

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE
CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD MARCH 11, 2008**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Cahill called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Present were Commissioners Davitt, Gelhaar, Hill and Mehranian, Deputy City Attorney Vargas, Senior Planner Buss, Planners Clarke and Gjolme and Assistant Planner Parinas.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Hill led the salute to the flag.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Comments were not offered.

V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

The minutes of February 26th were not submitted.

VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

**A. Second-Floor Review 07-45; Modification 07-56; Hovanessian/
Gabrielian; 2245 San Gorgonio:**

Planner Clarke recalled that the Commission previously considered this request in December and again in January. The concerns included the impact on privacy and lack of compatibility with neighborhood development. The Commission requested that the applicant lower the height, reduce the bulk and reconsider the need for balconies.

The original proposal, compared with the first revision and the current revisions were recapped and displayed on Power Point. Initially, the overall height was just under 30 ft. That was lowered to 25'-10" in January and now further lowered to 22'-1". Additionally, the roof pitch was lowered from 4:12 to 5:12 --- compared with the original proposal of 7:12; the rear balcony was eliminated (the front elevation now includes two balconies rather than a single one as previously proposed); the flat portion of the roof which could have been accessed from the balcony was removed; decks were removed from the sides and rear. Both side yard setbacks are generous. The story pole layout for the three iterations were displayed.

At this time, Staff sought direction from the Commissioners as to whether the revisions sufficiently respond to their concerns.

Project architect Richard Duridourian pointed out that the roof slope was lowered and the setbacks were increased.

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

Commissioner Mehranian commented that she was not present when the initial submittal was reviewed; however, the second submittal presented concerns of mass. She stated that she could support the latest revision with its softer edges and lowered roofline.

Commissioner Davitt stated that this submittal presented much less impact on neighbors and now fits in well with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Gelhaar thanked the applicant for the revisions and reported that he had met with the architect several times on site.

Commissioner Hill concurred that the latest redesign was supportable.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to approve Second-Floor Review 07-45 and Modification 07-56 as revised. Unanimous.

B. Hillside Development Permit 07-02; floor Area Review 07-01; Second-Floor Review 07-02; Large Garage Review 07-01; Bagramyan; 1419 Sugar Loaf Drive:

Assistant Planner Parinas provided a brief summary of the applicant's initial request, which was considered by the Commission in January. A 5,451-sf, two-story residence (including a 666-sf attached garage and basement) was proposed to be constructed on a 20,030-sf lot. The Commissioners continued the matter, out of concern with visible mass and privacy impacts to the neighbor residing down slope. An arborist report was requested to determine whether an oak in the southwest corner could be relocated so that the house could be shifted back and away from the slope.

The revisions include a 156-sf reduction in floor area, mostly taken from the second-floor; the 2,700-sf basement was eliminated from the plans, which reduces the grading; setbacks for both floors were increased (the arborist report supports relocation of the oak on the west side of the house, which allowed the increased setbacks); the balcony was eliminated from the east elevation; 2nd story windows on the east were changed-out to clerestory; the home was shifted away from the down slope and the overall height was reduced from 28 ft to 27' 2". Ms. Parinas advised that the Fire Department is requiring a wider driveway and retaining walls. The walls would be interior-facing and begin at

the front property line, increasing in height as they continue upward and parallel with the driveway, reaching a maximum height of 5 ½ ft. The draft conditions address proposed wrought iron fencing along the east property line and require it to be on the top of the down slope.

The residence is of Tuscan design with stucco, stone veneer and exposed rafter tails; a color and materials board was displayed.

Staff recommended positive findings and project approval.

Commissioner Gelhaar confirmed that the story poles reflect of the latest revisions.

Responding to a question from Chairman Cahill, Assistant Planner Parinas explained that a survey shows the east side property line going through the neighbor's garage. The surveyor suggested that the wrought iron fencing be placed on the upslope to replace wood fencing.

Project architect Craig Stoddard displayed a color rendering of the project.

Commissioner Davitt commented that he was not present at the January meeting. He asked Mr. Stoddard to explain the revisions and to respond to a letter submitted from the neighbor residing down slope.

Mr. Stoddard responded that the outside elevations reflect the view best reflect the view that the down slope neighbor would see. The entire second story was pushed back and the window sizes were dramatically reduced to protect that neighbor's privacy.

Chairman Cahill remarked that he went away from his most recent site visit noting the considerable room at the back. He asked if consideration was given to moving the house further back.

Mr. Stoddard responded that the entire structure was rotated away from the slope and the second floor was shifted.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hill, Mr. Stoddard related that the boundary line encroachment would remain as is; the neighbor's garage appears to be 1 ½ ft on his client's property.

Commissioner Gelhaar confirmed that Mr. Stoddard also designed the home upslope. Mr. Stoddard advised that his client, Mr. Bagramyan, currently resides in that house. Commissioner Gelhaar commented that much of the rationale for making findings relates to landscaping. When the residence located up slope was approved, it included conditions which have yet to be

met regarding landscaping. He asked why the Commission should believe that conditions imposed on this project would be adhered to.

Mr. Stoddard suggested that a condition requiring installation and approval of landscaping prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

Jon Pride reported being the landscape designer for this project and the one up slope. He is currently working with Staff on a revised landscape plan for the project up slope; the pool is no longer feasible because of cost; the back yard should be completed in approximately 6 weeks and will include a greater tree and plant count than what was approved. Regarding the instant project, he advised felt the landscape plan was elaborate and though it was not adjusted for the revised plan, the plant counts and hardscape layout will be maintained and adjusted to accommodate the driveway and the new location of the house.

Commissioner Mehranian confirmed that Director Stanley had reviewed and approved the revised and enhanced landscape plan.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Mr. Pride advised that the retaining walls up slope have been planter per the revised plan and the plants are just beginning to grow.

Chairman Cahill opened the public hearing.

Roger Smith 1415 Sugar Loaf Lane, stated that since he resides down slope, he is the most affected by the project. He lauded the revisions and stated that the plan is superior to what he saw 6 weeks ago. He was unaware of the boundary line issue prior to the survey; the property line is approximately 16 ft closer to his home than he thought. Stipulating that the wood fence remain in its current location is vitally important to him, as it serves as a visual buffer at the top of the slope. He believed that relocating it to the edge of the driveway on top of the retaining wall would be obtrusive and appear more as a barrier between properties.

Other concerns included retention of the existing vegetation for privacy and the house color. He noted that both houses have the same owner, the same architect and similar architectural features. He and his neighbors concur that using a color other than what is proposed, would help break the similarities. Lastly, he stated that drainage improvements are less than satisfactory, and he would address that when the opportunity arises.

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

Commissioner Davitt commented that it appeared revisions respond to some of the concerns expressed by the Commissioners and the neighbors. Given Mr. Pride's report, it seemed that the lack of landscaping on the upslope property

would be resolved shortly, and he was sensitive to the neighbors' concerns regarding the house color.

Mr. Stoddard advised that would not be an issue.

With that resolved, Commissioner Davitt stated that he could support the project.

Commissioner Gelhaar recognized the progress made, but he was unsure if he was ready to support the project at this point. As Chairman Cahill observed, he continued to believe that the house is too close to the edge of the hill and it is still too large and landscaping is obviously an issue. If some square footage were removed in order to move the structure back further, he could vote favorably.

Commissioner Hill agreed that great strides had been made with the plan, but he was not prepared to support it at this time. He drove down Mr. Smith's driveway and believed the house was too near and too imposing from that vantage point. He was unsure what more trees and landscaping would accomplish. He considered allowing the fence to encroach over the property line as a loose end should be addressed. He could not make findings 8 and 9 of the Hillside Ordinance, or finding 3 of the Second Floor Review.

Commissioner Mehranian confirmed that Commissioner Gelhaar and Hill preferred that the Commission review any changes, rather than to address them with conditions of approval. She stated that her issues were the proximity of the project to Mr. Smith's property and the lack of effort to buffer the house. She did not believe that redesign was necessary, but did support a reduction of the square footage.

Chairman Cahill stated he was under the impression that the house would be moved further back. It continued to be at the edge and there appears to be enough room to shift it more. He asked that the structure be either downsized or shifted back further. He appreciated the revisions to the second floor and also agreed with Commissioner Hill's comments regarding the fence encroachment; perhaps there should be a covenant addressing that issue.

Chairman Cahill provided the applicant with his options: either requesting a vote, which if resulted in a denial, could be appealed to the City Council or, a continuance to address the issues raised.

Mr. Stoddard preferred a continuance to a date certain.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to continue Hillside Development Permit 07-02, Floor Area Review 07-01, Second Floor Review 07-02 and Large Garage Review 07-01 to May 13. Unanimous.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Conditional Use Permit 422; La Cañada Enterprises/Alajajian; 2384 Foothill Boulevard:

Senior Planner Buss reported the applicant's request to replace auto service bays in the Unocal Station and replace them an expansion of the existing convenience store. Replacing the service bay doors, any color change and signage will be reviewed by the Design Commission. The food mart would comprise 1,720-sf, including an office, storage and rest room facilities.

The site is the last lot at the west end of the City, in the CPD Zone. The CPD Ordinance prohibits new convenience stores, but allows expansion of such facilities, so long as the expansion does not extend beyond the building walls.

A Power Point presentation depicted the location of the auto bays. The building walls would not be expanded; the sole issue is typically parking; however, there is adequate parking space to accommodate the expansion. The City's Traffic Engineer concluded that the change in use would not generate enough new trips in the peak hours to require a traffic analysis. Staff prepared an alternate parking layout, which re-orientes the spaces, added two more spaces and importantly precludes motorists from backing-out from the pump island area. Alcohol sales is not an issue, as alcohol is not currently sold from the store, nor is it included in this request.

Staff concluded that the 62,500-sf site could easily accommodate the requested expansion and that circulation would be improved. Staff recommended approval as conditioned.

Commissioner Davitt confirmed that the vapor recovery system which the Commission had approved was ongoing.

Commissioner Mehranian confirmed that employees would park on site and asked if there was any data regarding vehicle trips.

Mr. Buss responded that the parking spaces are dependent on the square footage of retail space - 5 spaces per a thousand sf.

Project architect Aram Alajajian was present to respond to any questions. The hours of operation will correspond with those of the gas station 6:00 am to 11:00 pm Monday-Saturday and 7 a.m. to 10:00 pm on Sundays.

Chairman Cahill opened the public hearing.

George Avanesian who resides down slope from the project site, stated that the neighbors' concerns dealt with trash. He did not see a trash enclosure on the plans; he requested that one be provided and that it be remain closed and locked and non-visible from down slope. Since there is no landscaping buffer,

he was concerned that longer hours of operation translated to more lights. He stated that if the owner wants to operate the premises until midnight, that a solid wall be provided, otherwise, 6 a.m. to 11 pm was acceptable.

Krikor Darakjian resides immediately down slope, approximately 30 ft away. He agreed with Mr. Avanesian that noise and trash are concerns.

Senior Planner Buss advised that the trash enclosure would be reviewed by the Design Commission. Nonetheless, he recommended adding a condition addressing the issue. Staff could look at options to contain noise, as landscaping will not suffice. Additionally, all light fixtures need shields to prevent light spillage.

Mr. Alajajian responded to comments and advised that there is a trash enclosure on the west side; his client is willing to upgrade and/or relocate it. Addressing concerns with noise, he pointed out that only the interior would be expanded. Additional noise was a non-issue and additional lighting is not proposed.

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

Commissioner Gelhaar commented that the station appeared to be a well-run operation. He would like the condition regarding the hours of operation to mirror the existing hours and he also requested a review in 12-months to determine if there were any issues with regard to noise.

Commissioners Davitt and Mehranian concurred.

Chairman Cahill also concurred and added that his preference would be to require a wall to be built, but a majority of the Commissioners did not allude to that.

M/S/C Mehranian/Gelhaar to approve Conditional Use Permit 422 with added conditions requiring a review in 12 months to ascertain noise impacts if any, be kept locked and non-visible from down slope properties and that the allowed hours of operation be 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 pm Monday through Saturday and 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 pm on Sundays. Unanimous.

B. Setback Modification 08-01; Beasom; 1118 Sheraton Drive:

Planner Gjolme described the applicants' request to construct a new pool, trellis and outdoor fireplace -- all which would encroach into the required street side yard setback along Hayman Avenue.

The 14,250-sf site is located at the southwest corner of Sheraton Drive and Hayman Avenue, in the R-1-10,000 Zone. The property is designated as a reverse corner lot i.e., the property's street side yard is adjacent to neighboring

front yards (on Hayman Avenue). When constructed in the 1950s, the house was sited toward the interior and near the rear property line. Doing so leaves the property without a functional back yard, and compels use of Hayman Avenue frontage for that purpose.

Planner Gjolme pointed out the uniform street settling along Hayman; where a majority of front yards meet the required setback. The few exceptions are four homes north of the subject side with exterior side yards along Hayman; those encroachments are not apparent as they are small, single-story structures buffered by mature landscaping. However, Staff believes the subject lot relates more to properties to its east and south, per the uniform setbacks shown on Power Point. That development pattern continues looking north from the east side of the street.

A unique characteristic of the subject is a legal, non-conforming, 6-ft-high wall that extends for 85 ft along Hayman, which encloses most of that exterior side yard. It is an anomaly in the area and is readily seen upon turning the corner, though it is softened by several street trees.

The pool would encroach 5 ft into the 10-ft setback required for pools located in the exterior side yard. The other requested improvements require a 19-ft setback, based on 20% of the 95-ft-wide lot; however, the trellis would encroach 6 ½- ft and the fireplace would encroach 9 ½ ft.

Photo simulations were shown on Power Point depicting the proposed improvements; Staff concluded they would be very apparent on this corner lot. The wall presents the least obtrusive component, since it would be at grade below the wall and satisfy the Code requirement for a 5-ft-high safety fence. On the other hand, the trellis is approximately 10 ft high and the chimney would be 12 ft in height. Staff believes those two components would compromise the uniformity along Hayman.

Staff recommended allowing the pool's encroachment and denial of the vertical elements, or require their compliance with Code's rear yard setback of 15 ft., given that the area is used as a rear yard.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Planner Gjolme explained that the wall along Hayman was constructed in 1999 and is therefore not subject to recent Code revisions addressing walls facing the street. Further, because Hayman is an exterior side yard, its setback is subject to 20% of the lot width.

Landscape designer Jon Pride, informed the Commission that the biggest issue for his clients is having shade for the pool, which the trellis would provide. It would also provide ingress and egress to the kitchen. He arrived at its location by taking an average of the encroachments on the 4 houses directly north.

Lastly, addressing the fireplace, he noted that only a 15" span of the chimney is over-height.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Mr. Pride advised that Code requires a 2-ft separation between chimney tops to be 2-ft above a roofed structure and 10 ft from any roof pitch. Since the trellis is flat, it only need be only 2 ft away. An option, which he discussed with his clients, would be to construct the trellis from steel, rather than wood, which would allow the chimney height to be level with the trellis.

Commissioner Gelhaar felt the trellis could be lowered and Mr. Pride explained that his client's wanted to add a plexiglass cover; if the trellis were freestanding, the posts would be in the middle of the paving.

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

Commissioner Hill concurred with Staff's conclusion; the trellis and fireplace represent additional massing that he would not support. The pool was not an issue as it would not be seen from the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Mehranian concurred with the staff report.

Commissioner Davitt commented that he was not as concerned with the fireplace as he was with the trellis from a visual standpoint. While he did not have any issues with the pool, he suggested that the applicant rethink the design or eliminate the trellis.

Commissioner Gelhaar concurred with Commissioner Davitt's comments; "the chimney would be okay if he could lower it, and the trellis could be replaced with a shade umbrella". The pool was not an issue for him.

Chairman Cahill concurred with comments regarding the pool, but he felt that at 12-ft, the chimney would present a lot of visible bulk.

Commissioner Hill's issue was the concentration of massing.

Mr. Pride noted that the neighbor across the street had submitted a letter in support of the project. He confirmed that his client could construct a 6-ft-high fireplace in the same location.

M/S/C Davitt/Gelhaar to approve Setback Modification 08-01, with added conditions requiring eliminating the trellis and lowering the chimney to a maximum height of 8 ft. 4 Ayes; Mehranian dissenting.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Tree Removal 08-09; Hill Street Café; 1004 Foothill Boulevard:

Planner Gjolme reported that the Design Commission reviewed and approved a series of changes for this site, dealing with exterior improvements, signage, etc. The one item the Commissioners struggled with was the existing landscaping in the front; their thinking was that it was too busy and the plantings were overly diverse. The approval included a condition that a new landscape plan be submitted. A rendering of that plan was included in the packets. The front entry would be reworked and would include a series of benches, a water feature and new landscaping. The plan cannot be implemented without removal of 3 trees at the front of the property. He noted that while the species is not protected, all trees on commercial properties are protected. Staff did not find the trees to be visually significant and believes that the trade-off between implementation of the new plan and replacement of the pines with olive trees would improve the function and aesthetics of the site. Staff recommended approval of the requested and advised that the Design Commissioners also supported removal of the 3 trees in order to implement the new plan.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Mehranian, Planner Gjolme recognized that removal of the trees would leave the structure temporarily exposed. He believed that 24-inch or 36-inch box replacement trees would be planted.

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

Commissioner Mehranian questioned the benefits of removing 3 mature trees and allowing a large, unattractive roof to be visible.

Commissioner Davitt commented that he could make the required finding. He believed that the landscape plan would enhance the building and removal of the trees would help in implementing the Plan.

Commissioner Gelhaar remarked that identifying the 3 pines as "trees" was being generous, as they are in poor shape. He supported the request.

Commissioner Hill stated that he also could make the required finding to support the request.

Chairman Cahill remarked that he would like to see substantial replacement trees installed. He suggested 36-inch box trees as a minimum. Commissioner Mehranian stated that she would support the project with that additional condition.

M/S/C Davitt/Gelhaar to approve Tree Removal Permit 08-09 with an added condition that the replacement trees be 36-inch box size at a minimum, with a

preference that 48-inch box size trees be installed. Staff was directed to make every effort to see that the largest possible tree replacements are acquired. Unanimous.

B. Zone Change 07-02; City-wide; proposed amendments to the Zoning Code regarding batting cages:

Planner Clarke recalled that the City Council had directed Staff and the Commission to draft standards for batting cages when located in residential zones. The Commission considered the matter in December and after discussing issues of noise, lighting, siting, setbacks, etc., Staff was directed to conduct a survey of those homeowners with batting cages within 500 ft of their residences. A total of 165 surveys were mailed to property owners in proximity to the 3 existing batting cages; summaries of the 29 returned surveys were included in the Commissioners' packets. In general, residents favored allowing them, so long as development standards were in place and some sort of City review process was established. Some respondents felt strongly that batting cages are an inappropriate use in residential areas and should not be permitted.

Current standards compared with Staff's draft recommendations were displayed on Power Point. The recommendations addressed setbacks, noise, cage size, lighting, hours of operation, grading, landscaping, users and review and notification.

Staff recommended that all batting cages comply with the setback standards for tennis courts i.e., a 15-ft perimeter setback; the use of a net and padding to mitigate noise; the regulation size for batting cages is 60' 6" long, however, 70' is required for them to function properly; lighting would require a CUP and hours of operation would be similar to those for tennis courts - 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; Staff recommended that grading in excess of 50 cubic yards require a CUP and that the Director of Community Development review usage one year after approval to ascertain if usage is an issue.

Chairman Cahill confirmed that if lighting or grading was involved, Planning Commission review would be mandatory. He also confirmed that Staff was not recommending pre-notification --- if a project met Code, the Director could approve a batting cage and the notify the neighbors for appeal purposes.

Commissioner Hill commented that noise is a big issue. He asked if it were feasible to prohibit batting cages if the noise exceeds a certain ambience level from the property line.

Commissioner Davitt remarked that we might just as well regulate noise emanating from pools.

Commissioner Hill quoted respondent's comments that he did not move to La Cañada to live next to a batting cage. He believed there is an emotional factor to this issue, which appears to be noise.

Responding to a comment from Commissioner Gelhaar, Planner Clarke reported that the surveys were for the most part anonymous and further advised that some respondents made their comments by phone.

Commissioner Hill related of having received a call from a resident who stated that his backyard was unusable due to an adjacent batting cage and that he would have to disclose it upon selling his house. The resident believed that the batting cage caused a downturn in his property value. Commissioner Hill stated that his first choice would be to prohibit them if we could not regulate the sound.

Chairman Cahill opened the public hearing.

John Moe, President of La Cañada Jr. Baseball and Softball, reported that 1,100 girls and boys play baseball or softball in the City. On behalf of the organization, he opposed the Draft Ordinance and prepared a written response. He requested a 30-day continuance so that his organization could work with Staff to correct misstatements in the staff report and propose restrictions or guidance with the goal that batting cages would be allowed on residential properties. Mr. Moe advised that LC Jr. Baseball does not oppose all restrictions; the fundamental premise is that batting cages should be regulated so that they are not detrimental to residential neighborhoods. His organization believes that in general, batting cages are beneficial.

Mr. Moe noted that the Board of Directors of LC Jr. Baseball was not contacted, despite its 53-year history in the City. Given the number of responses, he believed that more than 100 residents who received the survey and who live near a batting cage, had no objections; the basis for the staff report is inaccurate. He reported that batting cages on residential properties are not built on a cement slab; most are on dirt or lawn area and virtually all are removeable and all have only netting. He reported that batting cages on residential property use either an ATEC or a Jugs pitching machine, which make no sound. He related that there are 3 types of balls: a baseball, a batting cage ball or a Light Flite ball, as well as wood and metal bats. Sound deadening is not an issue if a composite bat and ball are used. He agreed that lights should require a CUP and that restrictions on hours of operation might be appropriate; however, a 15-ft perimeter setback would render batting cages moot, because only the very large properties could accommodate them and requiring a block wall is beyond reason.

Mr. Moe stated that he wanted an opportunity to work with the Commission and Staff, including giving demonstrations.

Responding to a question from Chairman Cahill, Mr. Moe stated that he was not proposing to eliminate a 15-ft setback on all batting cages because there might be someone who would want a cement base., etc.

Commissioner Hill commented that he would prefer to set a certain sound level rather than dictate use of a certain bat and ball. He added that if noise is not an issue, there is no problem.

Commissioner Gelhaar remarked that his issues with batting cages have always been with noise and aesthetics.

Mr. Moe advised that most residences use portable batting cages, similar to a Jugs pop-up net. The cage is basically a large accordion that opens and is approximately 10 ft height and 12-ft wide.

Commissioner Davitt noted that the fundamental issue is as described by Commissioner Hill. If noise is not affecting neighbors – either due to yard size, the type of bat that is used, or if sound baffling is required, then the noise issue is moot.

Michael Powers, 4033 Alta Vista Drive, commented that it was reasonable to expect that most responses mailed to the would be negative --- “if it were a significant problem, 40 responses seems to be a small number who are complaining”. He agreed there should be some restrictions regarding noise; he did not believe that wood bats make noise, as there is no “ping”. Insofar as measuring sound, he stated that batting cages should not be unjustly punished compared with swimming pools, tennis courts or drum sets.

Ridge Muller, 1604 Bonita Vista, offered his home and batting cage to demonstrate the difference among wood, aluminum and composite bats. He stated that it comes down to being a considerate neighbor and stated that noise from a neighbor’s pool when in use, leaf blowers, sirens, drum sets, helicopters, etc., are much louder. He believed that noise, hours of use and size could be worked out.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Mr. Muller advised that most coaches use composite bats, as they are durable. His 11-year-old son prefers composite bats, as they are lighten. High school players would likely switch to wood bats.

He responded to a question from Commissioner Hill and advised that composite bats and balls are amazingly silent.

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

Commissioner Gelhaar lauded the public hearing process, as it provides a forum for residents to provide information. He stated that the advanced technology was impressive and felt it would be practical to continue this item and learn as much as possible, including the opportunity for the Commissioners to test the bats and balls with Staff.

Deputy City Attorney Vargas advised that any site visits made by a majority of the Commissioners would have to be a noticed meeting.

M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian to continue Zone Change 07-02 to April 22.
Unanimous.

X. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

XI. COMMENTS FROM STAFF

Senior Planner Buss advised that the parking study was underway; field workers were measuring curbs.

The General Plan Advisory Committee will meet again on March 27.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/C Hill/Mehranian to adjourn at 8:48 p.m. Unanimous.

Secretary to the Planning Commission