

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

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Gelhaar called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL:

Present were Commissioners Cahill, Davitt and Mehranian, City Attorney Steres, Director of Community Development Stanley, Senior Planner Buss, Planner Gjolme and Assistant Planner Lang. Commissioner Engler was absent and Commissioner Cahill was expected to arrive shortly.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Gelhaar led the salute to the flag.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Comments were invited on any item not on the agenda, but were not offered.

V. REORDERING OF THE AGENDA:

The agenda remained as scheduled. Chairman Gelhaar took the opportunity to advise that given the lengthy agenda, applicants would be given 10 minutes to address the Commission and others would have 3 minutes to speak.

VI. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian to adopt the minutes of June 14 as modified on page 16 by Commissioner Mehranian. 3 Ayes.

B. M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian, approving Final Parcel Map 061195 for La Cañada Properties (Jay's Shell Station); 936 Craig Avenue and 4537 Marvin Street. 3 Ayes.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Floor Area Review 05-10; Kaesler; 1135 Green Lane

Assistant Planner Lang described the applicants' request to expand their two-story home that would exceed the sq footage standard for the lot by 4%, triggering Floor Area Review. The resulting 5,480-sf of floor area includes an existing pool house, garage, a storage building and a 12" cantilevered area on the west side of the building. The existing garage would be demolished and replaced with a new one on the east side of the property.

The project site is located on the north side of Green Lane, just east of its intersection with La Cañada Boulevard, in the R-1-15,000 Zone.

The property's allowed floor/roofed area is 4,861-sf. A combination of existing and proposed floor area would yield 5,480-sf (4% over the standard, which is allowed with Floor Area Review. All setbacks and height comply with Code. Assistant Planner Lang pointed out that the area beneath the second-floor cantilever, combined with the pool house and storage building constitute 1,357-sf. The first floor would be expanded by 852-sf, and 562-sf would be added to the existing second-floor. Assistant Planner Lang noted that parcels in the vicinity have significant floor area numbers and accessory buildings, which affect floor area numbers.

Commissioner Cahill arrived at this point.

Assistant Planner Lang reported that Staff had some concern with the proposed balcony on the second-floor, east side, which could raise privacy issues for the easterly neighbor. Otherwise, the project does not raise concerns of visual disruption of the character of the neighborhood. Staff recommended positive findings and approval as conditioned.

Commissioner Davitt requested clarification regarding Staff's concern with the balcony and screening.

Assistant Planner Lang responded that the existing garage would be demolished, leaving the storage building visible from the south (street) side. She had discussed additional screening with the applicant and if the Commission agrees, a condition needs to be added.

There were no further questions from the Commission.

Project architect Ariel Babikian, advised that 40-ft-high cypress trees serve as natural barriers that would preclude views to the easterly neighbor from the balcony. He agreed with any condition to mitigate the storage building, which is nearly 150 ft back from the street.

The Commissioners did not have questions of the architect.

Chairman Gelhaar opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Mehranian noted that the neighborhood is comprised of varying house sizes. The requested floor area was acceptable to her.

Commissioner Cahill did not have concerns with the project. He noted that while more width would be presented from the street, the project is appropriate for the property's dimensions. The scale and design were well thought out and pointed out that in reality, the balcony faces north. He initially had concerns after reading Staff's report, but those concerns were allayed after making a site visit. He agreed with mitigating the newly exposed storage building.

Commissioner Davitt concurred with his colleagues and stated that the design was tasteful. He agreed with Staff to eliminate the balcony from the plan, despite the addition of landscaping, which could be removed in the future. Otherwise, he could support the project.

Chairman Gelhaar pointed out that he generally has concerns when balconies face a neighboring home. This balcony lines up with the roofline and would not be imposing. He stated that landscape screening for the storage building was a good idea.

M/S/C Cahill/Mehranian to approve Floor Area Review 05-10 with an added condition to add landscape buffering to screen the storage building. Such landscaping shall be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Community Development. 3 Ayes. Davitt dissenting.

B. Modification 05-31; La Cañada LLC; 2027 Tondolea Lane:

Commissioner Cahill was recused from this hearing as he resides within 500 ft of the project.

Assistant Planner Lang related the request to allow construction of a 6-ft-high wood fence within the front yard setback. The property, which qualifies as a hairpin lot, is located at the northeast corner of Tondolea and Lone Pine Lanes, in the R-1-10,000 Zone, where a two-story home is currently under construction. The "average" front setback was calculated at 25 ft and if Code were strictly applied, both street frontages would be subject to a 25ft front yard setback.

The proposal is to construct a 6-ft-high, solid wood fence that would span approximately 41 ft from the rear property line and be set back 5 ft from the property line along Lone Pine Lane (within what would be considered as a side yard, were this not a hairpin lot). The draft conditions require an arborist

report to evaluate any impacts the proposed fence might have on nearby protected trees, on and off the property.

Given the orientation of the homes, the fence would be located on a street side yard and would typically not be subject to review. Shrubs would screen the fence from views to the south and from the adjacent property to the north. There would be minimum impact to homes west and south, which are sited at higher elevations. Staff determined that it would be an undue hardship to require compliance with the 25-ft front setback as required through the "averaging" process. Staff recommended positive findings and project approval as conditioned.

Commissioner Mehranian commented that the fence would present the appearance of a solid wall and that landscaping was not proposed.

Project architect Craig Stoddard, advised that his clients intend to install a pool and are seeking a means to provide privacy. He reported of having submitted a landscape plan showing low plants at the front, but he was willing to add vines to screen and grow over the fence. He stated that a wrought iron fence and landscape screening would be acceptable.

Commissioner Davitt made a site visit over the weekend and did not have concerns with the request.

Chairman Gelhaar concurred with Staff's recommendations and added that regardless if the fence is wood, stucco or wrought iron, it should be 100% screened with landscaping.

M/S/C Mehranian/Davitt to approve Modification 05-31 with an added condition prohibiting a solid fence and allowing a combination of fence and screening, subject to approval by the Director of Community Development. Unanimous.

Commissioner Cahill returned to the room.

C. Building Depth Review 05-06; Wing; 619 Meadow Grove:

Planner Gjolme described the applicants' request to add a 641-sf, single story addition to their single-story home. Because the project's wall height would exceed 10 ft in height, it must be included in building depth calculations. When combined with existing depth, the project would yield a building depth of 72 ft and exceed the 60-ft threshold for Building Depth Review.

The subject site is located on the east side of the Meadow Grove loop, south of Oriole Road, in the R-1-40,000 zone. It is spacious and well maintained, with a 6-ft-high hedge spanning the 200-ft frontage. The site's north, south and east property lines contain numerous trees, while the 210 freeway is located to the northeast.

The project would increase total floor area to 6,649-sf, well within the 9,680-sf allowed for the lot and reduce the south side setback to 21'-8" (exceeding the 20-ft standard for the lot). Additionally, a new brick patio is proposed approximately 30" above grade with a 5-ft high retaining wall --- both are code compliant.

Planner Gjolme emphasized that the project is not representative of the typical concerns of mass and scale that the process was intended to control. Staff does not anticipate any adverse effects and determined the request to be straightforward and supportable.

Chairman Gelhaar opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cahill concurred with Staff's analysis that the project is not representative of the concerns that the process intended to capture.

Commissioners Davitt and Mehranian concurred.

M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian to approve Building Depth Review 05-06 as conditioned. Unanimous.

D. Floor Area Review 05-16; Modification 05-37; Schwartz/Cioffi; 1447 El Vago:

Planner Gjolme related that the original request to expand a legal, non-conforming pool house and connect it to the residence, was reviewed twice. It was initially denied but, after changes to state law no longer recognized the structure as an ALQ (since it does not include a full kitchen), the applicant resubmitted the same project. The request required Floor Area Review and a Modification, compared with the more difficult Variance that was originally denied. That application was approved in 2004, however; before permits were issued, the approval expired. The applicant seeks another approval of the identical project.

Staff recommended positive findings and project approval.

James Coane, project architect, related that he had submitted for plan check and was ready to pull permits when he discovered that the approval had expired.

Applicant, Russell Schwartz, related of the numerous contractors that he's attempted to retain and asked the Commission to allow the process to continue.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Mehranian, Planner Gjolme advised that the project was pulled back nearly 15 ft and no longer poses a problem for the oak tree, per the arborist report.

Commissioner Cahill stated that he was not on the Commission when this project was previously reviewed and saw no reason to change the former Commission's approval.

Commissioners Davitt and Gelhaar agreed, stating that they approved it before and do so now.

M/S/C Davitt/Mehranian to approve Floor Area Review 05-16 and Modification 05-37 as conditioned. Unanimous.

E. Building Depth Review 05-04; Modification 05-48; Venneri; 4329 Encinas Drive:

Assistant Planner Lang reported the applicant's request to construct a new two-story home, with a second floor that would exceed the 60-ft threshold for Building Depth Review. The request also includes a reduction in the required front yard setback. The project consists of a 2,848-sf first floor (excluding a 693-sf attached garage), and a 2,107-sf second floor. A below grade basement is also proposed.

The project site is located on the southwest corner of Encinas Drive and Shepherds Lane, in the R-1-20,000 zone. It is designated as a hairpin lot.

The required front yard setback of 29'-3", is the average of adjacent properties on Shepherd's Lane and applies to both frontages because of the hairpin designation. The Modification addresses an encroachment of 3'-6" along Shepherd's Lane "frontage". The project meets the front yard requirement along Encinas, where the front entry would face. All other setbacks meet or exceed Code.

Additionally, the 94'-6"-deep second floor (which occurs diagonally, across the structure), qualifies for Building Depth Review and relates to the Encinas Drive frontage, rather than along side property lines, where concerns of massing

impacts are typically raised. In this case, building depth would be seen as 30 ft of building "width" from Encinas. The greatest impact of building depth would be to the west, where a 56-ft setback is provided. Additional landscape screening is proposed along the westerly property line to further reduce impacts.

A sole concern for Staff is the encroachment of a chimney into the protection zone of an oak canopy. The draft conditions require an arborist's review to address the issue, prior to issuance of building permits. Aside from that concern, Staff recommended positive findings and project approval.

There were no questions of Staff or the applicant from the Commission.

Chairman Gelhaar opened the public hearing. Comments were not offered and the public hearing was closed.

City Attorney Steres commented that a letter had been submitted from a Mr. Lange earlier in the day, requesting that a large tree replace one that died in the Encinas Drive right-of-way.

Commissioner Davitt was not concerned with the encroachment along Shepherd's Lane, give the hairpin lot designation. He noted that minimum sq. footage was being requested, and the proposed building depth was supportable. He believed the design is sensitive to the area and supported the request.

Commissioners Cahill and Mehranian concurred.

Chairman Gelhaar commented on a neighbor's letter requesting replacement of a tree in the right-of-way that had died. He noted that trees on-site are at least 80 years old and mature in appearance. He felt that requiring another tree off site would appear out of place, and would take 20-30 years to "fit in".

Commissioner Mehranian made a motion to approve the request with an added condition to replace the oak in the right-of-way. The motion died for lack of a second.

M/S/ Davitt/Cahill to approve Building Depth Re view 05-04 and Modification 05-48 and modifying condition #15 that the arborist's review address tree canopies in the proximity of chimneys. 3 Ayes; Mehranian dissenting.

F. Hillside Development Permit 05-26; Modification 05-35; Glassman; 525 Venado Vista Drive:

Planner Gjolme described the applicants' request to expand the first floor and construct a new second-floor to their home located on hillside property. A Modification would allow the second floor to encroach 7 ft into the required 16-ft, west side setback. Additionally, a new garage would encroach into the required 15-ft rear setback; as proposed, it would range from 6 to 14 ft from the rear property line.

The unusually configured property is located along a long and narrow driveway easement that extends from the east end of Venado Vista Drive and rises to the north, accessing 6 properties. The southern half of the property is comprised of a steep slope that falls 40-50 ft to the street below. The northern half of the property is bisected by the driveway, which is omitted from lot size calculations. Therefore, the sq. footage reported by the Assessor is reduced to 13,900-sf for purposes of review.

The expansion would occur along the west side of the home; the first floor would be expanded by 690-sf. and provide a 7-ft west side setback, below the 8-ft requirement. The garage's rear yard setback would range from 6 to 14 ft --- below the 15-ft requirement, but well over the one-ft setback that the home currently provides. Staff viewed the two encroachments as minor, considering the minor scale of the additions and location of the site.

The 1,012-ft second floor is shown as recessed from the front and west side of the garage below and would provide an 18-ft rear setback and a variable west side setback ranging from 9 to 15 ft. It would encroach 7 ft at the southwest corner. Total floor area is proposed at 4,066-sf, within the maximum for the site, but over the 3,508-sf maximum as modified by the Slope Factor Guideline. Building height would reach 22'-6", modest in Staff's estimation.

A 3-ft-deep balcony to the rear would span the length of the addition. Staff was concerned that it would result in intrusive effects, given its sweeping view to the south, and recommended that it be eliminated.

Substantial landscaping screens views of the site and immediate neighbors to the east and west would maintain their southerly views. The project would be minimally viewed from a distance.

Lastly, the draft conditions require a parking management plan since the site cannot accommodate construction vehicles, with the exception of deliveries in the small auto court. Staff determined that the expansion plans were

conservative and would not disturb neighboring views, nor introduce unreasonable bulk.

Applicant Keith Glassman, advised the Commission that the project was designed to respect all his neighbors, including the position of the second story and reduction of ceiling heights. He asked to be allowed to retain the balcony, noting that trees, which block views to down slope properties would be maintained. Those views are no different than what he has now sees from his pool area.

Commissioner Cahill confirmed with Mr. Glassman that he would maintain all the trees, rather than simply through the construction period as condition 16 reads.

Director Stanley stated that the Commission could require a covenant to ensure that the trees remain. Or, rather than burdening the property, it could require replacement of any tree upon its demise.

Commissioner Cahill preferred to accept that applicants' word rather than to require a covenant. He asked that "during construction" be eliminated from condition 16.

Commissioner Mehranian stated that she appreciated the sensitive design and concurred with Staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Davitt stated that the home was modestly designed, but he was concerned with the location of the second floor. While the home is not out of character with the neighborhood, he was concerned with upward views of the home as expressed by the story poles. He preferred to stay within the Slope Factor Guideline and reduce the second-floor's area.

Chairman Gelhaar also had a problem with the location of the second story and its size. He believed the home is too large for the lot, albeit it is a unique lot. He could not make Finding #8, as the project would not be mitigated by the proposed landscaping and he believed the balcony would be intrusive to neighbors' pools and back yards. Should the project be approved, he asked that the second story be relocated away from the hillside's edge.

Planner Gjolme confirmed that he wanted the massing reduced, but not necessarily where the encroachments occur.

Mr. Glassman pointed out the existing two-story homes with downward view to his property. He stated that his home would not be seen unless one is on Venado Vista and looks up the hill.

Commissioner Davitt asked if there was a way to install additional landscape screening.

Planner Gjolme responded that if the concern is the southern profile, mitigation would have to be a combination of recessing the second floor to the north and more landscaping.

Director Stanley noted the difficulty with planting on the steep hillside.

Commissioner Davitt commented that he could support the project if the second floor was shifted over approximately 10 feet.

Mr. Glassman stated that shifting it over would make the house visible to his immediate neighbors.

Chairman Gelhaar advised the applicant of his options, pointing out that a 2-2 vote was equal to a denial.

Commissioner Cahill noted that a continuance would give Commissioner Engler the opportunity to review the project.

City Attorney Steres clarified that if Mr. Glassman opted for a vote and his project was denied, his choices were to either appeal to the City Council or accept the denial and submit a new application. Otherwise, he could request a continuance so that a full Commission could review the project and he could possibly submit a redesign at the same time.

Mr. Glassman requested a continuance to September 13.

M/S/C Mehranian/Davitt to continue Hillside Development Permit 05-26 and Modification 05-35 to September 13. Unanimous.

Director Stanley advised the audience that there would not be further notice of the hearing.

G. Hillside Development Permit 05-18; Irie; 4534 Daleridge Road:

Chairman Gelhaar announced that this was an appeal of an Administrative Hearing over which he presided and denied. Though he was not required to be recused from the proceedings, he did so, in the spirit of fairness.

Vice-Chair Davitt requested Staff's report.

Planning Aide Shimazu reported that in November 2004, the City received a complaint, reporting that an over height retaining wall had been constructed without the required zoning clearance or building permits. The applicant thereafter applied for an Administrative Hillside Development Permit to legalize the wall. At a May 31 hearing, the request was denied. The applicant subsequently filed an appeal, stating there are no adverse impacts on the immediate neighboring properties and the wall allows expansion of the pad and preserves open space.

The neighbor immediately down slope from the project is concerned with the bulk and the lack of inspection. He asks that if an approval is granted, that the wall be subject to approval by Building and Safety.

Staff conducted a site visit and viewed the wall from Alveo Road, down slope. Staff determined that the wall does not violate any hillside issues and that it is not intrusive to neighboring properties. Staff recommended approval with a condition that the applicant must obtain a building permit within 30 days of approval.

Following confirmation that the wall is approximately 25-30 ft from the property line, Commissioner Cahill commented that a 28-ft-high structure could be built in that spot, subject to review.

Commissioner Mehranian inquired the reason for constructing the wall and how Staff justified its recommendation.

Planning Aide Shimazu stated that he believed it served to expand the rear yard area.

Director Stanley observed that the wall is not highly visible and there is a significant number of trees and distance separating it visually from down slope properties. However, the City needs assurance that the wall was constructed in a safe manner. The applicant will have to provide engineered plans and the wall would have to be inspected.

Carole Payton, spoke as the property owner who constructed the wall. She distributed photos of the wall from different views and stated that the wall would be screened with landscaping.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, MS. Payton advised that another wall that was demolished was the same height, but closer to the house by approximately 4 ft. The purpose was to expand the flat area.

Chairman Gelhaar invited comments. Testimony was not offered, and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Mehranian inquired how many complaints Staff had received.

Director Stanley stated that the neighbor, who resides down slope, wrote a letter citing his primary concern of stability.

Commissioner Cahill advised of having made a site visit. He stated that the wall is small and not intrusive and is minimally seen from Alveo Road. He commented that the Commission has approved many retaining walls that are higher and longer, though the Building Permit process should be adhered to and landscaping screening should be specified.

Commissioner Mehranian agreed.

Commissioner Davitt made a site visit over the weekend and concurred that it is a non-intrusive wall. He would support the request as long as it can be verified that it was safely built and landscape screening provided.

M/S/C Cahill/Mehranian to sustain the appeal of Hillside Development Review 05-18 with an added condition that the wall be landscaped. 3 Ayes.

The Commission recessed at 7:20 and reconvened at 7:34 p.m. Chairman Gelhaar returned to the table.

H. Hillside Development Permit 04-74; Building Depth Review 05-08; Melby; 1073 Oxford Way:

Commissioner Mehranian was recused from the hearing as she resides within 500 ft of the project.

Senior Planner Buss related the applicants' proposal to construct a new, two-story home of approximately 5,522-sf, excluding garage, on a 21,120-sf lot with an average slope of 27%. The second-floor bedroom wing along Madison Road exceeds sixty ft in depth, triggering the review threshold. Staff determined that significant environmental impacts would not result from the project and a Draft Negative Declaration was presented for adoption with project approval.

The project site is located at the northeast corner of Oxford Way and Madison Road, in the R-1-20,000 Zone. It currently accommodates a single-story residence, pool, pool house, carport and out building --- all to be demolished.

The lot most affected by the project is to the south, across the street at a higher elevation; surrounding properties are heavily wooded, which adds to the seclusion of the site. The house would be sited to follow the curved "L", formed by the conjunction of the two streets and faces inward, to create a private area facing down slope. The project complies with angle plane and setback requirements; the multi-level structure exhibits steppe massing and reaches an overall maximum height of 33.75 ft measured from the lowest to the highest point. The areas which exceed 28 ft are "light catching" roof elements, and comply with the Hillside Ordinance, which allows architectural extensions up to 20 ft in width to a maximum height of 40 ft.

Grading will be limited to 715 cubic yards of excavation for the basement.

Entry to the subterranean garage would be from a hydraulic lift that drops the car to the lower level to enter the house, then returns to the surface to "close". This design maintains the mass and the appearance of a grade-level, two-story structure. The garage would accommodate 4 vehicles without tandem parking, while additional parking space is provided for 3 cars off the street - two at the front entrance at Madison and one west of the driveway on Oxford. The City Engineer had some concerns regarding parking from Madison Road, as they appeared to encroach into the right-of-way. The draft conditions require redesign to meet the City Engineer's requirements.

Staff concluded that the project is reasonable and complies with the spirit of the Hillside Ordinance. The depth extends along Madison Road and is single-story in profile and preserves the character of the neighborhood.

Lastly, Staff recommended that the applicant follow-up with a separate application for a Decorative Fence.

Project architect, David Fink thanked Senior Planner Buss for his assistance and fair review. He referenced draft condition #22, which requires that light catching roof elements be reduced to cross sections no wider than 20 ft. Mr. Fink requested that the sloped roof that catches north light be allowed at 24 ft., as architecturally, it reads better. At one point, the roof extended across, but he since reduced it to 24 ft. He stated that Mr. Buss' only issue was that it impacts the height of the structure. He noted that overall height is 34 ft with stepped massing and that Code allows an exemption for architectural features up to 20 ft. in width or depth to a maximum height of 40 ft.

Chairman Gelhaar opened the public hearing.

Stephen Wright, who resides at 1078 Oxford Way, across the street from the project, referred to the Draft Environmental check list, page 5, which seemed to recognize some additional risk of hillside slippage. He disagreed with Staff's finding that there is less than a significant impact to his home and advised of having submitted a letter with specific recommendations regarding tree planting.

Senior Planner Buss commented that any house on the side of a hill is "engineered" to determine the foundation. The project geologist did not find any issues with regard to slippage. Final review is part of the foundation construction. He noted that the home would sit on an existing bench on one of the lower levels.

Responding to a letter from Commissioner Davitt regarding Mr. Wright's letter, Senior Planner Buss advised that Staff was studying the landscape plan and that the applicant is very willing to relocate one of his oaks to provide more screening.

Commissioner Davitt confirmed that the final landscape plan will be subject to review and approval by the Director of Community Development.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Cahill, Senior Planner Buss advised that the master bedroom windowsills are 9 ft high to preclude views to the outside. The Commission could require translucent glass in those windows also.

Commissioner Davitt inquired if the bedroom balcony issue was resolved.

Mr. Buss advised that it hadn't; however, it faces east and down slope, facing a property on Oxford Way. Those neighbors have a pool that is nearly even with the balcony across the rear yard. While there is a thick planting of oleanders on the neighboring yard, trees could be planted on both sides of their garage to further screen the balcony.

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

Commissioner Davitt walked the site over the weekend and spoke with a neighbor. He believed the project was supportable with additional conditions: he preferred that the landscape plan be reviewed by the Commission, so that

the neighbors could review and comment and if the balcony cannot be mitigated, he would like to see it eliminated from the plan.

Commissioner Cahill stated that he could not make a judgment regarding the balcony at this point. He asked for a condition prohibiting mechanical equipment on the rooftop to preserve views of property owners up slope.

Chairman Gelhaar made a site visit and viewed the project site from Mr. Wright's home. He would not support the project unless it was redesigned to preclude use of the balcony. Since it is located over the garage, he suggested either removing the doors or adding a condition that would prohibit sitting or standing on the balcony. He also asked that the front window on the south elevation be opaque and agreed with comments regarding the landscaping.

M/S/C Davitt/Cahill, approving Hillside Development Permit 04-74 and Building Depth Review 05-08 with added conditions prohibiting mechanical equipment on the roof, doors shall be removed from the balcony and that area shall be only for aesthetics, the final landscape plan is to be submitted to the Commission for review and approval and the window referenced by Chairman Gelhaar shall be translucent. 3 Ayes.

Commissioner Mehranian returned to the table.

I. Hillside Development Permit 03-57; Bolton; 5271 Vista Miguel Drive:

Senior Planner Buss reported the applicants' request to construct a two-story home on a 148,104-sf vacant lot with an average slope of 40%. Approximately 7,780-sf of floor and roofed area, including a garage and veranda is proposed.

The project site is located at the north end of Vista Miguel Drive, approximately 1,000 ft north of Vista Del Valle. Vista Miguel is a private cul-de-sac that climbs to the base of the foothills.

Staff determined that significant environmental impacts would not result from the project and accordingly drafted a Negative Declaration for adoption. Senior Planner Buss noted that a prior request to allow a 7,800-sf home at the southwest corner of the site was approved in May 2000, that sited the house in the center of a drainage pattern.

The proposed residence would be centered on east portion of the site. The hillside would be graded as much as 45 ft to approximately the 1875-ft elevation mark, creating a raised lip along the east side of the pad.

Grading - would exceed 11,000 cubic yards of cut and fill, for a balanced site. Excavation would be used to fill the foundation for the road and to create detention and infiltration basins. Cut at the top of the hill would create a raised lip along the north and west sides of the pad and a partial bowl in which the house would sit. A combination of 1½:1 and 2:1 slopes and retaining walls would create the pad and driveway. The highest wall, located at rear of the house, is 8 ft high.

Driveway - is 25 ft wide and approximately 850 ft long. It rises 100 ft from the front property line to the building pad, for an average slope of 11.76%, reaching a 20% slope for 100 feet, its steepest point adjacent to the infiltration basin. It would not exceed the maximum grade allowed of 20% at any point. The full width of the driveway lies on cut at the top of the site and around the face of the hill until it gets near the detention basin, where it sits half on cut and half on fill. The remaining portion sits on fill until it reaches the lower infiltration basin. The inside edge of the driveway shows a four-foot-high retaining wall at its highest point, with 1½:1 slopes up to the building pad. The driveway was designed by the Fire Department to handle 25-ton trucks/equipment in all-weather conditions and provides a hammerhead to accommodate emergency vehicle parking and equipment.

Parking - a detached, two-car garage is located behind the house, partially buried into the hillside. There is also parking space for two additional vehicles.

Landscaping - 20 trees would be removed, none of which are protected - 16 eucalyptus at the lower infiltration basin and 4 pines along the driveway area. The landscape plan proposes to add more trees and the landscape architect provided section drawings illustrating the expected screening that would result.

Drainage - the drainage system includes: swales to the rear of the house emptying into the detention basin; roof drains and sheet flow from the driveway would flow to the infiltrator basin located in the southwest corner of the lot; installation of an interceptor drain and a drainage basin to Vista Miguel Drive. The Consulting City Engineer does not object to approving the project, subject to conditions outlined in Staff's report.

Design - The entire building pad would sit into the hill and the top of the house would sit well below the rear property line. The home's overall height is 27½ ft and the closest point to any property line exceeds 45 ft. Materials include: stucco walls and columns with chamfer edges, wood windows, 4 x 8 rafter tails, wood trellis, wrought iron trim and a clay tile roof. The project

complies with all development standards of the Hillside Ordinance and of an R-1 zone.

The lot's average slope of 40% is associated with a slope factor of 0.67, which reduces the allowable total floor area from 31,370-sf to 21,018-sf. The request is to construct a 7,780-sf project.

Staff compiled a matrix of 39 nearby homes to compare their living area (no garages, covered porches and/or patios) with the requested project. The average lot size is 23,543-sf, the average house size is 2,788-sf, or 11.84% FAR. The project requests 3.71% Floor Area Ratio.

Staff did not recommend adherence to the root pitch guideline of the Ordinance, which requires the roof to follow the natural slope of the site. Doing so would raise the roof height and make the home more visible.

Ridgeline protection - There are no protected ridgelines associated with this site.

Views - Senior Planner Buss noted that the landscape plan illustrates view angles of the house from below. The proposed grading would lower the house pad, which allows a greater setback and which in turn provides more area for landscape screening. It would not be visually prominent. The "lip" edge screens the majority of the house from short-range views, while remaining views would be screened by existing landscaping. Only long-range views of the home would be possible

Summary - Staff concluded that, as conditioned, the project is reasonable. The design minimizes views of the house and restricts the applicants' short and intermediate range views. Importantly, the house is sited away from drainage patterns.

Applicant Scott Bolton, reported that he's attempted to understand the issues throughout the few years that he's owned the property. He stated that he wanted the best design for his family and his neighbors. It is a unique property --- 3½ acres on a hillside with a long history of drainage problems, which is a fire hazard in its current state. Using Power point, he described a private street easement that begins at the corner of Vista del Valle and Vista Miguel, continues upward through all the Vista Miguel properties, through the center of his lot and northward to serve the Gillen property. Mr. Bolton advised of having confirmed with a judge and attorneys that it would be impractical to continue the easement as configured (25-30 ft-wide and very steep) to allow the Gillen property its legal access to the private street easement.

He recalled that a previously approved plan showed a house and a road to the back and a silt basin. Despite being only 6-ft-wide, the road came within 6 ft of the proposed living room. He emphasized the need to stay away from the easement.

Mr. Bolton advised that he met with neighbors approximately 3 years ago and promised that he would not proceed unless he could mitigate the visual concerns. He then described what he viewed as advantages to this design over the previous plan: drainage would be redirected and significantly improved; debris and water would be directed away from down slope properties; the project reduces the amount of water flowing from the property; the fill would be away from the drainage channel, which has historically overflowed; the house would be at lower risk, as it would no longer be in the middle of a drainage channel (his insurance agent pointed out that coverage would not be allowed for mold and mildew if the house was located at the bottom of the slope, at Vista Miguel; the house and yard are not near a debris wall or a steep slope – the previous plan included a 12-ft-high debris wall, which raised safety concerns for his three children.

Mr. Bolton pointed out that he could have located the house at the top of the hill, but it would be very visible. The proposed grading sets the house back. The landscape plan calls for 200 new trees, of which 75 are protected species. Staff suggested more tree installation at the southern end of the driveway. The existing eucalyptus tree would be removed at the request of neighbors and the Fire Department. A few pine would also be removed, but he would consider relocating them. All oaks would be retained.

He concluded his presentation by stating that the project is better for safety reasons and better for the neighborhood as it resolves drainage issues.

Project architect, Craig Stoddard, reported that minor revisions e.g., a covered patio near the family roof was converted to a trellis, reduced the floor area so that it is now approximately 7,100-sf. He recognized the importance of preserving neighbors' privacy, which is why he placed the house as far back as possible. Setbacks are: 52 ft from the north, 41 ft from the east, 114 from the south and 246 ft from the west property line. The home is a Spanish design in the tradition of Wallace Neff. He distributed a color and material board and noted that the Light Reflectance Value is lower than what Staff recommended. There are currently 5 protected trees on site and 75 more will added. The two issues raised in the Staff report – a 6" overage in the building depth and excess height on the southeast side are minor corrections that can be easily remedied.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Davitt, Mr. Stoddard advised that it could be that only 2 pines would be removed.

Commissioner Cahill asked if the driveway would be lighted.

Mr. Bolton responded that a lighting analysis found that vehicle headlights were sufficient to light the driveway; however, if any are installed, they would be low to the ground.

Chairman Gelhaar opened the public hearing.

John Payton resides at the end of Vista Miguel, south of the project. His concern is the 20-ft-wide driveway at a 70% grade, immediately above a pad where children play. He questioned the driveway's safety for fire trucks or a motorist losing control. He opposed the project because of where the driveway is located.

John McClelland, 2984 La Canada Boulevard, resides directly west of the project site. His three concerns were privacy, aesthetics and safety. He displayed a Power point presentation of view from his back yard where the driveway would loop. He stated that motorists could peer into his back yard and car lights would be intrusive. He believed the project would be visible from his front yard and interrupt the skyline and ridgeline views from his property. The story poles are visible from his driveway. Safety issue included the stability of the hill. He asked where the dirt would go if the slope failed. Mr. McClelland was also concerned with the hazard of cars rolling off the steep, winding driveway. He asked that the plan be denied and that the applicant develop the lower pad, as previously approved.

Commissioner Cahill asked Mr. Bolton to respond to Mr. McClelland's photos.

Mr. Bolton advised that from the photos, he believed that a majority of trees and landscaping would remain, with the exception of one of the smaller pine trees.

Ann McClelland read a prepared statement addressing the findings that must be made to approve a hillside project. Her opposition to the project was: it invades its setting and the ridge and hillside are not preserved, over 11,000 cubic yards of dirt would be "dumped. Fire Department access is compromised by the long, winding driveway; her views would be impaired by excavation of the ridge to create a horizontal pad; the massive cut and fill increases the risk of slope failure --- all avoidable by placing the house in the southwest corner as approved for a previous developer.

Greg Brown, 5250 Vista Miguel stated "this project is the poster child of why we have the Hillside Ordinance". He believed the Ordinance requires the house to be situated in the area where it would have the least impact. He pointed out that the road extension is 850 feet, which doubles the length of Vista Miguel and is equal to 17,000-sf of pavement. Cement has to be mixed into the dirt to hold the hillside and 11,500 cubic yards of dirt would be moved for a house is in the 7,800-sf range. A combination of the 18,000-sf building pad and the road equals more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre of hardscape put on the hillside. The Biological Resources Assessment states that $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres would be disturbed by the project and indicates further study for plants that would not have been in bloom during the time of the survey. He recalled that water issues were addressed in 2000 for another project and an agreement reached among neighbor and the developer, which required the developer to install a storm drain when sewers were available and a further agreement that the developer would not subdivide the lot. He stated his belief that despite the large lot, "the house is too big - it's 3 times the size of many in the neighborhood", and that it met the definition of mansionization in the Hillside Ordinance. Mr. Brown stated that the hydrology report was troubling, as earlier studies showed the "real" drainage area included the entire area to the west; a "huge contributor not taken into account to reach the conclusions in the Report". He distributed a copy of the applicant's letter given to neighbors when the lot was purchased stating that they intended "to build a moderately sized home, in keeping with the neighborhood".

Ken McCue, 1001 White Deer Drive, believed there was a contradiction in Staff's report regarding the General Plan's designation between Estate Residential and Hillside Residential. Given the steepness of the area, he believed that 1 unit per 10 acres was more reasonable. He addressed Staff's statement regarding the General Plan's reference to prominent ridgelines, knolls, etc. "The most significant are identified" and "there is no significant impact" was an incorrect interpretation in his opinion. He believed the hillside was part of the San Gabriel Mountains and should be considered as a community resource.

Richard Harris, 5315 Haskell Street, agreed that this is a Hillside Ordinance issue; "allowing the project to displace 11,000 cubic yards of dirt is wrong and would destroy this valuable asset". He stated: that prominent land forms should be maintained; the project would be visible from the "rest of the City"; the project is highly dependent on massive cut and fill; the project should be rejected based on the fact that there is an appropriate location in the southwest quadrant of the property, where a previous property owner intended to build and which Staff supported. He requested that the Commission adhere to the Hillside Ordinance and reject the project as presented.

Joyce Brown, 5250 Vista Miguel, expressed disappointment that Planning Commission meetings are not televised as she felt it would be a useful source for the community. She read letters submitted by the Boyds at 5210 Vista Miguel Drive and from LaBran/Boyd at 5210 Vista Miguel Drive, each requesting to preserve the character of the neighborhood and the hillside. They also had concerns with an increase of water flowing down Vista Miguel as a result of the new road and stability of the retaining walls.

Kirk Witherspoon, 5259 Vista Miguel, requested that the Commission prohibit any subdivision of the property and opposed "having any more hills shaved or any more homes built on any ridge, anywhere in La Cañada". He stated that he reluctantly accepted the previous project that would have been 50 ft from his bedroom. Mr. Witherspoon commented that the project goes through his property - he wanted the driveway to "join" on Bolton's property, rather than on his. He referred to an 18"-wide by 6"-deep swale that drains on at least 5 properties on La Cañada Boulevard as well as on his and on the project site. He advised that no one seems to know who owns the waterway or who should maintain it and that Mr. Bolton promised to send overflow to the street. He concluded by stating that drainage is a big concern of the neighbors.

Susan Witherspoon's concerns were: drainage, protection of the hillside and the "huge slab of the house". She distributed photos showing water and debris running down the street, 3 days after the rains stopped. She stated "no matter what happens to the property, drainage needs to be addressed".

Mary Barrie stated that though she does not live in the neighborhood, mountain views are a great City asset. She questioned the staff report's statement that the project would only be seen from distant views e.g., Verdugo Hills hospital. She requested that bright survey poles be erected to determine distant views.

Kathleen Smith, 5225 Vista Miguel, who resides 4 homes down from the project, commented that many of her concerns were voiced. She reminded the Commission that Vista Miguel is a private street which is maintained by the homeowners. She was concerned that large construction vehicles would damage the street. Removing vegetation that's been there for years was another concern and she questioned whether it should be the Commission to decide whether the hillside is prominent.

Jack Dawson, 5278 Vista Miguel supported a project at the lower left corner of the lot. He recognized that Mr. Bolton had a right to develop his property and stated that looking at it selfishly, the project would provide a buffer between

his house and the next forest fire. He was concerned with slope failure and related that a small landslide occurred during the winter rains that washed out a portion of the permanent road that goes to the top of the hill.

Randall Wetzel, resides at 5290 La Canada Boulevard, immediately west of the project. He pointed out that the plans do not include a view looking west to east and distributed a photo of the site from his front door. He stated that his existing view would be replaced by an enormous house. "It is unfortunate that the only mitigation for not building on the flat pad is to shave off the hill top, artificially terrace it and dump 11,000 yards of soil into the canyon below."

Margaret Kruse, 1026 White Deer Drive, related that noise, dust, etc were problems when sewers were installed; and she dreaded the thought of the same from a project of the proposed size. She was also concerned with the excessive amount of dirt movement in a small area.

Gloria Miklowitz, 5255 Vista Miguel, advised that her biggest concern is drainage. In the past, the swale has failed and drained to her back yard and excess water and debris flowed into her driveway during the winter rains.

Ann Wetzel's concerns were: destruction of the hillside, noise and loss of privacy. She expressed support for a project on the flat pad, down slope.

Susan Ayvazian, 5306 La Cañada Boulevard opposed the project, stating it would destroy the natural setting and "we do not need another hilltop mansion that does not conform to the neighborhood".

Serge Ayvazian opposed the project and loss of privacy. He encouraged the applicant to build in the southwest corner of the site.

Scott Bolton responded to comments.

Dangerous driveway - he walked the site with John Payton and discussed the idea of installing barriers approximately 3-4 ft-high, comprised of pillars filled with concrete that are impenetrable by trucks and would be hidden by shrubs. His employer, JPL, installed such barriers after the September 11th terrorist attack.

Blocking fire access - the 20-ft driveway meets the Fire Department's specifications, but he would not have a problem reducing the width if the Department allows it.

Removal of vegetation - The Fire Department requires brush removal and total access to the back area. He noted that a desilting basin would be installed

in that area, no matter what is approved, that needs to be accessible to be maintained.

Chopping 65 ft off the hill – comments are inaccurate. It is 65 ft from the top of his property to the building pad. The biggest cut is 40 ft; the remainder is more in the neighborhood of a 20-ft cut in the slope.

Mansionization – the house approved in the corner was 6,500+-sf. His home is approximately 5,400-sf of livable space.; the 7,000-sf number includes the garage, patios and a veranda. Though it would be one of the larger homes on Vista Miguel, it would not be the largest.

Visible cut and fill – cuts and fill will not be visible when the landscaping is installed.

Build in the southwest corner – Mr. Bolton advised that as a scientist, he is a fairly technical person; he studied the previously approved design very carefully and concluded that putting a house at the bottom of a drainage channel would be foolish. The photos submitted by Mrs. Witherspoon showing the enormous discharge of water from the hillside validates why that option is unsafe -- debris would fall on the house, despite a 12-ft-high debris wall shown on the plans for protection. That same plan had the road (which would have to be widened), 8 ft from the living room, which he stated is not reasonable when that was the only area for children to play. Mr. Bolton stated because an approval was given doesn't mean it is a good place to build; "people make mistakes" as evidenced by recent landslides and the failure of the wall on Foothill Boulevard.

Subdividing the land – Mr. Bolton stated that he has no intention of splitting the land, but he cannot stop someone from using the driveway easement. He commented that he and his wife are environmentalists and scientists and didn't want to cut the hill, or put in a desilting basin in what they feel is a beautiful place. A desilting basin, which is not an attractive structure, will be installed no matter what is built, for the protection of all. When the road is in and the landscaping installed, he believed the site would be more beautiful than the existing situation. Mr. Bolton stated that the project would not be visible from most homes as evidenced by the story poles, with the exception of the Wetzel's home. He offered to shield that view by planting another tree, but felt the landscaped terrain would be more beautiful than planting another tree – it was Mr. Wetzel's decision.

In conclusion, Mr. Bolton stated that the drainage is what troubles him most. Looking at the photos, he doubted that anything could permanently protect the area. He showed on Power point how the water flow turns and "crashes" into

the McClelland property –the flow is substantial in both directions. He believed the fill would correct the situation to the maximum possible –it would clear the side that Mr. Witherspoon referred to and he will attempt to redirect the water to Vista Miguel but it would be less than flows now and better channeled. If he built the house at the southwest corner, the situation would be worse because he would be unable to direct the flow.

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

Commissioner Cahill commented that numerous difficult issues were raised; a few were not problematic for him. He recognized the existing problem with drainage and believed that this project was an opportunity to address that. Concerns were raised that what recently occurred in Laguna Beach could happen here, but he stated that hillside development is not over in California, just as building homes in hurricane zones is not over – it is something that has to be dealt with. He pointed out that because much of the project would be built on cut rather than fill, the likelihood of land stability problems is reduced; that conclusion is confirmed in the geology assessment.

Commissioner Cahill addressed the two aspects of the house: visibility and privacy. He recalled another project on the other side of the hill that presented privacy issues because it peered into back yards, swimming pool areas, etc. However; when he trekked up the subject hillside, he did not get a sense of intrusiveness; he stood where the second-story window level, and looked over roof tops and had long distance views. Additionally, since the pad would be cut, it would create a ledge and lessen the peering-over factor. The exception might be from the McClellan property that would be viewed– not from the house, but from the driveway.

Addressing visibility – Commissioner Cahill observed that he had difficulty determining what would be visible by neighbors and the neighborhood. He studied the story poles and drove around the neighborhood and down Vista del Valle to scope the project from different locations to determine what would be visible from down the hill, and couldn't reach a conclusion. He suggested digitally superimposing the house on the ridgeline to clarify the visibility issue. He emphasized that visibility is an important issue for hillside projects, and this is a steep hillside. The Hillside Ordinance twice talks about eliminating excessive visible bulk when dealing with slopes of 40% or greater.

The two components that concerned him were: the wide, curving driveway, that meanders around property and around a knoll, which requires a lot of movement of the topography, and vehicle lights on the driveway. An alternative to all the proposed movement of dirt would be preferable. He

reported that he has a driveway 5 ft from his house; “there are some things we have to live with”. But, because this driveway goes up and down, there would be a lot of light movement, especially with high beams. Commissioner Cahill stated that he didn’t get a definite conclusion from the Light Impact Report.; there was little discussion about impacts descending the driveway and talked about light that would probably shine over roof tops. He requested greater assurance from the consultant about the light factor.

Addressing landscaping, he stated that planting 200 trees and more shrubs would only beautify the hill. While there might be some views of the house, there will also be views of a lot of greenery.

The most problematic point for him was that the General Plan states that prominent knolls and ridgelines are to be preserved. “This is certainly a knoll or a ridgeline; the question is – is it prominent”? Commissioner Cahill commented that there is a certain amount of prominence to this knoll and once it is carved away and a house is up there, it would become more prominent. The Hillside Ordinance calls for preservation of these knolls, particularly when there is another feasible location for the home. He recognized Mr. Bolton’s apprehension with constructing a home near a drainage channel and added that perhaps that is not feasible location; more information in that regard would be helpful.

In conclusion, he was not prepared to reject the project, but there are factors such as the driveway, a pictograph demonstrating the views and visibility and information of alternative building sites, that he would need to have greater satisfaction to get to a ‘this is okay” point. If that should happen, mitigation factors would then have to be addressed.

Commissioner Mehranian reported of having made a site visit and visited a neighbor’s home to see if the story poles were visible. This is a complicated project, size magnitude, location, elevation. She commented on the need to separate facts from sentiment, to consider the property owner’s viewpoint as well as the neighbors and what is best for the community.

She wants any project on this site to be safe, buffered, protection for the neighbors from light and noise of the driveway and the environment protected. If the driveway emanates more traffic or light than what is typically experienced, it needs to be mitigated. She did not believe that building a home near the drainage channel would be practical or safe and could not advocate that alternative. She supported Commissioner Cahill’s suggestion for an overlay of the project and requested that it include all the landscaping (for the house and the driveway), to demonstrate how they would be mitigated

Commissioner Davitt thanked the applicant and Staff for the presentation, the neighbors for providing comments, and he emphasized the importance that the Commission be presented with factual data. He commented on the positive elements of the project e.g., increased landscaping, a balanced site and what appeared to be an improved drainage situation. Nonetheless, he was struggling whether it is appropriate to allow someone to “grade a hillside and build a house on it”. Commissioner Davitt pointed out that he was not comparing the request with the previous approval to build a home near a debris basin --- he was advised that would not be good engineering. It appeared that most of the issues would be mitigated, though the McClellands have a legitimate concern with light impact from the driveway and even that might be addressed. The proposed house size was not a concern --- “it’s a 3-acre lot and the house would be 260 ft from westerly neighbor”. While there would be benefits to allow the project, he noted that the proposed mitigation would not be necessary were it not for the fact that the hillside would be graded. At this point, he could not make the required findings, but was willing to consider additional information.

Chairman Gelhaar thanked his colleagues for their intelligent responses to a very difficult situation. He believed “the Hillside Ordinance allows someone to build a house somewhere on that hill”, though he struggled with the amount of dirt that would have to be moved. The dirt would not be “dumped down the hillside” as stated by a neighbor; the site would be properly engineered and the dirt relocated where it would be properly compacted to facilitate drainage and the driveway. He stated that the project would not cut off the hill, but rather cut into it - “there would be a lot of hill left behind the house”. While he was nowhere near approving the project, from the reports he read and studied, the project would improve the existing drainage situation. In conclusion, Chairman Gelhaar encouraged the neighbors to spend time with the applicant and the geologist to continue working on the drainage work. He stated that he would never build a house where it was initially approved and supported Commissioner Cahill’s request for additional overlays of the entire project.

Chairman Gelhaar informed the applicant of his options with regard to a vote or a continuance. Mr. Bolton requested a continuance.

Director Stanley observed that a continuance to a date uncertain would give Staff the needed time to review new information.

M/S/C Mehranian/Cahill to continue Hillside Development Permit 03-57 to a date uncertain. Unanimous.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

There were no issues to report

IX. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Gelhaar addressed the issue of when a project should be submitted for public review. He recalled that last week, a project before the Commission on Hampstead Road, did not have all the information requested by Staff, including story poles. He questioned if a Notice of Public Hearing should be published before an applicant has provided everything that is required in the application packet.

Director Stanley explained that state law mandates Staff to review a project within 30 days of application submittal for "completion" purposes. Once an application is deemed "complete", a letter to that effect is mailed to the applicant and the project must then be heard within 6 months. In the case referred to by the Chair, story poles were neither appropriately assembled nor timely installed. Staff is often pressured by applicants, who frequently do not provide promised information until the last minute. There was a time when Staff did not 'notice' a project until the staff report was completed; however, due to an inundation of projects and staffing issues, Staff was unable to hold to that policy.

Chairman Gelhaar recognized the pressure that Staff is under, but felt the Commission could put an end to that if it set a standard that it did not want notices to be mailed until all required information was submitted.

Commissioner Mehranian commented that Staff also consider the number of cases on an agenda, as it affects site visits, communications with neighbors, etc.

Commissioner Cahill commented that many times, critical information is e-mailed at the last minute; perhaps a project should be postponed if information is not timely delivered.

Commissioner Davitt stated that it is unfair to ask the Commission and Staff to wait for information submitted at the last minute. It is not orderly; Staff has a checklist and if all is not marked off, "it's not going".

Director Stanley felt that Staff should be able to catch up during August, when the Commission is dark.

The Commissioners directed that Staff was not to publish Notices of Public Hearing until an applicant has submitted all required information.

Commissioner Cahill reiterated prior comments that he has no desire to review large-scale plans, as they are difficult to work with when making site visits.

Chairman Gelhaar added that he wants them scaled, not necessarily large.

It was agreed that Staff would print out digital plans.

X. COMMENTS FROM THE STAFF

City Attorney Steres reported that he, Senior Planner Buss and Commissioners Cahill and Mehranian toured the Flintridge Tract site with Mr. Kudrave. All found it very worthwhile.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/C Mehranian/Davitt to adjourn at 10:08 p.m. Unanimous.

Secretary to the Planning Commission