

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES  
August 13, 2015 at 8:30 A.M.  
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE  
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

---

**PRESENT**

**DPRB Members**

David Bratt, Planning Commission  
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce  
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works  
Blaine Michaelis, City Manager  
Curtis Morris, Mayor  
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large  
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

**Staff Members**

Eric Beilstein, Building Superintendent  
Theresa Bruns, Director of Parks and Recreation  
Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner  
Steven Farmer, Landscape Manager  
Leon Raya, Recreation Services Manager  
Luis Torrico, Associate Planner  
Jennifer Williams, Associate Planner

**Absent**

Emmett Badar, Council Member

**CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR EMMETT BADAR**

Larry Stevens 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.

**DPRB Case No. 15-22**

A request to remove a total of 29 trees which include 23 dead trees (2 Locust trees, 6 Juniper trees, 12 Melaleuca trees & 3 Morus trees), three trees that are leaning and may fall (2 Pine trees & 1 Sycamore tree), one Pine tree that has damaged an existing retaining wall, and two trees that may damage an existing fence (1 Eucalyptus tree & 1 Fig tree) within Wayhill Village HOA common area.

**Teresa Boulton, property owner of 438 W Caldwell Ct., was present.  
Dennis Wilding, property owner of 462 Noah Ct., was present**

**Associate Planner Luis Torrico** stated the Applicant, on behalf of Wayhill Village Homeowners' Association, is requesting approval to remove twenty-nine trees. The removal includes 23 dead trees (2 Locust trees, 6 Juniper trees, 12 Melaleuca trees & 3 Morus trees), three trees with a significant lean (2 Pine trees & 1 Sycamore tree), one Pine tree that has damaged a retaining wall, and two saplings adjacent to a fence (1 Eucalyptus tree & 1 Fig tree).

All of the trees to be removed are located within the common area. Majority of the trees that are to be removed, twenty-three, are dead or in very poor health and are located on the hillside behind the residences. There is no irrigation system in this area, therefore the lack of irrigation and rain, due to the drought, has led to their current condition. The other trees to be removed are located at various locations inside the community and have either caused or may cause damage to existing walls and/or structures. The landscape development plans for when the community was developed in 1982 were not archived; therefore, Staff cannot determine whether the trees requested to be removed are part of the original planting plan for the development.

The trees located outside of the hillside will have their stumps ground down flush with the adjacent ground. The trees located on the hillside will have their stumps cut as close to the ground as possible as grinding the stumps on the hillside pose a danger to the landscaper.

As part of the review, Planning Staff and the City arborist visited the site to verify the condition of the trees. The City arborist agreed with the applicant's tree removal request with the exception of five trees, four of which are identified as dead trees and one is identified as a leaning tree. After inspecting the trees, the City arborist's opinion is that trees 14-16 & 18, as identified on the Removal List in Figure 1 are not dead but in poor health and may recover if we get rain during the winter season, since there is no irrigation system installed. However, it's not guaranteed that they will recover with the rain. Pine tree #28 in Figure 1 has been requested to be removed do to its lean, however, the City arborist's opinion is that the lean corrects itself towards the top and there isn't any lifting of the soil around the tree. Therefore, the tree should not be removed as there are no signs that the tree is in immediate danger of falling.

**Mr. Stevens** asked what the number of the tree was that is correcting itself.

**Associate Planner Torrico** replied that tree #28 is a pine tree that has corrected its own lean.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if that is a concrete v-ditch behind the tree, in the picture.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated yes, that is a v-ditch located behind the tree.

**Associate Planner Torrico** continued that Staff agrees with the City arborist's opinion to not remove the aforementioned five trees. The trees located on the hillside that are in declining health should not be removed and be monitored to see if they recover. In the event that they do die, the HOA may remove the four trees without having to come back to the Board. Pine tree #9 should also not be removed as there were no visual signs that the tree may fall from the City arborist's inspection.

The Tree Preservation Ordinance requires a two for one tree replacement ratio for each tree to be removed; however, the applicant is not proposing a replacement plan as part of their request and is requesting a tree replacement reduction of zero trees.

In addition to reviewing the tree's current conditions, the City arborist also reviewed potential replacement locations within the HOA. There are a generous amount of trees planted throughout the community; however, the arborist did identify locations that could benefit from replacement trees and would not oversaturate the community. The arborist further recommended that the trees to be replanted not be canopy-type trees but smaller trees such as Australian Willows, Chinese Pistache or Strawberry Tree.

As majority of the trees to be removed are located on the hillside where there is no irrigation system, replacing trees in this area would require the installation of an irrigation system in order for the trees to survive. In addition, the trees on the hillside are not highly visible from 5<sup>th</sup> street as they are located on the hillside behind several mature trees planted adjacent to the street and the existing homes. Removal of these trees will not have a major impact on the community and therefore, Staff recommends that no replacement trees be required for the trees to be removed from the hillside. The remaining five trees to be removed, that are located outside of the hillside and within landscaped irrigated areas will be replaced at a one to one ratio.

**Mr. Stevens** asked about the malaleuca trees and the single pine tree, if they are removed later will there be a replacement ratio.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated no, there will not be any replacement ratio for those trees as they are on the hillside without any irrigation.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the hillside was stable.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated yes, the hillside will remain stable with the roots left in place.

**Mr. Stevens** noted that in the aerial, the trees seem to be in two groupings. He asked what the ground cover was for those areas.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the ground cover on the hillside is a mixture of native grasses.

**Mr. Stevens** stated his concern for natural grasses taking over the hillside if there are not any replacement trees proposed. He noted that this was not the first removal Staff has done for this HOA.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that back in 2006, Staff approved the removal of six trees for this HOA.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that Staff needs to make sure the hill will not be too sparse after the removals have been completed.

**Mr. Patel** noted that Eucla and Hathaway have tree issues in the medians. He asked if Staff can address those issues with the HOA.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that Staff can address that issue to the HOA.

**Mr. Stevens** asked why there is not an arborist report for this item.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the City arborist went out and all parties concurred with her findings.

**Dennis Wilding, property owner of 462 Noah Ct.** stated he is a board member for Wayhill HOA. He goes on to mention that there is a pine tree on Noah Court with only approximately four and a half feet between the hill and the wall. He noted that he would rather the landscapers not put a tree back in that spot as it may cause damage to the wall in years to come.

**Associate Planner Torrico** noted the tree the residents are referring to is tree #29. The City arborist noted that a small tree may be put back in this general area.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the arborist gave a specific tree.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that the arborist recommended species such as Australian Willows, Chinese Pistache or Strawberry Tree.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the replacement trees need to be put back in the exact same spot.

**Associate Planner Torrico** stated that Staff will work with the landscaper to find the correct location.

**Dennis Wilding, property owner of 462 Noah Ct.** stated the trees on the hill have been there for a long time. The residents have taken care of the trees and irrigated them throughout the years.

**Mr. Stevens** asked the residents if they are ok with monitoring the trees on the hill to see if they come back during the predicted winter rains.

**Dennis Wilding, property owner of 462 Noah Ct.** replied no, they do not mind monitoring the trees this winter.

**MOTION:** Curtis Morris moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve subject to Staff's recommendations that no replacement trees be required for the trees to be removed from the hillside. Malaleuca trees 14-16, & 18 are not dead and shall not be removed but monitored during the winter season, and will only be removed if they die. The remaining five trees to be removed, that are located outside of the hillside and within landscaped irrigated areas will be replaced at a one to one ratio.

Motion carried 7-0

### **Tree Removal Permit 15-19**

A request to remove 13 trees (12 Ficus that are causing damage to the parking lot and 1 dead Podocarpus) and replant 25 trees within the San Dimas Arrow Plaza (Stater Bros.) shopping center parking lot at 1425 W. Arrow Hwy.

APN: 8383-016-015, -016, and -037

Zone: SP-2

**Sarah McLaughlin, Stater Bros. Property Manager, was present**  
**Mark Stinson, Stater Bros. Store Manager, was present**

*Associate Planner Jennifer Williams* stated the applicant is requesting approval to remove thirteen (13) trees within the HOA common area. Twelve (12) are Ficus trees that are causing damage to the parking lot and one (1) is a Podocarpus tree that is dead. The applicant is proposing to replant a combination of Maidenhair and Ginkgo trees for a total of 25 replacement trees.

Staff conducted a site visit along with the City Arborist and concurred with the applicant's arborist's report that the Ficus trees are causing damage to the planters, curbs, and parking lot. Root trimming is not a viable alternative as it will compromise the integrity of the tree and ultimately the Ficus trees are not appropriate for the size of the planters they were planted in. Staff also agrees that the dead Podocarpus tree should be removed and replaced.

The Tree Preservation Ordinance typically requires 2 trees to be replanted for each 1 tree that is removed, which in this case would mean 26 trees replanted for 13 removed. Staff concurs with the applicant that a reduction of 1 tree for a total of 25 replacement trees is appropriate for the shopping center to avoid oversaturation.

The applicant has stated that the trees have caused lifting of the curbs and parking lot and caused the property to be non-compliant with ADA requirements in addition to creating a safety and liability issue. Staff requested that the applicant address site improvements that would be done in conjunction with removal of the subject trees to abate any safety or ADA compliance issues. The applicant responded that they intend to repave the portions of the parking lot which were affected by the Ficus tree roots and slurry and seal the entire parking lot within 2 weeks after the tree removals are complete. Condition 6b is included to require that the applicant submit comprehensive plans for parking lot repairs to the Building Department within 15 days of the tree removals and obtain appropriate permits and commence the work within 90 days of the tree removals.

Upon a site inspection Staff noted the general lack of landscape maintenance in the center and expressed concerns to the applicant. The applicant responded that they intend to plant drought resistant plant materials in the planters and reconfigure the sprinkler system prior to planting any plants. Condition 6a is included to require professional landscape plans be submitted to the City for the tree replacements and landscape planter plantings prior to the removal of the trees.

Staff has concerns that the center will appear extremely bare with all of the tree removals being conducted at once and considered suggesting a phased tree removal and replacement plan. However, in consideration of the other parking lot and landscape improvements proposed, Staff recommends permitting all of the work to be conducted comprehensively at one time. The Board may wish to require replacement trees that are larger than the minimum 15 gallon size as this is a commercial shopping center in a highly visible location.

The applicant is proposing Crape Myrtle and Maidenhair trees as replacement trees. Staff suggests incorporating these trees on the Arrow Highway frontage but suggests Chinese Pistache as alternative replacement trees for the parking lot planters. The Podocarpus should be replaced with another Podocarpus for consistency along the northern project frontage.

Management from Stater Bros. is here if the Board has questions.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the green dots in the site plan were representative of the replacement trees.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated yes, the green dots represent replacement trees.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if all the trees in the finger planters are due for removal.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated yes, all the trees in the planters are destroying the parking area.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that twelve ficuses will be removed. He asked if each ficus will be replaced with two smaller trees.

**Associate Planner Williams** replied yes, the City arborist recommends the ficus trees be replaced with chinese pistache trees.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how wide the finger planters are.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated the planters are approximately five feet wide.

**Mr. Stevens** asked why only the one podocarpus died and how are the others surviving. He asked if this planter will be receiving new irrigation.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated yes, this planter will receive new irrigation and one new podocarpus to replace the one that is currently dead.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how the parkway looks presently.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that the parkway looks better than the rest of the center. She noted that the parkways could use some help with ground cover.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked what types of trees are along Arrow Highway.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that in 2006, the center did seven tree replacements using Sycamores and different types of plants. She added that the Board could ask the applicant to use something larger than a 15 gallon tree.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the size of the planter bed is the main concern for this project as we do not want to cause any further parking lot issues. He noted that crepe myrtles would not get big enough to cause future problems. He then asked if this project will fall under new drought tolerant landscaping and if the emergency water budget numbers apply to this project.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated she did not have all the square footages for the area but the commercial requirement is 2500 square feet.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the center should try to do this project with drip lines and bubblers; as a matter of principal Staff should look at irrigation standards.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** asked if the trees along Arrow Highway were doing well and providing the anticipated coverage.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated the new trees along Arrow Highway are doing well and there are not any problems with their health or appearance.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated that the applicant should look into following the palette set on Arrow Highway.

**Mr. Stevens** noted that the trees on Arrow Highway have room to grow where the trees in the parking fingers will be more restricted. He did go on to say that the new trees should complement those on Arrow Highway.

**Associate Planner Williams** asked if the new species could be mixed.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the new trees should be compatible with the species that are currently out there.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** noted that Staff does not want to visually oversaturate the area with one species of tree.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that if the planting ratio is 2:1 then the applicant will need to find a space for 26 trees.

**Mr. Morris** noted 26 trees may be too many when you need to consider line of sight.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the Board should allow Staff to look at using a ratio of 1.5:1.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated a 1.5:1 ratio would be good if the applicant picks a specific tree that works with the tree palette.

**MOTION:** Krishna Patel moved, second by Curtis Morris to approve subject to conditions of approval with the addition that the types of trees to be used compliment the current tree palette and that the applicant work with Staff to find the proper tree replacement ratio at no less than 1.5:1.

Motion carried 7-0

### **DPRB Case No. 15-23**

A request to enclose the existing drive-thru canopy to add approximately 700 square feet of office space, provide 4 new parking spaces in the former drive-thru queuing area, and construct related site modifications to accommodate the change of use of the subject building from a ground floor bank (formerly Opus Bank) with upstairs offices to financial planning offices on both floors. The property is located at 530 W. Bonita Avenue.

APN: 8386-007-089

Zone: CG-1

**John DiLauro, Architect, was present**  
**Mark Tolan, Applicant, was present**  
**Kevin Tolan, Applicant, was present**  
**Karen Shoemaker, property owner at 133 E. Eucla Ave., was present**

The subject site was developed in 1989 as a retail/bank space on the ground floor and offices on the second floor. The offices have historically been leased independently of the ground floor. Currently there is no interior access to the second floor and there are two exterior staircases

The site to the east was developed in 1980 as an office building. The site to the south was developed in 1957 as an industrial building. In 1996, a reciprocal parking and access agreement was recorded between the 3 properties in conjunction with a conditional use permit (CUP 95-10) for the drive thru and the vacation of the former alley.

The proposed plan is consistent with the "Early California village theme" that is required in the Creative Growth zone. The proposed 700 square foot enclosure addition is consistent with the design of the existing building.

Staff recommends lowering the fence enclosing the patio area to 3-4 feet in height from the proposed 6 feet in height for aesthetic purposes and has included Condition No. 12 to this effect. The Applicant prefers 6' in height for security purposes. Planning Staff recommends barrier plantings (such as bougainvillea), motion sensor lighting, and bolting down patio furniture as alternative security measures.

**Karen Shoemaker, property owner at 133 E. Eucla Ave.** asked where the new spaces will be located.

**Associate Planner Williams** physically pointed out the parking stall locations on the site plan.

**Mr. Morris** asked if the new spaces will be in line with the current spaces.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated yes, the new spaces will be next to the current spaces, along the front of the building.

**Mr. Morris** asked if the four new spaces will be in line with the current parking spaces.

**Mr. Bratt** noted that the angle seems different.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that the spaces are still lined up along the aisle. He mentioned that the applicant could propose a different layout and still have enough parking.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** noted that utilizing a different layout could provide space for more landscaping.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the two sites, 502 & 530 W. Bonita were evaluated separately to comply with minimum parking requirements. He mentioned that he does understand these buildings have a shared access but wanted to know if one building takes advantage of parking on the other property. He noted that it looks as if 530 W. Bonita may have a few more spaces than 502 W. Bonita.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated the ratio is one parking space per 250 square feet.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that 530 W. Bonita would need 33 spaces and they will seem to exceed that after this project is done.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that the applicant could add another 800 square feet and still have sufficient parking with the four additional parking spaces proposed; there is only a proposed 700 square feet.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if this business will have a lot of in and out clientele.

**Mark Tolan, Applicant** stated that two-thirds of meetings are done by phone. He goes on to mention that only about 20 clients a week physically step foot into the building.

**Mr. Stevens** asked how many employees the applicant employs.

**Mark Tolan, Applicant** stated he currently employs six. He is looking to hire five more employees.

**Mr. Bratt** asked the applicant if he will be renting out any portion of this building.

**Mark Tolan, Applicant** stated that a portion of the building is being rented already and that lease will remain. The applicant went on to state that he would like a patio area for clients to sit. He would like the patio railing to be higher due to Montana's bar clientele to the west. The Sheriff has informed the applicant that on the weekends, his property is used as overflow parking for the extremely popular weekend bar. The applicant feels a higher than average iron fence would detour bar patrons from lounging on the bank patio in the late hours of the weekend nights. Also, the applicant feels if the patio fence were to be a see-through iron fence, it would make police patrol much more productive. He also noted that he was open to adding motion lights if the Board felt it were acceptable.

**Mr. Stevens** asked what was recommended for the fence.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that she recommended a four foot fence with a plant barrier as she is aware that the Montana's crowd likes to loiter.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that a see-through fence would be more appropriate.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** mentioned that adding stucco pilasters to the fence would help the overall visual appearance.

**Mr. Stevens** asked to bring the issue back to the board for discussion.

**Mr. Morris** stated he is in favor of the higher fence.

**Mr. Stevens** stated that he is in agreeance with the higher fence as long as it is open with a corner stucco pilaster. He asked the applicant to work with staff regarding the pilaster and the fence.

**Mr. Patel** suggested that if the bollards are to remain, they be lighted bollards.

**Associate Planner Williams** stated that Staff proposed a plan to remove the bollards.

**John DiLauro, Architect** stated they are going to add planters.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated Staff should consider one more pilaster for the gate.

**John DiLauro, Architect** stated as far as the intention of the fence, we want something with a low impact.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** noted the intention of the pilasters is to try and visually tie in the new fence.

**MOTION:** John Sorcinelli moved, second by Scott Dilley to approve, subject to conditions of approval with the additional conditions that 1) stucco pilasters be added to the decorative six foot patio fence and 2) the existing bollards shall be removed and if they are to be replaced, they are to be lighted and decorative.

Motion carried 7-0

#### **DPRB Case No. 15-26**

A request to extensively remodel the existing 1,620 sq. ft. recreation building at Marchant Park. In addition to the remodel the building will be expanded 605 sq. ft. on the north side, for a total building area of 2,225 sq. ft. The exterior of the building will be completely remodeled in a similar style as the recently approved bathrooms that incorporates architectural elements of the Craftsman Style. The park is located at 425 E. Juanita Avenue.

APN: 8390-008-901

Richard Fisher, Architect, was present.

Randy Meyer, Architect, was present.

**Senior Planner Marco Espinoza** stated the Parks and Recreation Department is proposing to extensively remodel the interior and exterior of the recreation building at Marchant Park as part of a larger improvement plan of the park. The building will also be extended approximately 22 feet to the north to accommodate new bathrooms; the expanded floor area will consist of 605 sq. ft. for a new total building size of 2,225 sq. ft.

The existing building has a flat roof design with stucco walls with a slump stone wainscot. All the exterior doors and windows have a four inch wide wood trim painted a dark brown color. The flat roof houses the air conditioner unit and the associated vents which are screened with a dog-ear wood fence approximately 42 inches tall.

As part of the remodel all the windows and entrance doors will be relocated and /or reconfigured except for the exterior electrical equipment room enclosure. The existing electrical equipment enclosure will remain in the same location. The roof top mechanical equipment was evaluated and determined that it would be more feasible to allow for it to remain in the same location and provide a more substantial screening wall.

The finished design of the building will be similar to the recently approved bathrooms for the park that have architectural elements of a Craftsman design. The building will now have a main gable roof design with parapet wall to screen the air conditioner condenser and associated vents. The roof will be roofed with a composition shingle material. At the ends of the main gable roof there shall be decorative vertical roof vent inserts. There will also be decorative knee-braces at each end of the roof and in the center.

The relocated main entrance on the east side of the building will be accented with a new covered entrance as well as a secondary entrance on the west elevation. The covered entrances are designed with two smooth plaster tapered columns with a split-face block square base. The gable roof designs over the entrances are accented with decorative vertical vent inserts and decorative knee-braces. All the exterior doors and windows will have a three to four inch simulated wood trim.

The main walls of the building will be a smooth sand texture stucco finish with a split-face wainscot that will have one course as an accent band around the perimeter of the building. The windows will be fixed with decorative divided lites.

The building will be painted in a tan earth tone color with a muted blue hue for the trim.

This is the opportunity for the DPRB to provide comments for additional consideration by Parks and Recreation Staff. Since the building is similar to other buildings constructed by the City at other facilities, Planning Staff has no additional comments.

No formal action is required as this is a courtesy review. Design comments regarding the buildings and the site improvements are welcomed.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the color scheme stays the same as the bathroom that was previously approved by the Board.

**Senior Planner Espinoza** stated yes, the color palette remains the same.

**Mr. Stevens** asked what additional upgrades are being done to the park.

**Ms. Bruns** stated that Staff will be doing a rehab to the whole Marchant Park site. Included in the park will be a new playground along with tennis and basketball court resurfacing. They will be upgrading the bathrooms near the snack bar to make them fully ADA compliant along with upgrades to the snack bar. She goes on to state that one of the bigger projects for the park will be the demo and restoration of the bathroom nearest the Juanita side of the park. In a previous DPRB meeting, the Board had agreed on a specific shade of blue; since deciding to move forward on the multipurpose room, Staff has decided to dull down the color with a muted grey/blue tone. Staff has been working closely with the architect regarding the overall design of the expansion of the building. She goes on to note that the building is receiving an addition to bring the restrooms into ADA compliance. She introduces Randy Meyer and Richard Fisher as the architects for the project.

**Richard Fisher, Architect** states the existing entrance on the east side of the building is being moved to the center of the east side of the building. The west side of the building will have new access door that will open straight out to a new picnic area. He goes on to explain that the other

major improvement will be a new access way that will have a gentle grade making it ADA compliant without having to install handrails.

**Mr. Patel** asked what will be done to meet NPDES regulations.

**Richard Fisher, Architect** stated that this is a flat site. He noted that the building will not be changing flow or run off.

**Mr. Patel** stated that when more than 500 square feet of earth is disturbed then flows are changed.

**Richard Fisher, Architect** stated that he would like to meet with Mr. Patel privately to discuss NPDES regulations.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the building is big enough for the need.

**Mr. Morris** asked if you had infinite monies what would you do to this facility as a long term investment.

**Ms. Bruns** stated that was a tough question. She went on to explain that when expanding a facility such as this, she needs to be aware as to how much park space she is using. She has a great facility and wants to make sure she maximizes the use. She noted that any improvement is good improvement for the community.

**Mr. Stevens** stated when looking at the floor plan there is a lot of space for the restrooms, more than minimum requirements for ADA. He noted that a facility such as this one is always in need of storage, it may be possible to add a little more length to the building for storage purposes.

**Ms. Bruns** stated there was not reasonable park space to take for storage. She noted if she goes to the west, there is a gazebo, in great condition that would need to be removed. She goes on to state that the east side has play equipment and pathways. The north side is an open space but at that point, she explains that the building becomes very linear.

**Mr. Stevens** stated the addition will be made to the north side of the building as that is where the current restrooms are located.

**Mr. Morris** stated the only reasonable location for a second addition would be the west side of the building. He notes that he is not suggesting Ms. Bruns do that, he is asking her to think about the long term investment of the building. He believes if more square footage is needed long term, then, it may be beneficial to go back to City Council to ask for additional funding for this project.

**Richard Fisher, Architect** stated the mechanical room is located on the west side of the building and relocation of the panels is substantial to the budget. He mentioned that they could design a "L" shaped building off the new restroom area.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if it would be possible to add square footage between the columns on the west side of the building.

**Ms. Deleon** stated all the power and sewer lines run underground on the west side of the building.

**Mr. Sorcinelli** stated the current plan is great.

**Ms. Bruns** stated that she had a tough decision as in, does she remodel or does she opt to tear down and redo the whole building.

**Richard Fisher, Architect** noted that storage spaces have been integrated into the new design.

**Mr. Bratt** asked what this multipurpose room is used for.

**Ms. Bruns** stated this building is used for many things throughout the year. She goes on to say that most of the year it is used for the Tiny Tot program. The remainder of the time, this facility is used for dance, music and other similar activities. She also noted that in the summer this building is occupied by a children's day camp.

**Mr. Morris** stated that the expansion of this facility should be looked at on a long term basis. He mentioned that if project monies were sparse that maybe it would be in Ms. Bruns best interest to go back to Council and ask for sufficient funding.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if a larger facility was a need. He asked if the Parks Department was turning kids away because the facility could not accommodate the number of children who wanted to participate in the facilities activities.

**Ms. Bruns** stated this new room will be larger so we may have more participants.

**Ms. Sorcinelli** asked why the restrooms do not have exterior access.

**Ms. Bruns** stated the park will have a new larger restroom facility on the south side of the park to provide facilities to the playground and ball fields. Additionally, she noted there is another restroom on the north side of the park.

**Mr. Stevens** stated this is a park dependent neighborhood.

**Ms. Bruns** mentioned this was a golf course building that was transferred to this park and we are proud to remodel it and make the park more community friendly.

**Mr. Stevens** stated this is a highly utilized park. He asked if there were any other comments. He noted there is no action that is needed on this item unless the Board would like to make a specific comment.

**MOTION:** No motion was needed as this was a courtesy review. The Board asked to make a courtesy motion to show full support for this project. John Sorcinelli moved, second by Blaine Michaelis to approve.

Motion carried 7-0

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:08 a.m. to the meeting of August 27, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Development Plan Review Board  
LH  
Departmental Assistant

Approved: 9/24/15