
AGENDA
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

City Council Chamber
232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd.
Sierra Madre, California
Thursday, January 19, 2012
6:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

I. ROLL CALL Chairman Paschall, Commissioners Spears,
Frierman – Hunt, Pendlebury, Pevsner, Replogle,
Vandevelde

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

III. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION REGARDING:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL

Anticipated Litigation (Government Code Section 54956.9(b))
Number of potential cases: 1

<p><u><i>INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC</i></u></p>
--

The Planning Commission will consider the last item at 10:30 p.m. and they will adjourn the meeting by 11:00 p.m. The Planning Commission will continue all unfinished business to an adjourned meeting on the following Thursday at 7:00 p.m. or to a different time and date certain.

Copies of the Agenda are available for your convenience at the rear of the Council Chambers. State legislation (Govt. Code Section 54954.2) limits the Planning Commission's ability to take action on specific requests. Govt. Code Section 54954.2 limits the placement of items on the Agenda for action 72 hours prior to meetings, except for specific findings.

No action or discussion may be undertaken by the Planning Commission on any item if not posted on the agenda, except that Commissioners or staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by the public, a Council member or its staff may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement, or make a brief report on his or her own activities. A Commissioner or the Planning Commission itself may provide a reference to staff to report back to the Planning Commission at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter or may direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.

REQUIRED FINDINGS

Conditional Use Permit and Variance considerations are “quasi-judicial” decisions made by the Planning Commission. As such, these decisions may be challenged in court. Accordingly, courts require an adequate “record” to exercise judicial review. This means that the documentation supporting the approval or denial of a project must include an explanation of how the Planning Commission processed the raw information and evidence considered in reaching its decision. The California Supreme Court has laid down distinct, definitive principles of law detailing the need for findings when a public agency approves or denies a project while acting in a “quasi-judicial” roll. This decision is based upon the case, *Topanga Assoc. For a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (“Topanga”)*. The “Topanga” court outlined the following 5 purposes for making findings:

- Provide a framework for making principled decisions, enhancing the integrity of the administrative process;
- Facilitate orderly analysis and reduce the likelihood the agency will randomly leap from evidence to conclusions;
- Serve a public relations function by helping to persuade the parties that the administrative decision making is careful, reasoned, and equitable;
- Enable the parties to determine whether and on what basis they should seek judicial review and remedies; and,
- Apprise the reviewing court of the basis for the agency’s decision.

For more information on the necessary “Findings” that the Planning Commission must make, please contact the Development Services Department at (626) 355-7138.

(Source: Curtin’s California Land Use & Planning Law, Daniel J. Curtin, Jr., 2001)