

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

**MINUTES  
April 1, 2021, 6:30 P.M.**

Topic: CVTC 4/1 LUC Meeting

Start Time : **Apr 1, 2021 06:30 PM Pacific Time** (US and Canada)

Meeting Recording (starts during Agenda Item #8):

<https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/g9IRmXRtXqVAEjzQRCArfsmkVY9kJ4UrmQIOyM7dkWv83J0mRUWe8SIJYstEv7P3.cMgWAQDnm1kTKG4s>

Access Passcode: Et7i.&k&

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/97589570194>

**Meeting ID: 975 8957 0194**

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 975 8957 0194

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/adW9xcsOvb>

Meeting called to order 6:35 PM by Frank Beyt

**OPENING BUSINESS**

1. Pledge of Allegiance – Frank Beyt
2. Roll Call: FB (Chair of this meeting), CD (Minutes), IC, CK, PR, SG (7:23pm)  
Absent: NE, JB, KH, AO
3. Approval of Agenda for April 1, 2021 – Motion by CD to move Item #9 LUC Terms before Information Items, seconded by PR. Approved 5:0, no abstentions.
4. Approval of Land Use Committee Minutes from March 4, 2021 – Motion by PR, seconded by IC  
Approved 5:0, no abstentions.
5. Public Comment – non agenda items. None.

**PUBLIC HEARING & ACTION ITEMS**

6. LUC Terms

Dec 2021 – Chris Kilpatrick\*, Ines Chessum, Kendall Hales

Dec 2022 – Cheryl Davis, Frank Beyt, Aram Ordubegian

Dec 2023 – James Bodnar, Nicole Englund, **Steve Goldsworthy**

\*Chris Kilpatrick’s term on the CVTC will expire in 2023.

- A. Thank you to Paul Rabinov – One recommendation from Paul is continued enforcement of the CSD.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

7. Los Angeles County Housing Element – additional communication with Zoe Axelrod and Ayala Scott  
Reminder to take the Housing Element Survey. Ines had questions regarding changing residential to commercial zoning. There was an email today explaining County is working on zoning parameters for housing to be developed. The By Right Housing Ordinance goes into effect on April 8th. It includes some basic development standards for residential-only projects in commercial zones. The standards establish setbacks for residential-only projects in commercial zones that are generally aligned with the setbacks required by multifamily residential zones. Nicole had a question on the Housing Element where proposing changes to some zoning in Montrose, a question about changing R-3 - H30 (0-30

units/acre) to R-4 - H50 (minimum 20, maximum 50 units/acre) - confirmed there is a new minimum and you have to put the minimum of 20 units. Zone R-5 – H100 (maximum 100 dwelling units/acre) or H150 (maximum 150 dwelling units/acre - these will be reviewed but by the time plans are reviewed, they'll look at impacts this densification will cost.

8. California State Laws regarding Housing, Victoria Dochoghlian from Assemblymember Laura Friedman's Office – Has taken Blake Dellinger's position in our area. (Blake is now the Communications Director.) Looking forward to hearing concerns and will come to the next meeting with a report. Will keep us up to date with what's happening on the State side. Blake would give us the gist of any bills that are in the works so we'll be interested in continuing that. For today, Victoria can share there are over 30 bills in the Assembly that have to do with housing (incentives for developers, CEQA regulations, etc.) but not much is happening yet since the year just began. Depending on our concerns and areas of concern, she'll filter it out and bring us the important ones.  
Ines – historically, areas with high density have the most to lose due to loss social interaction due to density. Fear is that people who worked to live in a community that is less dense, why is it right to choose less dense housing being removed from us? Email concerns to [Victoria.dochoghlian@asm.ca.gov](mailto:Victoria.dochoghlian@asm.ca.gov)  
Regarding the housing town hall we were planning pre-COVID, maybe we can discuss ADUs since that bill passed. Will possibly provide a legislative update next month.
9. 2434 Foothill Blvd (SE corner of Sunset), Mr. Garo Nazarian (Domus Design) – Project PRJ2020-001576; Plan RPPL2020005035 filed 8/10/2020. 4-story 31-unit apartment building with 2-level sub-garage. Providing three affordable units at 50% AMI and requesting 1 incentive - 10 feet height. Per Planner Elsa Rodriguez, project is ministerial/by right, but may become discretionary due to oak tree encroachments. (Zoned C-2-BE)  
Garo Nazarian – C-2-BE Zoning. Proposing apartment building with affordable unit incentives, providing 3 affordable units. Only the front on Foothill Blvd. is 4-story. 57 parking spaces required, but more are provided (62 spaces, 2 levels of parking) to minimize parking impact. No oak tree encroachment - the walkway exiting garage to Sunset has been fixed. We do not have the updated plans. Providing open space on podium level and upper levels on east and west side of the building. Providing more open space and landscaping than required (3,200 sq ft landscaping required 6,200-6,300 provided). Asking for one incentive – one story more to provide affordable units for the community. Driveway access is not on Foothill Blvd. Has complied with all zoning and setbacks and lot coverage.  
FB – Is encroachment issue no longer present? Yes. Elsa has an updated oak tree report from the arborist stating previous encroachment is no longer an issue. Driveway portion pushed back 2' to solve the issue. This is likely a by-right project.  
Elsa needs to finish reviewing and is about 50% done but for now it's looking entirely by-right or ministerial. Affordable units is 3 so 1 1-bdrm, 1 2-bdrm, 1 3-bdrm. Parking is satisfied. Still working through some of the CSD standards:
  - A. Step back abutting residential on Sunset – tiering effect really works and there is usable open space. Along Foothill, working through entrance and finishes including La Crescenta rock and ground floor transparency. Project is residential so ground floor transparency is difficult to meet so it might need to be an incentive or waived, which is allowed in affordable unit project, but it needs to be justified to deviate from such a standard to allow the units granted by the density bonus. Garo & Elsa are working through it. La Cr rock might be feasible and celebrating the entrance by adding more windows and making them taller. Driveway location avoids Foothill and is placed on the side street, Sunset.
  - B. On height – asking for 10' height incentive. Height measured from natural grade entirely. In this case, Garo's group and all other affordable projects can ask for more than 10' to accommodate the elevator shaft or stairwell overrun and in most cases, they ask for more than 10'.

- C. Ines – Elevation on Foothill – concern base of building needs to be articulated different than the middle and the top. Can anything be done at the base as windows facing Foothill are 5’ away from the sidewalk so due to busy street, there might be a loss of privacy. CSD states the base must be different.
  - D. 60% transparency is meant to for commercial so maybe this can be an incentive.
  - E. Biggest concern is on the rear is not stepped back as required by the CSD. The sections don’t show the Interpretation of 45 degree angle required in the CSD. The terracing is not sufficient to meet the requirements of CSD – it increases or decreases the floor height 10’ every 10’ of horizontal floor. Envelope was put in place to protect residential zones behind the project. Elsa would like to check with the Advanced Planning Dept to confirm. There is a diagram in the CSD that shows the envelope. Garo would like to review it and speak with Elsa Monday.
  - F. We would like to see the requirements of the CSD be met. Incentives under the density bonus are granted.
  - G. Elsa asked if the base along Foothill can base be enhanced? Garo always try to work with the community and will try to do something, but using river rock which is a heavy element which will support the base of the building. Maybe heavy structural elements like columns and bringing the river rock higher can work with it. Discussion of difference between La Crescenta rock versus river rock.
  - H. Harry Leon asked if neighbors within 500’ were notified of this project. The neighbors not notified because it’s ministerial. The project still needs to go through various departments for review - Public Works, Health Dept., Fire Department, etc.  
The project is ministerial but the rules of the CSD still apply.  
Concerns that the community isn’t informed. Planning can’t require developer present to the community, but it is highly recommended and the Town Council can help him with that. It is a large project and the community doesn’t necessarily understand the CSD or what a by-right project is. This project is actually under the bonus allowed here. Garo could request 35% (9 units) but they’re only asking for 25% (6 units). The developer is trying to provide quality of lifestyle to the neighborhood and affordable and compatible with the neighborhood rather than getting more units and having a negative impact. Harry requests Mr. Nazarian provide outreach to the neighbors. Garo doesn’t mind but time is an issue as well. Will coordinate with Elsa and maybe ask for Town Council’s help to contact the neighbors. Maybe a presentation at Town Council or another Land Use Meeting.
  - I. How do you determine the number of 3, 2, or 1 bedroom units? A real estate agent looks at the local market.
10. Glendale City Council Public Hearing on Appeal of Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976 located at 2941-2943 Honolulu Avenue – the appeal was heard last Tuesday (3/31). Conclusion was brought back with redesigns to address the requirements from the DRB conditions. After discussion the project was approved as presented so height reduced to meet current zoning and design made to be more residential looking as opposed to commercial looking. Garo Nazarian was the architect on that project as well. There was a condition to add more natural stone. Appellants feel the project feels more compatible but the mass and scale doesn’t meet the North Glendale Community Plan. The NGCP doesn’t have a clear metric of the 45 degree step backs. Neighborhood Associations will push back with City Council to have the community plans be clearer for the architects and the community. Encourages community outreach ahead of time through TC or neighborhood associations.

#### **FUTURE PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

- 11. Walgreens CUP renewal application for the continued sale of alcohol (3001 Foothill), Stephen Jamieson. Application not filed as March 29, 2021. Requested to attend May 6 LUC meeting.

## EARLY NOTIFICATION / APPLICATIONS FILED AT DEPT. REGIONAL PLANNING

12. Ocean View Bar & Grill – request for renewal of CUP for alcoholic beverages. Janelle Williams, Williams Land Use Services, [williamslanduse@yahoo.com](mailto:williamslanduse@yahoo.com) We have not heard anything from her. Frank will follow-up.
13. 2413 Foothill & 4521 Briggs (NW corner of Foothill & Briggs) - RPPL2019006557 housing permit associated with Conditional Use Permit RPPL2019006553 to establish a Mixed-use 40 unit, 52 feet tall, 5 stories (4 units affordable at 50% AMI) ground floor 2,500 sf commercial, 1,700 sf multipurpose room and 3 levels of underground parking (103 standard spaces) in the C-2-DP-BE zone. Requested 35% density bonus and 2 incentives (10 feet height increase and FAR) via Discretionary Housing Permit. RPPL 2019006559 is housing project next to it. No further information.

## UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

14. Update from Nicole Englund regarding the DRP's Design Review Committee
15. Next LUC meeting is May 6, 2021

## ADJOURNMENT at 7:38 pm

## INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

**Public Comment.** During the Public Comment period, any person may address the Committee concerning any item that is not listed on the agenda. The Committee welcomes your participation and input. When addressing the Committee, please begin by stating your name and address for the record. Please limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes in order to provide for an orderly and timely meeting.

**Action & Discussion.** No action or discussion may be undertaken by the Committee on any item if not posted on the agenda, except that Committee Members may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by the public, ask a question for clarification, or make a brief announcement. A Committee Member or the Committee itself may nominate a Committee Member to report back to the Committee at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter relevant to the purpose of the Committee or may choose to place the matter on a future agenda.

**Regular Meetings.** This is a regularly scheduled meeting of the Land Use Committee, which meets on the first Thursday of each month at 6:30 P.M. ~~at the La Crescenta Library Community, 2809 Foothill Blvd., La Crescenta, CA.~~ During the COVID-19 Safer at Home Order, Meetings will be held, as necessary, via Zoom. See [www.thecvcouncil.com](http://www.thecvcouncil.com) for more information.