

PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
May 11, 2010

INITIATION:

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**
3. **ROLL CALL:**

Commissioners: Seibert, O' Leary, Chen, Horton, Valenzuela

Also Present: City Attorney Murphy, Community Development Manager Lambert, Associate Planner Liu, and Associate Planner Gulick

4. **TIME FOR THOSE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO WISH TO SPEAK:**

No one came forth at this time.

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

ALL CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS MAY BE APPROVED IN A SINGLE MOTION AS RECOMMENDED, UNLESS REMOVED FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION.

IF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION OR PERSONS IN THE AUDIENCE WISH TO DISCUSS ANY MATTERS LISTED ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR, (AGENDA ITEM A), PLEASE ADDRESS THEM AT THIS TIME.

- A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 27, 2010

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE AS SUBMITTED

Vice Chairman O'Leary – Made a motion to approve the Planning Commission Meeting minutes dated April 27, 2010, seconded by Commissioner Chen and unanimously carried.

6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** NONE

7. **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. APPEAL: APPEAL OF SITE PLAN REVIEW REGARDING A FAÇADE RENOVATION AT 9608 LAS TUNAS DRIVE

RECOMMENDATION: 1) HEAR STAFF REPORT
2) HEAR THOSE FOR AND AGAINST
3) UPHOLD STAFF'S DETERMINATION AND DENY THE SITE PLAN REVIEW

Chairman Seibert – Asked for a Staff Report.

Community Development Manager Lambert – Gave the Staff Report dated May 11, 2010.

Associate Planner Liu – Gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Chairman Seibert – Asked if there were any questions from the Planning Commissioners for the Staff. The Planning Commissioners had questions at this time.

Vice Chairman O’Leary – Asked Community Development Manger Lambert if the applicant had signed the Resolution accepting the conditions of approval.

Community Development Manger Lambert – Stated that the applicant had signed the Resolution accepting the conditions of approval.

Chairman Seibert – Asked if there were any additional questions from the Planning Commissioners for the Staff. The Planning Commissioners did not have any additional questions at this time. Invited the applicant to speak.

Xue Mei Ren, 493 Walnut, Arcadia, CA 91007 – Stated that she finds the proposed design favorable. Stated that she would like to have her representative speak for her.

Ben Dai, 7124 Sunny Glen Way, San Gabriel, CA 91775 – Stated that the applicant would like the restaurant to be visually pleasing to customers. Stated that the plan is not drawn to scale, and that the glass area is shorter than the sign area. Stated that he feels that the proposed plans would look better than the plans that were recommended by Staff. Stated that the applicant is afraid that the windows and the glass would be less noticeable if they followed Staffs direction. Stated that the applicant had already finished the work.

Chairman Seibert – Asked the applicant why they deviated from the plans that were approved by Staff.

Ben Dai, 7124 Sunny Glen Way, San Gabriel, CA 91775 – Stated that this is the first time that the applicant has been through this process. Stated that when the applicant spoke to the designer, she was told that it would be alright to remove the base treatment.

Chairman Seibert – Stated that Staff approved a plan and that plan was not followed.

Xue Mei Ren, 493 Walnut, Arcadia, CA 91007 – Stated that she was not aware of the guidelines, and she later received a Code Compliance notice from the City. Stated that she had already spent \$20,000.00 dollars on the façade of the building, and had already paid five months of rent.

Ben Dai, 7124 Sunny Glen Way, San Gabriel, CA 91775 – Stated that Ms. Ren would have to tear down everything and redo the entire façade of the building.

Chairman Seibert – Stated that he understands the applicant’s plight, however, she caused her own predicament.

Vice Chairmen O’Leary – Stated that if everyone did not follow the Downtown Specific Plan guidelines then there would not be any purpose of the Downtown Specific Plan.

Commissioner Chen – Asked Community Development Manager Lambert for clarification

regarding the deviation between the two plans.

Community Development Manager Lambert – Stated that the color elevation had been approved by Staff. Stated that the applicant was supposed to return with working drawings and go through building plan check, and then receive permits to start working on the facade. Stated that the proposed plans have elements that the Downtown Specific Plan encourages such as the base treatment. Stated that the applicant would like to have the windows drop to the floor, however, the Downtown Specific Plans discourages that design. Stated that the it would be best if the bulkhead projects out a few inches, and if the wall steps in slightly to give a tiered dimension. Stated that Staff would prefer a stone or brick veneer for the bulkhead along the bottom of the building. Stated that if the applicant left the design as is, it would not comply with the building code because the doors are flush with the elevation and open up onto the public sidewalk. Stated that the applicant already has installed the glass and the doors.

Commissioner Chen – Asked Community Development Manager if the windows would have to be removed if a stone veneer were placed at the bottom of the building.

Community Development Manager Lambert – Stated that placing a stone veneer directly on the glass may not work. Stated that if the building had a bulkhead base treatment, and a recessed entry, then this façade would be consistent with the principles of Staffs approval.

Chairman Seibert - Asked if anyone from the public would like to speak in favor or against the proposed request. Two people came forth at this time.

Mary Burke – Asked Community Development Manager Lambert if the colors on both of the designs were the same. Stated that she spoke at a City Council Meeting recently, regarding the different color schemes on the buildings throughout the City.

Community Development Manager Lambert – Stated that the colors on each plan are similar, and that applicant would like to use colors that are slightly different from Staff's recommendation.

Mary Kokayko – Stated that some of the colors along Las Tunas Drive are hideous. Stated that people feel that they could do whatever they want.

Chairman Seibert – Asked if there was anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on this item. No one came forth at this time.

Vice Chairman O'Leary – Made a motion to close the comment period, seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela and unanimously carried.

Vice Chairmen O'Leary – Stated that he concurs with the Staff's opinion that the proposed plan by the applicant should be denied.

Commissioner Chen – Stated that he also concurs with Staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Horton – Stated that it is regrettable that the applicant has spent time and money on the façade of this business and is glad that the business owner would like to operate their business in Temple City, however, he concurs with Staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Valenzuela – Stated that after reviewing the Planning Commission Minutes dated July 28, 2009, the applicant agreed to the conditions of approval. Stated that part of the conditions of approval included going through the site plan review process, and that their plans would be subject to the design review guidelines. Stated that the design they have proposed is not

consistent with the Downtown Specific Design Guidelines, hence he concurs with Staff's recommendation to deny the applicants site plan.

Chairman Seibert – Stated that he too agrees with Staff's opinion. Stated that he is frustrated that people sometimes think that they can do as they choose. Stated that in some cases he realizes that there is a language barrier, however, Staff has always been helpful and though it is a shame that money has been expended, the City codes are in place to ensure that the City is progressive and attractive.

Commissioner Valenzuela – Made a motion to uphold Staff's decision and deny the applicant's request to modify the approved façade design, seconded by Commissioner Horton and unanimously carried.

Chairman Seibert – Stated that the application was denied 5-0 and stated that there is a 15-day appeal/review period.

8. COMMUNICATIONS: NONE

9. MATTERS FROM CITY OFFICIALS: NONE

10. ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Seibert – Adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m. to the next Planning Commission meeting of May 25, 2010 at 7:30 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary