

INDEX
TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION – AUGUST 3, 2016

<u>SUBJECT</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
	<u>OPENING CEREMONIES</u>	
1.	Call to Order	1
2.	Flag Salute	1
3.	Roll Call/Motions for Excused Absence	1
4.	Posting of the Agenda	1
5.	Approval of Minutes	1
6.	Requests for Postponement	1
7.	<u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1</u>	1
8.	<u>TIME EXTENSIONS</u>	1
10.	<u>CONTINUED HEARINGS</u>	
10A.	CUP15-00035, DIV15-00011, WAV15-00018: Ricky de la Rosa (Manalo)	2-4
11.	<u>WAIVERS</u>	4
12.	<u>FORMAL HEARINGS</u>	
12A.	CUP16-00008: Arthur Avetisov <i>Res. 16-064</i>	4-6
12B.	CUP16-00009: Simon Thrush (Bow Sparrow, LLC) <i>Res. 16-065</i>	6-7
12C.	CUP16-00005, DIV16-00004, WAV16-00009, ZON16-00002: Robert Stringfield (Wayne Anastasi)	7-10
13.	<u>RESOLUTIONS</u>	10
13A.	MHE15-00094: Bruce Fryman <i>Res. 16-052</i>	
14.	<u>PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS</u>	10
15.	<u>MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS</u>	
15A.	MHE15-00071: John Ernst <i>Res. 16-006</i> 10-12	
15B.	Community Development Director Weekly Summary Reports	12
16.	<u>CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS</u>	12
17.	<u>LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES</u>	12
18.	<u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2</u>	12
19.	<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	12

At 10:05 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, August 17, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

August 3, 2016

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Planning Commission convened in a regular session at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 3, 2016, in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Gobble.

3. ROLL CALL/ MOTIONS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCE

Present: Commissioners D'anjou, Gibson, Gobble, Rudolph, Polcari, Tsao and Chairperson Watson.

Absent: None.

Also Present: Planning Manager Lodan, Planning Assistant Fernandez, Plans Examiner Noh, Sr. Fire Prevention Officer Kazandjian, Associate Civil Engineer Symons and City Attorney Fellows.

4. POSTING OF THE AGENDA

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the agenda was posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard on Thursday, July 29, 2016.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None.

6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS - None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1 – None.

*

Chairperson Watson reviewed the policies and procedures of the Planning Commission, including the right to appeal decisions to the City Council.

8. TIME EXTENSIONS – None.

9. SIGN HEARINGS – None.

10. CONTINUED HEARINGS

10A. CUP15-00035, DIV15-00011, WAV15-00018: RICKY DE LA ROSA (JOE AND OLIVIA MANALO)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a three-unit residential condominium development, in conjunction with a Division of Lot for condominium purposes, and a Waiver of the front yard and side yard setback requirements on property located in the R-3 Zone at 2109 218th Street. This project is categorically exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15303 – New Construction, 15315 – Minor Land Divisions, and 15305 – Minor Alterations.

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Assistant Fernandez introduced the request.

Ricky de la Rosa, project architect, noted that he met with neighbors after the March 2, 2016 hearing and briefly reviewed revisions made to address their concerns about the project's height and mass and privacy issues. He reported that he explored a two-story design, but in order to provide the square footage his client wants, it would have created a huge rectangular mass with no architectural character.

Commissioner Polcari asked about neighbors' response to the new plans, and Mr. de la Rosa reported that he did not have a chance to share the revised plans with them.

Evelyn Davalos, 1746 Manuel Avenue, contended that the scale and size of the project were not in character with the neighborhood, noting that there are no other three-story structures in the vicinity.

Ashley McCarthy, 2113 218th Street, expressed concerns that the proposed project will tower over her home, blocking sunlight and eliminating the view, and reported that a realtor has estimated that it will cause her property to lose approximately \$60,000 in value. She recommended that the applicant consider downsizing or going subterranean.

Gene Higginbotham, 2114 Arlington Avenue, stated that he was strongly opposed to the project and believes that the three-story structure will look out of place in this neighborhood, noting that a two-story "monolith" was built next to his home. He contended that developers were trying to cram as much as possible on a lot to maximize their profits with no regard for the neighborhood.

Brian McCarthy, 2113 218th Street, echoed his wife's concerns that the proposed project will tower over their single-family home, blocking sunlight and intruding on their privacy. He noted that the only other three-story structure in this neighborhood is next to a commercial building and suggested that approving it could open the flood gates for similar projects.

Martin Salzer, 1741 Martina Avenue, submitted photographs to show the size of the project in relation to other structures in this neighborhood, noting that the proposed 30-foot high structure will be almost as high as the adjacent power pole and it will dwarf the 18-foot tall two-story apartment building next to it. He expressed concerns that adding 9 parking spaces off the alley will exacerbate existing traffic problems. He contended that the project would also cause his property to lose value due to privacy impact and urged that it be limited to two stories.

Elizabeth Thompson, part-owner of apartment building at 1751 Martina Avenue, voiced objections to the project, explaining that it will negatively impact her tenants' privacy and block sunlight and airflow to the building.

Planning Manager Lodan clarified that since this project is not located within the Hillside Overlay District, there is no review in terms of a project's impact on air, light, view and privacy.

Mike Richardson, 1742 Watson Avenue, urged denial of the project, relating his belief that three-story structures do not belong in the Old Torrance neighborhood.

Emily Barclay, 1734 Watson Avenue, voiced objections to the project, citing the impact on traffic and parking. She expressed concerns that the owner of the subject property has made no effort to share the plans with her.

Maureen Whitlock, part-owner of apartment building at 1751 Martina Avenue, reported that she and other neighbors met with the architect and shared their concerns, which were mainly about the height and the massiveness of the structure, and suggested that the revisions were not shared with neighbors because the architect knew that a two-foot height reduction would not be satisfactory. She urged that the project be scaled down.

Marianne Salzer, 1741 Martina Avenue, expressed concerns that the proposed project will intrude on the privacy of her backyard, block sunlight from her property, decrease the value of her home and infringe on her quality of life.

Returning to the podium, Mr. de la Rosa stated that his clients are not developers and they purchased this property knowing that they would have the opportunity to develop it just like anyone else who purchases an R-3 zoned property. He reported that this area was zoned R-2 and R-3 several years ago because City planners recognized the need to accommodate Torrance's growing population and noted that there are many three-story homes in the area, including at Amapola and Carson and Cabrillo and Carson. He disputed the claim that the two-story apartment building adjacent to the project was only 18 feet tall and maintained that the height of the project was nowhere near the height of the adjacent power pole. He explained that he is utilizing the existing façade in order to blend with the neighborhood and the rest of the structure will have a similar design.

Commissioner Polcari indicated that he could not support the project due to the widespread opposition of neighbors to the three-story design.

Commissioner Gibson expressed concerns about project's 30-foot height.

Mr. de la Rosa explained that a three-story structure is the only way to get the square footage his clients desire, noting that R-3 standards allow structures up to 35 feet.

Commissioner Gobble asked about the feasibility of reducing the size of the back units from three bedrooms to two bedrooms.

Mr. de la Rosa reported that the extra bedroom is worth between \$750 and \$900 per month in terms of rental income. He noted that the property owner intends to live in the front unit and have one or two of her sons live in the back, or those units may be leased or sold to provide retirement income.

Commissioner Rudolph related his belief that the proposed project was a little too ambitious for this site.

In response to Commissioner Tsao's inquiry, Mr. de la Rosa reported that his client has owned the property for four years and currently lives in one of the units.

Olivia Manalo, owner of the subject property, explained that she can do a two-story project, which will be less expensive to build, but it will be a disadvantage to her because she can't get the same FAR (floor area ratio) and the project will not be as attractive as the one proposed. She emphasized that she is not an investor, but rather an ordinary person who is retired and trying to maximize her property.

MOTION: Commissioner Gobble moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

A brief discussion ensued, and it was the consensus of the Commission to continue the matter indefinitely to allow the applicant an opportunity to revise the project.

MOTION: Commissioner Rudolph moved to continue the hearing indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Polcari and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Planning Manager Lodan announced that the hearing will be re-noticed and re-advertised once a new date has been set.

11. **WAIVERS** – None.

12. **FORMAL HEARINGS**

12A. **CUP16-00008: ARTHUR AVETISOV (KIR TORRANCE, LP)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of small recycling collection facility within the parking lot of an existing shopping center on property located in the H-PR Zone at 19800 Hawthorne Boulevard. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15301- Existing Facilities.

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Assistant Fernandez introduced the request.

Arthur Avetisov, applicant, reported that he would like to operate a small recycling collection facility to the rear of UFC Gym at the Torrance Promenade Shopping Center, which will help promote recycling and increase diversion rates.

Commissioner Gobble suggested that the facility will provide an opportunity for multi-family residences to recycle since their trash collection service does not always include recycling.

Planning Manager Lodan agreed, but noted that it is the City's expectation that trash haulers will sort and recycle after collection when separate recycling bins are not provided for multi-family developments.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Mr. Avetisov reported that he has been in business 6 years and has 7 other recycling facilities, most of which are in Orange County; that the facility will be manned with one attendant during operating hours, which are 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Sunday; that he does not expect that people will drop off items during off hours because this has not been a problem at his other facilities; and that the shopping center has a cleaning service that cleans the lot throughout the night.

Commissioner Gibson reported that there have been several traffic accidents on Del Amo Boulevard near the driveway serving In-N-Out Burger because people are ignoring turning restrictions and expressed concerns about bringing more traffic to this center.

Planning Manager Lodan explained that the closest driveway and the most direct route to the recycling facility is on Hawthorne Boulevard and staff does not believe it will generate enough traffic to cause a problem on Del Amo Boulevard.

Commissioner Gibson noted her disagreement with staff, citing concerns about residential neighbors who are having difficulty getting in and out of their neighborhood via Del Amo Boulevard.

Commissioner D'anjou asked how the applicant plans to get the word out about the facility since it's off the beaten path and Mr. Avetisov reported that his main marketing tools are the Internet, Google Maps and classified ads.

In response to Commissioner Polcari's inquiry, Mr. Avetisov reported that he expects that a truck will have to come and collect recyclables once a week based on his experience at his other facilities.

A brief discussion ensued regarding traffic at this center, and Mr. Avetisov explained that he does not expect this facility to generate a lot of traffic, but expressed his willingness to install signage directing customers to exit via a certain route and to require trucks picking up recyclables to use Hawthorne Boulevard driveways only.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the penalty should truck drivers not use the specified driveways, and Planning Manager Lodan advised that the facility's Conditional Use Permit could be revoked for failing to comply if this is made a condition of approval.

Mr. Avetisov stated that he would agree to having his CUP revoked if truck drivers fail to follow the specified route in and out of his facility and voiced his agreement with all other recommended conditions of approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner D'anjou and passed by a 6-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Gibson dissenting.

Following a brief discussion, the public hearing was reopened so the public could comment.

Patrick Kim, 4204 Michelle Drive, questioned why a traffic study was not required for this project, and Planning Manager Lodan explained that a facility of this size does not require a traffic study.

Jeannie Fuller, 4133 Konya Avenue, expressed concerns about confusing markings on one of the driveways on Hawthorne Boulevard, which causes traffic to back up.

Irma Chiota, 4602 Konya Drive, reported that she prefers recycling centers with reverse vending machines rather than facilities with attendants because you get the full value for recyclables.

Maro Matthews, 109 Paseo de Granada, expressed concerns that the facility would detract from the appearance of the center.

Ellen Jung, 4489 Spencer Street, voiced her opinion that there was no need for this recycling center, which will only bring more traffic to the area.

Responding to audience members' comments, Mr. Avetisov reported that customers can request that the attendant do a count, instead of weighing recyclables and they will receive the full CRV value; that the facility is expected to have one customer every 20-30 minutes, many of whom are already at the center to visit other stores; that the facility is behind the UFC gym and won't be visible from the street; and that recycling centers provide an opportunity for people to get cash for recyclables rather than discarding them in their recycling bins.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to approve CUP16-00008, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the following added condition: That the recycling collection truck shall be required to access the facility from driveways along Hawthorne Boulevard to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rudolph and passed by a 6-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Gibson dissenting.

Planning Assistant Fernandez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-064.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-064 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gobble and passed by a 6-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Gibson dissenting.

12B. CUP16-00009: SIMON THRUSH (BOW SPARROW, LLC/ROBERT HILLARD)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a limited vehicle dealership within an existing industrial building on property located in the M-1 Zone at 1205 Bow Avenue. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15301 – Existing Facilities.

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Assistant Fernandez introduced the request.

Commissioner Rudolph announced that he has a business relationship with Nagy Bakhoum (project architect) and was therefore recusing himself from this hearing and exited the dais.

Nagy Bakhoum, project architect, reported that he designed the remodel of this building a few years ago and it was now changing hands and the new owner plans to use it as a storage facility for vintage and classic cars, which he sells primarily over the Internet. He voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Rudolph).

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to approve CUP16-00009, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Rudolph).

Planning Assistant Fernandez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-065.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-065. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Rudolph).

Commissioner Rudolph returned to the dais.

12C. CUP16-00005, DIV16-00004, WAV16-00009, ZON16-00002: ROBERT STRINGFIELD (WAYNE ANASTASI)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Zone Change from ML (M1-PP) (Limited Manufacturing District with Light Manufacturing – Precise Plan Overlay) to R-3 (Limited Multiple Family Residential District), in conjunction with a Conditional Use Permit to allow a 25-unit multiple-family residential community, a Waiver to allow a reduction of the window separation requirement and a Tentative Tract Map for subdivision purposes, on property located in the ML (M1-PP) Zone at 20411 Earl Street. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Sections 15332 – In-Fill Development and Final Environmental Impact Report State Clearinghouse No. 20081110146 – 2009 Torrance General Plan Update.

Recommendation: Approval.

Planning Assistant Fernandez introduced the request and noted supplemental material consisting of updated resolutions and code requirements and correspondence received after the agenda item was completed.

Scott Anastasi, representing the applicant, provided background information about the project. He apologized for failing to do proper outreach to the surrounding community.

Randy Morris, project architect, briefly described the proposed project. He discussed efforts to mitigate the privacy impact on single-family residences to the north, which are at a lower elevation, noting that windows facing these residences will be in bathrooms and laundry rooms and they will have higher sill heights and be made of translucent glass. He reported that concerns have been expressed about the project's impact on parking, however, similar developments with the same parking ratio have not impacted street parking because adequate parking is provided on-site and CC&Rs prohibit the use of garages for storage. He stated that the applicant has

requested a Waiver of the code requirement that a 10-foot buffer be provided between parking and any exterior walls with windows, explaining that the windows in question are in garages and bathrooms and while they can be eliminated, he does not feel these windows would create any concerns.

In response to Commissioner Polcari's inquiry, Mr. Anastasi reported that the property is currently in escrow and he hopes to begin building the project as soon as possible.

Patrick Kim, 4204 Michelle Drive, reported that neighbors have had only a few days to review the plans for this project, but his initial reaction is that it's too dense and too intrusive on the adjacent single-family neighborhood. He expressed concerns that the project will tower over his property and make it feel like he's living in a fishbowl. He stated that he was not trying to stop the project and just wants it to be harmonious with his neighborhood.

Ellen Jung, 4489 Spencer Street, noted that she was also representing her parents who live on Michelle Street, but were unable to attend this hearing. She expressed concerns that the project will increase traffic and exacerbate existing safety hazards for pedestrians, including school children and the elderly.

Bonnie Fuller, 4133 Konya Drive, suggested that translucent glass can easily be replaced with clear glass once a home has been purchased so they are not an effective way to mitigate privacy impact. She estimated that approximately 50 children will live in the proposed development and questioned where they will go to school, relating her understanding that Towers Elementary School is at capacity. She expressed concerns about the project's impact on traffic and parking and recommended that the development be limited to one-story houses.

Bob Chiota, 4206 Konya Drive, expressed concerns that the addition of 25 residences will make existing traffic problems worse and suggested that the development may be more palatable if the number of units is reduced from 20 to 25 and they are all single-family residences.

Irma Chiota, 4206 Konya Drive, echoed concerns about the project's impact on traffic and parking in this already congested area.

Walter Gonzalez, 4124 Konya Drive, indicated that he shares his neighbors' concerns about the project's impact on traffic and parking, but was mainly concerned about the loss of the tennis courts, which will impact the quality of life for the community.

Peter Coffee, 4131 Michelle Drive, urged the Commission to look at the big picture and consider the traffic impact in the context of the surrounding area, which includes schools, a hospital and a fire station.

Gisela Spees, 4108 Konya Drive, expressed concerns about the loss of the tennis courts.

Laurie Tom, 4128 Konya Drive, voiced objections to allowing a high density development in this overcrowded area.

Greg Brandt, 4221 Michelle Drive, expressed concerns that the development will tower over his neighborhood, noting that the tennis courts are clearly visible from his residence.

Responding to audience members' comments, Mr. Anastasi stated that as a developer, he is also concerned about traffic and safety issues and suggested that a stop sign may be

needed at Del Amo Boulevard and Earl Street. He asserted that the project would not contribute to existing parking problems because there is ample parking on-site. He stated that every project he has built has only increased the value of properties around it and he believes the same will be true in this case. He explained that the tennis club had first right of refusal and could have purchased the subject property but declined to do so.

Commissioner D'anjou recommended that the hearing be continued so the developer could do community outreach and Commissioner Polcari and Commissioner Watson noted their agreement with this recommendation.

Commissioner Gibson indicated that she was strongly opposed to allowing 25 residential units in this highly congested area.

Mr. Anastasi agreed to a continuance but requested that the new hearing be scheduled at the earliest possible date because he was facing time constraints.

In response to Commissioner Rudolph's inquiry, Mr. Morris provided clarification regarding the difference in grade between the subject property and adjacent residences on Michelle Drive.

Commissioner Rudolph asked about the maximum number of units allowed.

Mr. Anastasi reported that 18 units per acre are allowed and 17.8 units per acre are proposed, noting that having more units keeps them more affordable.

Commissioner Rudolph noted that there are industrial uses on two sides of the proposed development, which can create conflict, and questioned what was being done to ensure that adjacent businesses do not have to curtail their operations.

Mr. Anastasi suggested that windows on adjacent residences could be configured to minimize conflict, but doubted that there will be any problems if everyone utilizes their property the way they're supposed to.

Commissioner Gibson suggested that the applicant consider meeting with the principals of nearby schools to find out if there is space available for children who live in the development to go to school.

City Attorney Fellows agreed that it might be worthwhile for the applicant to touch base with the school district, but noted that one of the purposes of Development Impact Fees, which are paid by developers, is to provide classrooms for the anticipated student population.

Commissioner Gobble suggested that the grade of the property might have to be changed to a certain extent to reduce the project's impact and stressed the need to maintain proper drainage so rainwater does not flow into the backyards of homes on Michelle Drive. He also stressed the need to ensure that there is safe ingress/egress for the development because the hilly terrain can create visibility issues.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to continue the hearing indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by a 6-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Gobble dissenting.

Commenting on his vote, Commissioner Gobble explained that he would have preferred to continue the hearing to a date certain as requested by the applicant.

Planning Manager Lodan announced that the hearing will be re-noticed and re-advertised once a new date has been set.

13. **RESOLUTIONS**

13A. **MHE15-00094: BRUCE FRYMAN**

Planning Commission adoption of a Resolution reflecting their decision to uphold an appeal of a Community Development Director approval and deny without prejudice a Minor Hillside Exemption to allow a detached deck in the rear yard of an existing two-story, single-family residence on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 3019 Windmill Road.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-052. The motion was seconded by Commissioner D'anjou and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioner Gobble abstaining.

14. **PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS** – None.

15. **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

15A. **MHE15-00071: JOHN ERNST**

Planning Commission consideration of an appeal of a Community Development Director approval of a Minor Hillside Exemption to allow an as-built rooftop air conditioner unit on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 112 Via Colusa. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15301 – Existing Facilities.

Recommendation: Denial of the appeal and approval of the project.

Planning Assistant Fernandez introduced the request and noted supplemental material consisting of photographs taken by staff from the appellant's residence and a photograph previously submitted by the appellant.

Phillip Toomey, legal counsel for John Ernst, applicant, stated that staff has determined that the rooftop air conditioner unit does not have a significant adverse impact on views as reflected in the staff report from the January 20, 2016 hearing when this matter was originally considered; that this opinion is supported by the photographs in the supplemental material taken by staff, which clearly show that the view corridor in question is already obstructed by landscaping and utility lines; and that this underscores the fact that action taken by the Commission on January 20 to deny the appeal and approve the project was the correct decision. He noted that the Commission's decisions must be based on evidence and the evidence has not changed since the January 20 meeting, and while the composition of the Commission has changed there are still

enough of the same Commissioners that one would reasonably expect the same result. He reported that although he believes the applicant is entitled to keep the air conditioner on the roof from a legal perspective, he sent a letter to the City Attorney's office offering to discuss finding a middle ground, such as some type of an amortization period.

Maro Matthews, 109 Paseo de Granada, appellant, submitted photographs for distribution to the Commission. He explained that the photographs provided by staff do not tell the whole story because he has a different perspective when sitting on the couch enjoying the view. He conceded that there are utility lines and trees in this view corridor, but suggested that does not make the air conditioner unit any less of a monstrosity. Referring to photographs he submitted, he contrasted the original unit installed in 1971 with the new unit, noting that the applicant had initially claimed that the replacement unit was "like-for-like" but the original one appears to be between one and two tons, while the new one appears to be five.

Commissioner Rudolph explained that the difference between the January 20 hearing and the subsequent hearing on May 18 was that on January 20, there was no input from neighbors. He asked about Mr. Toomey's offer to the City Attorney's office about possible mitigations.

Mr. Toomey recalled that the only one who spoke at the May 18 hearing was a young man representing Mr. Matthews and the evidence was the same as included in the staff report for the January 20 hearing. He explained that he did not want this case to get blown out of proportion so he reached out to Assistant City Attorney Sullivan and suggested the possibility of an amortization period, after which the air conditioner unit would be relocated to the ground because he felt that might be a cost-effective way to resolve this matter.

Commissioner Rudolph indicated that he was inclined to support the solution proposed by Mr. Toomey and suggested the possibility of continuing the hearing so the applicant and the appellant could arrive at a mutually beneficial agreement.

Mr. Toomey responded that it was time to take action on this matter and affirm the decision that was made on January 20 because it is both the legal and the right thing to do.

Commissioner Watson stated that she was inclined to follow staff's recommendation and deny the appeal and approve the project, pointing out that according to photographs, there would still be vegetation in the distance blocking the appellant's view should the unit be removed.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the possibility of screening the unit with painted panels or vegetation.

Mr. Toomey reported that this possibility was considered, but screening the unit would only add to the view impairment because the enclosure would have to be much larger than the unit due to code requirements. He requested that the Commission make a final decision this evening and offered to work with his client and Mr. Matthews to try to arrive at an amicable solution.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to deny the appeal and approve MHE15-00071 as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by a 5-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Rudolph dissenting and Commissioner Gobble abstaining.

Planning Assistant Fernandez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-006.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 16-006. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by a 5-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Rudolph dissenting and Commissioner Gobble abstaining.

15B. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR WEEKLY SUMMARY REPORTS

Planning Manager Lodan noted that the Community Development Director Weekly Summary Reports for July 15, and July 21, 2016 were distributed to the Commission.

16. REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS – None.

17. LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES

Planning Manager Lodan reviewed the agenda for the August 17, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

18. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2

Commissioners welcomed Scott Gobble to the Commission.

Commissioner Tsao requested an excused absence for the August 17, 2016 meeting.

19. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:05 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, August 17, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

###

Approved as submitted September 21, 2016 s/ Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk
