# LA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA 

## A Regular Meeting

Date: $\quad$ Wednesday, May 1, 2024, 6:00 p.m.<br>Location: City Council Chambers, 8130 Allison Avenue<br>La Mesa, California<br>Commissioners: Chair Jerry Jones<br>Vice Chair Jonathan Frankel<br>Commissioner Andrew Torpey<br>Commissioner Lauren Cooper<br>Commissioner David Harris

The public may view the meeting in-person or live using the following remote options:
Teleconference Meeting Webinar
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84881824076

Telephone (Audio only)
(669) 900-6833 or (253) 215-8782 Webinar ID: 84881824076

Copy and paste the webinar link into your internet browser if the webinar link does not work directly from the agenda.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

- In-Person comments during the meeting: Join us for the Commission meeting at the time and location specified on this agenda to make your comments. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes.
- How to submit eComments: eComments are available once an agenda is published. Locate the meeting in "upcoming meetings" and click the comment bubble icon. Click on the item you wish to comment on. eComments can be submitted when the agenda is published and until $\underline{\mathbf{2 4}}$ hours prior to the meeting. eComments are limited to 3700
characters (approximately 500 words). eComments may be viewed by the Commission and members of the public following the close of the eComment submission period ( 24 hours prior to the meeting). Email your comment to planning@cityoflamesa.us if you have difficulty submitting an eComment. eComments will not be read aloud as a regular meeting item; however any member of the Commission or member of the public may do so during their respective comment time.

PLEASE NOTE: Public Comment will be limited to 3 minutes per item. The timer begins when the participant begins speaking. Time cannot by combined or yielded to another speaker.

Citizens who wish to make an audio/visual presentation pertaining to an item on the agenda, or during Public Comments, should contact the Community Development Department at 619.667.1176, no later than 12:00 p.m., the business day prior to the meeting day. Advance notification will ensure compatibility with City equipment and allow Commission meeting presentations to progress smoothly and in a consistent and equitable manner. Please note that all presentations/digital materials are considered part of the maximum time limit provided to speakers.

Agenda reports for items on this agenda are available for public review at the Community Development Department, 8130 Allison Avenue, during normal business hours.

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the Community Development Department, 8130 Allison Avenue, during normal business hours.

ACCESSIBILITY: The City of La Mesa encourages the participation of disabled individuals in the services, activities and programs provided by the City. Individuals with disabilities, who require reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the Commission meetings, should contact the Administrative Services Department 48 hours prior to the meeting at 619.667.1175, fax 619.667.1163, or GSpaniol@cityoflamesa.us.

Hearing assisted devices are available for the hearing impaired. A City staff member is available to provide these devices upon entry to City Council meetings, commission meetings or public hearings held in the City Council Chambers. A photo i.d. or signature will be required to secure a device for the meeting.

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

### 1.1 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

### 1.2 INVOCATION <br> Presented by Commissioner Harris

2. ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA
3. PUBLIC COMMENT - (TOTAL TIME - 15 MINUTES)

Note: In accordance with state law, an item not scheduled on the agenda may be brought forward by the general public for discussion; however, the Commission will not be able to take any action at this meeting. If appropriate, the item will be referred to staff or placed on a future agenda.
4. CONFLICT DISCLOSURES
5. CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar includes items considered to be routine. Unless discussion is requested by members of the Commission or audience, all Consent Calendar items may be approved by one motion.

### 5.1 APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION APRIL 17, 2024 MEETING

6. STAFF REPORTS
7. PROCEDURAL RULES FOR CONDUCT OF HEARINGS
8. HEARINGS
8.1 PROJECT 2023-0804

A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL PERMIT TO EXCEED THE SIX (6) FOOT MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW FOR AN EXISTING EIGHT (8) FOOT FENCE AROUND THE PROPERTY, AND TO EXCEED THE FOUR (4) FOOT MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT FOR FENCES LOCATED WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK TO ALLOW FOR A PROPOSED SIX (6) FOOT FENCE WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK LOCATED AT 4140 MERRITT BOULEVARD (APN 499-521-41-00) IN THE R1R-P (SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL/ SCENIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY) ZONE

## Recommended Motion:

1. Adopt a resolution (Attachment A) approving the Special Permit, subject to the conditions of approval.

## 9. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

10. ADJOURNMENT

# La Mesa Planning Commission Meeting Minutes 

| Date: | April 17, 2024, 6:00 p.m. <br> Cocation: <br> Ca Mesa, California |
| :--- | :--- |
| Present: | Chair Jones <br> Vice Chair Frankel <br> Commissioner Torpey <br> Commissioner Cooper <br> Commissioner Harris |
|  | Director of Community Development Santos <br> Staff: |
|  | Associate Planner Traffenstedt <br> Julia Carrillo |

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jones Call to Order 6:00 PM

### 1.1 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

### 1.2 INVOCATION

## 2. ADDITIONS AND/OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

No additions or deletions
3. PUBLIC COMMENT - (TOTAL TIME - 15 MINUTES)

Note: In accordance with state law, an item not scheduled on the agenda may be brought forward by the general public for discussion; however, the Commission will not be able to take any action at this meeting. If appropriate, the item will be referred to staff or placed on a future agenda.

No public comments

## 4. CONFLICT DISCLOSURES

No conflict disclosures

## 5. CONSENT CALENDAR

(Items 5.1 through 5.3)
The Consent Calendar includes items considered to be routine. Unless discussion is requested by members of the Commission or audience, all Consent Calendar items may be approved by one motion.

### 5.1 APPROV AL OF PLANNING COMMISSION DECEMBER 6, 2023 MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve - Cooper
Second - Frankel
5.2 APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION JANUARY 17, 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve - Cooper with correction to Commissioner's titles
Second - Frankel
5.3 APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION FEBRUARY 7, 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve - Cooper
Second - Frankel

## 6. STAFF REPORTS

### 6.1 PROJECT 2022-0898

CONSIDERATION OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR A PARKING MODIFICATION THAT WOULD ALLOW FOR A REDUCTION OF REQUIRED PARKING FOR A 3,694 SQUARE FOOT THIRD STORY ADDITION AND RENOVATION TO AN EXISTING TWO-STORY COMMERCIAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 8923 LA MESA BOULEVARD (APNS 490-472-31-00 AND 490-472-11-00) IN THE C-D-MU (GENERAL COMMERCIAL/URBAN DESIGN OVERLAY/MIXED USE OVERLAY) ZONE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING LOCATED ON A PARCEL TO THE NORTH AT 5264 WOOD STREET (APN 490-472-07-00) IN THE R3-P-MU (MULTIPLE UNIT RESIDENTIAL/SCENIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY/MIXED USE OVERLAY) ZONE

Moved by Chair Jones
Seconded by Commissioner Torpey

Adopt a resolution (Attachment A) to approve Project 2022-0898, subject to conditions of approval.

Yes (4): Chair Jones, Commissioner Torpey, Commissioner Cooper, and Commissioner Harris

No (1): Vice Chair Frankel
Motion Approved (4 to 1)

## 7. PROCEDURAL RULES FOR CONDUCT OF HEARINGS

8. HEARINGS
9. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

Work on scheduling 2024-25 Workplan Workshops
10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jones adjourns at 6:59 PM

REPORT to the LA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE:
SUBJECT:
DESCRIPTION:

May 1, 2024
PROJECT 2023-0804
A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL PERMIT TO EXCEED THE SIX (6) FOOT MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW FOR AN EXISTING EIGHT (8) FOOT FENCE AROUND THE PROPERTY, AND TO EXCEED THE FOUR (4) FOOT MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT FOR FENCES LOCATED WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK TO ALLOW FOR A PROPOSED SIX (6) FOOT FENCE WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK LOCATED AT 4140 MERRITT BOULEVARD (APN 499-521-41-00) IN THE R1R-P (SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL/ SCENIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY) ZONE

ISSUING DEPARTMENT: Community Development

Issue(s):

1. Should the Planning Commission approve a Special Permit to allow fences taller than 6 feet, and fences within the front setback taller than four feet?

Recommendation:

1. Adopt a resolution (Attachment A) approving the Special Permit, subject to the conditions of approval.

## Environmental Review:

This project has been determined to be Categorically Exempt from environmental review pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15303.

## Report to Planning Commission

Date: May 1, 2024
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## BACKGROUND:

The subject property is a 2.39 -acre (104,108 square foot) lot located on the west side of Merritt Boulevard, situated between Woodland Drive to the northeast and Panorama Drive to the southwest. State Route 94 is located just south of the subject property. The property slopes uphill from the southwest to the northeast, and is developed with an existing singlefamily residence.

Development on Merritt Boulevard is primarily single-family residential on existing sloped properties. The project site is located within the R1R-P (Semi-Rural Residential/ Scenic Preservation Overlay) zone and the General Plan Planned Land Use is Semi-Rural Residential, which is
 applied to suburban neighborhoods with lots of 14,000 square feet or larger, resulting in lower density developments with rural characteristics.

In the Scenic Preservation Overlay Zone, natural topography, vegetation, and scenic features of the site shall be retained insofar as feasible and incorporated into each proposed development with minimal grading. Since the property is already developed with a one-story, single-family residence, and no grading is proposed as part of the project, the natural topography, vegetation, and scenic features of the site are retained. Therefore, the project meets the intent of the Scenic Preservation Overlay zone and no further action related to the Scenic Preservation Overlay zone is required.

The applicant is requesting a special permit to allow for existing fencing that exceeds the fence height requirement in the R1R zone. In residential zones, including the subject R1R zone, "Fences or walls within the minimum front setback for a principal building shall not exceed four feet in height. Fences or walls in any other location shall not exceed six feet in height. However, fences or walls of greater height may be allowed by special permit, where topographic or other conditions reduce the effectiveness of normal height fences for privacy." The Planning Commission may authorize a Special Permit to allow for fences of greater height, if the required findings are made as per La Mesa Municipal Code (LMMC) Section 24.02.050. Project proposals shall be evaluated in terms of view obstruction, scale in relation to other structures in the vicinity, structure design, and

## Report to Planning Commission

Date: May 1, 2024
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offensive characteristics of potential use. As proposed, the existing fencing appears to meet these requirements.

In June of 2022, the City of La Mesa received a code compliance request to investigate whether an eight-foot-tall fence had been built on the subject property with benefit of permit. After review, the City determined and notified the property owners of 4140 Merritt that the existing fence exceeded the six-foot height limit, and a Special Permit application, reviewed by the Planning Commission, would be required to retain the fencing at the existing height(s) and location. Existing site photographs of the property and surrounding area are shown in Attachment B. The property owners have worked with the City in good faith to come into compliance, and have submitted a special permit application for the fencing on their property. Since applying for the special permit application, the City has received correspondence from a neighboring property expressing support for the project. The correspondence received can be found in Attachment C.

## DISCUSSION:

The application consists of a request to build a new 6-foot vinyl fence within the property's front setback along the south property line, and to permit an eight-foot vinyl fence along the eastern portion of the property. Project plans are provided as Attachment D. As discussed above, a Special Permit would be required for the height and location of the existing and proposed fencing on the site. Special Permits are required to expand the limits of certain development standards, when such expanded limits are reasonable but need evaluation of impact on adjacent properties and uses. If topographic or other conditions that reduce the effectiveness of normal height fences exist, then fences or walls of greater height than allowed per the La Mesa Municipal Code may be allowed by special permit. To grant a Special Permit for fencing exceeding the height limit, sufficient facts must be provided to address two required findings. Staff analysis shows that the proposed project meets the required findings as described below:

1. Will the location and characteristics of the proposed buildings and/or structures and the allowed use of them impact unfavorably upon adjacent properties?

The location and characteristics of the proposed fences and the allowed use of them would not impact unfavorably upon adjacent properties. The existing onestory, single-family residence, sits at a lower elevation than the two-story single-family residence located at the property adjacent to the east. The property owners are proposing to maintain an eight-foot fence along the east property line to provide further privacy and maintain the rural character of the property. It does not appear that the eight-foot fence would obstruct the viewshed from the residence located on the property located adjacent to the
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east, and the fence appears to be to scale in relation to the surrounding twostory structure on the adjacent property that sits at a higher elevation.

Along the south portion of the property within the front setback, six-foot-tall fences are proposed, exceeding the height limit of four-feet within the front setback. At the southeast corner of the site, the proposed fence would be constructed on top of an existing four-foot retaining wall for a maximum wall height of eight feet, measured from the average point of the finished grade. The property owner has indicated to staff that since the property sits at a lower elevation than Merritt Boulevard, a 6-foot-high fence on top of a four-foot retaining wall along the street frontage is necessary for privacy and safety concerns raised due to trespassing that has occurred on their property. In addition, the Director of Public Works and the Director of Community Development determined that the proposed fencing within the front setback does not interfere with sight distance necessary for the safe passage of vehicles and pedestrians as the existing 6 -foot fence is set behind existing landscaping and topography of the subject property and Merritt Boulevard.

The existing and proposed fences are also not directly along the property lines, allowing for vegetation to be maintained between the fences and the property lines. Existing landscaping is proposed to be maintained, and will provide visual interest while softening the height of the fences along the adjacent property to the east and the street frontage. Since the surrounding properties, including the property adjacent to the east and the properties located across Merritt Boulevard sit at a higher elevation than the subject property, the topographic conditions reduce the effectiveness of normal height fences for the subject property's privacy. Therefore, the proposed fencing in conjunction with the existing site features does not unfavorably impact adjacent and surrounding properties.
2. Is the project consistent with the design objectives established as policy of the City Council?

While there are no specific design objectives for fences in residential zones, the property owner chose a commonly used fencing material, white vinyl fencing, along the south and east property lines. Vinyl fencing is a popular fence material within single-family residences across La Mesa. Vinyl fencing is often stronger and more durable than wood fencing and can be an effective choice for large areas to maintain privacy and keep in or out animals. There is no offensive characteristic of the potential use of a six or eight-foot fence as proposed to remain as there is no view obstruction, due to topographic conditions it is not out of scale in relation to other structures in the vicinity, and
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as stated, it is a durable material and the structure design provides for both privacy and safety.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project is exempt from environmental review in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15303. Section 15303 exempts the construction of accessory structures, including fences. The project meets all of the conditions necessary to qualify for the exemptions and none of the exceptions listed in Section 15300.2 apply.

## CONCLUSION:

Adopt a resolution (Attachment A) to approve Project 2023-0804, subject to conditions of approval.

Respectfully submitted by:


Laura Traffenstedt
Associate Planner

Reviewed by:

Lynnette Santos

## Lynnette Santos <br> Director of Community Development

Attachments:
A. Draft Planning Commission Resolution
B. Site Photographs
C. Public Correspondence
D. Project Plans


#### Abstract

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LA MESA APPROVING PROJECT 2023-0804 - A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL PERMIT TO EXCEED THE SIX (6) FOOT MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW FOR AN EXISTING EIGHT (8) FOOT FENCE AROUND THE PROPERTY, AND TO EXCEED THE FOUR (4) FOOT MAXIMUM FENCE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT FOR FENCES LOCATED WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK TO ALLOW FOR A PROPOSED SIX (6) FOOT FENCE WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK LOCATED AT 4140 MERRITT BOULEVARD (APN 499-521-41-00) IN THE R1R-P (SEMI-RURAL RESIDENTIAL/SCENIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY) ZONE.


WHEREAS, the property owner submitted an application for a special permit to exceed the six (6) foot maximum fence height requirement to allow for an existing eight (8) foot fence around the property, and to exceed the four (4) foot maximum fence height requirement for fences located within the front setback to allow for a proposed six (6) foot fence within the front setback located at 4140 Merritt Boulevard (APN 499-521-41-00) in the R1R-P (Semi-Rural Residential/Scenic Preservation Overlay) zone;

WHEREAS, La Mesa Municipal Code (LMMC) Section 24.05.030I provides that fences of a greater height than typically allowed may be approved by a special permit where topographic or other conditions reduce the effectiveness of normal height fences for privacy;

WHEREAS; pursuant to LMMC Section 24.02.040, the Planning Commission may authorize a special permit to expand the limits of certain development standards, when such expanded limits are reasonable but need evaluation of impact on adjacent properties and uses;

WHEREAS; project proposals for a special permit shall be evaluated in terms of view obstruction, scale in relation to other structures in the vicinity, structure design, and offensive characteristics of potential use;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission did receive and consider a staff report for the proposal; and

WHEREAS, on May 1, 2024, the Planning Commission of the City of La Mesa did hold a duly noticed public hearing and accepted public testimony in consideration of Project No. 20230804.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION FINDS AND DETERMINES AS FOLLOWS:

1. The project is exempt from environmental review in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15303. Section 15303 allows exemptions for accessory structures, including fences. The project meets all of the conditions necessary to qualify for the exemption and none of the exceptions listed in Section 15300.2 apply.
2. Special Permit Findings (LMMC Section 24.02.050):
A. The location and characteristics of the proposed buildings and/or structures, and the allowed uses of them, will not impact unfavorably upon adjacent properties.

The location and characteristics of the proposed fences and the allowed use of
them would not impact unfavorably upon adjacent properties. The existing onestory, single-family residence, sits at a lower elevation than the two-story singlefamily residence located at the property adjacent to the east. The property owners are proposing to maintain an eight-foot fence along the east property line to provide further privacy and maintain the rural character of the property. It does not appear that the eight-foot fence would obstruct the viewshed from the residence located on the property located adjacent to the east, and the fence appears to be to scale in relation to the surrounding two-story structure on the adjacent property that sits at a higher elevation.

Along the south portion of the property within the front setback, six-foot-tall fences are proposed, exceeding the height limit of four-feet within the front setback. At the southeast corner of the site, the proposed fence would be constructed on top of an existing four-foot retaining wall for a maximum wall height of eight feet, measured from the average point of the finished grade. The property owner has indicated to staff that since the property sits at a lower elevation than Merritt Boulevard, a 6-foot-high fence on top of a four-foot retaining wall along the street frontage is necessary for privacy and safety concerns raised due to trespassing that has occurred on their property. In addition, the Director of Public Works and the Director of Community Development determined that the proposed fencing within the front setback does not interfere with sight distance necessary for the safe passage of vehicles and pedestrians as the existing 6 -foot fence is set behind existing landscaping and topography of the subject property and Merritt Boulevard.

The existing and proposed fences are also not directly along the property lines, allowing for vegetation to be maintained between the fences and the property lines. Existing landscaping is proposed to be maintained, and will provide visual interest while softening the height of the fences along the adjacent property to the east and the street frontage. Since the surrounding properties, including the property adjacent to the east and the properties located across Merritt Boulevard sit at a higher elevation than the subject property, the topographic conditions reduce the effectiveness of normal height fences for the subject property's privacy. Therefore, the proposed fencing in conjunction with the existing site features does not unfavorably impact adjacent and surrounding properties.
B. The project is consistent with the design objectives established as policy of the city council.

While there are no specific design objectives for fences in residential zones, the property owner chose a commonly used fencing material, white vinyl fencing, along the south and east property lines. Vinyl fencing is a popular fence material within single-family residences across La Mesa. Vinyl fencing is often stronger and more durable than wood fencing and can be an effective choice for large areas to maintain privacy and keep in or out animals. There is no offensive characteristic of the potential use of a six or eight-foot fence as proposed to remain as there is no view obstruction, due to topographic conditions it is not out of scale in relation to other structures in the vicinity, and as stated, it is a durable material and the structure design provides for both privacy and safety.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LA MESA AS FOLLOWS:

1. The foregoing findings of fact and determinations are true and hereby made a part hereof.
2. The foregoing findings of fact and determinations are supported by the staff report, plans, and exhibits, all of which are herein incorporated by reference.
3. The Planning Commission approves Project No. 2023-0804, subject to the conditions in Exhibit $A$.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of La Mesa, California, held the $1^{\text {st }}$ day of May, 2024, by the following vote, to wit:

## AYES:

NOES:

## ABSENT:

I, Lynnette Santos, Secretary of the City of La Mesa Planning Commission, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and exact copy of Resolution PC-2024-XX, duly passed and adopted by the Planning Commission.

Lynnette Santos, Secretary La Mesa Planning Commission

Exhibit A<br>PC Resolution PC-2024-XX<br>Project 2023-0804<br>Conditions of Approval

## A. GENERAL CONDITIONS:

1. The project is conditionally approved as set forth on the application and project drawings received electronically by the City on April 10, 2024, consisting of two (2) sheets total, including Sheet A1 - Site Plan and Sheet A2 - Fence Elevations all designated as approved by the Planning Commission on May 1, 2024, and shall not be altered without express authorization by the Community Development Department.
2. This approval shall not waive compliance with any section of the La Mesa Municipal Code and all other applicable City regulations in effect at the time of Building Permit issuance unless specifically waived herein.
3. This approval is for the proposed fencing as shown on the project drawings received electronically by the City on April 10, 2024, and does not approve any other grading or construction on the site.
4. Prior to any use or issuance of final occupancy of the project site pursuant to this approval, all conditions of approval contained herein shall be completed or secured to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department.
5. The applicant is responsible for coordinating architectural plans and supplemental materials at building permit submittal to ensure that all project plans and materials are internally consistent and consistent with each other. Inconsistent construction documents will not be accepted.
6. This constitutes an approval of the discretionary entitlement only. Additional permits, including but not limited to building and grading permits, may be required by the Community Development Department or other City departments prior to commencement of construction and/or use. It is the property owner and applicant's responsibility to obtain all necessary permits required for the type of project proposed.
7. The Owner(s) shall waive any claims of liability against the City and indemnify, hold harmless and defend the City and City's employees regarding any component of the City's approval, and shall execute an indemnity agreement in substantially the form as provided by the Community Development Department prior to building permit issuance, initiating use in reliance of this permit, recordation of the final map and/or recordation of the final parcel map, as applicable, and the Community Development Director is hereby authorized to execute the same.

## B. THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE SATISFIED PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:

## Planning

1. All specimen trees removed shall be replaced with healthy trees also of specimen size in accordance with the Scenic Preservation Overlay zone.
C. THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE SATISFIED PRIOR TO FINAL CONSTRUCTION:

## Building

1. The applicant shall obtain final approvals from all departments for all issued permits: building and planning.

## Subject Property





| From: | Adam Mindell [adammindell@hotmail.com](mailto:adammindell@hotmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:59 PM |
| To: | Laura Traffenstedt |
| Subject: | Fence on Ron \& Ann Musgrove's property - 4140 Merritt Blvd. |
|  |  |
| Follow Up Flag: | Follow up |
| Flag Status: | Flagged |

CAUTION: [EXTERNAL EMAIL] Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Laura, I live right across the street from the Musgrove's. First of all, they are both lovely people - friendly and considerate. They explained to me about the fence they want to put up - particularly the fact that they need an 8 foot high fence due to the fact that their property and driveway are a few feet lower than the street. It totally makes sense that their fence would have to be taller to be functional in their case, otherwise it would be useless. My house is directly across the street and would probably be the only one that could even potentially see it. My house is also elevated a few feet above the street so in no way, shape or form would it ever impact my view in that direction, not that I would care anyway. Please approve their permit as it will also make the neighborhood safer ie. less homeless/transient population wandering into their canyon.

Sincerely, Adam Mindell
Sent from my iPhone



