

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE  
CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE  
HELD JANUARY 11, 2004**

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairwoman Mehranian called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL:**

Present were Commissioners Cahill, Davitt, Engler and Gelhaar, Deputy City Attorney Noonan, Director of Community Development Stanley, Planner Gjolme, Planning Aide Shimazu and Planning Intern Mikhail.

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairwoman Mehranian led the salute to the flag.

**IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

Comments were not offered.

**V. CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**A.** Minutes of November 23, 2004 and December 14, 2004.

M/S/C Gelhaar/ Davitt to adopt both sets of minutes as submitted.  
Unanimous.

**B.** M/S/C Gelhaar/Davitt to adopt Resolution 05-01, denying Hillside Development Permit 99-15; Kobeissi; 5345 Haskell Street; unanimous.

**VI. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. Modification 04-40; Tranz; Hillside Development Permit 04-71 (Director's approval); 607 Wendover Road:**

Planner Gjolme recalled that when the Commission heard the applicant's request, it became apparent that other construction had occurred without City approval and permits and the Commission continued the matter.

In addition to a garage that was illegally constructed within the required front, side and rear yard setbacks, and over height driveway gates located within the front setback, Staff's investigation discovered an unauthorized patio extension at the rear of the house comprising 432-sf and a 168-sf entry at the front. These two components amount to 600-sf in addition to the 570-sf of garage area. Staff included the recently discovered hillside issues with the pending encroachment requests and continued to believe that the focus be on the Modification for the garage encroachments. Staff recommended project approval subject to a

number of conditions, including possible modification of draft condition 13 to require a 30-ft front setback that would require removal of the garage's easterly 10 ft. compared with 5 ft as originally conditioned. Either way, a compliant front setback would be provided. Staff's further suggestions included: reducing the garage height to 15 ft as required for accessory structures, reducing its eave height to 8 ft as required for detached garages, increasing the garage depth by 1 ft to provide a compliant 20 x 20 garage and requiring uniform roof material throughout to soften views from the upslope neighbor's home. Lastly, Staff continued to recommend that the over height driveway gates be lowered to a maximum height of 6 ft, as would be allowed by the Decorative Fence Ordinance.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Planner Gjolme explained Staff re-evaluated the project and determined that requiring removal of the garage's easterly 10 ft, rather than 5 ft as initially proposed, would provide greater separation and less view impact throughout. Commissioner Gelhaar confirmed that the composition of the gate does not conform to the Decorative Fence Ordinance and would be addressed through the Modification process, rather than a separate Decorative Fence review.

George Boghossian, representing the new property owner, advised that his client wished to fully comply with Code. Addressing the driveway gates, he asked that the excess 2ft-8 inches in height be allowed. He submitted a letter in support of the project from a neighbor who purportedly was in opposition as reported by another neighbor at the first hearing. Mr. Boghossian recalled that 5-6 letters in support of the request were initially submitted.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing.

Ramon Hannah, 3690 Karen Sue Lane, who resides directly above the subject site, reported that crews working as late as 2:00 a.m. and on weekends have been a 3-year continual noise problem for the neighborhood. Calls to the Sheriff to enforce Code were to no avail. Mr. Hannah recalled that in light of the Stop Work Order, the applicant was instructed in September that construction could not continue without approval from Building & Safety. He distributed photos which he believed proved that directive was being ignored. He asked that any conditions be very specific and opposed allowing a second garage on the property. Mr. Hannah refuted Staff finding that the project would not affect the enjoyment or valuation of other properties in the vicinity and reported that prospective buyers of his home refer to the project as a "monstrosity" and walk away. He pointed out that no other neighboring properties accommodate secondary structures.

Mark Chang, 3643 Karen Sue Lane, lives northwest of the project, concurred with Mr. Hannah that electric saws, quarreling among contractors, etc., goes on until 12:30 a.m. He asked how "Tranz can get away with everything""

John Offermans, has resided at 3612 Karen Sue Lane for 34 years. He reported of attempts to work with whoever was on site and never got a good feeling as to who owns the property or what was going on. He is a member of the Homeowners' Architectural Review Committee that will eventually review the project. Mr. Offermans believed that anything built without permits should be removed and stated that the illegal construction has a definite effect on market values.

Mr. Boghossian responded to comments. He acknowledged the illegal construction and reiterated that his client agrees to comply with all conditions, including reduction of the gate height. He advised that the only work done since issuance of the Stop Work Order is where Building & Safety required them to clean behind a wall.

Commissioner Cahill recalled that a change of property ownership was reported and confirmed with Mr. Boghossian that it was the prior owner who illegally built the garage and had contactors working at night and weekends.

Mr. Hannah was allowed to rebut. He distributed photos taken last July and invited the Commissioners to compare them with what exists today. He added that ownership of the property is questionable.

Further comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Engler advised that he could not make Findings 1 and 5 for the garage encroachments or Findings 1, 5 and 7 of the Hillside component. He commented that the garage needs to be removed and the site restored to its original condition.

Commissioner Davitt felt the best solution was to resolve this matter "as best we can". He believed Staff analyzed a difficult situation and stated that he could support the project with modified conditions as discussed. He asked that draft condition 15 be more specific with regard to roof materials and color.

Commissioner Gelhaar emphasized the importance of complying with the Noisy Construction Ordinance. He asked that condition 12 include the need for the driveway gates to be "see through", that condition 13 be modified to require a minimum 30-ft front setback for the garage, that condition 15

specifically call-out roof materials and color for the expanded roof, rear patio, front porch and new garage. Lastly, since the City does not enforce private CC & Rs, he asked for an added condition requiring project approval by the Homeowners' Association. With those changes, he could support the request.

Commissioner Cahill was concerned with the diametrically opposed positions regarding ongoing construction and asked if Staff could shed some light.

Planner Gjolme advised that he had not discerned any significant changes.

Commissioner Cahill commented that he could support the project with the expanded conditions, assuming Planner Gjolme's observations are correct. He agreed to require a 30-ft front setback and with Commissioner Gelhaar regarding the driveway gates. He noted that the existing roof materials are inconsistent and preferred the color and materials left to the review and approval of the Director.

Chairwoman Mehranian stated that anything not allowed by Code should be denied. She supported reducing the gates to 6-ft in height and requiring a 30-ft front setback for the garage. She asked that the roof color and materials be closely monitored.

Attorney Noonan advised that the monitoring be left to the Director of Community Development; she preferred that the City not be involved in any dispute that might arise between the applicant and the Homeowners' Architectural Review Committee (ARC). She advised it would be appropriate for the ARC to keep the City advised of the proceedings.

Commissioner Cahill commented that this project has been an imposition on the neighbors for a long time and preferred that the ARC be part of the administrative process. He requested that the Director consult with the Homeowner's Architectural Review Committee.

M/S/C Davitt/Cahill to approve Modification 04-40 and Hillside Development Permit 04-71, with conditions modified as discussed. 4 Ayes, Engler dissenting.

**B. Modification 04-82; Schwartz/Cioffi; 1447 El Vago:**

Planner Gjolme described the applicants' request to permit an existing batting cage located adjacent to the curved front property line, which encroaches 64 ft into the required front setback.

The subject site is located along the arced intersection of El Vago and Alta Canyada Road, in the R-1-20,000 zone. The 20,860-sf, pie-shaped lot has 260 ft of curved frontage which results in a required 64-ft front setback upon "averaging" the front setback of nearby homes. There is no definitive rear property line. The frontage is densely screened with landscaping to the extent that neither the home nor the batting cage is visible from the street. The home's size and positioning precludes other available area for the cage. Staff found that the 10-ft-high and 68-ft-long batting cage, where located, represents overdevelopment of the site.

Though the front encroachment is not apparent, Staff could not make the required findings of hardship or neighborhood compatibility and recommended denial of the request.

James Coane, who designed the home, advised that it never occurred to his clients that the cage would be considered as a structure, as it can be easily removed. He advised of having reviewed Code and it is not clear to him why the cage is a problem. His client has spoken with many neighbors about the batting cage and none has concerns.

Applicant Russell Schwartz, stated that he had no idea the batting cage would be an issue for the City and apologized if he did anything wrong. He added it was simply an idea that would allow his children to pursue their favorite sport at home. After reading applicable Code, he believed that at worst, the cage could be defined as a temporary structure and "temporary" is not defined. Addressing the staff report, he advised there is no chain link fence on the cage and that it can be dismantled within 2 hours. He rejected Staff's findings that the project introduces an encroachment of "unprecedented magnitude" and that it represents "overdevelopment" of the site; it is not visible from the street and is non-residential and temporary. He pointed out that Staff supported findings 4 and 5, citing that the project would not detrimentally affect the use, enjoyment or valuation of nearby properties and that it preserves the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood and protects public views and other property values.

Mr. Schwarz asked if the definition of "structure" would apply if the netting was removed or if the cage was used as an atrium. He discussed options with his contractor, also a La Cañada resident, which included anchoring the posts in concrete or leaving them on the surface and string netting around them. He chose the latter, as he did not want to assume that the cage would be permanent. He asked that the Commission be mindful that his is a pie-shaped lot with no back yard. The subject area is essentially a dead alley and lower

than his lawn area that was used for hitting balls. From there evolved the idea to providing a more protective environment.

He provided a brief history of how the batting cage came to the City's attention. The neighbor across the street mistakenly believed that trees were being removed and he was concerned with loss of privacy in his pool area. The concern was not about noise or being a detriment to the neighborhood. Mr. Schwartz remarked that he was unaware that his neighbor had a pool because of the dense landscaping. To placate his neighbor, the Schwartz family invested \$2,000.00 in trees and netting and painted the poles to further shield the cage from outside and from within.

The Staff report states that the batting is inconsistent with the area's development patterns --- he asked if the tennis courts on nearby properties affect the neighborhood's character similarly. He then submitted a petition in support of his project signed by 91 families in the immediate area. Mr. Schwartz asked for a timeline to prove that the batting cage will not be the source of complaints and agreed to remove the batting cage upon sale of his property. He reminded the Commissioners that CC & Rs have been recorded in connection with the approval of his guest house, which require the front landscaping to be maintained in perpetuity.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Gelhaar confirmed that when the applicant remodeled his home, the existing foot print was maintained; structures were not removed to accommodate the remodeling.

Commissioner Cahill confirmed with staff that a pool in that location would require review, as would a tennis court. His impression is that the batting cage is a structure; the fact that it is "temporary" does not change that. He stated that the project is a good example of why there are exceptions ---this is a unique lot with the front yard functioning as the back yard, with a 180° garden engulfing it. He briefly reviewed the findings and determined that the project is consistent with development of the site because of its unique character; continuation of the landscape screening would be mandatory; he disagreed with Staff that the project represented overdevelopment of the site and noted that other projects on the agenda represent 32% and 39% development; placing the batting cage elsewhere on the site would present practical difficulties because of the site's configuration.

Commissioner Davitt thanked Mr. Schwartz for his eloquent presentation and believed his good intentions. He stated that the batting cage is clearly a structure and that the landscape screening doesn't solve the fact that it was built where it should not have been built. He supported Staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Gelhaar concurred that there was no intent to violate Code and recalled prior dealings with batting cages and play equipment that the Commission has addressed. A sport court would require a 15-ft perimeter setback. He believed the project goes beyond a batting cage and supported Staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Engler asked if the applicant would be willing to remove the batting cage in the off season, since his position is that it is a temporary structure.

Mr. Schwartz responded that the idea of "putting it up and taking it down" is not what he intended as baseball is more than a seasonal sport for his children. He reiterated that the batting cage is not anchored, there is no concrete, no chain link fence or poles. He agreed that it is not a sports court.

Chairwoman Mehranian commented that she takes Staff's recommendations seriously, but disagreed in this matter. It is visually a "soft" structure and she stated she could support the request with a condition that it be removed upon sale of the property.

M/S Mehranian/Cahill to approve Modification 04-82 with an added condition as requested by Chair Mehranian. The motion died for lack of majority support.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to deny Modification 04-82. 3 Ayes. Mehranian and Cahill dissenting.

**C. Hillside Development Permit 04-73; Han; 1100 Inverness Drive:**

Planning Aide Shimazu recalled that the Commission continued action on this matter pending clarification of the plans, including details for a koi pond and waterfall, deletion of RV parking from the plans and story poles that accurately define the project. He noted that an oak located on the rear slope would be pruned less than 25% of its canopy.

The story poles evidence that the project would not impact views from neighboring properties or from the street and the koi pond will not require cutting into the slope.

Arthur Han, project designer, remarked that the revised plans are much clearer.

The Commissioner had no questions for Mr. Han.

Chair Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioners Cahill and Gelhaar concurred with Staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Engler had a concern with draft condition 12 dealing with construction parking. He believed that this project, combined with several ongoing projects on the street with dump trucks, front loaders, etc., would impact the neighborhood. He counted 16 construction vehicles during his site visit and stated that preferred that construction workers reach their individual project sites via shuttle vehicles.

Director Stanley offered to check the files and determine what the Commissioners required on the other projects; however, Staff had not received any complaints.

Chair Mehranian and Commissioner Davitt supported Staff's recommendations.

M/S/C Cahill/Mehranian to approve Hillside Development Permit 04-73 as conditioned. Unanimous.

## **VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **A. Hillside Development Permit 04-47; Cho; 5215 Stardust Road:**

The applicant's request was described by Planning Aide Shimazu to allow a residential expansion and to construct a new garage. The project would result in total floor/roofed area of 4,071-sf on the 14,750-sf lot. The project site is located on the east side of Stardust Road, near its intersection with Crown Avenue, in the R-1-15,000 zone.

The site is currently developed with a single-story home which is elevated approximately 10-ft above street grade and a detached garage at the rear. A new, 568-sf garage is proposed at the front that would be sunk below grade. A new, two-story addition atop the existing first floor would expand over the

garage, so that a three-story structure would be presented from street view. The existing rear garage would be demolished. The exist first-floor would be expanded by 920-sf , while the new second floor would comprise 394-sf. A new retaining wall would be constructed along the south property line to expand the pad and accommodate the project. It would not affect the most adjacent property, which is at a higher elevation. A draft condition assures a maximum height of 6 ft. An open balcony on the first floor would encroach 1-ft into the required 25-ft front setback. Planning Aide Shimazu noted that front setbacks on hillside property may be reduced to no more than 20 ft through Administrative Review or by the Planning Commission.

Though the project would slightly exceed the average size of homes in the immediate area, it is strategically situated to the side and rear and would not disrupt the residential scale of the area. Issues typically related to hillside projects are not raised by the project. Staff recommended positive findings and project approval.

A discussion followed related to discrepancy regarding lot size in the staff report. Commissioner Davitt confirmed that the correct lot size is 14,750-sf and that all calculations were based on that figure.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented that the location of the front property line was not clear and asked why story poles were not erected.

Mr. Shimazu responded that the applicant was requested to do so.

Chairwoman Mehranian confirmed that the applicant was not present.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to continue Hillside Development Permit 04-47 to a date uncertain and requiring story poles. Unanimous.

**B. Floor Area Review 04-17; Styler; 5009 Alta Canyon Road:**

Planner Gjolme reported the applicants' request add 273-sf to an existing two-story home, that would exceed the standard for the lot, but is within the maximum allowed with Floor Area Review.

The 10,620-sf site is located on the west side of Alta Canyon Road, north of Louise Drive, in the R-1-20,000 zone.

A Powerpoint presentation demonstrated the new master bath and closet centrally located at the rear of the second floor. All setbacks would exceed code standards and the existing profile of the home would for the most part, be retained. The first-floor ridge would partially screen the project from the front

and it would be seen in profile with the existing second floor from the north. It would not be seen from the south.

Given the minimal size and visibility of the project and preservation of the home's scale and appearance, Staff recommended positive findings and project approval.

Applicant Carolyn Styler, pointed out that an overhang of the master bedroom and creates 560-sf of covered patio area which is counted towards existing floor area.

The Commissioners supported the project, noting that it would be a non-obtrusive addition to the rear of the home.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to approve Floor Area Review 04-17 as conditioned. Unanimous.

## VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

### A. Continued: Tree Removal 04-66; Lim; 4381 Beulah Drive:

Planning Aide Shimazu recalled that this item was continued from the Commission's December 14<sup>th</sup> hearing for two more arborist reports addressing the possibility of saving a 42-inch-diameter oak. The two most recent reports cite the oak's progressive decay over several years and its compromised system. Staff continues to recommend removal of the tree with a condition that two, 36-inch-box oaks are planted on the premises.

Commissioner Davitt confirmed that staff attempted to have Western Arborists evaluate the tree, per Commissioner Gelhaar's suggestion. Unfortunately, they were overbooked but they did recommend an arborist who Staff retained.

Mr. Lim pointed out that there are currently 8 oaks on his property. He asked if the Commission would waive the condition to plant more oaks or, as an alternative, he would donate two oaks to the City.

Commissioner Gelhaar expressed disappointment that Western Arborists was not available. He felt it would be helpful if the City had an arborist who could advise us how to mitigate these situations. He stated he could approve the request with a condition requiring that two, 48-inch-box trees be installed or their equivalent value paid to the City's Tee Fund.

Commissioner Davitt commented that the oak clearly need to be removed. He preferred that it be replaced with a 48-inch trunk diameter oak in the same location.

Director Stanley advised that a deposit would have to equal the equivalent value of the subject tree. Staff also needs to verify with an arborist whether soil remediation is required before planting another tree in the same location.

Commissioner Cahill observed that all the reports clearly state that the oak needs to be removed. He preferred not to impose conditions, since the tree damage was not caused by the applicant.

Chairwoman Mehranian concurred with Commissioners Davitt and Engler that a replacement tree be installed in the same location with any soil remediation as required by an arborist.

Commissioner Engler was concerned that the subject oak is located in an irrigated area. Root rot will quickly occur to any tree planted in the same location.

Director Stanley stated that depending on what the Commission determines, an arborist should be retained.

M/S/C Engler/Mehranian approving Tree Removal Permit 04-66 with a condition that a 48-inch-box oak be planted in the same location and that the advice of an arborist be sought regarding soil remediation and irrigation. Unanimous.

**B. Tree Removal 04-68 and 04-69; Catalano; 4272 Hampstead Road:**

Planning Intern Mikhail reported that the subject site is vacant, pending approval of building permits for a new home that were submitted "at risk" with the understanding that the tree removals could be denied and the house would have to be redesigned to work around the trees.

The applicant had filed two separate permits: 1) to remove one oak, approximately 16' in trunk diameter, located in the middle of a proposed driveway and 2) to relocate an oak approximately 25" in diameter. However, during the evaluation process, it was discovered that a third oak, with a triple trunk diameter of 15 inches, would have to be removed to accommodate a walkway for the new home and that a fourth oak, located in the southwest quadrant of the property with a trunk diameter of 30", could be jeopardized due to grading and construction activity.

Review of the application materials, combined with numerous site inspections, and a report submitted from a city-certified arborist, determined that the required Findings could not be made. Staff concluded there are design options

available that would better accommodate a new home and not affect the oaks and topography. Staff

Planning Intern Mikhail noted that construction plans call for significant soil compaction, excavation grading and alternation of the water table.

Director Stanley advised that the intent is to reorient access from Beresford Drive.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Director Stanley verified that a demolition work exceeded the permitted scope of work. Pool and cement work was done in the middle and southern portions of the lot and some grubbing has been done to the west and southwest areas. As designed, a pad is designed around the house and basement, with pylons supporting the structure --- all this would create a new elevation around an oak. He advised that the plans show numerous elevation changes. He added that Staff calculated the slope several times and verified that the property is not "hillside".

Commissioner Gelhaar confirmed that "Parcel 3" is part of this project and noted that there is no notation for a Parcel 2.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Davitt, Director Stanley advised that the applicant understood that by submitting plans "at risk", with the understanding that the tree removal could be denied, which would require a redesign to work around the trees.

Project architect, Marco Brambilla, provided a brief history of his project and stated that plans were checked by Staff from the inception, at which time the project affected two trees. He related that Public Works suggested placing the driveway as far away from the intersection as possible, which he has done. Doing so affected one tree. Further, the house is tilted to make room for a leach system, which affected another oak. He proposed to relocate tree #3 to another spot on site and to replace #2 with another protected species. He reiterated that only oaks are involved.

Director Stanley disagreed, and noted that any trees as near structures as proposed will not survive more than 3 years. There are 3 oaks that fall under that category and another most likely would not survive.

Mr. Catalano responded to as question from Commissioner Gelhaar and advised that approximately 300-400 cubic yards of dirt would be imported.

Director Stanley advised Commissioner Gelhaar that trees marked 56,7, and 8 are oaks smaller than 12" in diameter and are therefore not protected.

Ken Doty, representing the owner, stated that he has worked with the City over a year on this project and that he was originally advised that tree #2 was not protected. He described it as three, 6-inch spikes protruding from the top. His client is willing to replace it with a 48-inch box oak, which Valley Crest Tree Service guarantees a 95% survival. Mr. Catalano offered to submit a bond to assure that would happen.

Mr. Doty stated that his client was adamant about not maintaining the driveway on Hampstead; she was raised in the home that was demolished and witnessed many accidents near the blind corner.

Commissioner Davitt remarked that there was confusion regarding tree #4; the arborists stated it would be affected by the retaining wall.

Director Stanley advised that the arborist did not review the plans that the plan currently under review. The arborist did state however, that any grade change or change to drainage patterns would affect #4. Experience has shown that in similar cases, a property owner returns within 1-3 years with a request to remove the tree.

Chairwoman Mehranian stated there was no need to understand the minutia about the building footprint or if the site could accommodate the house without affecting the trees.

Commissioner Gelhaar pointed out a large area that could accommodate the house and noted that the basement and its associated excavation would affect the oaks even more.

Commissioner Gelhaar stated that he was not anxious to having anything other than a neutral balanced site.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to deny Tree Removal Requests 04-76 and 04-79. Unanimous.

**C. Receive and file items:**

Administrative Hillside approvals: Planner Gjolme summarized an approval for 4989 Terracita Lane. Commissioner Gelhaar presided and approved the request to allow a 1,031-sf, first-floor addition.

A second Administrative Hearing was held earlier that day and approval given to allow a 910-sf, single story addition on hillside property.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented on the Alta Canyada project, which met all setbacks. The only issue was that it was discovered that the existing house is setback 41 ft, as was the extension. It therefore needed the sign-off of neighbors. He asked if it was reasonable that a single neighbor could "torpedo" a project and asked to discuss that issue when R-1 revisions are reviewed.

**IX. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS:**

A discussion followed regarding the Alta Canyada project over which Commissioner Gelhaar presided. The project involved "averaging" the front setback.

Commissioner Gelhaar reiterated his concern with the ability of a single neighbor to undermine a project which is supported by other neighbors and which would be supportable by an Administrative Officer.

Chairwoman Mehranian commented that building consensus is not the job of a homeowners who simply want to expand their home.

On another matter, Chair Mehranian confirmed that the Corona project sustained the recent storms; there was no slope failure.

Commissioner Gelhaar requested information from staff with regard to crib walls and if the Commission should continue to encourage them. He referred to the crib wall across from the YMCA, which failed during the rainstorms.

Commissioner Cahill remarked that it would be helpful if Staff provided a map keyed to the agenda that would assist the Commissioners in locating the project sites.

**X. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR:**

Director Stanley advised that the City declared a local emergency earlier in the day, mostly for funding purposes with regard to road failures. A slope failure at Inverness resulted in the road collapsing down to Highland and closing Highland. The collapse took out sewer pipe and water lines. It will be a long-term closure, though residents have other access options. He and the Building Inspector have visited all construction sites and confirmed that all required precautions had been taken.

A Power point presentation provided the Commissioners with the significant street and slope failures in the City. Director Stanley advised that rodents have damaged the slopes; water is visible in gopher holes throughout the hillside areas.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

M/S/C Davitt/Cahill to adjourn at 9:10 p.m. Unanimous.

---

Secretary to the Planning Commission