DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
September 13, 2012 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT

Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Ken Duran, Assistant City Manager
Curtis Morris, Mayor (Arrived at 8:40 a.m. and Departed at 10:44 a.m.)
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Schoonover called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:36 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Scott Dilley moved, seconded by Jim Schoonover to approve the August 23, 2012 minutes. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Badar absent, Duran abstain).

Tree Permit No. 12-34

A request to remove thirty-five (35) trees from the Tiburon Puddingstone HOA common area.

Zone: Single-Family 10,000

Mary Adams and Emily Adams, residents of 624 Briarwood Lane, were present.
Joshua Behnke, resident of 739 Smokewood Lane, was present.
Anita Boschoff, resident of 737 Smokewood Ln, was present.
Sally Deveze, resident of 648 Cottonwood Ln, was present.
Ron Edwards on behalf of Brooker Associates, was present.
Shirley Goyen, resident of 651 Cottonwood Ln, was present.
Terry Lee, resident of 641 Cottonwood Lane, was present.
Venkata S Nayani, resident of 716 Briarwood Ln, was present.
Beth Taylor, Tiburon Puddingstone Property Manager, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the applicant is requesting to remove thirty-five trees from the common area of the condominium development, the trees are as follows:

- One (1) Mimosa
- One (1) Alder
- One (1) Tulip
- One (1) Oak
- Three (3) Eucalyptus
- Five (5) Liquidambar
- Twenty-three (23) Pine

The applicant is requesting that the Board approve a zero tree replacement requirement under Code Section 18.162.060.A.3. Staff conducted an on-site inspection of the trees proposed for removal and Staff confirmed that the following 23 trees are within the required findings for removal: Tree No's: 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34 & 35. Staff recommends the following 12 trees be denied:

- Tree No. 2 → 701 Briarwood – Pine. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the patio area and tree appears to be in good health.
- Tree No. 3 → 707 Briarwood – Tulip Tree. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the concrete subfloor and the tree appears to be in good health.
- Tree No. 7 → 317 Beechwood – Pine. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the structure and the tree appears to be in good health.
- Tree No. 12 → 670 Redwood – Eucalyptus. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the structure and the tree appears to be in good health.
- Tree No. 13 → 669 Driftwood – Eucalyptus. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the structure and the tree appears to be in good health.
- Tree No. 17, 19, 20 & 22 → 651 Cottonwood – Pine. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the structure and the trees appear to be in good health.
- Tree No. 26 & 27 → 614 Briarwood – Pine. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the structure and the trees appear to be in good health.
- Tree No. 33 → 622 Briarwood – Pine. The applicant could not provide Staff with any proof of damage to the structure and the tree appears to be in good health.

Associate Planner Espinoza added that he inspected the site with the HOA Management Company. As a result, it was determined that 23 of the 35 were appropriate for removal, for either being too close to a building, diseased, causing damage to the sidewalk or was good forestry practice. The additional 12 trees make up the 35 trees requested for removal which Staff could not find reason to remove since no visible damage exists. The HOA indicated some tree removals were a proactive measure for potential future damage the trees may cause. Staff recommends that the HOA replace with 10 (ten) 15-gallon size trees with Staff's approval for location and species.

* * * * * * * * *

Curt Morris arrived at 8:40 a.m.

* * * * * * * * *

Associate Planner Espinoza provided the Board with two emails received from residents whom opposed the removal. One resident resides at 670 Redwood Lane and the other at 657 Driftwood Lane. He noted that a few other residents stopped by the counter to ask questions about the project.

Mr. Stevens asked what arborist accompanied Staff on the onsite inspection.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the arborist belongs to Brooker Associates, Inc. and serves as the landscape contractor as well. He explained that Ron Edwards was present during the walkthrough but the arborist was not; however, she put together the report based on previous walkthroughs of the property.

Mr. Stevens asked if after the walkthrough of the site and the determination of Staff to preserve several trees, did the HOA still wanted to remove 35 trees.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded yes and added that the HOA would still like to remove the 35 trees. He noted that they want to be proactive and remove trees before they cause future damage.

Mr. Stevens asked how many total trees are on the entire property.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied 400 plus trees, not including the open areas.

Mr. Schoonover commented that this is not the first time Staff has seen Tiburon HOA remove trees and asked if in the past, the HOA was required to replace trees at a 2:1 ratio.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that Staff has required replacement trees and added that the Code has been amended to reduce the replacement ratio from 2:1 to be a case by case or each site individually.

Mr. Morris commented that in the past, he has received many emails regarding trees being removed in a HOA community; however, they were decisions based on the HOA and not the approval of the residents.

Beth Taylor, Tiburon Puddingstone Property Manager, stated that the trees are being approved due to the damage it is causing on various property locations. The HOA does not want to remove the trees unnecessarily; however, residents are the ones filing the complaints of broken sidewalks, damaged patio slabs, etc.

Mr. Duran asked if all the trees being denied for removal are currently showing visible property damage.

Ms. Taylor replied yes and added that at 701 Briarwood Ln the tree is causing damage to the slabs. The HOA has spent around $17,000 on replacing sidewalks and added it continues to be an ongoing expense.

Mr. Sorcinelli recommended updating the CC&R's and making those repairs the homeowner's responsibility.

Ms. Taylor stated that they have thought of updating the CC&R's and will eventually amend them.

Mary Adams, resident of 624 Briarwood Lane, stated that she purchased the home mainly for the decorative landscaping and large trees. She is aware that during wind storms they may be blown down; however, removing Tree No. 24 is not the best solution. She added that she does not agree with all the tree removals and added her concern with the shade being lost on her property and the increase of her air conditioning bill.

Emily Adams, resident of 624 Briarwood Lane, recommended the replanting of trees because it adds value to the property and provides shade.

Mary Adams emphasized that a tree may fall onto her home; however, she is willing to take that risk.

Mr. Dilley asked if Tree No. 24 is removed, will there be a replacement tree.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded yes and added that the request for removal was based on the tree bending. The HOA's concern was, if it falls, the size and mass of the tree could cause a lot of damage.

Ron Edwards on behalf of Brooker Associates stated that another residence had a tree fall onto their property and it just missed the house.

Terry Lee, resident of 641 Cottonwood Lane, stated that the HOA has the responsibility to maintain: cracked foundations, patio slabs, etc. During the recent rain storms, a tree fell on a car; three fell on a building and one on a retaining wall. There have been other removal requests from residents that have been denied and added that the decision for tree removals are not taken lightly.

Mr. Edwards indicated that Tree No. 24 was built too close to the home and is starting to uproot.

Mr. Stevens asked what type of maintenance has been done to Tree No. 24 and added he understands that it is leaning due to the prevailing winds.

Mr. Edwards replied that there has been a cycle for tree maintenance, they have been thinned out.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Pine trees could be thinned; however, the tree appears to have dead branches that should have been trimmed. There could never be a perfect science to ensure a tree will not fall down; however, exercising good prudence is necessary. He stated that he does not support the removal of the 35 trees at this time and agrees with Staff's decision with a few exceptions. More of an effort could be done to preserve Tree No. 24. He noted that it is not causing any current damage and if trimmed, it can reduce the weight. He emphasized all trees that show evidence of damage should be trimmed.

Mr. Schoonover asked if a survey was conducted of the entire development based on the complaints of the residents.

Mr. Edwards responded that the HOA Board determined which trees were causing or will cause problems and were surveyed to be located at the Southern half of the HOA property. He noted that many applications have come through based on resident's requests for tree removals.

Mr. Lee indicated that there are problems in the entire complex and there is no particular area.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about Tree No. 14 which is located by the wood deck.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that the space where the Oak tree is growing is not large enough to fully grow and added that the Oak tree is touching the building.

Mr. Stevens inquired about Tree No. 33 and asked if Staff is recommending for to be preserved because it is causing damage from the root system.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that there was no visible damage.

Mr. Edwards indicated that they were being proactive with many of the tree removal requests. He noted that near Tree No. 33, the garage flooring was replaced due to damage that was caused.

Joshua Behnke, resident of 739 Smokewood Lane, stated that Tree No. 1 is in front of his home which was a deciding factor when purchasing the property. He indicated that the tree screens his home and provides privacy from those entering into the area. He also expressed his concern with an increase in the electricity bill if the shade is lost when the tree is removed. He emphasized his recommendation for the tree to be preserved.

Shirley Goyen, resident of 651 Cottonwood Ln, stated that she is in attendance today to verify that the trees near her property are being removed since the tree branches are coming over onto the property and causing damage to her backyard.

Mr. Stevens replied that Staff is recommending Tree No's. 17, 19, 20 and 22 not be removed and Tree No's. 18, 21 and 23 are removed.

Associate Planner Espinoza explained that he recommended those specific trees not be removed due to good forestry practice but instead can be thinned out and retained.

MOTION: Moved by Larry Stevens, second by Curtis Morris, to approve with two exceptions: 1) the HOA retain Tree(s) No. 1 and No. 24 in addition to the 12 trees recommended by Staff, making the total denied trees 14 and 21 trees approved for removal 2) require eight (8) 15-gallon replacement trees.

Motion carried 7-0

Mr. Stevens recommended that the HOA keep a close eye on Tree No. 24 and trim to minimize the risk of future damage.

Associate Planner Espinoza recommended that the HOA not permit Ficus Trees to be planted into the ground in patio areas.

Mr. Stevens recommended to the HOA that they hold meetings with their residents prior to the DPRB meeting, especially for such a large tree removal request.

Mr. Duran added that the HOA can also provide copies of the minutes from the meeting to avoid the lengthy discussion at the DPRB meetings.

Mr. Stevens stated that he noticed that many of the tree removals were close in proximity and have grown out of their original planted size.

Mr. Morris recommended using a root barrier along the curb line.

DPRB Case No. 12-07

A request to construct a 34,862 sq. ft. enclosed RV storage facility consisting of eight structures on a 4.39 acre site located on the south west corner of Baseline Road and San Dimas Canyon Road (APN's: 8661-016-004, 030, 031 & 032).

Associated Cases: Conditional Use Permit 12-05, Modification of Development Standards 12-01 and Lot Combination 12-01

APN's: 8661-016-004, 030, 031 & 032

Zone: Light Agricultural (AL)

Ariel L Valli, of Valli Architectural Group, was present.
Bud Wheeler, was present.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the concept, issues and applications for this project have been in the works over the past few years. The property is zoned Light Agriculture which allows for RV storage with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and also requires the Modification to the Development Standards that can be done in conjunction with the CUP that will be heard at Planning Commission. He indicated that the applicant is proposing to construct a 94,862 sq. ft. enclosed RV storage facility consisting of eight buildings. The project will front Baseline Road and will have one main entrance 160 feet west of San Dimas Canyon Road. The second entrance will be used for emergency purposes only. Most of the buildings are sited around the perimeter and serve as a screen wall. A new six-foot high decorative block wall will be installed. The development meets setback requirements. The applicant is providing several parking areas within the site: at the front entrance, south of the water pump substation, between buildings B & C and an area for temporary parking of RV's. The applicant will be required to provide full street improvements along Baseline Road as well as underground all existing utility lines except for the 66 and 12 KV lines.

Mr. Morris asked if this item was previously discussed for only outdoor storage and not an RV storage facility.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that the Code does not specify indoor or outdoor storage.

Mr. Stevens indicated it can be interpreted as outdoor storage since it is in the Agricultural Zone. He noted the item needs a CUP to evaluate if it is the most appropriate use for the site.

Associate Planner Espinoza continued with his staff report. He indicated that the buildings are designed in semi-Craftsman architecture. All the building walls facing the street have accented decorative materials such as a horizontal Hardie-Board siding in a board and batten pattern stone veneer and stucco. The roofs are metal ribbed at a ½:12 pitch. The applicant added a number of gable roofs on the building. He also noted that there will be a caretaker unit facing Baseline that will be ½ office and ½ caretaker unit.

He added that there are issues with the project. There are two storefront windows that are designed in the standard design, Staff recommends that the two window panes be redesigned to match all the other windows within the development and noted that the doors for the units will roll up.

He indicated that the applicant is proposing Eastern Redbud Trees along the west property line adjacent to the residences. Staff recommends they revise the landscape plan to show larger specimen

trees to match those proposed along Baseline and San Dimas Canyon Road in order to screen the RV storage buildings. He indicated that this item was heard by the Environmental Committee for initial study review and some issues came up including redoing the drainage system and landscaping to screen the building. The applicant is proposing either a wall sign and/or one monument sign for the site. The signs may be approved by the Director of Development Services at a later date.

Mr. Morris inquired if dump stations will be used on this property.

Bud Wheeler, applicant, replied that they will look at other RV storage facilities that have them and decide but currently they do not.

Mr. Stevens stated that there is a concern that the storm drain facility will be used inappropriately. He noted that having a dump station onsite is a great convenience.

Mr. Patel asked if Building D is adjacent to the freeway right-of-way and asked, how the back of the property is maintained.

Ariel L Valli, applicant, responded that Cal Trans will grant them access so they can maintain the building.

Mr. Stevens asked if the fence will be taken down.

Mr. Valli replied that if Cal Trans is ok with it, then they can take it down; however, it is a lengthy process.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that requiring approval from Cal Trans, Metropolitan Water District and Fire Department is necessary prior to the issuance of the building permits.

Mr. Dilley inquired about the slopes where the homes are located.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that there is a 4 ft. difference and tiers down to drain.

Mr. Duran asked about the setbacks.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded there is a 12 ft. setback on the west property line.

Mr. Schoonover asked if there will be a double fence that will come down on the west property line.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that a retaining wall will be required with a fence above. Staff will try to avoid a double fence.

Mr. Morris stated that landscaping is critical and asked how it will be maintained along the west property line.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated the landscaping will be maintained by the applicant and added they are looking at adding trees with no ground cover.

Mr. Valli stated that you cannot see the landscaping at ground level and can only see the tops of the trees.

Mr. Stevens expressed his concern with existing conditions. He noted that Staff will not allow for a double wall situation and noted that they need to build a retaining wall to do a wall to replace the existing wall. The two wall conditions are not acceptable. The grading needs to be minimized at the retaining wall versus building up.

Mr. Morris asked about the pipe retention.

Mr. Patel responded that there is pipe retention on the North/South of the property; however, the increase of the pipe size needs to be within the 12 ft. setback.

Mr. Stevens stated that a percentage of water drains to the Cal Trans property. He added that before the applicant returns to the Board, a preliminary hydrology and drainage design needs to be submitted.

Mr. Morris stated that much of the water at surface needs to be used.

Mr. Patel stated the applicant needs to use pipes and retention.

Mr. Stevens stated that Costco did a lot of undergrounding in their parking lots which have many tanks and pipes. The overall grade needs to be looked at. The setbacks for the property are 20 ft., 12 ft. and 10 ft.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the side yard setbacks seem to be between 10 – 12 ft. and added that it may need to be 25 ft. He added that there are different ways to interpret the front yard.

Mr. Stevens added that setbacks can be interpreted differently.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that he has come across projects requiring a 25 ft. setback on the side of the property and added that for this project, they could remove 3 storage units. The improvements to those living adjacent to the property can be substantial.

Mr. Valli stated that they are purposely putting smaller units on the property lines to have lower heights. The Planning Department prefers a larger setback. He added that all the details have not been worked out on the grading plan but stated that they will accommodate the drainage and water retention.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked how tall is Building D and asked if the elevations are drawn to scale.

Mr. Valli responded 20 ft. and added they are drawn to scale. He stated that Building E is greater than 12 ft. in height. The intermediate roofs progress in height from 12 ft. to 14 ft. to 20 ft.

Mr. Stevens asked about the elevation height of Building C.

Mr. Valli responded 21.3 ft.

Mr. Stevens asked what the smaller corner storage units will be used for.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded that it will be used for storing RV accessories, including: coolers, chairs, bikes, etc. and will not allow for self-storage only.

Mr. Schoonover pointed out there are 163 RV spaces and 40 extra storage units.

Mr. Valli stated that the smaller units are 12 by 12 designated for items such as for recreational activities. There are bigger spaces that will accommodate vehicles but are only available to RV renters.

Mr. Duran inquired about the parking on the property.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied that there are 4 parking spots in front of the gate areas, 6 parallel and 5 spaces large enough to accommodate storage. The condition of all parking spaces is to not allow overnight parking. The applicant is asking for a modification of the lot coverage to allow 30 %, they are currently at 49%. Additional parking spaces can be provided if needed.

Mr. Stevens stated that the parking concern will be addressed at Planning Commission. There may be a rational basis for personal storage. The size of the property would allow for additional parking, Staff would like to see more evidentiary support.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that for an accessory storage facility, there is no reason to have a high roof and advised it could be dropped down. He questioned the way RV's would reverse and maneuver out of the unit. He noted that the reversing seems to be a tight maneuver and those at the corner were changed to an accessory unit, it will be better off.

Mr. Morris pointed out that the rental spaces are 20 ft. wide.

Mr. Sorcinelli commented that it is a lot of space for RV.

Mr. Valli stated that their Staff will never rent out a space to someone whose RV is too large and does not have enough space to reverse out comfortably.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that sometimes a landscape buffer is included and noted that the last units are wider and have 13 ft. wide doors and are easy to reverse out of.

Mr. Patel stated that part of the requirements will be street improvements: lights, trees and landscaping. He pointed out the way it is on the Southside, 10 ft. wide landscape planter with Pine trees, and added that a 10 ft. parkway will be included to offset the existing sidewalk to be along the curb and the rest of the landscaping will allow for 5 ft. additional landscaping giving a 25 ft. setback.

Mr. Sorcinelli explained there could be an issue with the two units at back near the gate.

Associate Planner Espinoza stated that the exit at back is for emergency purposes only.

Mr. Stevens asked if the curb, gutter and right-of-way have been dedicated.

Associate Planner Espinoza replied yes.

Associate Planner Espinoza indicated that the landscaping area will be worked out with the applicant, Public Works and Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Valli stated that everything will be ADA accessible.

Mr. Patel pointed out that Condition No. 58 asks for improvements on San Dimas Canyon Road.

Associate Planner Espinoza added that the improvements will be for undergrounding some of the overhead utilities.

Mr. Valli stated that this commercial project will fit into the community. He confirmed that the interior functions will be screened from public view. He indicated that the they will redesign the store front entry to make it appear more residential.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant has done a project like this with the use of permeable paving.

Mr. Valli replied yes; however, the projects had smaller sites. He indicated that there are no opportunities to put pipes under the driveways but added that underwater tanks work better.

Mr. Stevens explained the issues with permeable paving; it is 100 % coverage to the surface area which is more volume of water to address. The asphalt has a tendency to create heat-sink affect that create hot spots.

Mr. Wheeler commented the use of concrete is ideal.

Mr. Stevens stated that for a business plan, the numbers of spaces have to be accessed. He asked if there is an area for washing vehicles and a dump station.

Mr. Wheeler responded that there is no area to wash the vehicles and added that there is a dump station in the rancho location but they are considering one for this location.

Mr. Stevens asked there is a designated trash area.

Mr. Wheeler replied yes and noted it will not be used for dumping of large debris.

Mr. Stevens asked if at the last meeting with the neighbors, was this the final plan seen or were there changes after.

Mr. Wheeler replied yes and noted that there was a discussion of the back wall whether they want an architectural element and the majority of the neighbors preferred it to be screened.

Mr. Morris asked what the reaction was from the neighbors to the west of the property.

Mr. Wheeler responded that they did not receive much feedback. He added that they are not opposed to doing a block wall.

Mr. Morris stated that the idea of giving an easement is not a bad idea; and it also solves the issue of who would maintain the west property line.

Mr. Stevens stated that it can be a requirement to have a block wall. He noted that the residents will be better off with a 10 ft. high building on the property line. He added that the problem that is raised is if it will have to be 12 ft. 6 inches which would require a 30 inch parapet.

Mr. Valli asked if noncombustible material is used, then is there a need for a 30 inch parapet; however, he added that they will verify with the Building and Safety Division.

Mr. Stevens replied that if Staff pushes for no landscaping, then the residences would need to do a Lot Line Adjustment or add an easement with landscaping. The rear building wall should be block versus metal. The only way around the setback is with the Modification of Development Standards. Staff will need to look at this more closely before going forward.

Mr. Duran asked if the changes can be addressed through a code amendment.

Mr. Stevens replied that the applicant is currently going through a Modification of Development Standards which will be done with the Conditional Use Permit. There is a 10 ft. setback along San Dimas Canyon Rd that is not good enough. A 20 ft. setback is ideal but everything would need to be shifted. He noted that he'd rather see no setback for the nearby neighbors but a 15 ft. setback at street frontage.

Mr. Morris indicated that because of the height, there needs to be a compromise for the neighbors.

Mr. Stevens stated that the neighbors should understand their options and they may not want additional property.

Mr. Morris stated a Lot Line Adjustment can be done to give them a larger backyard.

Mr. Stevens stated that having a no man's land is not a good approach; it needs to be looked at again.

Mr. Morris excused himself from the meeting at 10:44 a.m.

Mr. Stevens pointed out that there have been recent circumstances with drainage into the freeway and the difficulty of that process. He noted that the encroachment permits from Cal Trans may be required for this project.

Mr. Schoonover asked about the electronic gate and the distance from the curb.

Associate Planner Espinoza responded 60 ft. distance to curb.

Mr. Stevens asked if the gate uses a remote or punch code to enter and asked if each unit has an individual alarm system.

Mr. Wheeler responded that a swipe or key pad can be used which will be set up to each unit's individual alarm system.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked about the Manager's building unit. He noted that behind the building appears to have a parapet which presents a visual issue and asked why it is not freestanding.

Associate Planner Espinoza recommended a double gable roof.

Mr. Stevens stated that there are various options; however, it needs to be looked at as an entirety.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that by putting gable roofs, it will appear like any other residence on the street.

Mr. Valli explained that the design and transitions can be difficult.

Mr. Stevens asked how many square feet is the caretaker unit.

Mr. Valli responded 1,978 sq. ft.

Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant needs to work on many issues; however, it will come back to DPRB before the Planning Commission (PC) review. If the setback is reduced, then it needs to be the

decision from PC. The dump station also needs to be addressed. Staff will work on the Resolution prior to being heard at PC.

MOTION: Moved by Larry Stevens, second by Jim Schoonover to continue the item to a date uncertain for DPRB review in order to address several issues: caretaker layout arrangement, dump station, treatment of corner building and setbacks.

Motion carried 6-0-1-0 (Morris absent)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 a.m. to the meeting of September 27, 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: November 8, 2012