

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
August 27, 2015 at 8:30 A.M.
245 EAST BONITA AVENUE
CITY COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**

PRESENT

DPRB Members

Emmett Badar, Council Member
David Bratt, Planning Commission
Scott Dilley, Chamber of Commerce
Krishna Patel, Director of Public Works
Ken Duran, Assistant City Manager
John Sorcinelli, Public Member at Large
Larry Stevens, Assistant City Manager of Community Development

Staff Members

Marco Espinoza, Senior Planner
Luis Torrico, Associate Planner

CALL TO ORDER - CHAIR DAVID BRATT

David Bratt called the regular meeting of the Development Plan Review Board to order at 8:34 a.m. so as to conduct regular business in the City Council Conference Room.

Tree Removal Permit 14-57

A request to remove seven trees to accommodate sidewalk and hardscape repairs and replant seven trees within the HOA Common Area at Tiburon Puddingstone.

APN: (APN's: 8382-007-022, 8382-008-058, 8382-009-059, & 8382-010-084)

Zone: Single Family Zone, Residential Planned Development 10

Beth Taylor, applicant, was present
Ron Edwards, HOA Landscape Consultant, was present
Joshua Behnke, property owner of 739 Smokewood Ln., was present

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza stated the applicant is requesting approval to remove seven (7) trees within the HOA common area. Six (6) of the trees are Liquidambar and one (1) tree is a Pine tree. All of the trees are causing damage to hardscape or other improvements in some fashion, including public city sidewalks, private sidewalks, stairs, and/or retaining walls. The applicant is requesting a reduced replacement ratio and proposing a total of 7 trees be planted as replacements in roughly the same areas as the trees being removed, with minor adjustments

so that they are not planted as close to hardscape or other improvements as those proposed for removal.

Staff conducted a site visit and observed the tree roots lifting and damaging City sidewalks, private sidewalks, and stairs and retaining walls within the HOA common area. Staff concurs that the trees proposed for removal are causing damage and as such their removal is justified. Root pruning would have to be so severe (due to the amount of damage and their vicinity to improvements) that it would compromise the integrity of the tree and is not recommended by Staff or the applicant's arborist.

Mr. Badar asked who thought the root pruning would leave trees unstable.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated Staff and the applicant's arborist both felt root pruning would leave the trees unstable.

The Tree Preservation Ordinance typically requires 2 trees to be replanted for each 1 tree that is removed, which in this case would mean 14 trees replanted for 7 removed. The HOA is well forested and contains a number of mature trees. Staff concurs with the applicant that a reduction of the replacement ratio from 2:1 to 1:1 for a total of 7 replacement trees is appropriate for the HOA common area to avoid oversaturation and suggests that the following finding can be made: "The property in question has an adequate number of existing trees therefore a reduced replacement ratio is appropriate."

Staff recommends approval of this item. Included in the report are the letters, minutes from the HOA as well as pictures. Beth Taylor is here and along with her landscape consultant.

Mr. Duran asked if there was a prior tree removal permit at this location.

Mr. Patel stated the last permit was about three years ago. He went on to say that as a partnership, the City would remove sidewalk panels, the HOA would prune the roots, and then the City would re-pour new sidewalk panels.

Mr. Duran asked what the previous replacement ratio was.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated he would need to pull the permit to give exact ratio.

Mr. Badar asked if the City is consistent with the replacement ratio.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that the tree removal process is respective to the individual findings. He goes on the note that Staff recommends approval of this item due to the damages being caused by the aggressive liquidambar roots.

Mr. Badar stated he agreed with the 1:1 ratio for this case.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there were any conditions to repair damages made by these trees.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated as part of the scope of work, the HOA will repair all the damaged areas affected by the tree roots.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked what size trees will be used for replacement.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the HOA will be using 15 gallon trees for replacement.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked where the replacement trees will go.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated staff will work with the applicant to find proper placement for the replacement trees.

Mr. Bratt asked if the new trees will have the same type of root system as the previous trees.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated this was not his item so he did not research the root systems of the trees proposed. He did note that the new trees will be planted in the same vicinity as the old trees but the root systems will have sufficient room to grow.

Mr. Bratt asked if there were any comments from the applicant.

Beth Taylor, applicant replied no, she had nothing to add.

Mr. Bratt asked if the public had any comments.

Joshua Behnke, property owner of 739 Smokewood Ln, stated his name and said he attended DPRB two years ago regarding the removal of this same tree, tree #7. He feels this 40 year old tree is beautiful and provides solar protection for his home during those long hot summer days. He explains that he would like to keep the tree because he thinks it would hurt his property value to remove a mature tree and replace it with what is essentially a twig.

Mr. Badar asked Mr. Behnke if he had spoken with the HOA regarding this particular tree.

Joshua Behnke, property owner of 739 Smokewood Ln stated he came to DPRB two years ago and the HOA let him keep tree #7. He notes he would like to keep tree #7 as he does realize that tree #1 is ruining public sidewalk. He understands the tree is very large; he goes on to say that he has not seen any change in the trees size in the last couple years.

Mr. Patel asked Mr. Behnke if he has had his foundation inspected.

Joshua Behnke, property owner of 739 Smokewood Ln replied no, he has not had an inspection as he has not had any issues inside his home.

Beth Taylor, applicant stated this particular tree is destroying the landing and the stairs. She explains that the HOA does maintain all the trees with a regular maintenance schedule and it is trimmed properly every three years. She goes on to express worry about this area becoming a trip hazard due to the damages these roots are creating.

Mr. Duran asked if the HOA Board approved the removal of all the submitted trees.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated yes, the HOA Board did approve the removal of all the trees submitted.

Mr. Stevens asked how the HOA decides on which trees need to be removed. He asked if suggestions come from the residents or from landscape crews.

Beth Taylor, applicant stated she did a walkthrough and identified these seven trees as nuisances that needed to be removed. All seven trees have been monitored through the years and have steadily continued to produce damages around the HOA community; they need to be addressed before there are severe damages.

Mr. Stevens asked when the prior trees were removed, did the HOA complete the full scope of work.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated yes, they did complete the full scope of work.

Mr. Stevens stated that tree #7 looked to be creating a lot of damage. He also pointed out that tree #1 is lifting public sidewalk.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that tree #1 will need to be removed because it is ruining public property.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated that the location of tree on the map is to the west and blocks the afternoon sun. He notes that maybe the HOA could plant a new tree on the westerly side and let it grow for a few years and then remove the large tree. He explains that this way the resident would have a more established tree by the time the mature tree needs to be removed.

Mr. Stevens asked if the HOA maintains all the concrete work in the common areas.

Beth Taylor, applicant replied yes, all the concrete planters, stairs and walkways are maintained by the HOA.

Mr. Stevens states that he believes there is enough evident damage to have tree #7 removed as soon as possible. He notes that placing a 24"-36" box tree may be a more appropriate replacement size as it will provide more sun protection for Mr. Behnke's home.

Mr. Sorcinelli noted that with the drought, the tree will not change much and will allow more time for a new tree to root and mature.

Mr. Stevens asked if the applicant would be willing to work with the homeowner.

Joshua Behnke, property owner of 739 Smokewood Ln stated his major concern is that the 40 year old tree currently protects both floors of his home.

Mr. Stevens asked if the HOA has identified a replacement species.

Ron Edwards, HOA Landscape Consultant stated that previously the HOA has used canfer and tristania trees.

Joshua Behnke, property owner of 739 Smokewood Ln asked if the HOA will remove the tree roots.

Mr. Stevens stated yes, they will have to remove the roots.

Ron Edwards, HOA Landscape Consultant stated they will need to remove the stump and the roots, the whole planter is roots.

Mr. Stevens stated he would like for the applicant and the homeowner to work together. He notes that if they do not agree then both parties can come back to the Board for a final decision.

Mr. Bratt asked if the removal is delayed, what will that do for esthetics and safety.

Mr. Stevens stated the tree will be removed.

Mr. Bratt asked if that extends liability to the City.

Mr. Stevens stated that the City does not have any liability as the damages reside on HOA property.

Mr. Patel stated for safety purposes, the sidewalk will get a temporary fix until the tree work can be completed.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Emmett Badar to approve, subject to Conditions of Approval and the added condition that the applicant is to work with the homeowner at 739 Smokewood Ln. to resolve the issue for tree #7, regarding the placement and size of the new tree. If the applicant and the homeowner are unable to come to an agreement, the issue is to be brought back to the Board for a final review and determination.

Motion carried 7-0

DPRB Case No. 15-24

A request for a major remodel and addition to the existing 854 sq. ft. single-story home at 217 S. Glengrove Avenue (APN: 8383-020-030). The proposal consists of converting the attached one-car garage into living space and constructing a new detached two-car garage at the rear of the property. Additional living space will be added to the front and rear of the house for a total of 1,929 sq. ft. at completion. Additional site improvements consist of a new driveway and relocation of the existing street light pole in order to accommodate the new driveway.

APN: 8383-020-030

Zone: SF-7500

Maximus Karera, applicant, was present

Senior Planner Marco Espinoza stated the applicant is proposing a major remodel and addition to the front and rear of the existing 854 sq. ft. home. The house was constructed as a modest single-story with an attached one-car garage. The majority of the houses in this tract have not been modified since their construction. Some have been added to and/or modified in appearance. The tract was built in 1959.

Even though the applicant is proposing to double the size of the existing house it will be difficult to see the additional square footage due to the majority of the additional living space will be added to the rear of the home. None of the new living space will be added to the side of the house helping to minimize any noticeable size change to the house keeping it compatible with

the existing neighborhood. The home will continue to appear modest in size with an updated façade from the street.

The applicant is proposing to convert the existing one-car garage into living space and construct a new two-car garage at the rear of the property with a new driveway. Add approximately 243 sq. ft. to the front of the house that will include a covered front entry. The front door entry will be set back approximately five feet from the main street facing building plane with a modest gable roof. Realign a new driveway approach and relocate the existing light pole just north of its current location, final location shall be finalized during plan check. Construct 829 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the house. The window and exterior doors will have a simple three-inch wide stucco trim. All the windows will be white vinyl sliders without a grid pattern. The house and garage will be stucco in a smooth sand finish to match the existing and will have a brick wainscot along the front elevations and the entire house will be reroofed with composition shingles. The proposed design, architectural details and finished materials of the project are compatible with the surrounding residents and should not create a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Staff recommends that the Development Plan Review Board approve DPRB Case No. 15-24 subject to the attached conditions. This item, Staff could have approved but due to the expansive addition we thought we would bring it to the board for approval.

Mr. Badar asked how far the light pole needs to be moved.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that would be determined in the plan check process.

Mr. Stevens stated area is zoned SF- 7500. He asked if the back of the property has a setback.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated this property does not have a rear setback.

Mr. Stevens stated he would suggest pushing the garage west as it may make it more functional.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated that his idea was doable.

Mr. Stevens asked what will be done with the landscaping.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the residents will be keeping the grass and adding grass to where the current driveway is located.

Mr. Stevens noted that he wanted to make sure Staff was aware of how much landscaping was being altered. He also mentioned that he didn't believe turf would be a proper replacement at this moment in time.

Senior Planner Espinoza stated the applicant is currently looking into artificial turf.

Mr. Stevens asked Senior Planner Espinoza to make sure all drought tolerant standards are met.

Mr. Sorcinelli asked if there is enough room to turn around in the new driveway.

Mr. Stevens stated there is enough room for a 3-point turn.

Mr. Sorcinelli stated the driver parked in the north parking space may have a tough time performing a 3-point turn. .

Mr. Stevens stated the residents do not have to turn around, they can just back out of the driveway. He noted that the garage could be pushed back as far as possible and that may give two to three more feet to the driveway.

MOTION: Larry Stevens moved, second by Ken Duran to approve, subject to Conditions of Approval with the added condition that the garage be moved as close to the westerly property line as possible.

Motion carried 7-0

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:21 a.m. to the meeting of September 10, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.



San Dimas Development Plan Review Board

ATTEST:



Development Plan Review Board
LH
Departmental Assistant

Approved: 9/24/15