

**A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE HELD
FEBRUARY 26, 2002**

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Levine called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL: Present were: Commissioners Brown, Engler, Gelhaar, Assistant City Attorney Steres, Director of Community Development Stanley, Senior Planner Buss and Planning Assistant Gjolme.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: Comments were not offered.

CONSENT CALENDAR:
A. Minutes of 2/12 M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to adopt the Minutes of February 12. 3 Ayes; Abstain: Brown and Levine

**LOT LINE
ADJUSTMENT 02-01;
ELLIOT;
4261 BEULAH DRIVE:** Director Stanley referred to the memo in the packets advising that this matter would not be heard, pending receipt of information from the applicant.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:

**HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 01-41;
PETROSSIAN;
657 FOXWOOD RD.:** Chairman Levine stated his understanding that the applicant would request a continuance due to Staff's recommendation of denial. He confirmed that there were members of the audience who wished to speak despite the fact that the Commission would not be reviewing the revised plans in light of the anticipated request for continuation.

Planning Assistant Gjolme reported that the applicant's request for a residential expansion was reviewed and continued twice before. Each time, the Commissioners' expressed concern with the mass and lack of neighborhood compatibility. The third design revision includes: a reduction in width of the first and second floor by 5 and 7 feet respectively, an 895-sf reduction in the overall floor area and the height was lowered from 27 ft to 25-ft 6 inches - a majority of the structure's height is at 24 ft.

While the scale was somewhat reduced from the last public hearing, staff did not believe that it met the Commission's direction. Planning Assistant Gjolme pointed out that while the entire project meets Code, significant bulk is still apparent from the street and from across the street and adequate landscaping opportunities are not available due to the proximity of the house to the street and property line. Staff could not make Findings 1,5 and 8 and therefore recommended denial of the project as proposed.

Applicant, Pete Petrossian, detailed his efforts to use zoning regulations as they apply to hillside development and noted that his project meets architectural and landscape guidelines. He stated that he was receptive to input from the Commission and that he was confident the Commissioners would not apply their personal taste or biases. Mr. Petrossian requested a continuation to March 26 at which time he would address all reasonable concerns as they apply to design and that the landscape mitigation would 'totally' conform to the General Plan.

Commissioner Engler asked Mr. Petrossian why he was requesting a continuance.

Mr. Petrossian responded that he now better understood the interpretation of 'bulk' and felt he had a reasonable solution.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing and conducted a straw poll of his colleagues, confirming that a majority was willing to grant a continuance.

Don Witteman, 660 Foxwood, advised that the story poles which were erected the prior Saturday, confirm the massiveness of the house. He noted that his property is similarly configured, but his two-story home appears as single story from the front and the pool is at the rear.

Jack Schlomer, who resides across the street, remarked that the revisions were difficult to discern.

Further comments were not offered.

Commissioner Gelhaar advised that he had spoken with the applicant by telephone. He partially quoted from the Hillside Ordinance's reference to creating avoidable or unreasonable view blockage and stated that he would not support any increase in the roofline of his project.

Commissioner Mehranian stated that the Commission is as frustrated as the applicant and noted that the project has changed little during the three times it has been reviewed. She assured Mr. Petrossian that the Commission's concerns were not about personal taste but rather of mansionization and obstruction of views and good planning. She requested a landscape plan and a floor area comparison of adjacent properties and stated that she looked forward to reviewing a redesign.

Commissioner Engler remarked that consideration had not been given to developing the rear downslope area of the project site.

Commissioner Brown stated that he had no problem with the design per se, but rather with the design on "this lot". He felt it could be redesigned similarly to homes in the neighborhood which are not visually obtrusive.

Chairman Levine thanked the applicant for erecting the story poles, which he felt confirmed the concerns of visible bulk.

Assistant City Attorney Steres advised that this project would soon approach the deadline within which the City must take action, according to the Permit Streamlining Act. He advised further that the Commission and the applicant could agree to a 120-day extension and that he would like the applicant to state that publicly.

Mr. Petrossian agreed to a 120-day extension of his application.

M/S/C Mehranian /Brown to continue to Hillside Development Permit 01-41 to March 26. Unanimous.

**CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT 339; SETBACK
MODIFICATION 01-34;
LA BRUNA, JR./LOS
ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS;
615 BERKSHIRE AVE.:**

Director Stanley reminded the Commissioners that at the previous meeting, they decided not to act on the Resolution presented by Staff and expressed a preference to act on the project in its entirety. The Resolution dealt with partial compliance in terms of the number of pilasters on both street frontages and the height of the wrought iron fencing from the driveway to the horse trail. At that meeting, some of the Commissioners expressed concerns with allowing mesh screening along the wrought iron fence. Mr. La Bruna was now requesting that he be allowed to hang mesh screening during those occasions when the ball diamond is in use. Staff did not have a concern with that request and noted that the approved landscaping would eventually screen the fence. Director Stanley noted that the Woodleigh frontage is similar in appearance and function as a typical side yard.

Mr. La Bruna was now requesting a 90-day trial period with the batting cage in its current location and unlighted. After the 90 days, the Commission could review the impacts, if any, as well as the request for lights.

Staff concurred with Mr. La Bruna that, where sited, the batting cage is *reasonably* separated from adjoining residences, but continued to believe that it should meet the setback requirements of the Tennis Court Ordinance. Staff recommended that it be allowed at its 12-ft height, but that it meet the 20-ft side yard setback and the 15-ft rear yard setback. Staff continued to recommend denial of the lighting fixtures. Staff believed that the requested lighting and non-compliant setbacks present an intense use of property that would be inconsistent with the character of the area. Lastly, a letter from the Trails Council cites a concern that requiring a hedge might reduce the width of the trail and that irrigation could cause erosion and muddy conditions. Director Stanley commented that drip irrigation could be a feasible alternative.

Commissioner Engler confirmed that Staff could support the request for lighting if the batting cage met the required setbacks.

Jay Johnson, representing the applicant, described the efforts he and his client put in to reach a compromise for all concerned. The specific problem with the batting cage in its current location seems to be with errant balls hit into the street or horse trail area. Mr. Johnson advised that this has not been the case since the batting cage was erected. He and his client felt that revisiting the situation in 90 days, during baseball season would be appropriate. Addressing the location of the batting cage, he noted that even some of the Commissioners have commented that, as sited, it is the least impacting and most distant from any neighbor. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the batting cage presents more distance between homes than most tennis courts in the area. He was open to whatever the Commission recommended on the horse trail and invited the Commissioners to visit the ball diamond when it was in use.

Commissioner Brown asked Mr. Johnson what he proposed for the horse trail area if landscaping was not required.

Mr. Johnson felt that either vines or Boston ivy could be planted on the interior wall which could spill over the wall. He stated he would need approximately 6" for drip irrigation purposes.

Commissioner Brown referred to the numerous letters in support of the project, requesting "no restrictions". He asked for confirmation of his understanding that games would not be held on the site and that full speed pitching would not be allowed.

Mr. La Bruna confirmed that hard ball pitching would not take place.

Commissioner Engler recalled that he recommended that Mr. La Bruna purchase property from his neighbor in order to meet the setback requirement. He asked why that wasn't done.

Mr. Johnson responded that he and his client discussed the recommendation and Mr. La Bruna decided that he did not want to impose on his neighbor any further.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing.

Mary Barrie, President of the Trails Council, advised that her group felt it was preferable if the trail remained at its 12-ft width, rather than have landscaping encroach. She stated that she felt reassured about noise from balls hitting bats now that she understood that whiffle balls would be used and stated that drip irrigation might work.

Commissioner Brown asked Ms. Barrie to get the word out to the Trails Council members to provide feedback to Staff if the project was approved on a trial basis.

Responding to a question from Ms. Barrie, Chairman Levine advised that any conditions would apply to future owners of the property.

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

Commissioner Brown advised that his viewpoint had not changed and reiterated that "lighting is off the table". He felt that, as sited, the batting cage is most removed from all neighbors; he noted that the lack of adjoining properties provides a substantial buffer. He stated that he could make the finding of hardship or practical difficulty, because moving the cage inward would eliminate the ability of the field to expand and would also bring it closer to the homes on Woodleigh. Addressing the trail, his biggest concern was for the equestrians. Since a hedge might introduce an adverse situation, vines would be acceptable, though he did not have strong feeling about that. He did, however, feel strongly about a 90-day review and noted it might be determined at that time that the batting cage needs to be relocated. He also felt strongly about initially limiting the use of the field, which could possibly be lifted in 90 days. "No games, no full pitching with a full speed batter; however, whiffle balls, bunting practice and temporary mesh screening are acceptable". Regarding parking, Commissioner Brown commented that the applicant is creating a field that is professional in appearance and that will hopefully attract

youth ---he felt that a maximum number of players should trigger parking on site.

Commissioner Mehranian stated that she could support the temporary mesh screening and felt strongly that the batting cage should not be moved, that ivy should be planted on the wall at the horse trail and that a 90-day review period be set.

Commissioner Engler stated that he still had a problem with the non-conforming setback and confirmed that purchase of the 2-ft behind the batting cage had not taken place as yet. He felt that the baseball diamond's use should be restricted similar to the hours set forth in the Tennis Court Ordinance. He also felt that restrictions similar to those imposed on the Cornishon field should apply - maximum age of 12 years old with adults pitching to the children. Commissioner Engler stated that he would find it difficult to approve the request without the acquisition of additional property to meet the setback requirements.

Commissioner Gelhaar stated that he could support the fence along the trail without landscaping and the decorative fence. He did not believe it was necessary to purchase more land to meet the setbacks, he could support the use as a practice field with no one batting at home plate other than an adult hitting infield practice, no baseball games, any batting by children should be from within the enclosed batting cage. The reason for the backstop given by Mr. Johnson was to "stop balls being thrown into home plate". The recent letter submitted by Mrs. La Bruna asks the Commission to hold off on some of the restrictions - he felt this would be tantamount to playing Russian roulette with foul balls - without some restrictions and a 6-7-ft-high fence, balls would be hit into the street.

Chairman Levine stated that he had a problem with the batting cage as located, but offered that a collapsible, portable backstop, similar to what is used professionally, might solve the problem. Otherwise, he had a general concern with a resident inviting groups of people to use the field, which he felt could impact the neighborhood.

Summarizing the Commissioners comments, Assistant City Attorney Steres remarked that it appeared there would be a split vote and that the motions should be separated. He added that if the Commission wanted to consider a trial period, it might want to include the batting cage use.

Chairman Levine was concerned that doing so might result in approval of certain items which, when reviewed in its context, might not be approved.

Commissioner Engler confirmed that Mr. La Bruna would return in 90 days and that lighting would be discussed at that time.

Director Stanley explained that the CUP was for the lighting only and suggested that the Commission could approve the CUP with a 90-day review, or deny the CUP and allow him to resubmit in 90 days. He noted that Staff had not received a request to withdraw the CUP.

Mr. Johnson then formally requested that the CUP be withdrawn from the submittal and that his client would reapply. Director Stanley reminded him that additional fees would be required.

Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the requested Setback Modification.

Commissioner Engler confirmed that the batting cage posts were lowered to a height of 12 ft.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Director Stanley advised that Mr. La Bruna did not need to acquire County Flood Control property, as long as he has an easement and permits from the County to use its property.

John Moe, a member of the audience, noted that the County was named as a joint applicant.

Director Stanley clarified that the County is listed as a "property owner" -- not as a joint applicant.

In light of that information, Chairman Levine asked if the County had a right to use the entire area.

Assistant City Attorney Steres advised that the simple answer was "no, it did not".

Commissioner Brown then amended his motion to include additional conditions for the Setback Modification that would apply to the horse trail and batting cage areas.

Condition No. 17 should be amended to allow temporary mesh screening as requested by Mr. La Bruna. Also, the requirement for shrubbery on the trail should be deleted. Regarding parking, he felt that if more than 5 people, other than family members, use the field, that the maximum amount of parking be provided on the property, rather than on the street. Games would be prohibited and field use would be limited to infield practice. Addressing Commissioner Engler's recommendation, he did not believe that the rules for the City's Cornishon field would translate to private property. Additionally, full pitching of hard or soft balls to full speed hitters is prohibited; bunting and whiffle balls would be allowed. Full screening of the horse trail, left to the Director of Community Development to determine appropriate vine planting on the fence and wall in the trail area.

Commissioner Gelhaar asked that a condition be added requiring removal of the foul ball pole and the shed. Commissioner Engler asked that the lights be removed from the utility pole.

Commissioner Gelhaar seconded the motion.

Mr. La Bruna asked if the Commission would allow him to utilize a portable backstop as suggested by Chairman Levine.

Commissioner Gelhaar stated that he would have to see it before approving it as a substitute for prohibiting batting.

Commissioner Brown suggested working with the stated conditions and review them in 90 days.

Director Stanley remarked that Staff would insert condition #15 from the initial draft Resolution which addresses land acquisition from County Flood Control from the La Bruna's existing north property line to the fenced area of the ball field.

Chairman Levine restated that the Commission would review the project in 90 days; based on testimony or reports, the Commission has the authority to make revisions.

Mr. Johnson asked if the aforementioned portable backstop could be used to see if it would work.

Director Stanley noted that if it is mobile and temporary, it would not meet the definition of a "structure". He questioned why a mobile net was necessary if fast pitching was not allowed.

It was ultimately agreed that the portable backstop could be used and allowed to be open only during play.

3 Ayes; No, Levine; Abstain, Mehranian.

Commissioner Mehranian explained her vote - she did not believe the applicant should be required to purchase land from the County.

Chairman Levine stated that he could not make Finding No. 5 - relating to preservation of the existing scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood and property values.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**HILLSIDE
DEVELOPMENT
PERMIT 01-40;
NAJARIAN;
PALMERSTONE DR./
EUSTON PLACE:**

Chairman Levine read the notation on the agenda stating that this matter would not be heard and would be continued to a date uncertain. Following confirmation that there were members of the audience who wished to speak, he requested Staff to provide a brief explanation why this matter would not be heard.

Senior Planner Buss advised that it was discovered there are potential biological issues associated with this project. Staff therefore requested a continuance, requiring that an

evaluation be conducted in the spring. Once that is completed, the matter will be advertised again and notices mailed, before it is heard by the Commission.

Chairman Levine asked the City Attorney to comment on the statement on the agenda: "public testimony will not be taken at this time", given that there were people who wished to address the Commission.

Assistant City Attorney Steres explained that the statement was added so that anyone who looked at the agenda would know for certainty that the matter would be continued. Since speakers were in the audience, they should be allowed to address the Commission.

Chairman Levine invited testimony.

Ara Najarian, spoke on behalf of his parents, who recently sold their home on Wendover Drive and are anxious to move forward with their project. In 1990, when the tentative tract was approved, the findings stated that the project was not likely to endanger any fish, wildlife or similar habitat.

Senior Planner Buss advised that the statement in itself was made 10-12 years ago and would not obviate environmental review. When a project is submitted, staff needs to determine whether that statement continues to be supportive or if further review is required.

Mr. Najarian then advised that his parents received an order from the County to abate the brush surrounding their property. He stated that the environmental consults would be inspecting a cleared hillside.

Chairman Levine asked that Staff contact the Fire Department and get their order temporarily suspended.

Mr. Najarian stated that his parents found it ironic that they were being asked to pay for an environmental report when across the street, numerous cubic yards of dirt were moved without similar scrutiny and "the Flintridge Sacred Heart project flattened the hillside without environmental review".

Mrs. Mary Najarian, 675 Wendover Road, reported that the Fire Department sends annual notices for brush clearance; on three separate occasions, she was penalized for what the Fire Department stated was insufficient clearing of the property. Mrs. Najarian reported that she and her husband have cleared the property for ten years, ridding it of bottles, cigarette butts, etc.

Chairman Levine stated that if Mrs. Najarian could prove her statement, he “would have a real tough time requiring an environmental review”. He asked if the moving of earth at Flintridge Sacred Heart Academy forced a species into another area.

Dr. Najarian stated he understanding that he would have to pay between \$3,000 and \$5,000 for an environmental consultant; he stated that he would like to see more than one bid.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to continue Hillside Development Permit 01-40 to a date uncertain. 3 Ayes; Abstain; Levine and Mehranian.

**CONDITIONAL USE
PERMIT 342;
MODIFICATION 02-13;
DECORATIVE FENCE
01-02; CANYON;
752 GEORGIAN RD.:**

Director Stanley reported the applicant’s request to allow a new, two-story home, a trellis system, pool and a detached pool house to encroach up to 35 ft into the required 50-ft front setback. The project site is located at the southeast corner of Georgian and Commonwealth. It is triangular in shape and narrows significantly to the east; it has 180 ft of frontage along Commonwealth and 350 ft of frontage along Georgian Road. Because it is a *hairpin lot*, both street frontages are considered as ‘front yard’ for purposes of establishing setbacks. Included in the request is an appeal of the Director’s denial to construct four, six-ft-high, curved, solid walls along Georgian Road.

Director Stanley advised that building permits for the house were issued in July, 2000 and the pool was permitted the following January --each time, a Planner inaccurately determined the front setback as the shorter of the two frontages i.e., Commonwealth Avenue (rather than applying the *hairpin lot* definition). In November 2001, the applicant filed a request to allow a decorative

fence along Georgian Road as a means of screening the pool from the right-of-way. The fence design consisted of curved and segmented walls. The Director eventually denied the request based on his concerns with the solid appearance and incompatibility with the neighborhood. His concerns extended to the proposed location for the wall and the proximity of the pool to the street. An investigation was conducted at his direction which revealed that the applicant's surveyor had incorrectly measured the property line from the curb rather than from the edge of the right-of-way. This resulted in the property line being shown 5 ft further away than where it actually is; this led to the determination that approximately one-half of the house (by now 90% complete), the pool and the majority of the pool house, encroached into the front setback.

Staff's erroneous determination that the property had a front *and* a side yard was discovered at this point. A Stop Work Order was issued on January 10 and an application was subsequently filed for a Setback Modification and a CUP to allow a pool in the "front yard". The *hairpin* determination establishes 50-ft setbacks at both frontages. At a 52-ft setback from Commonwealth, the residence, meets that requirement, but its setback from Georgian ranges from 15 ft-3" to 42 ft. Other setbacks from Georgian Road are: the pool house at 33 ft. the pool at 8 ft and a 13-ft-high, front porch trellis is set back 42-ft from Georgian. Director Stanley recognized that numerically, the encroachments appear to be significant but advised that applying the 50-ft setback to both frontages leaves a restrictive 25% of the lot available for Code-compliant development.

In summary, Staff determined that with the exception of the proposed decorative fence, the scale of the project is consistent with the neighborhood and that the setbacks were acceptable considering the size and configuration of the property and they occur along what would otherwise be a street side yard.

Addressing the decorative fence, Director Stanley acknowledged its attractive appearance and proposed landscaping, but determined that the 6-ft-high walls

would appear as a solid mass spanning approximately 150 ft along Georgian and would not be harmonious with the neighborhood character. Staff could not make the findings for the wall as proposed.

Commissioner Brown alluded to a nearby property on the east side of Hobbs with a height similar to what is proposed. He asked for more specifics on Staff's determination of neighborhood inconsistency.

Director Stanley recognized that the wall(s) would provide privacy and screening for the pool, but as designed, would disrupt the scale and character of a neighborhood which maintain open front yards.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing.

Bill Abel, general contractor, expressed his frustration with the Stop Work order.

Chairman Levine stated that the Commission was not interested in hearing the details of the Stop Work Order.

Mr. Abel asked to what forum he should protest.

Chairman Levine asked where and how residents have the opportunity to challenge a Stop Work Order.

Assistant City Attorney Steres advised that he would get back to Mr. Abel within 2 weeks with that information.

Mr. Abel then advised that the setback in the approved plan was taken from the property line and that 5 ft south of the property line is a County easement that has been there since 1928. He stated that all documentation was given to Director Stanley and that he has requested a meeting with Assistant City Attorney Steres to no avail. He pointed out that the house was approved in accordance with approved plans and "now we're dealing with a 'hairpin' situation". Mr. Abel commented that he doubted the *hairpin* definition was intended to apply in this case; "it renders the property useless". He stated that everyone considers Commonwealth as the front yard and therefore, the pool screening was approached as if it

were in the side yard. He distributed a photo of the property at Hobbs and Georgian with an open 'front' yard and a screened 'rear/side yard'. Mr. Abel explained that his client removed a wrought iron perimeter fence to negate the need for solid fencing around the pool and to open the corner as much as possible. The proposed wall would extend from the garage and eastward, for approximately 150 ft. It would be segmented to neutralize the appearance of a long, single mass. It would also provide privacy for the pool area and mitigate noise -- he noted that the nearby Georgie's Pizza generates a great deal of traffic. He stated that he found it difficult to address the CUP and Modification since he believed that the 50-ft setback is a technicality.

Chairman Levine confirmed that the 5-ft road easement was not called out on the plans submitted to Building & Safety.

Director Stanley advised that the property line was shown but setbacks were not.

Commissioner Engler remarked that the previous house that was demolished had a Georgian address; this home is oriented towards Commonwealth.

Director Stanley advised that the City would not take steps to change the address unless the applicant wished to do so by filing a Request for Address Change with the Department.

Chairman Levine opened the public hearing.

Ed Johnson, an 18-year resident at 4418 Oakwood, advised that he would address only the fence issue. He stated that he strongly supported Staff's recommendations. His belief was that the house would be better suited on a larger lot and stated "a large, fortress-like wall would only impact the neighborhood". Mr. Johnson encouraged the applicant to construct a wrought iron fence and landscaping.

Mr. Abel displayed a photo of a nearby property with inordinately tall hedges, which he felt was an option for

his client, even though it would be less manageable and tends to obscure the line of sight. Mr. Abel stated that “the wall idea was only buying time, since it would eventually be covered with vegetation”.

Chairman Levine closed the public hearing and solicited comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Engler stated that he could support the requests for the Modification and Conditional Use permit and supported the Director’s determination to deny the decorative fence as proposed. He suggested that the Commission revisit the *hairpin lot* issue.

Commissioner Mehranian stated that she was wrestling with the requests, keeping in mind that mistakes were made all around. She concurred with Commissioner Engler’s suggestion that hairpin lots need further review.

Commissioner Brown stated that he did not have concerns with the trellis system or with the siting of the house. He felt that from the perspective of the neighbor across the street, the pool is in the “front yard”. He noted that the Decorative Fence Ordinance requires open fence work, even though arguments can be made that landscaping is allowed and can be more obtrusive. Ultimately, he concurred with the Director’s determination that the walls, as proposed, would be inconsistent with the Ordinance and with the neighborhood character.

Commissioner Gelhaar agreed with comments to revisit hairpin lots and considered the shortest frontage to be the front yard in this instance. He suggested that perhaps the Commission should study the definition of a *trellis*; he felt the proposed trellis system is imposing and preferred that the trellis in the front yard be removed. He also had a problem with requiring open decorative fences and allowing landscaping in front; he felt landscaping defeats the purpose. However, because of the pool location, he preferred the fence as submitted and supported the appeal.

Chairman Levine commented on the confusion in the initial stages of this project and stated that he could support the setback encroachments. Regarding the fence, he noted there was lattice work in between the curves of the wall and proposed as a compromise that solid portions of the wall be separated with segments of lattice work.

M/S/C Engler/Mehranian to approve Conditional use Permit 342, Modification 02-13 and upholding the Director's denial of the decorative fence as submitted. 3 Ayes. No: Levine and Gelhaar

Director Stanley advised that decorative fence language would be stricken from the conditions of approval.

Chairman Levine advised the applicant of her options to appeal the decision.

Director Stanley advised Mr. Abel that the Stop Work Order would be in effect until the 15-day appeal period is over; otherwise, he could continue construction "at risk".

OTHER BUSINESS:

**ZONE CHANGE 98-03;
proposed revisions to the
HILLSIDE
ORDINANCE:**

Director Stanley recalled that the matter of revising the Hillside Ordinance began in 1999. The City Council created a Hillside Committee to review the Ordinance and provide recommendations to the Planning Commission. Those recommendations were reviewed, the Commission made further changes and forwarded them to the City Council. The Council, in turn expanded the scope of revisions. This matter was before the Commission to comply with Code which requires that any modification or amendment by the Council which were not considered by the Planning Commission during its earlier hearings, shall first be referred to the Commission for review.

The proposed revisions were reviewed and included: upgrading the Slope Factor Guideline as a *standard* for subdivisions, flag lots are now prohibited on hillside properties, grading - a review threshold has been introduced applying when over 50 cubic yard of earth are moved. This closes a loophole that excluded earth that

was balanced on site from a review requirement. Front setbacks will now be “averaged”, with an allowed reduction to 20 ft for single-story development. Stepped Massing – the 40-ft height allowance remains; however, rooflines must now be parallel with the ridgelines. Architectural Extensions – current language prevailed. Also addressed were topographic maps, septic information and more restrictive language included under “Required Findings”.

**COMMENTS FROM
THE COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Mehranian asked Staff to check on 4040 Chevy Chase Drive; construction debris is strewn under the canopies of oak trees.

Chairman Levine advised of a similar situation on the Mahli project at 2062 Lyans Drive.

Commissioner Engler confirmed that on the MDI Development project on Vista Lejana, the developer was advised that the 6-ft-high wall needs to be reduced in height.

Commissioner Brown asked for a tutorial on the Hillside Ordinance and the draft revisions, since those discussions took place prior to his appointment. Commissioners Gelhaar and Mehranian requested to be included.

Commissioner Brown asked Staff to check on the St. Bede’s project; his recall was that the north wall was to be constructed prior to any other construction.

**COMMENTS FROM
THE DIRECTOR:**

Director Stanley reported on the pending Journey’s End project; he directed the applicant to cut the slope to 2:1 and not to do anything until the Commissioners can inspect it.

He also reported that a pre-construction meeting was held with Sport Chalet for their office building; grading began on February 25.

ADJOURNMENT:

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to adjourn at 9:20 p.m.
Unanimous.
