Brasada Homes Land, Inc. and subject to compliance with the requirements set forth in DPRB 19-0004 Conditions of Approval.

2. The Applicant/Developer shall agree to defend at his sole expense any action brought against the City, its agents, officers or employees because of the issuance of such approval, or in the alternative, to relinquish such approval. The applicant shall reimburse the City, its agents, officers or employees for any Court costs and attorney’s fees which the City, its agents, officers or employees may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his obligations under this condition.

3. The Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for any City Attorney costs incurred by the City for the project, including, but not limited to, consultations, and the preparation and/or review of legal documents. The applicant shall deposit funds with the City to cover these costs in an amount to be determined by the City.

4. Copies of the Conditions of Approval shall be included on the plans (full size). The sheet(s) are for information only to all parties involved in the construction /grading activities and are not required to be wet sealed /stamped by a licensed Engineer /Architect.

5. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with all requirements of Specific Plan No. 25 Zoning District.

6. All Conditions are final unless appealed to the City Council within 14 days of the issuance of the Conditions in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 18.212 of the San Dimas Zoning Code.

7. The building permits for this project must be issued within one year from the date of approval or the approval will become invalid. A time extension may be granted under the provisions set forth in Chapter 18.12.070 F.

8. The Applicant/Developer shall sign an affidavit accepting these Conditions of approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
9. All parking provided shall meet the requirements of Section 18.156 (et. seq.) of the San Dimas Municipal Code.

10. The Applicant/Developer shall comply with all City of San Dimas Business License requirements and shall provide a list of all contractors and subcontractors that are subject to business license requirements.

11. Submitted plans shall be consistent with the approved Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’s) and Design Guidelines on file with the City of San Dimas.

12. Graffiti shall be removed within 72 hours.

13. The entire site shall be kept free from trash and debris at all times and in no event shall trash and debris remain for more than 24 hours.

14. During construction, the construction manager shall serve as the contact person in the event that dust or noise levels become disruptive to local residents. A sign shall be posted at the project site with the contact phone number.

15. All Landscaping and automatic irrigation plans shall be prepared by a State registered Landscape Architect and include a $2,500 deposit for review of the plans by the City per lot.

16. This approval shall be subject to all conditions of approval for Tentative Tract Map 70583-Revision No. 1, Mitigation Measures from the Brasada Residential Final Environmental Impact Report and Precise Plan 12-02 (Design Guidelines).

17. Final Construction plans shall include a copy of letter of approval from the Brasada Homeowners Association.

DESIGN

18. Andalusian plans shall incorporate additional elements (wrought iron, Keyway arches and windows) to be more consistent with the Development Plan Review Boards previous approvals. Said changes shall be approved by the Planning Division prior to submittal of plans into Plan Check.

19. Prior to the issuance of building permits for a Casita, the applicant/owner shall submit an application for site plan/Materials/Colors approval to the Development Plan Review Board for review and compliance with Specific Plan 25 Zoning District and the Brasada Architectural and Landscape Design Guidelines.

20. Prior to installation, the Applicant/Developer shall submit an example of sufficient size and shape of the siding, stucco, stone/brick and roofing materials. Said material Boards shall be consistent with the Development Plan Review Board approval and be submitted to the Planning Department.

21. Details of the windows and window treatments, fascia, wrought-iron railing, brackets, cornice, eaves, gutters, etc. shall be shown on the construction plans submitted for building permits and shall be consistent with the Development Plan Review Board approval. Any substitution of approved materials shall approved by the Planning Division prior to installation.
22. Spanish and Andalusian Plans shall have a smooth/Santa Barbara stucco finish and all other Architectural Styles shall have a Fine Sand Float. The Stucco Finishes shall be consistent with the suggested application procedures identified in the Western Wall and Ceiling Contractors Association Technical Services Pamphlet “Plaster Textures and Acrylic Finishes”.

23. Prior to issuance of a building permit construction plans shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director that the residential structure will exceed Title 24 standards by 10 percent or more.

24. Solar panels, solar water heaters, and other allowed roof-mounted structures proposed as part of the development shall be non-reflective and non-glare in their appearance, and shall be designed and installed to blend in with overall roof appearances to the greatest extent feasible.

25. Windows with highly reflective treatments shall be avoided and windows shall be located as to avoid highly reflective sun orientations to surrounding properties.

26. Construction plans shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director that roofs are designed to comply with "cool roof" standards. Heat reflective materials shall be applied under roof shingles.

27. No roof mounted mechanical equipment shall be permitted other than allowed solar equipment.

28. Ground level mechanical equipment shall be placed a minimum of 5’ from the interior property lines and shall be completely screened with landscaping. Ground level mechanical equipment shall not be located within the front yard setback.

29. Gas meters, backflow prevention devices and other ground-mounted mechanical or electrical equipment installed by the Applicant/Developer shall be inconspicuously located and screened, as approved by the Director of Development Services. Location of this equipment shall be clearly noted on landscape construction documents.

30. All exterior building colors shall match the color and material board on file with the Planning Division. Any revision to the approved building colors shall be submitted to the Planning Division for review and approval.

31. The Applicant/Developer shall underground all new utilities on the property.

BUILDING DIVISION – (909) 394-6260

33. The Applicant/Developer shall comply and exceed where otherwise amended with the latest California Title 24 Energy requirements for all new lighting, insulation, and mechanical equipment and submit calculations at time of initial plan review.

34. The Applicant/Developer shall submit to the Building Division of the City of San Dimas plans to be forwarded for review by the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

35. The Applicant/Developer shall submit a Precise Grading Plan for a Casita after Development Plan Review Board approval of the site plan. Said Plan is to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and the Director of Development Services.

36. Building foundation inspections shall not be performed until a rough grading certification, survey stakes are in place, and a final soils report has been filed with the City and approved. All lot relevant and necessary downstream drainage facilities must be operable. Framing inspections will not be performed until a letter from the surveyor verifying the building perimeter is in the correct location has been submitted and approved.

37. Construction calculations, including lateral analysis, shall be required at the time plans are submitted for plan check. Electrical schematic and load list and plumbing (drainage, water, gas) schematics will be required before issuance of electrical or plumbing permits.

38. If applicable, fees shall be paid to Bonita Unified School District in compliance with Government Code Section 65995.

39. The applicant shall submit all Edison site plans as soon as possible for any proposed above ground transformers.

40. Construction hours shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., and shall be prohibited at any time on Sundays or public holidays, per San Dimas Municipal Code Section 8.36.100.

ENGINEERING DIVISION – (909) 394-6240

41. The Applicant/Developer shall provide a signed copy of the City’s certification statement declaring that the contractor will comply with Minimum Best Management Practices (BMPs) required by the MS4 permit for Los Angeles County as mandated by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

42. All work adjacent to or within the street right of way (private or public) shall be subject to review and approval of the Public Works Director and the City Engineer. The work shall be in accordance with applicable standards of the City of San Dimas; i.e. Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Green Book).
and further that the construction equipment ingress and egress be controlled by a plan approved by Public Works.

43. All site, grading, landscape & irrigation, and street improvement plans shall be coordinated for consistency prior to the issuance of any permits.

44. Construction parking and material storage to be confined to the site. No construction related parking or material storage will be allowed on the surrounding streets.

End of Conditions
EXHIBIT B – Casita Plan Set