

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD ON MARCH 22, 2016**

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Vice Chairman Smith called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.
- II. ROLL:** Also present were Commissioners Jain, Gunter and Hazen. Chairman McConnell 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 was none.
- V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA:** The agenda was not reordered.
- VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**
- A. **Minutes:** January 26, 2016 meeting – M/S/C – Jain/Hazen to approve the minutes. Approved 3-0-1. Gunter abstained.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. **Noise Ordinance:** Input discussion relating to a new City-wide noise ordinance to be placed within the Municipal Code [Public Peace - Chapter 5.02].

Deputy Director Susan Koleda gave a staff report. She cited the following items that had been revised in the draft Ordinance:

1. Ensure that there is consistency in the language and figures contained within the ordinance and corresponding tables.
2. Remove all tables taken from the Noise Element of the General Plan, but the maximum noise level table has been retained.
3. Make changes to the Exceptions section pertaining to minor maintenance and single family residential every-day life.
4. Identify temporary construction hours.
5. List mechanical equipment exceptions for items like air conditioning equipment.

6. Correct typographical errors.

The Commission made the following suggestions:

1. Further clarify the Minor Maintenance to Residential Property section as it relates to home improvement activities, indicating that they are the same.
2. Revise references to times for consistency.

The public hearing was opened for public comment.

Helga Ohannessian, 4360 Bel Air Drive, spoke about her concern over power tools and about her neighbor that enjoys woodworking as a hobby. She expressed that the tools he uses are loud and unbearable to her. She said that she does not like that the activity is allowed on Saturday and Sunday. She asked the staff and the Commission if she makes a complaint and calls the police, will they utilize a noise meter?

The Commissioners explained that the Police Department will be able to determine if there is an annoying sound which will be measured from the property line.

Director Stanley and Deputy Director Koleda both indicated that was correct.

Ms. Ohannessian asked staff if the draft Ordinance would contain provisions requiring that garages must be soundproof.

The Commission informed Ms. Ohannessian that staff can walk her through the draft Ordinance changes.

Director Stanley stated that the Ordinance would not require soundproofing. He stated that the draft Ordinance will be presented to the City Council for further review.

Ms. Ohannessian thanked the Commission and staff for listening to her concerns.

M/S/C – Smith/Jain to advise staff to make non-substantive changes to the draft Ordinance and to recommend to the City Council adoption of the draft Noise Ordinance. Approved 4-0.

VIII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. **Second-floor Review 15-35/Tree Removal Permit 15-18; Yee/Chin; 2064 Lyans Drive:** request to construct a new compliant 2-story residence and attached garage comprising 4,230 sq. ft. and remove one 26" oak tree. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Consulting Planner/Architect Cantrell).

A staff report was given by Consultant Roger Cantrell. He showed the site plan and lot configuration. He explained that the neighborhood is comprised of contemporary-designed homes and talked of the shared driveway and the status of the trees on the site. The tree removal request that is before the Commission for review is only for the Oak tree that is south of the proposed residence. The tree is in poor health.

The east elevation has articulated massing. The proposed roof design is consistent with the City's design guidelines. Though the overall height of the proposed project is 30 feet, 8 inches, only approximately 22 feet will be visible to other neighbors. The bottom level is comprised of 1,637 square feet. There is use of green roofs. The plan exceeds the code for setbacks.

There is a partial view of the house via the story poles. The existing large Oak tree will help to screen the massing.

The Commissioners asked for clarification on the easement and reciprocal access to the site.

Staff explained that the file would need to be accessed to review the easement language.

A grinding stone was identified near the property by the neighbor who believes it could be historically significant.

Director Stanley said that a survey was conducted which assessed the rocks on the property and Granite rocks were found to be prevalent. Director Stanley also conducted a site survey. He indicated that he could not determine whether the rocks on site were grinding stones. The stone identified by the neighbor was not on the subject property. Therefore, staff prepared a Categorical Exemption. Staff explained that they could not determine whether the rock even came from the area. It was located on the neighboring property and could not be confirmed as a grinding stone.

The site and home would be visible from the Ross shopping center to the south of the subject property.

The Commission questioned how many trees will need to be removed for the new two-story residence.

Director Stanley said that if only the easement would be used for access of the site that potentially a total of five trees would need to be removed. This might be a Fire Department requirement. The Director stated that the applicant should speak to this since there could be damage to the shared driveway during construction which would need to be repaired.

The Commission asked about the Condition of Approval pertaining to the base of the house walls.

Director Stanley clarified that Condition of Approval No. 14 addresses it and Deputy City Attorney Guerra confirmed this.

The Commission also questioned whether a condition relating to a haul route should be crafted.

Director Stanley indicated that a condition could be added.

The Commission also questioned if the pool was part of the subject application.

Director Stanley said that it was not part of the application.

The Commission asked if the arborist for this project is on the City's approved list.

Director Stanley indicated, "yes," it is arborist, Bill McKinley.

The applicant's representative, Greg George, said that he would like to save as many trees as possible. The subject tree that is requested to be removed has declined approximately 40%.

The Commission asked the applicant's representative how the applicant is working with the neighbors.

The applicant's representative said that a Reciprocal Easement agreement exists over 20 feet of the access driveway. He explained that the applicant would like to keep all trees where they are. There is a hammerhead at the end of the driveway which impacts turn-around in the driveway.

The applicant clarified that moving the road three to four feet would help with clearance. It would be moved onto the Lyan's property and onto an existing driveway.

The Commission asked for clarification on the Reciprocal Easement access and whether there was access for all affected neighbors.

The Community Development Director said, "yes," there is access to the easements. There are two flag strips. All affected properties have access over both flag strips.

Director Stanley also indicated that the tree removal request is only for the Oak tree to the south of the proposed project. If the property owner would like to remove more trees, another tree removal permit would have to be applied for.

Mr. Cantrell indicated that the subject property story poles could be seen from the Ross shopping center through the Deodar trees. He explained that staff regarded the second floor as having no real problems with views or view blockage. In addition, a condition is included for foundation shrubs and landscaping. Staff recommends positive findings and approval for the project.

The Commission reviewed a survey of the property.

Mr. George asked the Commission if they had any additional concerns.

The Commission indicated that historically they had to determine whether it was part of their scope to require that an applicant be able to obtain reasonable access to their site. The Commission expressed concern that if a property is sold in the future after entitlements are granted, that all conditions of approval tied to the property be clear and understandable.

The Commission discussed the easement and the lots that it covered and the fact that the Fire Department will review ingress and egress from the driveway access easement. Staff clarified for the Commission that a tree exists in the middle of the driveway access.

The Commission also asked staff to clarify the access requirements.

Director Stanley clarified that the access requirement is 20 feet and will go through a plan check process.

Regarding existing trees on the site, the Commission asked staff if all trees on the site were in good health. However, the one tree in question

is showing signs of decline. They also indicated to staff that the architecture of the roof is not good.

Mr. George said that he can articulate and move the hip roof.

Speaker Marilyn Anger, 2058 Lyans Drive, stated that she is advocating for the tree that is being requested to be removed as she does not believe it is dying.

Speaker Judy Trumbo, 2056 Lyans Drive, said that she is concerned about the rock that was found on her property as there could be other similar rocks dating back, in her estimation, to the Chumash Indians. She believes that when the subject project construction takes place, that an archeologist should be on-site. Ms. Trumbo indicated that she believed the staff report does not adequately reflect who could be affected by the subject project. She feels that the project could impact her enjoyment of her property. She had concerns about the height, setback, and floor area ratio.

Speaker Richard Lyans said he has power of attorney for his estate. He indicated that the project applicant has been transparent and up front. However, he was not aware of how large the project would be until the story poles went up. He says that he has concerns about the subject master bedroom windows as they are proposed to face his windows, though he believes that landscaping can help screen the area. The tree that is located within the circle is on his property. He feels that the tree could be trimmed and that it looked better ten years ago. He stated that he would like to see the house pushed back on the lot. He believes that the house will be exposed when viewing it from Foothill Blvd., above the parking lot.

He also stated that he believes that the grinding rock came from the subject property. Mr. Lyans provided the Commission with a picture of the driveway from the front of his house.

Speaker Jon Kaghawa stated that he will work with the applicant on the easement issue.

Ms. Trumbo stated that she is concerned about noise and view impacts that may occur as a result of the second floor deck. She asked if a condition to address construction parking in the fire lane could be added.

The public hearing was reopened.

Mr. George spoke and indicated that he is sensitive to landscape issues and promises that a significant amount of trees be planted. He attempted to mitigate for privacy issues as much as possible. He clarified for the Commission that the trees to be planted will consist of Evergreen trees and he intends to screen as much of the building as possible. Six trees will be planted and will be visible from Foothill Blvd.

Commissioner comments included acknowledgement that the subject site is a tricky one and how commendable the placement of the house is on the site. The proposed landscaping is also favorable. The Commissioners did express concern, however, on the access to the property and indicated that if access is in jeopardy, that the approved design will also be in jeopardy. The Commission felt that the finding could be made and pointed out that the proposed project is just under 1,200 square feet smaller than the maximum allowed. However, they are concerned about potentially approving a project that may not be accessible.

Commission Gunter is also concerned about the height of the entry, the roofline, and the eave. Also, the stair feature and the entry treatment appear to be too monolithic on the whole. The design can be supported, however, the drawings cannot be. There is confusion over the plans regarding the basement, and project height measurements. Staff should not have to verify this. It should be clear on-site. A copy of the easement will be made available to the Commission.

Another item of concern expressed by the Commission pertains to what is perceived to be the close proximity to the northeast corner of the subject site in relation to the street. More landscape screening might help.

Director Stanley mentioned that Condition No. 16 should cover this.

The applicant expressed that he wishes to work with the neighbors on the issues and said that he would like the project continued to a date certain.

Director Stanley explained that the plans would need to be submitted by April 18th to make the May 10th Planning Commission hearing date. He asked the applicant if he understood that all plans would need to be submitted by April 18th. The applicant answered that, "yes" they understood.

M/S/C – Jain/Hazen to continue the project to May 10, 2016. Continued 4-0.

Director Stanley said that no additional notice would go out to the public for the meeting of May 10, 2016.

- B. **Conditional Use Permit 416 (amendment) and Conditional Use Permit 492; Schaefer Funds, LLC; 2384/2388 Foothill Boulevard:** request for an amendment to remove Condition#14 to allow the walled enclosure to be retained. The Conditional Use Permit 416 allowed a temporary soil contamination and remediation facility. Conditional Use Permit 492 would allow expansion of an existing convenience store facility to replace existing automotive service bays. While new convenience stores are not among allowable uses within the CPD Zone, expansion of existing convenience stores is allowed within the existing building area. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planning Aide Yesayan).

No staff report was given.

The Commissioners had the following comments:

A member of the Commission expressed that he believes the property is out of compliance.

Director Stanley stated that Code Enforcement would be contacted. The Commission also questioned if an enclosure is built, will it comply with current code.

Director Stanley said that, "yes," he believed so.

The Commission expressed that a condition should be crafted that makes the determination that all piping is removed.

Director Stanley said that the business should be inspected to check for compliance.

Assistant Planner Yesayan indicated that Condition No. 15 states that the use is limited to a convenience store.

The Commissioners asked staff if the convenience store would have an impact on parking.

Director Stanley said that the use is for both convenience and gas.

The Commission confirmed that two additional parking spaces would be required. They said that they believed the findings could be made.

M/S/C – Gunter/Hazen to approve the project. Approved 4-0.

- C. **Hillside Development Permit 15-43/Second-floor Review 15-43; 4235 Mesa Vista Drive; Baghgegian:** request to allow construction of a new 5,055 sq. ft. 2-story residence and deck on a hillside lot. In addition, side yard retaining walls up to 6 feet in height are also proposed to accommodate a new swimming pool. Prior Hillside Development Permit and Second-floor Review approvals have been nullified since more than 30% of the previously existing residence has been demolished, thereby qualifying the project as "new construction". Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planner Gjolme).

Planner Gjolme gave a staff report. He explained that the request was originally presented to the Administrative Hearing Officer last November. Roof removal exceeded 30% which classified it as a new project and subject to second floor and hillside review by the Commission.

The Commission asked staff about the height of the structure and the plans as they pertained to a new swimming pool and wall. There was concern that there was not more detailed pool plans. Mr. Gjolme clarified that Sheets L1 and L2-2 were not included in the original package that went to the Commission this past February, but were part of the Administrative packet last November.

Mr. Gjolme indicated that a full grading plan may not be required. The qualified amount of earth, 50 cubic yards of material, will not be affected by the project. Staff believed that sheets L1 and L2 adequately depicted the swimming pool and associated walls.

Staff explained that the overall height of the roof does not exceed 28 feet at any point along a continuous vertical section measured to adjacent grade. When the downward slope of the hip roof is viewed, the height is appropriate. No vertical section of the building exceeds 28 feet. Staff feels that the height is largely compliant for the site.

Neighbors have expressed some concern to staff about construction vehicle impacts and conditions have been drafted accordingly.

Staff feels that the project is feasible and recommend approval.

The Commissioners had the following questions:

Relating to site drainage, particularly, sheets L1 and L2, they expressed a concern relating to a retaining wall. Another concern was raised about the deep end of the pool and an ascending slope and the possibility that the pool could fill up with mud should a major rain event ever occur.

Planner Gjolme stated that the concerns will be addressed at the plan check stage through the Building and Safety Department. He explained that the pool plan is more of a conceptual plan at this time.

The Commission asked if there is an encroachment issue.

Mr. Gjolme indicated that there was not an encroachment issue.

The Commission asked if the stepped massing exceeds the site's slope.

Mr. Gjolme said that it is extrapolated. A Director's Review can give relief for excess building height.

The Commissioners asked if Condition No. 19 should specify a maximum deck height of 7 ½ feet.

Mr. Gjolme indicated that the underside of the deck would be revised to meet code.

The Commissioners asked if the measurement is ten feet from the deck to grade.

Mr. Gjolme said that deck area in excess of 7 ½ feet would need to be removed.

The Commission noted that grading plans had been requested at the prior Planning Commission meeting for the project. They also were unsure if the pool was part of the requested entitlement but there was not enough time to prepare one.

Mr. Gjolme indicated, "yes," the grading plan was requested, he also explained that the pool and retaining wall is referenced in the Resolution and would be part of the approval.

The Commission asked the applicant if he would be able to satisfy the additional requests such as the removal of a portion of the underside of the deck. The Commission wanted to make it clear that the applicant must adhere to all required Conditions of Approval.

Mr. Baghgegian said that he will comply, but that it will hurt his project.

The Commissioners commented that they believe the applicant has clarified the height of the building and understands the clarification given by staff. It was expressed that the underside of the deck must be compliant at 7 ½ feet.

Commissioner Gunter stated that he was troubled by the applicant's commitment to understand what he had done with regards to construction without permits. He wished for staff to supply additional plans to the Commission and expressed his concern over the adequacy of the plans. He also pointed out that the arborists report must be adhered to and that Condition No. 19 is written in a manner that describes the project as a new building.

The Commission stated that they are reliant on staff to carry out the wishes of the Planning Commission.

Staff clarified that the height of the building must be approved by a Directors Miscellaneous Review.

Director Stanley asked to add a condition requiring the submittal of a pool plan to be revised and approved by the Director of Community Development.

M/S/C – Jain/Smith to approve the project with conditions to submit a pool plan to the Director of Community Development and a Director's Miscellaneous Review to allow the excess building height. Approved 3-1. Gunter no.

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Hillside Development Permit 15-17/Second-Floor Review 15-15; 1931 Parkdale Place; Ward/Lefebvre: request to allow a 698 sq. ft. first-floor addition, a 524 sq. ft. second-floor addition, 114 sq. ft. of cantilevered area over the patio, a new pool and retaining walls that achieve a maximum height of 2'-0" on a hillside lot. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Assistant Planner Harris).

Assistant Planner Harriet Harris gave a staff report. She highlighted the site dimensions and cantilevered area. She stated that the total floor area is 2,604 square feet. An unpermitted small room exists on the site and the applicant has agreed to remove it. The first and second floor setback would be eleven feet which is more than the ten feet, eight inches that is required for the second floor. There are many Oak trees on the property. It should be noted that a Condition of the Approval is misnumbered and will be fixed in the final resolution.

There is a master suite on the first level and the overall height of the structure is 21 feet. The garage is partially submerged. Photos of the site were viewed and many trees are visible. The driveway would be reconfigured slightly. The rear façade and roofline will remain unchanged. The existing entry will be reconfigured.

The neighborhood contains some split level and two-story homes and are close to the street. Staff recommends approval and can make the findings.

The Commission asked if the project is over the slope factor guideline.

Assistant Planner Harris said that the building is over the slope factor guideline but the additions are sited on the flatter part of the lot.

The Commission asked if there were additional requirements when the massing is not over the slope and when 25% of the roof is flat.

Assistant Planner Harris said that the modern design satisfies the design guidelines.

The Commission asked if there is any neighborhood opposition on the project.

Assistant Planner Harris indicated that there was none.

The Commission asked if there were Conditions of Approval for a new driveway from Public Works.

Assistant Planner Harris indicated that Public Works did provide a condition of approval.

The Commission referenced a requirement for concrete which they believed would be required for the driveway apron only.

Director Stanley indicated that it can be required for other parts of the driveway as well.

Applicant, Phil Lefebvre, said that he intends to pour a new concrete driveway anyway.

Assistant Planner Harris indicated that there is a Condition of Approval that requires verification that 50% or more of the front yard is landscaped.

The Commissioners said that they believed the project provided a nice face lift and that they can make the findings to support the project. They asked that a condition be added that if 30% of a roof is removed, the project will be treated like a new house.

M/S/C - Jain/Smith to approve the project amending Condition No. 21 and adding a condition regarding removal of the unpermitted work as well as

amending the condition requiring that the driveway apron receive inspection and approval by the City Public Works Department. Approved 4-0.

B. Hillside Development Permit 15-22/Second-floor Review 15-26/Variance 15-09/Setback Modification 15-10; 1061 Stratford Drive-vacant parcel at northeast corner of Hampstead Road and Stratford Drive (APN 5657-012-019); De Angelis/Dorman: request to allow construction of a new 8,060 sq. ft. two-story residence and related site work on a hillside lot, including pad grading and creation of a split-level driveway to accommodate a subterranean garage. A Setback Modification would allow over-height retaining walls within the required street side yard setback along Hampstead Road. A Variance would allow up to 3 feet of excess building height and 6 feet of excess overall height, attributable to a fill pad that would be created to accommodate the building footprint and lower-level garage. Staff is recommending approval of a Negative Declaration for the project (Planner Gjolme).

Planner Gjolme gave a staff report. He stated that the applicant requests to construct an 8,060 square foot two-story residence. The home's design is simple and elegant. There is an intricate retaining wall proposed to expand the pad. Along the west property line there is a grade differential of 15 to 18 feet between the pad and street. The terraced walls of up to six feet in height are allowed. The remainder of the wall and the area behind the residence wraps around the house and will meet code. Setback relief within the west side yard is being sought for the overhand and portions of the wall. The proposed house is compliant. The footprint of the house and the orientation is thoughtful. The L-shaped footprint orients the longer facades of the building as they relate to the site's interior. There are no potential massing exposure issues. Hampstead is markedly elevated as well as the view from Hamstead. Because of how the project is situated and the fact that the applicant also owns the property next door to the proposed project, there will be minimal impacts to neighboring properties during construction of the project. There are many Oak trees, all of which will be retained.

The project floor area exceeds the modified slope factor guideline. Staff regards this as a negligible excess. The residence will be largely oriented and exposed only to the interior of the site and will not be problematic as seen from off-site. The proposed floor area can be allowed if positive hillside findings can be made by the Commission.

The variance request addresses building height which is proposed to be over – height along the east façade. When qualified fill is added, there will be a total combined overall height of 41 feet which exceeds the hillside limit. Staff believes that the setbacks adequately alleviate the excess height. Setting the building back on the property will mitigate this.

The architecture is a Spanish revival architecture. The majority of the house is 27 feet in height, 1 foot below the maximum of 28 feet. The east portion of the building is the only area that exceeds the limit. There is a lower level garage proposed for the site. Terraces are proposed at the first and second floor level.

Sections show how building heights are seen. The pad and fill result in an overall height of 41 feet. There is stepped massing in the design, but the project does not qualify for the stepped massing exemption for height.

Staff believes that there is horizontal relief which is appropriate. The arrangement is innovative and efficient. The layout of the building is working with the topography of the site. The irregularly shaped property contains several large oak trees near a protected blue line stream. Given the configuration and topography, the applicant is trying to achieve allowed floor area, which in turn, yields excess height. A similar variance was approved for one of the adjacent neighbors.

The renderings are nicely designed. The Applicant did a commendable job on the design given the topography.

As to the 20-day public review period of the negative declaration, no comments were received. One letter voicing a concern about the excess height requested was received.

Commissioner Gunter asked staff how many variances the City has granted since 1994.

Mr. Gjolme commented that variances have been given and that he will have to research the total number given in that amount of time.

The Commission asked about step massing.

Mr. Gjolme indicated that it is measured one to one. The project does not qualify for stepped massing because of the overall height. He further explained that only a conceptual layout has been provided to staff.

Director Stanley explained that six feet of separation is required under the building code but may be reduced if a fire wall is built.

A Commissioner confirmed that a bridge will provide access across the blue lines stream.

Deputy Director Koleda stated that the appropriate permitting process can be found through the Department of Fish and Game.

Speaker Dave DeAngelis, 650 Foothill Blvd., is the project architect. He explained the objective of the applicant is to build a house that he and his wife can retire in. Mr. De Angelis explored other options, layouts and designs. He said that the proposed tile roof is elegant. He explained that the project will not pose a direct impact on a blue line stream.

Commissioner Gunter stated that four variances for height have been given over ten years. He also asked why a pathway is required and why the house is not pushed to the east. He questioned if there was any other place to design the garage other than as a car storage facility underneath the residence.

Mr. De Angelis said that the proposed site would work very well for the owners.

A Commissioner asked if there were any other ways to design the home and garage and if the site presents a true hardship to the owners.

Mr. De Angelis commented that the pad will be expanded and that the property owners intended to partially fill the hole in the ground.

A Commissioner asked if there is any option to move the lower-level garage.

Mr. De Angelis expressed that he cannot get around the front Oak trees. He also explained that the project is still over 35 feet unless the proposed house is pushed completely into the hillside. He explained that the fifteen-foot driveway is proposed to comply with the Fire Department.

Speaker, owner, Rod Dorman said that he and his wife wish to have a house that has sprawling views. However, out of respect for his adjacent neighbors, he visited each one in an effort to create a good rapport, the home's siting was lowered so views could be preserved.

Commissioner comments included that the site is tricky to build on. A conscientious effort has been made to use the site in a sensitive manner. Others include the fact there are not a lot of options to reduce height.

Commissioners went on to discuss the design and the fact that there is a lack of articulation on the west side of the proposed project. The parking will be challenging when under construction. The adjacent property will be used during that time as the site is problematic during construction of a large project.

A Commissioner highlighted that the structure is designed tastefully.

Staff indicated that a Hillside Development Permit addresses the height of the project.

A Commissioner indicated that he struggled with the garage. He said that he'd like to see another design for the garage in order to address the height issue.

The Commissioners agreed that the site is tricky, but that a conscientious attempt to use the site has been made. Most believe that the owner does not have many options for design given the challenging site. One of the Commissioners struggles with the setback modification and the garage placement and believed that a continuance should be asked for as he is not sure if there is a hardship justifying all of the exceptions sought.

The Commission believed that the depth of the windows should be conditioned for review and approval by the Director.

Director Stanley asked if it should be subject to Director's review or the Commission's review.

The Commission clarified that it was for Director review.

M/S/C – Smith/Jain to approve with revised conditions of approval, subject to Director Review, to which the applicant shall submit a design detail schedule to ensure all design elements are in fact constructed and that substantial compliance with the elevations is gained; Condition No. 20 shall also be modified to ensure an encroachment permit is secured for all work within the right-of-way. Approved. 3-0-1. Gunter no.

X. REPORT OF DIRECTOR'S REVIEWS – Was reported.

A. Hillside Development Permit 16-04 (Dir.); 3791 Hampstead Road; Champ: allowed demolition of an existing carport and construction of a replacement 2-car garage on a hillside lot.

B. Hillside Development Permit 16-05 (Dir.); 5349 Ivafern Lane; Scolnick: allowed a series of improvements including a deck, balcony extension, bathroom addition, new pool and spa on a hillside lot.

C. Hillside Development Permit 16-06; 945 Regent Park Drive; Hee: allowed enclosure of a covered patio at the rear of an existing 2-story residence on a hillside lot.

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS

Vice Chairman Smith raised the issue of the way findings are written and that they should be written in a way to demonstrate how they are being met rather than how they positively impact the project.

Deputy City Attorney, Guerra said that the findings should be consistently written for all projects.

XII. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR

Director Stanley wished the Commissioners a happy Easter.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.