

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

**October 11, 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
John Sorcinelli (arrived at 8:35 A.M.)*

ABSENT

Curtis Morris

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:30 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 27, 2007. Motion carried 5.0.2.0. (Sorcinelli and Morris absent)

HEARING ITEMS

DPRB Case No. 07-26

Continued from September 27, 2007. Request to remove seven (7) Canary Island Pine trees and four (4) Ficus trees already removed without permit located at 2411 Via Mariposa. APN: 8448-026-028. Zone: SF-15,000.

Timothy Garcia, property owner, was present. Mr. Garcia provided the Board with additional photos of his property showing view of Mr. Maksoudian's property from his property before and after trees were removed.

Angelo Labi, 2410 Via Mariposa, and Robert Acosta, 2423 Via Mariposa, were present in support of Mr. Garcia's proposed tree replacement plan.

Sid Maksoudian, 1156 Camino Del Sur, was present. Mr. Maksoudian stated that he objected to the tree removal which created a buffer and privacy between the properties.

Planning Associate Espinoza stated that this request was before the Board again in order to allow proper noticing of the adjacent neighbors. He reviewed timeline of complaints and action in regards to trees removed without permit. Applicant is requesting that the Board consider a reduced tree replacement ratio. Mr. Espinoza stated that the six trees required of Tree Permit No. 07-23, plus the six additional trees pursuant to Tree Permit No. 07-26 are adequate for the 12,580 s.f. lot therefore, a reduced replacement ratio is appropriate.

City Manager Michaelis explained City Council direction as it relates to penalties for unpermitted tree removal that led to changes in the Tree Preservation Ordinance, Chapter 18.162. He added that the ordinance does not provide for adjacent property screening or privacy.

In response to Mr. Coleman, Mr. Garcia stated that he would not be willing change proposed replacement fruit tree species in the northeast corner of his property because he felt that the ruby grapefruit tree would adequately screen Mr. Maksoudian's property.

In response to Mr. Maksoudian, Mr. Coleman stated that normally when considering a request to remove a tree an arborist report may be required to evaluate the health and condition of the tree; however, that in this situation an arborist report is moot because the trees have already been removed. He said that the issue before the DPRB today is what is the appropriate replacement for the removed trees? He indicated that Sunset Western Garden book describes grapefruit trees as reaching a mature height of 25 feet, the same as the trees which were removed. He also stated that the proposed Camphor tree in front yard is appropriate for location and space, and will reach a mature height of 50 feet with an even larger canopy spread. He noted that the front yard planting area measures approximately 50 feet in width.

Mr. Garcia stated that his only concern with the camphor tree was interference with utility lines and that he was working with utility companies on best placement.

Mr. Coleman also clarified earlier statements made about Tree Ordinance. The Tree Ordinance was amended in December 2006 and became effective in January 2007, not April as had been previously mentioned. In response to the DPRB, he indicated that fruit trees planted as replacement trees as a condition of a tree permit cannot be removed and would enjoy the same protection as any non-fruit replacement trees. He also noted that when trees are removed without a permit, the ordinance requires a minimum 24 inch box size for replacement.

MOTION: Dan Coleman moved, second by Krishna Patel to approve reduced replacement ratio of six (6) trees as adequate for the 12,580 s.f. lot, with requirement of 24" box size trees.

Motion carried 6.0.1.0. (Morris absent.)

City Manager Michaelis expressed concerns with availability of 24" box fruit trees. Mr. Coleman suggested that the applicant contact wholesale nurseries. He also stated that selection availability is out of our control and dependent on market and season.

DPRB Case No. 07-16

Continued from August 9, 2007. Request to construct an 8,956 s.f. gymnasium addition to an existing church facility at Valley Christian Center located at 1404 West Gladstone Avenue. APN: 8383-001-030. Zone: SF-7500.

Planning Manager Hensley stated that applicant has addressed issue of simulated wood treatment and board and batten that was brought up at the last meeting. The material will carry around all four sides. Parking lot meets code requirements. Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit No. 07-03 at its September 5, 2007 meeting.

Changes in Conditions of Approval:

"Landscape", add Condition No. 25 as follows:

The Developer shall submit a wall plan for review and approval by the Planning Department, prior to the issuance of building permits. If an existing block wall is not present, a new decorative block wall shall be constructed on all property lines. The developer is responsible for contacting all property owners to obtain approval to remove and replace the existing fences. Proof of property owner approval shall be provided by the developer to the Planning Division. In the case that property owners do not agree to new wall, a wall shall be located entirely on the development property.

"Engineering Division", revision to Condition No. 37, 40 & 41 as follows:

40. For projects which disturb soil during wet season, applicant must submit a signed certification statement declaring that contractor will comply with minimum Best Management Practices (BMPs) required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and also submit a Local Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan/Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan.
41. The developer shall provide full street improvements on all streets within the limits of the development. Improvements to include curbs and gutters, sidewalks, medians, and paving according to City standards, as shown in the following table (plans shall also be submitted to the City of Glendora for any necessary action).

Mr. Patel stated that applicant must connect on site drainage system to an existing public storm drain. Add to Condition No. 37 that it will be required that on site system must be connected to public system drain.

Mr. Sorcinelli suggested that walkway at north edge of main parking lot be widened.

Motion: Krishna Patel moved, second by John Sorcinelli to approve subject to standard conditions and amendments to conditions 37, 40 & 41.

Motion carried 6.0.1.0. (Morris absent.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m. to the meeting of October 25, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.