

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING CONVENED THIS 23rd DAY OF MAY 2016, 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: 6:32 p.m.</p> <p>Commissioners Present: Steven Dahl, Chair Evan Davis, Vice-Chair Kristin Morrish, Secretary Kelly Koldus Richard Tom</p> <p>Council Liaison: Marina Khubesrian, MD, Council Liaison</p> <p>Staff Present: Holly O. Whatley, Assistant City Attorney John Mayer, Senior Planner Knarik Vizcarra, Assistant Planner</p> <p>Staff Absent: David Watkins, Director of Planning and Building</p> <p>Comm. Morrish led the pledge of allegiance.</p> <p>Council Liaison Marina Khubesrian arrived at 6:34</p>
<p>PUBLIC COMMENTS</p>		<p>None</p>
<p>CONTINUED HEARINGS</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>2131 Hanscom Drive (Hillside Development Permit – Deputy Inspector Condition of Approval)</p> <p>Senior Planner, John Mayer presented his staff report, regarding if a deputy inspector is needed for the proposed project at 2131 Hanscom Drive. Mr. Mayer reviewed the history of the project and pointed out that a deputy inspector is needed to enforce rules and regulations, which will preserve Hanscom Drive, since it was repaved recently. The deputy inspector fee was reduced to \$5000.00 to accommodate the applicant for this project. At the conclusion of his staff report, Comm. Davis inquired if the requirement for a Deputy Inspector is required in all South West Monterey Hills projects. Mr. Mayer noted that when heavy construction trucks are used, a deputy inspector is needed to ensure that all regulations are followed for street protection. Mr. Mayer reviewed previous projects that required a deputy inspector with Vice-Chair Davis.</p> <p>The applicant’s lawyer, Wayne Brossman introduced himself to the Commission and expressed his client’s opposing views, regarding the requirement of an onsite deputy inspector. Mr. Brossman reviewed</p>

		<p>the history of a previous project, regarding another client that was opposed to the requirement of a deputy inspector. Mr. Brossman noted that there should be a uniform set of hillside conditions for the city.</p> <p>Chair Dahl declared the public hearing open. Mr. Brossman offered a comparison and pointed out similarities between Hansom Drive and Indiana Avenue, regarding traffic and noted that the same construction regulations should apply to all projects. Seeing that there were no other speakers in favor of or in opposition to this project, Chair Dahl declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the following: 1) should South West Hills projects adhere to different rules from all other hillside projects: 2) effective street maintenance must be established to protect the recent street improvement along Hanscom Drive; and 3) the utilization of an onsite deputy inspector will protect Hanscom Drive, during the construction process and the movement of large trucks along the street.</p> <p>Shin Furukawa, Deputy Public Works Director, noted that there are similar characteristics between Hanscom Drive and Indiana Avenue, but multiple vacant lots reside on Hanscom Drive, but not on Indiana Avenue; therefore, Hanscom Dr. will experience more construction traffic and be susceptible to street damage. Mr. Furukawa noted that great care must take place to protect the recently repaved Hanscom Dr.</p> <p>A motion was made by Comm. Tom, seconded by Comm. Morrish to approve the Hillside Development Permit for the property at 2100 Hanscom Drive as submitted by staff, including the amended conditions of approval along with the reduced deposit amount of \$5000.00.</p> <p>The motion carried 5-0. Resolution 16-12</p>
<p>NEW BUSINESS</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1008 – 1010 Mission Street (Valet Parking Use Permit – Status Report)</p> <p>Assistant Planner, Knarik Vizcarra presented a status report, regarding valet parking. Ms. Vizcarra noted that the majority of inquiries received by staff were in opposition to valet parking. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out that staff received one inquiry, regarding valet parking during the Eclectic Music Festival, such as valet operators using additional parking spaces, but incidents were not reported to the police department, since the last Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Vizcarra noted that weekend usage is generally the highest, with an average of 10 vehicles, within the 21 days of operation. At the conclusion of her presentation, Ms. Vizcarra answered questions and</p>

		<p>noted that the operator would like to continue with valet parking, even though the numbers for parked cars are minimal. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out that the City Council would not approve a permanent valet without an approved ordinance. The Commission received and filed Ms. Vizcarra's report by general consent.</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARINGS</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>1627 Via Del Rey – (Hillside Development Permit/Design Review – Single Family Addition and Pool)</p> <p>Chair Dahl recused himself from participating on this item and left the City Council Chambers.</p> <p>Assistant Planner, Knarik Vizcarra presented her staff report, regarding approval to create an outdoor recreational space and swimming pool. No inquiries were received by staff for this item and the findings for a Hillside Development permit were made. Ms. Vizcarra presented staff's recommendation for approval subject to the revised conditions of approval, specifically number 13 and 27 as follows: a) <u>Cond. 13</u> – Vehicle activity shall be limited from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mon. – Fri.; b) <u>Cond. 29</u> – does not apply [removed]. At the conclusion of her staff report, Ms. Vizcarra noted the construction truck hours for the area and that additional clarification is not necessary since condition 8 provides sufficient clarification.</p> <p>Vice-Chair Davis declared the public hearing open. The applicant, Larry Laschner, pointed out that construction equipment will be transported via trucks during the weekend and that construction work will commence on Monday. Comm. Morrish reviewed the project details with the applicant. Seeing that there were no other speakers in favor or in opposition to this item, Vice-Chair Davis declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Morrish, seconded by Comm. Tom to approve the project as submitted by staff including the revised conditions of approval.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0. Resolution 16-13</p> <p>Chair Dahl returned to the dais for the next planning Commission item.</p>
	<p>4</p>	<p>1100 Fair Oaks Avenue (Conditional Use Permit – Convert to Multi-tenant Building)</p> <p>Assistant Planner, Knarik Vizcarra presented her staff report regarding approval to convert a multi-tenant building into a three unit multi-tenant commercial space. The proposed uses are as follows; a) Suite 1 Blaze Pizza; b) Suite 2 food use; and Suite 3 retail or office use. Since</p>

	<p>the property is listed on the Inventory of Historic Resources, the Zoning Code only requires as much parking as can be provided on-site. No comments or inquiries were received for this project. Ms. Vizcarra pointed out the following revised conditions of approval: 1) Cond. 2&3 - the tenant is responsible for securing off-site parking for employees instead of the landlord, as stated in the original conditions of approval; 2) Cond. 5 -contrasting peak hours for Blaze Pizza morning/evening are to be provided by the applicant; 3) Cond 4 – regarding submittals for parking plans, the applicant felt that this condition was too restrictive and would further restrict the small unit and prevent tenants from renting. At the conclusion of her presentation, Comm. Morrish verified with Ms. Vizcarra that the small third unit may be used for retail or office use, which does not require a CUP.</p> <p>The applicant’s representative Aida Navasargian, noted that a detailed parking study was provided to the Commission and that it should be sufficient for all future CUPs from tenants for unit spaces 1 and 2.</p> <p>The public hearing was opened. Robert Freeman, 1107 Brent Ave., expressed his concerns about the following: 1) the closeness of proximity between the business and the residential area; 2) impacts of delivery trucks; and 3) traffic and debris. In closing the applicant’s representative, addressed the Commission and noted that the proposed use will be a positive addition to the community. Seeing that there were no other speakers in favor of or in opposition to this project, Chair Dahl declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the following: 1) the landlord should take the responsibility to secure off-site parking rather than the tenant as noted in the revised conditions of approval; 2) the party governed by the conditions of approval should be the responsible party, not the tenant; and 3); conditions 2 & 3 should remain as stated in the original conditions of approval.</p> <p>The applicant’s representative returned to the podium and pointed out that their business lease with Blaze Pizza includes wording, which states that the tenant is responsible to secure offsite parking for employees.</p> <p>Discussion ensued between the Commission and Ms. Navasargian, regarding the Commission’s request to hold the applicant responsible to secure offsite parking for employees rather than the tenant. Ms. Navasargian was not amenable to this request. The Commission was willing to work with Ms. Navasargian by changing the language in the conditions of approval so that the landlord will be responsible to ensure that the tenant secures offsite parking but the applicant was not</p>
--	---

	<p>amenable to the additional suggestion.</p> <p>A 10 min recess was taken to allow the Ms. Navasargian to contact the applicant. The change in language is tied to the building because the 3rd unit will not require a CUP.</p> <p>Robert Freeman, 1107 Brent Ave., addressed the commission and inquired about the process for offsite parking and compliance.</p> <p>Ms. Navasargian returned to the podium and notified the Commission that the applicant would like the tenant to take full responsibility in securing off-site parking.</p> <p>Discussion ensued between the Commission and Assistant City Attorney Whatley, regarding who is the responsible party to secure off-site parking. Chair Dahl declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>The Commission continued discussion regarding, which responsible party is to secure offsite parking and what would be the consequences for the applicant or the tenant for not securing off-site parking.</p> <p>A motion was made by Comm. Morrish to approve the project as submitted by staff, Comm. Koldus provided a second for the motion “only” for the sake of discussion.</p> <p>After the discussion, Comm. Koldus noted that she did not approve of the motion and withdrew her second; therefore, Vice-Chair Davis seconded the motion.</p> <p>Ms. Vizcarra verified with the Commission that the City was not willing to remove condition 4, but the City approved of adding the word evening to condition 5.</p> <p>The Commission resumed their meeting after a brief recess.</p> <p>Ms. Vizcarra informed the commission that the applicant was amenable to continuing this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting.</p> <p>Comm. Morrish withdrew her motion.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Tom, seconded by Comm. Koldus to continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting, on June 27, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p>The motion carried 5-0.</p>
--	--

	<p>5 1100 Fair Oaks Avenue (Conditional Use Permit – Restaurant > 20% in Multi-Tenant, Beer/Wine)</p> <p>Assistant Planner, Knarik Vizcarra discussed with Assistant City Attorney, Holly O. Whatley, if the Commission should proceed with the hearing for this item, since a tenant was not designated for the multipurpose building during the hearing for the previous item. The Commission discussed and chose to proceed with the public hearing for this item. Ms. Vizcarra noted that the findings were made for the Conditional Use Permits (CUP) and for the Administrative Use Permit (AUP).</p> <p>Thea Trindle, representative from Blaze Pizza, introduced herself to the Commission and noted the following, regarding the purposes for requesting the CUPs and the AUP: 1) the first CUP is for the purpose of establishing a restaurant in a commercial space which exceeds 20% of the total square footage; 2) the second CUP is for the purpose of enabling the sale and consumption of alcohol and beer; and 3) the AUP was requested for outdoor dining. Ms. Trindle reviewed the details of the project and the history of Blaze Pizza. Ms. Trindle was not in agreement with the revised conditions of approval, specifically with conditions 4 and 5. Per their parking study, Ms. Trindle noted that there is ample parking for Blaze Pizza. Public transportation and foot traffic may be utilized as well. Ms. Trindle noted that securing an off-site parking lease should not be the responsibility of the tenant, since it will result in a burden for the tenant.</p> <p>Chair Dahl declared the public hearing open and Robert Freeman, 1107 Brent Ave., noted that it would benefit the applicant and the owner to work together to come to a solution, regarding parking.</p> <p>Per Ms. Trindle, parking is sufficient and off-site parking leases generally, are not productive and usually very costly. Chair Dahl declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>Comm. Koldus noted that it is possible to revert an amended condition back to its original state, if the applicant can prove that the condition does not need to be changed or the condition is not necessary. An amended or deleted condition of approval may be requested.</p> <p>The Commission expressed their concerns, regarding the fact that the tenant and landlord were not in agreement, regarding the responsible party for the off-site parking requirement for employees and discussed the following; 1) occupancy in relationship to parking; and 2) all parking alternatives should be explored.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Tom, seconded by Comm. Morrish to continue this</p>
--	--

		item to the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 27, 2016 The motion carried 4-0.
	6	Minutes of the Planning Commission's March 28, 2016 meeting The March 28, 2016 minutes were approved with minor corrections.
	7	Comments from City Council Liaison Council Liaison, Marina Khubesrian noted that the budget was discussed at the last City Council meeting and it is in the process of becoming finalized. Valet parking was also discussed and changes were made to the ordinance.
	8	Comments from Planning Commissioners Comm. Koldus notified the public that Comm. Tom and she will attend a meeting to discuss the General Plan update this Thursday. Comm. Koldus encouraged the public to attend the Golden Street celebration.
	9	Comments from Staff No Comments
ADJOURNMENT	10	The meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m. to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting scheduled on June 27, 2016.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena at a meeting held on the July 25, 2016.

AYES: DAVIS, DAHL, KOLDUS, MORRISH & TOM

NOES: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

Steven Dahl, Chair

Kristin Morrish, Secretary

ATTEST:

Elaine Serrano, Recording Secretary