

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA PLANNING COMMISSION
CONVENED THIS MARCH 26th 2012, 6:30 P.M.
AT THE AMEDEE O. DICK RICHARDS JR.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1424 MISSION STREET**

ROLL CALL		<p>Meeting convened at: 6:33 p.m.</p> <p>Commissioners Present: Steven Friedman, Chair Anthony George, Vice-Chair Kristin Morrish, Secretary Evan Davis, Commissioner J. Stephen Felice, Commissioner</p> <p>Council Liaison: Robert S. Joe</p> <p>Staff Present: David G. Watkins, Director of Planning and Building Richard L. Adams II, City Attorney John Mayer, Senior Planner Paul Garnett, Assoc. Planner</p> <p>Comm. Morrish led the pledge of allegiance.</p>
PUBLIC COMMENTS		None
PUBLIC HEARINGS	1	<p>1008-1010 Mission Street (Conditional Use Permit)</p> <p>Vice-Chair George recused himself from the Council Chambers and did not participate in the voting for this item.</p> <p>Senior Planner, John Mayer presented his staff report, regarding approval for a Conditional Use Permit to establish two bar areas within a new 4,276 square feet restaurant by the name of Crossings. The restaurant will be located in the Edwards and Faw building, residing in the Mission West Historic District. The total bar area within the restaurant will be less than 6% of the total size of the restaurant. The findings were made; therefore, staff recommended approval for the project. Mr. Mayer pointed out condition number 3, which states that the CUP is required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission in one year to evaluate, if complaints have been filed with the Police Department. At the conclusion of his staff report, the Commission did not have questions for Mr. Mayer.</p> <p>Chair Friedman declared the public hearing open.</p>

		<p>Kim Ziel, represented the applicant and George Architecture. Ms. Ziel thanked the commission for considering their CUP for the inclusion of a bar at the Crossings restaurant. She pointed out that the architect is pleased to work on the rehabilitation of the Edwards and Faw historic building. One of the goals of the architect is to make this building an asset to the community. Ms. Ziel pointed out the following about the restaurant: 1) it is a fine dining restaurant featuring modern American cuisine; 2) two bars are proposed, one upstairs at 14 linear feet and one downstairs at 12 linear Feet; 3) the project meets all of the conditions of approval and the goals set forth in the Mission Street Specific Plan.</p> <p>Comm. Felice inquired about the location of the trash enclosures beyond the property line. Ms. Ziel pointed out that off-site trash arrangements have been made with an adjacent owner for trash removal.</p> <p>The following people spoke in favor of the item and pointed out that the the project will enhance the city, provide high quality dining, make good use of the outdoor space and provide modern American cuisine to the public. 1) Bill Cullinane, 2001 Mission St., 2) Scott Feldmann, 3) Odom Stamps, 318 Fairview Ave., and 4) Stephanie Kirchen, 1436 Indiana Ave.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. Davis to approve the Conditional Use Permit, as subject to the conditions of approval.</p> <p>Comm. Felice asked for a little more detail in the motion. Regarding the amended Conditions of Approval, he pointed out that the hours of operation have been changed from 5:30 p.m. – 12:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. to 12:30 a.m. After the clarification, Comm. Felice seconded Comm. Davis’ motion to adopt the resolution approving the Conditional Use Permit as subjected to the Conditions of Approval.</p> <p>The motion carried 5-0. (Resolution 12-08)</p>
<p>PUBLIC HEARINGS</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>500 Columbia Street (Tentative Parcel Map Modification)</p> <p>Associate Planner, Paul Garnett presented his staff report regarding a request to modify the Conditions of Approval and to make minor changes to an existing Tentative Parcel Map for 500 Columbia Street, which was initially approved in 2006 and extended in 2008. Mr. Garnett reviewed the details of the project. He pointed out that staff had received inquiries from Ms. Fehrenbacher (a neighbor) for this project. He pointed out that a finding needed to be made first so that the requested changes could be considered by the Commission, and that one of the required findings related to changes of circumstances relating to the original approval of the project. He cited the following such changes: 1) The application has all of the ingress and egress to the three parcels from the Columbia Street easement, with no access from the Hermosa Street easement; 2) Two of the parcels are listed on the City’s</p>

	<p>Historic Inventory; 3) The map is being amended to show where the required fire road will be located and to indicate the impact on trees; and 4) the applicant has chosen to deed the parcels of land to his heirs rather than developing the land. Staff determined that one of the required findings (change in circumstances) could thus be made.</p> <p>At the conclusion of his staff report, Comm. Friedman verified with Mr. Garnett that subdivision improvements will not be required unless or until development of the parcels occur, after the final map is recorded. Mr. Garnett answered questions from the Commission regarding the following: 1) 1,700 cubic yards of grading is for the proposed construction of the fire lane access road. 2) What would happen if proposed improvements prove to be infeasible? Mr. Garnett commented that modifications would need to be made to the recorded map to show any improvements that were changed from those shown on the approved map, and that the applicant would be responsible for this change.</p> <p>Chair Friedman expressed his concerns as to how any future map changes might affect the property.</p> <p>Richard McDonald, the applicant’s attorney, addressed Chair Friedman’s concerns about a possible future reconfiguration of the map. He pointed out that the Conditions of Approval were modified to take into consideration the privacy of the neighbors and the surroundings.</p> <p>Mr. McDonald discussed with Chair Friedman the jurisdiction of the Cultural Heritage Commission over the different parcels of land, once the subdivision takes place.</p> <p>Chair Friedman opened the public hearing for comments. Jane Fehrenbacher, 600 Columbia St., expressed her concerns regarding privacy and the subdivision. She made the following requests of the Commission: 1) Implement a follow-up meeting requirement, two months after the final map has been approved and recorded, to ensure that the covenant regarding height and setback restrictions is recorded on the title of the new parcel; and 2) To have a definition of height added to the revised conditions of approval.</p> <p>Mr. McDonald responded to Ms. Fehrenbacher’s concerns about height limitations regarding parcel #2 by pointing out condition 6 – “...This restriction shall be recorded in a covenant on the title for this parcel. This covenant shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and a fully executed covenant, in recordable form, shall be provided to the City prior to the approval of the Final Map.”</p> <p>The Commission took no action on Ms. Fehrenbacher’s two requests.</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 5-0. (Resolution 12-09)</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>2100 Hanscom Drive (Hillside Development Permit – New Single Family Residence)</p> <p>Senior Planner, John Mayer presented his staff report, regarding approval to build a new 1,427 square foot modern style home on a down-slope lot located at 2100 Hanscom Drive. Mr. Mayer reviewed the details of the project. Mr. Mayer pointed out the following conditions: 1) Condition 62- drainage study, 2) Condition 61 – grading/drainage plan, 3) Condition 63 –improvement completion, 4) Condition 49 - tree removal, 5) Condition 68 – Deputy Construction Manager, 6) Condition 69 – improvement bond, and 7) Condition 12 – dust management. At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Mayer answered questions regarding the following topics: 1) fee schedule, 2) Condition 51 & 69 in relationship to a bond, 3) Condition 37 Grading Bond, 4) Condition 68 the duties of a Deputy Construction Manager.</p> <p>Jim Fenske, the project architect spoke on behalf of the applicant and pointed out that the owner would like to build a small 1,400 square foot home on a 4,000 square foot lot. Mr. Fenske presented the Commission with a structural model of the project. He pointed out the details of the project. He also presented the Commission with a materials board. Mr. Fenske pointed out that the project is located on a very narrow street; therefore, most of the construction staging for the project will be done on Elkins street and the workers will have to park off site. The majority of the excavation will take place in the basement. The commission had question for Mr. Fenske regarding the infill driveway and Polygal sheets for the skylight.</p> <p>Chair. Friedman declared the public hearing open. Mr. Harry How, the applicant pointed out that he did not receive the conditions in a timely manner and did not agree with the following conditions: 1) Condition 68 - the deputy construction manager (\$54,000), and 2) Condition 63 – storm drain box. He felt that the conditions were too restrictive. He requested to be provided with standard conditions.</p> <p>Christopher Sutton Atty., 586 La Loma. He represented the applicant and disagreed with 12 of the conditions. He pointed out that the conditions were too restrictive and will hinder the completion of the project and cause it to go over budget. He pointed out the following conditions: 1) Condition 63 – provide storm drain, 2) Condition 7 –short construction</p>

	<p>hours from 8:30 to 2:00, 3) Condition 68 – on site Deputy Construction Manager [\$54,000]</p> <p>City Attorney Adams was concerned because the applicant did not receive the conditions in a timely manner.</p> <p>The following people spoke in support of the project but did not agree with the restrictive conditions: 1) David Margrave, 928 Buena Vista, 2) Mark Nansen, 2145 Hanscom Dr., 3) Colin Watanabe, 431 Camino Verde, 4) Rebecca How, 1734 Ellincourt Dr. #8. The</p> <p>The following people spoke in opposition to the project and expressed their concerns about the following: inadequate mitigation – street damage, inadequate CMP, overweight trucks, inappropriate fees, financial responsibility [applicant fees], unfinished projects [Hanscom Dr.], water runoff, multiple projects [responsible parties], child safety, environmental effects, tree removal/oak tree destruction, accurate drawings [tree canopies], root system in relationship to canopy size, insufficient impact assessment, prominent project site location, and inadequate drainage. An EIR was requested by Ms. Shapiro. 1) Nick Bangar, 1878 Peterson Ave., 2) Toby Bangar, 2118 Hanscom Dr., 3) Rebecca Latta, 359 N. Westridge Ave., and 4) Susan Shapiro, 2106 Hanscom Dr.</p> <p>Comm. George requested clarification on fees and SW Monterey Hills construction regulations.</p> <p>Comm. Morrish suggested continuing this item, to provide staff with additional time to research the reasons, regarding the multiple objections to this project by the homeowner and the neighbors.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Comm. George, seconded by Comm. Morrish to continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting on April 23, 2012 and to receive an analysis of the applicability of the Southwest Monterey Hills Construction Regulation and an analysis of the response of staff to the presented petition and all documents and letters presented this evening.</p> <p>The motion carried 5-0.</p>
4	<p>2121, 2123, 2127 Hanscom Drive (Hillside Development Permit/Design Review – Three New Homes)</p> <p>Senior Planner, John Mayer presented his staff report, regarding the request for approval of a Hillside Development Permit to build three new single family homes on the three undeveloped lots. Mr. Mayer reviewed the details of the project. Mr. Mayer pointed out that project construction is projected to go on for 15 months comprising of 8 phases. <u>Phase 1</u>: excavation and grading of the hillside, <u>Phases 2 - 5</u>: caisson construction and excavation of the upper, middle and lower tiers of the hillside. <u>Phases 6 – 8</u>: home construction. Mr. Mayer pointed out that the proposed project is subject to</p>

	<p>the Southwest Hills guidelines. Mr. Mayer pointed out the following conditions from Public Works: 1) 64 - \$25,000 street improvement bond and 2) Condition 63 –Deputy Construction Manager (\$90,000). At the conclusion of his staff report the Commission had questions for Mr. Mayer regarding the following: 1) Did the applicant view all of the conditions of approval; 2)what is the correct amount of soil removal referred to in the staff report in relationship to the CMP; 3) will a grading security be required, since there will be a removal of more than a 1,000 cubic yards of dirt. 4) Pg. 7 of the staff report, regarding 333 truckloads of soil as opposed to 275 loads of soil as stated in the Construction Management Plan [which is correct).</p> <p>Comm. Morrish inquired if the applicant had an opportunity to view all of the conditions of approval for the project.</p> <p>Comm. Friedman inquired about page 74 of the staff report, regarding the amount of soil that will be removed.</p> <p>Comm. Friedman declared the public hearing open. Milad Oueijan, the project architect pointed out that the soil removal represented in the staff report was different than the soil removal represented in the CMP, due to a project change, such as the movement of a retaining wall. Mr. Oueijan pointed out that he did not receive the conditions of approval in a timely manner and he did not agree with all of the conditions of approval. He pointed out the following conditions: 1) <u>Condition 7</u>: construction hours from 8:30 – 2:00. (the hours did not coincide with the construction hours in the SW Hills construction regulations). Mr. Oueijan pointed out that the hours would increase the duration of the construction time from the proposed time of 15 months to 24 months. 2) <u>Condition 63</u>: the fees for the Deputy Inspector would provide to be costly, since the duration of the project will increase; 3) <u>Condition 68</u>: all Construction workers are to park off site and be transported to the site. 4) <u>Condition 71</u>: Lumber will be removed and stacked by hand. Mr.Ouijan pointed out that the conditions will make it almost impossible to complete the project. And 5) <u>Condition 11</u>: a) the use of Alternate energy sources. Mr. Oueijan pointed out that he did not have the opportunity to discuss the conditions with staff or with the owner.</p> <p>Chair Friedman opened up the public hearing. The following people spoke in favor or the project but requested to have the restrictive conditions removed from the project: 1) Sabry Aziz, 2127 E. Ball Rd. and 2) David Margrave, 928 Buena Vista. The following people spoke in opposition to the project and expressed their concerns, regarding tree removal, overweight trucks, bird/nest impacts, storm water runoff (flooding), street damage, air quality, short driveways, unfinished projects and child safety. A Traffic Study was requested along with an EIR. 1) Sabry Aziz, 2127 E. Ball Rd., 2) Susan Shapiro, 2106 Hanscom Dr., 3) James Mentel, 1871 Peterson Ave., 4) Nick Bangar, 1878 Peterson Ave., 5) Toby Bangar, 2118 Hanscom Dr., 6)</p>
--	--

		<p>John Grab, 2001 Hanscom Dr., 7) Nick Bangar Jr., 2118 Hanscom Dr.,</p> <p>Mr. Oueijan pointed out that he understands the concerns of the neighbors. He pointed out that he plans on finishing the project. The design of the project includes three extra parking spaces, since the driveways are short. Regarding safety, traffic control has been taken into consideration. 4 flag men will be posted to control traffic a ½ mile before and ½ mile after the p</p> <p>Comm. Davis inquired if Joint and Several liability has been taken into consideration for developers of multiple projects.</p> <p>Shin Furukawa cost savings for developers of multiple projects can occur, if the projects overlap.</p> <p>After considering the staff report and draft resolution, a motion was made by Vice-Chair George, seconded by Comm. Moorish to continue 2121, 2123, & 2127 Hanscom Drive to the next regularly scheduled meeting on April 23, 2012 and to have staff provide the Commission with an analysis of the applicability of the Southwest Monterey Hills Construction Regulations and an review/analysis of the response of staff to the presented petition and all documents and written comments. Vice-Chair George pointed out four documents, relative to the South West Monterey Hills Construction Regulations: 1) SW Monterey Hills Construction Regulation guide for Homeowners and Contractors 2) SW Hills Citizens Committee Construction Mitigation recommendations, approved by the City Council, August 16, 2006 spreadsheet, 3) Ordinance 2155, 4) Ordinance 2153 and how they relate to tonight’s conversation. Comm. George referred to Part two - Preconstruction Phase of the SW Monterey Hills Regulation hand book, Question: “Which construction activities are regulated? Answer: The regulations apply to all projects that require a construction permit and typically includes the construction activities noted in sections 19A, 13B of the South Pasadena Municipal Code. It says, “which projects do these regulations apply to?” “All projects are subjected to these regulations, regardless of when the project was submitted to the city (for design approval, plan check etc.) or when the construction permit (building, grading, demolition, electrical, mechanical, roofing, plumbing etc.) was issued. Mr. George pointed out that the regulations apply weather you are getting a Hillside Development Permit or not. Comm. George encouraged the Commission to look at this matter closely.</p> <p>The motion carried 5-0.</p>
<p>NEW BUSINESS</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Rescheduling of May Meeting (Holiday)</p> <p>Mr. Watkins informed the Commission that that 820 Mission Street (Abbott labs) will be brought to the Commission in the Month of May. Mr. Watkins recommended the date of May 29, 2012 for the May meeting. The</p>

		Commission approved to conduct the special meeting on May 29, 2012 by general consent.
	6	Minutes of the Planning Commission's February 27, 2012 The minutes were approved with one minor correction.
	7	Comments from City Council Liaison Robert S. Joe pointed out the following: 1) the City Council approved a property exchange for Garfield Park and for 805 Stratford Avenue; 2) the City council amended the General Plan and the Zoning Code in order to provide the appropriate land use designation requirement for the exchange; 3) The City Council is going to hold a budget meeting this Thursday at the War Memorial Building.
	8	Comments from Planning Commissioners Comm Morrish inquired if the applicants at the next meeting will be able to view the conditions for their project in a timely manner. Vice- Chair George thanked staff for the on-site meeting located at Hanscom Drive. Comm. Felice inquired about the City taking eminent domain over the Rialto Theater. In response to Comm. Felice's comment, Mr. Joe pointed out that a subcommittee was formed to address the concerns, regarding the Rialto Theater. Comm. Davis felt that the onsite meeting for the Hanscom Projects was Productive but he did not agree with the way that the neighbors treated City staff.
	9	Comments from Staff Mr. Watkins apologized for the confusion, regarding the Conditions of Approval for the Hanscom projects. He pointed out that the continuance will provide staff with additional time to compile the requested information from the Commission and the public. Mr. Watkins also pointed out that the appeal of Mill Road will be scheduled for April 18, 2012.
ADJOURN- MENT	10	The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m. to the next meeting of the Planning Commission scheduled for April 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 April 23, 2012.

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

Steven Friedman, Chair

Anthony R. George, Vice-Chair

ATTEST:

Elaine Serrano, Recording Secretary