

CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

September 27, 2016 Hearing

Applicant:

Zaven Ayvazian
14541 Sylvan St. #109
Van Nuys, CA 91411

Case Types/Numbers:

Second-Floor Review 15-35
Setback Modification 16-06
Director's Miscellaneous Review 16-21
(Flat Roof and Roof Equipment)

Property Owner:

Chung Park
5030 Castle Road
La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011

Site Address:

5030 Castle Road

Project Planner:

Harriet Harris

1. Request:

The applicant is requesting a Second Floor Review, Setback Modification and Director's Miscellaneous Review (Flat Roof and Roof Equipment) to allow the construction of a new single-story house with an entry that exceeds 12'-0" in height (qualifying it as second floor). The applicant is also proposing

to extend an existing retaining wall along the south side property line with a fence on top that would achieve an overall maximum height of 9'-11". The project proposes a modern flat-roof design and roof-mounted air conditioning equipment requiring the Director's Miscellaneous Review.

2. Location:

The site is located on the east side of upper Castle Road, between Countryman Lane and Los Amigos Street, in the R-1-15,000 zone.



3. Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the request **BE APPROVED**, subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit "A", attached to the draft resolution.

4. Project Size:

Lot Area:	17,835 sq. ft.
Proposed one-story house:	4,036 sq. ft.
Attached Garage:	462 sq. ft.
Existing Garage/Pool House: (conditioned to be demolished)	700 sq. ft.

Total: 4,498 sq. ft. (FAR .25)

5. General Plan/Zoning/Existing Land Use:

The General Plan Land Use Map designates the site Low Density Residential (up to 4 dwelling unit per acre). The site is zoned R-1-15,000 (Single Family Residential - 15,000 Square Foot Minimum Lot Size). The site is presently occupied by a one-story residence with a swimming pool, detached garage and pool house. The detached garage, pool house and swimming pool will be demolished as part of the project.

6. Environmental Impact Review:

Staff has determined that the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, under Class 2.5(c)(1)(new construction) and 2.5(e)(1)(minor yard encroachments) of the City of La Cañada Flintridge Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA.

7. Previous Action:

None

8. Pending and Potential Actions:

Plan check submittal and issuance of building permits.

9. Staff Analysis:

A. Context:

The site is located on the northern portion of



Castle Road between Countryman Lane and Los Amigos Street on the east side of the street. Other parcels in the vicinity vary greatly in size and step up as Castle Road extends north. The deep lot is relatively flat with only a 4' to 5' elevation gain from the front to the rear of the lot. The site is currently developed with a one-story residence, swimming pool and detached garage with a pool house. The applicant is proposing to demolish the detached accessory structure to keep the proposed project limited to 4,500 sq. ft. and to eliminate the need for Floor Area Review for lots with less than 80' of lot width. The applicant is also proposing to demolish the swimming pool.

Parcel and house sizes vary greatly in the neighborhood as the following comparison chart reveals:

Address	Lot Size	House Size	FAR	Number of Stories
4947 Castle Road	15,080 S.F.	2,144 S.F.	14.2%	1
5005 Castle Road	15,118 S.F.	1,683 S.F.	11.1%	1
5013 Castle Road	15,118 S.F.	2,502 S.F.	16.5%	1
5018 Castle Road	30,000 S.F.	1,262 S.F.	4.2%	1
5021 Castle Road	15,348 S.F.	1,793 S.F.	11.7%	1
5026 Castle Road	38,768 S.F.	2,624 S.F.	6.8%	2
5038 Castle Road	17,467 S.F.	1,942 S.F.	11.1%	1
5040 Castle Road	14,780 S.F.	1,298 S.F.	8.8%	1
5044 Castle Road	15,670 S.F.	1,318 S.F.	8.4%	1
2202 Los Amigos Street	15,769 S.F.	2,025 S.F.	12.8%	1
2209 Los Amigos Street	15,785 S.F.	2,084 S.F.	13.2%	1
2146 Countryman Lane	15,091 S.F.	1,874 S.F.	12.4%	1
2147 Countryman Lane	12,665 S.F.	1,885 S.F.	14.9%	1
Average (Mean):	18,205 S.F.	1,880 S.F.	10.3%	
5030 Castle Road (Project)	17,835 S.F.	4,036 S.F.	22.6%	1

(Floor area figures DO NOT include garages and other exterior covered area and are intended for general comparison only)

Based on the chart above, it can be determined that the 17,835 sq. ft. subject parcel is just below the neighborhood average of 18,205 sq. ft. and the 4,036 sq. ft. project (without the garage) is above the 1,880 sq. ft. neighborhood average. With a FAR of 22.6%, the project is above the 10.3% average for the immediate neighborhood.

B. Project Description:

The project involves the construction of a new 4,036 sq. ft. one-story residence with a 462 sq. ft. attached garage. Total roofed/floor area would be 4,498 sq. ft. which is below the

4,500 sq. ft. review threshold for narrow lots. The front entry would exceed the 12'-0" height review threshold and, therefore, needs Second-Floor Review.

The applicant is also proposing a new outward-facing retaining wall along a portion of the south property line that, when combined with a 42" high safety fence and an existing retaining wall that is on the neighbor's property, would achieve an overall height of 9'-4". This exceeds the 9'-0" height limitation (3' retaining with 6' of freestanding on top) with the neighbor's endorsement and requires a Setback Modification. At one location toward the rear of the lot the applicant is proposing a 42" railing adjacent to an existing 6'-11" high retaining wall that straddles the property line, for a combined height of 9'-11" (with some overlap) which requires a Setback Modification. This combination of existing retaining wall and handrail would achieve an overall height of 9'-11" as measured from the low side on the neighbor's property. The additional wall is required due to the raising of the grade on the south side. The existing grades in the front yard would be retained in the front yard to preserve the 38" oak tree.

The existing swimming pool on the east side of the residence would be removed to accommodate the expanded house. The detached garage/pool house would also be removed. If the property owner wishes to retain the detached structure, a Floor Area Review (FAR) would be required since the lot qualifies as a narrow lot (less than 80' of average lot width) and when combined with the new house would exceed the 4,500 sq. ft. review threshold.

Lastly, the applicant is proposing a flat roof and roof-mounted A/C equipment which requires a Director's Miscellaneous Review and is included as part this review.

The project compares with code standards as follows:

<u>House</u>	<u>Standard:</u>	<u>Project:</u>
Floor Area:	5,317 S.F.	4,498 S.F.
With Floor Area Review		
Floor Area:	4,500 S.F.	4,498 S.F.
Front SB:	46'-3"	48'-8"
North Side SB:	6'-0"	6'-0"
South Side SB:	6'-0"	7'-0"
Rear SB:	15'-0"	82'-10"
Height:	28'-0"	24'-3" from existing grade

C. Second Floor Review:

Issues

Since the proposed front porch eave is greater than 12'-0" in height, the porch qualifies for Second-Floor Review per Section 11.11.50(A)(1)(e) of the Zoning Code. Front porches are generally encouraged in the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines. The proposed front porch will become the primary focal point of the residence and will accentuate the modern contemporary-style house. The actual entry will be recessed from the front façade. The front porch is more distant from the street than the neighboring houses (except for the home immediately to the south of the subject property) and would be partially screened by existing trees in the front yard that are proposed to be retained. A majority of the project is single-story and would not be visible for the street.

Findings

1. The two-story design includes adequate setbacks, screening and modulation.

The front porch provides a front setback of 48'-8", exceeding the required front setback by 2'-5", is more distant from the street than neighboring properties, is partially screened from off-site views by existing mature trees, and is otherwise minimally visible from off-site. Staff supports this finding.

2. The two-story design preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood.

The eclectic neighborhood is primarily comprised of single-story homes. With the exception of the front porch, a majority of the project is single story which preserves the existing character of the neighborhood. Staff supports the finding.

3. The two-story design protects public views, aesthetics, privacy, and property values of the neighbors.

The new front porch would not cause any view blockage, is more distant from street than neighboring properties, is partially screened from off-site views by existing mature trees, and is minimally visible from off-site. Staff supports the finding.

4. The two-story design is consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines as adopted by resolution of the City Council.

The new porch is consistent with the architectural style and scale of the proposed residence, serves as the primary focal point of the new house and, therefore, is consistent with the directives of the City's Single Family Residential Design Guidelines. Staff supports the finding.

D. Setback Modification

Issues

The proposed new outward-facing retaining wall on the south side property line incorporates a 42" safety fence on top, and therefore, exceeds the height limitation for fences and walls within side-yard setbacks. The code allows up to 3'-0" of retaining wall with up to 6'-0" of freestanding fence or wall on top for a total of 9'-0" high as measured from the lowest side. This scenario would have to be endorsed by the neighbor since they are exposed to the overall height. The existing wall already varies in height and the combination of existing and new retaining wall will exceed 3'-0" in some and spots will exceed the maximum permitted 9'-0" height when combined with the 42" fence. Therefore, a Setback Modification is required for the over-height fence within the south-side setback. The existing wall is partially on the neighbor's property for portions of its length but for other portions it is wholly on the neighbor's property. Where the wall is wholly on the neighbor's property, a new retaining wall would be constructed on the subject property immediately adjacent to the neighbor's wall.

On the south side and slightly forward of the proposed house (Section 1) the existing 2'-10" retaining wall is wholly on the neighboring property and a new 42" fence is proposed immediately adjacent to that wall but on the subject property. At this location the overall height would be 6'-4" from the neighbor's side. Farther east along the south side (Section 2) the neighbors wall is 2'-11" but since the grade is increasing at this point a new outward-facing retaining wall is proposed. The new wall, when combined with the existing retaining wall, would achieve a 5'-6" retaining wall. When combined with the 42" fence at this location it would achieve an 8'-6" overall height. Farther east at the top of the proposed stairs (Section 3) a new retaining wall would be added immediately adjacent to the existing wall. In combination, these two walls would achieve a 6'-4" overall height and with the 42" fence on top would reach a 9'-4" overall height with some overlap. Where the existing retaining wall straddles the property line (Section 4) it is 6'-11" high and when combined with the new 42" fence on the subject property would achieve a 9'-11" overall height for the rest of its length.

Forward of the house it is the 42" fence adjacent to the existing wall that causes the combination to exceed 6'-0" in height. At the steps, as well as farther east towards the rear of the property, it is the existing retaining wall, additional retaining wall and adjacent fence that cause the combination to exceed 6'-0" in height. The unique situation, adding to the grade on the south side and the preservation of the lower grade within the front yard to preserve the existing Oak tree cause the wall and safety fence to

exceed heights as allowed by code.

Findings

- 1. The proposed project is compatible with the existing development on the site, and is consistent with other development in the immediate vicinity.**

The proposed fence/wall combination allows the grade to be altered on the south side of the structure. The over-height wall is compatible with the existing development on the site, and is consistent with other sites in the vicinity that benefit from over-height fences or walls within their side-yard setbacks. The proposed location of the wall would have limited impacts on the street setting. Staff supports the finding.

- 2. The Modification would not be a grant of special privilege that is inconsistent with the limits placed on other properties in the area and in the R-1 zone.**

The project maintains the existing single-family use of the property and similar height fences and walls are present on other properties in the vicinity because there is a change in grade as the street rises as it traverses north. Staff supports the finding.

- 3. Strict application of the R-1 zoning regulations results in practical difficulties and unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the purpose of the R-1 zone regulations and standards.**

The change in grade between the properties and existing retaining wall heights already create an over-height wall situation when adjusting the grade and adding a 42" safety fence, necessitating a higher wall/fence combination. Staff supports the finding.

- 4. The Modification will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare, or the use, enjoyment or valuation of property located in the vicinity.**

The proposed retaining walls and fence would not cause any view blockage or line-of-sight safety issues, and would not be detrimental to the public safety because it is setback from the roadway and would provide retaining in the front and side yards. The addition of the 42" safety fence on top of the combination of existing and proposed retaining wall is for safety purposes. Staff supports the finding.

- 5. The proposed project preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood and protects public views, and aesthetic and other property values in the neighborhood.**

The proposed fence/wall combination would not change the existing scale and

character of the surrounding neighborhood and would improve the appearance of the property. Due to the stepped nature of the neighborhood, some properties in the vicinity also benefit from wall/fence combinations. Staff supports the finding.

E. Director's Miscellaneous Review

Flat roof

Issues

Flat Roof Review was implemented to insure that modern designs, many of which employ flat roofs, do not clash with the prevailing architectural character of an area. The neighborhood is primarily lower pitched ranch-style homes. The house immediately to the south is more Spanish style and has a flat roof on its garage. In the case of the subject house, its single story profile diminishes the overall flat-roof impacts, if any. Furthermore, the flat roof is in keeping with the architectural style of the proposed home.

Findings

- 1. The roof configuration accommodates an architectural objective, as dictated by style, scale, and/or architectural consistency with the subject structure.**

The use of flat roofs and sloping shed roofs combine to create an interesting and focal roof structure that is consistent with the home's modern style. Staff supports the finding.

- 2. The proposed project preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood, and protects public views, and is sensitive to private views and aesthetics and other property values in such neighborhoods in a manner compatible with development of the subject lot and with the residential design guidelines.**

The roof design is consistent with the modern style of the proposed house and its single-story profile eases overall massing through a reduction in the project's perceived vertical scope. No scale or privacy issues attributable to the project's roof design are apparent. Staff supports the finding.

Roof Mounted Equipment

Issues

The roof-mounted equipment would be sited towards the rear of the new structure and would be completely screened by a 4'-0" high parapet wall that would have the same stone finish as the new porch, as well as, other portions of the façade around the new

single-story structure. As such, the equipment enclosure would blend well with the proposed materials and architectural style of the house. Off-site visibility is not evident and the screening is integral to the design of the structure.

Finding

- 1. The equipment is not in a position to be visible from offsite, or that it is adequately screened from offsite view.**

The location of the equipment is screened on all sides and is not visible from neighboring properties or the street. Staff supports the finding

F. Recommendation:

Based on the above discussions, staff recommends that the request **BE APPROVED**, subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit "A", attached to the draft resolution.

cc:

Zaven Ayyazian / 14541 Sylvan St. #109 / Van Nuys, CA 91411

Chung Park / 5030 Castle Road / La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011

RESOLUTION NO. 16-xx

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
APPROVING SECOND-FLOOR REVIEW 15-35,
SETBACK MODIFICATION 16-06
DIRECTOR'S MISCELLANEOUS REVIEW 16-21
(FLAT ROOF AND ROOF EQUIPMENT)
FOR A NEW ONE-STORY RESIDENCE THAT HAS A FLAT
ROOF WITH ROOF-MOUNTED A/C EQUIPMENT AND AN
ENTRY PORCH THAT QUALIFIES AS SECOND FLOOR
AT 5030 CASTLE ROAD
AS REQUESTED BY CHUNG PARK**

WHEREAS, a request by Chung Park has been received for a Second-Floor Review, a Setback Modification and a Director's Miscellaneous Review for a new one story house with a flat roof and roof-mounted equipment where the front porch qualifies as second floor, said request attached hereto and incorporated by reference; and

WHEREAS, after publication and posting of the request in the prescribed manner, the Planning Commission, on September 27, 2016, held a public hearing on the project, conducted a review of the request; and

WHEREAS, the Commission reviewed the project and determined that no significant environmental impacts would result from the project, which is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, under Class 2.5(c)(1)(new construction) and 2.5(e)(1)(minor variances) of the City of La Cañada Flintridge Guidelines for the implementation of CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the facts contained in the staff report dated September 27, 2016, regarding the application for a Second-Floor Review, Setback Modification and Director's Miscellaneous Review, and heard and considered the testimony of the applicant and the public; and hereby determines the following:

Section 1.

Second Floor Review:

1. The two-story design includes adequate setbacks, screening and modulation since the front porch provides a front setback of 48'-8", exceeding the required front

setback by 2'5", is more distant from the street than neighboring properties, is partially screened from off-site views by existing mature trees, and is otherwise minimally visible from off-site.

2. The two-story design preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood because the eclectic neighborhood is primarily comprised of single-story homes. With the exception of the front porch, a majority of the project is single story which preserves the existing character of the neighborhood.
3. The two-story design protects public views, aesthetics, privacy, and property values of the neighbors since the new front porch would not cause any view blockage, is more distant from street than neighboring properties, is partially screened from off-site views by existing mature trees, and is minimally visible from off-site.
4. The two-story design is consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines as adopted by resolution of the City Council because the new porch is consistent with the architectural style and scale of the proposed residence, serves as the primary focal point of the new house and, therefore, is consistent with the directives of the City's Single Family Residential Design Guidelines.

Setback Modification:

1. The proposed project is compatible with existing development on the site, and is consistent with other development in the immediate vicinity since the proposed fence/wall combination allows the grade to be altered on the south side of the structure. The over-height wall is compatible with the existing development on the site, and is consistent with other sites in the vicinity that benefit from over-height fences or walls within their side-yard setbacks. The proposed location of the wall would have limited impacts on the street setting.
2. The Modification would not be a grant of special privilege that is inconsistent with the limits placed on other properties in the area and in the R-1 zone since the project maintains the existing single-family use of the property and similar height fences and walls are present on other properties in the vicinity because there is a change in grade as the street rises as it traverses north.
3. Strict application of the R-1 zoning standards results in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose of the R-1 zone regulations and standards because the change in grade between the properties and existing retaining wall heights already create an over-height wall situation when adjusting the grade and adding a 42" safety fence, necessitating a higher wall/fence combination.

4. The Modification will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare, or to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property located in the vicinity because the proposed retaining walls and fence would not cause any view blockage or line-of-sight safety issues, and would not be detrimental to the public safety because it is setback from the roadway and would provide retaining in the front and side yards. The addition of the 42' safety fence on top of the combination of existing and proposed retaining wall is for safety purposes.
5. The proposed project preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood and protects public views, and aesthetic and other property values in the neighborhood because the proposed fence/wall combination would not change the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood and would improve the appearance of the property. Due to the stepped nature of the neighborhood, some properties in the vicinity also benefit from wall/fence combinations.

Director's Miscellaneous Review:

Flat roof:

1. The roof configuration accommodates an architectural objective, as dictated by style, scale, and/or architectural consistency with the subject structure since the use of flat roofs and sloping shed roofs combine to create an interesting and focal roof structure that is consistent with the home's modern style.
2. The proposed project preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood, and protects public views, and is sensitive to private views and aesthetics and other property values in such neighborhoods in a manner compatible with development of the subject lot and with the residential design guidelines since the roof design is consistent with the modern style of the proposed house and its single-story profile eases overall massing through a reduction in the project's perceived vertical scope. No scale or privacy issues attributable to the project's roof design are apparent.

Roof Mounted Equipment:

1. The equipment is not in a position to be visible from offsite since it is screened on all sides and is not visible from neighboring properties or the street.

Section 2.

Based on the above findings, the Planning Commission of the City of La Cañada Flintridge hereby approves the Second-Floor Review, Setback Modification and Director's Miscellaneous Review (Flat roof and roof mounted equipment) for a new single-story house that has a flat roof with roof-mounted equipment where the entry

qualifies as second floor, subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit "A", attached to this resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of September, 2016.

Chair of the Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary to the Planning Commission

EXHIBIT "A"
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
SECOND-FLOOR REVIEW 15-35
SETBACK MODIFICATION 16-06
DIRECTOR'S MISCELLANEOUS REVIEW 16-21
(FLAT ROOF AND ROOF-MOUNTED EQUIPMENT)
5030 CASTLE ROAD

1. Compliance with and execution of all conditions listed herein shall be necessary prior to obtaining final building inspection clearance and/or prior to obtaining any occupancy clearance. Deviation from this requirement shall be only by written consent of the Director of Community Development.
2. This approval is granted for the land or land use as described in the application and any attachments thereto, and as shown on the site plan submitted, labeled Second-Floor Review 15-35, Setback Modification 16-06 and Director's Miscellaneous Review 16-21(Flat Roof and Roof-Mounted Equipment).
3. Prior to obtaining a building permit or when applicable initiation of use, the applicant and property owner shall file with the Secretary of the Planning Commission written acknowledgment of the conditions stated herein on forms provided by the Planning Department.
4. All structures, site work and other features including but not limited to, buildings, roadways, parking areas, landscaping and other facilities shall be located and maintained as shown on the plans Second-Floor Review 15-35, Setback Modification 16-06 and Director's Miscellaneous Review 16-21(Flat Roof and Roof-Mounted Equipment), except as otherwise stated in these conditions.
5. This approval will expire unless "start of construction" is commenced within 24 months after approval is granted and diligently pursued thereafter. The Director of Community Development may extend the original expiration date by as much as 24 months upon receipt of a written request from the applicant prior to expiration of the original approval if the approved project and applicable zoning standards are unchanged. Start of construction is defined as:
 - a. All zoning and related approvals are effective; and
 - b. All required building and grading permits for the project have been issued; and
 - c. The "foundation inspection" and "concrete slab or underfloor inspection" have been made and received approval from the Department of Building and Safety; i.e., all trenches must be excavated, forms erected, and all materials for the foundation delivered on the job and all in-slab or underfloor building service equipment, conduit, piping accessories and other ancillary equipment items must be in place. Nothing in this definition

shall be construed to alter the applicable legal standards for determining when vested property rights to complete the project have arisen.

6. All applicable requirements of any law, ordinance, or regulation of the City of La Cañada Flintridge shall be complied with.
7. This approval is subject to the applicant paying all fees, deposits and assessments to the City of La Cañada Flintridge, as established by policy, ordinance or resolution of the City Council prior to occupancy or initiation of use. This includes payment for contracted staff services as invoiced to the city.
8. In the event the City determines that it is necessary to take legal action to enforce any of the provisions of these conditions, and such legal action is taken, the applicant agrees to pay any and all costs of such legal action, including reasonable attorney's fees, incurred by the City, even if the matter is not prosecuted to a final judgment or is amicably resolved, unless the City should otherwise agree with the applicant to waive said fees or any part thereof. The foregoing shall not apply if the permittee prevails in the enforcement proceeding.
9. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and its officers, agents, and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City or its officers, agents, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul approval of this project. The City shall promptly notify the applicant of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense.
10. An approval granted by the Planning Commission does not constitute a building permit or authorization to begin any construction. An appropriate permit issued by the Department of Building and Safety must be obtained prior to construction, enlargement, relocation, conversion, or demolition of any building or structure within the City.
11. The trees located within the front yard shall be retained to aid in screening the front of the house. If any trees are removed they shall be replaced as necessary. The two Oak trees identified in the Arborist Report dated January 21, 2016 shall be retained unless allowed to be removed through a separate Tree Removal Permit process. All recommendations for the maintenance and protection of on-site trees included in the Arborist Report shall be followed. Barriers shall be placed around the trees as recommended by the Arborist and their placement shall be verified by staff prior to issuance of building permits.
12. All construction/contractor parking shall be on-site only. If it is deemed by the Director of Community Development that sufficient on-site parking may not be available, a Parking Management Plan shall be prepared by the applicant indicating where additional construction vehicles will be parked. Any additional construction vehicle or equipment parking may be required to occur off-site at a location approved by the Director of Community Development. The Parking

Management Plan prepared by the applicant shall demonstrate that the alternate location shall not interfere with the neighbors in the area or hinder the public's use of the surrounding streets. Contractors and construction workers will be required to carpool to the construction site. No construction, no deliveries and no movement of construction materials shall occur on Sundays or City recognized holidays.

13. All eave depths shall be no greater than 4'-0" and no closer than 2'-6" from the rear and side property lines. Revised drawings shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Development prior to the issuance of building permits.
14. The detached accessory structure located at the rear of the lot shall be demolished or go through Floor Area Review to permit retention of the structure. It shall be demolished or reviewed prior to final occupancy.

Public Works Conditions:

15. Applicant shall submit a preliminary grading plan, indicating elevation contours, on-site drainage flow and BMPs.
16. Project shall comply with Los Angeles County's Low Impact Development Standards.
17. This project **disturbs less than one acre of land**, and, therefore, is subject to the following minimum construction requirements:
 - Sediments from areas disturbed by construction shall be retained on site, using structural drainage controls to the maximum extent practical, and stockpiles of soil shall be properly contained to minimize sediment transport from the site to streets, drainage facilities, or adjacent properties via runoff, vehicle tracking, or wind.
 - Construction-related materials, wastes, spills or residues shall be retained on site to minimize transport from the site to streets, drainage facilities, or adjoining properties by wind or runoff.
 - Runoff from equipment and vehicle washing shall be contained at construction sites unless treated to remove sediments and pollutants.
18. Site plan shall indicate existing/proposed sewer mainline on Castle Road, and existing/proposed point of connection (lateral) serving the project. This shall be verified by the Public Works Department prior to plan check submittal.
19. Prior to any construction (including, but not limited to, drive approaches, sidewalks, curb and gutter, etc.), trenching or grading within public or private street right-of-way, the applicant shall submit a street improvement plan

consistent with the approved Site Plan and conditions of approval and obtain encroachment permits from the Engineering Division.

- 20. Any proposed mailbox structure shall be approved and permitted by Public Works.
- 21. Provide a recorded Covenant for decorative driveway approach prior to final occupancy.

#