

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**CITY OF SIERRA MADRE
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

Regular Meeting of
Thursday, May 7, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

This meeting will be conducted utilizing teleconference communications and will be recorded for live streaming. In accordance with the State of California Executive Order N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020, all City of Sierra Madre public meetings will be solely available via live streaming and made available on the City's official website.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hutt called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Hutt, Vice Chair Denison, Commissioners Catalano, Dallas, Desai, Pevsner, Spears

Staff: Vincent Gonzalez, Director of Planning and Community Preservation
Clare Lin, Associate Planner
Jennifer Peterson, Administrative Analyst
Aleks R. Giragosian, Assistant City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Catalano moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner Spears seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 2, 2020

Commissioner Catalano requested that on Lines #120 - 129 the word should be "Hunched". Commissioner Catalano moved to approve the minutes with the noted changes. Vice Chair Denison seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Mayor John Capoccia

Mayor Capoccia stated that he intends to attend more Planning Commission meetings as part of his role as City Council liaison.

PUBLIC HEARING

Disclosure of site visit - Ex Parte

The Commission disclosed if they visited the project sites, and if they had any communication with the applicants

45 **1. HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT 14-02 (HDP 14-02) AND CONDITIONAL USE**
46 **PERMIT 14-08 (CUP 14-08)**
47 **Address: 9 Nathaniel Terrace (Lot 5)**
48 **Applicant: LCRA Architects**
49 **Continued from January 16, 2020 and April 16, 2020**
50 **Continued to May 7, 2020**

51
52 **Commissioner Denison recused due to proximity to the project.**
53

54 Associate Planner Lin delivered the staff report.
55

56 Everado Garcia
57 LCRA Architects

58 Detailed the revisions to the project in response to the Planning Commission's
59 comments at previous meetings.
60

61 Commissioner Desai clarified the change in pad elevation.

62 Commissioner Catalano inquired about the landscape plan compliance with the Design
63 Guidelines.

64 Chair Hutt commented on the screening wall near the motor court.

65 Commissioner Desai pointed out a discrepancy between the material board and
66 rendering.

67 Commissioner Pevsner felt that the revised project meets all of the architectural
68 requirements, and that the revisions were improvements in line with the direction the
69 Planning Commission had given.

70 Commissioner Dallas felt that it was a good design before, and that this is an
71 improvement all the way around.

72 Chair Hutt concurred that this is a big step forward.
73

74 No public comment received.
75

76 Commissioner Catalano stated that he was ready to approve as presented.

77 Commissioner Desai felt that this is a great improvement.

78 Commissioner Spears stated that he appreciated the revisions and the reduction in
79 massing.
80

81 **ACTION: Commissioner Desai moved to approve Hillside Development Permit 14-**
82 **02, Conditional Use Permit 14-08 as presented, Commissioner Spears seconded.**
83 **Motion carried unanimously with Commissioner Denison recusing.**
84

85 **2. DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT 19-06 (AHDP 17-02)**

86 **Address: 751 Oak Crest Drive**

87 **Applicant: Fiona Wu, FW Design**
88

89 **Chair Hutt recused himself due to proximity of the project.**
90

91 Associate Planner Lin delivered the Staff Report
92
93 Commissioner Spears inquired if any awards had been given to the original architecture.
94 Director Gonzalez stated that the property is not designated as a cultural or historic
95 landmark.
96
97 Commissioner Pevsner inquired if the project would require a Discretionary Demolition
98 permit.
99 Director Gonzalez stated that the property is not eligible for designation as a local
100 landmark, is less than 75 years of age, and therefore a discretionary demolition permit
101 would not be required.
102 Commissioner Pevsner noted that more information is needed to evaluate the project.
103
104 Commissioner Catalano noted that a letter had been received from a neighbor who was
105 concerned with erosion of the site.
106 Associated Planner Lin verified that there has been no work done at the site, but Grading
107 and Drainage review will be required as part of plan check.
108
109 Commissioner Spears was concerned with the deck out over vegetation, which would
110 trigger the requirement of fire sprinklers. He was concerned that it is possible that the
111 new design would not meet current Fire Code. Indicated that there may be a need to
112 explore landscape alterations and to remove flammable plant material, i.e. as Eucalyptus
113 trees.
114
115 Commissioner Catalano inquired as to why a demolition permit was not required outright.
116 Director Gonzalez explained that process would follow the normal procedure to obtain a
117 demolition permit once a replacement project has been approved.
118 Commissioner Catalano expressed that he has no neighborhood compatibility issues
119 with the design; inquired about location of nearest fire hydrant; and length of the
120 driveway. Noted concerns about the visibility of the house from different vantage points
121 and site stabilization concerns.
122
123 Commissioner Dallas indicated that it is hard to justify exceeding the 25-foot height
124 zoning requirement (building height proposed 32'-2"). Also noted that height is related to
125 building massing and the white wall color makes the building appear bigger. Concerned
126 with site stability of the hillside.
127
128 Commissioner Desai inquired why it was recommended that this project be continued.
129 Director Gonzalez responded that staff had concerns with the redesign of the project. He
130 noted that the more information is required—more detail on site plan and building
131 sections. Also noted concerns about visibility of the house.
132
133 Commissioner Denison stated to remove existing height nonconformity; expressed water
134 supply and fire suppression concerns, and need for a site stability plan.
135
136 Public Comment -

137 It was noted that the Commission received a letter from a neighbor who was not in favor
138 of the project.

139
140 Commissioner Spears noted that the submitted drawings are from a designer rather than
141 an architect, and they were missing plans, grading plans, site lacking maintenance,
142 hillside stability.

143
144 ACTION: Commissioner Spears moved to continue this item to June 18, 2020.
145 Commissioner Desai seconded. Motion carried unanimously, with Chair Hutt recusing.
146

147 **Oral Communication**

148
149 **Audience**

150 None.


151
152 **Planning Commission**

153 Commissioner Dallas shared that she had been attending a webinar on Accessory
154 Dwelling Units by Cole Peterson.
155 Commissioner Pevsner requested agendaizing discussion about arbors in the front yard
156 setback.

157
158 **Staff**

159 Director Gonzalez stated that at the next meeting the Commission will consider the
160 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Report and a report from the Assistant City Attorney
161 regarding an update on Density Bonus legislation.
162 Deputy City Attorney Giragosian pointed out that the current ordinance is extremely out
163 of date.

164
165 Vice Chair Denison adjourned the meeting at 9:10 pm.

166
167 
168 _____
169 Secretary to the Planning Commission
170 Vincent Gonzalez, Director of Planning & Community Preservation