

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE  
CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE  
HELD APRIL 25, 2006**

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

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

**II. ROLL CALL:**

Present were Commissioners Cahill, Davitt, Engler and Mehranian, Deputy City Attorney Cobey, Director of Community Development Stanley, Senior Planner Buss, Planner Gjolme and Assistant Planner Lang.

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Engler led the salute to the flag.

**IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Comments were not offered.

**V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA**

Chairman Gelhaar announced that the applicant for item VII-A, Ibrahim; 5703 Ocean View, had requested a second continuance. M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian to continue Hillside Development Permit 06-01 and Modification 06-01 to a date uncertain. Unanimous.

**VI. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Commissioner Engler requested that item C be separately voted on.

**Minutes of April 11, 2006**

**A. Lot Line Adjustment 06-02; Chulack; 1325-35 Olive Lane.**

M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian to approve A & B; unanimous.

**B. Approving Tentative Tract Map 53647, Variance 02-10 and Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report; Flintridge Properties, Inc. M/S/C Davitt/Cahill 4 Ayes; Engler dissenting.**

**VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. Hillside Development Permit 06-02; Modification 06-10; Andonian; 5314 Stardust Road:**

Assistant Planner Lang described the applicant's request to allow a first-floor expansion and to construct a new, 1,162-sf, second floor. A modification is required to allow the second floor to encroach into the required south side yard setback and for an over-height retaining wall along the north property line.

The project site is located on the west side of Stardust Road, in the R-1-10,000 zone. It is 12,750-sf in area and has an average slope of 23%. While the front half of the lot is relatively flat, it falls approximately 35 ft at the rear to a heavily vegetated ravine.

At Staff's suggestion, the garage would remain attached, but would be rotated to face the street, increasing the first-floor side yard setback to 11'-10". Also, the front entry was lowered from 24' to 16'-10". The new, 1,162-sf second floor includes 2 balconies – one off a bedroom above the garage facing the street, and the other wrapping around from south to west, facing a neighboring home and the rear property line. The two-story home to the south is 14 ½ ft from the shared property line and is lower in elevation.

The second floor presents a 2'-2" encroachment into the south side yard setback and an existing 9-ft-high (approximate) wall would be extended 11 ½ ft along the north property line. All remaining setbacks and structure height are code compliant.

Assistant Planner Lang advised that the story poles show the correct ridge height, and also show a box roof, rather than the proposed sloping roofline. Homes across the street are at a significant upslope, while those to the rear are significantly lower and screened by mature vegetation. The neighborhood is a mix of single-story and two-story homes. Given the Commission's consistent concern with the intrusive nature of balconies, Staff recommended either removing the rear balcony or requiring additional screening on the subject lot. The front balcony does not pose concerns for Staff.

Ms. Lang reviewed the required findings to approve a hillside project and a modification request. Opportunities to expand the first-floor are limited, given the topographic constraints of the site. The project would expand the profile of the home without disturbing the open space on the lot and would not alter views from any property. Staff believes that the first-floor setback of 9'-8" and the second-floor setback of 14'-10" is adequate separation from the neighbor to the south; however, eliminating or reducing the rear second-floor balcony would minimize any impacts that might be caused by the encroachment. Lastly, extending the existing, over-height, inward-facing wall and adjacent swale would not create discernable impacts to the adjacent neighbor to the north. Staff recommended project approval as conditioned and possibly additional conditions addressing the balcony.

Commissioner Mehranian confirmed that the landscape plan is subject to review and approval by the Director.

The applicant was present, but did not have comments at this time.

Chairman Gelhaar opened the public hearing.

Charles Calix, the neighbor residing upslope from the project site, was concerned with the additional weight that a filled pool would add to the 23% average slope; his understanding was that it would add 74 tons to the slope. Additionally, the engineering report that he reviewed did not analyze the deck's foundation or pressure to the soil.

Ms. Lang advised that the plans were routed to the City Engineer, who returned them with standard conditions.

Director Stanley advised that Soils and Structure would be addressed at the building permit stage when the plan goes to plan check.

Commissioner Mehranian confirmed that Mr. Calix could question the building inspector and plan checker when the plans are submitted.

Paul Li, who resides two houses upslope and North, stated he had similar concerns. He welcomed the Andonian's to the neighborhood and noted that they cut down shrubs on the hillside. A large home and a filled pool in proximity to the hill could be devastating. He felt it is important that trees are planted to hold the soil and stated "the City should think about allowing such a large home so close to the hillside". He inquired what would happen if the request was approved only to find out later that there are safety issues.

Director Stanley responded that the Commission is reviewing zoning and what can be built according to the zoning standards. Building & Safety, which reviews safety-related issues reviews footings and their proximity to the slope. Any modification required by a reviewing agency which results in a significant change could trigger another review by the Planning Commission.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Mr. Calix advised that a year-old aerial view of the project site shows it covered by trees, compared with the existing cleared site.

Commissioner Engler asked that Staff advised Messrs. Li and Calis when the plans come out of Plan Check.

Property owner, Rita Andonian, advised that only the tops of shrubs, etc, were cut; the roots remain in the ground and that she intends to plant fruit trees. She

further advised that contrary to what Mr. Li and Calix believe, the pool has not been empty all the time.

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

Commissioner Engler had concerns with impacts resulting from the balconies and he could not make Finding #2 for the Modification; the 2<sup>nd</sup> story alignments create more mass.

Commissioner Davitt stated he could support the request if the balcony at the rear were removed entirely.

Commissioner Mehranian agreed.

Commissioner Cahill supported the project. He did not feel strongly either way regarding the balconies.

Chairman Gelhaar stated he could make all the findings so long as the wrap-around balcony at the rear was removed; the front balcony was acceptable.

M/S/C Mehranian/Cahill to approve Hillside Development Permit 06-02 and Modification 06-10 with an added condition to eliminate the rear balcony in its entirety. 4 Ayes; Engler dissenting.

The Commissioners agreed that it was not necessary to add more landscaping, given removal of the rear balcony.

## VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### A. Conditional Use Permit 234 (amendment No. 3); Taylor's Steak House; 901-909 Foothill Boulevard:

Senior Planner Buss reported that this was the 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment request for this CUP. The 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment allowed an expansion of the restaurant with conditions requiring parking lot improvements (areas north of the site and along the Beulah extension were to be re-striped to conform with code) and evidence of an agreement between Taylor's and the property owner showing that Taylor's controlled that particular area for restaurant parking. Absent that, the applicant would not be allowed to expand.

Since then, the La Cañada Properties development project was submitted, with a substantial parking concept that includes the Taylor's parking area. Consequently, Mr. Taylor requests relief from conditions 13 and 14, since the shopping center project includes parking for Taylor's. Staff provided 3 options: Deny the request, require temporary parking per the conditions of amendment

#2; allow the request without further improvements. Senior Planner Buss encouraged discussion regarding a "good" interim proposal pending the La Cañada Properties project. Staff recommended an interim arrangement that would allow expansion and parking with a condition that the parking meet Code if the shopping center does not proceed.

Commissioner Cahill confirmed that the La Cañada Properties project would raze all buildings with the exception of Taylor's.

Director Stanley explained that Taylor's Steak House is part of the shopping center project, which eliminates the Beulah extension and constructs a new road on the west side of Taylor's. Staff wants assurance that Taylor's Restaurant complies with conditions 13 and 14 if the La Cañada Properties project is not approved --- the revised draft conditions reflect that. La Cañada Properties developer has talked about valet parking or phasing the project around Taylor's.

Commissioner Engler referred to draft condition #3, which was modified by the City Attorney and distributed for consideration. He questioned why a Certificate of Deposit, equal to the cost of completing the permanent improvements, was being asked of the applicant, rather than a bond, which would be less costly.

Deputy City Attorney Cobey explained that bonding companies are typically difficult to deal with and reluctant to part with funds. A Certificate of Deposit is much more flexible and reliable.

Darren Mattix, developer of the La Cañada Properties project, advised that because of re-grading, there is a significant amount of work necessary west of Taylor's and to the North. Substantial work will envelop Taylor's throughout construction of the Center. He and Mr. Taylor are considering a valet parking arrangement since there would not be safe access to the restaurant for a period of time - construction timing for curbs, gutters, blacktop, etc. is unknown at this point. Upon conclusion of the shopping center, there will be a large field of parking for joint use. He asked that the Commission approve a valet parking arrangement until a more workable, temporary solution is reached.

Commissioner Engler preferred that the applicant submit a lease agreement, subject to review by the City Attorney. He asked who would be providing the valet service.

Mr. Mattix responded it is the subject of negotiation; Mr. Taylor's lease arrangement will be renegotiated prior to start of construction.

Applicant, Bruce Taylor, advised that he was comfortable with condition #2 as drafted by Staff. He and Mr. Mattix have discussed the issue of parking at length and while construction would cause an imposition for a couple of months, he was confident it would work out. He was considering having the valet company from his Los Angeles restaurant work the La Cañada site for a couple months.

Director Stanley noted that draft condition 2 talks about a temporary parking situation, rather than valet parking.

Commissioner Davitt asked if one option was to allow the restaurant expansion with valet parking, but without parking improvements? He then confirmed that Mr. Taylor was not amenable to providing temporary parking at the rear of the restaurant.

Attorney Cobey addressed the issue of valet parking - if the Commission preferred to go in that direction. If a condition was imposed, the applicant would be required to provide valet parking; it would be a matter between Messrs. Taylor and Mattix as to who pays for it, but the condition would be absolute.

Commissioner Mehranian asked where valets intended to park the cars.

Director Stanley responded that cars could only be parked on properties where excess parking is available. He pointed out that the City has no idea how long valet parking would be necessary.

Commissioner Davitt felt the Commission should be flexible and mindful that this is a temporary situation.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Mr. Taylor advised that he hoped to apply for building permits within 6 months.

There were no further comments and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cahill remarked that it is not unusual for the Commission to approve uses with added conditions and confirmed that if the conditions are not met, the CUP is revoked; that seemed to be the biggest "hammer" available. He supported allowing the request subject to conditions and he did not believe it was necessary to require a bond - if the conditions are not satisfied by a certain time, the approval would be rescinded.

Attorney Cobey stated there was no problem with that approach, so long as the conditions are clearly worded.

Senior Planner Buss commented that the "downside" would be if the expanded restaurant was in full operation without compliance of the parking conditions -- "how would we deal with that?"

Chairman Gelhaar supported Commissioner Cahill's suggestion and presumed the applicant would also.

Commissioner Davitt recalled that the expansion centered on interior improvements, rather than increased seating capacity. He supported the request with a condition stating that when parking is no longer available, the applicant needs to provide valet parking.

Commissioner Cahill concurred with a sunset clause added.

Attorney Cobey asked if the Commission was comfortable with the generic notion of valet parking, or did it want to review a plan?

Commissioner Cahill stated "when Taylor's is unable to control parking, the valet comes into play".

Director Stanley asked if the Commission preferred to impose restrictions, since impacts are an unknown at this point, as is the availability of off-site parking.

Mr. Mattix commented that Taylor's day business is low, compared with the evenings, and could easily be accommodated with nearby parking. The adjacent McGregor building has a number of stalls available at night. He asked that the Commission focus on whether to allow Taylor's to begin expansion with the understanding that it would probably be 10 months before an Occupancy Permit would be issued and that it is now unknown whether temporary parking would be complete by then.

Director Stanley remarked that the City does not object to allowing the request to proceed on a temporary basis. When the Commission deals with Mr. Mattix's project, it can deal with temporary parking and impose conditions at that time. His concern was that it appeared the Commission was willing to allow a valet service to solve the parking problem, and he preferred that the City had some control.

Chairman Gelhaar requested a motion to allow the applicant to use existing temporary parking without improvements.

Director Stanley stated that there needed to be a mechanism to compel the parking lot improvements if the La Cañada Center does not go through. The revised conditions reflect Staff's desire to provide as much flexibility as possible.

Chairman Gelhaar confirmed with Mr. Taylor that he would accept a condition giving him the option of providing either a bond or Certificate of Deposit.

Senior Planner Buss summarized the discussion. Defer conditions 13 and 14 of amendment #2 and allow the applicant to proceed with the requested expansion without providing parking lot improvements. The CUP is to be revisited in one year, when the matter of valet parking and whether the La Cañada Properties Center is imminent can be discussed.

M/S/C Engler/Mehranian to approve amendment 3 of Conditional Use Permit 234, modifying draft condition #2 to allow use of existing temporary parking and modifying draft condition #3, adding "Certificate of Deposit *or* a bond". Unanimous.

**B. Hillside Development Permit 05-65; Building Depth Review 05-15; Modification 06-19; Zarate; 4141 Cambridge Road:**

Planner Gjolme described the applicant's request to construct a new, two-story home and related site work. The project site is located on the north side of Cambridge Road, in the R-1-40,000 zone. The irregularly shaped site rises steeply from east to west along Cambridge. It rises 45-50 ft from its low point at the southeast corner to the highest point at the northwest side.

The 40,520-sf property falls under the purview of the Hillside Ordinance with a 28% average slope. Building Depth Review is required for a 95-ft, second-story depth and the Modification deals with an over-height retaining wall on the north side that accommodates a new driveway. The existing single-story home would be demolished and the existing driveway would be abandoned and landscaped. A tree inventory shows that 63 of the 65 existing trees (including oaks) would remain.

A total of 9,037-sf is proposed, including an existing 546-sf guest house. The new residence would be sited on the existing pad and expanded back, requiring some grading. The first floor would comprise 5,478-sf, including a 3-car garage and a subterranean storage area. It is a well modulated and

staggered footprint with compliant perimeter setbacks. The 3,000-sf second floor is recessed 20 ft from the first floor at both ends and amply exceeds code minimums, with more than 40-45 ft side setbacks provided. The abandoned driveway area will be landscaped so that the wooded, curved slope would extend around the corner and augment the existing, wooded bank that covers the entire frontage. Public Works and the City Engineer reviewed the plan and concluded that the site for the new driveway would be an improvement and a safer situation, as it would allow access from a level section with visibility from both sides. Planner Gjolme noted that the applicant would have to acquire an encroachment permit from Public Works for the driveway apron.

An outward facing retaining wall would extend along the majority of the north property line at a maximum height of 6-7 ft (outward facing walls are limited to a height of 3 ft). Retaining walls are a result of creating the new driveway at an appropriate grade relative to the pad level of the new garage.

Absent the garage, approximately 8,350-sf of habitable area is proposed, equal to a density of 21%. The immediate area's density ranges from 9 to 19%, excluding garages and covered patios. Staff does not believe that the floor area is excessive or unreasonable, given that the project site is nearly one acre in area and heavily screened.

Overall height from the primary ridge at the upper pad level reaches 26 ft and would increase as the project descends north to a height of 3 \_\_\_ ft. Since no portion of the project exceeds 28 ft in height, the excess height is allowed, since stepped massing is exhibited. Two towers raise the overall height to 32 ft and 36 ft when measured from the low grade of the garage - these qualify as architectural extensions (allowed to a maximum height of 40 ft) and are not included in measuring building height. Staff initially had concerns with the height and partial visibility of the towers from homes on Dover, but believes that the lot can absorb the project in its totality with the understanding that the Commission may want to discuss the towers further.

Planner Gjolme noted that a proposed balcony off the rear corner would have partial exposure to a pool and patio area of a neighboring home upslope and west. While it is adequately screened, there could be a potential privacy issue that the Commission might want to consider.

Substantial landscape screening precludes the project from being seen in totality. Neighbors across the street at 4138 Cambridge would have partial views of the new home, but those views would be mitigated, given that the project extends to the rear and away from the street and new trees would add to the substantial existing landscape buffer.

Lastly, the guest unit at the front of the property would be expanded. Since it currently encroaches into the required front setback, a condition of approval ensuring that the encroachment is not expanded is necessary, since expansion of non-conforming ALQs is prohibited.

Staff determined that the project is reasonable designed in relation to the site and recommended positive findings and project approval.

Janelle Williams, Williams & Associates, representing the applicant, related of the efforts put into this project and thanked Planner Gjolme for his assistance in getting to this point. The neighbors were consistently apprised of the project's progress and are supportive of it. Ms. Williams stated that the excess height is reasonable; the towers anchor the design and foyer and without them, the house would seem out of balance. No views would be blocked, the house is proportionate to the site and in character to the estate designation, and after the existing driveway is abandoned, the area would be abundantly landscaped. The new driveway would be much safer and turnaround areas would allow safe exit from the property. Only 1 small eucalyptus and 1 pine tree would be removed; more than 65 trees, including oaks, would be preserved and 16 new trees would be planted. Existing and new landscaping would buffer the site and visually screen the over-height retaining wall. She related of having visited the site several times with Staff and followed their suggestions, which she felt resulted in an improved project.

Property owner Kathleen Zarate, recounted her appreciation of the site and the privacy it affords and that she intends to maintain that aspect. The plans were revised to adhere to the Hillside Ordinance and the neighbors were provided copies of the plans. She pointed out the neighbors in the audience who support her project and she submitted two letters of support.

Tom Otto, 4155 Cambridge Road, supported the project; his bedroom faces the subject site and the story poles are not visible from his home. Relocating the driveway as proposed is much more logical and he complimented Staff on the outstanding job.

Kim Montoya with Williams Services reviewed the findings and requested that the Commission approve the project as conditioned.

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

Commissioner Cahill agreed with Staff's evaluation; the hillside and modification findings were not issues, so long as the existing trees would not

be impacted. Though the requested building depth is high, the manner in which the home is oriented does not raise the problem that Depth Review was designed to address. He felt the towers were positive architectural features, but the rear balcony could be a problem, as it has views into the neighbor's pool.

Commissioner Mehranian commented though a large home is proposed, it is the nature of the neighborhood. Her two issues were the balcony and the relocated driveway; she wanted an arborist to supervise installation of the driveway to protect the nearby oak.

Commissioner Davitt stated that the project is an extremely large home, but he felt the lot can support it. He also wanted the balcony removed due to the potential of privacy infringement and the architectural extension removed – 36 ft was excessive.

Commissioner Engler did not have concerns with the requested building depth or with the balcony, but he shared Commissioner Davitt's concerns regarding the excess height of the architectural extensions.

Chairman Gelhaar preferred that the balcony be removed; he viewed the project site from the neighbor's pool and believed privacy is an issue. He also felt the architectural extensions should be removed as they present view issues from the Martin home. Should a future owner of the Martin home remove landscaping, the towers would be easily seen. Additionally, since the guest house is non-conforming and the roof would be removed, he asked that a condition require the guest house to comply with the required front yard setback.

Project architect John Buetter, asked that the Commission reconsider removing the towers, as they are an important feature and give the home its character. He offered to lower their height to match the ridge height, but the copper cupolas atop the towers were essential.

Director Stanley commented that the tower/cupola break the mass of the house and provide visual relief.

M/S/C Mehranian/Davitt approving Hillside Development Permit 05-65, Building Depth Review 05-15 and Modification 06-19 with added conditions: lower the towers to 26 ft in height, exclusive of the cupolas measured from adjacent grade at the upper pad level; remove the second floor rear balcony; the guest house must provide code complaint setbacks; an arborist shall

oversee the driveway grading and retaining wall construction to ensure protection of the nearby oak. Unanimous.

**C. Hillside Development Permit 05-66; Garcia; 1926 Hilldale Drive:**  
Senior Planner Buss reported the applicant's request to add approximately 1,690-sf to an existing 2,048-sf home on hillside property, exceeding the allowed floor area for this lot by 186-sf.

The project site is located south of the 210 freeway and west of the 2 freeway at the edge of the City. The lot is sited close to the narrow street and lacks any flat area; the existing home is supported on the downhill side by poles and piers, similar to the other homes on the downhill side of the street.

Mr. Buss recalled the long history of this house. A former owner purchased the home after it was severely damaged by fire and proceeded to make additions without building permits. Following several referrals to the City Prosecutor's office, the property owner eventually requested of the Planning Commission to legalize all illegal construction including an Accessory Living Quarter Unit (due to a second kitchen on the site) and a Variance for excess floor area. Both those components were denied; however the hillside development request was approved with conditions to convert the 580-sf of habitable space to open balcony, similar to the remaining portion of the lower floor; removal of internal stairs between the main floor and the lower balcony; removal of all kitchen and bath appliances and stub-outs from the lower floor; conversion of the enclosed central balcony on the main floor to pre-1990 fire damage; issuance of permits before any modifications were made; submittal of a detailed landscape plan prior to issuance of any construction permits, to screen the lower floor, the exposed foundation and the poles and piers.

The new owner/applicant seeks to legalize the lower floor (1,692-sf), and make it habitable and accessible from the interior only. The first floor would be maintained as is, with a stairway added to access the lower floor. Staff looked at every house on Hilldale Drive and determined that this proposal falls within the floor area range of the neighborhood and is 23-sf over the average house size and 120-sf below the median. Senior Planner Buss noted that the added floor area would not add bulk to the structure since the requested area is within the existing framework. It would not be visible from Hilldale Drive and the required landscaping would screen much of the project from downhill.

Commissioner Engler confirmed that the previous illegal construction was fully abated and stated that he wanted the applicant to be aware that the project falls under the current seismic code. He requested that a condition be added that the project must meet current the Uniform Building Code.

Director Stanley advised that the previously approved work did not get to the full compliance stage. After referral to the City Prosecutor, the house was sold and the new owner purchased it fully aware of the compliance factor.

Senior Planner Buss advised that a court order stipulates that the current owner/applicant inherits all the previously imposed conditions, including the landscape plan. The Court has allowed the current property owner to proceed through this entitlement process.

Responding to a question from Chairman Gelhaar, Senior Planner Buss advised that 2 additional parking spaces are not required since this is not a new house.

Chairman Gelhaar stated that 6 bedrooms and 2 parking spaces was a concern. He noted that the applicant or a representative was not present to respond to questions.

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

Commissioner Engler asked for another condition requiring installation of landscaping and irrigation as approved, before permits are issued. He did not have a concern with the massing and stated that the existing piers look worse than a vacant lower floor.

Commissioner Davitt agreed with the lack of view or massing issues; the house is more visually appealing with the second floor than without.

Commissioner Mehranian concurred.

Commissioner Cahill agreed with Commissioner Engler's comments but he could not support the project as he had questions that would remain unanswered due to the applicant's absence.

Chairman Gelhaar stated that he could support the project and totally agreed with Commissioner Engler that the landscaping and irrigation must be installed before permits are issued.

Senior Planner Buss asked if the Commission was comfortable with a portion of the lower floor being used as open space, should the Health Department prohibit 6 bedrooms on a septic system.

Chairman Gelhaar supported that, out of concern with 6 bedrooms and 2 parking spaces.

M/S/C Engler/Mehranian to approve Hillside Development Permit 05-66 with added conditions: if the Health Department approval is not secured due to the number of proposed bedrooms, the portion of the lower level not approved shall remain open; landscaping and irrigation shall be installed and maintained prior to issuance of building permits. 4 Ayes; Cahill dissenting.

Commissioner Mehranian left the meeting at this point.

## **IX. OTHER BUSINESS**

Director Stanley asked that this item be reordered.

### **A. Budget Consideration Items:**

The Commission was provided with a copy of the Department's budget. Department requests are made to the City Manager; anything exceeding budget will be included as a Council consideration item.

Chairman Gelhaar asked why management or staffing was not included; he stated it should be the number one issue and aggressively pursued.

Director Stanley advised what he was proposing in terms of staffing levels: a contract code enforcement person to deal with the approximately 400 cases per year; eliminate the position of Planning Aide for an Assistant Planner and hire another Planner. The Planning Intern would be retained. An unknown factor for staffing levels is the number of two-story permits issued last year. We only have 2-year-old data. He is talking with a code enforcement contractor, who has ideas for cost recovery and who will provide a proposal to change the Ordinance to create a citation fee process and a direct cost recovery for staff time. This ideas has been tested in other cities.

Responding to a question from Chairman Gelhaar, Director Stanley advised that zoning applications bring in approximately \$200,000 annually.

Commissioner Cahill asked that eliminating the 2 remaining billboards in the City be a budget item.

### **B. Residential Design Guidelines**

Chairman Gelhaar reviewed the guidelines from other cities and circled those items that would apply to La Cañada Flintridge, He asked that his notations be incorporated on the draft guidelines and distributed to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Davitt commented that he would like the benefit of Commissioner Engler's comments before his term on the Commission expires.

Director Stanley encouraged the Commissioners to provide their comments. A strikeout/highlighted version would be distributed to them.

**X. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS**

Further comments were not made.

**XI. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR**

Director Stanley advised that on the advice of the City Attorney, a few changes to the Ordinance for changes to the R-1 standards would be re-introduced on May 1.

Planner Gjolme advised the Chair that the project on Dover required installation of a fence after 30 days of approval and the landscaping is to be installed after the project is 'finalled'.

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

M/S/C Engler/Cahill to adjourn at 9:25 p.m. 4 Ayes.

---

Secretary to the Planning Commission