

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA PLANNING COMMISSION
CONVENED THIS FEBRUARY 28TH, 2011, 6:30 P.M. AT
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1424 MISSION STREET**

<p>ROLL CALL</p>		<p>Meeting convened at: 6:37 p.m.</p> <p>Commissioners Present: J. Stephen Felice, Chair Vijay Sehgal, Vice-Chair Richard Tom, Secretary Anthony George, Commissioner</p> <p>Council Liaison: Richard D. Schneider, M.D. (Arrived at 6:39 p.m.)</p> <p>Staff Present: John Mayer, Senior Planner Ivy Tsai, Deputy City Attorney John Mayer, Senior Planer Paul Garnett, Assoc. Planner Jose Villegas, Planning Intern Knarik Vizcarra, Planning Intern</p> <p>Vice-Chair Sehgal led the pledge of allegiance.</p>
<p>CONTINUED HEARING</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p>1128 Huntington Drive (Conditional Use Permit and Design Review - Three New Condos)</p> <p>Associate Planner, Paul Garnett presented his staff report, regarding a request for approval for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review to build three new detached dwelling units. This item was initially continued from the October 25, 2010 meeting. Mr. Garnett pointed out the following: 1) the architect addressed some but not all of the Commission’s concerns, as reflected in the revised plans; and 2) project approval was recommended only if specific design issues were addressed, such as the window materials, recessed windows, the lack of articulation on the in-facing courtyard walls, the use of sand finish stucco, the use of foam trim elements and the ornate front elevation on the first unit. At the conclusion of his staff report, Mr. Garnett answered questions from Comm. George, regarding the Negative Declaration for the project.</p> <p>Project architect Tom Nott reviewed the details of the project and discussed the following: 1) vinyl windows 2) elevation details 3) side entrance changes on the North elevation and 4) offsetting an expansive wall by way of the use of a continuous stucco band. Mr. Nott answered questions from the Commission regarding: 1) window detailing for recessed windows; 2) high privacy windows on the east wall; and 3) the possible use of gutters and down pipes.</p> <p>Chair Felice declared the public hearing open. Seeing that there were no</p>

	<p>speakers in favor or in opposition to the item, the public hearing was declared closed by Chair Felice.</p> <p>The Commission continued discussing possible design mitigations for the East (blank) walls between the units.</p> <p>Staff’s recommendations: 1) <u>vinyl windows vs. wood windows</u> – Comm. George pointed out that metal-clad windows have been recommended in the past for Mediterranean-style architecture. The proposed vinyl windows look very similar to metal-clad windows, as long as a bronze finish is selected; 2) <u>foam cornice moldings vs. a natural product</u> – Chair Felice approved of the foam moldings, as long as they are finished properly with a stucco finish. Comm. George approved of the foam molding aesthetically, but he questioned the longevity of the molding.</p> <p>A motion was made by Comm. Tom to approve the Conditional Use Permit and Design Review for the property at 1128 Huntington Drive as submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>Comm. George amended Comm. Tom’s motion to include a smooth plaster finish color coat instead of sand-finish stucco.</p> <p>Comm. Tom amended his motion to include the adoption of the Negative Declaration. Comm. Tom noted, per Mr. Garnett, that the plans were submitted on February 16, 2011.</p> <p>At the request of Mr. Garnett, Comm. George clarified that he was referring to a smooth trowel plaster finish with an integral color coat</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0.</p>
2	<p>736 Mission – ARCO gas station (Conditional Use Permit-minimart/wine/beer sales)</p> <p>Associate Planner Paul Garnett presented the applicant’s request to continue this item to the next regularly-scheduled meeting on March 28, 2011 to provide the applicant with additional time to obtain data and information previously requested by the Commission.</p> <p>By general consensus, the Commission continued this item to the next regularly-scheduled meeting on March 28, 2011. The motion carried 4-0.</p>

<p>PUBLIC HEARING</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>1744 Peterson Avenue (Hillside Development Permit/Design Review – Addition and New Garage)</p> <p>Planning Intern, Jose Villegas presented his staff report, regarding approval for a Hillside Development Permit and Design Review for an addition and a new carport at 1744 Peterson Avenue. Mr. Villegas pointed out the following: 1) a new 480 square foot carport will replace the existing 424 square foot carport; 2) a new 424 square foot family room addition is proposed; 3) a river rock tower element will be added to the front elevation; 4) the tower will add approximately 25 square feet to the front elevation and the tower will be 17 feet high; 5) river rocks will be incorporated into the fascia of the new addition and the carport; and 6) the project is consistent with the General Plan. At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Villegas answered questions from the Commission, regarding the City’s carport allowance and surveying issues for the project location (centerline - the right of way for Peterson).</p> <p>Susie Gabriel, the designer for the project referenced picture 8 in the staff report and pointed out that the existing carport will be converted into a family room and the new carport will be located in the front of the garage. The Commissioners asked Ms. Gabriel why river rocks were incorporated into the design and if an alternate entrance to the house existed besides the entrance through the carport. Ms. Gabriel responded in the positive, regarding an alternate entrance and she commented that the homeowner suggested the use of river rocks. It was suggested, by the Commission, that the pathway to the alternate entrance should be highlighted. The Commissioners pointed out the following, regarding the project: 1) the existing floor plan for the house was not included in the plans; 2) the front entrance, thorough the carport, will be approximately 1 foot away from the car located in the carport; and 3) the tower was incongruous with the rest of the house.</p> <p>The owners commented that the tower will accentuate the front entrance and that the river rock blends in well with the pilasters and the design of the house.</p> <p>The Commissioners pointed out the problematic features of the tower, such as: 1) the tower is connected to the house “only” by it’s exterior wall; 2) the scale of the tower is out of proportion with the house; 3) the sole function of the tower is to highlight the entrance; 4) the circular shape and the materials of the tower does not work well with the design; 5) most towers are proportional to the floor plan, which is not demonstrated in this project; 6) the house does not have the elements of the tower; 7) the scale of the tower and the materials do not highlight the entrance in a proper manner; 8) the entrance can be highlighted in a less expensive manner without the tower. Comm. George pointed out that the design of the carport was done well and</p>
------------------------------	-----------------	--

		<p>he compared the carport to that of a covered bridge.</p> <p>Comm. George suggested that the applicant pursue alternatives to the tower or mitigate the negative impact of the tower.</p> <p>The public hearing remained open. The applicant consented to a continuation. Chair Felice closed the public hearing.</p> <p>The Commission was not opposed to a stone or round tower executed properly.</p> <p>A motion was made by Comm. Tom, seconded by Vice-Chair Sehgal to continue this item to the next regularly scheduled meeting on March 28, 2011.</p> <p>The public hearing was re-opened by Chair Felice. The applicant requested clarification. Comm. George clarified and pointed out the following problems with the design of the tower: 1) it encroaches into the parking space for the sole purpose of creating a tower in the front entry way; 2) the tower does not connect to the second floor; 3) the tower should be in scale with the project; 4) the tower should have a function; and 5) it is difficult to engage a round tower on the side of a building.</p> <p>Chair Felice encouraged the applicant to create an entrance along the side of the carport, by incorporating the use of landscaping or architectural details which will direct visitors to the front door.</p> <p>The motion carried 4-0.</p>
<p>NEW BUSINESS</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Time Extensions – Recommendation to City Council</p> <p>Senior Planner, John Mayer presented his staff report, regarding a recommendation by the City Council and Redevelopment Commission for the Planning Commission to consider an amendment to the Zoning Code related to time limits for Planning approval extensions for large projects. Planning approvals will be allowed to remain active for more than 12 months, for large projects, such as the Downtown project. The Downtown project was the catalyst for this amendment. It has been difficult for the applicant, since Planning approvals expire for the Downtown project every 12 months, unless plans are submitted to plan check. Mr. Mayer pointed out that a survey was done for 30 cities in the San Gabriel Valley, regarding their time limits for extensions and found out that the majority of the surveyed cities have stricter time extension requirements than the City of South Pasadena. Mr. Mayer pointed out three options for the Planning Commission to choose from, regarding Planning extensions as follows: 1) initiate a Zoning Code amendment to expand the maximum time limit from 1 to 3 years for all zoning approvals [CRC’s recommendation]; 2) extend the maximum time span for extensions from 1 to 3 years for Plan Development permits only for</p>

		larger projects [staff's recommendation]; 3) maintain the 1 year time limit and recommend the amending of condition number 10 of the Plan Development Permit to designate a reasonable time limit for project completion. At the conclusion of his presentation Mr. Mayer discussed various scenarios for the different options with the Commissioners. The Commission provided direction to Mr. Mayer. By consensus, the Commission chose option 1.
	5	Planning Commission Reorganization It was the consensus of the Commission to postpone the Planning Commission reorganization until the return of Comm. Friedman.
	6	Minutes of the Planning Commission's January 24, 2011 meeting The minutes of the Planning Commission minutes for January 24, 2011 were approved with a minor correction.
	7	Comments from City Council Liaison: None
	8	Comments from Planning Commissioners: Comm. George informed the commission that the AdHoc Fire Ordinance Committee has had two meetings. The Committee will have a report ready for the Commission soon.
	9	Comments from Staff: None
ADJOURN- MENT	10	The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. to the next meeting of the Planning Commission scheduled for March 28, 2011.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing minutes were adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of South Pasadena at a meeting held on March 28, 2011.

AYES: FELICE, GEORGE, SEHGAL, TOM
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: FRIEDMAN

J.Stephen Felice, Chair

Vijay Sehgal, Vice-Chair

ATTEST:

Elaine Serrano, Recording Secretary