

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
December 20, 2012 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

*Emmett Badar, City Council
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Ken Duran, Assistant City Manager
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Jim Schoonover, Planning Commission
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development*

ABSENT

John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large

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 City Council Conference Room.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development, Larry Stevens, stated that the items will be heard out of sequence. Items 2 (Precise Plan No. 12-03) and Item 5 (Tree Removal Permit No. 12-48) will be discussed jointly. He added that Precise Plan No. 12-02, architectural guidelines has no staff report but will be presented verbally.

Precise Plan No. 12-03

A request to approve conceptual grading plans for Tentative Tract 70583 (Brasada).

Zone: Specific Plan No. 25

Saliba Boutros, resident of 210 Prairie Dr., was present.
James O'Brien, resident of 110 Maverick Dr., was present.
Gil Gonzales, resident, was present.
Nagy Khattar, resident of 132 Prairie Dr., was present.
Roger A and Rebecca A Pike, residents of 1412 N Cataract Ave, were present.
Kim Scott, developer, was present.
Stan Stringfellow, applicant, was present.
James Rowe, resident of 1353 N Shirlmar Ave, was present.

Tree Removal Permit No. 12-48

A request to remove 468 mature trees in preparation for grading for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

Zone: Specific Plan No. 25

Mr. Stevens stated that these items need to go through the Precise Plan process because it is a requirement of Specific Plan No. 25. In late 2010, the tract map was approved to allow the development of 61 lots and with that, there were amendments to zoning requirements. Also, the EIR analyzed the impacts associated to the project and development agreement, which will keep in place certain fees and regulations and gives additional time to move forward to record the maps. This is one of the entitlement components for a future residential project broken into five separate applications. He noted that each item will be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council before the final approval. He mentioned his discussion will be focused on the grading and tree removal and added he will not discuss mitigation measures since it has been previously discussed. He stated that the engineering details have evolved and there have been some changes on how grading would be done on the property. He added that the pad locations, sizes and street locations are in generally the same condition but adjustments were made due to soil conditions and outside agency regulations.

Mr. Stevens noted the changes that have occurred include an increase in quantity of the grading. The original approval was for a little more than one million cubic yards that was anticipated in the Environmental document; however, adjustments had almost doubled the quantity. There are two issues: adverse soil conditions which include remediation, and they need to comply with the intent of the tract map conditions of approval including maintenance of large drainage basins. The discussion about the basin height may trigger review by the State Dam Authority. The applicant and Engineer worked on changing to drainage system and detention basins. The basin has changed, previously 150 ft. away; however, the berm that supported it was over 50 ft. in height. They are trying to get away from the State Dam Authority safety requirements. The basin shifted downward and is closer the residents on Dalepark and is lower in overall height, about 23 ft. The Board members referenced the grading plan exhibit and reviewed the 1st redline sheet which includes the cross section for revision to the drainage basin. The proximity of the berms may be a concern for the residents on Dalepark and needs to be discussed. Notices were sent for today's meetings to the residents on Dalepark in order for them to determine their level of comfort for the change. Staff believes the flat area behind Dalepark should be increased from 13 ft. to 25 ft. The berm will be required to be landscaped.

Mr. Stevens stated that the water tank has been moved to a higher location and a grading adjustment has been made. The intent was to adjust elevations for the water system and eliminate additional retaining walls. He noted that with all the changes made to the retaining walls, there is a reduction in the overall heights. There are shifts in Lots 27 and 49. The pad and lot sizes have been reduced, which makes an increase of the common area. Staff looked at each of these changes to determine if it would need to be reviewed as a formal tract map amendment and believed that since the street and pad elevations are the same, it will not need to be reviewed again. Overall, the changes are better and the project has improved.

Mr. Stevens pointed out and identified seven areas that need to be looked at which have been discussed with the applicant. The applicant provided a cross section to evaluate the difference between engineered and contour grading. Contour grading is a style that smooth's out the edges to make the end product appear natural. Engineered grading is grading done in a straight line and does not appear natural. He emphasized that contour grading is a requirement in the Specific Plan 25 Zone and Staff also recommends the Board vote to have the grading be contoured when the final grading plans are submitted. He noted several areas were more engineered graded and asked the applicant to look at contour grading more areas. The applicant provided plans with redlines to depict the contour grading.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Tree Removal permit was driven directly by the grading. He handed out a packet that depicts the trees and proposed species. The footprint of grading has changed a little. The number of trees to be removed is 468 trees. He added it seems like a lot to be removed; however, there are 3,900 trees on the property. There are a variety of trees including: Oak, Sycamore,

Eucalyptus and Pine. The trees are plotted on the map and are in an area where they are near grading. He noted the mitigation measures in the EIR which include requirements for raptor nests that are currently empty. Biologists have submitted letters to the City to remove those nests between November and March due to breeding season. He added that two eucalyptus trees have already been authorized for removal. Most trees are in good condition, by virtue of mitigation measures and the City, the applicant will replace with 15-gallon trees at a 2:1 ratio. The Board can determine if the size or ratio for replacement as long as it is consistent with mitigation measure. The applicant has requested a consideration to allow tree replacements to be located in the front yard setbacks of houses when developed. The applicant has requested to allow replacement trees to include the three trees to be planted in the front yard setback area which are two 36-inch box trees and one 24-inch box tree. He noted 180 trees will be replaced, 3 trees on the 61 lots and added since they are larger in size the applicant is requesting double credit for these trees. Staff thinks that a 2:1 replacement ratio may be more appropriate but the growth of the trees can take 10-15 years to develop. The applicant is requesting this because they have a lot of environmental mitigation due to State Fish and Game and are limited in locations. The applicant is now being told they cannot put trees into a lot of mitigation areas. Staff is ok with counting the three trees to be planted in the front yard setbacks but is not convinced they should be counted as six trees. The applicant also noted they may identify trees they want to relocate and do not know if there will be any; however, the preference is to wait to see if those trees have a chance of survival.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the residents on Dalepark were notified for the meeting today and if they will also be noticed be noticed for Planning Commission or City Council.

Mr. Stevens replied yes and noted that the description for the notices, outside of the agenda packet, were not that detailed.

Mr. Schoonover asked if the Dalepark residents seemed concerned.

Mr. Stevens responded that the applicant may want to consider having a neighborhood meeting to address their concerns. He added that there is technically no notice requirement for DPRB; however, as a matter of practice, the adjacent property owners were notified.

Mr. Duran asked what the height of the berm was on the previous plans.

Mr. Stevens responded over 50 ft. and about 150 ft. from the property line. He added that on the proposed plan, the berm backs up to the properties on Dalepark.

Mr. Duran asked if there will be a landscape buffer.

Mr. Stevens responded yes and added it will be on the berm itself.

Roger A Pike, resident of 1412 N Cataract Ave, inquired about the distance of the crest of the berm.

Mr. Stevens responded 20-25 ft. tall. Staff recommended it be 71 ft. away and the applicant proposed 59 ft.

Mr. Pike asked how it will affect their view on the property.

Mr. Stevens responded that some residents on Dalepark will lose some portion of their lower view.

Mr. Pike asked how this will be taken into consideration for the neighbors.

Mr. Stevens responded that Staff is looking at putting the berm farther back. He noted that if there is a concern, the Board can have the applicant draw additional exhibits.

Mr. Pike asked why the berms are so close to the houses and asked why they were moved farther south when there is room at the upper part of the basin.

Mr. Stevens responded they do not have the room in the basin. He stated they are trying to keep the overall height to less than 25 ft. He noted they will need to go through the State Dam Safety otherwise.

Mr. Patel inquired about the detention basin and asked if there is more depicted on the original map.

Dave Gilbertson, RKA Engineering Consultant, responded there are two or three other detention basins.

Mr. Stevens added they are mostly located on the upper portion of the property which was driven by changes in grading.

Mr. Patel asked if the basin capacity is the same.

Stan Stringfellow, applicant, responded that it has been reduced.

Mr. Stevens stated that all basins are intended to meet County standards and are would be maintained by the Flood Control District.

Mr. Patel asked if there is connectivity of the basins.

Mr. Stringfellow responded some basins are connected through pipes.

Kim Scott, developer, added that it is done for the purpose of the LA County Flood Control.

Mr. Gilbertson added it connects to the basin and outlets to the natural canyon.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that there are two drains at Shuler Canyon and Wildwood Canyon. He noted that they are occurring on site and currently flow naturally to a downstream inlet which will not allow an increase in the amount of flow which is why they are being detained on the side.

Nagy Khattar, resident of 132 Prairie Dr., asked if there will be any changes affecting Maverick Drive or street openings.

Mr. Stevens responded that there is no change affecting that area.

Mr. Scott pointed out the drainage on the site plan. He noted that in order to reduce environmental impacts; the basin has been moved down closer to the Dalepark properties. He agreed they should have a meeting with the residents on Dalepark.

Mr. Patel stated that the exhibit shows 10 ft. and the V-ditch 3 ft.

Mr. Scott stated that the plans have been updated to reflect the change.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that it is problematic to push the berm up; he noted that there is significant drainage that inundates the lower properties now. At the toe of the slope, there will be a fence but fencing has not been discussed along Dalepark. The basin design is much less impactful.

Gil Gonzalez, resident, asked if there is a debris basin or detention basin since structures are too small to retain water.

Mr. Stringfellow replied there is a debris basin and added they act as a small retention basin.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if a debris basin was being used to save money and asked why a retention basin isn't proposed.

Mr. Stringfellow replied there is a home where a wall was built, the drainage and easement that went into the golf course is limited to 93 CFS. He added that in the event of a 100 year storm, there could be 400 CFS and that will inundate. A series of retention basins were built for a limited time to reduce inundating the system.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if the downstream storm drain systems will be improved.

Mr. Stringfellow responded they do not have the authority since they are not public systems.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that the grading has been altered and the lot sizes reduced to make the retention basin bigger.

Mr. Stevens stated that some of the pads have been reduced, which has changed the lot size but increased the natural open space.

Mr. Gonzalez asked if it would change the intent of the Specific Plan No. 25 Zone.

Mr. Stevens responded it is mostly contour grading consistent with the intent of the map and Specific Plan No. 25.

James Rowe, resident of 1353 N Shirlmar Ave, inquired about the Equestrian trails.

Mr. Stevens responded that there is a trail requirement that calls for a connecting trail and noted there is an option to revise the trail. The tract map allows for that consideration to occur. The trails will go through the Equestrian Commission and maybe City Council.

Mr. Patel stated that the goal is to have the detention basin maintained by the County. He asked what would happen out of the seven basins if they can only maintain three.

Mr. Stringfellow replied he is working with the County and designing all basins per County.

Mr. Patel stated that he wants to verify that the basins are less visually impacting. He recommended the applicant do a profile with the current and previous proposal.

Mr. Scott stated that the LA County Flood Control do not want any trees on the maintenance easement.

Mr. Patel added it makes sense to move 25 ft. for added landscape.

Mr. Scott stated that it does not work hydraulically and reemphasized they need to meet with the Dalepark residents.

Mr. Gilbertson recommended moving it farther back.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that the only way to do this is to reduce the basins.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that there are options such as adjusting the basin and determining the volume.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that there has been six months of work and explained that due to the basin, the whole entry road had to be re-designed.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that they cannot make it deeper and noted that the depth of the basin triggers State Dam Authority review with limits imposed.

Mr. Scott noted that if it is dropped any lower, there are many variables involved. They are trying to reduce the impacts of the debris basins.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that they will review with RKA to limit the impact as much as possible.

Mr. Stevens stated that on the berm itself, the County does not allow landscaping.

Mr. Stringfellow discussed the contour grading and added that the reason behind the engineered slopes on map is that they are trying to reduce grading. He noted he is unsure of the number of retaining walls and noted they are remediating a landslide area. They need to mitigate for temporary impacts due to grading. They would like to reduce the amount of grading; however, some areas are difficult due to the proximity to property lines. He noted they are using soil nail walls which work similar to MSE walls and are strong as a structural wall. It is reasonable and cost effective.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that soil nail walls are treated with different textures and colors. He noted the plans do not depict this.

Mr. Stringfellow noted that they will mark the walls on the next set of drawings.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that a condition should be added to determine the color and texture of those walls.

Mr. Patel stated that he is in support of contour grading, it will enhance the project. He recommended that the applicant do as much contour grading as possible.

Mr. Stringfellow commented that he preferred engineered grading but will do contour grading.

Mr. Scott noted that some areas were shown as contour grading due to constraints of property lines. He added he wants to mitigate contour grading because it takes more grading, thus minimize grading by doing engineered grading.

Mr. Duran asked if Specific Plan 25 specifies only contour grading or are they allowed to do engineered grading.

Mr. Stevens responded contour grading is encouraged and is a preferred method; however, does not exclude engineered grading.

Mr. Gilbertson pointed out there are some areas indicated where it is acceptable for engineered grading.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that a detailed architectural landscape analysis was submitted for review by the Board. He inquired again about the perimeter zone and questioned if credit for the replacement trees can include the three 24 & 36-inch box trees to be planted in the front area, to total six trees. He stated that a chart will be created indicating where the trees will be removed and replaced. He stated that

they are looking to preserve as many trees as economically viable; however, some cannot be saved during grading.

Mr. Scott indicated they can pick the location of where the trees are to be planted before grading; however, it may take months to actually see growth from the trees.

Mr. Stevens stated that a condition can be added that states they cannot conduct tree removals until a grading permit is issued. The tree removal and relocation of the trees need to be proximate to the grading permit. The current issue is on the relocation of the trees.

Mr. Stringfellow noted that it takes 90 days to box a tree and added it is very expensive to relocate trees.

Mr. Stevens stated that more discussion needs to occur to make parameters clearer. He posed the question to the Board if the larger trees are to be considered for more than one tree credit.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that there are four landscaped zones within a private lot. The perimeter yard zone that includes the slope and there is a street scape zone. Some of the lots will have an open space, natural zone, which will not allow any building and only landscaping.

Mr. Patel asked how these regulations will be restricted.

Mr. Stringfellow responded that there will need to be a landscaping plan submitted. Fences will be permitted at the slope of the properties; however, will not restrict view but provide security.

Mr. Stevens pointed these out in at the guideline booklet.

Mr. Patel stated that there is a scenic easement issue.

Mr. Stevens asked how the slope areas will be treated so that property lines are not disrespected and how much encroachment is appropriate.

Mr. Stringfellow responded that the guidelines were modeled after Shady Canyon in Orange County whom used similar consultants. He noted that Mr. Stevens stated markers would be put on the rear property lines where the fences can be built.

Mr. Duran asked if some of the replacement trees could be off site.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that they are trying to create a natural environmental look. The final landscape plan will represent the grouping of the trees. He noted that they want to meet mitigation requirements. He added there is a tree palette in the guidelines which can be modified.

Mr. Stevens discussed options on how to proceed with the rest of the items on the agenda.

Mr. Duran stated that there has been a lot of discussion in regards to the tree removal and grading.

Mr. Stevens asked the Board if they would like to hear the results from the neighborhood meeting, TBD, or would the Board like these items to be heard at Planning Commission and City Council then return back to DPRB.

Mr. Patel commented that Staff will benefit if the applicant returns to DPRB first.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that they are planning to submit construction drawings for plan check on January 18, 2013.

Mr. Stevens recommended focusing on the grading and tree removals. He noted that Mr. Gilbertson will review the plans for contour grading versus engineering grading.

Mr. Scott stated that they will set up a meeting with the Dalepark residents between now and January 10, 2013 and will also provide cross sections at the next DPRB meeting.

Mr. Stringfellow agreed they will send letters to the Dalepark residents to schedule a meeting.

Mr. Stevens stated that the architectural guidelines can be discussed at the next DPRB meeting. He noted that the consensus today is that contouring grading is the optimal choice. He noted that a discussion needs to take place in regards to the quantity of grading that has changed. He stated that the grading conditions will be tweaked and the final conditions will be formulated for approval. He asked the Board about the tree removal credits.

Mr. Badar and Mr. Schoonover responded they do not have a problem with double credit for the tree replacement when residents are required to plant larger trees in the street zone.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that the grading will be conducted in three phases and should tie into the tree removal.

Mr. Stringfellow indicated they want to begin grading in July of 2013.

Mr. Patel asked when you phase the development, how will the phase basins be approved.

Mr. Scott stated that the 1st phase will have a temporary basin.

Mr. Patel noted that the improvement plans will reflect this in the development plans. He added that when the 1st basin is built; it will need to meet the current standards.

Mr. Badar commented that he wants to hear the feedback from the Dalepark residents.

Mr. Stringfellow stated that the concern with meeting with the Dalepark residents is that half will want one thing and the other half will want another. He asked what the Board's recommendations are.

Mr. Patel recommended providing the residents at the meeting a larger scale plan of the area behind their homes.

Mr. Duran noted that it seems to be a drastic change from what the residents were previously presented and emphasized that they need to be informed.

Mr. Stevens stated he will meet with the applicants before the next DPRB meeting to review the architectural guidelines and will try to resolve the issues with the fencing and landscaping.

MOTION: Emmett Badar moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue this item until the DPRB meeting of January 10, 2013 so that the applicant can have a neighborhood meeting with the residents on Dalepark Dr. to hear their concerns and inform them of changes. Also, Staff can review with the applicant the conditions of approval.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sorcinelli Absent and Stevens Abstain)

Precise Plan No. 12-02

A request to approve architectural guidelines for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

Zone: Specific Plan No. 25

MOTION: Emmett Badar moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue this item until the DPRB meeting of January 10, 2013.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sorcinelli Absent and Stevens Abstain)

Precise Plan No. 12-04

A request to approve conceptual landscape plans for Tentative Map 70583 (Brasada)..

Zone: Specific Plan No. 25

MOTION: Emmett Badar moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue this item until the DPRB meeting of January 10, 2013.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sorcinelli Absent and Stevens Abstain)

Precise Plan No. 12-05

A request to approve conceptual fencing plans for Tentative Tract Map 70583 (Brasada).

Zone: Specific Plan No. 25

MOTION: Emmett Badar moved, second by Jim Schoonover to continue this item until the DPRB meeting of January 10, 2013.

Motion carried 5-0-1-1 (Sorcinelli Absent and Stevens Abstain)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:16 a.m. to the meeting of January 10, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.

Jim Schoonover, Chairman
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

Jessica Mejia
Development Plan Review Board
Departmental Assistant

Approved: January 24, 2013