

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA PLANNING COMMISSION
CONVENED THIS JUNE 25th 2012, 6:30 P.M.
AT THE AMEDEE O. DICK RICHARDS JR.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1424 MISSION STREET**

<p>ROLL CALL</p>		<p>Meeting convened at: 6:33 p.m.</p> <p>Commissioners Present: Steven Friedman, Chair Anthony George, Vice-Chair Evan Davis J. Stephen Felice</p> <p>Staff Present: David G. Watkins, Director of Planning and Building Richard L. Adams II, City Attorney Knarik Vizcarra, Assistant Planner Jose Villegas, Planning Intern</p> <p>Absent: Kristin Morrish, Commissioner Robert S. Joe, Council Liaison</p> <p>Comm. Davis led the pledge of allegiance.</p>
<p>PUBLIC COMMENTS</p>		<p>None</p>
<p>CONTINUED HEARINGS</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>500 Alta Vista (Hillside Development Permit – Deck)</p> <p>This item was continued from the May 31, 2012 Planning Commission meeting to provide Comm. Davis with the opportunity to vote on the project, since he was absent and there was a 2 to 2 split vote for the project.</p> <p>Ms. Vizcarra reviewed the details of the project and pointed out that the applicant did not propose any changes to the project. Staff received several letters opposing the project. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out that the required findings for a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review were made. At the conclusion of Ms. Vizcarra’s staff report, the Commission did not have questions for her.</p> <p>The project architect, Dimitris Klapsis, gave a PowerPoint presentation, which addressed neighbors’ concerns expressed at the May 31, 2012 meeting, regarding noise, deck location, deck size and impacts. He also gave examples of approved neighborhood roof decks. Mr. Klapsis pointed out the</p>

	<p>following regarding the proposed drawings: 1) the top of the deck was placed below the ridge of the existing roof; 2) the top of the deck is at the same height level with the PV panels in front of it; 3) the deck will not be outlined against the sky, and 4) the cable rail design will provide maximum transparency and minimize presence. At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Klapsis requested approval for the project.</p> <p>Chair Friedman pointed out that Comm. Davis reviewed the DVD and staff report for this item.</p> <p>This public hearing remained open from the May 31, 2012 meeting.</p> <p>The following people spoke in opposition of the project and expressed their concerns regarding privacy, size, location, noise, visibility, impacts, parking, tree removal, neighborhood incompatibility, traffic, scale, characteristics and possible accidents 1) Patricia Plumeri, 510 Alta Vista Ave., 2) Jane Cavenagh, 520 Alta Vista Ave., 3) Rick Freeman, 511 Alta Vista Ave., 4) Debbie Brooks, 505 Alta Vista, and 5) John Uribe, 1399 Indiana Ave.</p> <p>Mr. Klapsis addressed the neighbors' concerns, regarding tree removal. He pointed out that three trees on the property fell down due to natural causes; therefore, the homeowner planted four replacement trees. He also noted that the deck will be used for private enjoyment instead of parties.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>Comm. Davis pointed out that he read the meeting materials and viewed the DVD from the May 31, 2012 meeting for this item and for 440 Camino Verde.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the impacts of the proposed project on neighbors, such as, noise increase, privacy decrease, deck location, and mitigating possibilities.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Felice, seconded by Comm. Davis to approve the project as submitted by staff.</p> <p>The motion carried 3-1 with Chair Friedman as the dissenting party. (Resolution 12-17)</p>
2	<p>440 Camino Verde (Hillside Development Permit/Design Review – Single Family Addition)</p> <p>This item was continued from the May 31, 2012 meeting to provide the architect with additional time to make changes to the design of the proposed project and to resolve design incompatibilities.</p>

		<p>Planning Intern, Jose Villegas presented his staff report, regarding a single family addition at 440 Camino Verde. The required findings for a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review were made. At the conclusion of his staff report, the Commission did not have questions for Mr. Villegas.</p> <p>The project architect, John Chan gave a PowerPoint presentation, regarding the project. He cited examples of modern horizontal canopies located in the neighborhood. He pointed out the changes made to the proposed plans to create a modern style house as follows: 1) a horizontal cedar canopy was included over the entry way creating an aperture into the side yard; 2) cedar paneling was included to cover the garage on the right side of the entry way; 3) the cedar wood will integrate into the landscaping; 4) a modulated and contemporary, trim was incorporated into the elevations, which transitions nicely with the modern backyard addition. At the conclusion of his presentation, Comm. George had design questions for Mr. Chan, regarding project details.</p> <p>The public hearing remained open. There were no speakers in favor of or in opposition to the project.</p> <p>Vice-Chair George expressed his concerns, whether the design intent can be carried out as detailed; therefore, he requested additional details. He pointed out that the drawings should reflect accurate details.</p> <p>Comm. Felice pointed that his concerns about the project were alleviated after the architect's PowerPoint presentation.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Vice-Chair George, seconded by Comm. Felice, to approve the project as submitted by staff, including the provision of additional details by the architect to staff prior to acquiring permits.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0. (Resolution 12-18)</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARINGS</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>1230 Kolle Street (Hillside Development Permit – Single Family Addition)</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing open to entertain a motion to continue this item.</p> <p>A motion was made by Vice-Chair George, seconded by Comm. Davis to continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting on July 23, 2012.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0.</p>

	<p>4 Orange Grove Park (Conditional Use Permit/Design Review – Telecom Modification)</p> <p>Planning Intern, Knarik Vizcarra presented her staff report, regarding the request for a Conditional Use Permit Modification and Design Review for two unmanned wireless telecommunication facilities. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out that the proposed project consists of replacing one existing 26’ diameter Radom light pole with a 30’ diameter Radom light pole to accommodate larger antennas and to replace a park light with a second 30’ diameter Radom light pole. The proposed project was approved by the Park and Recreation Commission. Staff received one letter in opposition to the project on the basis of design and safety. Staff found that the proposed project met the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review and recommended project approval.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing open.</p> <p>The applicant/AT&T representative, Edwin Kim was in agreement with the staff report.</p> <p>Vice-Chair George inquired if all park representatives were involved with the revisions and alterations made to the drawings. Mr. Kim pointed out that Planning & Building staff and Parks & Recreation staff were a part of the onsite visit, which is how the proposed padding came about. Mr. Kim answered additional questions regarding the vault and trenching.</p> <p>Chair Friedman inquired about the frequency of alterations made to the project. Mr. Kim commented that he was not aware of any changes, since the original Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Mr. Kim would like to see antenna size decrease in the future. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out that an initial CUP was approved in 2006, for which, an extension was granted, in order for the improvements to be completed.</p> <p>There were no speakers in favor of or in opposition to the project; therefore, Chair Friedman declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>The Commission continued discussion on this item, regarding pole size, aesthetics, and the appropriate amount of lighting for homeowners along the south side, as well as people using the field for recreation.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Vice-Chair George, seconded by Comm. Davis, to approve the project as submitted by staff.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0. (Resolution 12-19)</p>
--	---

	5	<p>2130 Huntington Drive (Conditional Use Permit/Design Review – Telecom Modification)</p> <p>Planning Intern, Knarik Vizcarra presented her staff report, regarding the removal of six wireless antennas and the location of three replacement antennas on an existing parapet wall at 2130 Huntington Drive. The project included the location of 9 new remote radio head units, the replacement of existing equipment cabinets and cabinet retrofitting. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out that all work on the cabinets will be within an existing screened area on top of the roof. The mismatched antennas will be screened along the south and east parapet wall. Staff did not receive inquiries, regarding this project. The project met the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review; therefore, staff recommended approval for this project.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing open.</p> <p>The applicant/Sprint Nextel representative, Jay Higgins pointed out that this modification is for the purpose of upgrading the facility to provide 4G data service for customers. He pointed out that the additional screening was included at staff’s request.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Felice, seconded by Comm. Davis to approve the project as submitted by staff.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0 (Resolution 12-20)</p>
	6	<p>1205 Blair Avenue (Hillside Development Permit – Retaining Wall)</p> <p>Mr. David Watkins pulled this item from the agenda, due to the applicant’s decision to change the scope of the project.</p>
	7	<p>Minutes of the Planning Commission’s April 23, 2012 & May 31, 2012 Meeting)</p> <p>The minutes were approved with minor corrections.</p>
	8	<p>Comments from City Council Liaison</p> <p>Council Liaison Robert Joe pointed out that the City Council continued the 1933-1941 Mill Road project on July 11, 2012 to provide Planning staff with additional time to prepare a resolution and conditions with the appropriate CEQA documentation for project approval.</p>
	9	<p>Comments from Planning Commissioners</p> <p>Vice-Chair George congratulated Knarik Vizcarra on her promotion to Assistant Planner.</p>

		Comm. Felice pointed out that he left early from the SW Hills Committee meeting due to animosity demonstrated towards City staff by local residents. Mr. David Watkins, Director of Planning and Building pointed out that the committee was subsequently able to focus on the City Council's charge of reviewing the 18 recommendations. Mr. Watkins and Comm. Felice were in agreement with keeping the committee on task, which will enable them to discuss the main issues at the next committee meeting (review the deputy inspector fees and the pavement impact fee).
	10	Comments from Staff Mr. Watkins pointed out that the State of California certified the Housing Element for the City of South Pasadena and that the appeal for Mill Road will be presented to the City Council on June 6, 2012.
ADJOURN- MENT	11	The meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m. to the next meeting of the Planning Commission scheduled for July 23, 2012.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena at a meeting held on August 27, 2012.

AYES: DAVIS, FELICE, FRIEDMAN & GEORGE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: MORRISH



 Anthony R. George, Vice-Chair



 Kristin Morrish, Secretary

ATTEST:



 Elaine Serrano, Recording Secretary