

**A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE,  
HELD JANUARY 28, 2003**

- CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Levine called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.
- ROLL:** Present were: Commissioners Brown, Engler, Gelhaar and Mehranian, Assistant City Attorney Steres, Director of Community Development Stanley, Planner Cantrell, and Assistant Planner Gjolme.
- COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** Comments were not offered.
- CONSENT CALENDAR:** M/S/C Brown/Mehranian to adopt the minutes of December 12, as amended by Chairman Levine and Commissioner Mehranian. Unanimous.
- PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
- HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 02-49; BUILDING DEPTH REVIEW 02-12; HARRIS; 3907 DURHAM PLACE:** Planner Cantrell described the applicants' request to allow a residential expansion comprised of: an 86-sf ground floor addition, a new, 1,792-sf second floor and review of the building depth since the second floor eaves would extend beyond the 60-ft threshold for review. Total floor and roofed area would reach 4,902-sf.
- The project site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac on Durham Place, off Chevy Chase, in the R-1-40,000 Zone. It is 44,490-sf in area.
- The property is accessed via a driveway, which bisects the property, separating the northern portion, where the house is located, from the undeveloped southern portion. The house faces the driveway, with the entry hidden from street view. It is situated slightly above Chevy Chase Drive, though barely visible from there and is well screened from neighboring properties. Directly south is a steep, forested downslope with a house far below. To the west at 3903 Durham Place, is a single-story residence, elevated slightly above the subject property, with a view slightly north of the

subject house. North of the site is 3941 Chevy Chase, with driveway access off Durham, from where the subject house would be visible. The house is profiled against the sky as viewed from that angle. Planner Cantrell noted that landscape screening further into the property and between the two lots serves to mitigate views of the subject house. The addition would maintain the unusual orientation away from the street and the generous setbacks.

The design is straightforward, using hipped roofs, composition shingles, exposed rafter tails and wide window frames. The second floor steps back on three sides. Existing landscaping would be maintained and there would be minimal change to the home's footprint. The subject house is distant from neighboring properties, with very little view from offsite. Accordingly, the second floor's 62-ft depth did not raise concerns, and compliance with the Light Reflectance Value limitation was not considered as necessary. The project meets all development standards and total floor area is approximately half of the maximum allowed for this property.

Staff recommended positive findings and project approval as conditioned.

Commissioner Mehranian commented that the project represents a considerable expansion and stated that it was difficult to visualize the project.

Planner Cantrell stated that there would be very little change in the footprint and the mature landscaping would remain.

Mike Geragos, project designer, explained his efforts to maintain the Craftsman style of the home. He noted that all setback requirements are met and the only view of the house would be from the private driveway.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Gelhaar expressed support for the project. He advised of having viewed the site from above and agreed that the project would result in little, if any, view obstruction.

The Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Mehranian restated her request that Staff provide "before and after" views.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to approve Hillside Development Permit 02-49 and Building Depth Review 02-12. Unanimous.

**HILLSIDE  
DEVELOPMENT  
PERMIT 02-61;  
MODIFICATION 02-69;  
VARIANCE 02-09;  
SOUSA;  
4075 CHEVY CHASE  
DRIVE:**

Planner Cantrell reported the applicant's request to construct a new, two-story home, which would exceed the 28-ft height maximum and the 35-ft stepped massing limit. It would also encroach within the front and south side setbacks.

The project site is located on the east side of Chevy Chase Drive, in the middle of a long, winding block between Flintridge Avenue and Stratford Drive in the R-1-40,000 Zone. It is 20,360-sf in area, 106-ft wide, with an average slope of 22%.

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing house and replace it with a new, 5,700-sf home, including a new, 1,100-sf garage, on approximately the existing footprint. The project was designed with the intent to avoid disruption or removal of the numerous trees, including oaks. A new garage would extend farther forward than the existing one and be lower in elevation by approximately 1½ ft. It would accommodate four vehicles, parked in tandem, with access from a new and wider driveway. The new home would essentially maintain the existing front setback of 33 ft, but extended over a wider area. R-1 revisions call for all properties to establish front setback parameters by 'averaging'. This results in a minimum 55-ft front yard setback requirement for this property.

A new kitchen is proposed over the new garage. The majority of the house measures 28 ft in height; however, a height of 38 ft is attained as measured from the

lowered garage wing. This occurs in the descending portion of the site, and the project does meet the requirements for stepped massing. However, a variance is required for that component because overall height exceeds the 35-ft limit for stepped massing. Staff believes that the Variance could be avoided by raising the level of the garage so that overall height of 35 ft is not exceeded. The higher peak north of the main ridge qualifies as an architectural extension. Staff discussed this option with the applicant, who concurred that it would be a more reasonable approach in terms of making the findings.

The new first floor would be comprised of 2,730-sf; the second floor would add another 1,870-sf. On the south side, the 11-ft side yard setback would be used for the new structure. Planner Cantrell stated that the angle plane requirement dictated a greater second floor setback, which was attractively addressed.

Bulk and view blockage are not significant; the house would not be viewed from the downslope neighbor and neighbors residing upslope would not have their views blocked. The house is only slightly elevated above the street and is closer to the street than others are, yet it provides an attractive effect. The house to the rear is at a much higher elevation and the rear and there are no long-range views of the house. Given the limited views of the house, Staff did not believe that application of the Light Reflectance Value was necessary. Lastly, the City Engineer reviewed the project and recommended conditions requiring drainage and recycling plans, septic approval, an Urban Storm water Mitigation plan and Public Works approval for driveway walls that encroach within the public right-of-way.

Staff recommended positive findings and project approval, with the slight change to achieve compliance with the approval stepped massing height limit.

Chairman Levine confirmed that the first floor side yard setback meets Code.

At Commissioner Mehranian's request, Planner Cantrell explained Staff's suggestion --- the height from the garage to the major ridge could easily be lowered to 35 ft. Additionally, the principal ridge over the entry element reaches 38 ft --- it would be lowered to 37 ft if the garage pad were raised. The entry element could then be allowed as an architectural element, which is allowed at a maximum height of 40 ft.

John Vandavelde, project architect, stated that the slope of the lot and abundance of tree coverage, dictated that the footprint remain fundamentally identical to that of the former home and would preclude extensive grading. He concurred with Staff's recommendations to raise the level of the garage and advised that his clients recently agreed to lower the roof pitch to 4:12. He felt that compromise should eliminate any concerns of meeting the requirements for stepped massing.

He advised that the massing was contained towards the north end of the lot to eliminate any downslope wall over 20 ft in height.

Commissioner Brown confirmed that cut and fill would be balanced.

Steve Smith, landscape architect, stated that his mission was to refrain from disturbing any of the significant trees.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing. Since comments were not offered, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Gelhaar stated that while the design was beautiful, he was not convinced it is in the right location, where he felt a single-story home would be more appropriate. He drove around the area and the majority of homes are set back at greater distances than this project. Should the house remain a two-story design, he would like it set back at least 55 ft to meet the "averaging" requirement.

Chairman Levine confirmed that Staff's recommendation would not require a variance.

Commissioner Brown concurred with Commissioner Gelhaar --- "this is a very large home and the trade off is the setback and the parking". The additional parking space recommended by Staff in the draft conditions would allow more on-site parking. He also pointed out that the lack of any protected trees that would preclude pushing the house further back.

Commissioner Mehranian encouraged the applicant to restudy the design, adding that "overpowering projects such as this one destroy what Chevy Chase is all about".

Chairman Levine commented that the design was pleasing, but the setback encroachment was a cause for concern, given that this is not a remodel. He noted that if he called for a vote, it was likely that the project would be denied. The applicant was offered the option of a vote with the option of an appeal to the City Council, or a continuance to rework the design.

Mr. Vandavelde requested a continuance to a date uncertain.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Brown to continue Hillside Development Permit 02-61, Modification 02-69 and Variance 02-09 to a date uncertain. Unanimous.

**MODIFICATION 01-34;  
CONDITIONAL USE  
PERMIT 339;  
LA BRUNA JR.,  
615 BERKSHIRE AVE.:**

Director Stanley provided a brief overview of the project site which has street frontage along Berkshire and Woodleigh Avenue. The property falls under the definition of a *hairpin* lot and therefore, both street frontages are considered as "front yards" for purposes of establishing setbacks. As a result, the north and west property lines are considered as "side" property lines. A batting cage, located in the northwest corner of the lot, encroaches into both side yards.

On November 12<sup>th</sup>, the Commission denied a CUP to allow fully encased lights on the batting cage. Prior to adoption of the Resolution of denial, the applicant requested, and was granted, reconsideration

based on his offer to revise the landscape and fencing plan along Berkshire. Meanwhile, the applicant filed an appeal to the City Council regarding imposed conditions set by the Planning Commission regarding permanent installation of vinyl mesh screening and hedge height along Woodleigh Lane.

The appeal was heard on January 6, at which time the City Council remanded the entire matter to the Planning Commission.

The following items were before the Commission for further review: 1) permanent installation of mesh screening on the wrought-iron fence along Woodleigh Lane, 2) allowed landscape height along Woodleigh, 3) installation of lights on the existing batting cage located at the northwest corner of the lot. A power point demonstration compared the original request with the applicant's proposed revisions.

**Landscaping** - A row of 42-inch box Texas privet would be installed within 3-ft in front of the existing Carolina cherry shrubs along Woodleigh. Director Stanley advised that the Director of Public Works has approved their location within the right-of-way.

**Fabric mesh screening along Woodleigh** - As a further concession, the applicant proposes to remove the most southerly 50 ft of mesh fabric, pending maturity of the landscaping. The removed fabric would be reinstalled, subject to the approval of the Director of Community Development. Staff requested that the applicant provide a demonstration section and darker green fabric. The result was a more effective barrier.

Staff continued to recommended approval with modified conditions, due to the lack of any visual impacts along Woodleigh Lane. The lighting on the batting cage was supported, given the scientific information provided by an acoustical engineer, concluding that the lighting would be comparable to tennis court lighting. Lighted tennis courts are allowed

with a CUP in the R-1-40,000 Zone. As requested, the acoustical engineer's resumé was included in the Commissioners' packets.

Conditions added by Staff to the previous conditions included #16, allowing permanent mesh screening contingent upon preservation, maintenance and density of landscaping. It also addresses fabric and landscaping along the horse trail, subject to the Director's approval. Condition 26; reducing the number of pilasters from 17 to 11 and removing a low planter wall and shrubs along Berkshire. No. 27 Limits use of the batting cage to no later than 9:00 p.m., 7 days a week. No. 28 establishes a 45-day trial period for the lighted batting cage, following issuance of permits. Thereafter, Staff will file a report of its findings to the Commission for any action. Lastly, Director Stanley alluded to condition #20, which carried-forward from the previous approval, which requires the applicant to provide a record of purchase for the land currently owned by Los Angeles County, from the north property line to the outer perimeter of the wall and fencing. A Lot Line Adjust would then be recorded. Barring compliance with that condition, all structures shall be removed the County property.

Commissioner Gelhaar addressed the height restrictions of the hedge along Woodleigh - his recall was that the restriction also applied to the wrought iron fence.

Assistant City Attorney Steres explained that on the second "go around", the Commission imposed conditions that were not acceptable to the applicant, and that approval lapsed. Consequently, the previous approval, allowing hedge height of 6-ft was still valid.

Commissioner Mehranian and Chairman Levine confirmed that Staff would monitor the hedge height and landscaping maintenance.

Commissioner Gelhaar then read from the January 8, 2002 staff report, which was not supportive of lights for the batting cage. The report state that it was not consistent with the General Plan and would have a negative impact on the adjacent neighbors.

Director Stanley responded to a question from Commissioner Brown; the fence elevations are called out on the plan and it also shows where the 50-ft of mesh would be removed until the landscaping matures.

Commissioner Brown confirmed that Staff's current position is to allow the lights as requested and as conditioned.

Applicant, Angelo La Bruna, explained where his property is and where the County's property begins. He is in the process of purchasing an additional 2 ft to provide a greater setback.

Commissioner Gelhaar inquired what the distance is from the existing fence and the new property line when the purchase is completed.

Director Stanley advised that following the land purchase, the northerly retaining wall would be along the property line. The lights would be set back 11 and 13 ft from the property line and 13 ft from the westerly boundary. Staff has prepared an Administrative Modification to allow those encroachments, pending approval of the CUP.

Commissioner Brown confirmed that the lights are identical to those demonstrated for him during a site visit. Each light is shielded, and east of the batting cage for a 25-ft distance, the candlepower is nearly zero. There would be no light spillage on the horse trail.

Director Stanley confirmed that that Mr. La Bruna understands the ramifications of the 45-day review period. He advised that the light fixtures would not exceed 1 ft candlepower and that Mr. La Bruna is asking permission to use aluminum and wood bats; a difference of 2 decibels per the sound study.

On behalf of the applicant, Jay Johnson stated that the important aspect to consider is the line of sight from Woodleigh. The fabric mesh and landscaping provide a visual screen.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered from the audience, and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Brown sought assurance that the “entire package” was under review, including the Berkshire frontage.

Director Stanley commented that the applicant was offering to forego elements that the Commission had previously approved i.e., reducing the number of pilasters along Berkshire and eliminating a garden wall. This accommodation would provide a more open appearance and along the front of the property.

Commissioner Brown stated that his concern all along was the fabric mesh and its appearance. He made a site visit earlier that day and found the augmented landscaping and darker color mesh was much more desirable and the concessions along Berkshire were a “huge improvement”, and presenting a more natural appearance on Berkshire. Regarding the batting cage, he stated “sound studies are fine, but the test period is key”, and Mr. La Bruna is willing to risk installation of the lights.

Commissioner Mehranian supported the concessions along Berkshire and stated that the mesh was never a concern for her, given the safety factor and the landscape screening. Noise from batting practice could be a problem, though she acknowledged the lack of complaints and the 45-day review period.

Commissioner Engler stated he did not have any problem with adding lights to the batting cage. Regarding concerns of noise, he pointed out that the Noise Ordinance allows operation of landscape maintenance equipment until 9:00 p.m. in residential areas. He doubted that batting practice would be noisier than a lawnmower and concurred that the darker mesh screening fabric is preferable. He stated he was “extremely happy with the proposed changes along Berkshire”.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented that the landscaping and the redesign along Berkshire was a great improvement; but he continued to be troubled with allowing the CUP for various reasons. He recalled that on January 8, 2001, Mr. La Bruna was granted reconsideration based on his offer to modify the project. Commissioner Gelhaar subsequently phoned Mr. Johnson, stating that he could support the project if the request for the lights was withdrawn. The subsequent meeting did not include the lights, and Commissioner Gelhaar voted to support the request. He stated that he could not make the findings and asked his colleagues to keep in mind condition #21, which limits use of the field to infield practice only and bunting. Mr. La Bruna thereafter stated he needed the mesh for safety and indicated pop flies were being hit. Commissioner Gelhaar asked that a condition be added stating that pop flies must be hit within the infield so that players would have no need to run and hit the fence. He also requested additional conditions requiring Commission review should any complaint regarding use of the field be filed with the City and asked for a term limit or annual review of the use. Lastly, he asked that the CUP approval expire upon sale of the property.

Chairman Levine acknowledged that his prior statements were not generally favorable; however, the most recent concessions "represent a great improvement over what has been there". He stated that the batting cage might not appear as a problem now, but "neighbors change and things change". He felt that hitting balls and use of aluminum bats could impact a neighborhood and that noise seems greater during the evening hours. Chairman Levine acknowledged those are his perceptions, rather than scientific information. He continued to oppose use of the mesh fabric, though the double row of privet helps. He supported the suggestion for either a "term limit" or annual review and "definitely removing the CUP or bringing it back to the Commission for reconsideration based on who owns the property".

Assistant City Attorney Steres advised that a Conditional Use Permit runs with the land; therefore

the Commission may not impose a condition that the CUP expire with transfer of ownership.

Chairman Levine confirmed that information was gleaned from law.

Attorney Steres reiterated his prior advise and added that the Commission can establish a review period, but not a term limit or cause the CUP to lapse upon sale of the property. If there was to be a motion for approval, he suggested striking "if any complaint received" from condition #28 because of the 45-day review period. It is clear that after the trial period, the Commission would receive a report from Staff and could set a hearing based on any information in that report. Condition #27- strike "only wooden bats", #24, strike "street" lights.

Chairman Levine confirmed that lights were removed from all utility poles; therefore, condition #24 should also be stricken.

Commissioner Brown referred to the draft conditions which trigger a review if a complaint is *ever* filed. He felt that would be unfair and too much of a "hammer" in someone's hands and could result in unnecessary expense. He suggested discretionary language to allow the Director to determine if operation of the field was creating a nuisance or problem. He could recommend additional conditions and return the matter to the Commission.

Attorney Steres confirmed that would be an appropriate condition.

Commissioner Brown addressed Commissioner Gelhaar's suggestion to preclude foul balls and stated "it is almost like trying to legislate nature". He felt that limiting field use to infield practice spoke to the Commission's intent and was comfortable with the existing language.

Commissioner Gelhaar asked his colleagues to think about allowing a CUP that would "last forever".

Director Stanley reminded the Commission that the CUP applies solely to the lights on the batting cage –all other components fall under the Modification.

M/S/C Brown/Mehranian to approve Modification 01-34 and Conditional Use Permit 339 as conditioned in the draft resolution with modifications as discussed “street” lights from conditions #24 and #27, eliminate prohibition of only wooden bats, modify #28 as suggested by Attorney Steres and add a condition that if at anytime, the Director determines that the use is creating a nuisance to the comfort, use and enjoyment of surrounding properties, he may impose reasonable additional conditions on the use.

Commissioner Engler asked that “Edison” be replaced with the word “utilities”.

3 Ayes; Dissenting: Gelhaar and Levine.

**PUBLIC MEETING:**

**MODIFICATION 02-65;  
GOLDSTEIN; 4407  
OAKWOOD AVENUE:**

Assistant Planner Gjolme described the applicant’s request to allow a new, 6,318-sf, two-story residence to encroach into the required front yard setback.

The property qualifies as a *hairpin* lot; therefore each frontage along Oakwood and Georgian Road are considered as “front yards”, where a 50-ft setback is required. The project site is located on the northwest corner of Oakwood and Georgian, in the R-1-20,000 Zone.

The new residence would be sited near the center of the lot, facing Oakwood, with garage access off Georgian Road. The first floor would comprise 4,174-sf and the second floor 2,144-sf. While the total area is substantial, Assistant Planner Gjolme advised that it complies with the 6,642-sf maximum allowed for the lot and is less sf than neighboring homes to the north and south.

Side and rear setbacks and height requirements are met; the sole issue is the front yard encroachment along both frontages. A 45-ft setback is provided along Oakwood (a 6-ft encroachment into the 50-ft “average”

requirement), whereas the existing home is setback 55 ft from Oakwood. A 20-ft setback would be provided along Georgian Road, which serves as a side yard. Six, non-protected trees are slated for removal to accommodate the residence, and would not compromise the dense perimeter buffer.

Staff presented a matrix of surrounding properties, which included 4 other *hairpin* lots, which use Georgian as their functional street side yard, despite its qualification as a "front" yard. Setbacks for those homes are 20, 16, 17 and 25 ft. Three of those homes accommodate smaller front yards than what the applicant proposes and two are larger in floor area than this project.

Staff concluded that the *hairpin* designation justifies relief to the setback requirement along Georgian, but recommended against allowing the 6-ft encroachment along Oakwood. Staff recommended positive findings and project approval with an added condition restricting construction equipment and vehicles to the project site.

Commissioner Gelhaar noted that the front property line curves inward and confirmed that the porch, with two support columns, is where the encroachment occurs along Oakwood.

Guy Maturo, project designer, advised that all restrictions were discussed with Staff from the inception and that the project was designed to fit the lot. He prepared a matrix showing the average size of surrounding properties. Mr. Maturo stated that he pushed the house as far back as possible on the pie-shaped lot. He acknowledged that he could push it back further, but it would impact the home theater area. He then presented an overlay of the existing house over the proposed footprint.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Engler, Mr. Maturo stated it could be that his client was contemplating a fence with pilasters.

Chairman Levine invited testimony from the audience.

Phil Cosgrove, 708 Georgian Road, resides across the street from the project. He related that approximately one year ago, he was before the Commission with a similar *hairpin* situation; one corner of his home encroached into the front setback. Mr. Cosgrove conceded that relief was in order for the odd shaped properties, but expressed concern that the two-story mass would run parallel with Georgian. He felt the house should be less massive and imposing along that frontage.

Mr. Maturo commented that the design complies with the depth requirement and that the project does not protrude farther than any other home on Georgian.

Chairman Levine asked if any consideration was given to having the house face Georgian Road.

Mr. Maturo responded affirmatively; however, the present configuration allows better use of the back yard.

Further comments were not offered.

Commissioner Engler concurred with the neighbor's comments that the bulk along Georgian Road needs to be reduced.

Commissioner Mehranian commented that it was difficult to approve a house of the size proposed, especially with the encroachment.

Commissioner Brown recognized the need for relief on hairpin lots, but he felt that the project needs to be predominately one-story where the bulk is presented. It appeared that the house was intentionally designed to appear large.

Commissioner Gelhaar stated that he could support the project as submitted. He considered the numerous existing trees as mitigation. He noted that the house is set back 20 ft from Georgian and 30 ft from the curb.

Chairman Levine stated that he didn't have a significant problem with the project until he heard the Mr. Cosgrove's comments. He commented that moving the house back might be helpful and he encouraged the applicant to remove some of the bulk along Georgian Road. He then stated that if a vote were called for, a denial would be a likely result. The applicant was provided with options.

Mr. Maturo opted for a continuance to March 11<sup>th</sup>.

M/S/C Mehranian/Brown to continue Modification 02-65 to March 11. Unanimous.

Chairman Levine advised the audience that there would not be any further notification regarding the continued meeting.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Overhead Utilities  
Appeal 03-01; Avesyan;  
4465 Gould Ave.:**

Director Stanley reported the applicant's request for relief from the Municipal Code requirement to underground utilities. Mr. Avesyan constructed a new house and is required to underground electrical service from the nearest pole, which is approximately 2 ft on the neighboring commercial property. The applicant desires to comply with Code, but his 5-month effort to acquire an easement from owners of the neighboring commercial property and cross the property line, has been unsuccessful

Director Stanley recalled that in a similar situation, the Commission required a covenant to be recorded, stating that when and if an easement is provided, utilities would have to be placed underground. Code allows the Planning Commission to waive, modify or delay the undergrounding requirement if practical difficulties or unreasonable hardship would result from compliance.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Engler, Director Stanley advised that the easement would be above ground and restricted to overhead services. An option would be for the applicant to place a pole on his property, underground, and proceed overhead for 2 ft, across the neighboring property.

Mr. Avesyan advised that Edison requires all three partners who own the neighboring commercial property, to grant the easement. Only two of the partners have provided consent.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Mehranian, Mr. Avesyan stated that his preference at this point was for overhead placement. He offered to put the utilities underground when the commercial property changes ownership.

Commissioner Engler suggested relocating the electrical line to the west corner of the house, where there would be less drop.

Further comments were not offered.

Commissioner Brown commented that an alternative is to extend the utility wires overhead and he supported Commissioner Engler's suggestion.

Director Stanley stated that a recorded covenant would allow the applicant to proceed. He advised of having made contact with one of the neighboring owners, who is acting on the advice of counsel – his lawyer suggest not allowing the easement because of all the requirements.

Commissioner Engler stated he could vote to allow overhead utilities provided a covenant is required and if the applicant stubbed at least 3 ft from the house so that utilities could be easily undergrounded in the future.

Chairman Levine stated that he would refrain from voting, as he is employed by Edison. He suggested extending another line toward a pole on Gould. He felt there were other opportunities for undergrounding that would involve someone other than the problem neighbor.

The Commissioners agreed to table the matter and asked the applicant to investigate undergrounding towards another direction.

**COMMENTS FROM  
THE COMMISSIONERS:**

Commissioner Gelhaar addressed Staff's comments that story poles were unnecessary due to lack of view issues.

He felt that story poles can also address issues of massing, setbacks, etc. While they should not be required in all cases, they would have helped on the Chevy Chase project heard earlier on the agenda.

Commissioner Engler concurred and added that he wanted hillside submittals to include landscape plans and color palettes.

Commissioner Mehranian had similar concerns, adding that story poles help visually.

Commissioner Gelhaar encouraged Staff to speak with planning staff in the cities of Laguna Niguel, Pacific Grove and Carmel.

Commissioner Brown asked Staff to check the conditions for the Mahli development on Palm Avenue; construction vehicles are parked all over the street.

Commissioner Engler stated that he anticipated reviewing an application for 3990 Chevy Chase in the near future. Also, at 355 Corona, the oaks need to be protected.

Regarding 355 Corona, Commissioner Brown noted that a series of mature oleanders along the driveway which were specifically "conditioned" to remain, were removed. He suggested remedying the situation with full size replacements.

**DIRECTOR'S  
COMMENTS:**

Director Stanley encouraged the Commissioners to report problems prior to Commission meetings and as they are encountered, so that Staff can investigate and provide a report at the following meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to adjourn at 8:20 p.m.  
Unanimous.