

**MINUTES OF A GENERAL PLAN WORKSHOP #9
OF THE TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance General Plan Planning Commission Workshop convened in a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on September 14, 2005, in City Council Chambers at City Hall.

2. FLAG SALUTE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Muratsuchi.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Fauk, Guyton, Horwich, La Bouff, Muratsuchi and Chairperson Uchima.

Absent: Commissioner Drevno.

Also Present: Senior Planning Associate Chun, Senior Planning Associate Richardson, Senior Planning Associate Lodan, Planning Associate Joe, and Planning Manager Isomoto

Chairperson Uchima explained policies and procedures for the meeting.

Planning Manager Isomoto reported that a meeting scheduled for September 28 had been postponed until November 30 to provide staff with more time and the next scheduled meeting is on October 26 with the focus on refining policy.

Planning Manager Isomoto observed that several points which keep coming up in the process are the question of what the General Plan is; what zoning is and how they interrelate. She stated that the General Plan is the vision that the City is looking for over the next 20 years whereas zoning dictates the actual level of development appropriate for the parcel to allow the vision to be implemented and commercial zoning is based on where the property is and how it interrelates with adjacent properties, traffic, streets, etc. She noted that zones are already in existence citywide and if they require a change that would be addressed after adoption of the General Plan with separate public hearings.

Planning Manager Isomoto reported on progress of the citywide traffic study noting that traffic counts were complete and being analyzed with regard to level of service and she indicated that recommended improvements would be forthcoming. She added that data evaluation is separate and noted that RBF would be creating a land use circulation model using traffic counts.

4. APPROVAL OF WORKSHOP MINUTES

Addressed later in the meeting.

5. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Senior Planner Richardson reported questions regarding existing uses that don't conform to the General Plan designation but are viable uses and cited an office park located between Plaza Del Amo and Monterey Street near Greenwood and Iris constructed in the 70s or 80s as an example. She noted that the area had originally been zoned industrially but during the 1980s most property was recycled to residential uses so the area was re-designated in 1992 to medium density residential. Zoning for the office park remained at M-2 with a buffer zone P1 (Planning) for the residential properties on Monterey. The office park use has remained because zoning has been retained which allows the property owners to continue the use as long as they wish. At such time as the property recycles, the General Plan will provide guidance for any future property owners and that is when a zone change would be initiated.

Commission Muratsuchi received clarification that the General Plan is the vision for the next 20 years and a signal for where the City is going and Senior Planning Associate Richardson noted that what remains is controlled by the zoning and residents should express any issues they may have with zoning at this time.

6. PRESENTATION: LAND USE STATISTICS AND POPULATION AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS

Laura Stetson, CBA, stated they were looking for direction on the seven focus areas for preferred land use for a proposed General Plan. She indicated that there had been much participation in the process and land use decisions need to be made in order to move forward with the rest of the General Plan.

Ms. Stetson provided background on the General Plan noting that it is a guide for the long term enhancement of the community and a plan to coordinate interrelated City systems so they stay in balance and maintain a quality of life. She acknowledged that despite the best laid plans, things change with new visions and goals that come up and she pointed out the importance of revisiting the Plan and renewing the vision with adjustments made if needed.

Ms. Stetson observed that Torrance is a balanced community that has matured over time to have a significant amount of commercial space but she noted that while Torrance has maintained viable, attractive residential neighborhoods, pressure has been created for housing as more and more people want to live in the City. The update will examine the 1992 General Plan to gauge whether it is still valid and determine the best ways to react to internal and external pressures. The City is not only looking at land use and circulation networks, but is also looking to update older proportions of the plan that address public safety, parks, community facilities and infrastructure as well as other components that affect the quality of life and are part of the General Plan. She announced that there would be additional meetings to look at goals and policies for public safety, schools, infrastructure and circulation.

Ms. Stetson explained that the seven focus areas for land use were compiled through a process of very detailed data gathering from a variety of sources including interviews with department heads, school district officials, neighborhood groups and local businesses and input was also taken from the public at the General Plan Exhibit at the Public Safety Open House to measure the general feeling about Torrance. She reported working with the planning department and the public to identify stable areas and those areas that might change and found a desire for the City to preserve the industrial core and job space, with modest growth directed to the City's periphery where recycling land uses would improve business districts, improve neighborhoods and enhance property values. The City would continue to accommodate a diverse range of commercial development and uses at appropriate locations, and modest residential growth is planned to accommodate a diverse demographic and maintain family friendly neighborhoods with new residential only when it proves to be compatible with those areas around it, near established schools and neighborhoods. Mixed use can be accommodated through zoning tools but should be examined on a case by case basis and critically looked at.

Ms. Stetson explained that changes would be signaled by changes to the General Plan Land Use Policy Map for the seven focus areas as they represent the long term vision of Torrance and she clarified that current uses would not have to be abandoned and owner initiated changes consistent with General Plan land use would be acceptable but zoning would not change as part of the process.

Ms. Stetson reported that the General Plan was about half complete and she asserted that there were many more opportunities to participate in the process with all ideas welcome because the Plan is meant to reflect the collective vision of the City.

Diana Gonzalez explained procedures for collecting requested data noting that trip generation uses varied by land use. She added that student generation is calculated for residential uses from a school fee justification study commissioned by the Torrance Unified School District (TUSD) and student generation rates vary depending on the density of the development.

Ms. Gonzalez explained land use designations per the material of record and presented a comparison of year 2025 population projections based on the Planning Commission Land Use Alternative with 2025 population estimates provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) noting that Preferred Planning Commission Land Use Alternatives reflect almost 8,700 less than projected by SCAG and would occur only if land use changes were implemented.

7. PRESENTATION: COMMISSION AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOCUS AREAS

Jeff Henderson indicated that he would be presenting their interpretation of Planning Commission recommendations for the seven focus areas.

Area 1: Crenshaw/Amsler, consists of about 10 acres east of Crenshaw along Amsler Street, Dormont Avenue and Morton Street. The area is underutilized given its location along a major corridor and across the street from Torrance Crossroads. The existing General Plan designates the area as business park. Consensus from previous workshops suggested two alternatives: Recommendation 1 was to consider a new

alternative that would incorporate commercial frontage on Crenshaw with single family housing behind. Recommendation 2 was to have commercial frontage with medium high to high density residential if it could be limited to senior housing or convalescent care.

Planning Associate Lodan reported that staff recommended General Commercial for the Crenshaw frontage but felt that residential should be medium high density with attached town homes or stacked flat units which would facilitate senior housing but would preclude high rise residential development. Staff did not recommend restrictions to allow only senior housing but would allow the potential for entry level housing and alternative housing types. The recommendation is based on the location adjacent to shopping areas and staff felt that the property was not conducive to low density residential due to the configuration which does not allow for typical single family user amenities but would allow for the clustering of units, a greater emphasis on common open space, less emphasis on private open space and buffering of adjacent uses.

Area 2: Western Avenue south between Plaza Del Amo and 228th Street just north of Sepulveda and adjacent to the city of Los Angeles. The existing General Plan for the area calls for business park uses which are the most predominant existing use in the area. The Planning Commission and staff recommend medium density residential use based on impacts to the school system and other quality of life factors.

Area 3: the west side of Border Avenue, south of Carson Street and north of Lincoln. The area currently consists of older office and light industrial uses with several homes interspersed. The existing General Plan allows for business park uses and the Planning Commission recommendation is to retain that designation.

Planning Associate Richardson reported that staff recommended residential office for the area since there has been very little recycling due to the configuration of the area with shallow lots which make it difficult to develop business park uses. The change would provide an opportunity to encourage office uses and an opportunity for architects, designers, artists, and individuals who might like to live where they work as well as providing a type of housing that is inappropriate for most of Torrance. The area would be a transition area between residential to the west and true office park use across Border and staff did not view the area as an opportunity for horizontal mixed use.

Area 4: Western Avenue north between Artesia and 190th Street has a need to develop a vision for development of the corridor as it currently has some outdated industrial and commercial properties with some newer commercial and residential uses. The area contains several General Plan designations including local commercial with a maximum FAR of .4, general commercial with a maximum FAR of .6, a large mobile home park, and a portion of the area is adjacent to single family neighborhoods. The Planning Commission and staff recommendations are to continue to promote general commercial uses with a maximum FAR of .6 and mixed use might be acceptable if more details could be provided as to the type of use. Such mixed use would be limited to a maximum FAR of 1.0 and would be dealt with more through the zoning process and discretionary approvals.

Area 5: Redondo Beach Boulevard runs east/west along the northern city boundary with properties on the north side not within Torrance city limits. The 405 freeway intersects the corridor near Prairie Avenue. Area issues include a lack of

gateways providing a significant entrance to the City, shallow lots and underutilized commercial properties. The existing General Plan calls for .4 FAR commercial uses east of Crenshaw with the area west of Crenshaw medium high and high with local and general uses near major intersections. Several members of the Planning Commission supported changing the designation on the Radium site from general commercial to low density residential or single family with residential office along the Redondo Beach Boulevard frontage. All commercial properties east of Crenshaw would be changed to residential office and the south east corner of Redondo Beach Boulevard and Crenshaw would be general commercial.

Senior Planning Associate Chun reported that the staff recommendation was similar to the Planning Commission recommendation with a change to medium density residential designation on the Radium site because of the ideal location as the site can be developed cohesively without having to assemble multiple lots or displacing existing residential. The site could provide student housing near El Camino College and would not disrupt traffic patterns in the neighborhood because access could be from the Redondo Beach Boulevard corridor. She indicated that a higher density designation could allow a chance to design greater setbacks and a buffer to residential uses as well as provide functional design opportunities for common open space such as parks and other possible amenities. Low density single family development would need to be integrated into adjacent neighborhoods to prevent an isolated neighborhood and common space opportunities would not be provided.

Area 6: the East Victor Precinct is bounded by Anza Avenue, Del Amo Boulevard and Torrance Boulevard, it is bisected by Earl Street in a north/south direction and is under the Hawthorne Boulevard Specific Plan. Area issues include the transition of industrial properties to residential uses and future expansion needs of Little Company of Mary Hospital. The existing General Plan allows for a variety of uses and includes several large parcels designated for business park with a maximum FAR of .6 on Spencer and Earl Streets. General commercial designations with a maximum .6 FAR are located on Earl Street, south of Emerald Street and a variety of residential densities are allowed in the area.

The Planning Commission recommended expanding the hospital medical designation north along Earl Street to Spencer Street, maintaining the business park designation north of Spencer Street and east of Earl Street and allowing a transition from business park to medium density residential for one parcel east of Earl Street and south of Spencer Street. The hospital medical designation is broad enough to include hospital uses and medical offices that would support those uses and the hospital facilities would be located in areas adjacent to the current site.

Senior Planning Associate Lodan reported that the staff recommendation for the East Victor Precinct would extend the hospital medical designation north to Emerald Street, incorporating residential and congregate care facilities to allow for orderly expansion of the main hospital campus and still preserve rental opportunities east of the hospital. The business park area north of Spencer is proposed for residential uses which would facilitate recycling an isolated pocket of industrial uses in favor of residential development and would help offset the potential loss of residential units adjacent to the hospital campus and protect the integrity of other established manufacturing districts in the City.

Area 7: the Jefferson Oak area on the south east corner of Carson Street and Crenshaw Boulevard, bounded by Jefferson to the south and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad to the east and bisected by Oak Street north and south. Business park uses comprise a large portion of the area with heavy industrial uses on Jefferson east of Oak Street. Condos and senior units have been approved on the east side of Oak Street and the Torrance First Presbyterian Church is also in the area. The Planning Commission supported designating properties between Crenshaw and Oak Street and Carson, west of Oak, general commercial with those properties facing Carson east of Oak as well as west of Plaza Del Amo retaining their current business park designation. The remainder of the area not already designated for residential uses would be designated medium density residential which would increase housing options in the area.

Planning Associate Joe explained that the staff recommendation would facilitate improvements to a blighted area and he observed that the area had been transitioning away from industrial to medium density residential. He reported that the business park designation for many of the parcels had not been implemented and the remaining industrial uses are isolated and incompatible with Wilson Park and Torrance High School and with the recently approved residential uses on Oak and the church use in the area. The re-designation of properties to medium density residential would allow for future reuse with development more consistent with the pattern of uses currently in the area while enhancing the visual character of an area that has seen no physical change in quite some time. Re-designating properties on Crenshaw and Carson to general commercial would allow retail and commercial service uses along the corridor and support or have an affect on the residential properties to the east.

8. COMMISSION FOCUS AREA DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Responding to Commissioner Horwich as to whether the Commission would have discretion with regard to the maximum FAR, Planning Manager Isomoto explained that maximum FARs were included in the current General Plan, but also included in the zoning ordinance are opportunities to exceed the maximums with approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) which would require a public hearing with all projects assessed independently.

Commissioner Muratsuchi questioned student generation figures per recommended residential land use which he felt were too low and Ms. Stetson explained that those were the student generation factors provided by the school district and used as a nexus study for establishing school fees. She added that the statistics were taken from the 2004 David Taussig and Associates study and Planning Manager Isomoto explained that the school district is required to update the study every two years.

Commissioner Muratsuchi reiterated his request that a school district representative be present at the meeting and he questioned whether they had been invited to participate in the General Plan process. Ms. Stetson indicated that they had been invited.

Commissioner Muratsuchi questioned the reason for the school district's reluctance to participate and Ms. Stetson reported that the school district had provided enrollment numbers for each school for the past year but unfortunately too late to include in the report.

Commissioner Muratsuchi expressed appreciation for staff and consultant efforts to get information and commented that it seemed unwise to make important decisions without school district input.

Ms. Stetson reported that former Superintendent Dr. Fish had been interviewed at the start of the General Plan process and he felt the district had capacity in the schools and if additional room was needed for Torrance students, inter district or permit students would have to go elsewhere.

Commissioner Muratsuchi acknowledged that as the standard argument of the school district but he pointed that it was clear to the community that some schools had more permit students than other schools. He indicated feeling irresponsible having discussions about the General Plan without having detailed responses to some of these important questions.

Commissioner Faulk also expressed frustration with the school district and supported Commissioner Muratsuchi's comments noting that he preferred to hear directly from the district rather than from an intermediary.

Commissioner Faulk reported that that the Planning Commission had come to a consensus on Focus Area 5 for low density residential and he questioned the staff recommendation for medium density residential with regard to student information. Planning Manager Isomoto explained that district assumptions for students developed by Taussig and Associates indicated that single family student generation is considerably higher than multi family generation which tends to have renters who do not have children or are empty nesters. She reported that multi family housing is comprised of smaller units which are less conducive to having a larger number of children in them but she agreed that the figures appeared counterintuitive.

Jeff Henderson with CBA pointed out an error on one of the slides and noted that in the example, the medium density residential on the Radium site increases the number of students but not markedly.

Commissioner Guyton reminded staff of previous requests for permit information from each of the schools and he expressed discomfort with making decisions on the amount of residential being proposed without more specific information. He reiterated his request for the capacity of each school and what the permits are as they relate to each focus area.

Planning Manager Isomoto reported that after multiple requests she had just today received additional information from the school district indicating that there were 25,176 students enrolled with just under 7% or 1,720 being permit students from outside the district but the information was not broken down school by school.

Commissioner Muratsuchi expressed empathy for frustrated residents concerned with a lack of vision and who indicate that all they see is additional residential development and a piece meal approach. He suggested that if the General Plan is the comprehensive big picture and vision for the next 20 years it seems they should identify what they want in the community and then talk about how to get there instead of focusing on small areas in the City with recommendations for medium to high density

residential. He recognized community frustrations with being unable to see the vision for the City and he expressed disappointment and concern with the direction they were headed noting that it appeared that things were going along business as usual.

Ms. Stetson provided a history of the General Plan process noting that they had talked about Torrance being a balanced City and they had looked at the City as a whole and how people want the City to remain the same. The process began by focusing on land use and exercises were conducted to identify where people wanted change. The current task is to look at how those 7 areas fit into the City as a whole with a projection as to how changes fit in the framework of circulation, public safety and public services. She noted that some cities spend 2 years formulating a visioning report but Torrance chose a different process from the outset.

Commissioner Muratsuchi appreciated the modest approach taken and noted that he had been through the brainstorming exercises regarding vision and goals for the City but he did not see how the 7 focus areas supported ideas such as additional open space, parks and affordable senior housing which had been proposed early in the process. He pointed out that the proposal for a big hospital medical complex could be focused around senior support services clustered in the area with a park to support that so seniors could walk to a neighborhood park.

Ms. Stetson pointed out that everyone wanted parks but cities can not designate new open space unless they are willing to buy it. She noted that when looking at a medical campus, a vision can be written through the policies of the land use element and they will return to that when coming back to goals and policies.

Commissioner Muratsuchi questioned how they would work toward the vision when everything had been general planned for residential and Ms. Stetson indicated that was up for discussion tonight.

Commissioner Muratsuchi observed that it appeared that they were working backwards in that they were setting a direction for focus areas without establishing where they wanted to go first.

Commissioner Faulk pointed out that they were going down the path they had established in the beginning but he acknowledged the importance of vision, open space, and aesthetics though he was not sure how to get there. He questioned SCAG population projections indicating a huge population spike in the next ten years when the past 30 years have been flat and he noted that City projections were more along the historical trends established.

Chairperson Uchima agreed with Commissioner Faulk's comments and noted that Mayor Hardison had testified to the same effect. He questioned whether there had been a new study or whether it was projections were based on SCAG projections because he felt a clear answer was needed in order to meet the residential development needs over the next ten years. He wondered how SCAG calculated their numbers noting that if they are going to designate areas of higher density and increase the population they needed to know why they are doing it.

Chairperson Uchima observed that many of the projects that have come forward are residential developments and he questioned what the demands were for commercial

and industrial space as they have not yet been explained and he is aware of a shortage of industrial space in Torrance especially for those who want to buy their own buildings. The only new development he remembered approving in the past few years was on 190th Street and he noted that it had sold immediately. He suggested that if they were going to make recommendations for a balanced City over the next 10 years he felt it would be important to have a projection for business needs in Torrance.

Ms. Stetson acknowledged that SCAG's projections were historically much higher than what the City wanted to and planned to accommodate and she clarified that the City number illustrated what the population would be if Planning Commission recommendations were followed and that number is only slightly higher than the existing General Plan. She reported that an economic trends analysis had been conducted but she did not have the data currently available.

Chairperson Uchima cited a recent article in the Daily Breeze indicating that Torrance is at a historic low for business space available for lease and he felt business needs should be incorporated into the General Plan in terms of lease-able space and buildings to purchase along with residential needs if Torrance is to maintain being a balanced city. He added that the City could move more toward being a bedroom community if that is what the people want.

Chairperson Uchima asserted that demands and available space should be considered and he suggested that the Amsler area might be appropriate for commercial space. He agreed that the Radium site would probably not be appropriate for industrial use nor would the Western Avenue sites which are pretty small and not suitable but he thought that mixed use could work.

Chairperson Uchima indicated that the Earl Street area is currently industrially zoned and should be considered carefully before changing it to hospital use or residential. He observed that the Jefferson Oak area is challenging as it is transitioning from predominantly industrial to residential and he suggested reviewing projections and business needs before rezoning the area to residential or commercial.

Ms. Stetson agreed to provide additional information for those areas that Commissioners are not comfortable making decisions on so the Commission can discuss them in the context of goals and policies as was planned for the next meeting.

Commissioner Faulk asserted that zoning integrity needed to be upheld in the General Plan and if that could not be included in the General Plan he would like to see that addressed somewhere else as that is one of the major concerns of the Commission and has been raised repeatedly by the community

Commissioner Horwich disagreed with Commissioner Faulk's desire for inflexible zoning noting that he did not think any General Plan adopted in the next 6 months would remain firm over the next 15 years because circumstances change and the City has to change with them. He wanted to see the amount of underutilized area in the City decreased and he did not want to see any blight set into the City because areas are in transition and nothing is being done to improve them.

Commissioner Horwich commented on the dynamic nature of land adding that he did not see anything significant with the 7 sites being discussed and the few changes the

staff was recommending. He asserted that which recommendation got adopted was less important than the need for flexibility based on what the demand is for business or residential.

Commissioner La Bouff expressed surprise at the dissention and requested additional information to proceed.

Chairperson Uchima explained that commissioner comments were made as a result of public testimony, valid suggestions and questions raised since the process began. He agreed that the General Plan is a framework to work with that gets molded over time but he felt that long term goals were necessary to project and accommodate needs 10 years from now. He indicated that he was not clear as to what specific needs are for senior housing, residential, industrial and commercial space and so he has asked the consultants for additional information.

Chairperson Uchima indicated that he also did not want to see blight in the City but he did not want to move forward without thought put into the process and though the General Plan may be a framework to work with, if a direction is set it should be well thought out.

Commissioner Faulk clarified that he was prepared to make recommendations on the previously discussed focus areas but wanted to voice concerns about the entire City and the process to keep it the balanced community that residents and the City have indicated they want. With regard to his concerns with zoning integrity, he cited instances of property owners letting their parcels fall into disrepair so they can cite blight to make a case for a zone change as a way to get a higher economic payoff by converting the use to residential.

Chairperson Uchima called a brief recess from 8:45 to 9:13 pm

9. COMMUNITY INPUT

John Sanders, Emerald Street, Senior Pastor of Pacific View Baptist Church which occupies 4½ acres in Area 6 requested careful consideration of any re-designation that could preclude maximizing the use of their property including senior and other affordable low density housing which would be consistent with surrounding uses. He noted that the Planning Commission alternative was labeled business park and the staff recommendation is for medium density residential and but both are hospital medical.

Commissioner Muratsuchi questioned how the church's use of the property would be affected and Mr. Sanders expressed appreciation for the discussion of the big picture as he felt it was important for the community.

Planning Manager Isomoto pointed out an error on page 11 indicating the incorrect staff recommendation for low medium density residential and she noted that page 22 reflected the proper designation. The current church designation is low density residential but staff had recommended extending the hospital medical designation which would maintain a cohesive area that could be used for hospital medical which could include convalescent hospitals, assisted living, medical offices, etc. She indicated that

would not affect the current use which would be allowed to remain until the property owners choose to do something different with the property and request a zone change.

Mr. Sanders reiterated their strong desire that the Commission and staff reconsider their recommendations so that their options not be precluded. Commissioner Horwich clarified that they could remain the same or add to the property and in no way would they be restricted. Mr. Sanders indicated that part of their vision might include senior and low density housing and Commissioner Muratsuchi clarified that Mr. Sanders was talking about only the church property and they had no plans to expand to other parcels.

Arthur Evans, Arvada Street, received clarification that the General Plan was projected out for 20 years and he expressed concern with the affect to the tax base of eliminating the transmissions lines. He suggested focusing on that for future land occupation for industry and homes on Hawthorne Boulevard if there is land available and he proposed that the Planning Commission appoint someone to interface with Redondo Beach which will have to deal with the same thing, impacting schools and requiring more trailers as well as having a major impact to on traffic.

Tom Brewer, Evalyn Avenue, reported attending most of the workshops and he thanked commissioners for their insight. He was happy to hear residents' frustrations acknowledged noting that they have pointed out problems in the City with traffic and overcrowded schools but those issues have not been addressed and there is talk about adding in more things when the existing issues have not yet been resolved which will just exacerbate traffic and crowding. Mr. Brewer noted that there are 1,720 permit children in the City but 1,627 students will be added if current recommendations are followed yet parents feel the schools are already overcrowded with the temporary classrooms.

Steve Fechner, Surf Management, Van Ness, commented on the differences between the staff and Planning Commission recommendations for the East Victor Precinct especially for the area east of Earl and Spencer Streets. He cited the RV Park as the only property in the area that might be underutilized and he supported the business park alternative as he felt that an overlay for town homes and residential would break up the remaining buildings which have a very long useful life. Mr. Fechner perceived a bias against industrial development in the City and noted that the staff report discussed the area south of Emerald Street that would be rezoned from residential to hospital with the loss of residential properties being compensated for by taking some industrial property elsewhere in the City. He emphasized the importance of protecting the concepts of good zoning and cautioned against a checkerboard approach.

Howard Sachar, South Catalina, Redondo Beach, expressed admiration for the expediency of the Torrance Planning Department noting that he was involved with the Redondo Beach General Plan process which took many years. He reported owning and operating a property management company with properties in Torrance, commented on the blend of residential, commercial and industrial land that is the strength of Torrance and he expressed concern with plans to eliminate support functions vital to the health of the City.

Dee Hardison, West 236th Street, appreciated Planning Commission comments and the questioning of the process and what they would be recommending. She

acknowledged the importance of commercial property in the City but expressed concern with regard to the lack of preservation of industrial property noting that provided high paying jobs and brought a balance to the City of not just new service jobs but high paying technical jobs. She questioned what the current job mix is compared to 20 years ago and felt that business parks were working well, looking good and not blighted so she was not sure why they were being eliminated. Ms. Hardison agreed that the southern part of Western Avenue is a blighted area but felt that the City would have to get involved before anything would happen there and she noted that residents had concerns with the area behind that on the southern part of Western as that is an area also in need of some attention. She cautioned against replacing strong industrial areas with residential, she felt industry was not being supported but rather being eroded and she worried that soon the industry would be gone.

Ms. Hardison appreciated Commissioner Fauk's comments on the very small increase to population and she expressed hope that population estimates for 2025 would not be based on the SCAG estimate as those numbers are always high and she felt sure there were newer numbers available. She encouraged the City to examine historical figures and noted that there is still a lot of underutilized property in the City and single family homes on R-2 and R-3 lots which means there are sites available to provide housing if needed. Ms. Hardison pointed out that Torrance had actually built more housing than what was required and she did not feel it unreasonable that the City could gain 10,000 people in 20 years. She expressed hope that the City would determine the true needs and formulate the Plan with enough vision to meet those needs but not exceed them.

Commissioner Muratsuchi asked about threat of being sanctioned if SCAG requirements are not met and Ms. Hardison clarified that the state would sanction, not SCAG. She related previous experiences with SCAG and noted that in the past the state had not gotten the housing it had hoped for and she did not think the process would be undertaken again. She acknowledged the possibility of being sanctioned but felt that Torrance would fare well as the state takes jobs into consideration and she felt that although the states would work hard to get more housing, Torrance would be able to defend the necessity of meeting their needs.

Victor Methaky, Manhattan Beach, owns the Weber's Bread Depot in Area 4 on 178th Street and Western. He reported difficulty with neighbors complaining about noise and so after 35 years Weber's did not renew their lease because they were not allowed to unload their trucks between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. He thanked the City noting that the zone change from local commercial to general commercial would allow him to construct an 11,000 square foot building that would greatly enhance the value of the property.

Charles Deemer, Talisman, pointed out that because of school district boundaries, putting housing in the Amsler/Crenshaw area would require children to go to South High School which he felt was an impractical use of the property. He questioned how senior housing could be permanently enforced and he discussed population trends, questioning what plans were for acquiring land for schools. He noted that the last General Plan update indicated the saturation point for City population to be 180,000 and he felt that the population increase would mostly be in the western part of the City

Bonnie Mae Barnard, Gramercy, thanked the Commissioners for their comments and concerns and she felt it important to stop the process and determine the focus of the

General Plan before moving forward. She observed that over the past few years there had been much concern voiced about the increase to density in the community and she felt that the General Plan was proposing more increases as a reaction to external pressures such as SCAG population projections. Ms. Barnard reminded everyone that the League had asked the City to look at the impact of the cumulative approved projects in the City but that has not been done and she felt that was vital before moving forward. She noted that at the first meeting when asked about unstable areas she believed the areas were considered unstable because of zoning; she did not realize that by identifying an area as unstable that meant it was an area where housing would be increased.

Ms. Barnard related that in the 1950s Torrance had received an All American award for experiencing growth without strain but she noted that in recent years there had been much strain with numerous traffic problems and schools losing playground areas to portable trailers. She expressed appreciation for the rejected proposal to rezone a massive area from commercial to residential, she questioned data with regard to population growth and the number of students, and she expressed concern with keeping the proper balance between residential, industrial and commercial in the City noting that too much residential would turn Torrance into a bedroom community.

Dick Perkins, Christine Avenue, commented that so far the process had focused on 1.7% of the City. He observed that a large area of the City is zoned for R-2 but is primarily developed R-1 and he felt that those additional units should be considered in the equation of where Torrance is today because thousands of units can be built there with no zone change required. Mr. Perkins reiterated previously made requests to staff to provide a graph or chart to illustrate what that pre-approved number would be if it were to be developed.

10. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Stetson stated that the current land use plan would allow enough housing units to accommodate 143,887 and if the Planning Commission alternatives were adopted the number would be 145,530.

Responding to Commissioner Muratsuchi, Ms. Stetson clarified that the number provided reflected the possibility of 2 units built on all R-2 zoned areas and she added that the housing element indicated the hidden capacity so that is accounted for in the number in the existing General Plan.

Ms. Stetson reported that planning for schools is under the jurisdiction of an entirely different agency, (TUSD) so schools and also parks are not shown on the General Plan map but open space requirements can be included in the Plan. She noted that Mr. Evans had raised an interesting question about the shut down of the Edison facility and Planning Manager Isomoto agreed to find out if updated information was available noting that her most recent information indicated that the plant would not be closing down. Ms. Stetson reported that Edison was currently designated as open space but she would look to see if additional information was available.

Ms. Stetson indicated options for moving forward with the General Plan: 1) Take action on any focus areas the Commission feels prepared to act on; 2) Continue

others to the next meeting to allow staff to return with critical information that has been requested; or 3) Step back to take a critical look at a broader vision of Torrance.

Chairperson Uchima favored stepping back.

Commissioner Muratsuchi echoed Chairperson Uchima's desire to step back noting that the process has been educational and the implications of what should be examined are becoming clearer. He felt it important to examine whether this is where they really want to be headed and suggested looking into where they want to go and then look at how they want to get there.

Commissioner Guyton expressed concerns with industry being replaced by residential and with population increases generating additional operating expenses. He felt that City should be catering to the high tech industry as much heavy manufacturing business has been lost due to the current business climate and he felt that adjustments should be made to the business plan. He suggested that while heavy manufacturing would not be coming back, some of the industrial property could be maintained by identifying future markets and catering to them.

Commissioner Guyton cited the need to sustain the City's revenue and he asked the consultants to look at the Roadium property to see if a Crossroads-type development could be a viable option.

Commissioner Muratsuchi suggested the Commission recommend that the Mayor send a letter to TUSD or an appropriate body requesting a representative be sent to a General Plan meeting and a voice vote reflected unanimous agreement with the exception of Commission La Bouff who disagreed.

Ms. Stetson recommended retaining the proposed meeting dates but adjusting topics for those dates to reflect the requests for additional information and retooled work program.

Commissioner Muratsuchi requested a copy of the latest Taussig study from the school district for the Planning Commission and Ms. Stetson suggested the Planning Commission also review a copy of the City's strategic plan.

Commissioner Faulk asserted that he was not ready to throw out the established focus areas and he expressed support for Commissioner Guyton's suggestion that the Roadium be further looked at.

Responding to Commissioner Muratsuchi, Ms. Stetson indicated that they would not go back to square one but would provide the Commission with additional information about the current mix of land use in the City, where revenue is coming from, and how much housing there is to give a better sense of the current state of the City and help identify problem areas. Many of these topics have been talked about in subcommittees where not all Commissioners were present so it might appear piece meal so information will be brought back to provide a broader picture.

Commissioner Muratsuchi felt that the vision had been constrained by the process they had followed. He cited an earlier suggestion of his to include a vision of working toward extending light rail to Torrance and he felt a focus area would be to

work toward that type of goal but discussions were limited business park, residential, density issues, etc., and they have not been able to work toward the lofty goals identified in early meetings.

Ms. Stetson commented that there were different ways to do General Plans and some cities take years to craft a vision. Torrance chose to do a technical revision to the 1992 General Plan but since the Commission wants to do something more involved she will need to talk to staff about that as there are budget implications.

Commissioner Horwich indicated that he would be in favor of delaying voting if they felt the additional information would be available in another month.

Responding to Commissioner Faulk, Ms. Stetson asserted that the economic impact of the current use vs. what is being proposed would be considered.

Planning Manager Isomoto stated that they had heard good information and she indicated that staff would work to pull information together, take a look at the strategic plan and meet with consultants to see how they can assist the Commission in looking at things differently. She indicated that staff would provide additional information at the October 26 meeting

4. APPROVAL OF WORKSHOP MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of February 23, 2005. Commissioner Faulk seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval with the exception of Commissioner Guyton who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of March 9, 2005. Commissioner Horwich seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval (absent Commissioner Drevno).

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of March 23, 2005. Commissioner Uchima seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval (absent Commissioner Drevno).

The Environmental Quality and Energy Conservation Commission meeting minutes of April 7, 2005 were included for information only.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 13, 2005. Commissioner Muratsuchi seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval with the exception of Commissioners Guyton and Horwich who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

MOTION: Commissioner Guyton moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 27, 2005. Commissioner Uchima seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval (absent Commissioner Drevno).

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of July 27, 2005. Commissioner Uchima seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval with the exception of Commissioner Horwich who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved to approve the General Plan Planning Commission meeting minutes of August 24, 2005. Commissioner Faulk seconded the motion and a roll call vote reflected unanimous approval with the exception of Commissioner Guyton who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

11. PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS RESOLUTIONS

Planning Manager Isomoto explained that the following resolutions were left over business from the previous meeting.

A. DIV05-00012: BHRAT PATEL

Planning Commission consideration of a resolution approving a Division of Lot to allow one lot to be subdivided into two lots on property located in the R-1 Zone at 22245 W. 233rd Street.

Planning Associate Joe read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-118.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-118. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote with the exception of Commissioner Uchima who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

B. CUP05-00020, DIV05-00009: MENILOS SARIDAKIS (CHARLES BELAK-BERGER)

Planning Commission consideration of resolutions denying a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a two-unit attached condominium project and a Division of Lot for condominium purposes on property located in the R-3 Zone at 1008 Arlington Avenue. (Res. Nos. 05-119, 05-120)

Planning Associate Joe read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-119 and 05-120.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolutions No. 05-119 and 05-120. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Faulk and passed by unanimous roll call vote with the exception of Commissioner Uchima who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

C. CUP05-00022, DIV05-0010: ROBERT TREMAN (K.T. ZIEGLER)

Planning Commission consideration of resolutions denying a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a two-unit attached condominium project and a

Division of Lot for condominium purposes on property located in the R-2 Zone at 815 Portola Avenue. (Res. Nos. 05-121, 05-122)

Planning Associate Joe read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-121 and 05-122.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-121 and 05-122. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Faulk and passed by unanimous roll call vote with the exception of Commissioner Uchima who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

D. **ZON04-00006, ZON04-00007, MOD04-00012, MOD04-00013, MOD04-00020, MOD04-00021, TTM061850, TTM61463, DIV04-00019; STANDARD PACIFIC HOMES**

Planning Commission consideration of resolutions denying Modifications of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP03-00034) and Planned Development Permit (PD-03-00004) to allow the construction of a 33-unit townhome development and 86-unit condominium development. Vesting Tentative Tract Maps for condominium purposes, and a Division of Lot to allow a Lot Line Adjustment for properties located at 2303 and 2349 Jefferson Street. (Res. Nos. 05-123, 05-124, 05-125, 05-126, 05-127, 05-128, 05-129)

Planning Associate Joe read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-123, 05-124, 05-125, 05-126, 05-127, 05-128, 05-129).

MOTION: Commissioner Guyton moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-123, 05-124, 05-125, 05-126, 05-127, 05-128, 05-129). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by

unanimous roll call vote with the exception of Commissioner Uchima who abstained (absent Commissioner Drevno).

12. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:47 p.m. the meeting was adjourned to September 21, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

Accepted as Presented February 22, 2006 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
--