

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA PLANNING COMMISSION
CONVENED THIS MAY 31ST 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: 6:35 p.m.</p> <p>Commissioners Present: Steven Friedman, Chair Anthony George, Vice-Chair Kristin Morrish, Secretary J. Stephen Felice</p> <p>Staff Present: David G. Watkins, Director of Planning and Building Richard L. Adams II, City Attorney John Mayer, Senior Planner Jose Villegas, Planning Intern Knarik Vizcarra, Planning Intern</p> <p>Absent: Evan Davis, Commissioner Robert S. Joe, Council Liaison</p> <p>Comm. Felice led the pledge of allegiance.</p>
<p>PUBLIC COMMENTS</p>		<p>None</p>
<p>CONTINUED HEARINGS</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Downtown Project (Planned Development Permit Extension)</p> <p>This item was continued from the April 23, 2012 Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Mayer reviewed the history of the project. He pointed out that on May 21, 2008, the Downtown Revitalization project was approved by the City Council. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the developer was not able to submit plans to plan check within the last three annual deadlines. Currently, Genton Property Group has taken over the project; therefore, Mr. Mayer requested an additional extension (36 months) for the new developer. To qualify for the extension, the developer must show delays beyond the applicant's control, such as project complexities, legal challenges, economic downturn or requirements imposed by other governmental agencies. At the conclusion of his presentation, Chair Friedman verified with Mr. Mayer that it was at the Commission's discretion to grant an extension from 12 months up to 36 months.</p>

	<p>The project applicant, Mr. Jonathan Genton, responded to Comm. Felice's question, regarding the status of negotiations with Citizens Bank and Bank of America. Mr. Genton pointed out that both banks have indicated that they are interested in selling, but Bank of America has not been responsive and Citizens Bank has been very responsive.</p> <p>This public hearing remained open.</p> <p>Ms. Lucia Wiltrout took a neutral position on this item. She requested a new EIR and an additional entrance/exit to the parking structure on a street other than Mound Avenue.</p> <p>Jack Pettee, 1400 Wayne Ave., spoke in opposition to the project and expressed his concerns about the following: 1) the proposed parking structure, 2) the cost of a new EIR, and 3) the developer's profit.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the proper time period to grant for the extension.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Felice, seconded by Vice-Chair George to approve the extension as submitted by staff.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0. (Resolution 12-14)</p>
2	<p>820 Mission Street (Planned Development Permit, Parking Use Permit, Design Review, and Tentative Tract Map Mixed Use)</p> <p>Comm. George recused himself from participating on the voting for this item and left the Council Chambers.</p> <p>Senior Planner, John Mayer presented his staff report, via a PowerPoint presentation, for the development of a mixed use project that includes 38 residential units and 3,585 square feet of office space. This property was previously owned by Abbott Laboratories. Mr. Mayer pointed out that New Urban West submitted plans to demolish all of the buildings except for the three story building which will be converted into nine residential units. The total amount of units for the project is 38. Mr. Mayer pointed out that the proposed development is divided into three clusters: A) <u>Cluster 1</u> is located on Mission Street - Brick office Building with one residential unit; B) <u>Cluster 2</u> is also located on Mission St. - 15 unit townhome cluster with office space fronting Mission St; C) <u>Cluster 3</u> is located in the Middle of the project Lot - 9 residential units including a roof top terrace and additional 13 townhome units [Spanish Colonial]. Mr. Mayer pointed out that Condition No. 9 was revised at the request of the applicant as follows: 1) the Planned Development Permit will remain valid for two years instead of the usual 12 months; and 2) clarification for submitting plans to plan check and paying</p>

	<p>the plan check fees are actions that keep the Planned Development Permit active. At the conclusion of his presentation, Chair Friedman inquired as to why the applicant's requests were appropriate for the project. Mr. Mayer pointed out that the applicant's requests were appropriate due to the complexities of the project.</p> <p>Regarding the Initial Study, Chair Friedman noted an inconsistency in section <u>10 regarding Noise</u> issues on page 27 for a, b, and c. either the conclusions were incorrect or the incorrect boxes were checked.</p> <p>Tom Zanic, the owner/co-applicant addressed the commission. Mr. Zanic proposed a re-use of the site. He pointed out that one of the goals for New Urban West is to comply with the vision for the Mission Street Specific Plan.</p> <p>Ryan Bean, the owner/co-applicant presented the Commission with a PowerPoint presentation, regarding the dynamics of the project. Mr. Bean pointed out that he was in agreement with the staff report and the revised conditions of approval. He covered 8 key attributes for the design of the project: 1) mixed use nature of the project, 2) sensitive design 3) lower density, 4) sustainability aspects 5) transit orientation 6) open space 7) low traffic and 8) location walkability.</p> <p>Regarding the initial study, Mr. Mayer pointed out that in section <u>10 regarding Noise</u> issues on page 27, the checkmarks should be in the "less than significant" column for a, b & c.</p> <p>Chair Friedman opened the public hearing.</p> <p>The following people spoke in favor of the project: Tamara Tolkin, 1024, David Margrave, 835 El Centro St., Richard Garrish, 1499 Huntington Dr. Mission St., and pointed out that the proposed mixed-use project was beautifully designed and will fit in well with the surroundings.</p> <p>The Commissioners were in agreement that this project was well designed and that it was a superior example of a project meeting the criteria for a Planned Development Permit.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Felice, seconded by Comm. Morrish, to approve the project as submitted by staff including the revised Conditions of Approval (Exhibit B).</p> <p>Mr. David Watkins pointed out that section <u>10- Noise</u> of the Initial Study. will have the corrected checkmarks in the proper boxes.</p> <p>The motion carried 3-0. (Resolution 12-15)</p>
--	--

<p>PUBLIC HEARINGS</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>500 Alta Vista (Hillside Development Permit - Deck)</p> <p>Knarik Vizcarra presented her staff report for approval of a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review for a roof deck at 500 Alta Vista Avenue. Ms. Vizcarra reviewed the details of the project and pointed out that staff received several inquiries, regarding this project focusing on noise, privacy and safety concerns. Ms. Vizcarra stated that the project met the required findings for a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review. At the conclusion of her presentation, the Commission did not have questions for Mrs. Vizcarra.</p> <p>The applicant, Ms. Kelan Ackerman pointed out that she purchased the house in poor condition. The house has limited space including a small concrete patio; therefore, she decided to renovate the house and create outdoor livable space, via an outdoor deck.</p> <p>The project architect, Dimitris Klapsis pointed out that his goal was to create an outdoor use that was compatible with the neighborhood uses and to provide the Ackerman family with a beautiful view of the San Gabriel Mountains.</p> <p>Mr. Klapsis pointed out the following: 1) the deck was placed over the existing foot print of the house; 2) the required setbacks of the property were taken into consideration; 2) the deck will be hidden from view, shielded by trees and vegetation; 3) the deck will not obstruct the view of the neighbors; 4) three new trees were planted (two Crape Myrtles and one Pepper tree) The deck will have a modern look with cable rails, and a redwood walking surface and guardrails.</p> <p>Mr. Klapsis pointed out that he conducted a deck survey of the neighborhood and found that there are two open-air roof decks and four or five covered roof decks in the neighborhood.</p> <p>Chair Friedman opened the public hearing.</p> <p>Patricia Plumeri, 510 Alta Vista Ave., and Richard Freeman, 511 Alta Vista expressed their concerns regarding, 1) privacy, 2) noise, 3) deck size, 4) deck location, 5) safety and 6) parking.</p> <p>Mr. Klapsis responded to the concerns of the neighbors. He pointed out that from a structural and safety perspective; the Building Code will be followed.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing closed.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the architecture, design, use of space, deck size,</p>
-------------------------------	-----------------	---

		<p>and the neighborhood impacts for the proposed project. Comm. Morrish inquired if the deck could be made smaller or if it could be moved away from the edges of the roof.</p> <p>Chair Friedman re-opened the public hearing to allow the applicant to respond to respond to Comm. Morrish's question.</p> <p>Mr. Klapsis pointed out that the orientation of the deck cannot be changed as that would result in a need for additional structural work that would not be reasonable. He added that the deck is pulled in from the edges of the roof.</p> <p>The Commissioners continued to discuss the design and the impacts of the project.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Felice, seconded by Vice-Chair George to approve the project as submitted by staff.</p> <p>Vote: 2-2 with Chair Friedman and Comm. Morrish as the dissenting parties.</p> <p>*Since a split vote would result in the denial of the project, Chair Friedman reopened the public hearing to entertain a motion for a continuance to provide Commissioner Davis an opportunity to vote on the matter.</p> <p>A motion was made by comm. Morrish, seconded by Chair Friedman to continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 25, 2012.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0.</p>
	4	<p>Rollin/Flores de Oro/Via del Rey Zoning Map Determination</p> <p>David Watkins, the Director of Planning and Building, presented staff's request to have this item pulled from the agenda. This item will return to the Commission as a Public hearing for a General Plan Amendment/Zoning Change.</p> <p>Action was not taken on this item.</p>
	5	<p>1685 Camino Lindo (Hillside Development Permit/Design Review Single Family Addition)</p> <p>Planning Intern, Jose Villegas presented his staff report for a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review for a single family addition. The addition consists of a single story addition, a second story addition, a patio cover (front elevation) and a wooden deck (rear elevation). Mr. Villegas reviewed the details of the project. Staff did not receive any inquires for this project. The project is compatible with the General Plan, Hillside Standards and the surrounding neighborhood. The five required findings for a Hillside</p>

		<p>Development Permit and the four required findings for Design Review were made. At the conclusion of his staff report, Comm. George had questions for Mr. Villegas, regarding the setback requirements for the outdoor deck, in relationship to the Hillside Development standards.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing open.</p> <p>The architect, Eric Luke, pointed out that the homeowner chose to remodel the home to increase access and to accommodate grandchildren. Mr. Luke pointed out the following: 1) two suites are proposed including an elevator; 2) the addition will increase the size of the house by 256 square feet; 3) two existing suits will be enlarged; 4) ten native Southern California species will be planted on site; and 5) the proposed 700 sq. ft. deck will be hidden by the trees and will not be visible from below.</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 Vice-Chair George to approve the project as submitted by staff.</p> <p>The motion carried 3-1 (Resolution 12-16)</p>
	6	<p>440 Camino Verde (Hillside Development Permit/Design Review – Single Family Addition)</p> <p>Planning Intern, Jose Villegas presented his staff report for a Hillside Development permit and Design Review for a second story addition and an outside deck located in the back of the property. Staff did not receive inquires for this project. The five required findings for a Hillside Development permit and the four required findings for Design Review were made. Mr. Villegas reviewed the details for the project. Mr. Villegas pointed out that the project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. At the conclusion of his staff report, Comm. Morrish verified with Mr. Villegas that the plans reflected an entrance gate, which separates the cedar wall to accommodate an entrance to the guest parking space.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing open.</p> <p>Jessie Hurtado, the project designer pointed out that the project is located in an eclectic neighborhood, surrounded by ranch style and modern style homes. He pointed out that this is a simple lines project and that the project site is located at the rear of the property.</p> <p>Comm. George pointed out that the drawings were very complicated, demonstrating an aggressive design solution.</p>

		<p>Mr. Hurtado pointed out that the property owners preferred a modern architectural style for the addition. The homeowners enjoy the indoor/outdoor lifestyle and the view of the outdoor landscape.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the project and pointed out the following issues that need to be addressed by the architect: 1) the design of the addition did not build on the design of the existing structure; 2) an aggressive design solution was applied; 3) the plans did not match the model; 4) the design intent should be carried out correctly; 5) additional details are needed to show how the design of the project will be carried out.</p> <p>The Commission was in agreement in continuing this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting, providing the architect with additional time to resolve the incompatibly issues.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Felice, seconded by Comm. Morrish to continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 25, 2012.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0</p>
NEW BUSINESS	7	<p>Appointment of a Planning Commission representative to the Southwest Monterey Hills Citizen's Committee</p> <p>Mr. Watkins presented the City Council's request to reconstitute the Monterey Hills Citizen's Committee to review the status of the 18 recommendations that were made in August of 2006. The committee is to report back to Council, if any additional steps need to be made. Mr. Watkins requested the reaffirmation of Comm. Felice or the appointment of a new committee member.</p> <p>Comm. Felice consented to serve on the committee.</p>
	8	<p>Minutes of the Planning Commission's April 23, 2012</p> <p>The minutes were continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting on June 25, 2012.</p>
	9	<p>Comments from City Council Liaison</p> <p>None</p>
	10	<p>Comments from Planning Commissioners</p> <p>None</p>
	11	<p>Comments from Staff</p> <p>Mr. Watkins pointed out that the State of California certified the Housing Element for South Pasadena and that the appeal for Mill Road will be presented to the City Council on June 6, 2012.</p>

ADJOURN- MENT	12	The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m. to the next meeting of the Planning Commission scheduled for June 25, 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 June 25, 2012.

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



Steven Friedman, Chair



Anthony R. George, Vice-Chair

ATTEST:



Elaine Serrano, Recording Secretary