

CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES February 9, 2016 City Hall Council Chambers 1327 Foothill Boulevard

- I. **CALL TO ORDER** Chairman McConnell called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.
- II. **ROLL:** Also present were Vice Chair Smith and Commissioner Hazen. Commissioner Gunter arrived at 6:09 p.m. and Commissioner Jain was absent.
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** The Flag Salute was recited.
- IV. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** At this time, members of the audience may address the Commission regarding matters that are not on the agenda or matters that are on the Consent Calendar. There were none.
- V. **REORDERING OF THE AGENDA** Chairman McConnell recommended reordering the agenda as follows: Item VIII C., VIII B., VIII D., VII A., VIII A., IX, X, XI, XII, & XIII.
- VI. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. **Minutes:** December 8, 2015 meeting. Chairman McConnell indicated that voting on the Minutes must be continued to the next meeting in order to have a quorum of Commissioners that were in attendance at the December 8, 2015 meeting.

VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. [Hillside Development Permit 14-39/Second-floor Review 14-36/Conditional Use Permit 506/ Director's Misc. Review 15-23 \(flat roof\); 520 Haverstock Road; Giragosian/Johnson:](#) request to allow construction of an 11,022 sq. ft. 2-story residence on a hillside lot. Other site improvements include driveway and interior retaining walls, swimming pool and spa and outdoor patios. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planner Gjolme).

Planner Gjolme presented a staff report and indicated that the item was continued because of civil engineering issues. The architectural changes are subtle with the house being shifted back to allow for a greater front yard setback. The proposed three-car garage with a fourth tandem bay

will be placed to the rear of the property. Removal of the garage wing at the front has helped to reduce the overall massing which staff looks at favorably. Furthermore, the proposal will reduce the grading by one foot. Applying the reduction over the entire building footprint would equal 900 cubic yards of export and import which translates to a 30% reduction, overall, on the site.

Mr. Gjolme indicated that the lot can accommodate 16,240 square feet of buildable area. There are upslope views of the house from the street. Staff does not believe the presentation is unreasonable. In addition, the proposed front entry is 13 ½ feet high. Staff views the overall massing as acceptable. It cannot be viewed at all off-site.

The existing drainage swales are deteriorated and would be replaced per City Engineering specifications. Street improvements are proposed from Inverness up to Haverstock to the far southwest end of the property. A street improvement plan proposes installation of curbs and gutters which is typical of this scale project.

Approximately 39,000 square feet of land will be disturbed which is less than the threshold that would trigger Low Impact Development (LID) and specific construction management measures on the site. In the instance this changes during the plan check or construction phase, Condition of Approval number 21 is in place to deal with any potential LID requirements such as a storm water permit.

An aerial of the site was viewed to show the subject property location in relation to the neighboring properties.

Mr. Gjolme stated that staff recommends approval for all of the requested applications.

Speaker Jay Johnson said that color renderings were provided. The primary façade was reviewed for light reflectance from a distance and from a lower vantage point. Some changes may need to be made to meet reflectance limits. He also indicated that measures would be put into place to deal with drainage, grading, and truck trips during construction.

Commissioner Gunter asked a question about the grading plan and about redesigning the drainage.

Director Stanley and Mr. Gjolme clarified that the driveway would be graded.

Commissioner Gunter asked about the methodology for this.

Director Stanley said that Building and Safety would perform the grading review. If there is over-excavation, then that would have to be shown during the plan check process. The current drainage plan shows drainage improvements. As part of the grading plan approval, an agreement between the subject property owner and the neighbor will be required or the drainage would need to be redesigned to be contained on the subject property. A note to this affect must be included on the grading plan. Also, a detailed Condition of Approval should be made regarding the drainage.

Vice Chairman Smith asked if construction drawings exist for the project and if the height of the house has changed. He asked about the existing grade.

Mr. Gjolme said that the applicant can clarify both of these items.

Chairman McConnell asked whether the project meets front landscaping requirements.

Mr. Gjolme indicated that the landscaping plan that is proposed is acceptable.

Chairman McConnell said that the overall size of the project should be looked at with regards to floor area. He said that he recalls from a past Planning Commission meeting that a member of the public asked about approvals from a past entitlement on the subject property.

Mr. Gjolme clarified that it was approved, but was never built.

Chairman McConnell asked about the lighting from the front of the house and whether staff had viewed it recently in the evening hours.

Mr. Gjolme said that, "no," staff had not recently viewed the lighting while illuminated in the evening.

Chairman McConnell asked if it would be looked at.

Mr. Gjolme asked for feedback as to how to word a condition regarding exterior lighting.

Commissioner Gunter suggested that a condition be written in a way to discourage intense light glare and to provide clarification that the lighting shall not be "uplit."

Chairman McConnell indicated that there is no plan for filtering light down for the project.

Chairman McConnell opened up the public hearing.

Speaker Jay Johnson mentioned a hydrology study and that curb and gutter details have been made. He is working to reduce square footage at the front of the property and even removed five square-feet from the house. The overall height was not reduced, though, he lowered ceilings inside the house. The width of the house was reduced by 20 feet. The house is narrow. The biggest impact on the neighborhood is at the rear of the property. The intent is to design a simple and elegant home.

Commissioner Gunter asked if the pool is referenced in the landscaping and grading plan.

Mr. Gjolme said, that, "yes," it is on the civil plan and is referenced in the notice and resolution as well.

Vice Chairman Smith said he'd like to speak to the applicant's representative, Mr. Johnson, to clarify the lighting.

Mr. Johnson said that he was all-right with a condition that would not allow flood lighting.

Vice Chairman Smith and Commissioner Gunter asked Mr. Johnson about further clarification about the illumination and the number of fixtures to be proposed.

Mr. Johnson said that exterior wall sconces would be designed and agreed that a clarifying condition should be stipulated. He said that perhaps a condition requiring a timer be installed should be added.

Commissioner Gunter asked the applicant's representative if the owner might be opposed to having a requirement for the lighting restriction.

Mr. Johnson said that, "no," he did not anticipate any opposition.

Commissioner Gunter said that he would like to ensure that lighting is appropriately spaced.

Mr. Johnson asked for clarification as to whether Commissioner Gunter was referring to the area along the driveway.

Commissioner Gunter said that the west side lights are the ones he is referring to.

Vice Chairman Smith said that he was concerned about the massing of the north elevation.

Chairman McConnell asked for clarification on the landscape plan and what material is called out on the downward slope of a hill.

Mr. Johnson indicated that it was groundcover.

Chairman McConnell asked if there were any other comments from the public.

The public hearing was closed and Commissioner comments were made as follows:

Vice Chairman Smith said that he liked the way the applicant dealt with the failing drainage system. He said that the garage relocation is good and that he did not have any issues with the depth of the house. He said that the entry height is good and fits well with the overall design. He can make all of the findings.

Commissioner Hazen said that he appreciates that the biggest issues have been contended with from past Commission meetings, especially with regards to drainage and street curbs. He congratulated the applicant's representative for his efforts and stated that he could make all of the findings as well.

Commissioner Gunter said that he appreciated the reduction of the grading. He said that he is all-right with the size of the home and its excess beyond the slope factor guideline. He said that it is important that the amount of grading has been reduced. Mr. Gunter also stated that lighting is important and that he felt the design fit well, especially during the daytime. He indicated that he was happy the garage was moved to the back of the property and the articulation is acceptable. He felt that a lighting and photometric plan should be provided for Community Development Director approval. He said that he could make all of the findings.

Chairman McConnell said that he is concerned about the lighting and that it is conditioned right.

Commissioner Hazen said that the reflective issue must be addressed.

Chairman McConnell asked if a haul route management plan had been submitted and if it can be reviewed by the public under CEQA via a Negative Declaration.

Deputy City Attorney, Guerra said, "no," that just a condition of approval would need to be crafted.

Chairman McConnell asked if it is required that the neighbors receive notice of the haul route management plan. Commissioner Gunter asked that a haul route management plan be required.

Director Stanley asked Deputy City Attorney Guerra if a seven-day noticing period is required for such notice.

Deputy City Attorney Guerra said that a fifteen-day noticing period is required for those neighbors adjacent to the haul route.

Chairman McConnell said that he can make the findings for the project. He stated that his biggest concern relates to grading. He said that the haul route can be helpful and will enable neighboring residents in their understanding of potential impacts.

M/S/C – Gunter/McConnell to approve the project with the following additional conditions; a 10-day comment period for the haul route plan shall be provided to all properties within 800 feet of the project site; an exterior lighting plan for the residence shall be reviewed and approval by the Director of Community Development prior to issuance of building permits. Approved 4-0.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Second Floor Review 15-31/Setback Modification 15-17; 1925 Lombardy Drive; Peter and Helen Kim:** request to allow the construction of a 4,029-square foot two-story residence. A Setback Modification is required because the project would encroach 14'-0" into the required 42'-0" front setback. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Consulting Planner Cantrell).

Assistant Planner, Parinas gave a staff report on the item. She explained that if roof removal is less than 30% of the total roof area, it would not be considered as a new house. Ms. Parinas showed a floor plan which indicated that the proposed front setback is 32 feet and a maximum of 42 feet is allowed.

She stated that a setback modification request is reasonable. The existing house is set back toward the rear of the property and is in line with the other homes in the neighborhood. The proposed rear and side yard setbacks are compliant and exceed the minimum that is required by code.

Chairman McConnell questioned the maximum height allowed by code.

Ms. Parinas clarified that the maximum height allowed by code for the front elevation is 32 feet and the proposed is 28 feet. She indicated that Staff has issues with the wall heights as well as the height of the dormers on the front elevation which makes the second floor appear larger. She stated that she recommends they be eliminated. A condition of approval can be drafted to contend with this.

Ms. Parinas showed photos of the property and of the story poles. She does not believe there are issues with the view. The east side window design will not impact the adjacent neighbors east side yard. She also showed photos of other existing two-story homes in the neighborhood. She stated that staff supports the project.

Vice Chairman Smith asked that the highlights in blue on the site plan be clarified as to what is there today. He asked if the request is to legalize what is already there.

Commissioner Gunter asked for clarification of the garage pop-out.

Ms. Parinas asked what Commissioner Gunter was referring to.

Commissioner Gunter clarified that he was asking about articulation.

Ms. Parinas said that there would be some modulation due to the design of the roof at the first floor. The second floor would be moved further back so that it will not tower over the street.

Commissioner Gunter asked if there were any discrepancies with the ridges as the front elevation above the garage and the rear elevation and roof plan do not match up. He asked if this has been discussed with the applicant.

The applicant, Peter Kim, explained the second floor design. He said that the difference relates to the bathrooms. He said the intent of the pop outs were to give more variation.

Commissioner Gunter said he was concerned with having someone help with the roof and the angles.

The applicant described how he approached the roof ridge.

Commissioner Gunter had a question about the overhang.

Vice Chairman Smith referred staff to the site plan and indicated that he was having a hard time visualizing what the addition was going to look like.

The applicant said it would be added to the back.

Vice Chairman Smith asked about the unpermitted space.

Director Stanley said that the building permit will need to be reviewed.

Chairman McConnell asked if the second story is to be placed on the rear portion of the house.

Speaker Hamlet Grabedian, 1922 Lombardy Drive, owns the residence directly across the street from the subject property. He stated that the property slopes downward and he looks up to the subject property. He is concerned his view will be impacted by the proposed project. He is also worried about his privacy being impacted by windows that he believes will be situated so one can look directly from the subject property down into his home.

Speaker Scott Bentz, 1919 Lombardy Drive owns the property directly to the east of the subject property. He does not mind the setback. He is concerned, however, for his neighbors and about the proposed project height. He feels that the massing of the project will be felt by the neighbors. He is not sure if removal of the proposed dormers might help. He is not sure if the angle plane works.

Ms. Parina indicated that staff believes that the design fits the character of the neighborhood.

Applicant, Peter Kim, would like to work with the neighbor and within what he perceives to be the appropriate limits. He indicated that the interior ceiling can be reduced.

Commissioner Hazen asked the applicant if he had thought about reconfiguring the second floor design.

The applicant said that he could work on the current design.

The public hearing was closed.

Chairman McConnell asked for clarification of the parking area and the public right-of-way. He said that he visited the site and toured the neighborhood. The majority of the 2nd story structures are treated in a way that respects the neighborhood. There are some that could obstruct the aesthetic character of the street and the subject property could represent a third such design. He said that he would like to see a redesign that respects the neighborhood. He said that he cannot make the required findings.

Vice Chairman Smith said that he struggled with the drawings and what is existing and what is being removed. He relates drawings to the story poles and feels like the proposed design is looming. He said that he cannot make the findings.

Commissioner Gunter said that he does not agree with staff's suggestion to delete the dormers. He indicated that he feels he needs to look at a redesign. He has a hard time envisioning what is going on and feels that he needs a clearer take on what is proposed. He would like to be sensitive to the neighbors. He said that he is not bothered by the setback modification. He said that he cannot make the required findings because what has been indicated is not clear. He would like staff to note that a grade break is not obvious on the plans. He said that he would like to assurance that staff is measuring the height correctly.

Commissioner Hazen said that he agrees that the plans are less than adequate and agrees with Commissioner Gunter that he does not have a problem with the dormers. He feels that they can be softened a bit. He said that he cannot make the findings.

The public hearing was reopened.

Chairman McConnell said that he would like to speak with the applicant about continuing or denying the project. Continuing the project to a date certain will result in the applicant not having to pay to renotice the project.

The public hearing was closed.

M/S/C - McConnell/Gunter to continue the project to the Planning Commission meeting of April 12, 2016. Continued 4-0.

B. Zone Change 16-01/Minor Conditional Use Permit 521; 814 and 820 Foothill Blvd.; St. George's Episcopal Church: request to amend the Downtown Village Specific Plan (DVSP) by redesignating the land use district for 814 and 820 Foothill Boulevard from "Institutional" to "Mixed Use 1" and an

application for the establishment of a tutoring use at 820 Foothill Boulevard. Staff is recommending approval of a Negative Declaration for this project. (Deputy Director Koleda).

Deputy Director Susan Koleda presented a staff report. She clarified the project would include 814 and 820/822 Foothill Boulevard and explained the applicant's intent to request a zone change that would result in an amendment to the DVSP through the redesignation of the land use specifically to 814 and 820 Foothill Blvd. from an "Institutional" to a "Mixed Use 1" land use designation. St. George's Episcopal Church owns the subject properties. The Deputy Director spoke to the surrounding land use and zoning districts. She highlighted neighboring commercial uses such as JSB motors, a fitness studio, spa, the Outlook Newspaper, and explained the past use of the Dragon Thrift Shop.

The Deputy Director clarified that if the Mixed Use 1 designation is retained, it would present very limited opportunities for commercial use of the subject properties. The objective of the Village Center area of the DVSP is to promote and enable pedestrian oriented businesses. She explained that a tutoring Center within the Mixed Use 1 Zone is permitted with a CUP. It is anticipated that a maximum of eleven persons will be present at any one time in the tutoring center, which includes both students and employees. This is expected to increase slightly in the summer months to a maximum of 14 persons to include a maximum of 10 students and 4 staff members.

The Deputy Director presented a site plan and explained that the tutoring center is proposing to operate in the afternoon and evenings, Monday through Friday and will be closed Friday – Sunday. There is no on-site parking, though, a shared parking arrangement with St. George's Church is proposed. There are 81 parking spaces that are accessible from Foothill Boulevard and Commonwealth Avenue. The Deputy Director provided an overview of the neighboring businesses on the site and highlighted their peak operating periods. She explained that staff believes that there is sufficient shared parking to justify the proposed tutoring use. She informed the Commission that an Initial Study has been prepared and no comments were received from the public during the 20-day review of the document.

Staff recommended amending DVSP Figure 6-1 Land Use Districts, modifying the land use of the subject properties from "Institutional" to "Mixed Use 1". Should the MCUP application be approved, it will only become effective upon City Council approval of the Zone Change request. The Deputy Director concluded by explaining that staff believes that rezoning the subject property to permit institutional uses is a good land use for the site.

Chairman McConnell asked staff why the property was not zoned for commercial in 2000 when the DVSP was adopted and why 800 Foothill Blvd. is not included in the request.

The Deputy Director stated that at the time of the preparation of the DVSP, community feedback was gathered. St. George was in the process of redeveloping their entire property and was requesting a Conditional Use Permit; therefore, they wanted at that time to retain the "Institutional" designation. Also at that point in time, the Dragon Thrift Shop had a legal non-conforming status and would be allowed to continue operating. As to why 800 Foothill Blvd was not included with the current Zone Change, this was at the request of the applicant. Director Stanley indicated that the new zoning will be identified under the new Zoning Code update. A rewrite of the DVSP will be revisited at a later date.

Chairman McConnell asked if the required number of parking spaces for all shared parking had been determined. Staff said that it had not.

Staff indicated that the church had allowed JSB to utilize the churches parking, as do surrounding businesses during non-peak hours.

Commissioner Gunter asked why St. George's parking should be allowed to be utilized by other businesses. He asked staff about their thoughts on a parking agreement with the current owner. The DVSP Mixed Use 1 Zone allows for restaurant uses with certain parking requirements. Are the parking requirements different for tutoring? Should these parking requirements be allowed in this zone in the future?

Director Stanley clarified the parking plan for the DVSP. He indicated that a prospective new restaurant would need to provide information so that a parking analysis could be performed to determine if there is an adequate number of parking spaces in the area.

Commissioner Gunter asked if approving the applicant's request would result in spot zoning. He also asked if a church use is allowed in a commercial zone. Director Stanley said he did not believe it meets spot zoning criteria with the existing Mixed Use 1 uses to the east and west. He also stated that an institutional use, such as a church, is not permitted in commercial zones.

Vice Chairman Smith asked if 820 Foothill Blvd. is a stand-alone parcel and if there is a parking agreement. He asked for clarification on a shared parking agreement at the time of potential sale of the property. Vice Chairman Smith asked when the best time to address the parking would be. The Deputy Director stated that as the MCUP is being requested, this is the appropriate time to place a condition that the shared parking agreement be formalized.

Director Stanley clarified the City would have to approve a shared parking agreement through a CUP process.

Chairman McConnell asked who the parking agreement would be between. Deputy City Attorney Guerra clarified that it would be between the owners of the lots.

Commissioner Gunter asked if a parking agreement would be part of the Zone Change or not. Director and Deputy Director indicated it would be tied to the CUP and not the Zone Change.

Commissioner Gunter asked how a restaurant would be handled if it came in to the zone. Director Stanley said that the applicant would have to demonstrate that they had an adequate amount of parking for their operation.

Chairman Gunter asked if there was a sunset on such requirements. Director Stanley indicated that the CUP runs with the land. If a property became vacant, then it would need to be occupied within nine months to comply with existing CUP conditions, otherwise, CUP approval would lapse.

Commissioner Hazen asked if a parking agreement had been drafted. The Deputy Director clarified that it had not, but a condition of approval of the MCUP would require it. She indicated that staff believe that there is sufficient parking available to allow for the use. Eight shared parking spaces are required for the tutoring center use and a total of 81 parking spaces are available within the shared parking arrangement. The existing 81 spaces are only fully utilized on Sunday mornings during services.

Chairman McConnell questioned staff on the irregular lot configuration of the various parcels owned by St Georges Episcopal Church. Deputy Director Koleda stated the Church had relayed their intention to develop a master plan for the site in the near future and at that time a parcel map may be processed to address this issue.

Commissioner Gunter asked if a dashed line depicted on the plan would indicate that the properties were subdivided in the past. Based on the survey provided, it appeared that several feet of the building associated with 820/822 Foothill Boulevard overhung the western property line.

Director Stanley indicated that the western property line went through the building. When a parcel map is requested, then the lot lines would be cleaned up or a lot line adjustment could be applied for. Based on a question from Commissioner Gunter regarding the appropriate timing of a lot line adjustment,

Director Stanley suggested that a condition could be placed on the MCUP requiring a lot line adjustment.

Commissioner Hazen asked if the rezoning would need to be adjusted following approval of a lot line adjustment. Director Stanley indicated that the rezoning was tied to the address and the Assessor's Parcel Number; therefore if a lot line adjustment were approved, no additional rezoning would be necessary. Both 814 and 820/822 Foothill Blvd. would be included. If any of the retail uses at 800 Foothill Blvd went out of business, a future applicant might approach the City again with a request to rezone the corner parcel at a later date.

The public hearing was opened for public comment.

Speaker, Amy Pringle, identified herself as St. George's Head Pastor. She said that in her estimation, the parking is not a problem. She needs to have a required amount of parking spaces maintained. She said that if a lot line adjustment is required, she will apply for it. She said that, long range, the plan is to process a parcel map to redraw the parcel lines in a logical manner. She would like time to reflect on the long-range plan. However, at this time, the church is seeking approval for the subject application because it is beneficial to the church.

Commissioner Gunter asked Ms. Pringle if the signed lease for 820 Foothill Blvd. includes a parking agreement. Ms. Pringle indicated it did.

Chairman McConnell asked if there was congestion on Sundays during the 12 pm – 1 pm hour and whether there would be enough parking to accommodate both church and other uses during peak times.

Ms. Pringle showed the parking layout on a site map. She highlighted the parking usage. She said that she felt that the peak lasts about 15 minutes.

Speaker Mark Trueblood said that the total amount of commercial space is 5,500 square feet. There is no problem, to date, with parking issues.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Hazen said that it is good to change the zone for revenue purposes for the church. It is an odd parcel and he can support the findings.

Vice Chairman Smith said that he visited the site. He said he could support the zone change and, as to the CUP request, that given the recent approval of tutorial centers in the City, which is good for the children of the area, the use will also result in good tenants. He suggested that in the resolution that it be

mentioned that there was no public comment received during the 20-day review period.

Commissioner Gunter agreed that it seemed like a logical use for the location. He would like to craft a condition pertaining to the lot line adjustment. As the final decision will stand the test of 50 years or more, he would like the condition pertaining to the lot line adjustment and parking agreement to be easy to understand and to comply with.

Director Stanley confirmed that the previous use (Dragon Thrift Shop) was legal-nonconforming.

Commissioner Gunter asked about rezoning half of the property as he felt there could be a change in the future, and that the language should be cleaned up, later. Deputy City Attorney Guerra asked the Planning Commissioners for staff direction on the issue.

Chairman McConnell stated that both the subject tenant and owner need to have a shared parking agreement. Director Stanley said that staff needs to have a parking agreement in place and that the appropriate steps were to draft the document and make it effective via the appropriate approvals.

Chairman McConnell said that he considers the area to be messy from a zoning perspective. He felt that a long-range, more thoughtful exercise should take place rather than a short term plan or solution. He said that he is willing to vote on the item with conditions to be included in the proposed ordinance. It would then be forwarded to the City Council.

Director Stanley said that a CUP would become effective once the Zone Change is adopted by the City Council. Deputy City Attorney Guerra indicated that the resolution and conditions or approval for the MCUP could be revised and brought back before the Commission on a future agenda. This could be completed prior to the City Council hearing the Zone Change request.

Commissioner Gunter said that he does not need to see the final result, but advised that the conditions be updated regarding the shared parking agreement and lot line adjustment.

M/S/C – Gunter/McConnell to recommend to the City Council for approval, Zone Change 16-01. Approved 4-0. & M/S/C – Gunter/McConnell to approve Minor Conditional Use Permit 521 with conditions and direct staff to bring a Resolution and revised conditions of approval back to the Planning Commission at a future date on the consent calendar. Approved 4-0.

B. Setback Modification 15-16/Hillside Development Permit 15-38; 5546 Alta Canyada Road; Verdugo/Waters/Wells Fargo Bank:

request to construct a driveway gate and 5'-0" tall retaining wall on a hillside lot. A Setback Modification is required because the driveway gate is proposed to be located approximately 9 feet from curb face, less than the 20-foot requirement. The proposed driveway gate is set back 3 feet from the front property line. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Assistant Planner Parinas).

Assistant Planner, Parinas gave a staff report. She said that the retaining wall can be constructed with a maximum of 5 feet.

The hillside application is under 10 feet and is typically handled with a Director's Review. It will need to be brought back to the Planning Commission as it had already been noticed.

Chairman McConnell asked the Planning Commission if they had any questions to which the Commission replied, "no."

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Gunter said that he feels the mud in driveway justifies the applicant's request. He said he could make the findings.

Vice Chairman Smith said that he agreed and could make the findings.

Commissioner Hazen said that he could also make the findings.

M/S/C – McConnell/Smith. Approved 4 – 0.

C. Second-Floor Review 15-33/Floor Area Review 15-02/Large Garage Review 15-02; 4443 Commonwealth Avenue; Troedsson/Kim:

request to allow the construction a new two-story house and detached cabana comprising 7,675 sq. ft. on a 29,625 sq. ft. lot. Floor Area Review is also required since total project area would exceed 4,500 sq. ft. on a lot with an average width of less than 80 feet; the subject lot is 75 feet wide. Large Garage Review would allow a non-street facing 3-car garage with an overall width of 39 feet at the front of the residence. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planner Gjolme).

Planner Gjolme presented a staff report. He said that the requested 7,700 square footage can be supported by a 29,000 square foot lot, though it is constrained by width. There are deep setbacks to the front. The subject property's front setback is more than adequate. Staff believes the basic

arrangement is logical and works well within the restrictions of the lot. When the threshold is exceeded, certain requirements must be met for the first and second floor level.

A three-car garage is proposed. There is significant massing, however at the north and south side elevations. Staff believes that the garage is compatible with the rest of the structure. There is an overall height limitation of 32 feet; the project reaches approximately 30 feet in height. A total of 4,500 square feet threshold is being exceeded.

Staff believes that the texture and color that is proposed is a good fit and that the garage is nicely massed and the color details work well. This could lead to a positive finding for large garage review.

Mr. Gjolme showed an aerial view to the Commission in order to depict how the proposed project would fit the lot. Story poles have been placed where the garage will project out. Written support has been given by all adjacent property owners.

Staff believes the massing is appropriate for the area as it relates to all proposed applications.

Chairman McConnell asked staff to explain front setback requirements.

Mr. Gjolme said that 62 feet is required and 77 feet is proposed.

The public hearing was opened as there were no Commission comments.

Speaker Andeus Troedsson spoke as the representative for the applicant.

Chairman McConnell asked if there were any neighbor concerns.

The applicant responded that there were none.

Vice Chairman Smith said that he visited the site and was initially concerned whether there are any privacy impact concerns. He felt that the site has no privacy issues. He feels the design is good and can make the findings.

Commissioner Gunter said that he can make all of the findings. He appreciated that the home is built within the site and keeping within the neighborhood and not overbuilt. He felt that there is thoughtful architecture included in this project. He thanked the applicant for going to neighbors first to discuss his proposed project. He said that it helps the Commission when all parties are on-board. He feels that the modulation

and the massing mitigates nicely and can make all of the findings for all applications.

Commissioner Hazen believed the design was thoughtful. He is happy that the proposed project has been designed to meet all setbacks. He can approve all of the findings and congratulated the applicant on a job well done.

Chairman McConnell said that he can make all of the findings and the size of the house fits nicely on the lot.

M/S/C – Smith/McConnell. Approved. 4-0.

The Commission complimented Mr. Gjolme on his report and his role in the proposed project application.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS There was none.

X. REPORT OF DIRECTOR'S REVIEWS Were reported.

A. **Director's Misc. Review 15-46 (Setback); 322 Mellow Lane; Wertheimer:** allowed a 1,159 sq. ft. 1st-floor addition to encroach into the east and west side yard setbacks while maintaining the building line of the existing residence.

B. **Director's Misc. Review 16-03 (Setback); 1125 Descanso Drive; Hairapetian:** allowed pool/spa equipment within the side and rear setbacks with provision of minimum 5-foot setbacks as required by code.

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS There were no comments.

XII. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR- Director Stanley informed the Commission of a Climate Action Plan meeting to take place on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 6 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Chairman McConnell asked if front yard landscaping would be discussed in the meeting.

Director Stanley said that the Climate Action Plan consultant would discuss with the public that attends.

Commissioner Hazen asked how the Plan could be helpful to the public.

Director Stanley said that incentives like the HERO and Home grant programs would be discussed at the meeting.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

I hereby certify that this agenda was posted in a location accessible to the public at 1327 Foothill Boulevard, at least 72 hours prior to the regular meeting, in accordance with Government Code Section 54945.2

Chris Gjolme ~ Planner ~ Community Development Department

Project applications, project drawings and other materials related to items on this agenda are available for public inspection in the Planning Dept., Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Fridays, except City holidays. Staff Reports are available on the Friday before the meeting. Any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council by any interested person by filing a letter of appeal with the City Clerk and paying an appeal fee of one-half of the applicant's fee plus the applicable Notice Fee. The appeal must be filed within 15 days after the decision is rendered. The date of the decision is the date the associated resolution is adopted by the Planning Commission.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's Office, [\(818\) 790-8880](tel:8187908880) no later than Friday prior to the Tuesday meeting. (28 CFR 34.102.104 ADA TITLE II)