

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

**September 27, 2007 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CONFERENCE ROOM**

---

**PRESENT**

*Dan Coleman  
Scott Dilley  
Blaine Michaelis  
Krishna Patel  
Jim Schoonover*

**ABSENT**

*Curtis Morris  
John Sorcinelli*

**CALL TO ORDER**

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:33 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the Council Chambers Conference room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, second by Scott Dilley, to approve minutes of September 13, 2007 with correction to page 3 and page 5. Motion carried 3.0.2.2. (Curtis Morris and John Sorcinelli absent. Krishna Patel and Blaine Michaelis abstained.)

**HEARING ITEMS**

**Tree Removal Case No. 07-26**

Request to remove seven (7) Canary Island Pine trees and four (4) Ficus trees (already removed without permits) located at 2411 Via Mariposa. APN: 8448-026-028 Zone: SF-15,000.

Timothy Garcia, property owner, was present. Mr. Garcia stated that termites destroyed his fence and infested the pine tree adjacent to the fence. Ficus trees adjacent to fence were removed when fence was removed.

Sid Maksoudian, 1156 Camino Del Sur, was present. Mr. Maksoudian stated that he was the one that reported the unpermitted tree removals to the City. He stated that he was upset about the trees being removed as they provided screening and privacy and that he was not notified about the meeting today.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant was in the process of removing a tree when the City received a complaint about tree removal. Code enforcement commenced

with applicant submitting a tree removal permit application on August 21, 2007 which was approved on August 24, 2007. On August 28, 2007 the City received another complaint about previous tree removal at same location which resulted in applicant submitting another tree removal permit application on August 31, 2007.

Mr. Espinoza stated that the applicant removed trees without permit resulting in penalties for unpermitted tree removal per Code of up to 4:1 tree replacement ratio. He is asking DPRB to discuss as total number of trees based on this ratio would total fifty (50). He stated that the applicant is requesting that the Board consider a reduction in the tree replacement requirements due to insufficient planting area for fifty (50) trees. The applicant is proposing 12 replacement trees.

Craig Hensley, Planning Manager, stated in response to question regarding replacing six pine trees in front yard with one Camphor tree that it will grow very large, such as the Camphor tree in front of the Historic Depot.

Mr. Coleman recommended that applicant research location of underground utilities in front yard before selecting tree location. Mr. Espinoza continued, stating that recommendation is for DPRB to make the following findings for removal of the trees:

*“The condition of the mature significant trees(s) with respect to disease, danger of falling, proximity to existing or proposed structures, and interference with utility series warrant removal of the trees.”*

And, based on changes made to the Tree Preservation Ordinance, Chapter 18.162, by City Council, to better facilitate the application process and allow for some flexibility especially for residential properties like this one to make the following findings:

- 1. The reduced replacement requirement is consistent with the purpose of this chapter.*
- 2. The tree(s) in question are located where the impact of the tree removal on the community is limited (such as trees in a generally flat portion of the rear yard of a single-family house that are deemed to have less public benefit”.*
- 3. The property in question has an adequate number of existing trees; therefore, a reduced replacement ratio is appropriate.*

Mr. Espinoza concluded with the recommendation that a reduced ratio is appropriate and no additional trees should be required.

The Board reviewed photos and site plan of property.

**Motion:** Blaine Michaelis moved, second by Krishna Patel, to approve replacement with 12 trees as recommended by Staff.

Motion carried 5.0.2.0. (John Sorcinelli and Curtis Morris absent)

### **DPRB Case No. 07-37**

**Preliminary Review** - Request to construct a 29,721 sq.ft. warehouse located behind an existing warehouse at 510 West Arrow Highway. APN: 8382-005-027. Zone: M-1

Rick Leslie, architect, and Fred Inman, property owner, were present.

Assistant Planner Grabow presented facts of the request and stated that the applicant is working with Staff to comply with the following issues:

- Provide accommodations for bicycle and motorcycle parking;
- Loading areas are required to be screened from public view, through use of screen walls, landscaping and similar methods;
- Provide additional landscaping areas that border the side property lines and the outdoor storage;
- Provide additional architectural elements to the entry areas;
- Address building mass issues.

Mr. Hensley stated that this project requires a use permit because of storage area. Planning Commission will be hearing this request as well. In addition, the trees proposed for removals are mostly palm trees. In response to Mr. Schoonover, he stated that it is parked for warehouse use. The easterly gate off of Arrow Highway was installed by a previous owner without permits.

Mr. Patel expressed concerns about overhang onto Arrow Highway at easterly gate and need for an ADA path of travel on property.

Mr. Iman stated that the gates would be open only during business hours. The two gated driveways are for truck traffic.

Mr. Coleman indicated that easterly gate should be moved back to provide a minimum of 75 feet behind curb so that a big rig truck could pull completely off road.

The Board expressed desire for substantial landscaping along the property lines and parking areas. It was suggested that the 4' planters be removed and a continuous planter with shade trees be considered for parking lot. Substantial landscaping should be present at the front of the property on Arrow Highway as well. Mr. Kelly stated that they could remove the 4' planters and use trees instead along the new building wall. Mr. Coleman stated that he would not recommend removing landscaping on south property line as the rear of the building will be viewed from Metrolink commuter train. He added that he would support a block wall instead of wrought iron, but would recommend trees be planted at wall as well.

The Board requested that applicant provide several landscape design alternatives for the side property lines for review at a future DPRB meeting.

Discussion concluded.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:34 a.m. to the meeting of October 11, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.