

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
July 26, 2012 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

*Emmett Badar, City Council  
Dan Coleman, Director of Development Services  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large*

**ABSENT**

*Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works*

**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 City Council Conference Room.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

June 14, 2012 and June 28, 2012

**MOTION:** Dan Coleman moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the June 14, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Patel absent, Badar abstain).

Mr. Sorcinelli stated he had three corrections to the June 28, 2012 minutes, on page 5, his second comment at the top of the page should omit the word corridor and read "on a scenic corridor if plan to underground services." Next correction is the third comment on Page 5 should read "Mr. Sorcinelli stated that they should not have to get rid of 2 poles if all other poles remain. We need to look at the impact of the other property developments along the street." The third correction is on page 7; his first comment should omit the words purified water and read "treated by use of a clarifier."

**MOTION:** Jim Schoonover moved, seconded by Dan Coleman to approve the June 28, 2012 minutes as amended. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Patel absent, Dilley abstain).

**Tree Permit No. 11-33**

A request to approve the removal of 17 mature trees located on the vacant parcel at 2057 Paseo Lucinda.

APN: 8448-038-045

Zone: Specific Plan No. 11

Alex Bayas, applicant, was present.  
Scott FyFe, 1614 Calle Cristina, was present.  
Mark Mitchell, 2069 Paseo Lucinda, was present.

Associate Planner Rojas explained that the applicant removed 17 trees from the vacant lot without a tree removal permit because he felt the trees were rotting away and not taken care of correctly by the previous owner. The majority of trees were near a potential residence; however, the property owner does not intend to propose construction now. The majority of the trees were California Walnut and a few California Ash trees. The applicant is proposing to replace with 16 trees (seven (7) California Ash and nine (9) California Walnut) that are a minimum 24" box trees. The location of the trees will be at the north portion of the lot where no construction is proposed for the future. There are 33 remaining trees on-site. Per SDMC 18.162.130B, the property owner is required to replace the trees at a 4:1 ratio, which would require 68 replacement trees, totaling 101 trees. Staff has recommended a minimum of a 1:1 ratio totaling 50, including the 33 existing trees plus the 17 replacement trees. Since the parcel is vacant, the applicant is not proposing to install irrigation and Staff is concerned it can hinder the growth of the trees. The Code Section indicates that a development permit should be issued for any lot that one or more trees have been removed unless the owner has replaced each tree, this is applied when there is construction occurring onsite. Another option would be to require the applicant to plant a portion of the trees on the slope with irrigation and Staff would make note in the computer system that this parcel is required to plant seven (7) more trees when construction occurs. This will allow the applicant to have flexibility to have trees planted at the top of the slope when the house is built and ensure the trees are planted throughout the site. Staff recommends approval and requires the applicant to plant 10 single trunk 24" box trees with irrigation within 60 days of approval and the remaining 7 trees during the construction of the residence. She added that the applicant is not in support of replacing the trees right now; however, would like to replace the trees when the house is built.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked how the applicant will propose irrigation for the first proposal.

Associate Planner Rojas directed the question to Building Official Eric Beilstein.

Mr. Beilstein responded that in order to have access to water, they need an above ground system out of a PVC pipe, whichever is best for the tree.

Mr. Michaelis asked if the applicant could plant trees offsite as well.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that the ordinance permits it; however, other residents would want their replacement trees to be offsite on City property versus replacing on their own property.

Alex Bayas, applicant, explained that it has been a slow progression for the house but as for the replacement trees; we are trying to go through the cost of the house and conduct soils reports.

Mr. Coleman asked if the house has been designed.

Mr. Bayas replied that he has not found the design he is looking for but added it will be two-story.

Mr. Coleman commented that it is important to know the footprint of the house.

Scott FyFe, resident at 1614 Calle Cristina, explained he would like to see the vacant lot restored to its original state with the mature trees. He explained it is an eyesore and other neighbors have inquired about the current status and have asked why it appears so bare. He recommended the replacement of trees be equal to that of the removal.

Mark Mitchell, resident of 2069 Paseo Lucinda, stated that his understanding of the situation is that the trees have been removed in preparation for future construction of a new home.

Mr. Coleman stated that the City prefers having trees removed after the house is approved; unfortunately, it did not happen that way. The decision is based on the fact that 17 trees were removed, the question is at what ratio is required and when will they be replaced. He explained he visited the site and understands the loss of the trees especially near Paseo Lucinda which changes the view scape. He added that anything replanted in that area might then change especially when grading and driveway construction, etc. occurs.

Mr. Michaelis stated that the purpose of the discussion is if the front of the property will have a front yard and the struggle is not knowing when the home will be built. In the meantime, there are no trees in the front yard and there needs to be landscaping and the 17 trees should be planted in the areas where they were removed. He explained that if the house is built in 5 or more years, Staff needs to consider that the trees could be replanted and included in the future house footprint.

Mr. Coleman agreed. He added that since the date of the home being built is uncertain, it is best to replace the trees now. He explained that they can be planted where they were removed and if the home is built, they can be removed again and replanted at a different location.

Mr. Dilley pointed out that the conditions of approval call for Ash and Walnut trees and asked if they are slow growing trees.

Associate Planner Rojas responded yes.

Mr. Schoonover agreed with the neighbor's comments that the property looks bare without the trees and would like to see the 17 trees back on the property whether they have to be relocated and replanted once the house is built.

Mr. Dilley asked if it would be possible to plant 24" box trees that grow faster and the rest slow growing trees that are a smaller box size.

Associate Planner Rojas responded, per the Municipal Code, the minimum size is 24" inch box for replacement trees, thus the replacement trees should be that size.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that he understands the neighbors concern and agreed that the trees should be replanted at the same locations. He added that per the Ordinance, the replacement tree count should be more than the initial amount removed. He recommended increasing the number of replacement trees and plant them in the front area and recommended fruit trees or ornamental trees.

Associate Planner Rojas responded that per the Municipal Code fruit or ornamental trees are not suitable replacement trees.

Mr. Coleman commented that the trees were removed on the upper part of the lot.

Mr. Beilstein stated that the penalty should be that the applicant plant 17 trees now and the landscape plans depict the additional 17 trees that are to be planted when the house is built.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if the applicant could consider planting the trees at the edge of the property. This would help provide for future screening; however, it may not solve the immediate problem. The 17 trees should be replaced now with additional 17 replacement trees when the house plans are submitted. He asked if the landscape plan will incorporate the size and species or will they be unidentified.

Associate Planner Rojas stated that the applicant will include on the landscape plans, the size and species.

Mr. Coleman responded it can be added as a condition that the Planner will determine the size and species.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked the neighbors if the applicant plants the side yard, will assist in the screening.

Mr. FyFe responded yes and will block the view.

**MOTION:** Moved by Dan Coleman, second by John Sorcinelli, to approve, add and amend Condition No. 7 to specify that 17 trees be planted within 60 days of today's approval and an additional 17 trees be planted at the time of the development of the house with size and species to be determined by Staff as part of the approved landscape plan.

Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Patel Absent)

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 a.m. to the meeting of August 9, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.

---

Jim Schoonover, Chairman  
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

---

Jessica Mejia  
Development Plan Review Board  
Departmental Assistant

Approved: August 23, 2012