

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF BRADBURY, HELD ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017 AT 7:00 PM
IN THE BRADBURY CIVIC CENTER**

- Meeting Called to Order and Pledge of Allegiance:** The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Bradbury was called to order by Chairperson Kuba at 7:00 p.m. Vice-Chairman Hernandez led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- Roll Call:** PRESENT: Chairperson Kuba, Vice-Chairman Hernandez, Commissioners Dunst and Esparza
- ABSENT: Commissioner Novodor
- STAFF: Interim City Manager Inman, City Planner McIntosh, City Clerk Saldana and Management Analyst Parker-St John
- Commissioner Novodor Excused:** Commissioner Esparza made a motion to excuse Commissioner Novodor from the meeting. Commissioner Dunst seconded the motion, which carried.
- Approval of Agenda:** Commissioner Dunst approved the agenda as presented. Commissioner Esparza seconded the motion, which carried.
- Approval of December 14, 2016 Minutes:** Commissioner Esparza made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Dunst seconded the motion, which carried.
- Compliance with Fair Political Practices Act:** In compliance with the California State Fair Political Practices Act, each Commissioner has the responsibility to disclose direct or indirect potential for a personal financial impact as a result of participation in the decision making process concerning development applications.
- Public Hearings:** 6.A 338 Mount Olive Drive:
Commissioners residing within 500 feet of 338 Mount Olive Drive:
Commissioner Novodor (not present)
- Motion:** Commissioner Dunst made a motion to order the Fair Political Practices Report dated February 17, 2017 received and filed. Commissioner Esparza seconded the motion, which carried.
- 338 Mount Olive Drive:** *Architectural Review AR 16-014*
Neighborhood Compatibility NC 16-011
- Project Description:** City Planner McIntosh stated that this is a request by Steven Phillips, Architect AIA, on behalf of 338 Mount Olive LLC (Patricia Hou and Howard Li) to construct a two-story, split level 19,000 square foot development, including a 14,362 square foot house, a 1,001 square foot guest house, and a 3,448 square foot (7 or 8 car) subterranean garage. The site is in the A-2 zone. The lot size is 88,753 square feet. The site is currently vacant. The development pad is flat and graded. The Architectural Review is for a structure over 1,000 square feet in size. The Neighborhood Compatibility is for structures greater than one-story in height.

Analysis: City Planner McIntosh stated that there are several concerns regarding this request. First, the applicant submitted a set of drawings for the agenda packet that do not match the plans submitted with the application. There are features in the new plans that would not be permitted because they exceed the massing allowed in regards to height and setbacks. The revised plans would require at least two variances.

Second, neither iteration of the plans – those submitted with the application, nor those submitted with the agenda packet – meet neighborhood compatibility and architectural review findings.

Neighborhood Compatibility Findings: Section 9.04.050.040 of the Development Code has standards for determining neighborhood compatibility. The size, site design, and architectural style of this project do not meet the neighborhood compatibility requirements. Both the application set of plan, and the agenda packet set of plans, depict a development that is not compatible with the Mount Olive Drive neighborhood. The development square footage (19,000) far exceeds the typical single-family homes in the neighborhood (3,000 to 6,000 square feet). Other recent new development on Mount Olive Drive is half this size, including the neighboring property at 330 Mount Olive, and the project across the street at 333 Mount Olive.

Architectural Review Findings: Section 9.04.030.030C of the Development Code states that the Commission may approve, conditionally approve, disapprove or approve as modified any design or project given architectural review. No application shall be approved unless the Commission determines the following:

1. That the proposed development is designed and will be developed to preserve to the greatest extent practicable the nature features of the land, including the existing topography and landscaping; and
2. That the proposed development is designed and will be developed in a manner which will be reasonably compatible with the existing neighborhood character in terms of scale of development in relation to surrounding residences and other structures.

Staff does not feel that this project meets numbers those findings. Simply stated, the development is too large for this site and this neighborhood. The French Neoclassical architectural style is not uncommon in the Bradbury Estates, but it is not a style used in the Mount Olive Drive neighborhood. Allowing an austere and massive frontage at this location, atop a highpoint along Mount Olive Drive, would be a significant departure from previous approvals.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing, receive a staff report and a presentation of the project by the architect, receive public testimony, deliberate regarding the merits of the project, and adopt Resolution No. PC 17-262, denying the applications.

Environmental: The proposed project is Categorical Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15302 (New Construction) and Section 15332 (In-Fill Development) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Alternatives: City Planner McIntosh stated that the Planning Commission has the following options:

OPTION 1: Open the public hearing tonight and deny the application based on the inability to make the required findings (Staff Recommendation).

OPTION 2: Continue the public hearing open, find that the requested plan approval may be appropriate with certain design modifications, and/or additional permit requests that meet the zoning code, the neighborhood compatibility findings and architectural review findings. Direct the applicant to revise the plans and continue the hearing to a future date.

Public Hearing Opened: Chairperson Kuba opened the public hearing and asked those wishing to speak in favor or opposition to come forward and be heard.

Public Testimony: Steven Phillips, Architect, apologized for the mix up with the plans. After giving his presentation Mr. Phillips stated that he needed more time to revise the plans and asked the Commission to consider continuing the public hearing.

Patricia Hou, property owner, stated that she has been working on this project for about three years. Ms. Hou stated that the house cannot be seen from Mount Olive Drive but possibly from the Duarte Mesa. The footprint of the house is 6,000 square feet, compatible with other houses in the neighborhood.

Walt Dahlem, 160 Mount Olive Drive, asked what the height limit is for Mount Olive Drive. City Planner McIntosh stated that it is 28 feet.

Public Hearing Closed: There being no further public testimony, Chairperson Kuba declared the public hearing closed.

Discussion: Commissioner Dunst stated that the Commission needs more accurate information to make a decision. Commissioner Dunst also stated that the main house and guest house are totally different styles.

Vice-Chairman Hernandez suggested to the applicant to get rid of the variances (side yard setback and height limit).

Commissioner Esparza was concerned about the project being double the size of other projects on Mount Olive Drive. Commissioner Esparza also stated that the City does not allow equipment on the roof top and wasn't sure if that applies to solar panels as well.

Commissioner Dunst suggested to the applicant to put up story poles.

**Motion to Continue
Public Hearing:**

Commissioner Dunst made a motion to continue the public hearing open for 338 Mount Olive Drive. The applicant, Steven Phillips, was directed to submit revised plans to eliminate the 3-story appearance, eliminate the need for variances, and to erect story poles. Commissioner Esparza seconded the motion, which was carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Chairperson Kuba, Vice-Chairman Hernandez, Commissioners Esparza and Dunst

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Novodor

ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried 4:0

Public Comment:

None

**Reports and Items for
Future Agendas:**

Commission Members: The Planning Commission inquired about the drainage from 534 Old Ranch Road (Beltre) onto Lemon Avenue. Interim City Manager Inman stated that the City Engineer is working closely with the builder to keep the drainage under control.

City Planner: City Planner McIntosh informed the Commission that the applicant for 28 Dovetail Lane did not appeal the Planning Commission's decision to deny the project.

The applicant for 412 Mount Olive Drive withdrew the application for a proposed addition.

City Planner McIntosh stated that the monthly Development Review - Project Status Log for February 2017 will be emailed after the Development Team meeting on March 6th.

Adjournment:

At 8:00 p.m. Chairperson Kuba adjourned the meeting to Wednesday, February 22, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.



Darlene Kuba – Chairperson

ATTEST:


Claudia Saldana - City Clerk