

I N D E X

TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL - AUGUST 11, 1987

<u>SUBJECT:</u>	<u>PAGE:</u>
<u>OPENING CEREMONIES:</u>	
1. Call to Order	1
2. Roll Call	1
3. Flag Salute/Invocation	1
4. Approval of Minutes/Motion to Waive Further Reading	1- 2
5. Motion re Posting of Agenda	2
6. Withdrawn or Deferred Items	1
7. Council Committee Meetings	2
<u>8. COMMUNITY MATTERS:</u>	
8a. Recognition of Amanda Virginia Van Deusen	2- 3
8b. Introduction of Rotary Club Exchange Visitors	3
8c. Recognition of Former Cable TV Advisory Board Members	3- 4
8d. Civic Center Authority Appointment	4
<u>9. LIBRARY/PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS:</u>	
9a. Appointment to Senior Citizens Council	5
9b. Senior Citizens Council 1986-87 Annual Report	5
9c. Designation of Leader of Kashiwa Delegation	5- 6
9d. Reallocation of Grant Monies	6- 7
<u>10. TRANSPORTATION/PUBLIC WORKS MATTER:</u>	
10a. General Aviation Center Schematic Design Drawings	7-21
<u>12. PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS:</u>	
12a. Findings re Denial of PP 8-13 - Ellingson	30
<u>13. ENVIRONMENTAL/BUILDING AND SAFETY MATTERS:</u>	
13a. Appeal of Sign Case S80-2 - Del Amo Fashion Center	30-31
13b. Recommendation for Resolution re Air Safety Matters	31-33
<u>15. HEARINGS:</u>	
15a. PP 87-17, Nick and Tami Hansen	22-30
15b. Ordinance Change re Commercial/Industrial Parking	33-35
<u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u>	
17a. Adoption of MOI's, MOU's and Supplemental MOU's	39
17b. Executive Session	38
<u>20. CONSENT CALENDAR:</u>	
20a. Release of Subdivision Bonds - Tract No. 27617	36
20b. Award of Contract - Radar Units	36
<u>22. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:</u>	
22a. Councilman Applegate re commuter helicopter traffic	37
22b. Councilman Applegate re fishing trip	37
22c. Councilman Nakano re FAA authority	37
22d. Councilman Nakano re transportation for senior citizens	37
22e. Councilman Walker re Councilman Applegate's trip	37
22f. Councilman Wirth re marriage of Ms. Hardison's son	37
22g. Councilman Wirth re marriage of Mr. Brewster's daughter	38
22h. Councilman Wirth re Del Amo Fashion Center request	38
22i. Mayor Geissert re tie-down space at the Airport	38
<u>23. ADJOURNMENT:</u> 1:36 a.m. Wednesday, August 12	39

* * *

Marlene Lewis
Minute Secretary

City Council
August 11, 1987

August 11, 1987

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL

OPENING CEREMONIES:

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The Torrance City Council convened in a regular meeting at 7:02 p.m. on Tuesday, August 11, 1987, in the Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall, 3031 Torrance Boulevard.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Councilmembers Applegate, Hardison, Mock, Nakano, Wirth, and Mayor Geissert. Councilman Walker arrived immediately following roll call.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Manager Jackson, City Attorney Remelmeyer, and Staff Representatives.

3. FLAG SALUTE/INVOCATION:

The Flag Salute was led by Boy Scout Troop No. 310 under the direction of Scoutmaster James Gordon.

Mr. Bob Monroe, Lay Leader, Calvery Chapel, provided the invocation for the meeting.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES/MOTION TO WAIVE FURTHER READING:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to approve the City Council minutes of July 14, 1987. Councilman Wirth seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous roll call vote.

City Council
August 11, 1987

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved that after the Deputy City Clerk has assigned a number and read title to any resolution or ordinance on tonight's agenda, the further reading thereof be waived, reserving and guaranteeing to each Councilmember the right to demand the reading of any such resolution or ordinance in regular order. This motion was seconded by Councilwoman Har-dison and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

5. MOTION RE POSTING OF AGENDA:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to accept and file the report of the City Clerk on the posting of the agenda for this meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilman Mock and carried by unanimous roll call vote.

6. WITHDRAWN OR DEFERRED AGENDA ITEMS:

City Manager Jackson announced that the City had received from the applicant a request for continuance on Agenda Item 13a, an appeal of the Environmental Quality Commission's denial of a request by Del Amo Fashion Square for four electronic readerboard ground signs (S80-2).

It was suggested by staff that this matter be postponed to September 22, 1987 and there were no objections voiced. (See Page 31 for formal action on this matter.)

7. COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

None announced.

8. COMMUNITY MATTERS:

8a. RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING AMANDA VIRGINIA VAN DEUSEN:

At the request of Mayor Geissert, Deputy City Clerk Hong read number and title to:

RESOLUTION NO. 87-190

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF TORRANCE COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING
AMANDA VIRGINIA VAN DEUSEN
FOR HER OUTSTANDING SERVICE ON BEHALF OF THE
MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY ASSOCIATION AND THE
CITY OF TORRANCE

City Council
August 11, 1987

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 87-190. The motion, seconded by Councilman Wirth, carried by unanimous roll call vote.

It was with expressed pride that Mayor Geissert invited 11-year-old Amanda Virginia Van Deusen to join her at the podium whereupon the Mayor read the resolution aloud and, on behalf of the entire City Council and the people of the City of Torrance, presented this framed document to Miss Van Deusen together with a pin commemorating the City's 75th Anniversary.

Miss Van Deusen accepted the honor bestowed upon her with voiced appreciation.

8b. INTRODUCTION OF ROTARY CLUB EXCHANGE PROGRAM VISITORS:

At the Mayor's request, Mr. John Ashley (President of the Del Amo Rotary Club) provided a brief history of the Rotary's Exchange Program with England and Japan initiated 17 years ago to promote the exchange of cultural good will and understanding.

Mr. Ashley then introduced this year's visitors, Maki Inomata and Sakota Susuki from Urawa City, Japan (who presented the Mayor with a memento from their country), and Michael Burley and Christine Oakley from Fareham, England.

On behalf of the City Council, the Mayor welcomed these guests and presented them with mementos as a token of friendship and as a remembrance of their visit to the City of Torrance.

Speaking for the entire group, Michael Burley expressed appreciation to the Mayor, City Council, and all of those people responsible for the Exchange Program.

8c. PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION TO FORMER CABLE TV ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:

The establishment of the Cable TV Advisory Board, its accomplishments, and its ultimate reorganization were reviewed by Mayor Geissert as a prelude to her presentation of Certificates of Appreciation to former members of the original Board.

Present to receive their Certificate were:

Jo-Ann Waller
John Alter
Una Bullard
Sue Herbers

City Council
August 11, 1987

The Mayor also recognized former members of the original Cable TV Advisory Board who could not be present at the meeting:

Kathryn Joiner
Charlotte Lobb
Robert Pedersen
Janice Williams

On behalf of the entire City Council, Mrs. Geissert thanked these former Board members for their service to the City of Torrance.

8d. LOS ANGELES COUNTY-TORRANCE CIVIC CENTER AUTHORITY
APPOINTMENT:

Mayor Geissert announced that there were two applicants for the Los Angeles County-Torrance Civic Center Authority and noted that copies of their resumes were in the hands of Councilmembers.

At the Mayor's request, applicants Henry Carlson and Cecilia Laxton briefly commented on their interests and qualifications, whereupon Mayor Geissert entertained nominations.

Councilwoman Hardison nominated Cecilia Laxton.

Ms. Laxton having mentioned during her discourse that she is currently a member of the Fine Arts Commission, Councilman Mock questioned whether she would be allowed to serve on both bodies, if selected.

There were responses by both the City Manager and the City Attorney, the latter stating that a person may not be a member of two commissions, but may be a member of a commission and the Authority (examples were noted).

MOTION: Councilman Walker moved for a unanimous ballot. Seconded by Councilman Wirth, his motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Following the appointment, the Council thanked Mr. Carlson for his interest in the Authority and Deputy City Clerk Hong administered the oath of office to the new appointee.

Mayor Geissert, on behalf of the entire Council, congratulated Cecilia Laxton on her appointment.

City Council
August 11, 1987

9. LIBRARY/PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS:

9a. APPOINTMENT OF A TORRANCE ADULT CLUB REPRESENTATIVE TO THE SENIOR CITIZENS COUNCIL:

RECOMMENDATION:

The Parks and Recreation Director recommends that the City Council confirm the appointment of Delores Tiernan as the Torrance Adult Club representative to the Senior Citizens Council.

MOTION: Councilman Wirth moved to concur with the staff recommendation and confirm the appointment of Delores Tiernan as the representative of the Torrance Adult Club to the Senior Citizens Council. The motion, seconded by Councilman Mock, carried by unanimous roll call vote.

At the Mayor's invitation, Betsey Matthews, Chairwoman of the Senior Citizens Council, came forward to introduce Ms. Tiernan. The new appointee was welcomed by Mayor Geissert and was given a round of applause by those present.

9b. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TORRANCE SENIOR CITIZENS COUNCIL FOR 1986-87:

Copies of the Torrance Senior Citizens Council Annual Report for fiscal year 1986-87 were in the hands of Councilmembers for review.

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to receive and file the Annual Report of the Torrance Senior Citizens Council for 1986-87. His motion was seconded by Councilman Wirth and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

9c. RESOLUTION DESIGNATING COUNCILMAN GEORGE NAKANO AS THE OFFICIAL LEADER OF THE DELEGATION TO KASHIWA, JAPAN, NOVEMBER 1 - 13, 1987:

At the Mayor's request, Deputy City Clerk Hong read number and title to:

RESOLUTION NO. 87-191

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE DESIGNATING COUNCILMAN GEORGE NAKANO AS THE OFFICIAL LEADER OF THE CITY'S DELEGATION TO KASHIWA, JAPAN, NOVEMBER 1-13, 1987

City Council
August 11, 1987

MOTION: Councilwoman Hardison moved to adopt Resolution No. 87-191. The motion was seconded by Councilman Walker and carried by majority roll call vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Applegate, Hardison, Mock, Wirth, Walker and Mayor Geissert.

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: Councilman Nakano.

9d. REALLOCATION OF GRANT MONIES:

RECOMMENDATION:

The Human Resources Commission and the Director of Parks and Recreation recommend the City Council reallocate an undistributed 1986-87 grant of \$1,000 to the 1987-88 Social Service Agency Grant Program.

Councilman Mock suggested additional guidance be provided the Human Resources Commission should they encounter any future program problems.

Present in the audience, Hope Witkowsky, Chair of the Human Resources Commission, 18827 Gerkin Avenue, came forward to explain that guidelines are in place which prohibit the distribution of grant monies to a nonprofit organization for purposes other than those designated on their grant application.

This speaker discussed the rationale behind the Human Resources Commission's decision to recommend denial of a request for a grant project change in opposition to staff's recommendation. The purpose of the grant being of issue in determining awards, Ms. Witkowsky said it was the Commission's belief that to allow a recipient such change "after the fact" would be unfair to other grant applicants.

The Council was urged by Ms. Witkowsky to reallocate undistributed funds as requested so that all nonprofit organizations would have an equal opportunity to reapply for these monies.

In response to voiced concerns, Ms. Witkowsky reported that the Retired Senior Volunteer Program was able to obtain the copy machine they needed through other sources.

City Council
August 11, 1987

MOTION: Councilwoman Hardison moved to concur with the staff recommendation on Agenda Item 9d. Councilman Walker seconded the motion and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

10. TRANSPORTATION/PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:

10a. SCHEMATIC DESIGN DRAWINGS FOR THE GENERAL AVIATION CENTER:

A chronology of events leading to the development of the schematic design drawings for the General Aviation Center (per agenda information of record) was provided by Airport Manager Cagaanan.

During his presentation Mr. Cagaanan reported that these drawings had been presented to the Airport Commission at their May 14, 1987 meeting, reviewed at their June 11 meeting, and that it was their recommendation that the plans be modified to include the comments of individual Commissioners, Citizen's Groups, and Pilot Associations.

The recommendation of the Department of Transportation and Building and Safety Department, that the City Council approve the schematic design drawings for the General Aviation Center (GAC) as presented, was also set forth by Airport Manager Cagaanan.

Indicating his support of the latter recommendation, Mr. Cagaanan advised of staff's concern that by following the Airport Commission's recommendation the architect would have to scrap the preliminary drawings presently completed and stop work on the project until an acceptable program could be developed, which staff felt would be both expensive and time consuming.

The schematic design drawings were then presented on screen and were described in detail by Capital Projects Administrator Tilden, who deemed the architect's plans to be consistent with the program and costs established by the Airport Commission and City Council.

Mr. Tilden reported that every effort was made to keep the people of the City informed of this project and he commented that scheduling is several months behind as a consequence of the lengthy review process.

The status of the bond debt burden for the GAC was questioned by Mayor Geissert, in response to which the City Manager advised that late next year would be the deadline for completion of construction and commencement of rent whether or not the building is completed.

City Council
August 11, 1987

In response to another of the Mayor's inquiries, Director of Transportation Horkay estimated that scheduling is six months behind on this project. Noting this program would be back before Council for design development, upon the completion of construction documents, and for the award of contract, it was Mr. Horkay's projection the building would be completed by the spring of 1989.

Councilwoman Hardison asked two direct questions of staff:

1. Were there adequate opportunities for community input?
2. Were the community concerns addressed in the drawings now before the Council?

In response to Ms. Hardison's first question, Capital Projects Administrator Tilden recalled that there was considerable citizen input received at earlier Airport Commission meetings concerning the design of the program; the opportunity for community input at the January 13, 1987 City Council meeting, at which time there was a conceptual presentation in conjunction with the architect's agreement; the opportunity for citizen input at the May Airport Commission meeting when the schematic design drawings were first presented and again in June when the drawings were brought back before the Airport Commission for review. Director of Transportation Horkay added that there were 14 or 15 meetings in conjunction with the previous architect who did a conceptual layout of the GAC.

Responding to Ms. Hardison's second question, Capital Projects Administrator Tilden confirmed that none of the citizen input received at the May and June Airport Commission meetings had been incorporated into the drawings before the Council at this time.

Mr. Tilden then responded to a volley of questions by Councilman Applegate.

Reviewing the drawings a second time, Councilman Applegate stated his concerns regarding building setback, configuration and proximity to the tower. Observing that the administration building would be higher in elevation and located in front of the public/pilots' building, Mr. Applegate opined that the opposite should be true and voiced his disagreement with this arrangement, which he felt would incite problems at the outset,

Mayor Geissert invited comments from the audience at this time.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Mr. Eli Alexander, 2914 Briarwood Drive, Torrance, having distributed copies of his written comments to the Mayor and City Council regarding the Plans for the General Aviation Center (dated August 11, 1987, of record), recited essentially the contents of that document and used overhead projections to compare the architect's schematic drawings with plans for the GAC he devised himself.

The following suggested improvements were set forth during Mr. Alexander's presentation:

- That the public/pilots' building be moved forward in line with the administrative office building.
- That the observation deck be moved forward, reduced in size and extended in length to increase viewing area.
- That Noise Abatement be relocated to the second floor of the public/pilots' building for better visibility.
- That additional parking be provided to allow for future growth.
- That the administrative office building be reduced in size by moving the crash truck into the operations yard and rearranging remaining areas, which would also increase parking.

In answer to an inquiry by the Mayor, Mr. Alexander said he was prepared to make this presentation at the June Airport Commission meeting, but that the Commission recommended he make it at a City Council meeting instead.

Reporting that neither she nor the Council had received copies of what appeared to be alternate plans for the GAC, Mayor Geissert requested that Mr. Alexander remove his slides, submit his plans to the Airport Manager for review, and direct his comments to the drawings submitted by the architect, only, at this time.

Councilman Walker clarified the Council's position and urged Mr. Alexander to use his expertise to comment to the architect's proposal.

In reply, Mr. Alexander said he was not prepared to comment on the plans of the architect except with respect to his own proposal. This speaker mentioned that he had submitted his plans

City Council
August 11, 1987

to the City Engineer for review at least two weeks before this meeting.

Mr. Jack LeResche, Chairman of the Airport Commission, read aloud the Airport Commission's recommendation contained on Page 4 of this agenda item (of record):

The Airport Commission recommends that a new conceptualized plan or modification of the present architect's plan for the General Aviation Center be considered to bring into focus the following concerns of the FBO's (fixed base operators), Pilots Association and Citizens/Homeowners.

FBO's: Move west wing forward in line with east wing for better public and pilot view of airport activities and to gain additional parking spaces.

Pilot's Association: A more functional utilization of space, i.e., a consolidated two-story single building.

Citizens/Homeowners: A size reduction of the building with de-emphasis or elimination of public meeting rooms.

Noted by Airport Commission Chairman LeResche was staff's comments at the beginning of this item indicating that this was the time to suggest changes to the architect's plans and subsequent remarks by staff alluding to the fact that it's too late in the process for changes.

The motion and comments by the City Council at its January 13, 1987 meeting and City Manager Jackson's recommendation (as set forth on Page 30 of the agenda material, of record) were referenced by Mr. LeResche and he submitted that the suggestions made to the Airport Commission and forwarded to the City Council fell within those guidelines.

Next to address this issue was Mr. Ted Stinis, Torrance Area Pilots Association, 4118 Via Lado, Torrance, who maintained that staff's chronology of the GAC planning process was not accurate; that no input was received from the pilots when Architect Haas was hired; that Haas and Associates told the pilots that they were specifically instructed not to consider the pilots' comments; that the pilots had not been given proper opportunity for input; that when the pilots did provide input it was ignored; and that approval of the current architect's drawings would be a bad mistake.

In the interests of time, Mr. Stinis said he decided not to present slides, as planned, and he distributed handouts of

City Council
August 11, 1987

written material intended to augment his presentation with instructions to Council to "ignore the square footage" ("TOA General Aviation Center Pilot's Viewpoint," Torrance Area Pilots Association, 11 June 1987, of record).

Mr. Stinis took issue with the fact that the Pilots had been told for a long time they would have plenty of opportunity for input yet the first time they saw the schematic drawings was two months before this meeting and their input, presented at the subsequent Airport Commission meeting (in June), was not considered.

Commenting on the document he distributed for the benefit of the Mayor, Mr. Stinis explained that the pilots looked at the architect's drawings from the standpoint of functionality and needs and devised a layout which they feel would satisfy everybody's needs with a one or two-story building that is functional, less expensive, aesthetically pleasing, and with optional meeting rooms.

Relative to the architect's plans, Mr. Stinis stated his opinion that the layout is "completely self defeating"; that it is not conducive to interaction between the pilots and staff; that the plaza area between buildings is a needless expense; and that two buildings are a needless expense.

While at the podium, Mr. Stinis related the pilots' desire to be able to access the map in the Noise Abatement trailer that shows the location of noise generated, which he suggested would help them to be better pilots. He indicated that this was just one of many details not provided for in the architect's drawings.

Mr. Stinis' comments precipitated a question by the Mayor as to the rationale for the placement of the Noise Abatement Center, which was directed to Bob Schiller, a representative of the project architect (H. Wendell Mounce & Associates).

Before a plan was reached that was satisfactory to staff, Mr. Schiller reported, there were five or six separate meetings with staff, at which Airport Commission members were present, to look at alternatives and modify plans to meet staff's requests. A two-story box scheme was initially entertained as an option, he said, and consideration was also given to switching this facility from east to west. The plans for a multi-story building, Mr. Schiller explained, addresses requests by both Airport Management and Noise Abatement that they be elevated above the field level for visibility while minimizing the distance between those areas and the public area.

City Council
August 11, 1987

The Council's attention was directed to the Airport Commission minutes of July 17, 1986 (Page 47 of the agenda item regarding the Haas conceptual layout of the GAC) by Mr. Michael Bedinger, 4011 West 232nd Street, Torrance, who said he was speaking as a member of the Airport Commission. As the person who seconded the motion therein, Mr. Bedinger clarified that it was the Commission's intent to hold the square footage of the building to 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Bedinger submitted that the Airport Commission voted to change the GAC plans at every opportunity, yet not one of those recommended changes were implemented in the plans before Council. He further charged that the Commission was denied access to the subject schematic design drawings "until the last possible moment when we were running out of time to change it." This speaker therefore labeled the drawings "staff's plan."

A "no frills" functional GAC that would satisfy basic airport needs was favored by Mr. Joe Arciuch, 23521 Kathryn Avenue, Torrance, who read an excerpt from the January 13, 1987 Airport Commission minutes stating his opposition to a large meeting room (Page 28 of agenda material). Mr. Arciuch voiced his concern that a large meeting room would make it easier for outside interests to come in and change the nature of the airport. Referring to the June 11, 1987 Airport Commission meeting (excerpts of which were contained on Pages 9 through 13 of agenda material) speaker Arciuch maintained that the pilots and homeowners were in agreement regarding the meeting room, but that no one was listening to what the community was saying.

Responding to the Mayor's inquiries, Mr. Arciuch proposed that the pilots' waiting room is large enough for all needed uses. This speaker submitted that there are already enough meeting rooms in the City and stated his desire that records be kept to show how many times community meeting rooms are used and by whom.

Mayor Geissert maintained that there is a shortage of such facilities in the City. The proposal is not a devious plot on the part of staff, she said, but an opportunity to make space available to community groups as well as Airport related groups.

Contrarily, Mr. Arciuch argued that a lot of community rooms in the City go unused. He again requested that factual information be provided in this regard.

Continual use of the Recreation Center and Library meeting room was affirmed by City Manager Jackson. He was directed by the Mayor to make information available within the week regarding the usage of other City-owned community rooms.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Speaking as an individual, Ann Adam, 5359 Bindewald Road, President of Seaside Homeowners Association, related her participation in the review process; mentioned the recommendations of Mr. Greg Hach (a pilot and member of the Board of Seaside Homeowners Association) at the June 11, 1987 Airport Commission meeting (Page 9 of agenda material of record); and reiterated the complaint voiced by earlier speakers, that community input has not been acted upon.

Mr. Walter Lowell, Board of Directors, California Aviation Council, 1720 The Strand, Manhattan Beach, stated his opinion that an airport should have an on-site meeting room where aviation safety meetings can be held and stressed the importance of such meetings. This speaker also commented on the FAA's Accident Prevention Program.

The earlier statements by Mr. Joe Arciuch favoring a reduction in the size of the waiting area (see Pages 12 and 13) were supported by Mr. Bill Sobko, 23220 Fonthill, Torrance, Chairman of the Airport Committee of the Palo del Amo Homeowners Association, who stated his concern that too large a facility would draw an off-loading major airport commuter to the City. It was suggested by Mr. Sobko that FAA has the jurisdiction to channel such traffic into a community and he stated his preference as a resident and homeowner not to see that happen.

Back at the podium, Airport Commission Chairman LeResche, 3634 238th Street, Torrance, reiterated his comments of June 11, 1987 by reading aloud from the Airport Commission minutes of that date (Page 10 of agenda material):

Chairman LeResche stated that, generally speaking, he is in favor of the proposed plan by the architect. He stated that during the planning session with the architect he was afraid that the GAC would look like and be easily convertible to a commuter terminal. He therefore suggested that the public and pilots' waiting area be cut off at a line extending directly in line with the north side of the community meeting room and that the food service area be compressed into a food preparation and storage area. He stated that Council has repeatedly expressed a desire for a community meeting room at the Airport, and under the circumstances it would be more effective to cut the public and pilots' waiting area in half and preserve the community meeting room as it is rather than adding an accordion-type partition to the public and pilots' waiting room.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Having attended meetings with the architect, Mr. LeResche noted that there were a lot of tradeoffs in arriving at the design, he therefore said, "basically speaking" that he could not otherwise fault the bulk of the GAC design as it stands.

Mr. James Matheson, 25908 Matfield Drive, Torrance, a tenant at the Torrance Airport for 22 years, voiced his complaint that the "7th busiest airport in the United States" has no place to meet.

A member of the Torrance Area Pilots Association, and formerly an airline captain for 40 years, Mr. Matheson made his remarks as a private tenant of the Airport. This speaker suggested that meeting notification relative to the May 14, 1987 presentation of the schematic design drawings could have been more efficient; observed that input was requested and given, but the plans were rendered to the City Council status quo; maintained that the GAC should be for the benefit of the users and the public (rather than Airport Management); suggested the Noise Abatement people could do their work at their current location; and maintained that the GAC could be much smaller and have more usable space at less cost.

In regard to the plan before the Council, Mr. Matheson advised the Mayor that "the whole thing should be thrown out," that it's oriented toward staff input and not experience with airport operations or aviation operations, and suggested that the location of airport staff in relationship to other functions should be studied. This speaker supported the need for a meeting room at the Airport as a valuable tool for the exchange of ideas. Having received notification of this meeting late, Mr. Matheson said he was not prepared to address the flight planning area.

Meeting notification procedures were questioned by the Mayor, in response to which Airport Manager Cagaanan verified that at least 600 notices were distributed for this meeting. The Airport Commission meeting notification procedure was also set forth by Mr. Cagaanan.

Addressing the Mayor's specific concern that Mr. Matheson did not receive notice, Mr. Cagaanan advised that Mr. Matheson was sent a letter as an occupant of a hangar at the Airport and, as an active member of the Torrance Area Pilots Association, should have received notification from Mr. Stinis.

Recalling that a meeting was held in the Council Chambers in July of 1983 to allow public input regarding plans for the Airport, Councilman Wirth questioned the notification procedure and attendance at that meeting.

City Council
August 11, 1987

In response to Mr. Wirth's query, the Airport Manager recalled that at least 500 notices were distributed by hand and seven people attended that meeting, four of whom spoke.

Mr. Ted Stinis, 4118 Via Lado, Torrance, Torrance Area Pilots Association, returned to the podium to tell of the difficulty he encountered in trying to obtain information as to when the schematic design drawings for the GAC would be considered by Council, such information not being readily available until the day before this meeting, he said, at which time he notified Mr. Matheson.

Ms. Ann Adams, President of the Seaside Homeowners' Association, 5359 Bindewald Road, Torrance, said she encountered similar difficulties in trying to obtain a copy of the agenda package for this meeting. (Airport Manager Cagaanan reported that he personally delivered Ms. Adams' agenda package whereupon it was discovered through discussion that he made the delivery to the wrong house.)

Airport Commissioner David Winkler, 22827 Galva Avenue, Torrance, commented on the dissemination of meeting information and materials, staff's efforts to make this information available, and the difficulty he encountered in obtaining information in conjunction with this item. Mr. Winkler also commented on the Airport Commission's recommendation to Council and the reasons therefor.

Addressing the schematic design drawings for the GAC, Mr. Winkler agreed with previous speakers that the "west" building should be moved forward and that meeting space, which he felt is needed, could possibly be rearranged or reduced in size.

Expanding his comments at the Mayor's request, Mr. Winkler stated his opinion that Noise Abatement function needs to be relocated so that function is accessible to the public.

If new plans were to be initiated, Mr. Winkler said he would recommend a two-story functional building, closely aligned with the tower, with the public/pilots' area and Noise Abatement on the top floor and and staff offices on the bottom floor.

Another member of the Airport Commission, Mr. Gary Kovacs, 2528 West 234th Street, Torrance (speaking, he said, more as a citizen than as a Commissioner) shared Councilman Applegate's opinion that the public area (left wing) should be brought forward (see Page 8); disagreed with a suggestion by Mr. Arciuch that accordion-type partitions be used to separate uses in the flight planning area, believing, as a pilot himself, that such an arrangement would not provide the absolute solitude needed to set

City Council
August 11, 1987

up flight plans; supported the need for a community meeting room of adequate size and sufficient parking to accommodate this use; and agreed with the need for increased functionality.

Mr. Kovacs stated his opinion that the design presented is aesthetically pleasing and indicated that he would support same with realignment of the left wing.

In answer to the Mayor's question, Mr. Kovacs stated his opinion that the pilots' planning area seemed adequate. However, he deferred to Mr. Ted Stinis, who from the audience opined that the space allowed for this purpose was inadequate. Commissioner Kovacs noted that he does most of his flight planning at home at the present time.

Mr. Joe Arciuch, 23521 Kathryn Avenue, Torrance, clarified that he recommended the accordion doors for temporary use in the waiting area, not for use in the pilot training room. Regarding the community room, Mr. Arciuch said the appeal for a meeting area for safety purposes is hard to refuse; however, he related his attendance at a pilots' training meeting arranged by FAA held in the Library meeting room which, he said, was attended by three pilots and 12 homeowners.

Identifying himself as a private pilot with a plane based at Torrance Airport, Mr. Tom Mason, 25928 Matfield Drive, Torrance, maintained that the flight planning area would not be used except for instrument flights. This speaker stated his opinion that there is a good possibility the Torrance center would be used for commercial purposes and turned into an "LAX" type function.

Once again at the podium, Mr. Ted Stinis, Torrance Area Pilots' Association, 4118 Via Lado, Torrance, reiterated comments voiced at earlier meetings that the flight planning procedure of the future, which he feels will be computerized, should be considered now in determining the flight planning area necessary.

The Mayor invited comments from the Council.

Councilman Walker said he concurred with ideas expressed by Airport Commission Chairman LeResche, being 95 percent in favor of the plan and desirous of seeing it move forward, but also being desirous of seeing the pilots' and public area moved forward. He supported the staff recommendation with modifications.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Considering the Council's fight against jet fuel at the airport, Councilman Walker questioned the rationale for the belief that there could be some grand conspiracy by the City Council or staff to bring commuter traffic to Torrance Airport by providing a community room and deemed it nonsense to cut needed facilities. It was observed by this speaker that the inclusion of a community meeting room would provide an opportunity for future space adjustments as they become necessary.

Councilwoman Hardison said she agreed with Councilmen Applegate and Walker that the west wing should be moved forward. Referring to the concerns she voiced at the January 13, 1987 City Council meeting (see minutes of that meeting, of record for detail), Ms. Hardison supported the need for an adequate flight planning area; did not see the need for a large public/pilots waiting area and agreed with Airport Chairman LeResche that this room could possibly be divided.

Another concern voiced by Councilwoman Hardison was that the community room would be isolated from the food preparation area and restrooms. It was suggested by this speaker that the second half of the public/pilots waiting area could be eliminated and the community room rearranged to provide access to the food preparation facilities.

Councilwoman Hardison stressed the need to move forward on the GAC, and said her concerns would basically be met with the elimination of part of the public/pilots area and by moving the west wing forward.

In looking at the schematic before him, Councilman Applegate suggested that staff facilities had taken the primary position and recommended the west building be realigned -- moved forward -- in keeping with the original purpose of the GAC, to facilitate the pilots.

Relative to the community meeting room, Mr. Applegate said he totally disagreed with anybody alluding to the fact that there is some ulterior motive or that there would some day be commercial air traffic at the Airport. Contrarily, he observed the growing importance of air safety, the emphasis on knowledge and awareness and the need to have space for that type of function. He suggested it would be foolish on the part of City not to provide a meeting room at the Airport for this purpose as long as it is financially feasible to do so.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Councilman Applegate concluded that plans before the Council appeared to have staff input, only. He recommended this matter be returned to Council for a vote after it has been sent back to the architect to attenuate Airport Commission concerns and to address suggestions by the community and pilots.

Councilman Nakano said he was concerned about moving forward with the current plan, so many groups having expressed distress that their input was not taken into consideration.

Addressing his own concerns, Mr. Nakano recommended the drawings be modified to bring the west wing forward in line with the east wing (for better public view) and to reduce the size of the public meeting room. However, it was his opinion that there should not be major design changes at this time.

Councilman Nakano discussed the contents of an article in the January 1986 Airport Services Management concerning the forced expansion of an air terminal at Martha's Vineyard ("Airports Battle Airline on Right of Access to Community Airfields," included in the agenda material of record), which he felt gave rise to concern, and commented on current pressure for suburban airports to provide commuter service because of the increase in traffic at major airports.

In conclusion, Councilman Nakano said he was not prepared to go forward with this particular plan until modifications have been made to address concerns expressed.

Councilman Wirth noted the time spent on this project by Airport Commissioners and the City Council's Transportation Committee and efforts to allow for public input and stressed the need to move ahead on the GAC.

It was suggested by Councilman Wirth that staff be directed to work with the architect to address concerns and bring the matter back in 30 days and that a workshop be scheduled before a meeting, similar to the review of the Cultural Arts Center, to allow the City Council an opportunity to address some of their concerns regarding design elements.

Anticipating that the GAC would be presented with options, Councilman Mock agreed with the public's impression that these plans appeared to be final and that their concerns appeared to have fallen on deaf ears. In concurrence with his colleagues that the plan as a whole should move forward, Mr. Mock said he would be in favor of a reduction in the size of the community meeting room and the pilots lounge and in favor of moving the west wing forward, the latter being absolutely necessary to make the GAC

City Council
August 11, 1987

functional, in his opinion. It was his recommendation this matter be returned to Council with options as to how desired reductions can be achieved.

Given the conflicting flow of information, City Manager Jackson noted the difficulty in proposing priority options for consideration.

It was Mayor Geissert's opinion that the GAC should be attractive as well as functional. She believed what she was hearing in testimony was the need for the design to be more "user friendly," placing the pilots in a better position to view the field, and indicated that plans should be changed accordingly.

As to her own concerns, Ms. Geissert suggested rearrangement of the flight planning and food preparation areas so the food preparation area could be shared by the users of the community meeting room; and that an outside entrance to the meeting room be provided so when outside groups use the room they would not have to walk through the pilots' area. It was noted by the Mayor that no outside access was provided to the kitchen area for the taking out of trash or for bringing in food. She also questioned where trash containers would be located.

In response to Mayor Geissert's voiced concern, the City Manager stated his opinion that 30 days would be an appropriate amount of time to bring this matter back as a workshop.

City Manager Jackson reviewed Council concerns to be addressed to his understanding:

- Options as to how the west wing might be moved forward and inter-relate with the overall design of the building.
- Alternatives for a reduction in the size of the pilots' lounge and the impact and appearance of same.
- Evaluation of the size of the meeting room:
 1. Evaluate community needs.
 2. Option of reducing the size of the community meeting room and the effects of this reduction on the overall facility.
- Option of relocating the food preparation center as it relates to the meeting room.

City Council
August 11, 1987

- Option of providing an outside entrance to the meeting room.
- Evaluate in more detail the size of the pilots' flight planning room.
- Conduct a needs study re the use of City meeting rooms.
- Conduct a workshop meeting before a Council meeting allowing two hours for discussion.

Councilman Applegate requested a straw vote regarding the pilots' waiting room, it being his opinion this area should not be considered for a reduction.

Councilman Mock indicated his desire to see options in this regard.

Councilman Wirth said he did not favor a reduction in the size of the community meeting room, requested to see possible options for increasing the size of the pilots' "ready room," and clarified that it was his direction to staff to return with options for other modifications for discussion.

Agreeing with Councilman Wirth, Mr. Applegate said he had no problem with looking at options for a larger size. He explained his desire to instruct staff not to come back with options for a smaller pilots' waiting room, if his colleagues were in agreement on this matter.

Councilman Nakano stated his desire to see staff return with alternatives for flexibility and said he did not want to see the pilots' preparation area any larger than it is.

That there are two rooms, the pilots' preparation area and the pilots lounge area, was noted by City Manager Jackson. He advised the Council that options for changing the size of a room can be provided, but pointed out the difficulty in bringing back a full array of options for each room in the facility.

Expressing his thoughts, Councilman Walker indicated that he was satisfied with the size of the pilots' and public waiting area and the size of the community meeting rooms and suggested the City might find itself using one of these uses for the other in the future. Mr. Walker said he liked the Mayor's comments relative to connecting the meeting room and food preparation area.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Councilwoman Hardison said she did not want the pilots'/public waiting area increased, but would be willing to look at a reduction of either that area or the community meeting room. Regarding the flight planning area, she did not think it should be smaller and felt there was some question as to whether it should be larger. Ms. Hardison said she was in favor of directing staff to return with options in 30 days, if feasible.

Mr. Robert Schiller, representing Mounce & Associates, the project architect, stated his feeling that 30 days' time would be feasible for a City Council workshop.

It was announced by the Mayor that the workshop would be open to the public and that the public would be notified. She encouraged Mr. Ted Stinis of the Torrance Area Pilots Association to notify pilots and other interested parties of the pending workshop.

That there had been no discussion regarding the east wing as to alternatives was noted by the City Manager Jackson at this time.

Mayor Geissert observed that several speakers felt the east wing was designed for staff. She therefore felt the need for Council to receive information as to why staff functions were located in primary areas.

City Manager Jackson asked if Council was in agreement with the direction given staff on this item. There were no objections voiced.

Regarding the administrative side of the building, Councilman Walker clarified that discussion was directed to placement, the average office size proposed being minimal, in his opinion.

* * *

The Mayor called a brief recess at 10:08 p.m. At 10:34 p.m. the City Council reconvened.

* * *

City Council
August 11, 1987

The following matter was considered out of Agenda sequence . . .

15a. PP 87-17: NICK AND TAMI HANSEN:

Mayor Geissert announced that this was the time and the place for City Council consideration of a neighbor appeal of a Planning Commission approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of a first and second story addition to an existing single-family residence in the Hillside Overlay District on property located at 25920 Matfield Drive, PP 87-17: NICK AND TAMI HANSEN.

Proof of publications was presented by the Deputy City Clerk and filed without objection.

Planning Associate Jeff Gibson provided the staff presentation augmented by a slide presentation depicting a silhouette of the proposed addition as viewed from various angles. During his presentation, Mr. Gibson reported that the applicants elected to reduce the height of the addition for an overall height of 27 feet 3 inches from grade to the top of the ridge and noted that the chimney would extend 3 1/2 feet higher than the ridge height from the west elevation. It was also mentioned by Mr. Gibson that the Planning Commission voted to approve the Precise Plan with an added condition disallowing additional kitchen facilities on the second floor; the Planning Department recommended approval of the request with conditions, finding that the proposed addition would not have an adverse impact on other properties in the vicinity.

Responding to Council inquiries, Planning Associate Gibson informed Councilman Nakano that the rear of the subject building could be extended a maximum of 20 feet pursuant to Code.

Mayor Geissert invited the proponent or his representative to speak.

Mr. Robert Garstein, architect, 2545 West 237th Street, Suite I, Torrance, advised that his clients evaluated the project vertically and horizontally to find a workable approach, discussed the proposal with adjacent residents, and worked with City staff on adjusting the height of the building. He expressed interest in the comments of the objecting parties from the standpoint of possible compromise.

In response to a question by Councilman Mock, Mr. Garstein explained that the matter at hand did not come up until the Planning Commission meeting (July 15, 1987); and, to his understanding, the properties at issue are located outside the boundary of the notification area. (Addressing Mr. Garstein's latter remark;

City Council
August 11, 1987

Planning Associate Gibson explained that properties located close to the notification boundary are often included.)

Proponent Nick Hansen, 25920 Matfield Drive, clarified that the actual living area of the house with the addition would be 3,522 square feet; the 4,182 square feet finished size included the garage and the balcony in back.

Having conducted a personal study of second-story homes in his area, Proponent Hansen reported that there are 24, two of which are over 3,000 square feet in size, three of which are located on Matfield Drive. A list reflecting the location of these properties was submitted by the proponent at this time; and based on this information, he maintained that approval of his request would not set a precedent.

Noted by Mr. Hansen was a petition signed by ten of his neighbors in agreement with the addition. He pointed out that the neighbors above him and to his immediate south would be substantially impacted if he expanded from the back of his property, which is why, he said, they decided to build vertically.

Ms. Mary Woodman, 2609 Highcliff Drive, Torrance, presented slides supporting her opposition to the project and depicting the view impact from her property. She also presented a petition signed by concerned neighbors in the vicinity regarding interpretation of the Hillside Overlay Ordinance.

Relating her participation at the July 15, 1987 Planning Commission hearing on this matter, Ms. Woodman observed that people who spoke in favor of this project would not be directly affected by it and supported it for reasons of increased property value and possible future development on Matfield Drive (see Planning Commission minutes of July 15, 1987). As someone who would be directly impacted by the Hansen's proposal, she conveyed her surprise at the Planning Commission's decision.

Referring to the agenda package, Pages 15 through 17, Appellant Woodman reviewed the responses to criteria therein, reading them aloud, and stated her opinion that the answers are vague, irrelevant, do not relate to the issues and do not demonstrate the intent of the Hillside Ordinance.

Relative to the above noted criteria, Speaker Woodman contended that the Hansens' addition would not be in harmony with other two-story additions in the area; would eliminate the view from two rooms she added to her house in 1982; and, in so doing, would create an unreasonable hardship on her. Were the addition to be consistent with other two-story homes in the area, Ms. Woodman noted it would still create a hardship on her.

City Council
August 11, 1987

A slide was then provided by Ms. Woodman to support her position that the proposed addition is not consistent with existing development on Matfield Drive as to height and size and that the gentleman residing on Matfield Drive who supported the addition would not be impacted by it.

Referring to the Planning Commission hearing (July 15, 1987), Appellant Woodman contended that other arguments in favor of the Hansens' project were by individuals on Matfield Drive who were for a favorable decision because of plans to submit a similar proposal to the City themselves.

Ms. Woodman observed that during the hearing it was stated that approval of this project would not set a precedent for future development. She also observed that the City was referring to existing two-story homes in the area to justify the Hansens' addition, which she felt was contradictory.

The second slide presented by Ms. Woodman depicted the anticipated view impact from the Hansens' addition. Noted by Ms. Woodman was that the view she would lose had been given an appraised value when she added these rooms to her house.

Ms. Woodman said she and other neighbors took an excerpt of the Hillside Ordinance and pictures showing the Planning Commission approved addition and asked people in the area if they would be interested in an interpretation of the Hillside Ordinance. She handed staff a document with 60 signatures of people "that hope this does not happen to them."

In summation, Ms. Woodman maintained that the Hansens' proposed addition would adversely impact the value of her home, her privacy and her view. She said her neighbors support her position. Further, she submitted that the Planning Commission's decision was based on the testimony of individuals not directly affected by the proposal. Speaker Woodman urged the City Council to help enforce the intent of the Hillside Ordinance by denying this request.

Responding to inquiries by individual Councilmembers, Ms. Woodman advised Councilman Mock that she met with the Hansens for the first time on August 8, 1987 at the Melchers' home; that a redesign was discussed at that time; that the Hansens did offer to submit a new design; and that the neighbors informed the Hansens that a new silhouette would be required for same.

Mr. Chris Melcher, 2613 Highcliff Drive, Torrance, identified himself as a neighbor of Ms. Woodman. Before making his presentation, Mr. Melcher commended members of staff in the

City Council
August 11, 1987

Building and Safety and Planning Departments for their help and efficiency.

Because of vacation plans, Mr. Melcher reported that he was unable to attend the July 15 Planning Commission meeting and drafted a letter to the Planning Commission addressing his concerns about the Hansens' project. Mr. Melcher said he was disturbed that comments by people not directly affected by the project were allowed to overrule arguments by Mary Woodman, and concerns addressed in his letter. This speaker expressed his apprehension about the impact to him and to his neighbors from future construction on Matfield Drive given that some of the people who supported the Hansens' request did so because they had similar requests in mind.

Mr. Melcher then presented slides depicting the silhouette of the Hansens' addition blocked in to demonstrate the view obstruction from his home, which he said would be approximately a 30 percent loss.

Addressing provisions in the Hillside Ordinance relative to hardship and harmony in the neighborhood, Appellant Melcher presented a chart he developed based on Building and Safety Department data indicating that the majority of homes in the vicinity of Matfield Drive fall into the 1,000 to 1,500 square foot range. Based on the information he obtained, Mr. Melcher argued that the large size of the Hansens' addition would be clearly out of the range of anything else in the neighborhood and reflected neither harmony nor hardship.

Plan changes proposed by the Hansens at a neighborhood meeting at his residence on August 8, 1987 were described by Mr. Melcher as "minor corner shaving" of the roofline with no major improvement to his view.

In conclusion, Mr. Melcher said the Hansens' addition would definitely impact his view and would not be in harmony with the rest of the properties in the area. He was therefore distressed by the Planning Commission's ruling.

Back at the podium, Mr. Nick Hansen, 25920 Matfield Drive, Torrance, reported that when he met with the neighbors the Melchers were agreeable to some compromise, but Ms. Woodman was not. Proponent Hansen also offered a brief rebuttal to comments by the appellants and clarified that his house would not be higher from grade than the other two-story home on Matfield Drive.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Mr. Steve Duel, 25916 Matfield Drive, Torrance (house directly north of the Hansens' property), said he favored the project, believing it would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood and the City of Torrance in general and would have minimal impact, in his opinion. He did not think the property would be overbuilt for the area as noted in No. 3 of the reasons for the appeal (Page 18 of agenda material of record).

Addressing the issue of precedent, Mr. Duel related the City's policy of considering each request on its own individual merit and deemed this fear "unrealistic" given the City's practice.

Mr. Duel suggested this matter should be kept in prospective, observing that the people on Matfield Drive support the Hansens' addition and the opponents are two blocks away. He urged Council support of this project.

Mrs. Etienne Melcher, 2613 Highcliff Drive, Torrance, commented that not one person on Highcliff Drive hesitated to sign the petition she circulated requesting interpretation of the Hillside Ordinance because their views and property values were impacted before the Hillside Ordinance took effect. Ms. Melcher maintained that the Hansens' proposal would have a negative impact on her view and on the value of her home.

Mr. John Hall, 25917 Matfield Drive, Torrance (across the street from the proposed addition), said he did not find the project offensive from his viewpoint. He pointed out that if the Hansens built out instead of up it would impact his view.

Mr. Dennis Noble, 2605 Highcliff Drive, Torrance, said he moved into the area a year ago, in part for the view. This speaker stated his opinion that the project would impair other people's lifestyles and the equity in their homes.

Ms. Brenda Goulet, 2617 Highcliff Drive, Torrance, stated her concurrence with the opinion of the Woodmans and the Melchers that the Hansens' addition would obstruct their view and negatively impact the value of their homes and other homes in the area. Ms. Goulet urged the Council to overrule the Planning Commission's decision on this matter.

Mr. James Matheson, 25908 Matfield Drive, Torrance, identified himself as the owner of a two-story house located two houses down from the project site. Mr. Matheson expressed his opinion that the small tract houses in this area do not properly reflect the value of the property, commented on other two-story additions in the immediate area and said he encouraged increased development and houses of a larger magnitude in this tract.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Referring to the notification circle, Mr. Matheson pointed out that the people on Highcliff were not part of that area and should not be considered as part of the affected properties, in his opinion.

Speaker Matheson suggested that "no matter what you do with your property, somebody is going to be unhappy" and urged approval of the Hansens' project.

In response to Council inquiries, Mr. Matheson said he would be willing to lose the privacy from his swimming pool area because he felt the advantages of the Hansens' addition would far outweigh this loss.

Back at the podium, Mr. Chris Melcher, 2613 Highcliff Drive, Torrance, directed attention to the diagram of the notification circle in staff material (of record) and pointed out that the people on the east side of Highcliff Drive own property down to Crest Road and therefore the notification circle is inclusive of this area.

Ms. Tami Hansen, 25920 Matfield Drive, Torrance, clarified that some of the speakers who supported their project at the Planning Commission meeting would, in fact, be directly affected by the proposal. Ms. Hansen expressed her frustration at having opposition to building onto her home in either direction.

Architect Garstein returned to the podium to suggest that he might be able to clip the ends of the roof and drop the profile of the roof two feet to lessen the impact of the Hansens' addition without major modifications to plans.

Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilwoman Hardison, moved to close the public hearing. The motion was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Comments from the Council were entertained at this time.

Observing that there is view obstruction on Highcliff Drive from trees, Councilman Nakano inquired if the trees in this area belong to the City and whether they were scheduled to be trimmed.

Planning Associate Gibson responded that the majority of these trees were on private property. It was elucidated by City Manager Jackson that it is the City's policy to trim City trees for safety purposes and in consideration of the welfare of the trees, but not for view considerations.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Councilman Nakano stated his opinion that the Hansens' could extend the back of their house 20 feet without impacting the neighbor on the uphill slope. Having observed from site review that their proposal would cause some view impact from Highcliff Drive, Mr. Nakano said he would not be in favor of approving the Hansens' proposal as it is.

In response to an earlier request for information by Councilwoman Hardison, Planning Associate Gibson now reviewed the locations, square footages, height and dates of approval for two-story houses in the subject area, noting that some of the projects predated the Hillside Ordinance.

As a result of viewing the project from inside residences on Highcliff Drive, Councilwoman Hardison stated her belief that the Hansens' project would impact the view, particularly from Mary Woodman's house. The question then becomes subjective, she suggested, as to what is substantial impact and what is not.

It was Councilwoman Hardison's opinion the plan could be redesigned to allow for desired square footage with less impact to the people on the hillside. Ms. Hardison indicated that she would be willing to continue the matter for this purpose.

Councilman Walker briefly discussed his former residency in the subject area. Relative to the appellants' property, Mr. Walker said he felt the view blockage from the project could be described as minimal.

Although he voiced concern over the question of what can be built on the Hansens' property given the problem of view obstruction, Councilman Walker indicated that he would be willing to "take a second look" relative to the development of this site.

The "no win" aspect of Hillside cases that come before the City Council was mentioned by Councilman Mock. Mr. Mock said he felt this project would have an adverse impact on the neighbors' view. Being of the opinion that many of the Hillside cases could be resolved through better communication, Councilman Mock offered the following motion.

MOTION: Councilman Mock moved to hold PP 87-17: NICK AND TAMI HANSEN for two weeks and have the neighbors sit down with Planning Associate Gibson to possibly work out a compromise among themselves. His motion was seconded by Councilman Applegate. (This motion was later amended and ultimately carried; see Page 30.)

City Council
August 11, 1987

During continued discussion, the City Attorney suggested that two weeks' time might not be sufficient and Planning Associate Gibson advised of staff's preference that a new silhouette be erected if there is substantial redesign.

Councilman Applegate discussed the architect's proposal to drop the project's roofline two feet and clip the corners, stating his opinion that this would represent a substantial reduction. A two-week return period was upheld by Mr. Applegate as appropriate for this purpose.

Councilman Mock AMENDED HIS MOTION TO EXTEND THE CONTINUATION FROM TWO WEEKS TO 30 DAYS to September 8, 1987.

Following clarification by staff, Councilman Applegate, WITHDREW HIS SECOND to the original motion.

Councilman Mock's MOTION, as amended, to hold PP 87-17: NICK AND TAMI HANSEN for 30 days (to September 8, 1987) and have the neighbors sit down with staff to work out a compromise among themselves, was then treated as a new motion and was seconded by Councilman Wirth.

Councilman Applegate offered a substitute motion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to postpone PP 87-17: NICK AND TAMI HANSEN for two weeks to August 25, 1987, at 7:00 p.m. Councilman Walker seconded the motion.

Councilman Wirth explained that he seconded the motion by Mr. Mock (for a 30-day continuance) because he personally felt it would take more than lowering the roofline two feet to remedy the situation and he wanted to allow more time and flexibility to reach a compromise solution.

Mayor Geissert said she felt there would definitely be a view impact, particularly looking at the project from the picture window of the Melchers' living room (she noted that the Melchers had improved their home, staying on the first level). The Mayor said she would support the main motion for a 30-day continuance.

Mayor Geissert called for a vote on the SUBSTITUTE MOTION, which FAILED TO CARRY by roll call vote:

AYES: Councilmen Applegate and Walker.

NOES: Councilmembers Hardison, Mock, Nakano, Wirth and Mayor Geissert.

City Council
August 11, 1987

The MAIN MOTION (to continue the matter 30 days [approximately] to September 8, 1987, at 7:00 p.m. to allow involved parties time to discuss possible resolutions to problems), then CARRIED by unanimous roll call vote.

It was mentioned by Planning Director Ferren that there would be no additional advertising for the continued hearing.

Planning Associate Gibson said that staff would act as a facilitator for getting neighbors together to discuss options and to lend guidance.

The Council now returned to regular agenda order to consider. . .

12. PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS:

12a. FINDINGS RE DENIAL OF ELLINGSON PRECISE PLAN APPLICATION:

At the Mayor's request, Deputy City Clerk Hong read number and title to:

RESOLUTION NO. 87-192

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DENYING THE APPLICATION FOR A PRECISE PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE HILLSIDE OVERLAY DISTRICT AT 23627 SUSANA AVENUE (PP 87-13 JAMES P. ELLINGSON)

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 87-192. Councilwoman Hardison seconded his motion and the motion carried by majority vote, roll call reflecting the following:

AYES: \ Councilmembers Hardison, Mock, Nakano, Wirth and Walker.

NOES: Councilman Applegate and Mayor Geissert.

13. ENVIRONMENTAL/BUILDING AND SAFETY MATTERS:

13a. APPEAL OF SIGN CASE 80-2: DEL AMO FASHION CENTER REQUEST FOR FOUR ELECTRONIC READERBOARD GROUND SIGNS:

Mayor Geissert opened the hearing. The proponent's request for continuance having been noted earlier (see Page 2, Item 4), a motion was now offered.

City Council
August 11, 1987

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved that the appeal of Sign Case 80-2: Del Amo Fashion Center be held until September 22, 1987, at 7:00 p.m. Seconded by Councilman Wirth, his motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

13b. RESOLUTIONS TO STATE AND FEDERAL REPRESENTATIVES
REQUESTING IMPLEMENTATION OF AIR SAFETY MEASURES:

Environmental Quality Administrator McElroy set forth the Airport Commission's recommendation for approval of Resolution "B" and the recommendation of the Building and Safety and Transportation Departments for approval of Resolution "A." The primary difference between the two resolutions, she explained, is the inclusion of Section 2 in Resolution "A," which would urge Congress to provide an adequate number of experienced air traffic controllers and staff to allow more stringent enforcement of terminal control area violations. It was staff's opinion, Ms. McElroy said, that Resolution "A" most closely approximates requests by the City of Cerritos and the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and relates to current indications that there are needs in those areas.

It was pointed out by Environmental Quality Administrator McElroy that neither the Airport Commission nor staff were recommending the adoption of Resolution "C," which would provide for the marking of freeway systems to serve as navigational aids for private pilots.

Explaining for the benefit of Mayor Geissert the rationale of the Airport Commission in supporting Resolution "B," Environmental Quality Administrator McElroy explained, to her understanding, that the Commission felt the FAA was adequately dealing with the situation.

It was observed by Councilman Wirth that this matter originated when the Transportation Committee met last fall. Stating his personal desire to see the City go on record in support of the Federal Department of Transportation's position in favor of more air traffic controllers, Councilman Wirth offered the following motion.

MOTION: Councilman Wirth moved to concur with the Building and Safety and Transportation Departments' recommendation for approval of Resolution "A." His motion was seconded by Councilman Mock. (This motion was ultimately amended; see Page 32.)

City Council
August 11, 1987

Of expressed concern to Councilman Walker was a particular paragraph in proposed Resolution "A," which he read aloud:

WHEREAS, the Cerritos air disaster that resulted in the tragic loss of eight-two (82) people's lives could likely have been prevented, had air traffic controllers had the use of a three-dimensional tracking system . . .

Councilman Walker questioned the validity of this information and challenged that such language should be in a statement of endorsement.

In response to his query, Director of Transportation Horkay stated his belief that this wording did not reflect the conclusions of the National Transportation Safety Board.

Councilman Walker said he would support Resolution "A" with modified wording in the subject paragraph.

The subject language was also found objectionable by Councilman Applegate, who felt it was out of the scope of the City to make such a determination. It was therefore his recommendation that any reference thereto should be eliminated.

Mayor Geissert affirmed that the maker and seconder of the motion were in agreement with Mr. Applegate's recommendation and there were no objections voiced by those present at this time.

Mr. Tom Nosek, 2422 Paseo de las Tortugas, Torrance, a member of the Airport Commission, related the rationale of the Airport Commission in making its recommendation for approval of Resolution "B". Speaker Nosek reported that the Commissioners felt Resolutions "C" and "A" involved technical determinations beyond their scope. The Commission therefore stood behind the resolution emphasizing the need for air safety (Resolution "B"), he said, and deferred to the expertise of the regulatory agencies of the Federal Government for specific solutions to the problems.

City Council
August 11, 1987

The Council was next addressed by Mr. Jim Matheson, 25908 Matfield Drive, Torrance, formerly an airline captain for 40 years. Mr. Matheson related his belief that the "inverted wedding cake" TCA is the cause of problems. Regarding signs on the freeways, Resolution "C," Mr. Matheson indicated that they would not be used by pilots.

At Mayor Geissert's direction, Deputy City Clerk Hong read title and number to Resolution "A":

RESOLUTION NO. 87-193

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF TORRANCE RELATING TO AIR TRAFFIC SAFETY

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 87-193 as modified (with Paragraph 6 deleted). Seconded by Councilman Mock, the motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

15. HEARINGS:

15a. PP 87-17, NICK AND TAMI HANSEN:

Held earlier; see Pages 22-29.

15b. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE CHANGES TO ELIMINATE THE USE OF MODIFIED GROSS FLOOR AREA:

The Mayor announced that this was the time and the place for Council consideration of ordinance changes (Alternate Ordinances "A" and "B") to eliminate the use of modified gross floor area by calculating commercial and industrial parking requirements on the basis of gross floor area.

Proof of publication was provided by the Deputy City Clerk and it was filed without objection.

Planning Assistant Pryor provided the staff presentation (pursuant to the staff report of record) and noted the Planning Commission's recommendation for adoption of Ordinance "B."

In conjunction with the Planning Department's recommendation, Planning Director Ferren related staff's suggestion that the language in Ordinance "B," Section 93.1.5 b) [Page 9 of agenda material] be modified to read:

City Council
August 11, 1987

- b) In any building for which a building permit (instead of Certificate of Occupancy) had been issued . . .

In response to a direct inquiry by Councilman Mock, Ms. Pryor explained that difficulties can sometimes arise from the calculation of parking requirements by the modified gross floor area method because it allows for a variety of measuring techniques.

Responding to Councilman Applegate's query, Planning staff advised that the difference in parking requirements between the modified gross and gross methods of calculation ranges between 0 and 16 percent and averages approximately 5 percent (Table I, Page 17 of the agenda material).

MOTION: Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilman Wirth, moved for the approval of Ordinance "B" with the language modification requested by staff (stipulating "Building Permit" instead of "Certificate of Occupancy.") [Withdrawn; see Page 35.]

Discussion continued.

For the benefit of Councilwoman Hardison, Planning Director Ferren explained that any request going to the Planning Commission would have to meet the gross floor area parking requirements upon the adoption of Ordinance "B."

For the benefit of Mayor Geissert, Planning Assistant Pryor provided clarification relative to the information contained in Table I (Page 17 of agenda material of record).

Councilman Walker questioned the necessity of changing the existing ordinance, noting that the modified gross floor area method provides flexibility for the architect to work out problems. The possible impact of proposed changes on recent, pending and open development was noted by Mr. Walker, and he indicated that he would not be supporting the motion (for approval of Ordinance "B").

In response to Mr. Walker's expressed concerns and inquiries by the Mayor regarding notification on this item, Planning Assistant Pryor advised that the major developers, the major users of parking, the League of Women Voters and the Chamber of Commerce were notified. Ms. Pryor further reported that there was little participation when this matter was reviewed by the Planning Commission.

City Council
August 11, 1987

Councilman Applegate WITHDREW HIS MOTION, indicating his specific desire that there be a more in-depth notification of this proposal, and of the possible impact it would have on pending and proposed projects, before action is taken by Council.

It was observed by Councilman Mock that the City of Gardena has adopted the gross floor area formula without any problems therefrom.

Addressing a question by Councilwoman Hardison, Planning Director Ferren verified that applicants are informed that there is a change forthcoming when the modified gross formula is being used and figures are close. It was also confirmed by Mr. Ferren that both gross and modified floor area figures have been provided for the benefit of the Planning Commission since that body approved this proposal a year and a half ago.

As a point of clarification for the benefit of Mayor Geis-
sert, Planning Director Ferren explained that if Ordinance "B" is adopted and becomes law, a variance would be required for projects that are short required parking. He noted, however, that variances for new projects are not looked upon favorably by staff.

Councilman Walker moved to close the public hearing. His motion, seconded by Councilman Mock.

Councilman Applegate reiterated his desire that people be properly informed as to the possible impact of the proposed action on open and pending development. He also stated his preference that Council be provided with information relative to exceptions to be made, if any, and requested that staff return with this information.

Councilman Walker WITHDREW HIS MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. Councilman Mock, as seconder, did not object to withdrawing the motion.

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved "to continue this hearing for 28 days . . . to September 22 [sic] at 7:00 p.m." His motion was seconded by Councilman Walker and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

Mayor Geissert requested that information be provided regarding other cities that have adopted the gross floor area formula for calculating parking requirements.

City Council
August 11, 1987

17. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

17a. RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER THAT COUNCIL ADOPT VARIOUS MEMORANDUMS OF INTENT, MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING AND ASSOCIATED SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING:

Held pending Executive Session; see Page 39.

17b. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Held; see Page 38.

20. CONSENT CALENDAR:

20a. RELEASE OF SUBDIVISION BONDS - TRACT NO. 27614

Subdivider: Carriage Real Estate Group

Location: West side of Walnut Street, between
234th Street and 235th Street.

Recommendation:

The Engineering Department recommends that the subject bonds be released.

20b. AWARD OF CONTRACT: To furnish replacement hand-held radar units for the Torrance Police Department.

Expenditure: \$5,751.00, including tax.

Recommendation:

The Purchasing Division recommends that the City Council authorize the award of a contract for the purchase of six (6) hand-held radar units from Kustom Electronics, Inc. of San Molino, California as a SOLE SOURCE purchase in the total amount of \$5,751.00 including sales tax.

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to concur with the staff recommendations on Consent Calendar Items 20a and 20b. Councilman Wirth seconded his motion, and roll call vote was un-animously favorable.

City Council
August 11, 1987

* * *

The hour being 12:37 a.m., the City Council recessed without leaving their seats and convened as the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Torrance. Upon the completion of Agency business at 12:38 p.m., the Redevelopment Agency meeting was adjourned and the City Council returned to regular Council agenda order.

* * *

22. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

22a. Councilman Applegate requested that staff closely monitor commuter helicopter traffic. Staff will follow up.

22b. Councilman Applegate commented on his recent fishing trip to Alaska.

22c. Councilman Nakano requested that the City Attorney investigate whether it is within the authority of the Federal Aviation Authority to impose a commuter airline terminal at the Torrance General Aviation Center.

22d. Councilman Nakano expressed his desire that transportation be provided for the City's senior citizens and requested that staff return with information concerning budget priorities relative to providing such service.

Director of Transportation Horkay reported that seniors are encouraged to use fixed bus routes and pointed out that Dial-A-Lift is reserved for those who are unable to walk to the bus stop. He indicated that the information requested would be provided in terms of implementation cost and budget impact.

22e. Councilman Walker commented on Councilman Applegate's Alaskan fishing trip.

22f. Councilman Wirth congratulated Councilwoman Hardison on the marriage of her son the previous weekend.

City Council
August 11, 1987

22g. Councilman Wirth commented on the marriage of former Councilman (current Planning Commissioner) George Brewster's daughter also held on the previous weekend.

22h. Councilman Wirth requested a silhouette or some other means of ascertaining the size and appearance of proposed electronic readerboard signs at Del Amo Fashion Center.

22i. Mayor Geissert commented on a letter she received concerning the long wait for tie-down space at Torrance Airport, and indicating (supported by photographs and documentation) that a number of aircraft holding tie-down spots are in various states of disrepair. The enforcement policy in this latter regard was questioned by the Mayor.

Addressing the Mayor's concern, Director of Transportation Horkay elucidated that although newer leases state that aircraft must be air worthy, some of the very old leases do not contain this clause. Mr. Horkay said he would research this problem.

The Mayor expressed her desire for a timely response to this correspondence and for enforcement of the air-worthy requirement when there is provision therefor.

The Council now returned to consideration of

17b. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Mayor Geissert read the following statement into the record at this time:

The City Council will now recess to closed session to confer with the City Manager regarding salaries, salary schedules and compensation for certain represented employee groups. Authority for holding an executive session for this purpose is contained in the provisions of Government Code Section 54957.6(a).

At 12:50 a.m. the Council recessed for the purpose of holding an executive session to discuss matters set forth above. The City Council reconvened at 1:34 a.m. to consider Item 17a and to take action related thereto.

City Council
August 11, 1987

17a. RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER THAT COUNCIL ADOPT VARIOUS MEMORANDUMS OF INTENT, MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING, AND ASSOCIATED SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilwoman Hardison, moved to concur with the recommendation of staff relative to the Memorandum of Intent for the Torrance Police Officers Association. Roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

At the request of Mayor Geissert, Deputy City Clerk Hong read title and number to:

RESOLUTION NO. 87-194

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE SETTING FORTH CERTAIN CHANGES REGARDING HOURS, WAGES, AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES REPRESENTED BY THE TORRANCE PROFESSIONAL AND SUPERVISORY ASSOCIATION
RESOLUTION NO. 87-177

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved for the adoption of Resolution No. 87-194. His motion was seconded by Councilman Mock and carried by unanimous roll call vote.

Responding to Mayor Geissert's request, Deputy City Clerk Hong read title and number to:

RESOLUTION NO. 87-195

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE SETTING FORTH HOURS, WAGES AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES REPRESENTED BY THE TORRANCE FISCAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION FOR THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 2, 1987 TO JULY 2, 1988

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved to adopt Resolution No. 87-195. Councilwoman Hardison seconded the motion and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

Council resumed regular agenda order for. . .

23. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to adjourn the meeting of Tuesday, August 11, 1987 at 1:36 a.m. (on Wednesday, August 12, 1987) to August 18, 1987 at 5:30 p.m. His motion, seconded by Councilman Mock, carried without objection by those present.

* * *

Marlene Lewis
Minute Secretary

City Council
August 11, 1987

Kate Messer
Mayor of the City of Torrance

Ronald E. Hiben
Clerk of the City of Torrance

Marlene Lewis
Minute Secretary

City Council
August 11, 1987