

**INDEX**  
**TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION – SEPTEMBER 16, 2015**

<b><u>SUBJECT</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><u>OPENING CEREMONIES</u></b>	
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. <b><u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1</u></b>	2
8. <b><u>TIME EXTENSIONS</u></b>	2
9. <b><u>SIGN HEARINGS</u></b>	2
10. <b><u>CONTINUED HEARINGS</u></b>	
10A. ADM15-00003: Phillip Pecord c/o Autozone	2
10B. PRE15-00007, WAV15-00005: Peha & Associates	2-6 <i>Res. 15-037 &amp;-038</i>
11. <b><u>WAIVERS</u></b>	6
12. <b><u>FORMAL HEARINGS</u></b>	
12A. CUP15-00016: Mediterranean Cuisine Operating Co.	6-7 <i>Res. 15-070</i>
12B. PRE15-00015: Korajack Srivongse (Chaturonk Ngamary)	7-8 <i>Res. 15-071</i>
12C. PCR15-00003: Sunny and Steven Sohn	8-11 <i>Res. 15-072</i>
13. <b><u>RESOLUTIONS</u></b>	11
14. <b><u>PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS</u></b>	11
15. <b><u>MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS</u></b>	
15A. Community Development Director Weekly Summary Reports	11
16. <b><u>CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS</u></b>	12
17. <b><u>LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES</u></b>	12
18. <b><u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2</u></b>	12
19. <b><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></b>	12

At 9:25 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, October 7, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

**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, September 16, 2015, in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

**2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Tsao.

**3. ROLL CALL/ MOTIONS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCE**

Present: Commissioners Herring, Polcari, Skoll, Tsao, Watson and Chairperson D'anjou.

Absent: Commissioner Gibson.

Also Present: Planning Manager Lodan, Planning Associate Gomez, Plans Examiner Noh, Associate Civil Engineer Symons, Assistant City Attorney Sullivan.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to grant Commissioner Gibson an excused absence for this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

**4. POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the agenda was posted on the Public Notice Board at 3031 Torrance Boulevard on Friday, September 11, 2015.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Councilmember Herring moved for the approval of the August 19, 2015 Planning Commission minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Watson and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioner Polcari abstaining (absent Commissioner Gibson).

**6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS**

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the applicant has requested a 30-day continuance for Agenda Item 10A, ADM15-00003: Phillip Pecord C/O Autozone, but staff was recommending that it be continued indefinitely since this will be the third continuance.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Tsao moved to continue Agenda Item 10A indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Polcari and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Manager Lodan noted that the matter will be re-advertised when a new hearing date has been set.

7. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1** – None.

\*

Chairperson D'anjou 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. **ADM15-00003: PHILLIP PECORD C/O AUTOZONE (FRANKLIN REAL ESTATE, LP)**

Planning Commission consideration of an appeal of a Community Development Director denial of a Planning Administrative Action to allow exterior modifications to an existing storefront on property located in the C-3 Zone at 4675 Torrance Boulevard. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 153011 – Existing Facilities.

Item was continued in definitely.

10B. **PRE15-00007, WAV15-00005: PEHA & ASSOCIATES (JERRY MCBRIDE)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow first and second-story additions to an existing one-story, single-family residence in conjunction with a Waiver of the side yard setback requirements, on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 406 Camino de Encanto. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Sections 15301 – Existing Facilities and 15305 – Minor Alterations.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request and noted supplemental material consisting of correspondence received after the agenda item was completed.

Chairperson D'anjou disclosed that she had viewed the property and her observations along with tonight's discussion would be the basis for her decision.

Jerry McBride, 406 Camino de Encanto, property owner/applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Larry Peha, Peha & Associates, project architect, submitted additional information, which was distributed to the Commission. He explained that before beginning work on the project, he did a site analysis that revealed a potential impact to a view corridor from the condominiums across Palos Verdes Boulevard, which was taken into account in the design of the project. He reported that the project was originally scheduled to be considered at the June 3, 2015 Commission meeting, but a continuance was requested when his clients became aware of a neighbor's concern about view impact and an upward segment of the roofline was subsequently eliminated to mitigate this impact. He noted that his clients had gone above and beyond the typical neighborhood outreach. He clarified that statistics in the letter submitted by Judy Brunetti, co-president of the Riviera Homeowners Association, are incorrect and the correct figures are in the staff report.

Kiyomi Haverly, 406 Camino de Encanto, property owner/applicant, reported that she and her husband moved from North Redondo because they needed more space for their family and they settled on this property because their sons loved the park-like backyard and a survey of the surrounding neighborhood indicated that a second story would be feasible. She stated that they were disappointed to learn that a neighbor had complained about the project shortly before the June 3 hearing because they had done extensive outreach and neighbors had been very welcoming when they moved in.

Jerry McBride, 406 Camino de Encanto, property owner/applicant, reported that he and his wife distributed approximately 40 fliers either face-to-face or in mailboxes to neighbors on Camino de Encanto, Calle Miramar and condominiums in Village Palos Verdes, prior to an open house held on April 22, 2015 to inform them about the project. He explained that after learning of objections from Andrea Coene, who owns a rental at 422 Calle Miramar, the project was revised so it now has a maximum height 20.5 feet, which is well below the maximum allowed; that after he informed her of the revisions she expressed concerns about trees in the backyard, which he offered to trim after consulting an arborist; and that she failed to respond to further outreach efforts. Additionally, he noted that information about revised project was posted in his front yard; that he invited Riviera Homeowners Association co-president Judy Brunetti to view the project; and that he sent an email to the Village Palos Verdes HOA offering to go over the project and received an acknowledgment that it had been received, but no other response. He stated that having been in the military for 28 years, he understands the importance of following the rules and he and his wife have tried very hard to do the right thing, but they have found the last minute objections to be very frustrating. He called attention to the highlighted map showing all the neighbors who approve of the project.

Jill Tomkwicz, 412 Calle Miramar, reported that her condominium is directly across the street from the proposed project and she cannot determine the view impact because of overgrown foliage and requested that this matter be tabled until December when the City is scheduled to take up the issue of view blocking foliage.

Chairperson D'anjou explained that the Commission could not address view blocking foliage because currently no regulations are in effect.

Ms. Tomkwicz stated that trees blocking views can be trimmed, but the proposed structure would be a permanent obstruction for residents of the condominiums to the rear of the project, who are the only ones affected by it. She reported that she has never been contacted by the applicants.

Commissioner Skoll asked if Ms. Tomkwicz had attended the community meeting hosted by the applicants. She explained that after purchasing her condominium earlier this year, she moved out of state while it was being renovated and only recently returned and learned about the project at an HOA meeting.

Warren Scharff, 414 Calle Miramar, reported that he purchased his home in 1979 with the knowledge that his view was protected by the Hillside Ordinance and since that time two projects have been denied on Camino de Encanto due to view blockage. He stated that he was not claiming that whitewater views would be impacted, but the view from his balcony will definitely look different if this project goes forward. He contended that existing two-story homes look out of place because the area was designed for one-story homes. He noted that there are alternatives to building a second story, including building a semi-subterranean garage, which would add approximately 400 square feet without impacting neighbors.

Debra Breckheimer, 434 Palos Verdes Boulevard, stated that she bought her home in 2010 because she knew her view would be protected and any changes to that view will cause her property to lose value. She suggested that the applicants can expand into their large backyard if they want more space.

Asked by Commissioner Herring to quantify her view loss, Ms. Breckheimer stated that the project would not impact her view too badly and she was more concerned about cumulative impact and setting a precedent that would make it more difficult to stop two-story projects in the future.

Pat Lagnese, read a letter on behalf of his son and daughter-in-law, Tony and Nina Lagnese, 418 Calle Miramar, objecting to the project. The letter asserted that the project would permanently block the majority of the ocean view from their living room and deck, noting that the view is now partially blocked by overgrown trees, but they are working to correct that.

Andrea Coene, resident of 420 Camino de Encanto/ owner of 422 Calle Miramar, stated that she has told the applicants repeatedly that she wants the project lowered by lowering the lot, but they claimed it was too expensive and instead only slightly reduced the project's height. She voiced her opinion that the project does not fit in with the neighborhood.

Christina (last name inaudible/no speaker card), 444½ Calle Mayor, stated that she did not believe the applicants did outreach to neighbors east of the project because she only heard about it at an HOA board meeting. She explained that she is not personally impacted by the project, but believes those who are affected deserve to have the views they paid for protected.

Carma Hardin, 443 Camino de las Colinas, reported that she only learned of the project after receiving notice from the City and suggested that the applicants outreach efforts were clearly inadequate because they distributed only 40 fliers and there are 180 units in the Village Palos Verdes. She contended that photographs submitted by the applicants were not representative of the impact. She stated that while she was not personally affected by the project, she was concerned about the cumulative impact of investors seeking to do the same thing. She conceded that it's a very attractive project, but voiced her opinion that this was the wrong location for it.

Maribeth Borowski, 215 Calle Mayor, indicated that she was not impacted by the project and was there to support her neighbors. She stated that she met the owners of the property when they were walking around the neighborhood and was invited to the community meeting, however, just because someone does outreach does not mean they can violate the Hillside Overlay Ordinance. She called for the ordinance to be strictly enforced so neighbors do not have to go through this process every time someone wants to build.

Craig Reidt, 410 Camino de Encanto, voiced support for the project and commended the applicants for their unprecedented community outreach. He noted that his neighbor was involved in the drafting of the Hillside Overlay Ordinance and it makes clear that projects are considered on an individual basis so there should be no concerns about this project setting a precedent.

Cyrus Shargh, 421 Camino de Encanto, also voiced support for the project, relating his belief that it's well designed and appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Peha suggested that condominium owners' concerns were mainly related to views they might have if view blocking foliage was removed and should be discounted since the foliage has been there for a long time and even if the City decides to take action to regulate vegetation, such action is down the line.

Commissioner Herring noted that a couple of the speakers mentioned that the project would block existing ocean views.

Mr. Peha responded that he went to the units that claimed view blockage and he believes the impact has been mitigated by lowering the roofline. He noted that the Hillside Ordinance provides that each project is considered on a case-by-case basis so there should be no fear of setting a precedent.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Planning Manager Lodan reported that notification of this hearing and the previously scheduled hearing in June was sent to the owner of record for each of the condominium units in Village Palos Verdes at least 10 days before the hearings.

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

Commissioner Tsao suggested the possibility of continuing the hearing so the applicant could do a little more to mitigate the impact and expressed concerns about the proposed rooftop deck.

Planning Manager Lodan clarified that even though the deck is on the roof of the garage, it is considered to be a balcony because it can be accessed by multiple doors on the second floor.

Commissioner Tsao reported that he drove by the site and could not tell if the house to the north was taller than the proposed project, and Planning Manager Lodan recalled that the proposed project is lower than the house to the north at 402 Camino de Encanto.

Commissioner Herring commended the applicants for their extensive community outreach and related his belief that this is a good project. He stated that he understood condominium residents' concerns about view blockage, but felt they should have responded earlier in the process, and indicated that at this point, he was leaning toward approving the project.

Commissioner Skoll stated that according to the photographs submitted by the applicant, the view blockage appears to be minimal and while he would like to personally assess the impact from the condominiums of those who have complained, he was not sure that would be possible. Conceding that there is a foliage problem, he noted that is not something the Commission can address and expressed the hope that the McBrides would trim their trees significantly enough to improve views for condominiums to the east.

Indicating that he was inclined to approve the project, Commissioner Polcari stated that he also saw only minimal view blockage from the photographs, but recognizes that photographs can be deceiving.

Chairperson D'anjou commended the applicants for their extensive community outreach. She pointed out that only a couple of tonight's speakers claimed that the project would result in view loss and one of them characterized the view impact as not too bad. She noted that the project has a flat roof and is only 20 feet high, which is very low for a two-story home, and related her observation that there's a considerable distance between this project and the condominiums across the street, including a green belt, a sidewalk and a four-lane highway. She voiced her opinion that while there may be some slight impact, it was not significant enough to deny the project.

Also voicing support for the project, Commissioner Watson explained that this is an area of post-World War II housing, built for baby boomers and although the homes were well-built with hardwood floors, they were only around 1200 square feet and most all of them have been modified in some way. She recalled that the green belt was controversial when it was installed to provide a buffer for these homes.

Referring to the staff report, Commissioner Skoll noted that the applicant has requested a Waiver of the north side yard setback requirement in order to maintain the existing 3'8" setback and staff has determined that it meets the criteria for granting a Waiver since no living area is proposed at this setback, only the balcony. He also noted that the project complies with all code requirements and is under the maximum FAR.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to approve PRE15-00007 and WAV15-00005, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Watson and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 15-037 and 15-038.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 15-037 and 15-038. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

11. **WAIVERS** – None.

12. **FORMAL HEARINGS**

12A. **CUP15-00016: MEDITERRANEAN CUISINE OPERATING COMPANY, LLC/  
LA CAZE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY (CITY OF TORRANCE)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow an on-sale beer and wine license in conjunction with the operation of a restaurant, on property located in the P-D Zone at 25420 Crenshaw Boulevard. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15301.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request.

Mark Fernandez, representing Mediterranean Cuisine Operating Company, applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. He explained that the company is replacing Daphne's Restaurant with a new concept, which will also feature Mediterranean-style food.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Mr. Fernandez reported that the project includes a complete remodeling of the interior and construction will begin as soon as permits are issued and this re-branding has been done at two other locations in Culver City and Burbank.

Commissioner Herring commented that the remodeled restaurant appears to be a very nice facility, which will add value to this shopping center.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Watson and passed by unanimous voice vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to approve CUP15-00016, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-070.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-070. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

**12B. PRE15-00015: KORAJACK SRIVONGSE (CHATURONK NGAMARY)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow first and second-story additions to an existing one-story, single-family residence on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 5320 Calle Mayor. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Sections 15301 – Existing Facilities.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request.

Korajack Srivongse, project architect, briefly described the proposed project, noting that the project was designed with the addition at the rear of the existing residence so it will still look like a one-story home when viewed from the street. He reported that the project does not affect anyone's view and the plans were shared with neighbors on either side and they have no objections. He explained that his client was adding on because his two granddaughters do not like to share a bedroom.

Chairperson D'anjou commended the architect for the well-designed project, noting that the FAR (floor area ratio) is only 0.21.

Commissioner Polcari asked about the timeline for the project, and Mr. Srivongse responded that he hopes to start construction by early February 2016.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Watson and passed by unanimous voice vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to approve PRE15-00015, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-071.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-071. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

**12C. PCR15-00003: SUNNY AND STEVEN SOHN**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Planning Commission Review to allow the construction of a new two-unit project with two open tandem parking spaces that exceeds an 0.50 floor area ratio on property located within the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District in the R-2 Zone at 1904 Gramercy Avenue. The project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15303 – New Construction.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request and noted supplemental material consisting of correspondence received after the agenda item was completed.

Commissioner Skoll disclosed that he received an email from Bonnie Mae Barnard, of Save Historic Old Torrance (SHOT), approximately one week ago stating that the house at 1904 Gramercy is the only remaining house in Torrance with an intact design by Irving Gill, the architect who designed the Torrance bridge and several business buildings in old Torrance. She explained that ten Irving Gill houses were built, with five on Andreo and five on Gramercy, and of the three that remain, 1904 Gramercy is the only one that still looks like the Irving Gill design. She urged that a CEQA review be conducted to determine what the loss of this structure would mean to the culture of Torrance.

Steven Sohn, owner of the subject property and project architect, reported that he currently lives in Gardena and wants to raise his family in Torrance and began searching for a suitable property over four years ago. He explained that he finally found this property and has worked with Planning staff to come up with an appropriate design and his sister-in-law and her family will live in one of the units and help with the funding. He stated the he was aware of the historic issue, however most of the historic value of the home has been removed because the porch has been enclosed, the windows and doors have been changed, and the roofline has been altered. He noted that the existing two-bedroom, one-bath house is only 740 square feet.

Mr. Sohn voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions, with the exception of Condition No. 6, which requires the relocation of the existing utility pole in the alley to facilitate the movement of vehicles. He explained that he contacted Southern California Edison and was told that it would be very difficult to relocate the pole because of work already done by the next door neighbor and they do not recommend moving the pole.

Commissioner Skoll asked about the claim that the existing house has little historic value.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that the Torrance Historical Society recently conducted a survey of structures within the original Torrance Tract and this structure was included and listed as a “non-contributor” because it’s been significantly modified from its original design.

Commissioner Herring asked if he had discussed the project with neighbors, and Mr. Sohn indicated that he had not.

In response to Chairperson D’anjou’s inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan reported that the proposed parking layout, with two enclosed spaces and two open tandem spaces, would still work if the power pole remains in its existing location and would be the preferred layout if the pole is not moved.

Responding to Commissioner Skoll’s inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan clarified that projects within the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay are not restricted to an FAR of 0.50, however above this limit a Planning Commission Review is required and confirmed that the proposed FAR of 0.65 was in compliance with R-2 standards.

Commissioner Watson stated that she would have thought five parking spaces would be required since there is one three-bedroom and one two-bedroom unit.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that the project meets parking requirements, however one guest parking space would be required if these were condominium units.

Ann Basile, 1824 Gramercy Avenue, stated that the house has been vacant for two years and has become an eyesore and she was pleased that someone was going to fix it up, live in it and take care of it and she was also glad there will be no curb cut so street parking will not be affected by the project.

Randy Langsdale, 1804 Gramercy Avenue, requested clarification regarding the FAR, which was provided by Planning Manager Lodan.

Bonnie Mae Barnard, Save Historic Old Torrance, reiterated the request made in her email to Commissioner Skoll that a CEQA review be completed to determine if the structure has cultural/historical value before it is demolished. She explained that Irving Gill was the architect hired to design buildings in Torrance after the City was laid out by the Olmsted firm and of the three Gill homes left, this one looks most like the original cement cube design. She noted that while the home’s value has been diminished due to the changing of windows, they can be replaced.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that a CEQA review is not required based on California law and staff believes a review is unnecessary due to the fact that Torrance does not have any historic preservation programs in place at this time. He reported that staff was aware of five to seven Irving Gill designed worker homes in Torrance and there are two in addition to the subject property that still demonstrate the original one-story form according to the Historic Resources Inventory: 1) 1920 Gramercy, which is listed as an altered contributor in good condition, with altered windows and added tile roof and tile cladding; and 2) 1819 Gramercy, which is listed as an altered contributor in fair condition, and the comments state that it’s probably the best remaining example of an Irving Gill worker house.

Ms. Barnard explained that anything designed by a significant architect can have historic value and Irving Gill was not only one of the most significant architects of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, he was Torrance's architect. She related her belief that requiring a CEQA review was a reasonable request because the demolition of this structure would be a huge cultural loss.

Commissioner Skoll indicated that he was inclined to require a CEQA review.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that it was staff's position that the project was exempt from CEQA, therefore it was up to the Commission to decide if further review is necessary.

Sunny Sohn, owner of the subject property/applicant, explained that she and her husband have spent a lot of time, money and energy on this project and they only moved forward with it because Planning staff indicated that the existing house had no historical value and they cannot afford any further delays. Noting that the property is not in livable condition, she stated that while she does not know who Irving Gill is, she felt everyone would agree that the house does not look good and detracts from the neighborhood. She emphasized that they are not investors and simply want to build a home in which to raise their family.

Commissioner Tsao disclosed that he drove by the property but did not speak with anyone. He suggested the possibility that if some agency wants to preserve this house, it could be moved to another location at their expense. He noted that the Commission has approved many two-unit projects in this area and the property is currently an eyesore and related his belief that the City cannot stay in the 1920s and needs to move forward.

In response to Commissioner Watson's inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that neighbors within 500 feet received notification of the project and that the applicant was made aware that a series of workshops on potential historic preservation programs were underway and was encouraged to contact the historical society and other organizations interested in preservation. He clarified that staff did not tell the applicants that the structure had no historic value and only reported what is listed on the Historic Resources Inventory.

In response to Commissioner Skoll's inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that the applicants would have to pay any expenses associated with the relocation of the power pole.

Requesting approval of the project, Mr. Sohn reported that this is the first time he has designed a project for his family and he wants very much to become a resident of Torrance and raise his family here.

Chairperson D'anjou stated that she found this case to be very frustrating because while she could appreciate the historic nature of the home, no rally call was put out to save it during the years it sat vacant in disrepair. She indicated that she favored approving the project now that someone has invested in the property and wants to improve it, but was concerned about the power pole issue.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan noted that the letter from Bo Ng, Service Planner for Southern California Edison, states that the company prefers that the pole remain in its existing location and advised that it is within the Commission's discretion to delete Condition No. 6.

In response to Chairperson D'anjou's inquiry, Mr. Sohn agreed to relocate the pole if the Commission decides not to delete the condition.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous voice vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Commissioner Skoll stated that he sympathizes with the Sohns and recognizes that SHOT should have done something a long time ago, however he hates to see the house demolished and wished it could be moved to another location in Torrance and put on display.

Chairperson D'anjou noted that even if the house is determined to have historical significance, the cost to move it or restore it would be astronomical and expressed concerns about the financial burden on the Sohns if the project is delayed.

Commissioner Herring stated that he's in favor of preserving the character of Torrance and according to the staff report, the project "is compatible with the character of the neighborhood and with the development in the surrounding area," and noted that a neighbor attested to the fact that the property has become an eyesore. He voiced his opinion that in addition to preserving history, we must be concerned about the future and it's important to have places where families like the Sohns, who represent Torrance's future, can live and raise their children so Torrance can continue to grow.

Commissioner Watson commented that although she regrets the loss of this house, the City currently has no historic preservation programs in place that would prevent it and she did not think it would be appropriate to deny the project at this time after it has gone through all the planning process.

A brief discussion ensued, and it was the consensus of the Commission to delete Condition No. 6.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved to approve PCR15-00003, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the deletion of Condition No. 6, which required the relocation of the existing utility pole in the alley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-072.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Polcari moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-072. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tsao and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

13. **RESOLUTIONS** – None.

14. **PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS** – None.

15. **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

15A. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR WEEKLY SUMMARY REPORTS**

Planning Manager Lodan noted that the Community Development Director Weekly Summary Reports for August 28, and September 3, 2015 were distributed to the Commission.

**16. REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS**

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the City Council unanimously approved the condominium development at 17502 Van Ness Avenue at the September 15, 2015 City Council meeting.

**17. LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES**

Planning Manager Lodan reviewed the agenda for the October 7, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

**18. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2**

**18A.** Commissioner Skoll expressed concerns about the condition of the access road to Costco and asked about the completion date for the new Costco.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that staff will ask for the access road to be cleaned up and indicated that he had not heard when the new Costco is expected to open.

**18B.** Commissioner Watson asked about the status of the Little Company of Mary property at Torrance Boulevard and Palos Verdes Boulevard, and Planning Manager Lodan reported that the hospital recently indicated that they want to move forward with the project previously approved for that site.

**19. ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:25 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, October 7, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

###

Approved as submitted October 7, 2015 s/ Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk
--