

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE  
HELD ON APRIL 26, 2016**

- I. **CALL TO ORDER-** Chairman McConnell called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.
- II. **ROLL:** Also present were Vice Chairman Smith and Commissioners Jain and Hazen. Commissioner Gunter 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:** February 23, 2016 and April 12, 2016 meetings – M/S/C – McConnell/Jain to approve the minutes with one minor typographical error to be corrected in the minutes of February 23, 2016.
- VII. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:** There was none.
- VIII. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
  - A. **Second Floor Review 15-38/Floor Area Review 15-03; 4352 Beulah Drive; Jones/Stoddard:** request to allow a 1,110 sq. ft. first-floor addition and 697 sq. ft. second-floor addition to an existing two-story house. The project requires Floor Area Review because the project would exceed the 4,500 sq. ft. limitation for narrow lots (less than 80 feet wide). However, total floor area would be 5,124 sq. ft., which is under the 5,130 sq. ft. maximum allowed for the lot size.

Assistant Planner, Harriet Harris, gave a staff report. She highlighted that the subject lot is very narrow. Ms. Harris stated that the requested square footage meets floor area requirements.

Ms. Harris referred to a site plan and explained that a new porch and dormers would be added to the existing house. The proposed front setback would meet code. It was explained that the applicants have agreed to Condition No. 12 that requires them to remove the encroaching portion of the existing accessory structure and increase the north side-yard setback to a minimum of 5'-0" as allowed through the Director's Miscellaneous Review process or less than 5'-0" as allowed through the

Setback Modification process. The entitlements shall be in place for the accessory structure and the work shall be completed prior to final occupancy clearance by Building and Safety.

Ms. Harris discussed the floor plan with the Commission and reiterated that the proposed project will meet all setback requirements. As to the new architectural elements, the new dormers to be added will change the architectural style. There is an existing angle plane encroachment that will not be exacerbated. The proposed height is 24 feet, six inches. The Juliet balcony would not result in any privacy concerns and the existing architectural style is Monterey Colonial which will be changed to a Colonial Revival Style. The interior of the building has undergone many changes and thus, the proposed project is not historic.

A single-story garage addition is also proposed. The existing accessory will be cut back as required in a condition of approval. The floor area ratio is in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood.

Staff recommends a condition of approval clarifying that removal of 30% of the total roof area would require additional entitlements.

Vice Chairman Smith asked about the attached garage and accessory structure and whether both would be included in the square footage comparison chart.

Director Stanley clarified that only the habitable square footage is included.

Chairman McConnell asked for clarification on removal of the roof over the present balcony and roof pitch. Director Stanley confirmed that a ridge is being added to it.

Chairman McConnell asked if additional parking is required for the accessory structure. Ms. Harris indicated "no," only if a kitchen is included.

Vice Chairman Smith asked if staff checked to see if a kitchen in the accessory structure, to which staff indicated, "No, they had not checked."

Chairman McConnell asked if the project is considered to be a new home. Ms. Harris explained that less than 30% of the roof is being removed which does not classify the project as a new project. The Commission engaged in a discussion about the 30% roof removal rule for designating a project as a new project.

Commissioner Jain inquired about the accessory structure currently located over the property line and whether an easement could be granted allowing for the continuation of the structure without modification.

The public hearing was opened.

The applicant's representative, Craig Stoddard, spoke and indicated that there were no permits located for the old garage. He said that he was exploring a lot line adjustment with the neighbor's approval.

Chairman McConnell asked that the Zoning Code be complied with and that the appropriate entitlement be approved whether it be a Director's determination, setback modification, etc.

Vice Chairman Smith commented on the fact that the standing seam roof seems to be out of character with the rest of the house. Mr. Stoddard replied that there are a few homes with a similar design, nearby.

Chairman McConnell suggested that if applicable to the project, that a condition be added requiring applicants to submit calculations of the percentage of roof to be removed and the amount of roof to be retained. It was also recommended that Condition No. 12 be modified to state that an accessory structure should comply with City Code.

The Commission reviewed photos of the existing roof.

Director Stanley asked whether the portion of the balcony that currently protrudes out would be removed. Mr. Stoddard said, "Yes," it will be removed. The second floor porch will be included.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Hazen indicated that he visited the site, felt that the proposed project fits the neighborhood and that he could make all of the findings.

Commissioner Jain said that he visited the site and believed that the proposed project is a nice solution to a narrow lot. He indicated that he could make all of the findings.

Vice Chairman Smith said that he visited the site and that he appreciated that the existing home is being left intact. He stated that there is a lot of landscaping between homes and believes that the proposed design is well thought out. He felt that the design has elements that respect the neighbor's privacy. He said that he could make all of the findings.

Chairman McConnell said that he visited the site, has no issue with floor area ratio and can make all of the findings.

Ms. Harris indicated that the tree trimming that will take place on the site must be completed by a company that is listed as approved by the City.

M/S/C – Jain/Smith to approve the project with direction to modify Condition No. 12, requiring that the accessory structure comply with City code. Approved 4-0.

**IX. REPORT OF DIRECTOR'S REVIEWS –**

- A. **Hillside Development Permit 16-10 (Dir.); 3800 Domal Lane; Lee/Kim:** Allowed a 2-foot retaining wall within the side yard setback in conjunction with construction of a new 2-story residence on a hillside lot.
- B. **Director's Misc. Review 16-11 (Chicken Coop Waiver); 1743 Fairmount Avenue; Haaga:** allowed installation of a chicken coop within an abandoned dog run approximately 2 feet from the north side property line.
- C. **Director's Misc. Review 16-14 (Height); 4235 Mesa Vista Drive; Baghgegian:** Allowed 9" of excess building height in conjunction with construction of a 2-story residence.

Pertaining to Item B, Chairman McConnell asked if there is a review process required for a chicken coop and Director Stanley indicated that a Directors Review would be required. He said that the number of chickens would be limited to six or seven, total, on the property and depends on the size of the lot.

**X. OTHER BUSINESS -** There was none.

**XI. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS**

Vice Chairman Smith asked about an issue pertaining to pawnbroker uses that went before the City Council recently. Director Stanley informed the Commission that the item was denied by the City Council in keeping with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

**XII. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR**

Commissioner Jain asked about the status of Sport Chalet and adjacent office building. Director Stanley indicated that Sport Chalet will officially close their doors by June 30, 2016 and will have a going out-of-business sale.

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT –** The meeting was adjourned at 6:42 p.m.