

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE
CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD APRIL 26, 2005**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairwoman Mehranian called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Present were Commissioners Cahill, Engler and Gelhaar, City Attorney Steres, Director of Community Development Stanley, Assistant Planner Lang and Planning Aide Shimazu. Commissioner Davitt was absent.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Cahill led the salute to the flag.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Comments were not offered.

V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA:

Director Stanley advised that Staff had received a written request from the applicant for the continued public hearing item, for a second continuance. Following confirmation that no one in the audience wished to address the Commission on this matter, the Chair asked for a motion.

M/S/C Cahill/Gelhaar to continue Conditional Use Permit 392 to a date uncertain. Unanimous.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to adopt the minutes of March 22, 2005, as submitted. Unanimous. Minutes of the April 12, 2005 Commission meeting were not submitted.

B. Resolution 05-26; denying Floor Area Review 05-02; 4344 Hayman Avenue. M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to adopt; 3 Ayes, Cahill dissenting.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Modification 04-43 (amendment); Odell; 4232 Chula Senda Lane:

Director Stanley recalled that the Commission had previously approved a modification to allow fencing atop retaining walls along the north-side and east property lines at a height of approximately 9 ft.

The current request is comparable to the initial approval. Over-height fencing is proposed to close gaps in the previously approved fencing along the north and south property lines. The result would be a continuous fence line along the north side property line, broken only by the drainage channel. The proposal is within allowable limits but because the existing retaining wall exceeds the 3-ft-high maximum, an amendment is required.

At the rear (south side), a 7-ft-high wooden fence would replace a chain link fence that is immediately adjacent to a block wall. Though it exceeds allowable fence height by 1 ft, Staff considered the request as reasonable, given its visual isolation and separation from the neighboring home.

Chairwoman Mehranian inquired if landscape screening was originally discussed.

Director Stanley's recall was that it was not discussed; however, the wooden fence is painted green and steps down toward the channel. Since the property to the North is approximately 6 ft higher in elevation, there is a privacy issue that the fence would mitigate. He noted that the applicants are in the process of relocating a trail easement that extends across the lot; it is preferable to keep that area clear of landscaping. Identical conditions are recommended for this amendment as were for the original approval.

Commissioner Engler clarified that the fencing varies in height to a maximum of 9 ft.

Applicants, John and Amy Odell, explained that the retaining wall is located on the north property line and that the existing 3-ft-high fence does not afford them privacy. They distributed photos of the area and advised that since it is a shady area, landscaping would not grow quickly.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented on the photos and noted that the neighbor has a structure that abuts the fence on the property line. He stated "there is lots of evidence that the roof is draining to the applicants' property", and asked if the City could require resolve that at this time.

Director Stanley advised that Staff would investigate whether it is a legal, non-conforming structure. If it was building without permits, the City would request that it be removed.

Responding to a request from Commissioner Engler for an assessment of the retaining wall's structural integrity, Director Stanley advised that Building &

Safety would inspect the wall and the property owners would have to provide evidence that the wall can withstand the load.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Engler stated that he did not have a problem with the fence if it could be screened with landscaping.

Commissioner Gelhaar preferred to bifurcate the request and vote on the fence separately. He supported the 9-ft-high portion, but had a problem with the 7-ft-high fencing.

Commissioner Cahill asked if there was any particular reason the applicant needed a 7-ft-high fence rather than a 6-ft-high fence that would meet Code.

Mr. Odell commented that there is a lack of property maintenance on both adjoining properties, which he can currently see, since his property is at a higher elevation.

Commissioner Cahill stated that the request for both fences seemed reasonable and would be consistent with the existing fencing.

Chairwoman Mehranian agreed that the visual impact of a 7-ft-high fence versus a 6-ft-high fence was not a problem, but she was concerned with landscaping the fence.

Director Stanley commented that the abutting neighbor to the north did not have a problem with the previous 6-ft-high fence facing their property.

Mr. Odell remarked that on the north side, they would simply be replacing fencing which their neighbor removed when ivy destroyed it. He is replacing the entire fence at his cost.

Director Stanley noted that the fence could not be maintained if ivy was allowed to grow on it and added that wood fencing, which Staff believed was attractive, presents a softer appearance than a block wall. The area in question is heavily wooded and not easily seen. The existing wood fencing that would be continued was shown on Power point.

Commissioner Engler asked if both neighbors signed-off on the fence.

Director Stanley advised that they were mailed notices of public hearing and neither provided comments.

Mr. Odell submitted a letter signed by both neighbors.

M/S/C Cahill/Gelhaar to approve the requested amendment to Modification 04-43. Unanimous.

B. Modification 03-69; Hillside Development permit 03-51 (Director's Review); Pinkerton; 1627 Alta Park Lane:

Director Stanley reported the applicants' request to construct a 536-sf addition to their single-story home. The 15,416-sf site is located on the north side of Alta Park Lane, west of its intersection with Alta Canyon Boulevard, in the R-1-20,000 zone.

A new wing, extending down slope to the north would present a two-story profile at 17 ft and triggers a second-floor setback for the northern half of the addition. A 7'-2" side setback is provided where a 20-ft side setback is required. Director Stanley noted that the angle of the house to the property line causes the encroachment. He noted that the project presents a stepped massing design and reaches an overall height of 31 ft, measured from lowest grade to the highest ridge. The project area is isolated and would have limited effect on the adjacent lot to the west and would not affect lots to the north and east.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing; comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed. She requested comments from her colleagues.

Commissioner Cahill stated that the stepped massing design was appropriate and precluded a high profile design. He agreed with Staff's recommendation for landscape screening along the wall; with an added condition stating that, he would support the project.

Commissioner Engler commented that a clerestory window could be added to the wall, which seemed stark to him. He also agreed with adding landscaping.

Director Stanley suggested that low shrubs and at the most, 3 trees be installed, given the existing landscaping, prior to issuance of final permits.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to approve Hillside Development Permit 03-51 with an added condition regarding landscaping as discussed. Unanimous.

C. Modification 05-07; Andrews/McQuay; 1939 Tulip Tree Lane:

Assistant Planner Lang described the applicants' proposal to replace a demolished garage with one that would include a bonus room to the rear. A below grade, unfinished basement is also proposed. The 16,225-sf site is located on a private street and was recently developed with a new, two-story home and pool.

Since the proposed garage would be located at the rear of the property, 5-ft rear and side setbacks are allowed, provided that garage is no more than 25 ft in length. The project calls for a 22' x 24' garage and a 16'-9½" x 24' bonus room and a proposed trellis extending 5'-5" further to the rear; nevertheless, a code compliant rear setback if provided.

Assistant Planner Lang noted that the side setback is comparable to that of the demolished garage, the rear setback is greater, and the finish floor would be approximately 4-ft lower than the demolished garage.

Staff determined that the requested side yard encroachment would have no greater impacts than the former structure and strict adherence to the 10% side yard setback would not yield any greater visual or privacy benefit. While the project is considerably deeper than the demolished garage, the proposed rear setback is greater, the side yard setback is maintained and the finish floor is lower. Staff recommended approval as conditioned.

Commissioner Cahill confirmed that the applicants lowered the grade at the rear so that it would appear lower than the former structure.

Commissioner Gelhaar observed that there would be 5½-ft between the driveway of the adjacent flag strip and the new garage and questioned if the 2-ft-high garden wall would retain the grade.

Applicant Todd Andrews, advised that the private strip encroaches 4 ft on his property and that the project had been engineered; the face wall of the garage would hold the grade. The bonus room would serve as a game room for his children

He stated that the staff report captured the nature and scope of the project i.e., replacement of a 1940's garage located at the back northeast corner, which is the highest point on their property. He added that they were "simply bringing it forward 25 ft, inward 2 ft and down by 4 ft." The project would lower the driveway and relocate a parking area and eliminate the easterly neighbor's view of cars. Lastly, he expressed appreciation for the assistance provided by Assistant Planner Lang.

Commissioner Cahill confirmed that the neighbor across the street supported the project and recognized that while the project is a deeper structure than the former garage, it would be 4 ft. lower.

Commissioner Engler requested an added condition prohibiting plumbing fixtures in the basement and requiring that it remain unfinished.

M/S?C Engler/Gelhaar to approve Modification 05-07 with an added condition per Commissioner Engler's request. Unanimous.

D. Floor area Review 05-08; Hillside Development Permit 05-01 (Adm.); Agakanian; 700 Forest Green Drive:

Planning Aide Shimazu reported the applicant's that would result in total floor area of 9,694-sf for the lot, exceeding the 9,067-sf allowed for the lot. Hillside Review addresses a new infinity edge pool to be installed at the top of the slope, a raised wooden deck and a 294-sf gazebo.

The site is located at the end of Forest Green Drive and is a highly prominent lot in the City, specifically from Starlight Crest Drive as well as from Pasadena and Altadena. It is 36,586-sf in area and currently development with a two-story home, an attached garage and a pool.

The existing pool would be demolished and replaced with a pool sited at the top of the slope; a wooden deck would extend outward and over the slope to the south and access the gazebo via stairs. A 294-sf gazebo, at the east side of the deck, would reach 12-ft-in height on a fill pad, 4 ft below the deck. Additionally, one 6-ft and two, 3-ft outward facing retaining walls are proposed downslope. The upper wall would span approximately 130 ft and curve with the contour, reaching a maximum height of 6 ft at the center, while two walls of similar length would reach a maximum height of 3 ft at their centers. All walls taper to natural grade at each end. The area between the walls will be graded to create 20-ft wide, useable level strip. Landscaping is proposed around the walls and the new patio structure would maintain a low profile, so that view impacts are not anticipated.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented that he had difficulty determining what the story poles represented, since the gazebo is on top of the deck.

Mr. Shimazu stated that the best way to resolve that would be to require story poles.

Responding to a comment from Commissioner Cahill, Mr. Shimazu explained that approximately 1,300-sf is based on slope factor guidelines.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Gelhaar, Mr. Shimazu advised that the highest portion of the deck was 5 ft; Commissioner Gelhaar questioned that, stating it appeared more like 15 ft.

Chairwoman Mehranian confirmed that the full picture of the project was represented, and that the pool, walls, etc., comprise a single-phase project.

Curtis Suchmel, with Majestic Pools, advised that a survey and elevations was submitted – all conform to the 5-ft-high exposed deck area per cross sections. He stated that the deck would be 2 ft lower than the gazebo.

Commissioner Engler noted the lack of landscaping under the deck. Mr. Suchmel stated it could be screened at the Commission's direction.

Applicant Nick Agakanian, reported of having met Commissioners Cahill and Gelhaar on site and explained his understanding of the project. He advised that the existing pool is dangerous for anyone to stand on the side, as they could fall down a steep slope and its edges are sharp. The new pool would solve those problems and get sun. He agreed that story poles would illustrate the project more clearly.

Mr. Suchmel advised that the retaining walls would maintain a height of 6 ft regardless of the uneven terrain.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Director Stanley confirmed that the Commission was requesting story poles to outline the entire height of the gazebo and span of the walls, the highest ridge and landscape planting under the deck.

Commissioner Cahill asked Staff to verify the area of the gazebo.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Engler to continue Floor Area Review 05-08 and Hillside Development Permit 05-01 to May 10th. Unanimous.

E. Hillside Development Permit 00-40 (amendment); Modification 01-17; Luis Lluis; 5350 Harter Lane:

Planning Aide Shimazu recalled that the Commission originally heard this request on January 25, 2005 and continued the matter with specific direction.

Following several meetings including the applicant, Staff, and the Trails Council, a revised site plan depicts code-compliant, non-lighted sport court and trellis/ fireplace; a former crib wall was replaced with a 5-ft-high retaining wall with a 5'-6' fence atop it; the topography causes the height of the wall and fence to vary from 6 to 11 ft. The retaining wall at the bottom of the west slope was reduce from 6 ft to 3 ft. Crib walls proposed along the rear property line would be replaced with a 6-ft-high, wrought iron fence. Lastly, a new, inward-facing retaining wall, reaching a height of 5'-6" at its center is proposed on the south side of the driveway (a wall on the north side is in place as previously approved).

The Modification addresses one of two entry gate columns; it is proposed to be located within the east side yard setback and at 8'-6" in height, exceeds the 6-ft maximum. The remaining column was appropriately installed, thought without a permit.

Should the Commission approve the project, the applicant must retroactively obtain a grading permit from Building & Safety for the illegal grading done in the rear yard.

Tree Removal – as mitigation for the relocated oak that did not survive, Staff proposes requiring 3 new oaks along the east property line; however, other restitution options were provided.

Director Stanley addressed the issue with the trail easement. He advised of having met on site with the property owner, his architect, the City Engineer, Building & Safety Inspector and the Trails Council. A survey showing the location of the trail will be an exhibit attached to the engineering description. A 10-ft-wide trail easement spans the entire length of the property from south to north. There is also a 10-ft wide access from the driveway to Harter Lane --- originally, 5 ft was required, but the applicant is willing to give us 10 ft. He advised that discussions continue between the City Engineer and the applicant's engineer.

Property owners residing east of the project and above Mr. Lluís' property, expressed concern that the new trail would damage or narrow the stream flow and erode the slope on their properties.

Director Stanley displayed an overhead map, which depicted a Flood Hazard warning along the rear of the properties to the east. It also showed the 10-ft-wide trail (dedicated to the County) at the bottom of the streambed. Mr. Lluís is giving the City an additional 10 ft to expand the trail along the west side of the existing County trail and stream area.

An aerial photo of the subject site showed rear yards of neighboring properties at a severe down slope from the applicant's rear property line. At Director Stanley's request, the City Engineer to inspect the grading done by the applicant. He advised that the work did not affect the slope. The concrete channel installed by the County remains intact.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Director Stanley advised that historically, equestrians used the trail while the property was vacant; a draft condition requires Mr. Lluis to provide a 10-ft-wide trail easement on his property that would exit to Harter Lane.

Commissioner Engler confirmed that the Fire Department has signed-off on the driveway, though Staff was unsure if the Fire Department approved the decomposed granite for their all-weather needs. The County approved its slope, width, and engineering.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented that the relocated oak was originally in the middle of the property. One of Staff's recommendations was that it be replaced with the same size, species and location; he was unsure if that was possible.

Applicant Barbara Lluis, addressed the oak that was relocated without a permit. She stated there was no excuse for doing so, that it was a big mistake, there was no malicious intent and that its demise was a loss to the property and the City. She has no record or information to provide regarding the contractor who removed the oak, as the work was done on a cash basis. Mrs. Lluis advised of having paid a deposit and has worked with the City for the last 9 months to resolve the pending issues. She requested that the Commission agree to the last option suggested by Staff - "a greater number of replacement trees to mitigate the impact of the lost oak."

Landscape architect Roy Leisure, explained the revisions to the landscape plan. At the last meeting, there was an issue with a crib wall encroaching approximately 2 ft into the trail. He changed the design to a split face block wall - out of the easement -- with vines cascading over the front. He discussed the plan with the Trails Committee and advised that they seem satisfied. Where the trail transitions along the driveway, he added a low wall to level out the trail. Fire trucks will now have a 20-ft access and all oaks at the rear would be retained.

He then addressed the over-height pilaster that was constructed inside the setback. He believed that the height was appropriate, given the steep slopes,

the numerous trees and mass of the building, and asked that the Commission grant the requested Modification.

Director Stanley pointed out that the revised plan maintains the smaller oaks located near the south property line and eliminates grading in this area. Fencing will curve around those trees as a protection measure; he suggested adding a condition requiring wrought iron fencing.

Commissioner Gelhaar commented on the substantial grading for the pool and sports court. He asked what the plans were for the excess dirt.

Mr. Leisure advised there would not be any export of dirt.

Director Stanley advised that a grading plan is currently under review by Public Works and Building & Safety. The majority of dirt will be balanced on site and only a few cubic yards would be exported. Drainage pipes will be required to take water under the trail; County approval will be required for the end of that pipe to be located in the streambed area.

Chairwoman Mehranian opened the public hearing.

Mary Barrie, representing the Trails Council, thanked Staff and Mr. Leisure for their efforts – the trail easement is now correctly depicted on the plans. She noted that the landscape plan still showed the trail as 6-10 ft in width and that it cannot be less than 8 ft wide. Director Stanley assured her that the trail would be raised 16" at the lowest spot and that the City Engineer is also reviewing that aspect. Ms. Barrie referred to Commissioner Engler's prior remark regarding decomposed granite. Given the continual problem with drainage on the trails, she stated "if it can't be decomposed granite, it should have been addressed long ago" and thanked the applicants for dedicating a portion of their property for trail use.

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

Commissioner Engler asked that "subject to Fire Department approval be added to the appropriate conditions. He also asked that all bullet items regarding tree removal be added to condition 17.

Attorney Steres advised that all bullet items could not be included, as some have no direction.

Commissioner Gelhaar was satisfied with the plan's progress and stated that everyone now had a better understanding of what's going on. He preferred

requiring a balanced site and felt strongly that the largest size oak possible be installed as close to where the relocated oak originally grew. Since numerous homes are at a higher elevation and have downslope views of the project, he requested that a covenant be recorded prohibiting fencing or lights on the sport court.

City Attorney Steres recommended against requiring a covenant and cited the need to consider these uniformly. He advised that any owner of this property would be required to file for a CUP and amend the Hillside Permit to light the sport court despite a recorded covenant. He further noted that 6-ft-high fencing is permitted without any approval. He recommended modifying condition #20 to state that the sport court shall not be lighted and that any fence must be maintained at a height of no more than 6 ft.

Commissioner Cahill stated that the concerns expressed at the last meeting had been resolved and that the project now appeared very acceptable. He requested an additional condition that landscaping be added to the blank wall on the horse trail, subject to the Director's review and approval.

Ms. Barrie stated that she could accept landscaping in that area provided irrigation does not drain to the trail; drip systems seem to work well.

Commissioner Cahill continued. The over-height pilaster located in the setback was not a concern, given its location and lack of visibility. He viewed requiring installation of an oak in the same location as punitive and supported restitution by requiring new trees, of a significant size, to be planted in a logical location that would screen the project from neighbors' views.

Chair Mehranian concurred with requiring the largest tree possible, but was unsure if it should be planted in the same location as the oak that was removed.

Commissioner Engler preferred the option of installing more trees and asked Staff to investigate whether there have been any covenants imposed on sport courts.

Director Stanley suggested adding "and recorded" to condition 23 to assure that the trail easement is recorded.

The Commission then discussed the matter of a covenant for any lighting of the sport court and fencing.

Chair Mehranian supported a covenant.

Commissioner Cahill was concerned with placing a restricting on this property forever, though he agreed that the sport court should not be lighted. He concurred with the City Attorney that a CUP was the more logical way to approach the issue.

Commissioner Engler stated that he would agree upon advice that covenants have not been required for sport courts in the past.

The Commissioners agreed that a drip irrigation plan for the trail area be submitted to the Director for review and approval as well as a landscape screening plan for the rear property line area.

Attorney Steres addressed condition 22 which required the applicant to provide contact information for the contractor who illegally relocated the oak, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. He stated that the purpose dealt with the Commission's interest in enforcing Code for any contractor. Another option was for the applicant to provide in writing what was stated earlier - that they have no information on the contractor, who was paid in cash.

A brief discussion followed regarding mitigation for the relocated, dead oak. Commissioner Engler supported requiring installation of as many trees as it takes to equal \$20,600, which is the agreed-to value of the removed tree. Commissioner Cahill concurred.

Mr. Leisure reported that he had Valley Crest Nursery, specialists in large trees, out to the site. He was advised it would be impossible to get a tree of equal size down the driveway. He agreed to get the largest tree possible and to work with the Director and have more trees installed.

Director Stanley stated he would research to determine the largest tree that can be accommodated via the driveway.

Commissioner Engler remarked that the \$20,600 applies to trees only and should not include transportation, labor, etc.

Director Stanley stated that the landscape plan should be corrected to reflect a 10-ft wide trail.

Commissioner Engler asked to strike "plantings are to be adjusted" from the landscape plan.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Engler, Mr. Leisure advised that, according to the civil engineering plan he reviewed, the tree shown on the landscape plan adjacent to the pool is the same location of the original oak that was removed. If that is found to be incorrect, his client is willing to install the biggest tree that can fit in that location and he would design the pool around that tree.

Commissioner Gelhaar asked that a condition require the site to be "balanced" and eliminate condition 14, addressing a haul route.

The Commissioners agree not to require a covenant since a CUP would be required to light the sport court.

M/S/C Gelhaar/Mehranian to approve the requested amendments to Hillside Development Permit 00-04 and Modification 01-17, with added conditions as discussed. Unanimous.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Receive and file: Commissioner Gelhaar reported on an Administrative Hillside project that involved a pool and small retaining wall. Though the check list indicated it would be a balanced site, dirt will have to be exported for the pool. Since the site is across from Palm Crest School, he added a condition requiring a haul route. During a visit to the project site, it was discovered that the neighbor's house encroaches one foot into the applicant's property. He asked what and if the Commission should do in these instances and if there was a process.

Director Stanley advised that if the structure was constructed with a permit, it would be considered legal, non-conforming and could be renovated but not expanded. When a Commissioner is aware of a problem which he or she feels is illegal, it can be reported to Staff for investigation.

Attorney Steres responded to a question from Commissioner Engler regarding prescriptive rights. The burden is on the person who owns the encroaching structure; a court can order a monetary remedy or require removal of the structure. He added that it depends on many factors; if the encroachment occurs on a portion of a property without structures, it can be easily remedied.

B. Budget Considerations

Director Stanley reported that the City is currently undergoing the budget preparation process for Fiscal Year 2005-06. He requested information regarding any projects and/or programs that the Commissioners would like to

pursue for the next budget year. A copy of last year's budget and goals was included in the Commissioners' packets for their review.

Staff would like to see funds appropriated to update the General Plan; the most recent amendment was done in 1993 and it was only one Element that was addressed; all other Elements are outdated. Additionally, a Parking Model that would analyze and digitize existing parking, followed by a review of our Ordinance would be very helpful. It would facilitate matters for applicants and Staff when a plan is submitted with deficient parking and where off site parking is available. It is a very efficient way to determine available parking and a good tool for the Downtown Village Specific Plan area.

Responding to a comment from Commissioner Cahill regarding formation of a Redevelopment Agency, Director Stanley advised that the City does have such an Agency, but it is inactive. The City Council, the City Attorney and a consultant reviewed the possibility at length; however, the required finding of Blight could not be made and we can't show an economic downturn.

M/S/C Cahill/Gelhaar to support the Director's request for a parking analysis and strongly encouraged the Director to add staff to his department.
Unanimous.

X. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Engler confirmed that it would be appropriate to ask if there were any court reporters in the audience before a request is discussed.

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR:

Director Stanley reported that the City Council conducted a study session on the Downtown Village Specific Plan area. The Council requested an update and recommendations from Staff on how to implement and improve the area.

Commissioner Engler stated that the City needs to partner with developers and take on a bond indebtedness.

R-1 revisions will be reviewed by the City Council on May 2.

Two appeals have been filed by Mr. Liang on Shepherd's Lane and by Mr. and Mrs. Bywater on Oakwood.

Director Stanley stated that he would like to schedule landscape requirements on a future agenda and discuss whether the Commission wants to require submittal of landscape plans on Building Depth Review, Garage reviews, etc. Staff's preference is for the Commission to require landscaping as necessary,

via a condition, rather than requiring a full plan upon submittal of an application. A landscape plan is not required by Ordinance, but it is a requirement on our applications.

Commissioner Cahill stated that he was comfortable with leaving it to the discretion of the Director. The Commissioners concurred.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/C Cahill/Engler to adjourn at 9:00 p.m. Unanimous.

Secretary to the Planning Commission