CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 14, 2019 (Dilley Absent)

March 28, 2019

1. DPRB Case No. 19-0004 – Brasada Homes Tract No. 70583

   Associated Cases: ACCELA PROJ-18-0076

   A request to approve (2) Casitas (Guest House) floor/elevation 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. This item was continued from the January 24, 2019 Development Plan Review Board meeting.

   Applicant: Brasada Homes Land LLC APN: 8665-001-009

   Planner: Larry Stevens Zone: SP-25

ADJOURN

CITY OF SAN DIMAS
LICENSE AND PERMIT HEARING BOARD
THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2019 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM

CALL TO ORDER

1. Entertainment Special Permit 18-01

   Associated Cases: LPHB 18-0002
       PROJ-18-0035

   A request to allow live music entertainment in conjunction with an existing restaurant, Café Las Pupusas, located at 380 S. San Dimas Avenue within the Creative Growth Area 3 (CG-3) Zone. (APN: 8390-018-070). Continued from November 08, 2018.
Applicant: Steve Mendoza  APN: 8390-018-070
Planner: Ariana Ruiz  Zone: Creative Growth Area 3

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.
CALL TO ORDER

Dave Bratt called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:40 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Blaine Michaelis moved, seconded by Larry Stevens to approve the January 24, 2019 minutes.

Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve the February 14, 2019 minutes.

Larry Stevens moved, seconded by Blaine Michaelis to approve the February 28, 2019 minutes.
DPRB Case No. 19-0007


Associate Planner Jennifer Williams presented the staff report with the recommendation of approval of the guidelines to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. Stevens stated Edison is currently changing out wood poles due to structural analysis. Asked if Staff normally reviews Edison’s structural calculations.

Associate Engineer Steven Barragan stated Edison is regulated by the CPUC.

Mr. Stevens asked when Edison replaces a pole, do they get a permit from the City.

Associate Engineer Barragan stated yes, they do obtain a permit from the City.

Mr. Stevens asked if Edison had recently replaced any cross arms.

Associate Engineer Barragan stated he could not recall any.

Mr. Stevens stated maybe Staff should add verbiage stating no new cross arms. He adds if Staff is not allowing Edison to replace cross arms, then Staff can reasonably prohibit the small cells from adding cross arms. It’s a major aesthetic consideration.

Associate Planner Williams finishes her presentation.

Mr. Stevens stated maybe Staff should make this an ordinance. Staff can have a section that states the City may charge the max allowable under the allowable fees.

Building Superintendent Eric Beilstein states there is a possibility that we tie it to LA County permit structure. Building adopted LA Counties fee structure and does not need to adopt fees ever again.

Associate Planner Williams stated Staff needs to get the guidelines wrapped up so they may be presented to contractors soon. She presented the locational and type orders of preference.

Mr. Stevens stated he would prefer the applicants apply for service in the highest concentrated areas they wish to serve.

Associate Planner Williams added near San Dimas Ave., an applicant inquired about putting equipment on a pole in an interior cul de sac. If the applicant/provider can meet the standards, then the main street would be a preference.
Mr. Stevens stated Staff should include preferences in the guidelines.

Associate Planner Williams stated she can add preferences to the guidelines.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked who will be viewing this document.

Associate Planner Williams stated the photo documents of what is acceptable will be for Staff’s and the Board’s use.

Mr. Stevens stated the text will need to note that improvements are not allowed on city owned nostalgic or Copenhagen designs. He then asked about adding the improvements to the parks.

Associate Planner Williams stated the guidelines only apply to public right of way.

Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0007: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to proceed and take the Design Guidelines to Planning Commission. Also, a paragraph needs to be added that allows Staff to change verbiage at a later date if needed.

Motion carried: 6-0-1 (Dilley absent)

DPRB Case No. 19-0009

New 806 square-foot single-story, single-family residence and 250 square-foot detached garage at 123 N. Monte Vista Avenue (Former Taylor House Site) in the single-Family Downtown Residential (SF-DR) Zone (APN: 8387-014-902)

Doug Joyce, Onyx Architects was present

Associate Planner Williams presented the staff report with the recommendation of approval of DPRB Case No. 19-0009 to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Michaelis asked what the setback is on Monte Vista.

Associate Planner Williams stated some homes have a setback of mere inches where the home next door is set back six feet. The code requires 20 feet but the lots are so small. For this project Staff opted to go with eight feet.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked what the setback is for the fence along the First Street side of the home.

Associate Planner Williams stated the side fence will be set back 10 ft. 2”, keeping it in line with the garage.
**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the porch can be brought forward to make a slightly bigger backyard. He also asked who will maintain the front and side yards of this property.

**Mr. Stevens** stated the City will maintain this property; it will be kept as an affordable rental. He adds if the fence is moved toward the sidewalk, it may cause a line of sight issue. The Board can do away with the fence if they would like. If the fence is to stay, does the Board have a preference of material.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated Staff would like to see a split face block but is open to the discussion of changing materials.

**Building Superintendent Beilstein** asked if this project will go to City Council.

**Mr. Stevens** stated the bid for the project will go to City Council but the project design will not. Staff may take the project to City Council just so they may see the City project.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated he would like to see a horizontal wood fence.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated the Facilities Department has discouraged the use of wood as a fencing material.

**Mr. Stevens** proposed the side fencing material be discussed at a later date. As of now, he is OK moving the fence out 5-6 feet. Along the southern property line wall, he would like to keep the split face block wall.

**Building Superintendent Beilstein** stated if one were to look at the neighborhood they would notice the street side yard of this house. A wood fence would be a nice soft back drop for that.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated the fence should have a small jog and not be up against the house.

**Building Superintendent Beilstein** stated 10 feet is plenty of yard for a modest house such as this.

**Mr. Stevens** stated he would like the fence to jog out a bit and be a wood fence. He likes the idea of a softer material along First Street.

**Mr. Bratt** asked if it would be appropriate to move the whole house north 15 inches to give a bigger side yard with a buffer to the property line.

**Building Superintendent Beilstein** stated moving the house to the north would be appropriate.
Mr. Stevens stated he would like to widen the garage about 14 inches to give more room for access and storage.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the driveway would be two concrete strips.

Doug Joyce, Onyx Architects stated parking strips would be a maintenance issue; he suggests a driveway.

Building Superintendent Beilstein stated the key thing to remember about this property is that it is City owned. Staff needs to demonstrate the use of the Town Core guidelines. It would be more fitting to the project to do parking strips.

Mr. Stevens stated Staff can look at the layout when the landscaping comes back for review.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about the Staff’s thoughts on accessibility.

Building Superintendent Beilstein stated he does not feel the house needs to be redesigned. He believes the best way to handle this home is to make it adaptable. He suggests a three-foot wide door and bars in the bathroom.

Doug Joyce, Onyx Architects stated to make the house accessible he would like to add some square footage to the back of the home.

Associate Planner Williams stated if square footage is to be added, it needs to be done before Planning Commission. She added the lot coverage is currently at 33%, adding 5% would give the structure an extra 150 sq. ft.

Mr. Stevens added a small increase to the square footage acceptable. He asked if the house will be on slab or a raised foundation.

Doug Joyce, Onyx Architects stated the house will be a slab foundation.

Building Superintendent Beilstein stated it would be appropriate to do a slab on grade but give the appearance of a raised foundation from the outside.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the columns on the front porch could be made thicker.

Doug Joyce, Onyx Architects stated he would like to do a 6x6 column.

Mr. Stevens asked the Board which color scheme they would like to approve.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated he would prefer the color scheme with the red door.

Associate Engineer Barragan asked if there had been any discussion in regards to off-site improvements.
**Associate Planner Williams** stated street trees may need to be added. Street improvements can be added when Staff asks for Conditions of Approval.

**Mr. Michaelis** stated whatever is traditionally done for a new home, needs to be done for this property as well.

**Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0009:** Larry Stevens moved, second by John Sorcinelli to move forward and take the Variance to Planning Commission.

Motion carried: 5-0-1-1 (Dilley absent, Bratt abstain)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 a.m. to the meeting of March 28, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.

__________________________
David Bratt, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

__________________________
Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: 05/23/19
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
MARCH 28, 2019 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT

Emmett Badar, City Council
David Bratt, Planning Commission
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager

STAFF

Mena Abdul-Ahad, Assistant Planner
Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
Anne Nguyen, Associate Planner
Fabiola Wong, Planning Manager

CALL TO ORDER

Dave Bratt called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:40 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

DPRB Case No. 19-0011

A request to change the paint scheme, roofing material, and several windows on the commercial building located at 120 W. Bonita Avenue within the Creative Growth zone, Area 2 – Frontier Village. (APN: 8390-023-019)

Shari Nign, Applicant was present

Mr. Sorcinelli asked where on the building the standing seam roof will be placed.

Shari Nign, Applicant stated the standing seam roof will be used on the canopies at the back of the building and on the tower.

Mr. Bratt asked if the applicant will replace all windows.
Shari Nign, Applicant stated all windows on the building will be replaced except for the north facing windows.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked the applicant if the front of the building will be fixed where the canopies were removed.

Shari Nign, Applicant stated the building will be repaired before painting.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated signage animates the building, is the applicant planning for signage or lighting.

Shari Nign, Applicant stated the building could use an identifying sign but the building does not have a proper name like the Mercantile Building.

Mr. Stevens stated he is not sure he is supportive of the color. He does not think there are any similar color schemes in the downtown. He asked about two-layer versus three-layer roofing.

Building Superintendent Beilstein stated three-layer gives more shadow and depth.

Shari Nign, Applicant stated the three-layer is the presidential and it is almost the same cost as tile. She adds only a small portion of the roof will be seen from San Dimas Ave.

Mr. Sorcinelli states he doesn’t object to the colors.

Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0011: Emmett Badar moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried: 7-0

DPRB Case No. 19-0012

A request to repaint all the buildings at Christ Church of the Valley located at 1404 West Covina Boulevard. (APN: 8385-010-024)

Jason Gayton, Applicant was present
Greg Linzay, Church Administrator was present

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza presented the staff report with the recommendation of approval.

Mr. Stevens asked if the color scheme will follow what currently exists.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the colors by name and explained the difference.
Mr. Badar asked if there is a reason the applicant went so dark with the color choices.

Jason Gayton, Applicant stated they feel the greys will give the property a new feel.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Applicant had brought any alternative color schemes. He does not feel greys are right for this particular building. He asked the Board if greys were the right color scheme for a building with a red tile roof.

Mr. Sorcinelli states these colors are not right for this building. He would like the applicant to come back and bring color schemes that differentiate a bit more.

Greg Linzay, Church Administrator stated he went around to surrounding areas and found this color scheme to be fresh and inviting. He adds, he would like to get away from the current color scheme.

Jason Gayton, Applicant stated the only colors seen from the street would be the medium color and the white.

Mr. Dilley stated he prefer to see the tower painted in the medium color.

Mr. Stevens stated he believes the applicant should work with staff on the colors and bring it back to the Board at a later date. He would like to see colors that are more distinct form one another.

Mr. Badar states the colors seem to be too dark to him.

Mr. Sorcinelli states the colors on a church should be uplifting and welcoming. He would like to see more earth tones brought back to the Board.

**Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0012:** Moved by Larry Stevens, second by Emmett Badar to have the Applicant work with Staff to provide more color options and bring them back to the Board.

Motion carried: 7-0

DPRB Case No. 18-0029

**Revised Request:** A request to modify DPRB approval obtained on December 13, 2018 to: (1) construct a 672-square foot detached two-car garage; (2) remove one mature multi-trunk Jacaranda tree that is in the location of the new garage; (3) eliminate the 498-square foot accessory dwelling unit and 205-square feet covered patio; (4) maintain previously approved 625-square foot deck expansion, 374-square foot freestanding covered patio with retaining walls, and a new ppl to an existing 3,688 two-story house located at 2068 Paseo Lucinda. (APN: 8448-008-042)
Jennifer Wilson, Applicant was present

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza presented the staff report with the recommendation of approval.

Motion DPRB Case No. 18-0029 Larry Steven moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve subject to conditions of approval.

Motion carried: 6-0-0-1 (Patel abstain)

DPRB Case No. 19-0014

A request to construct a four-foot high, 45’-7” long retaining wall on the side yard along the east property line in order to create a flat yard area. A three-foot high retaining wall is proposed at the southeast corner of the property to allow for an expansion of the swimming pool and deck area at 1702 Gainsborough Road. The retaining wall will be 48’-6” linear feet along the south property line and 25’ linear feet on the east property line. The site is developed with a 4,091 square foot, two-story single family house. (APN: 8426-034-018)

Yamir, Creation Builders was present

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza presented the staff report.

Mr. Patel asked if there is a 20’ sewer easement at the rear of the property.

Mr. Stevens stated it appears the current pool encroaches on the sewer easement. He adds for any design, Staff needs to make sure there is not a surcharge on the sewer line. He asked if there is a retaining wall for the pool.

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza stated no, there is not a retaining wall for the pool.

Mr. Bratt asked if the back fence will be tubular fence

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza wrought iron to match existing.

Mr. Bratt asked if the neighbor to the east was OK with the proposal.

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza stated the neighbor to the east came into City Hall and asked Staff for details. He is OK with the proposed project.

Mr. Patel stated the concern is adding the pool where it could charge the sewer line. He added he would like to continue this item until Staff can verify the placement of the sewer line.
Mr. Stevens stated depending on the placement of the pool and the sewer line, the pool may have to be moved to the north. Staff needs to verify the placement is acceptable.

Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0014 Larry Stevens moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve subject to conditions of approval with the addition that the applicant may need to move the pool to the north as to not charge the sewer line. Nothing is to be placed within the sewer easement; footings may need to be moved once Staff verifies the location of the easement. If nothing is done, the current pool may stay where it is.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 19-0006

A request to modify the exterior façade of an existing industrial building. The proposed modifications include: (1) to install a metal canopy over the main entrance of the building, (2) to install vertical architectural fins to the front façade of the building, (3) to install an automatic vehicular and pedestrian gate on both sides of the building to secure the parking areas; (4) to remove four windows and install four roll up doors; (5) to repaint the building; (6) to install perforated header trims at ground level openings; (7) and to construct an outdoor enclosure for a proposed gas tank at the rear of the property located at 650 W. Cienega Ave in the Creative Growth Area 4 Zone.

David Crawford, Architect was present
Luis Reyes, Program Director was present

Assistant Planner Mena Abdul-Ahad presented the staff report with recommendation of approval.

Mr. Bratt asked the purpose of the four roll-up doors.

David Crawford, Architect stated one roll-up door is for the warehouse. The other three roll-up doors are for the classrooms; to bring in equipment for training.

Mr. Badar asked how many students are enrolled in the program.

Luis Reyes, Program Director stated the program has 80-100 students enrolled at a time. Majority of students are in an apprenticeship and go to school at night from 6pm-9pm. During regular business hours, there are only 6-7 admin employees.

David Crawford, Architect noted they have explored multiple locations for the gate and the logical position is for the gate in the more forward position.
Mr. Stevens asked if the slats on the building will be thin. Also, the only black on the building will be under the slats.

David Crawford, Architect stated the slats will be thin and about 18” wide. Regarding the black, that will be the only area on the building that will be black.

Motion DPRB Case No. 19-0014 Larry Stevens move approval, second by Scott Dilley to approve subject to conditions of approval with the gate staying in the more forward location.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 15-33 - The applicant is proposing to develop the site with a total of 20 two-story, single family homes. A total of three different floor plans are proposed with the smaller house being 2,893 square feet of habitable space and the larger unit being 3,312 square feet. All units will provide a two-car garage and an option for a three-car garage with a tandem parking space.

Hagop Sargisian, Applicant was present
Sally Wildasinn, Architect was present
Steve Hunter, Project Engineer was present

Senior Planner Espinoza presented the staff report with the recommendation that the Board provides comments to the applicant and Staff related to the design issues.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if this will be a gated community.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated this will not be a gated community.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if these homes will have large enough backyards to house pools.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the proposed lots will be 7,500 and should be large enough for a pool.

Mr. Bratt stated he would like to see a one-story.

Sally Wildasinn, Architect stated it would be difficult to produce a one-story with suitable lot coverage.

Mr. Stevens noted Brandywine, John Begin and Brasada; all those projects have single-story overlays. A single-story would allow for lot coverage of up to 40%.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Staff has been working with the applicant to find a suitable design. He noted the preliminary check of the home designs were boxy. Staff helped the designers look at over all massing and scale.
Mr. Bratt stated from a design standpoint, the fronts look visually pleasing. But the other three sides look very plain.

Sally Wildasinn, Architect stated she can look into adding shutters to windows or moldings where appropriate.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated both the 3a and 3b models seem to be lacking visual interest on the first floor.

Steve Hunter, Project Engineer stated he and his team could look into adding pop-outs or a different color stucco.

Building Superintendent Beilstein stated the views from Foothill would need to be enhanced.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated he would like to make sure trees are added to the back of the properties along the channel.

Steve Hunter, Project Engineer stated he agrees with that suggestion. He would like more trees to help screen the residents from the back of the office building across the channel.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated in regards to the Spanish style homes, he would like the front window to have a special accent. Whether that special accent be foam spiral pillars or a nice arch with tile. He would like the garage door to be an upgraded version to the standard door. Also he would prefer the vinyl windows are not all white. He would like Staff to work with the applicant to find the best color for each home style.

Mr. Stevens asked the Board if there should be a push for a couple single-story homes.

Mr. Bratt stated he would like staff to have a conversation with the applicant in regards to adding single-story homes. He believes Planning Commission would like to see at least a couple single-story homes on the plans.

Mr. Stevens stated if Staff is going to impose a one-story overlay or tract map condition; there needs to be a consensus amongst the Board. Then the Planning Commission and the Council can decide if they would like to impose that. Then if that is how it is approved, it will come back to the Board with a one-story approval. He asked the Board if there is a consensus.

Mr. Bratt stated there was a consensus amongst the Board to ask for single-story homes in this tract. He asked Staff if they had received enough input regarding the design of the tract.
Senior Planner Espinoza stated he had received enough input from the Board to move forward to the Planning Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:59 a.m. to the meeting of April 11, 2019 at 8:30 a.m.

David Bratt, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: 05/23/19
DATE: May 23, 2019
TO: Development Plan Review Board
FROM: Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager
SUBJECT: A request to approve (2) Casitas (Guest House) floor/elevation 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. This item was continued from the January 24, 2019 Development Plan Review Board meeting.

FACTS:
The Brasada Housing Development is a 270 acre, gated community, featuring 65 single-family home sites. As currently planned, the development will be constructed in three phases. In October and December of 2018, the Development Plan Review Board reviewed and approved eight (8) House Plans (that can be built on any of the 65 lots) and 34 site plans, specific house plans for each lot, in the first phase of the Brasada Housing Development.

In addition, on January 24, 2019, the Board conditionally approved a Gate House for the gated entry into the development. As part of that application, the developer submitted floor plans and elevations for guest houses, which they refer to as Casitas. Similar to the approval of the House Plans, the request was for approval of the floor plan and elevations only. These plans could only be built if the Board approves a site plan in the future when a development application is submitted to the City.

At the January meeting, the Board expressed concerns in approving the elevations/floor plans without additional information on site appropriateness, buildout of additional structures and/or walls/landscaping on each lot. The continuance was granted to allow the applicant time to identify sites where the Casitas are appropriate, develop a sample plotting plan on the identified lots, and having staff bring back the applicable components of the adopted CC&R’s and State Regulations as they relate to guest houses/Accessory Dwelling Units.

ANALYSIS:
The construction of an accessory building in the development is governed by Specific Plan 25 (SP-25), the Architectural and Landscaping Design Guidelines and the adopted Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R’s). The San Dimas Municipal Code defines an Accessory Building as follows:
“Accessory building” or “accessory structure” means a detached subordinate building or structure, the use of which is incidental to that of the predominate use of the land, and which is located in the same or less restrictive zone on the same lot or parcel with the predominate building, structure or use. (Ord. 659 § 2, 1979; Ord. 37 § 120, 1961)

The Guidelines and CC&R’s provide more clarification as to the type of occupancy of the structure. In particular, the Guidelines define the type of occupancy as follows:

**Accessory Structure** – Refers to an unoccupied structure or building, which is separate from the main residence such as a cabana, carriage house, barn, stable or greenhouse. An accessory Structure is not a Detached Structure as defined in these A&LDG.

**Detached Structure** – Refers to a detached building used for a pool house, recreation room, and/or guest house and commonly referred to as a ‘Casita’ in these A&LDG, located on the same Lot as the main building and for use by temporary guests or the occupants of the premises. Such building shall have no plumbing or plumbing facilities of any kind except for space heating, air conditioning, utility basin, and/or bathroom. A Detached Structure is not an Accessory Dwelling Unit as defined in the CC&Rs.

The CC&R’s also define the occupancy of a structure as follows:

**12.5 Accessory Dwelling Units.** Other that than the main building/Residence on the Lot, the Declarant prohibits Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”) in the Project. ADU means a building or portion thereof either designed or used as living quarters, that includes kitchen facilities, of one person living alone or a group of two or more persons living together whether related to each other by birth or not.

**1.22 “Detached Structure”** means a detached building used for a pool house, recreation room, and/or guest house located on the same Lot as the main building and for use by temporary guests or the occupants of the premises. Such building shall have no plumbing or plumbing facilities of any kind except for space heating, air conditioning, utility basin, and/or bathroom. A Detached Structure is not an Accessory Dwelling Unit as defined in section 12.5.

As provided for in the Zoning, Guidelines, and CC&R’s a lot owner may construct a detached structure or Casita on his or her Lot, behind the main structure. A Casita or detached structure shall be limited to a maximum height of twenty-five feet (25’), and the setbacks shall be established by the development plan review board, but no less than twenty feet to the side or rear yard property.
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, if unattached from the main unit. 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, setbacks, lot coverage, 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.

**Floor Plans/Elevations**

The applicant proposes 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. Overall height for both plans ranges from 14’-6” to 20’-0”.

![Floor Plan – Casita 1](image)
Floor Plan 2 will be a rectangular structure measuring 20’- 6” by 58’- 0” with a 154 square foot attached covered patio. The 1,006 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.
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.

Floor plans and elevations for all of the building types in Plan 1 and 2 and attached as Exhibit B.
Casita 1 – Italianate Front Elevation

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

Casita 1 – Tuscan Front Elevation
ISSUES:

Concerns identified in the first review of this application still remain including the difficulty of considering materials and colors without the full context of the site plan and approved house 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).

Additionally, 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 23 will address this concern. In the future, at site plan review, the Board may want to consider revisions to the design of a Casita based upon the house plan it is being paired with.

At the January meeting, the board identified the following additional concerns, a) applicable components of the adopted CC&R’s and State Regulations as they relate to guest houses/Accessory Dwelling Units, b) identify sites where the Casita are appropriate, c) develop a sample plotting plan on the identified lots.

The following provides additional information for the board to consider.

**CC&R’s & State Regulations for Guest House/Accessory Dwelling Units**

The development of each housing site is intended to allow for multiple structures consistent with an estate type development. Pool houses, detached garages/carriage house, barns, guest house, etc. are permitted and will depend upon each owner’s desires and needs. As identified in the Analysis section of this report, if a structure is intended to be occupied, it is defined to be a detached structure.

In addition, the CC&R’s specifically prohibit Accessory dwelling units (state defined term, limiting local regulations of this type of housing). The City’s concern is to make sure each lot developed in a coordinated fashion and that each of the lots does not have too many occupied structures.

This concern should be alleviated in that the CC&R’s and Design Guidelines will limit each lot to no more than one residence on each lot. There are however, opportunities for more than one unoccupied structure on each lot (barn, garage, pool house etc.). Requiring individual site plan approval of any casita will allow the Board to make that determination on a case by case basis (Condition 19).

The primary issue is the size of the structure. It may be ok on some of the larger lots, but not appropriate on some of the smaller lots. This is an area the Board may want to have additional discussion.

To assist with this discussion, the applicant has provided some conceptual layouts to show how a Casitas could be incorporated into a lot (Examples are from Phase 1). In addition, the overall site plan for Phase I is included showing each of the lots in that phase.
In summary, the Board’s concerns regarding the number and type of structures is addressed in the CC&R’s, the design guidelines and the City’s Zoning Code. To address the size of an occupied structure, a condition has been added (Condition 20.) which will read:

20. Based upon specific site criteria, the Board may limit the size of a Casita to less than the approved or maximum square footage.

On the basis of the amended conditions and the criteria identified in this report, the Boards concerns should be addressed and a recommendation of approval is appropriate.

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

Prepared by Steve Sizemore

Reviewed by Larry Stevens

EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A – Conditions of Approval
Exhibit B – Casita Plan Set
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. Based upon specific site criteria, the Board may limit the size of a Casita to less than the approved or maximum square footage. Where a casita is proposed, the maximum coverage of the buildable pad shall not exceed ___%.

21. 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.
22. 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.

23. 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”.

24. 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.

25. 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.

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

27. 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.

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

29. 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.

30. 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.

31. 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.

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

BUILDING DIVISION – (909) 394-6260

34. 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.

35. 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.

36. 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.

37. 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.

38. 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.

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

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

41. 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

42. 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).

43. 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.

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

45. 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
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DATE: May 23, 2019

TO: License Permit and Hearing Board

FROM: Ariana Ruiz, Planning Aide

SUBJECT: Entertainment Special Permit 18-0001

Associated Cases: LPHB 18-0002
ACCEL PROJ 18-0035

A request to allow live music entertainment in conjunction with an existing restaurant, Café Las Pupusas, located at 380 S. San Dimas Avenue within the Creative Growth Area 3 (CG-3) Zone. (APN: 8390-018-070). Continued from November 08, 2018.

FACTS:

The License Permit and Hearing Board (LPHB) reviewed the abovementioned case at its meeting on August 9, 2018. During the hearing, the Board reviewed the request for live entertainment inside the restaurant and in their outdoor patio area. The Board voted to temporarily approve the live entertainment from August 23, 2018 to October 31, 2018 and requested that the business owner maintain a detailed log of each live entertainment event.

The case was brought before the LPHB on November 8, 2018 to evaluate the use during the trial period granted by the Board. At this meeting, some residents raised concerns about noise and hours of the events of the temporary approval. The residents as well of the Sherriff have raised complaints and concerns regarding the violation of the temporary conditions of approval. The Board determined that a six-month trial period would be appropriate before approving ESP 18-0001. The six-month period ended April 2019. The owner was required to continue to maintain a log of each entertainment event hosted, so the Board can evaluate the use of the Entertainment Special Permit (ESP). Staff reached out to the business owner to obtain a copy of the logs to bring forward to the LPHB. However, Staff has not received the required information.

The Applicant has not yet provided the information and Staff is requesting this item to be continued to allow the business owner additional time to submit the required information.
RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the License and Permit Hearing Board continue the item to the next scheduled meeting on June 13, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Ariana Ruiz,
Planning Aide