

Sample Projects with Replacement Tree Canopies 2002-2004

E Orange Grove Blvd. (38-unit Multi-family Residential Project) 2003

Language from decision letter:

1. Acknowledge that the new development will cause the **removal of seven native trees** within the project site; a 16" diameter-breast-height (DBH) — *Platanus racemosa* (California Sycamore); and six 10" to 24" DBH *Qercus Lobata* (Valley Oak);
2. Acknowledge that the trunk diameter of nine additional specimen trees on the project site fall beneath the diameter-breast-height threshold in the adopted specimen tree list, and these trees are exempt from the findings for removing specimen trees;
3. Found that the canopy of the replacement trees (approximately 60 new trees) will likely result in tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed (to be verified at Final Design Review) per Section 8.52.075 A.

Evaluation in February 2009:

In general, trees are well maintained. The new trees in natural soil are thriving and the trees planted on a podium have done surprisingly well. These small species are in approx. 4 feet of soil and have seen modest growth and are in full bloom; however at least one did not survive.

N Madison Ave. (179-unit Multi-family Residential Project) 2003

Language from decision letter:

- Acknowledge that the new development will cause the removal of **three specimen trees** within the project site; a 2x12" diameter-breast-height (DBH) *Jacaranda mimosifolia* (Jacaranda); a 30" DBH *Magnolia grandiflora* (Southern Magnolia); and a 16" DBH *Pinus canariensis* (Canary Island Pine);
- Approved removal of the three protected specimen trees based on the findings that:
 - a) "there would be a substantial hardship to a private property owner in the enjoyment and use of real property if the injury or removal is not permitted" (§8.52.075, A4 of the Pasadena Municipal Code). Specifically, the parking garage would be segmented; access to the parking garage would require multiple entrances; the reconfigured site plan would result in a loss of units; and if the trees were retained, existing at-grade conditions might conflict with the finish surface elevations of the project;
 - b) Found that the canopy of the replacement trees will likely result in tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed (to be verified at Final Design Review) per Section 8.52.075 A;

Evaluation in February 2009:

In general, trees are well maintained. Most of the new trees in natural soil (in front and side) are thriving. The existing mature trees on the side of the project do not seem to have suffered trauma from adjacent development. The palms planted on the podium have done very well (as expected), other species have seen mixed results.

S. Lake Ave. (Five-unit Multi-family Residential Project) 2003

Language from decision letter:

Acknowledges the previous underlying entitlements and environmental approvals for the project: the categorical exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (§15303: Class 3; Small Structures), the Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the existing structures on the property; and the removal of one protected specimen tree (a 14" Coast Live Oak with the condition that an identical replacement tree, Coast Live Oak (48" box), be included in the new landscape plan (instead of a California Pepper tree) as the major canopy tree in the main garden to insure an adequate canopy and retention of a specimen tree on the site.

Evaluation in February 2009:

In general, trees are well maintained. The new trees in natural soil are thriving and the trees planted on a podium have done surprisingly well. These smaller species are in approx. 2 feet of soil and have seen significant growth (height).

Note: No coast live oak in a 48" box was obvious; however, access to the site was limited.

Mohawk Street (11-unit Multi-family Residential Project) 2002

Language from decision letter:

1. Acknowledge that the site contains three specimen trees, Phoenix canariensis, Canary Island Palm (greater than 25-feet tall);
2. Acknowledge that the arborist report (Jan C. Scow, 7/26/02) evaluated all three trees of being in fair to poor condition;
3. The two specimen trees in the front yard will be retained and protected during construction by following the requirements of the City's Tree Protection ordinance and the specifications indicated in the arborist report;
4. Acknowledge that the placement of the driveway requires that one of the specimen trees (Tree #2 on the arborist report and landscape plan, sheet L-1) in the front yard will be moved to the west. The health of the tree will be protected by following the specifications in the arborist report, which include hiring a professional tree moving company to move the tree;
5. Acknowledge that the third specimen tree (Tree #1 on the arborist report and landscape plan, sheet L-1) on the site, along the west edge of the property line, will be removed;
6. Find that the **canopy of the replacement trees in the main garden (including a 36-inch box tree) will result in a "tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed"** (§8.52.075 A, P.M.C.) The existing trees are fruit trees, Italian Cypress, and Chinese Holly (sheet L-1);
7. Find that retaining the tree in place would be a substantial hardship to a private property owner in the enjoyment and use of real property (§8.52.075 A, P.M.C.) because it would eliminate required parking and possibly eliminate a unit;
8. Find that because this tree is in fair to poor condition, not an "outstanding specimen of a desirable species... to warrant the protections of" the tree ordinance. "(§8.52.020 T, P.M.C.);

9. Based on these finding, approve the removal of Tree #1 (sheet L-1);

Evaluation in February 2009:

In general, the trees are poorly maintained. The approved landscape plan was not followed and/or many trees have died. The existing palm and the relocated palm in the front yard are also in marginal condition. The site as of now is almost completely void of any trees. Note: access to the site was limited.

S. Grand Avenue, (29-unit Multi-family Residential Project) 2003

Language from decision letter:

- Acknowledged that during concept design review the Commission reviewed the effects of the proposed development project on protected specimen and native trees and adopted findings to approve the **removal of two specimen trees and the relocation on site of two specimen trees.**
- Acknowledged that the final design for phase II of the project includes the removal of one additional specimen tree (Schinus molle, California pepper, #40, Sheet L3.0).
- Found that the canopy of the replacement trees (with **30 new trees on the phase II portion of the site**) will result in “tree canopy coverage of greater significance than the tree canopy coverage being removed, within a reasonable time after completion of the project” and that there is “an objective feature of the tree [its location on or near a foundation wall] that makes the tree not suitable for the protections” of the tree ordinance (§8.52.075 A P.M.C.);
- Based on these findings, approved the removal of the protected specimen tree.

Evaluation in February 2009:

In general, trees are well maintained. Most of the new trees in natural soil are thriving. The existing mature trees do not seem to have suffered trauma from adjacent development, though there was at least one that was in decline. The species planted on the podium have done well with good to modest growth, depending on the species.