

**LAND USE COMMITTEE
OF THE CRESCENTA VALLEY TOWN COUNCIL**

**MEETING MINUTES
November 12, 2015**

La Crescenta Library Community Room, 2809 Foothill Blvd., La Crescenta, CA

CALL TO ORDER: 6:33 pm

OPENING BUSINESS

1. Roll Call: Present: C. Davis, P. Rabinov, J. Bodnar, I. Chessum, F. Beyt, and K. Hales (6:35 pm), M. Claessens (6:39 pm), A. Ordubegian (6:44 pm). Absent: N. Englund
2. Approval of Agenda for November 12, 2015 with amendment to move Information Items before Public Hearing & Action Items- FB,PR (Passed Unanimously, CD,PR,JB,IC, and FB)
3. Approval of Land Use Committee Minutes August 13, 2015 – PR,FB (Passed Unanimously, CD,PR,JB,IC, and FB)
4. Public Comments – none on items not on agenda

INFORMATION ITEMS

5. Report by Town Council President on interaction with LA County Planning Commission

President Robbyn Battles – the LUC could benefit by using the Planning language and looking at the code before making a recommendation. Need to look at whether the project is putting an undue burden on neighbors. No indication of denial for the Park Project. Could have a standard set of information for proponents of project. The planners do not always understand the “lay of the land” relevant to the project. Traffic concerns are not a major element because traffic in La Crescenta is much lower than many areas in Los Angeles County. Structuring the LUC Hearings similar to Planning could benefit the process. Suggest LUC could benefit by watching or attending the Planning Commission meeting. LUC could also benefit by getting involved earlier on in the process before a as **DRP staff** recommendation is being developed. **At least one LUC member should become a point person with any given project, and remain in contact with the planners as they develop their recommendations.**

PUBLIC HEARING & ACTION ITEMS

6. **In attendance from the DRP were: Carmen Sainz Supervising Regional Planner, Community Studies East and Philip Estes, Principal Planner.**

Process and schedule for review of the draft La Crescenta/Montrose Community Standards District

- **Once LUC comments are incorporated, the draft will have to go through additional county review, not only the DRP but also other agencies such as Public Works, Fire, etc. after LUC comments are incorporated.**
- ~~The process will continue to be public and will also involve the Crescenta Valley Town Council. Once the LUC completes the review of the CSD, it will be presented to the CVTC and the public at large.~~

7. Review of the draft La Crescenta/Montrose Community Standards District by CS and PE.

- The proposed draft of the CSD follows the existing format, but the format will change, ~~without changing words.~~ , as DRP is reformatting all CSDs to a new consistent format throughout, the content will remain.
- Parking Policy Memo – existing buildings ~~are~~ parking requirements can be grandfathered when occupancy is changed. If one built additional square footage one would need to add additional parking for the additional square footage only.
- Parking Idea – can the county purchase vacant lots along Foothill Blvd. to improve parking along Foothill Blvd.? That would come under a Community Development Commission (CDC) purview and typically a county property is assigned for that purpose. AO will look into it.
- Mansionization – the size of residential homes will be addressed under a separate process.
- Massage Parlors – need a CUP, if existing they have five years to come into compliance.
- Structure Design – suggested to modify that the five design features include at least five of the design features consistently and clearly visible from the street (Section G.9, page 10 unedited).
- Building Top “The differentiation may be significant or subtle, and possible approaches ~~from~~for this differentiation ~~and~~include variations in color, materials, ornamentation, or shape.” (Section G.11.b.3, page 13 unedited).
- Remove “Downspouts should be concealed within walls.” (Section G.11, b.4, page 13 unedited).
- Remove duplicate “Building walls” (Section 12.a.ii, page 13 unedited).

Stopped at Awnings (Section G.16, page 27 unedited).

8. Staggering of Land Use Committee terms and appointments (postponed discussion).

FUTURE PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

9. None

EARLY NOTIFICATION / APPLICATIONS FILED AT DEPT. REGIONAL PLANNING

10. None

UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

11. None

CLOSED SESSION

12. None

ADJOURNMENT: 8:50 pm