

CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD JUNE 9, 2015

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** 6:00 p.m.
- II. **ROLL:** Commissioners Gunter, McConnell, Smith and Hazen present; Vice Chair Jain absent. Commissioner McConnell is acting chair.
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- IV. **SELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR** (if all members are present): No action
- V. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** No Comments were offered
- VI. **REORDERING OF THE AGENDA**
- VII. **CONSENT CALENDAR**
- VIII. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**
- IX. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 - A. **Second Floor Review 15-12/Categorical Exemption; Aramouni/Maya Boutros; 1344 Verdugo Boulevard:** Request to allow a 1,225-square foot second-floor addition, 180-square foot roofed balcony, and a 1,746-square foot first floor addition to an existing two-story house. This project was previously approved on October 8, 2013 as Second Floor Review 13-15, but its approval expired on October 8, 2014. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Assistant Planner Parinas)

Assistant Planner Parinas presented the project in accordance to the staff report.

Commissioner Gunter confirms that there have been no changes to the zoning code and project since the previous approval.

Assistant Planner Parinas stated that a balcony is no longer being proposed on the east side.

Commissioner Gunter confirmed that the proposed addition is code compliant

Assistant Planner Parinas stated that the proposed addition is compliant and the project is not considered a new house because the proposed roof removal is less than 30%.

Commissioner Smith confirmed that the plans were the same as the previous approval.

Commissioner McConnell asked if the Health Department delay was unusual.

Assistant Planner Parinas stated that the delay was not unusual for the Health Department.

Commissioner McConnell asks if the conditions of approval have been updated using the new language for construction parking.

Assistant Planner Parinas looked at the draft conditions of approval and stated that the construction parking condition from the previous approval is being carried forward and was not updated.

Director Stanley stated that the condition of approval pertaining to construction parking could be modified and revised using the new language.

Commissioner McConnell opened the public hearing

Edgar Aramouni, project designer, confirms the balcony deletion. He stated that the Health Department delay was the problem.

Commissioner McConnell closed the public hearing.

Commissioners Smith, Hazen, Gunter, and McConnell can make the findings for approval.

Commissioner Smith made a motion to approve Second Floor Review 15-12 with modifications to Condition of Approval 11 as discussed. Commissioner Hazen seconded the motion. Approved; 4-0.

- B. **Variance 15-03/Categorical Exemption; Wannier; 1010 Foothill Boulevard:** Request to allow installation of a 22-square-foot sign for onsite postal service, which would constitute the 10th sign upon the property, exceeding the code limit of 4 signs. For clarification, two primary wall signs and seven small bronze ledge signs were previously approved as a maximum collective for the site, with the understanding that additional signage would require further review. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Consultant Cantrell)

Consultant Cantrell presented the project in accordance to the staff report.

Commissioner Smith asked if the sign would remain if the Post Office leaves.

Consultant Cantrell stated that a condition of approval could be included in the draft Resolution to require the sign to be removed if the Postal Service use is discontinued.

Commissioner Gunter stated that the site would have 10 signs. He asked about the amount of signs allowed for the property.

Consultant Cantrell stated that the Design Commission approved 9 signs on the property and the majority was considered design features.

Commissioner Gunter asked if staff knows what the minimum size of the government-mandated sign.

Consultant Cantrell stated that he does know the minimum dimensions of the mandated sign. He added that other government mandated sign such as the gas station signs are written as exempt in the sign code, but does not address Post Office signs.

Commissioner Gunter asked if the use would be operated by the Post Office.

Commissioner McConnell opened the public hearing.

Peter Wannier, property/business owner, stated that the bookstore staff would be trained to ask security questions and provide the service. The bookstore will sell stamps and collect packages for the Post Office. In order to do this, the Post Office requires a sign.

Pat Anderson, Chamber of Commerce President, stated that she has been working with Mr. Wannier since March 2014. She feels that the Post Office in the bookstore will be a great public service. Mr. Madrigal of the Post Office worked with Mr. Wannier and the Chamber of Commerce to decide on the sign. Some sign options were bigger and illuminated.

Commissioner Smith stated that he was familiar with the business. He believes that the Post Office service is a good idea for the community; majority of the signs onsite are architectural details. The government mandate came after the other signs have been approved. He would like a condition of approval added that the sign is removed when the Post Office service is terminated. He can make the findings for approval.

Commissioner Hazen agreed that the other signs onsite are architectural. He can support the project with the condition of approval as suggested by Commissioner Smith.

Commissioner Gunter agreed with Commissioner Smith regarding community service. However, he feels that the façade is cluttered with signs. He does not have a problem with the Post Office sign, but cannot overlook the variance findings. He cannot make the findings for approval.

Commissioner McConnell stated that his initial reaction was that the location is a poor choice because of the trees. He pointed out that the Design Commission initially worked with applicant to design the bookstore signs to come up with a smaller sign, but in exchange allowed the amount of signs onsite. He can make the findings as it relates to the variance.

Commissioner Hazen made a motion to approve Variance 15-03 with the added Condition of Approval requiring the sign to be removed when the Post Office use is terminated. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. Approved; 3-1. Commissioner Gunter dissenting.

- C. **Hillside Development Permit 15-08/Second Floor Review 15-08/Setback Modification 15-03/Categorical Exemption; Woodcraft/Bae; 135 Inverness Drive:** Request to allow 1st and 2nd-floor expansion of an existing single-story residence, inclusive of a new 1,824 sq. ft. 2nd-floor. Roof removal to accommodate said 2nd floor would exceed 30% and qualify the project as new construction. A Setback Modification would allow

retention of an existing 22'-10" minimum front setback at the 1st-floor level, below the 38'-4" requirement for the lot. The Setback Modification would also allow the new 2nd floor to encroach into the required front and south side yard setbacks. Staff is recommending approval of a Categorical Exemption for this project. (Planner Gjolme)

Director Stanley presented the project in accordance to the staff report.

Commissioner Smith asked if there were any letters received from neighbors. He asked why Public Works removed the shrubs.

Director Stanley stated that no letters were received from neighbors. He clarified that Public Works removed shrubs in the public right-of-way because of line-of-sight visibility issues.

Commissioner Gunter asked why the second-floor addition was designed close to the front property line.

Astra Woodcraft, applicant, stated that she felt that it made sense to follow the footprint of the existing house so that the second-floor looks like it was designed with the original house. She stated that the encroachment is very minor on the south side.

Commissioner Gunter stated that the reasoning for the encroachment was that it is convenient to the design of the floor plan.

Ms. Woodcraft stated that since the existing house is not parallel to the property line, cutting two feet off is a significant reduction.

Commissioner McConnell asked Ms. Woodcraft if she was comfortable with the LRV condition.

Ms. Woodcraft presented material and color samples. She stated that the proposed roof's LRV is 32%, which is only slightly above the limit since the requirement is less than 30%. The required LRV for the wall is less than 50%; the proposed color of the stucco is white. She presented color options and showed photographs of other homes in the area that are of similar color.

Commissioner McConnell asked for clarification that the areas surrounding the existing building pad are not "buildable" areas.

Commissioner McConnell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Gunter stated that the design is lovely: simple and clean. He is concerned that the second-floor south side encroachment is not necessary and the second-floor encroachment along the front is greater than the existing. The house could be designed without the encroachments. He can only make the findings for the Second Floor Review and the Hillside Development Permit applications.

Commissioner McConnell stated that upon approach from the west, the story poles present clearly and prominently to the driver. Because the property has hillside areas to the north, it presents some hardships to the property owner. He feels that the front setback encroachment is in

exchange for difficulty of expansion to the north. He has a problem with the south side encroachment.

Commissioner Smith stated that the site is a unique site and he understands the challenges. He feels comfortable on giving some encroachment on the front to avoid constructing on the hillside. He can make all the findings for all the Hillside Development Permit, Setback Modification, and Second Floor Review. He does not agree with the relaxation requested of the LRV standards.

Commissioner Hazen can support the project and make the findings for Hillside Development Permit, Setback Modification, and Second Floor Review. He cannot support the request to overlook the LRV standards.

Commissioner McConnell went over the decision options for the applicant.

Ms. Woodcraft proposed to remove the south side setback encroachment.

Commissioners McConnell and Smith suggested a condition of approval require the Director to review and approve the revised plans prior to building and safety plan check submittal.

Commissioner McConnell motioned to approve Hillside Development Permit 15-08, Second Floor Review 15-08 and Setback Modification 15-03. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. Approved 3-1. Commissioner Gunter dissenting.

X. OTHER BUSINESS: None.

XI. REPORT OF DIRECTOR'S REVIEWS

- A. Director's Miscellaneous 15-21; Caire; 2028 Lombardy Drive: Approved pool/spa mechanical equipment to encroach into the required 7-foot side and 15-foot rear yard setback. The equipment will be located within an enclosure which shall not exceed the maximum height of 6-feet. Pool equipment will maintain the required distance from an existing 20-inch protected oak tree.
- B. Director's Miscellaneous Review 15-14 (SB); Bowman; 4933 Indianola Way: Approved an encroachment of 1'-1" into the 6'-0" side-yard setback for an addition that will be located 4'-11" from the north property line. The proposed addition will not encroach further into the north side-yard setback than the existing structure. As part of this project an existing non-permitted room enclosure will be removed.

XII. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS: No comments.

XIII. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR: No comments.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT: 7:30 p.m.