

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
HELD ON JULY 13, 2010**

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Cahill called the meeting to order at
- II. ROLL:** Present were Chairman Cahill, Vice Chair Curtis, Commissioners Davitt, Der Sarkisian, and, Jain, Director Stanley, Senior Planner Buss, Planner Clarke, Planner Gjolme, Assistant Planner Parinas, Deputy City Attorney Guerra, and Traffic Engineer Erik Zandvliet.
- III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Commissioner Jain led the flag salute
- VI. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:** No comments were offered.
- V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA:** Item VII D. was moved before item VII A.
- VI. CONSENT CALENDAR:** M/S/C Curtis/Davitt to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried 5-0.
 - A.** Minutes – April 13, 2010
- VII. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**
 - A. Conditional Use Permit 449; Platinum Energy (Chris Martin)/Kingsley Family Trust (Jane Kingsley); 1001 Foothill Boulevard:** A request to consider an application for a Conditional Use Permit to reopen the Union 76 gasoline service station with convenience store and alcohol sales. The Conditional Use Permit is required for service stations in the Mixed Use 2 zone that have never had a prior CUP when triggered by a change in tenant, and for sales of beer and wine. The applicant proposes minor changes to the existing premises.

Senior Planner Buss presented the case in accordance with the staff report.

Commissioner Curtis asked about the plans for landscaping and consistency with the area.

Senior Planner Buss clarified that landscaping is required and staff has recommended some changes to the landscaping because of changes to the interior circulation to the service station and a dedication of the corner. The existing monument sign located at the corner of Angeles Crest Highway and Foothill Boulevard would have to be relocated. In addition, the landscaping near the bus stop would have to be moved. Staff will rely on the Design Commission to review and approve the landscaping.

Commissioner Curtis asked if there is a condition of approval regarding a type of lighting review.

Senior Planner Buss confirmed that there is a condition of approval requiring that lighting is recessed so that we do not have the glare issue.

Commissioner Der Sarkisian asked if the 20-foot back up space is proper for the last two stalls in the parking lay-out. What is the rectangle above the parking spaces?

Senior Planner Buss clarified that based on the total floor area for retail, 7 parking spaces are required. He pointed out that there are also parking spaces located near the gas pumps. There are 21 parking spaces available on-site. The Design Commission will review and approve the final lay-out. The Design Commission will look at the location of the trash enclosure, the design of the trash enclosure, and the parking lay-out (in conjunction with the City Traffic Engineer). The rectangle above the parking spaces is a box structure.

Commissioner Jain asked if there is an analysis regarding the south driveway on Angeles Crest Highway. Is the driveway too close to the intersection? Would it be better to move it? Once the dedication happens would the driveway be shortened?

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained that the City allows driveways into the curb radius of an intersection. The intersection is a right-turn in/right-turn out only intersection, so the only likely movement is to make a right-turn to proceed continuing right. There are access issues regarding getting in and out of pumps and with the tanker truck that delivers the gasoline for the unloading of the gasoline. We looked at accident history; we haven't had any problems in the past. There is no problem with going into that paper driveway. He confirmed that the dedication will narrow down the driveway because of the radius of the intersection. Moving the driveway to the north can be considered, however, there is a catch basin between the two driveways and we do not want two driveways to be too close. The driveway will be reviewed with the streetscape design.

Commissioner Jain suggested that the driveway should be moved at least five to seven feet to the north to relieve the pressure on the intersection. Moving the driveway five to seven feet is a possibility without affecting the catch basin.

Senior Planner Buss suggested that the traffic flow issue be left to the Traffic Engineer's review.

Commissioner Cahill asked how old the building is and if the building will be rebuilt? Who is going to operate the service station?

Senior Planner Buss clarified that there has been a gas station on the site since 1935 but the current building is not the same. The building will remain; the bays will be closed and turned in to walls, and the interior will be remodeled to expand the convenience store. Platinum energy is the applicant. Platinum Energy holds the lease to operate the gas station. The property is owned by someone else. Senior Planner Buss clarified that the property owner signed the application. The Planning Commission may put landscaping concerns in the form of a condition of approval and/or recommendation to the Design Commission.

Director Stanley clarified many different routes the Planning Commission could take: ask for a redesign to look at the service station and see the added landscaping, send the project to the Design Commission prior to approving, or add a condition of approval regarding the landscaping.

Commissioner Cahill asked if there was a height limit to gas station signs. Could the gas station proposed a big tall pole sign?

Director Stanley clarified that there are restrictions to the size of the monument sign. The service station would not be able to build a pole sign without obtaining the approval of a Variance.

Commissioner Curtis asked the Traffic Engineer to explain the dedication area to widen street for right turn lanes.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet presented the diagram that was created to illustrate the future development and full build-out of the Foothill Boulevard/Angeles Crest Highway intersection. There are four south bound lanes: two right turn lanes and two left turn lanes. We do not have two right turn lanes right now because the turn is too sharp. The dedication will widen the curve to allow for the two right turn lanes.

Commissioner Curtis asked if it would make more sense to require the curve to be widened now since we are currently dealing with signage and landscaping. He noted that some of the work may not be the responsibility of this particular applicant and that the new Henry's and other developments that are coming should participate in the costs. How much of a burden is it to do the work now? The developer should be required to contribute their "fair share."

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained that there should not be anything built in the areas that are going to be removed for sidewalks and the curb. Currently the traffic does not demand the dual lanes. The City does not have the funds to construct the street improvements. Requiring the developers over time to share the costs is a good point. The construction cost would be approximately \$200,000 to \$300,000. The City Council has directed staff not to start street improvement projects and impose that on developers for street improvement projects that are not warranted or not justified yet. Platinum Energy is responsible for the streetscape improvements for the frontage of their own property. Platinum Energy's "fair share" based on future traffic is zero because the project would not increase the amount of traffic.

Chairman Cahill opened the public hearing.

Amad Ghaderi with AMS Engineering (207 W. Alameda Suite # 203, Burbank CA) spoke on behalf of Platinum Energy. He stated that rather than reopening the facility right now and then coming back to re-do the façade of the building and landscaping, the applicant felt that it would be best to submit an application for the food-mart conversion and go through the Design Review so that it could be done all at the same time rather than in phases. All the sites that Platinum Energy operate have beautiful landscaping and they pride themselves on having a beautiful facility. He clarified that Condition of Approval #16 required the modification of the alley driveway so that the opening is 30 feet wide. He also clarified that Platinum Energy has a long term lease on the property and that the property owner is aware of the project. We will work on getting the dedication done. Hopefully the dedication will be considered a contribution by the property owner.

Commissioner Davitt asked Mr. Gideri if the applicant (Platinum Energy) wanted to get Planning Commission approval for the use and then go to the Design Commission for the next step.

Mr. Gideri stated that Platinum Energy wanted to make sure to get the use approved first and then go to the Design Commission to get the landscaping and the exterior façade approved. We want to make sure that the exterior looks beautiful and the canopy looks fantastic. We are not going to substantially increase the landscaping area, but the quality of the landscaping will be far more superior. Will we try to match the project across the street. We will also improve the curb and gutter.

Commissioner Jain stated that he is concerned with the driveway and where additional landscaping will be installed. He suggested obtaining conceptual approval first.

Mr. Gideri pointed out that the area of dedication will have additional landscaping. Landscaping will also be increased along the northwest corner of Angeles Crest Highway and along the west side of the property. We will work with city staff to move the driveway and add to landscaping.

Randy Strapazon, 444 Georgian Road, distributed a 2004 article regarding Chevron's proposal to sell alcohol. The City Council needed to make findings of convenience and necessity. There are enough places in the City for responsible adults to buy alcohol where IDs can be checked. It is difficult to check ID on the corner of Angeles Crest Highway at 2-o'clock in the morning. Since this is a family town, to put a mini-mart that sells alcohol sets precedence for other gasoline stations and would not set a good example for our children in the town. We would have an over-saturation. We worked so hard against drinking and driving. Please deny that part of the CUP. She clarified that her opposition has nothing to do with the gasoline station.

Bob Levine asked the applicant to verify that they agree with all Conditions of Approval listed in the draft Resolution, which include no sales of alcohol.

Mr. Gideri verified that they agree with all the Conditions of Approval, including no sales of alcohol.

Director Stanley proposed changes to Condition of Approval #25: change "applicant" to "owner" and add "prior to occupancy" in order to ensure that we get the dedication.

Chairman Cahill closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Curtis stated that he would prefer seeing the full landscape plan and materials board, but he understands that this is in the Design Commission's purview and is willing to leave it at that. He stated that his questions and concerns were addressed by the Traffic Engineer. Given that the Design Commission will look at the project extremely closely, he is supportive of the project as proposed with the modification suggested by Director Stanley. He does not support alcohol sales.

Commissioner Davitt concurs with Commissioner Curtis. To get the gas station open again is important. It is a critical piece of the community. He would like to move the item forward and approve the project with added condition to instruct the Design Commission to work with staff and applicant to increase landscaping to enhance the site. It would be nice to have the project come back to the Planning Commission; however, we want to be as expeditious as possible to get the project done. This is the third time that the Planning Commission reviewed the project so it is fair to move the project forward. It is important to get dedication now. He does not support sale of beer and wine. The sale of alcohol could lead to problems. He is in support of the staff recommendation to deny alcohol sales, but would like to support the rest of the project.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian supports the project. It would be nice to flip the driveways in the alley because it would relieve the corner and help traffic congestion. The landscaping at the corner is very critical. The plans show very minimal landscaping. He concurs with the suggestions to increase landscaping particularly on the perimeter area. He does not support alcohol sales onsite. There are already many stores in the City where responsible people can purchase alcohol.

Commissioner Jain supports the project. He suggested that moving the driveway on the north side be considered. The sketch prepared by the Traffic Engineer should be part of the Conditions of Approval to ensure that the north side of the property is closed as suggested by the Traffic Engineer. The final driveway and landscaping result should be incorporated into the landscape plan. He does not support alcohol sales onsite.

Chairman Cahill concurs with his fellow Commissioners. His only concern is that adequate landscaping is installed. The Traffic Engineer has done a great job in addressing traffic concerns. He would like to approve the project with a strong recommendation to the Design Commission regarding requiring abundant landscaping within this "Gateway" project.

Applicant Mr. Gideri clarified that they can not relocated the driveway opening from the east side of the building to the west side of the building because the fuel delivery tanker truck's only access onsite is through the east side driveway.

Senior Planner Buss affirmed that the fuel delivery tanker truck can not make the right turn from Angeles Crest Highway on to Foothill Boulevard to enter the site. Closing the driveway opening on the east side of the building would mean closing the gasoline station.

M/S/C Davitt/Cahill to approve Conditional Use Permit 449 with a modification to Condition of Approval #25 to change "applicant" to "owner" and add "prior to occupancy," a modification to Condition of Approval #16 to incorporate the Traffic Engineer's sketch to the approved plan, and an added condition to direct the Design Commission to work with staff and the applicant to require increase and enhance the quantity and quality of landscaping onsite. 5-0.

B. Conditional Use Permit 424/Modification 07-53; Agakanian; 700 Forest Green Drive: A request for lighting for a sports court and a Modification request for overheight fences and a sports court located in the side and rear setbacks on the property located at 700 Forest Green Drive.

Planner Clarke presented the item in accordance to the staff report.

Chairman Cahill asked when the retaining wall was built. He asked if the landscaping condition of approval listed in the 2005 Resolution was ignored. There is no landscaping installed to screen the wall.

Director Stanley clarified that the wall is not a retaining wall, but is a closed-in deck. It is wood-siding that has been placed to close the deck. The previous approval was for an open deck with pylons. It is a part of an open code enforcement case/action. The items being reviewed tonight is for the over-height fencing, the sport court, and lighting. The application does not include a Hillside Development Permit.

Commissioner Davitt asked if it will be appropriate for the Planning Commission to approve the project with conditions requiring landscaping and other problems onsite be fixed.

Planner Clarke pointed out that Condition of Approval # 11 requires building permits to be obtained for all unpermitted work completed on site.

Commissioner Davitt asked if it would be appropriate that the case is continued until everything on site is settled and resolved.

Director Stanley stated that the item could be continued to allow staff to analyze the complete project so that everything constructed on site without building permits will be reviewed at the same time.

Commissioner Der Sarkissian stated that Planning Commission approval may be required in addressing Condition of Approval #11. He asked what type of light is being proposed. There is a type of light that does not project over certain limits.

Director Stanley stated that a problem with the project is that it is on a hillside and anything that shines down will reflect off the hillside. The light itself will not only be visible, but the hillside will also be lit up by the light. This type of setting will be disruptive. It will be like a halo.

Chairman Cahill opened the public hearing.

Nick Agakanian, property owner, verified that landscaping was part of condition in the previous approval. The landscaping was installed but was burned by the Station fire. New landscaping has been installed. He explained that the fence is necessary so that the balls would not go down slope. He indicated that the Fire Department likes the lighting because it was instrumental during the Station fire. He suggested changing the type of light. He agreed to temporarily install recessed low voltage lights to demonstrate the impacts of the lighting.

Jim Stoker, 4555 Encinas Drive, expressed that his concern is that the ridge line is one of the designated prominent ridgelines in the General Plan. There is a section in the Hillside Ordinance that states that fences shall not be visible from offsite against the sky. If the fence is visible anywhere offsite against the sky then it is a violation of the Hillside Ordinance. The fence would be visible from the Gabrielino National Trail at the bottom of the Arroyo Seco. One of the concerns regarding the lights is that the Gould Mesa campground at the bottom of the Arroyo Vista is nearby and lights affect the native campground experience. The area should be kept as natural as possible. He suggested the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) because water run off from the sport court goes into the Pasadena watershed. He does not think Pasadena considered this. The project is also a violation of the Hillside Ordinance reflectivity requirement. The walls would have to be neutral.

Mr. Agakanian stated that there are no parks below. He has hiked on the trail; you can not see the house, sport court, and fences/walls from the bottom of the trail. The white wall is covered with vegetation. There are other properties in the area with similar wood siding.

Director Stanley clarified that the slope immediately around the project is owned by Pasadena and is not National Forest. The National Forest begins north of the project site and the trail is below that, so it will be difficult to see the fence from the trail. Staff can go on the trail and take a picture. The proposal does not rise to the level of an EIR because the project would have to have a significant impact as indicated in the checklist and that is not the case for this project. In addition, staff has not recommended approval on the lights. In regards to the light reflectance value (LRV) requirement on the wall, staff will review the previous approval to see the requirements for that wall and the deck to see if it had the white siding. If the applicant wishes to continue with the white siding, we will add that and the Hillside Development Permit application to the project.

Chairman Cahill closed the public hearing.

M/S/C Davitt/Curtis to continue the project to a date uncertain with direction to include the Hillside Development Permit application and all structures constructed without building permits to the project. 5-0.

- C. Second-Floor Review 10-08/Tree Removal Permit 10-03; Johnson/Balachian; 4816 Hillard Avenue:** A request to allow construction of a code-compliant new 5,993 sq. ft. 2-story residence with a cabana on a 21,250 sq. ft. lot and removal of a 22 inch protected sycamore tree at the rear of the house.

Planner Clarke presented the case in accordance to the staff report.

Commissioner Curtis asked if a relocation of a tree is considered a tree removal and would have to satisfy one of the findings in the Tree Ordinance. The Tree Ordinance does not clearly discuss tree relocations.

Director Stanley clarified that the City considers tree relocation as a removal because there is no guarantee that the tree will survive.

Chairman Cahill asked if a valuation of the Sycamore tree is provided.

Planner Clarke stated that the value of the Sycamore tree is \$13,400.

Chairman Cahill opened the public hearing.

Jay Johnson, project architect, stated that after the June 8, 2010 Planning Commission meeting he met with the neighbors to discuss the changes which includes: improving the screening by installing a hedge along the property line, the installation of a 36" box tree on the neighbor's property, and reducing the deck by 50% so that only the front portion is going to continue. During the June 8, 2010 Planning Commission meeting, the removal of the sycamore tree and the planting of five replacement Deodar Cedar trees were discussed. Mr. Johnson informed the Planning Commission that Valley Crest Tree Company guarantees 95% that the tree will survive relocation and live. He believes that relocation is not a removal. A tree removal is when a tree is killed. The findings do not apply to the request. He asked for Second Floor Review approval and a continuance on the tree removal application in order to provide the City Attorney and staff time to review the Tree Ordinance (how it applies to relocation).

Chairman Cahill asked why the tree is being removed.

Mr. Johnson stated that his client does not want the tree near the pool because it is messy. His client would like to relocate the sycamore tree somewhere else on the property. He restated that Valley Crest Tree Company guarantees 95% that the tree will live.

Chairman Cahill explained that 100% is a guarantee, 95% is a probability. He clarified that the Valley Crest letter states that "the survival rate is 90%."

Mr. Johnson stated that he misspoke, but if the Planning Commission would like the word "guarantee" in the letter, he will ask Valley Crest to revise the letter. He asked that the Planning Commission add a condition of approval stating that if the Sycamore tree dies the applicant would have to pay \$13,400.

The City Attorney clarified that tree relocation is considered a removal and is subject to the five findings listed in the Tree Ordinance for tree removal. He stated that the Planning Commission would first have to make one of the five findings for tree removal and if the Planning Commission is able to make one of the findings then a condition of approval may be added to the Resolution addressing fees if the Sycamore tree does not survive.

Chairman Cahill closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Der Sarkisian stated that the offer to relocate the Sycamore tree is a goodwill offer and might prolong the life of the tree. If the relocation is not approved, the Sycamore tree may not be there in 4-5 years. He is in support of the project. He stated that adding some vegetation along the front will help mask the house.

Commissioner Jain can support the project. He pointed out that access to the deck was from the closet, but was changed and is now from the bedroom. He asked if there is an intent to make the flat-roof into a deck in the future. He stated that if the tree is moved to the front, the tree will mask the deck.

Commissioner Curtis stated that the house is great benefit to the neighborhood. He can not make the findings for tree removal, but can make the findings for the new house.

Commissioner Davitt stated that he can make the findings for approval. He would like to see a condition of approval added requiring the installation of additional landscaping and the revision of the plans to reflect the landscaping changes. He stated that he prefers to see the balcony removed but with the installation of additional landscaping he can support it. He agrees that the Sycamore tree can soften the appearance of the house from the front; however, he can not make the findings for tree removal.

Chairman Cahill stated that the house is beautiful, is well designed, and will enhance the neighborhood. He would like the deck reduction and the installation of additional landscaping reflected in the conditions of approval. He is in support of the project but can not make the findings for tree removal.

M/S/C Curtis/Davitt to approve Second-Floor Review 10-08 and deny Tree Removal Permit 10-03 with two additional conditions: the installation of additional landscaping and the size reduction of the deck. 5-0.

D. Conditional Use Permit 451/Setback Modification 10-07/Hillside Development Permit 10-13 (Dir.)/Fence Review 10-02; Socoloske; 423 Meadow Grove Street: A request to allow a new 342 sq. ft. pavilion to encroach into the required front and south side yard setbacks. A Conditional Use Permit would allow a new spa to be added to an existing front yard pool. Fence Review is requested since a front yard wall/fence up to 6 feet in height is proposed as are new driveway gates, which, considering their solid composition and location within the required front setback, are a second component of the requested Setback Modification. **[NOTE: the applicant has requested a continuance to explore staff supportable project design.]**

M/S/C Davitt/Curtis to continue the item to a date uncertain. Motion carried 5-0.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Second-floor Review 10-14/Setback Modification 10-11; Blatt/Semler; 277 St. Katherine Drive:** A request to allow construction of a new 464 sq. ft. 2nd-floor. A Setback Modification is also requested since the addition would encroach approximately 16 feet into the required 32-foot front setback.

Planner Gjolme presented the item in accordance to the staff report.

Michael Blatt, architect, offered to answer any questions the Planning Commission may have.

Chairman Cahill closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Curtis stated that the only issue was visiting the site because St. Katherine was closed. He stated that the addition is modest in size and he is in support of the project.

Commissioner Davitt stated that he can make the findings and can support the project.

Commissioner Der Sarkisian stated that he is in support of the project.

Commissioner Jain stated that the project is designed well. He can support the project.

Chairman Cahill stated that the hairpin lot results in a practical difficulty. He likes the design and can support the project.

M/S/C Der Sarkisian/Jain to approve Second-floor Review 10-14 and Setback Modification 10-11. 5-0.

- B. Second Floor Review 10-15/Modification 10-13; Buchanan; 843 Lynnhaven Lane:** A request to consider a Second Floor Review and Setback Modification to allow conversion of an existing attic to a new second floor and for a 333 sq. ft. first floor addition. A Modification (Setback) is requested to allow an encroachment into the front yard setback for the first floor addition.

Planner Clarke presented the item in accordance to the staff report.

Al Lira, architect, presented the material board. He explained that there will be no access to the attic. The objective of the project is to enhance curb appeal. The attic space will not be converted to habitable.

Yeon-Fang Wang, 855 Lynnhaven Lane, suggested that the final documents clarify that two windows are being added in the attic space. He stated that he received the notice and attended the meeting because he thought that the proposal was for a new second floor.

Chairman Cahill closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Davitt stated that the proposal is a great project. The second floor is just a technicality. The project will enhance the neighborhood. He can support the project.

Commissioner Der Sarkisian stated that he can support the project. He stated that the only problem is that the house is very exposed to the street. He suggested that landscaping be included in the process. Foreground landscaping will help mask modification.

Mr. Lira clarified that due to budget concerns landscaping is not included in the submitted plans, but there will be landscaping done.

Commissioner Jain stated that he can support the project. He concurred with Commissioner Der Sarkisian's suggestion of installing landscaping to improve the project.

Commissioner Curtis stated that the proposed encroachment is minor. The street changes in topography and it does not look like we are establishing a new setback by allowing an encroachment. He is in support of the project as proposed.

Chairman Cahill stated that he can make the findings. He does not have a problem with landscaping and does not feel strongly about it.

M/S/C Davitt/Curtis to approve Second Floor Review 10-15 and Modification 10-13. 5-0.

C. Zone Change 10-02; City of La Cañada Flintridge; City-wide: A request for adoption of an amendment to the City's Zoning Ordinance pertaining to campaign signs in the public parkway in single-family residential zones.

Attorney Guerra presented the item in accordance with the staff report.

Commissioner Der Sarkisian stated that he fully agrees with intent of the Ordinance.

Commissioner Curtis asked why political signs were a problem in the past.

Attorney Guerra explained that during the last election the City received many complaints that political signs were placed on the public right-of-way.

Director Stanley clarified that as part of the code enforcement process the City removed political signs on the public right-of-way that property owners erected believing that the sign was on their property. The public right-of-way width varies throughout the City and it is sometimes difficult for both property owners and City staff to determine where the public right-of-way ends.

M/S/C Davitt/Der Sarkisian to recommend the approval of Zone Change 10-02 to the City Council. 5-0.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

X. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Cahill asked if Redwood trees were recommended by the Planning Commission to be protected. He asked if the Tree Ordinance change was reviewed by the City Council. He suggested that Redwood trees should be added to the list of protected trees.

Commissioner Curtis stated that the Commission should consider that all trees greater than a certain diameter should be protected.

Director Stanley clarified that the Planning Commission held a study session regarding changes to the Tree Ordinance. A formal public hearing to review the Zone Change has not been held. During the study session the Planning Commission discussed protecting all trees larger than a certain dimension, but there was no consensus. Director Stanley reminded the Planning Commission that the Tree Ordinance was not an agenda item and should not be discussed further. Staff will include the Planning Commission's recommendations in the report for the next study session.

Commissioner Jain asked Director Stanley for a written synopsis regarding the previous Tree Ordinance study sessions since there are two new Planning Commissioners that were not present at the time.

Commissioner Curtis asked if a study session can be held on-site once Henry's submits the application to redevelop the former Sportsland building. The site is complicated with frontages and easements to consider and a study session with the project planner would be beneficial.

Commissioner Curtis stated that it would have been beneficial if the Union 76 project received preliminary approval from the Design Commission. Otherwise, a color/material board and renderings should have been provided. The Planning Commission should have reviewed the entire project.

Director Stanley explained that there was a rush to get the Union 76 project through. He agreed with Commissioner Curtis that the Planning Commission should have reviewed the entire project.

Director Stanley informed the Commission that Henry's is currently being reviewed by the Design Commission, but has not filed the Conditional Use Permit and Zone Change applications.

Commissioner Jain stated that some of the project plans that the Commission has reviewed did not have complete dimensional information. He would like the plans to have complete dimensional information before it is scheduled for Planning Commission review so that the Commission would be able to review the projects properly.

Commissioner Der Sarkisian stated that he would like staff to provide a synopsis of the previous discussion for continued projects.

Commissioner Curtis reported on an Administrative Hearing that he presided which was held the morning of July 13, 2010: a) Hillside Development Permit 10-06/Second Floor Review 10-07; 3907 Durham Place for a 635-square foot first-floor addition and 392-square foot second-floor addition to an existing two-story residence on a hillside lot. b) Hillside Development Permit 10-20; 3647 Hampstead Road for a 497-square foot second-floor addition to an existing two-story house on a hillside lot.

XI. COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR

- A. Report of Director's Approvals since the last meeting:
1. **Hillside Development Permit 10-16; Wynton; 4004 Robin Hill Road:**
Approved a 594 sf deck on a hillside lot.
 2. **Second Floor Review/Director's Miscellaneous; Gordon; 1355 Green Lane:**
Approval of 540 sf on the first floor and 116 sf on the second floor. Approximately 59 sf of the second floor would encroach into the required east side 11'-6" side setback.
 3. **Hillside Development Permit 10-21; Mathieson; 5154 Redwillow Lane:**
Approved location of gas grill, fireplace, outdoor sink, and refrigerator.

4. **Director's Miscellaneous 10-19; Peevey/Liu; 1322 Verdugo Boulevard:**
Approved enclosure of a covered porch totaling 85 sf that encroaches about three and a half feet into the side property line.

Director Stanley informed the Planning Commission that the City Council reviewed the appeal for 2048 Lyans Drive. The City Council's direction was interesting and the Planning Commission might want to have a study session to talk about those specific findings that the City Council discussed. The findings had to do with view impacts. He believes that the Planning Commission should talk about the case to observe if the City Council provided a clear direction. Another case that the City Council will review is the appeal for Dr. Phil Merritt's project on Windermere Place. It would be interesting to see if the City Council will be consistent with their decisions. We will have a study session to discuss the two cases.

Chairman Cahill asked what the City Council decision was on the 2048 Lyans Drive project.

Director Stanley stated that the project was denied without prejudice.

- B. Other Comments – No other comments were offered.

XII. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:47p.m.