

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD ON MAY 8, 2012**

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m.
- II. ROLL:** Present were Chairman Curtis, Vice Chair Cahill (6:11p.m.), Commissioners Der Sarkissian, Jain, Gunter, Director Stanley, Deputy City Attorney Guerra, Senior Planner Buss, Planners Gjolme and Clarke, Assistant Planners Lang and Parinas, Planning Intern Rodriguez.
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Commissioner Der Sarkissian led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** There were no comments from the public.
- V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA:** The CIP program was moved to after the 1st public hearing.
- VI. CONSENT CALENDAR:**
- A. Approval of Minutes:** February 28, 2012; March 13, 2012
- M/S/C Jain/Der Sarkissian to approve the minutes as submitted.
- VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**
- VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
- A. Hillside Development Permit 10-44/Second Floor Review 10-31/Modification (Setback) 10-28; Paul/Vickery/Gross; 5545 Rock Castle Drive:** Request to construct a 732-square foot pool house, 382-square foot second-floor addition, 457-square foot second-floor volume space, and 447-square foot first floor addition to an existing single-story house on a 38,420 sq. ft. hillside lot. A Setback Modification is requested to allow a 13'-0" first floor north side setback encroachment, a 4'-3" second floor north side setback encroachment, and a 5'-0" front setback encroachment. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Assistant Planner Parinas)

Assistant Planner Parinas gave a presentation in accordance with the staff report.

Commissioner Jain wanted to know the area of the building pad.

Commissioner Gunter asked for clarification if the pool house will be put on the flat pad and will not require grading.

Assistant Planner Parinas replied yes.

Dan Vickery, the project architect, stated that the intent was to have as little impact on the area as possible with respect to the additions. He added that the pool house is on a flat area and the foot print of the first floor will not extend beyond the existing roofline.

Vice Chairman Cahill asked if the existing walls on the first floor were being replaced with glass.

Mr. Vickery replied that most of the house is already glass.

Harriet Hammonds of 5404 Rock Castle, has lived in across the street for a long time and is in support of the project.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian stated that he visited the site and the only potential problem he sees is that of view blockage from the neighboring deck. He also asked what the proposed plate height is for the second-floor office.

Mr. Vickery replied that the plate height would be 8'-0".

Commissioner Der Sarkissian felt that the plate height in the office could possibly be lowered 6" but that he could support the project as designed.

Commissioner Jain visited a year ago. He originally met with the impacted neighbors but they are not present tonight. His main concern was that the project was above the Slope Factor Guideline. He indicated that he could support the project if the volume space could not be converted to floor area in the future.

Assistant Planner Parinas reported that she calculated that the building pad was approximately 8,000 S.F.

Commissioner Jain said that an 8,000 S.F. lot could support a 2,900 S.F. house. He added that he would like to see a covenant that the volume space could never be turned in to floor area.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian asked if it only applies to the living room volume space.

Commissioner Jain replied yes.

Vice Chairman Cahill stated that he visited the project site a year ago and he felt that there were two issues. The main issue was view blockage but the house does have a low profile of 19'-6" which is much less than is permitted. He agreed with Commissioner Jain in that it was a large house on a small pad but no one is objecting to the size of the house. He added that he is okay if the volume space turns into floor area since the roof wouldn't change. He would like to see a smaller project but that he could vote for the project as designed.

Commissioner Gunter also visited the site and he has some concerns. He could make all the findings for the Hillside Development Permit and the Second Floor Review. He expressed some concern about the SFG. He liked that the pool house is on the flat pad. He could not make the finding for the north side setback encroachment. He could not justify the hardship. He said they were being asked to use the full area of the site to allow for the large floor area and using the smaller size of the pad to justify the encroachment. He could support the pool house in the back and the size of the house but could not support the north side encroachment.

Chairman Curtis agreed that the project does exceed the SFG significantly but felt that it was an exception where it would be okay because of the secluded location of the pool house. He added that the additions to the main house were tastefully done. He felt that there was a hardship to allow for the north side encroachment because it is potentially mitigating the neighbor's impacts by allowing the encroachment. He can support the project as proposed.

M/S/C Cahill/Der Sarkissian to approve the project as conditioned. 5-0 Unanimous.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Draft 2012-13 Capital Improvement Plan: The annual request for determination of consistency with the General Plan (Senior Planner Buss) was moved forward.

Senior Planner Buss gave a presentation in accordance with the staff report.

Chairman Curtis asked if the improvements were consistent with the Proposed General Plan.

Senior Planner Buss replied yes.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian asked if there was already a shade structure in Memorial Park.

City Engineer Kwan explained that the shade structure proposed was for the existing play area to help alleviate the heat.

Chairman Curtis asked about the timing on the linear park at the west end of Foothill Boulevard.

City Engineer Kwan explained that the linear park proposed for the west end of town was delayed because the grant money is not yet available.

Chairman Curtis asked if there were more signs, street lights, or stop lights proposed on Foothill Boulevard near the Town Center.

City Engineer Kwan replied that there were no more plans to do so. He added that we will have another busy year for capital projects.

Commissioner Gunter found that the improvements proposed are in conformance with the General Plan.

All the Commissioners concurred.

M/S/C Gunter/Cahill 5-0 Unanimous.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- B. Conditional Use Permit 293 (Amend #2)/Hillside Development Permit 12-10 (Dir.); Pride/Keegan; 4055 Chevy Chase Drive:** Request to allow the construction of a new infinity edge reservoir consisting of two parallel retaining walls (6'-6" and 42") , and a new Baja bench. A Conditional Use Permit is required because the proposed improvements to the pool are located in front of the residence. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planning Intern Rodriquez)

Planning Intern Rodriguez gave a brief presentation in accordance with the staff report. He explained that there are no view impacts.

Vice Chairman Cahill clarified if the recommendation was for an arborist report.

Planning Intern Rodriguez replied yes.

Chairman Curtis asked about the Oak trees that were never planted. He asked if the approved location was part of the previous approval.

Planning Intern Rodriguez indicated that the previous approval required that the Oak trees be planted as mitigation and staff could not verify that this was completed.

Director Stanley clarified that the original project was proposed by the previous owner and he suggested that the Commission could add a condition to the current proposal to add more trees.

Chairman Curtis stated that Condition No. 15 covers that unless staff was suggesting extra plantings in addition to that.

Director Stanley replied yes that Condition No. 15 takes care of the plantings.

Jon Pride, the landscape designer representing the owner, stated that the new Baja bench is about 13' away from the Oak trees. The 3 mitigation trees were previously planted, just not in the area as specified on the approved landscape plan. Views would be lost if they plant them where they were originally proposed. As planted they provide more screening. He asked if they could amend the previously approved landscape plan.

Director Stanley is OK with them planting 3 additional trees on the lot.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian asked for clarification about the Baja bench relative to the Oak trees.

Mr. Pride clarified that the proposed Baja bench is within the existing patio and not near the Oak trees.

Commissioner Jain stated that he couldn't get access to the site but walked around on the street. The project is not visible from the street and he can make the findings.

Commissioner Gunter stated that he visited the site and can make findings.

Vice Chairman Cahill stated he also could not get in to the site but that the project would not be visible from street

Commissioner Der Sarkissian concurred

Chairman Curtis concurred and clarified that the condition to plant additional Oak trees is included in the resolution for adoption before them.

Vice Chairman Cahill felt that if the 3 trees were planted and if the Director was OK with their location, then he is OK with it too.

Chairman Curtis asked Vice Chairman Cahill if he wanted to modify the condition.

Vice Chairman Cahill clarified that it could be amended to say that 3 trees should be planted unless the Director found that the already planted trees were in substantial conformance with the previously approved landscape plan.

M/S/C Cahill/Jain to amend the Condition of approval regarding the planting of trees if the Director could determine that the locations were in substantial conformance with the approved locations. 5-0 Unanimous.

- C. Minor Conditional Use Permit 478; Galkowski /Weight Watchers/La Cañada Retail, LLC; 895 Foothill Boulevard, Suite B:** Request to allow a Weight Watchers in an existing building in the Town Center that is zoned Mixed Use 1 of the Downtown Village Specific Plan. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planner Clarke)

Planner Clarke gave a presentation in accordance with the staff report.

Chairman Curtis asked about parking since this can be an intense use because of classes.

Planner Clarke explained how occupancy was calculated and he used the worst case scenario to determine how much parking would be needed. He also pointed out that

there were no classes on weekend evenings that could conflict with the other uses in the center.

Commissioner Gunter asked why the hours were limited in a condition of approval.

Planner Clarke added the condition based on what the applicant stated.

Commissioner Gunter felt that this could limit early classes and an amendment to the CUP could be a burden. He also asked if there was a benefit to the City by limiting early morning classes.

Planner Clarke suggested amending the condition of approval to allow for early morning classes or removing the condition all together.

Director Stanley suggested keeping the condition to limit the hours of operation.

Terry Erickson, territory manager for Weight Watchers, stated that they would like to keep early morning meetings as an option once they determine if there is a need.

Director Stanley asked Ms. Erickson how early they would have their meetings.

Ms. Erickson stated that they are testing a 7 a.m. meeting in another city.

Commissioner Gunter stated that he could support the project and is comfortable with parking in the Town Center. He suggested changing Condition No. 11 to have a 7 a.m. start time and leave the end times as proposed.

Vice Chairman Cahill stated that he is OK with expanding the hours of operation. He felt that the use was appropriate for the site. He felt that the parking in the Town Center was built for the highest and most intense use.

Commissioner Jain stated that he can support the project with the extended times.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian stated that purchasing habits have changed over time. It seems that they have been approving a lot of service type businesses lately. He can support the project.

Chairman Curtis could support the project and liked the mixed uses in the City and the Town Center. He could also support the earlier hours of operation. He liked that they closed earlier on Thursday since it has become the new Friday and there is increased restaurant patronage.

M/S/C Gunter/Cahill to change Condition No. 11 to expand the hours to 7 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. seven days per week. 5-0 Unanimous.

D. Hillside Development Permit 12-21/Second-floor Review 12-06/Setback Modification 12-04; Sheriff/Yacoubian; 835 St. Katherine Drive: Request to allow 1st and 2nd-floor additions totaling 1,730 sq. ft. to an

existing 2-story residence on a hillside lot. A Setback Modification is also requested since the additions would encroach into the required front and west side yard setbacks, albeit no further than the existing residence, which currently maintains a 24'-6" front setback and 6'-8" west side setback, below the 45-foot and 9'-6" requirements for the site. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planner Gjolme)

Planner Gjolme gave a presentation in accordance with the staff report.

Chairman Curtis asked Planner Gjolme to clarify why he felt that not approving the kitchen bump out would be a hardship.

Planner Gjolme explained that the allowed projection would only be 6 inches without the Setback Modification. The existing corner is already within the required setback. They are asking for 2 feet, consistent with the location of the existing house.

Chairman Curtis asked if the drainage condition was to identify, as well as, mitigate the project's impacts with regard to the site's drainage.

Planner Gjolme explained that it was a Public Works condition but that was his understanding.

Garth Sheriff, the project architect, explained that the two-story projection is on a flat pad area. The family is growing family and they desired more space. Most of the additions face away from the neighbor. He explained that the activity is far away from neighbor and that the kitchen bump out is under the existing roof.

Lee Bird of 845 St. Katherine Drive, is the immediate next door neighbor and the most impacted. He submitted photos to the Commission. He pointed out some unique characteristics of the two adjacent lots. These two homes share a driveway and are very close to each other. Their front doors face each other along the shared side property line. At the northwest corner the two roofs are within 5 feet of each other. He expressed concern that the subject home already has significant encroachments. He quoted from the tapes of the 2004 Planning Commission meeting when the original house was approved. He is concerned with the size and scale of the project. The project is 23% over the Slope Factor Guideline. He is also concerned with the proposed encroachments on the south and west side because the kitchen is being moved closer to his home thereby reducing his privacy and increasing the noise closer to the bedrooms of his home. He felt that the septic system should be identified on the plans given the history of septic problems on the subject lot. It appeared that the new porch would be constructed closer to the property line than stated by the project architect and would be built over the septic system. He felt that a landscape plan and fire report should have been included in the submittal and that the application was deficient in many aspects. He opposed moving the house closer to his house. He thought that the house could be expanded to the east where there is plenty of room on the parcel. He asked that the applicant not proceed with the west side additions.

John Chaves of 817 Waldorf Road indicated that he had no concerns and supports the project as designed.

Mr. Sheriff responded to the concerns of the neighbor. He stated they did not make the design decisions arbitrarily. The windows on the west side are on the first floor. He concluded by saying that his client has offered to do more planting on that side which could solve the issues raised.

Vice Chairman Cahill asked Mr. Sheriff what kind of windows he is proposing at the bump out and for clarification if the front door was being relocated.

Mr. Sheriff stated they are proposing to relocate the front door further away from the neighbor and that some of the windows would be fixed and some would be operable. He pointed out that he was trying to keep all the "gathering" rooms away from that side.

Commissioner Jain asked Mr. Sheriff if the kitchen could be moved 3 feet to the south. He added that the addition as proposed is close to the neighboring home and moving it south could alleviate the problem.

Mr. Sheriff responded that the staircase is difficult to move but that the pantry could be moved. He added that septic plans have been submitted and approved by the County

Chairman Curtis asked staff to clarify if the septic system has to be approved prior to building permit issuance.

Planner Gjolme replied yes.

Commissioner Gunter asked why staff used the average of the floor area allowed with and without the SFG applied.

Planner Gjolme stated that he used it to illustrate that, in his opinion, the excess above the SFG was minimal, and justified by the lot and house size.

Commissioner Jain said he could support the project but that he was concerned with the kitchen bump out and suggested moving party further to the south.

Vice Chairman Cahill felt that the project was well designed and that the addition is sensitive to the lot. The east side additions have a low impact on that side. SFG is a guideline and there's a lot of landscaping that can be enjoyed on that side. The bump out in the kitchen is warranted since the encroachment is just a clip – a small triangle portion. He liked the concept of moving the front door since it will reduce traffic and noise in favor of the neighbor. He concluded by saying that he is favor of the project as is.

Commissioner Gunter is in favor of the east side expansion. He is Ok with exceeding the SFG because the existing flat pad is being utilized. He felt that both two-story homes are laid out in an awkward situation. He is strongly opposed to the proposed expansion on the west side of the house.

Chairman Curtis asked for clarification if Mr. Gunter was not in favor of any expansion on the west side or just the encroaching portion.

Commissioner Gunter was not in favor of any expansion on west side.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian could not access the site but he was told by the property owner that the kids play in the front yard which creates noise. He liked the bump out because it articulates the front of the house at the first floor level. He liked the idea of moving the bump out to the south as proposed by Commissioner Jain.

Chairman Curtis asked Commissioner Der Sarkissian if he was in favor of moving the bump out area outside of the setback area.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian was not sure if moving it would completely outside the setback area.

Planner Gjolme felt that in order to completely eliminate the encroachment it would need to move 5 feet not 3 to 3.5 feet as suggested by the commissioners.

Chairman Curtis stated that he was OK with exceeding the SFG. He felt that the bump out creates the illusion of houses being closer together. He had an issue with the bump out and would like it completely out of the required setback. He asked Commissioner Jain to clarify if he would consider a portion of the addition within the setback.

Commissioner Jain stated that he would be comfortable with the pantry moving a minimum of 3 feet south which would allow a smaller pantry even though it is still within the required setback.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian stated that it would not leave much of a pantry for the applicant.

Chairman Curtis asked applicant if they wanted a vote tonight.

Mr. Sheriff said that they would prefer a vote tonight.

Planner Gjolme clarified that moving it 3 feet would not move it completely out of the setback.

Commissioner Gunter summarized that the Commission was not willing to allow an encroachment of any kind on the west side and move the bump out.

Chairman Curtis would like to add to Condition No. 19 clarification that the hydrology study is to mitigate impacts of the project and add a condition requiring a landscape plan.

M/S/C Jain/Der Sarkissian to approve project with the relocation of the kitchen bump out outside the setback area and amended conditions. 4-1 Gunter dissenting.

- E. General Plan Amendment 05-01; City-wide:** A public hearing to receive public comments on the proposed City of La Cañada Flintridge General Plan Update. The proposed City of La Cañada Flintridge General Plan 2030 update amends the existing General Plan in its entirety. It includes the following elements: Land Use, Open Space and Recreation, Conservation, Safety, Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, and Housing. California state law requires each city to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan to guide the physical development of the incorporated city and any land outside of the city boundaries that bears a relationship to its planning activities. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Final Environmental Impact Report. (Senior Planner Buss)

Director Stanley reminded the Planning Commission that the Planning Commission has been over all of the elements of the Draft General Plan in the past and that their comments, as well as, those of the other commissions that reviewed it have been addressed. He introduced Patricia Bluman, the City's General Plan consultant.

Senior Planner Buss gave a presentation in accordance with the staff report.

Chairman Curtis asked for clarification if a property owner could submit a proposal for a General Plan Amendment and how many are allowed per year.

Director Stanley replied that the State allows up to four General Plan Amendments per year.

Commissioner Gunter asked if the parking lot up by the golf course and the property at the corner of Indiana Avenue and Foothill Boulevard was part of the multi-family allotment that is required.

Senior Planner Buss replied no.

Gordon Hoopes, of 4416 Wyncrest Way and a member of the City's Design Commission described a potential project that could place a small hotel on the back portion of the Von's lot that is under utilized. He highlighted a new stair and elevator tower that would be incorporated into the design. He explained that the parcel is under parked when the second floor above TJ Maxx is used. He explained that his proposal calls for the second floor space above TJ Maxx to be used as office space. He gave a brief overview of the area and explained that a parking district would be beneficial for this area. He showed that a public parking structure could be established behind the Dona Maria restaurant.

Chairman Curtis asked if the Von's Company owns the entire site and if Mr. Hoopes was working with the Von's management.

Mr. Hoopes indicated that he was working with Von's management in Monrovia until they moved their management of this site to northern California.

Director Stanley reminded the Commission that the concept of a boutique hotel is supportable by staff and that there is a need and desire for a small hotel in the City.

Commissioner Gunter asked if there have been any financial models done and if any operators had expressed interest in locating here.

Mr. Hoopes explained that he spoke to three hotel operators and there was a very positive response, but interest in the project has waned since the financial crisis.

Pat Anderson, of the Chamber of Commerce spoke and explained that the hotel concept would provide additional jobs in the area and retail on the ground floor of the hotel. It would increase activity and foot traffic at this location. She felt that a hotel use should be allowed for in the General Plan.

William Johnson, of 5857 Angeles Crest Highway spoke and expressed appreciation that the Commissioners visited his property. He gave a brief history of the immediate area. He explained that Mr. Gould was an attorney in the late 1800's and the early 1900's. He planted olive trees and 40 acres of table grapes in the area. His wife donated riding trails in the immediate area. He would like to maintain his property as an agricultural area and would like to see the agricultural overlay.

Gilbert Dreyfuss, of 5805 Lone Grove Way in the Angeles Crest Estates asked if Mr. Gelhaar was involved in the process. He was primarily concerned with fecal matter on the Johnson property. He wanted to make sure that the concerns of the home owners in the Angeles Crest Estates were addressed.

Mary Barrie, of 5159 Crown Avenue expressed concern that this is the first time she's heard of any agricultural overlay zone. She wanted to know what an agricultural overlay zone would do to other open space areas such as the trail areas.

Director Stanley stated that the City has 929 acres of open space. He explained that Mr. Johnson's proposal is not new.

Ms. Barrie was concerned about the agricultural overlay. It would affect more than Mr. Johnson's property.

Randy Strapazon, of 444 Georgian Road expressed concern that under the overlay zone proposal people could expand their backyards into trail areas especially under the power lines.

Randy Dreyfuss, President of La Cañada Flintridge Country Club spoke regarding changing the parking lot on the west side of Godbey Drive to high density residential and the City's proposal to designate the Country Club as open space. It would be the only commercial enterprise on the list that is designated as open space. He explained their long range plan for Country Club is to maintain the club. They feel that they can generate more revenue by building apartments on the current parking lot site. He added that the club is opposed to the open space designation as it would invalidate their land appraisals and borrowing power. He would like to see it designated as parks and

recreation. He concluded by stating that they want the debris basin terminology removed from draft General Plan because they removed the debris basin some time ago and replaced it with a storm drain.

Ari Sikora, the architect and development consultant for the country club, showed pictures of the Country Club and showed an example of the proposed housing for the parking lot site. They are proposing sustainable housing at that location.

Dave DeAngelis, local architect, stated that he represents the applicant Robert Ford who owns the vacant property at El Camino Corto and Foothill Boulevard. He stated that they are here to answer any questions about their proposal to change the land use designation of the property from residential to commercial/office.

Chairman Curtis asked if anyone wanted to speak on any of the recommendations in the housing element for the increased residential density for various properties throughout the city. He suggested that the Planning Commission discuss the five items that they just heard about from staff and the public.

Commissioner Gunter spoke regarding the William Johnson proposal. He felt that open space should be preserved and not used in any way that could have unintended consequences. We have moved away from an agriculture community. He is not in support of the agriculture designation. He felt that our current animal keeping regulations do a good job of monitoring those uses and doesn't see a need to modify it.

Commissioner Cahill felt that the tour of Johnson property was pretty interesting. Since the tour, he was able to attend an event in Alta Dena that focused on a new trend of urban agriculture. He has since changed his mind about agriculture and feels that it might have a place in the City's rural character. He felt that it should be considered on a case by case basis. There could be considerations of parcels that are close to residential. He feels that the Johnson property is unique and there are other parcels in the city that are also unique. He would not approve of open space as agriculture in general but adding an overlay on a case by case basis where the use is warranted so that conditions can be applied as necessary is worthy of consideration. He is not against animals or agricultural uses with appropriate limitations.

Chairman Curtis also felt that agriculture on open space is too broad. He didn't want to designate a specific parcel as agriculture. It hasn't been studied enough. He felt that a policy for urban agriculture uses that doesn't identify a specific parcel as an agriculture use may be appropriate.

Commissioner Jain concurred with his fellow commissioners. He felt that open space should remain open to general public. By adding animal or agricultural use takes away from the open space use. He also felt that it hasn't been studied enough. He felt a policy that could be evaluated on a case by case basis would be appropriate.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian also concurred. He felt that it could be considered spot zoning. What should the process be to deal with the issue on a case by case basis?

Chairman Curtis clarified that the commission should just establish a policy and the process could be discussed and developed at a later time.

Commissioner Gunter clarified that they are talking about just the General Plan and it should say that there is a procedure to convert open space land to agriculture uses. He added that Commissioner Cahill made a good suggestion. It could be handled in the zoning code similar to the way animal keeping is addressed for residential zones.

Chairman Curtis suggested that they oppose agricultural uses in open space areas but create a new policy for an urban agriculture program and that it be further reviewed.

Senior Planner Buss clarified they already have a policy in the Land Use Element.

Commissioner Cahill felt that the policy Senior Planner Buss read was not enough. How does it get implemented? Each owner can decide what to do with their land within limits but each situation should not be prejudged. He thought that a process should be added to the General Plan.

Chairman Curtis suggested modifying the second policy to allow for a process. He did not want to say that all open space areas would be appropriate for agriculture uses.

Commissioner Cahill suggested having the policy apply to all zones, not just open space.

Director Stanley asked for clarification that the Planning Commission did not want to change the open space designation to allow agriculture. He also asked for clarification that they wanted to allow certain agricultural uses on residential properties city-wide where appropriate.

Commissioner Cahill clarified that the Commission was saying that open space should remain open space unless someone goes through the process to change it and that any zoning designation could be used for agriculture – not just residential.

Commissioner Gunter suggested that there should be a process whereby you could explore alternate uses within the open space designation.

Director Stanley felt that they were getting away from the purpose of open space as a passive use. He added that he didn't want to load it up with other potential uses.

Chairman Curtis reiterated that they should leave discussion for another day and just create a policy. He clarified that the Commission was rejecting the notion of allowing agriculture on open space designations.

Senior Planner Buss reminded the Commission that staff's recommendation is to leave open space open as it is under the current code. There was merely a suggestion to allow animal keeping if appropriate. He added that they have not had enough time to explore the options.

Director Stanley suggested that urban agriculture be limited to residential property only.

Senior Planner Buss stated that they could increase the cap on animal keeping for larger R1 lots.

Commissioner Cahill asked where the definition of open space located in the Draft General Plan.

Senior Planner Buss read the definition of open space from the Draft General Plan.

Director Stanley added that areas of open space include Descanso Gardens, Cherry Canyon, etc.

Senior Planner Buss clarified that Descanso Gardens functions as open space.

Chairman Curtis clarified that they have two issues 1) the notion of allowing agriculture vs. no agriculture and 2) creating a policy that would allow urban agriculture.

Director Stanley suggested allowing urban agriculture in R1 zones only so that we can establish standards. This would apply to crops. Animal keeping (i.e. cattle) should require larger parcels.

Chairman Curtis indicated that one could change the General Plan designation for open space to allow for something else through an amendment. He called for a vote regarding open space with no agriculture uses:

Commissioner Gunter - no agriculture uses in open space designated areas.

Commissioner Cahill - no agriculture uses in open space designated areas as a general rule but there should be a mechanism in place to consider unusual cases.

Chairman Curtis - no agriculture uses in open space designated areas.

Commissioner Jain - agreed with Director Stanley that open space should not have any animal keeping or agricultural uses and that animal keeping should stay in residential uses only.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian - agriculture combines planting and animals. He agreed with his fellow Commissioners but added that some planting in open spaces is OK and that animal keeping is very different.

Commissioner Cahill indicated that he has seen where people have planted grapes in the Arroyo and he doesn't think it detracts from the open space but enhances it. He did not know the zoning of the area he was referring to.

Director Stanley stated that an agriculture operation could be an industrial/commercial use with its associated impacts.

Chairman Curtis indicated that we already have the policy regarding encouraging agriculture uses in other zones. He felt that developing procedures was a good idea.

Commissioner Cahill added that it should be researched and encouraged where appropriate.

Director Stanley suggested a new policy to develop the procedures to address the issue.

Commissioner Cahill addressed the proposal at the country club. He felt that designating the country club as open space may not be a good idea because of negative impact on the commercial enterprise. He supported the idea of changing it to a parks and recreation designation. He also supports the multi-family component proposed within the county club's parking lot if it's done the right way but did not have enough information for the conversion of the other lots to single family.

Senior Planner Buss suggested removing debris basin designation and the Commission concurred.

Chairman Curtis supported changing the country club to a park and recreation designation and the removal of the debris basin designation. He felt that there was not enough information for the proposed residential component of the country club proposal. They need more analysis. It should probably be addressed as General Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Jain felt that the open space designation could be changed to parks and recreation and that changing the debris basin designation was OK. He expressed concern about changing the parking lot to high density and felt that more study was necessary.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian concurred with the first two issues. He is OK with the multifamily designation. He is in support of the multi-family proposal since he felt that there is a need for higher end multifamily in La Cañada. He stated that the single-family proposal should be reviewed on a case by case use since they do not have enough information now.

Commissioner Gunter agreed that it makes sense to change the parks and recreation designation and removal of the debris basin designation makes sense to change. He was not opposed to the other ideas but they did not have enough information and it should be done as a separate General Plan Amendment.

Chairman Curtis addressed the Ford property and is supportive of changing the designation to commercial office as requested. He would like to see the lots merged.

Commissioner Jain was in support of changing the designation to commercial office but would like to limit it to one story and require a conditional use permit since it abuts residential uses.

Director Stanley indicated that requiring a CUP could not be addressed through this process. He suggested a low intensity commercial use on that site.

Senior Planner Buss said we could create standards for commercial office zoning designation in the zoning ordinance. They could specify single story and require a CUP to go higher in zoning ordinance.

All the Planning Commissioners concurred

Commissioner Jain asked Deputy City Attorney Guerra if he needed to recuse himself since his office building is in proximity to the Von's Center.

City Attorney Guerra indicated that he could recuse himself on this item if he wanted to.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian addressed the Von's property. He asked what is allowed on the commercially zoned site now. He didn't see the need to change the zoning to allow the hotel since it is already allowed. He suggested leaving it alone as commercial.

Director Stanley suggested a general policy for a hotel use somewhere in the city.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian felt that would be OK but not specific to this site.

Commissioner Gunter agreed with Commissioner Der Sarkissian that it would be nice to have a hotel. He didn't understand why it had to be in the General Plan.

Commissioner Cahill agreed with his fellow commissioners and liked Director Stanley's suggestion of creating a general policy in the General Plan

Chairman Curtis also agreed and liked the idea of a policy.

Commissioner Jain agreed that we should encourage a hospitality use as a policy.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian added that he would like to see the parking district developed in the city and a related policy.

Director Stanley indicated that there is not a current parking district but that it was encouraged in the Downtown Village Specific Plan.

Senior Planner Buss pointed out that there was a Land Use policy in the draft General Plan that also encourages the consolidation of parking.

Director Stanley stated that staff could add a line or create another policy regarding parking districts in the draft General Plan and that the City could pursue it.

Chairman Curtis stated that it wouldn't hurt to have it in the General Plan so that it was consistent with the Specific Plan. He polled the Commissioners if they would like to see a new policy regarding a parking district in the General Plan so that it was consistent with the Downtown Village Specific Plan.

Commissioner Jain next addressed the increased residential density at Joann's and other site on Foothill Boulevard. He concurred with the suggestion by staff to allow those sites to be used for higher density and mixed use.

All the Commissioners agreed with staff to change it to a higher density.

Chairman Curtis commented on the Program EIR. He was concerned with the site-specific health-risk assessment study required on Page 3-8 of the Final EIR. He would like to see the underlined portion removed from the final EIR mitigation measures. He asked who added it and why. If we don't know who added it, we should remove it since it could have unintended consequences. He felt that it doesn't serve a legitimate purpose.

Commissioner Gunter agreed with Chairman Curtis because it would be a burden for property owners and it would have significant unintended consequences.

Chairman Curtis felt that there no basis for requiring a health-risk assessment and that it would be terrible for businesses and the City.

Senior Planner Buss read the mitigation measure.

Director Stanley stated that they would make note of the Planning Commission's objection and pass it along to the City Council. Staff would also research whether or not it is mandatory to have this kind of review.

Commissioner Gunter asked why this was added.

Senior Planner Buss explained that it is a mitigation measure to address potential air-quality issues related to development projects.

Senior Planner Buss stated that City Council would make the final decision. He would have to analyze to see if removing the text is an issue. He explained that their objection would be passed along to the City Council.

Chairman Curtis reiterated that it would be burden on businesses and home owners.

Commissioner Gunter asked staff to explore what it is actually asking for because it might not have any meaning in the city.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian read from the EIR and the attached Exhibit A regarding the restriction on idling trucks and their impacts. It would be difficult to monitor the idling equipment. He highlighted other difficult mitigation measures.

Commissioner Cahill also referred to the document's Exhibit A with respect to the designation of various parcels to open space. He wanted to know who owns land that is being proposed to change to open space designation.

Senior Planner Buss clarified that it is all publicly owned property – owned by the City or the County.

Ms. Barrie explained that it was land that was mis-zoned and is not privately owned property. It is currently zoned residential.

Chairman Curtis asked the Commissioners if they had any final comments on the General Plan Final Program EIR, the mitigation measures and the Findings of Facts and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian stated that if something is not required by law it should be removed.

Chairman Curtis suggested the Planning Commission be added to the acknowledgements.

The Commissioners discussed the issues addressed in the Staff Report that were previously suggested by the Planning Commission:

Page 4 no comments

Page 5 no comments

Page 6 no comments

Page 7 no comments - Director Stanley asked for clarification if the Commissioners wanted to consider a franchise agreement with trash haulers.

Chairman Curtis felt that it didn't need to be a policy.

Page 8 no comments

Page 9 – Chairman Curtis asked if they could change "encouraged" to "required" regarding the water companies. Consensus was achieved by the Commissioners.

Page 10 no comments

Page 11 no comments

Page 12 no comments

Page 13 no comments

Page 14 no comments

Page 15 Chairman Curtis asked about CE Policy 1.2.3 regarding right-of-way acquisition when needed.

Deputy City Attorney Guerra suggested deleting "when needed."

The Commission concurred.

Senior Planner Buss stated that this came from the Public Works and Traffic Commission and they suggested pursuing right-of-way acquisition to meet the City's adopted standards.

Director Stanley suggested that we clarify to the City Council that "when needed" was not supported by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Jain was concerned that the City would pursue the acquisition of the right-of-way when there wasn't a project on a specific parcel.

Senior Planner Buss clarified that the City would get the dedication of the right-of-way but that we would not necessarily utilize it at that time.

Director Stanley stated that we can't take it out but can report that Planning Commission doesn't support it.

Page 16 no comments

Page 17 - Chairman Curtis commented on CE Policy 3.1.1 regarding the construction of sewers.

Senior Planner Buss clarified that staff was recommending that it be left alone and that the City continue to pursue the construction of sewers where feasible.

Page 18 no comments

Page 19 no comments

Page 20 no comments

Ms. Barrie commented on page 4 of the Staff Report that staff was recommending that language be clarified to reference other documents in the General Plan. She felt that the Trails Master Plan was very clear in the Open Space Element that the Master Plan is a stand-alone document and an amendment to the Master Plan would not require a change to the General Plan unless it created inconsistencies.

Commissioner Gunter clarified that he remembered discussing that the Trails Master Plan was consistent with the General Plan but that other documents may not be and that was all they were asking for.

Commissioner Cahill added that the plans that are consistent with the General Plan shouldn't require a General Plan Amendment when they were revised.

Chairman Curtis asked Ms. Barrie if the document was modified in a way that was not appropriate.

Ms. Barrie felt that the General Plan was clear that the other plans wouldn't need to be modified through a General Plan Amendment process unless the proposed change was inconsistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan.

Patricia Bluman – the City's General Plan consultant, recalled that the other plans are incorporated by reference but that they cleaned up the language a little bit to make it more understandable.

M/S/C Cahill/Jain to recommend approval of the General Plan with the recommendations as discussed. Unanimous 5-0

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Item IX. A. was moved to the beginning of the agenda.

- A. Draft 2012-13 Capital Improvement Plan:** The annual request for determination of consistency with the General Plan (Senior Planner Buss)

X. REPORT OF DIRECTOR’S REVIEWS: [Director’s Setback Modifications; Director’s Height Modifications and Director’s Second Floor Reviews]:

A. Director’s Miscellaneous Review (Setback) 12-08; Lim; 4932 Crown Avenue: Approval of a request to allow a 120 sq. ft. addition to encroach into the side-yard setback to an existing single-story residence per Section 11.45.010.B1 of the City’s Zoning Code. The required side-yard setback is 7’-9” and the existing setback on the south side is 6’-2”. The addition to the living room would not project beyond the existing structure. The proposed chimney would also encroach in to the south side-yard setback. It would have a 5’-0” setback which is allowable through this review. The front-yard setback would be compliant at 34’-6”. The other additions would be compliant.

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS There was no comments by the Commissioners.

XII. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR Director Stanley reported to the Commission that the Tree Ordinance would be heard by the City Council at its May 21st meeting and that staff would send them an email to remind them of the date. He explained that we were recommending some changes from the version that they approved. He explained that most of the changes were related to grammar and structure but that there were a few substantive changes.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 p.m.