

CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

March 28, 2017 meeting

To: Planning Commission
From: Chris Gjolme ~ Planner
Re: Hillside Development Permit 13-14 / Second-floor Review 13-04
(amendment #2) and Director's Misc. Review 16-42 (flat roof) 458 Noren
Street; McDonnell/Boyerian.
Date: March 9, 2017

BACKGROUND:

On July 9, 2013, the Planning Commission reviewed a request to construct a new 5,290 sq. ft. residence on a 19,360 sq. ft. hillside lot. Although the project complied with all code standards, the design of the house was problematic, most notably its stark and **symmetrical massing**. **The home's** overall size, which was well above the neighborhood average, was a lesser concern to staff, but paramount to neighbors in the area. The front landscaping treatment was also regarded as inconsistent with the prevailing streetscape. The item was continued to reduce and refine the visual scale of the proposed structure and simplify the landscape palette.

The project was revised and reviewed by the Planning Commission on October 8, 2013. Total floor area was reduced to 4,774 sq. ft. and building height was reduced by 2 feet through lowering of the primary pad. Setbacks were increased along the north side, and, most importantly, the design of the house was refined to better fit the immediate Noren Street neighborhood. As a result, unanimous project approval was granted.

Several neighbors objected to the approval, citing view and massing concerns, and the project was subsequently appealed to the City Council. On December 2, 2013, the City Council reviewed the project and voted unanimously to uphold the Planning Commission's **approval and deny the appeal, noting that the project was appropriate for** the site and area, and that neighboring views were not unreasonably impacted.

Several months later, a request to amend the project's approval to allow additional floor area and building height was submitted by the applicant. Said request involved increasing total floor and roofed area from 4,774 sq. ft. to 5,372 sq. ft., an increase of 598 sq. ft. primarily at the rear of the house. In addition, overall project height was to be increased by 4 feet. House height would be raised by 2 feet to accommodate one foot of additional plate height at each floor level. Additionally, due to unforeseen drainage complications, the pad would no longer be graded down 2 feet, but would be retained at its current elevation. In summary, a 26-foot structure as measured from

existing grade was requested, as opposed to a 24-foot structure at -2 datum as approved by the City Council.

On July 8, 2014, the Planning Commission reviewed the amendment request. The request to increase project floor area was acceptable to the Commission since the new area was almost entirely to the rear of the house and had no major effect on the scale and appearance of the house as seen from the street. However, the requested height alteration was not approved. With this, project height was again limited to approximately 22 feet from existing grade or 24 feet from -2 datum. To address minor siting deviations that could result from demolition, site prep, etc., a maximum elevation of 1427.50 was established for the project, allowing for flexibility in grading, construction, etc., Following are images that detail the project's evolution from initial submittal to approval in its current form:



Project as originally submitted



Project initially reviewed by the Planning Commission



Project approved by both the Planning Commission and City Council

AMENDMENT REQUEST:

The **project's Hillside and Second**-floor approvals are still in effect and the applicant has submitted a second amendment request which primarily involves revisions to the exterior design of the residence. A third application has been added to the overall **request; Director's Misc. Review (flat roof)**. **Importantly, the home's size, siting and height would remain consistent with the approved project.**

The 1st-floor plan continues to include typical living area and a 3-car attached garage that would project to the front. One change of note would occur along the south side of the residence where a continuous 82-foot façade was approved. The revised design includes a needed recess near the middle, where a 30-foot section inclusive of the mud room and playroom would step inward **4 feet, improving the footprint's overall modulation.**

A sizeable basement is still proposed, though it has been reconfigured, a benefit of which would be a slight size reduction from 2,600 sq. ft. to 2,300 sq. ft., provision of two smaller light wells along the sides, and the elimination of a third lightwell to the rear. With its subterranean location, the basement, despite its size, is exempt from floor area calculations. Export from the site, however, will continue to require a haul route plan subject to City review and approval.

The second floor would continue to be centrally located and substantially recessed from the forward-projecting garage. Four bedrooms would be provided, including a master suite to the north. The north and south facades at the 2nd-floor level were also originally approved as continuous walls. Similar to the 1st-floor below, the revised design includes improved articulation, in particular, to the south, where several recesses have been incorporated into the design. A modified window array is proposed, with use of taller windows, particularly along the south elevation, where the home would continue to be blanketed by several large oak trees. A lesser number of similarly configured windows

are also proposed on the north elevation. Staff regards the windows as consistent with the revised design, and absent any major concerns.

At a total of 5,283 sq. ft., total floor area for the new residence remains unchanged. Front and side setbacks are also compliant and consistent with the approved project. **Building height would be 22'-6". More importantly,** the 1427.5 maximum elevation would be met.

To the rear, pool, patio and deck improvements are still proposed. The primary change in this area involves the pool, which would be rotated 90° along a north-south axis to increase patio area to the rear of the residence. A large trapezoidal deck would continue to flank the pool to the rear. The approved landscape plan has not been significantly modified and remains part of the overall project.

The focus of the amendment pertains mainly to the home's exterior design, revised from a Traditionally massed and detailed structure to a more contemporary-styled home; "modern ranch" as indicated by the applicant.

The approved project employed earth-tone stucco facades throughout and stone accents primarily to the front. A gray color palette is now proposed. The revised design continues to utilize stucco and stone, but introduces a third exterior material – vertical siding. Primary material would continue to be stucco. The stone would be applied to the garage and entry columns to the front, but would also comprise a wainscot around the entire perimeter of the structure. The siding is regarded as an effective complement, especially to the front, where it adds rustic nuance. Similar to the stone, it would be strategically used on all sides of the house, ensuring cohesion between the elevations.

Perhaps the most notable change **involves the home's roof.** The approved roof design blended hip and gable components to provide variable eave height on all sides. The revised roof design includes much shallower hips and flat components to the side and rear. Primary roof pitch would be 1:12, which, at less than 2:12, qualifies for flat roof review. Typically, main hips meet to form a primary ridge. The revised project, however, uses vertically offset hips bisected by a lower, flat roof. Approved 2-foot eave depth has been maintained per the roof plan; however, the elevations suggest deeper eaves, use of which staff would recommend.

In all, the above revisions are reflected in the home's front elevation as shown on the following page:



Project as currently proposed

In all, staff regards the revised design as an improvement, one that yields refined massing, architectural nuance, and a more diverse material palette; importantly, while remaining consistent with the siting, size and height of the currently approved residence.

FINDINGS:

Hillside Development Permit:

1. The project, through elements of architectural and landscape design, will enhance its setting.

The project uses articulated and tasteful massing of reasonable scale and contemporary form and protection of landscape screening to minimize the effects of construction as viewed from the street. The revised design of the house would not adversely impact the street setting while the landscape palette offers an appropriate mix of trees, shrubs and groundcover. Staff can support the finding.

2. The project will maximize potential for sensitive use and effective preservation of open space.

The project would maintain a majority of existing sloping area to the rear and a visually adequate front yard, using a combination of two-story construction and 1st-floor expansion. Staff supports the finding.

3. The project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

With regard to health and general welfare, the project is not of a type or scale to have any significant adverse effect, and with regard to safety, the project would maintain

adequate driveway access onto the street, which experiences minimal traffic due to its cul-de-sac terminus. Staff supports the finding.

4. The project will not adversely affect the orderly development of property within the City.

The project would replace a single-story residence with a new two-story home, resulting in reasonable size conforming to the allowable density for the subject lot. Although larger than the average house size in the immediate area, that size is mitigated by the **home's articulated design and modest height. Staff supports the finding.**

5. The project will conform to the goals and policies set forth in the General Plan.

The house will respect the sloping terrain and add reasonable development in terms of density on the site and other applicable code standards. The compatibility of the house as analyzed in this report upholds the General Plan Land Use Element Goal 4 to "(m)aintain hillside areas for the purpose of preserving the visual quality of the City, protecting the public from safety hazards, and conserving natural resources", and the applicable policies and objectives contained therein. Staff supports the finding.

6. The project will not create a nuisance, hazard or enforcement problem within the neighborhood or the City or require the City to provide an unusual or disproportionate level of public services.

The project, consisting of an enhanced single-family residential use, will not result in a change of use or intensification of development beyond those allowed in the General Plan and zoning codes. Staff supports the finding.

7. There are special conditions or unique characteristics of the subject property and its location or surrounding which justify exceeding one or more of the provisions set forth in this Chapter to permit project development.

The project would comply with all Hillside standards and improves wall modulation at the 1st and 2nd-floor levels in comparison to the approved project. Staff supports the finding.

8. Any potential for the project to present visibly excessive bulk from any vantage point, near or far, is mitigated by screening or siting characteristics.

The new house would be located at the end of a cul-de-sac which minimizes the number of visually proximate neighbors, while the 2-story building program is staggered and asymmetrical and adequately forward on the pad to preclude upslope views from

downslope properties to the southwest. To the front, stepped recession of the 2nd floor and a varied roof form would combine with modest building height and enhanced screening to ease the overall effect on the street setting. Staff supports the finding.

9. The project does not create an avoidable or unreasonable impairment of the view from any other property.

Effort has been taken to reduce structure height as seen from offsite and the house is not in a position or at an elevation that would lend to problematic downslope exposure. Several homes across the street would have views of the new residence, but the overall impact to existing view corridors above and beyond the site, when considering vantage points and associated range, would be less than significant. Staff supports the finding.

Second-floor Review:

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

Setbacks in excess of code requirements are provided at the 2nd-floor level while massing is eased through limited building height, interesting façade and roof modulation, diverse materials, preservation of side yard screening and enhanced front yard screening. Staff supports the finding.

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

The new home is larger than other homes in the area and of a more contemporary style, **but the lot's size accommodates the floor area as proposed as evidenced by** surplus setbacks and total floor area below standard and modified hillside limits, while its location at the end of the street visually insulates the site to a degree. The residence would be limited in overall height, while the precedent for 2-story construction is already evident along the subject street. Staff supports the finding.

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

The site is a graded lot in an area that is not conducive to long-range public views beyond that of open sky to the southwest, while neighboring homes are adequately separated and would not be impacted by the proposed 2nd-floor considering its modest profile and reasonable window array at the 2nd-floor level. The home would be positioned adequately forward on the lot to preclude upslope views from below. 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 **home's** contemporary style is somewhat of a departure from the style of most homes in the area, but not to a problematic extent. Although primarily a single-story **neighborhood, the home's two-story** scale and presence is alleviated by limited building height, a well-articulated and detailed design, mature side yard screening and intervening trees to the front, both existing and proposed. Staff recommends the finding.

Director's Misc. Review (flat roof):

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 and minimally-**sloped roofs is consistent with the home's** contemporary style and would limit the home's profile and overall height. 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 modulated, **consistent with the home's style** and eases massing by limiting building height. No significant scale, compatibility or privacy issues attributable **to the project's roof design are apparent given** the character of the area, wherein other two-story homes are found, and somewhat isolated location of the project site. Staff supports the finding.

SUMMARY / RECOMMENDATION:

As discussed, the amendment request pertains mainly to exterior design changes that would not significantly alter the scope of the project or adversely impact the immediate neighborhood. Therefore, staff would recommend APPROVAL of the amended project, **subject to the conditions of approval listed in Exhibit "A"** (largely carried over from the previous approval), attached to the draft amendment resolution.

Since Commissioners Hazen and Oh were not members of the Planning Commission during the original project review, attached are the staff reports and corresponding minutes from previous meetings **and an 11"x17" set of plans for the** currently approved project to allow comparison.

*C: Kevin K. McDonnell, Esq. / 1900 Avenue of the Stars, 7th Floor / Los Angeles, CA / 90067
John Boynerian & Talar Tejrjian / 829 Calle La Primavera / Glendale, CA / 91208*

CITY OF **LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE**

RESOLUTION NO. 17-xx

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 13-14
AND SECOND-FLOOR REVIEW 13-04

AND DIRECTOR'S MISC. REVIEW 16-42 (FLAT ROOF)
THAT WOULD ALLOW EXTERIOR DESIGN AND SITING CHANGES
IN CONJUNCTION WITH
A NEW TWO-STORY RESIDENCE, RETAINING WALLS,
SWIMMING POOL AND RELATED SITE WORK
AT 458 NOREN STREET
AS REQUESTED BY
KEVIN MCDONNELL, ESQ.
ON BEHALF OF
JOHN BOYNERIAN AND TALAR TEJIRIAN

WHEREAS, a request by John Boynerian has been received for a Hillside Development Permit and Second-floor Review to allow construction of a new 2-story residence and related site improvements, 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 July 9, 2013, held a public hearing on the project and continued the item to address design and massing issues; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, on October 8, 2013, held a continued public hearing on the revised project and voted to approve the project; and

WHEREAS, on October 21, 2013, an appeal of the Planning Commission's determination was filed with the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, on December 2, 2013, held a public hearing on the revised project and voted to deny the appeal and approve the project; and

WHEREAS, on March 18, 2014, a request to amend the project's approval to allow for additional floor area and building height was received; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, on July 8, 2014, held a public meeting and conducted a review of the amendment request, and voted to approve the request for additional floor area and deny the request for additional building height, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, on August 5, 2014, held a public meeting and conducted further review of the amendment request to confirm maximum building height/elevation; and

WHEREAS, on October 21, 2016, a second **request to amend the project's approval** to allow exterior design and siting changes was received; 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 Section 2.5(c)(1)(new construction) and 2.5(c)(5)(accessory structures) 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 memo dated March 28, 2017 and previous staff reports and associated minutes regarding the application for a Hillside Development Permit, Second-floor Review and **Director's** Misc. Review (flat roof), and heard and considered the testimony of the applicant and the public; and

WHEREAS, based on the evidence presented by the application materials, staff report, and public testimony, the Planning Commission finds the following:

Section 1:

Hillside Development Permit:

1. The project, through elements of architectural and landscape design, will enhance its setting because the project uses articulated and tasteful massing of reasonable scale and contemporary form and protection of landscape screening to minimize the effects of construction as viewed from the street. The revised design of the house would not adversely impact the street setting while the landscape palette offers an appropriate mix of trees, shrubs and groundcover.
2. The project will maximize potential for sensitive use and effective preservation of open space because the project would maintain a majority of existing sloping area to the rear and a visually adequate front yard, using a combination of two-story construction and 1st-floor expansion.
3. The project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare because with regard to health and general welfare, the project is not of a type or scale to have any significant adverse effect, and with regard to safety, the project would maintain adequate driveway access onto the street, which experiences minimal traffic due to its cul-de-sac terminus.

4. The project will not adversely affect the orderly development of property within the City because the project would replace a single-story residence with a new two-story home, resulting in reasonable size conforming to the allowable density for the subject lot. Although larger than the average house size in the immediate area, that size is mitigated by the home's articulated design and modest height.
5. The project will conform to the goals and policies set forth in the General Plan because the house will respect the sloping terrain and add reasonable development in terms of density on the site and other applicable code standards. The compatibility of the house as analyzed in this report upholds the General Plan Land Use Element Goal 4 to "(m)aintain hillside areas for the purpose of preserving the visual quality of the City, protecting the public from safety hazards, and conserving natural resources", and the applicable policies and objectives contained therein.
6. The project will not create a nuisance, hazard or enforcement problem within the neighborhood or the City or require the City to provide an unusual or disproportionate level of public services because the project, consisting of an enhanced single-family residential use, will not result in a change of use or intensification of development beyond those allowed in the General Plan and zoning codes.
7. There are special conditions or unique characteristics of the subject property and its location or surrounding which justify exceeding one or more of the provisions set forth in this Chapter to permit project development because the project would comply with all Hillside standards and improves wall modulation at the 1st and 2nd-floor levels in comparison to the approved project.
8. Any potential for the project to present visibly excessive bulk from any vantage point, near or far, is mitigated by screening or siting characteristics because new house would be located at the end of a cul-de-sac which minimizes the number of visually proximate neighbors, while the 2-story building program is staggered and asymmetrical and adequately forward on the pad to preclude upslope views from downslope properties to the southwest. To the front, stepped recession of the 2nd floor and a varied roof from would combine with modest building height and enhanced screening to ease the overall effect on the street setting.
9. The project does not create an avoidable or unreasonable impairment of the view from any other property because effort has been taken to reduce structure height as seen from offsite and the house is not in a position or at an elevation that would lend to problematic downslope exposure. Several homes across the street would have views of the new residence, but the overall impact to existing view corridors above and beyond the site, when considering vantage points and associated range, would be less than significant.

Second-floor Review:

1. The two-story design includes adequate setbacks, screening and modulation because setbacks in excess of code requirements are provided at the 2nd-floor level while massing is eased through limited building height, interesting façade and roof modulation, diverse materials, preservation of side yard screening and enhanced front yard screening.
2. The two-story design preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood because the new home is larger than other homes in the area and of a more contemporary style, **but the lot's size accommodates the** floor area as proposed as evidenced by surplus setbacks and total floor area below standard and modified hillside limits, while its location at the end of the street visually insulates the site to a degree. The residence would be limited in overall height, while the precedent for 2-story construction is already evident along the subject street.
3. The two-story design protects public views, aesthetics, privacy and property values of the neighbors because the site is a graded lot in an area that is not conducive to long-range public views beyond that of open sky to the southwest, while neighboring homes are adequately separated and would not be impacted by the proposed 2nd-floor considering its modest profile and reasonable window array at the 2nd-floor level. The home would be positioned adequately forward on the lot to preclude upslope views from below.
4. The two-story design is consistent with the Residential Design Guidelines as adopted by resolution of the City Council because the **home's contemporary style** is somewhat of a departure from the style of most homes in the area, but not to a problematic extent. Although primarily a single-story neighborhood, the **home's two-story** scale and presence is alleviated by limited building height, a well-articulated and detailed design, mature side yard screening and intervening trees to the front, both existing and proposed.

Director's Misc. Review (flat roof):

1. The roof configuration accommodates an architectural objective, as dictated by style, scale, and/or architectural consistency with the subject structure because use of flat and minimally-sloped roofs **is consistent with the home's contemporary style and would limit the home's profile and overall height.**
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 because the roof design is modulated, consistent with the

home's style and eases massing by limiting building height. No significant scale, compatibility or privacy issues attributable to the project's roof design are apparent given the character of the area, wherein other two-story homes are found, and somewhat isolated location of the project site.

Section 2.

Based on the above findings, the Planning Commission of the City of La Cañada Flintridge hereby approves the Hillside Development Permit (amendment), Second-floor Review **(amendment) and Director's Misc. Review (flat roof) at 458 Noren Street,** subject to the **conditions listed in Exhibit "A",** attached to this resolution.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of March, 2017.

Chair of the Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary to the Planning Commission

EXHIBIT "A"
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
Hillside Development Permit 13-14 (amendment #2)
Second-floor Review 13-04 (amendment #2)
Director's Misc. Review 16-42 (flat roof)
458 Noren Street

Standard Conditions:

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 Hillside Development Permit 13-14 (amendment), Second-floor Review 13-04 (amendment) **and Director's Misc. Review 16-42** (flat roof).
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 labeled Hillside Development Permit 13-14 (amendment), Second-floor Review 13-04 (amendment) **and Director's Misc. Review 16-42** (flat roof), Sheets T-1.0 thru L-3, 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 12 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 and assessments to the City of La Cañada Flintridge, as established by Resolution of the City Council.
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 Hillside Development Permit (amendment), Second-floor Review **(amendment) and Director's Misc. Review**. 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. All construction/contractor parking shall be on-site only. At the time of approval, if it is deemed by the Director of Community Development that sufficient on-site parking may not be available, then on-street parking in front of the site will be permitted if it can be demonstrated that such parking will not interfere with the **immediate neighbors, and will not interfere with the public's use of the** surrounding streets. If this cannot be found, then any additional construction vehicle or equipment parking must occur off-site at a location approved by the Director of Community Development. Approval of the off-site location shall be based on the submittal of a Parking Management Plan by the applicant that demonstrates that the site 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.

12. Any subsequent substantive change to these approved plans by the Fire Department or any other agency having subsequent approval authority shall cause these plans to be returned to the Planning Commission for additional review and approval prior to permit issuance.

Planning Conditions:

13. The applicant shall prepare a Haul Route Management Plan. The plan will describe the route, queuing and destination of the trucks for removal of dirt from the site, as well as the frequency of operation. Frequency of operation shall include days of operation, time of operation and the time spacing of vehicles between pickups. The Haul Route Management Plan shall be reviewed by the Director of Public Works and the Director of Community Development. In particular, the plan shall prohibit hauling operations on Saturdays and Sundays, and on days when other large trucks are scheduled to be in the area (trash on Mondays). Times of operation shall also address local school operations and any other similar activities that would be affected by the movement of large trucks. As part of the plan, the applicant shall fund a temporary city employee to act as the Haul Route Manager for the city. This person shall be responsible for managing the plan and shall report directly to the City Engineer or the Director of Public Works. No permits of any kind shall be issued until the Haul Route Management Plan is approved by both Directors and the Plan Manager hired.
14. Structure height for the pool side and deck staircase shall not exceed 6 feet **within the required 10'-8" side yard setbacks.**
15. **Planter wall height within the required front yard setback shall be limited to 42"** per code.
16. Overall deck height shall not exceed **6 feet at any point along the deck's** outermost perimeter. Confirmation to this effect shall be required prior to plan check.
17. The landscape plan shall be expanded to include screening along the base of the deck of appropriate species, height and density to blend with the hillside and **buffer the deck's underside.**
18. The front yard hardscape/landscape ratio shall not exceed 0.50. Minor refinement to the proposed driveway may be required to satisfy said ratio. Confirmation to this effect shall be required prior to submittal of the project for

plan check

19. All landscaping indicated on the approved plans labeled Hillside Development Permit 13-14 (amendment), Second-floor Review 13-04 (amendment) and **Director's Misc. Review 16-42** (flat roof) shall be installed and verified by staff prior to final clearance and occupancy.
20. The pine trees on the rear yard slope to be removed shall be compensated by 3 oak trees as shown on the revised landscape plan submitted as part of Hillside Development Permit 13-14 (amendment), Second-floor Review 13-04 **(amendment) and Director's Misc. Review 16-42** (flat roof). Planting size of one oak tree **shall be increased to 24"-box**.
21. Overall building height shall not exceed elevation 1427.5 as measured from existing average grade as shown on the survey submitted as part of Hillside Development Permit 13-14 (amendment), Second-floor Review 13-04 **(amendment) and Director's Misc. Review 16-42** (flat roof). Said building height shall be confirmed in the field by a certified engineer during construction.
22. Grading and excavation shall be monitored by the Arborist of Record and reported to the Director of Community Development prior to foundation pouring.
23. Exterior construction activity including but not limited to demolition, grading, excavation, retaining wall construction, foundation work, framing, etc. shall be prohibited on Saturday and Sunday.
24. Unless this approval is appealed to the City Council, story poles shall be removed promptly (within one week) after expiration of the 15-day appeal period. Verification of this shall be required prior to submittal of the project for plan **check OR prior to issuance of building permits for those projects where "at-risk"** plan check is in process or has already been completed.

Public Works Conditions:

25. Applicant shall submit on-site and offsite drainage study along with a preliminary grading plan, indicating elevation contours.
26. **Project shall comply with Los Angeles County's Low Impact Development Standard.**
27. This project disturbs less than one acre of land, the project 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 practicable, 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.

28. 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.
29. Any proposed mailbox structure shall be approved and permitted by Public Works.
30. All work in the public right-of-way shall conform to City standards, codes, and requirements.
31. An encroachment and/or excavation permit is required for any work within the public right-of-way.

#