

**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 15, 2012 in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Skoll.

3. ROLL CALL/ MOTIONS FOR EXCUSED ABSENCE

Present: Commissioners D'anjou, Gibson, Polcari, Rizzo, Weideman, Skoll and Chairperson Uchima.

Absent: None.

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

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, August 9, 2012.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Weideman moved for the approval of the July 18, 2012 Planning Commission minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS – None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1 – None.

*

Chairperson Uchima 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. PRE12-00007: JOHN J. YANKOSKY (SAM LEUNG)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow first and second-story additions to an existing two-story, single-family residence on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 5356 Doris Way.

Recommendation: Approval.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana introduced the request.

Commissioner Skoll stated that he was not present at the August 1, 2012 meeting when this item was originally considered but he listened to audiotapes from the meeting and was prepared to participate in this hearing.

Commissioner Weideman disclosed that he had visited 5364, 5327 and 5323 Doris Way and his observations, along with the testimony from this hearing and the previous hearing, would be the basis of his decision.

John Yankosky, project architect, reported that in response to concerns discussed at the last meeting, he has agreed to eliminate the balcony off the master bedroom to address the privacy impact at 5364 Doris Way and that he visited 5327 Doris Way, but did not observe a view impact.

Commissioner Weideman noted that there was also discussion about raising the sill height of the window in the master bedroom facing 5364 Doris Way.

Mr. Yankosky stated that staff recommended a minimum sill height of 5', however, he would prefer a minimum sill height of 4½' to allow for a 2' x 2' or 3' x 2' window.

Commissioner D'anjou reported that she visited 5327 Doris Way and did not observe any view blockage, noting that the predominant view from this home is almost completely blocked by 5337 Doris Way due to the way the structures are angled.

Mercedes Houghtaling, 5324 Doris Way, voiced objections to the proposed project due to the impact on her neighbors' views.

Commissioner Weideman reported that he visited 5323 and 5327 Doris Way and did not see any view impact, except for standing on the front porch.

Zhaoji Hou, 5327 Doris Way, stated that the proposed project would block ocean and sunset views from the front of his home and it would also block the views of his neighbor at 5323 Doris Way.

Cheung Hiuching, 5327 Doris Way, explained that the view impact was not apparent when staff visited her home because it was hazy, but in good weather there is an ocean view that would be completely blocked by the proposed structure. She stated that while there is no existing seating area in the front yard, they've only been in the home for approximately one year and they may decide to add one in the future.

Chairperson Uchima reported that he visited 5327 Doris Way on a fairly clear day and did not see the ocean view Mr. Hou and Ms. Hiuching had mentioned. He asked if the original color photos submitted by Mr. Hou at the last meeting were available because they might show

the impact better than the black-and-white copies in the staff report; Planning Manager Lodan provided file copies of the color photos for the Commission to review.

Commissioner Weideman voiced his opinion that a view impact from a front yard or driveway, which is apparently where the photos were taken, was not as significant as a view impact from inside the home.

Ms. Hiuching conceded that there was no view impact from inside her home, but stated that her children really enjoy the view from the front yard.

John Houghtaling, 5324 Doris Way, related his observation that many residents are building patios in their front yards to take advantage of the view. He suggested that the impact on the sunset view will be more pronounced in the winter when the sun sets further south.

Marge Miller, 5364 Doris Way, stated that she was present to support her neighbors, noting that she often sees Mr. Hou and his children playing in the front yard in the early evening.

In response to Chairperson Uchima's inquiry, Ms. Miller confirmed that the elimination of the balcony off the master bedroom had addressed her privacy concerns.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Yankosky reiterated his position that the project would not impact views. He reported that the subject property has a better vantage point of the same view Mr. Hou claims would be blocked and you have to use your imagination to see the ocean.

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

Commissioner Rizzo asked for input from Commissioners who had visited the property.

Commissioner Polcari stated that he drove by the property but couldn't see anything.

Commissioner Weideman reported that the only impact he observed was from the front porch, front yard and driveway and there was no impact from inside the house.

Commissioner D'anjou stated that she went to the site two times to make sure she wasn't missing something, but did not see a view impact. Based on her experience as a parent, she doubted that the children were savoring the view when playing in the front yard.

The Commission briefly discussed raising the sill height of the master bedroom window, and reached a consensus to require a 5-foot minimum sill height as recommended by staff.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved for the approval of PRE12-00007, as conditioned including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the following modifications:

Add

- That the balcony shall be eliminated
- That the west-facing window in the master bedroom shall have a minimum sill height of 5 feet.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-044.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-044 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Weideman and passed by unanimous vote.

10B. PRE12-00008: KEVIN LANG (JOHN AND PAT LANG)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow first and second-story additions to an existing two-story, single-family residence on property located within the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 319 Monte D'Oro.

Recommendation: Approval.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana introduced the request and noted supplemental material consisting of a revised silhouette certification and a revised resolution of approval.

Commissioner Skoll stated that he was not present at the August 1, 2012 meeting when this item was originally considered but he listened to audiotapes from the meeting and was prepared to participate in this hearing.

Commissioner Weideman disclosed that he had visited 408 Via Monte D'Oro.

Kevin Lang, project architect, reported that he met with Patrick Smith, 408 Monte D'Oro, and observed that the silhouette was infringing on his view; that he agreed to lower the height of the project by 6-9 inches to restore the ocean view; and that he was able to achieve a 6-inch height reduction by changing the roof pitch from 2.5-in-12 to 2-in-12, which is 3 inches lower than the maximum height of the existing ridgeline.

Patrick Smith, 408 Via Monte D'Oro, stated that he spoke with Pat Lang shortly before noon and she indicated that the silhouette would be dropped a few more inches. He expressed concerns that the figures listed in the revised resolution do not appear to reflect the 6-inch height reduction mentioned by Mr. Lang.

Chairperson Uchima related his understanding that the view impact was from an original portion of Mr. Smith's house and Mr. Smith reported that he has made no changes to the footprint of the house.

Bill Balcer, 408 Paseo de las Estrellas, stated that a height reduction of 6-9 inches would restore his sliver of ocean view, however, he also was concerned that the figures don't seem to reflect this reduction.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana offered corrections to Condition Nos. 3 and 4 in the revised resolution. He explained that the discrepancy occurred because the conditions typically reference the maximum height of the residence, which in this case is higher than the maximum height of the addition. He confirmed that the maximum height listed is the finished height of the addition including all roofing materials, underlayment and Spanish tiles.

Mr. Smith requested clarification regarding the height reduction.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana advised that the original project had a maximum height of 124.60' and the revised plans show a maximum height of 124.09', which represents a height reduction of 6.12 inches. He noted that the revised silhouette certification (supplemental

material) indicates a maximum height of 124.25', which is approximately 2 inches higher than the proposed maximum height.

Mr. Lang explained that the revised silhouette certification included in the supplemental material reflects the height of the silhouette last Saturday and that the silhouette was modified this morning to accurately reflect the revised plans, but he did not have the paperwork to verify it at this time.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana noted that without a revised silhouette certification that reflects the changes that were made today, staff has no way of knowing its current height and how it compares to the revised plans.

Mr. Smith indicated that he had not noticed any change in the silhouette today, however he would be satisfied if the project is reduced 6.12 inches in height.

Mr. Lang submitted color photos showing the silhouette from two weeks ago and the silhouette today after it was modified to accurately reflect the revised height of the project.

Commission Weideman reported that he visited Mr. Smith's home today at approximately 12:30 p.m. and the photo of the revised silhouette submitted by Mr. Lang matches what he saw at that time.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Weideman moved to approve PRE12-00008, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff with the following modifications:

Modify

No. 3 That the maximum height of the ~~residence~~ addition at the highest point on the roof shall not exceed a height of ~~20.25'~~ 20.33' as represented by the elevation of ~~124.25'~~ 124.09' and a lowest adjacent grade of ~~104.0'~~ 103.76' based on a benchmark elevation of 96.56' located near the northeasterly corner of the property as shown on the official survey map on file in the Community Development Department.

No. 4 That the height of the ~~structure~~ addition shall be certified by a licensed surveyor/engineer prior to requesting a framing or roof-sheathing inspection and shall not exceed ~~20.25'~~ 20.33' based on an elevation of ~~124.25'~~ 124.09' and a lowest adjacent grade of ~~104.0'~~ 103.76' as indicated on the certified silhouette based on the benchmark elevation of 96.56' as shown on the survey map in the Community Development Department.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Polcari and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Commissioner Skoll commended Mr. Lang for working with neighbors to resolve their concerns.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-045.

MOTION: Commissioner Weideman moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-045 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Polcari and passed by unanimous vote.

*

The Commission recessed from 8:10 p.m. to 8:20 p.m.

11. **WAIVERS** – None.

12. **FORMAL HEARINGS**

12A. **PCR12-00001, WAV12-00005: ELIPIDIO MANALO**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Planning Commission Review to allow two units to exceed a 0.50 floor area ratio in conjunction with a Waiver of the side yard setback on property located within the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District in the R-2 Zone at 2212 Gramercy Avenue.

Recommendation: Approval.

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

Elipidio Manalo, 2212 Gramercy Place, applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. He reported that he met with a neighbor earlier in the day and agreed to change the west elevation façade to wood siding from the top of the balcony to the roofline, however, the balcony will be stucco to blend with the stone finish of the existing house, which he cannot afford to change at this time.

Sara Guyan, 2119 Gramercy Avenue, voiced objections to the proposed project and urged the Commission to enforce the restrictions established for the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District. She expressed concerns that another applicant agreed to install wood trim on his building in 2005, but it was never done and there was no enforcement.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that the trim would have to be installed before the final building inspection if it was required by a condition of approval and that a complaint can be filed and staff will investigate if someone believes a project has not complied with a condition of approval.

Gene Higginbotham, 2114 Arlington Avenue, stated that he is not personally impacted by this project, but felt it was very important that everyone follow the rules that have been established for this area, which is what he did when he recently built an addition to his house. He indicated that he was strongly opposed to the Waiver of the side yard setback requirement and the floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.648.

Planning Manager Lodan clarified that the Waiver of the side yard setback requirement is only for the north wall of the garage; that the living space above meets all setback requirements; and that staff supports the Waiver because it's the only way to provide the four required parking spaces without adding a curb cut on Gramercy. He noted that if the garage was detached and had no living space above, only a one-foot side yard setback would be required. He advised that an FAR up to 0.65 not including the garage is allowed in the R-2 Zone in other areas of the City; that an FAR up to 0.65 including the garage is allowed in the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay with Planning Commission approval; and that a project with an

FAR of 0.50 or under is allowed by right and does not have to go through the Planning Commission Review process.

Mr. Higginbotham explained that he chose to comply with the restrictions in the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District rather than pushing the limits because he felt it was important to maintain the character and the scale of this historical neighborhood. He indicated that he supports the City's requirement that R-2 projects provide 4 parking spaces and does not want more curb cuts on Gramercy because he believes that would be very detrimental.

Chairperson Uchima stated that he understands Mr. Higginbotham's desire to maintain the character of this area, however, the existing guidelines provide the Commission with some latitude and allow an FAR up to 0.65 as long as the project would not have a significant negative impact.

Mr. Higginbotham stated that while this project does not negatively impact him, he would be greatly impacted if a similar project was built next door due to the reduced side yard setback.

Chairperson Uchima explained that each project is considered on an individual basis and judged on its own merits.

Commissioner Weideman commented that since the City has not established a Historic Preservation District, the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District is the only tool the Commission has to preserve the character of these two blocks of Gramercy, which have beautiful and historic Craftsman homes, and he felt the Commission should avail itself of the opportunity to do so by strictly enforcing the guidelines, including the 0.50 FAR.

Noting that there was much discussion of historic preservation during the General Plan update, Commissioner Skoll indicated that he strongly supports the preservation of historic old Torrance and would not vote to approve a project that deviates from the guidelines established for the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District.

Gary Candell, 2216 Gramercy Avenue, voiced objections to the proposed project, stating that he was also representing the neighbor at 2208 Gramercy Avenue. He reported that the owner of this property has encroached on his property; that he has divided the existed single-family house on this property into two homes; and that the rear of the property looks like "Sanford and Son," with non-operable vehicles parked in the driveway. He contended that the proposed project would greatly impact his quality of life and that of his neighbors.

Commissioner Skoll questioned whether the reduction in the side yard setback would create access issues for the Fire Department, and Planning Manager Lodan advised that the Fire Department did not object to the Waiver because the setback on the other side exceeds requirements.

Bonnie Mae Barnard, vice president of Save Historic Old Torrance, 2028 Gramercy Avenue, noted that she previously submitted a letter detailing her concerns about the project (supplemental material). Referring to copies of the *Torrance Telegram* distributed to the Commission, she reviewed photographs of homes in old Torrance that have been remodeled and enlarged while maintaining an FAR of 0.50 or below and preserving the character of the neighborhood. She reported that she met with Mr. Manalo earlier today and was pleased that he agreed to add wood siding to the façade of the addition, however, she does not support the project due to the Waiver and the FAR. She urged the Commission to require the applicant to design a project that blends with this historic neighborhood.

In response to Commissioner Gibson's inquiry, Ms. Barnard confirmed that no area of the City has been designated as a Historical Preservation District.

Chairperson Uchima commended Ms. Barnard for her efforts to preserve the old Torrance neighborhood.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Manalo indicated that he was under the impression the project complied with requirements because it has an FAR of 0.50, excluding the garage.

In response to Commissioner Skoll's inquiry, Mr. Manalo stated that he did not know anything about the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay District when he purchased this property and his discussion with Ms. Barnard earlier today was his only contact with Save Historic Old Torrance.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan noted that applicants are not required to meet with representatives of Save Historic Old Torrance.

Commissioner Polcari stated that he was not convinced this project was in the best interests of the neighborhood because it doesn't look like any of the other houses and it is quite large, therefore he would not vote to approve it.

Noting that the front elevation of the project appears to be very plain, Chairperson Uchima indicated that he would be more inclined to support it if architectural details were added so it would blend in with the neighborhood. He asked if the applicant would like an opportunity to revise the project.

Mr. Manalo agreed to revise the plans, but requested that Commissioners clarify their position with regard to the FAR.

Chairperson Uchima stated that he is flexible on the FAR, however other Commissioners have indicated that they are not and he believed the Commission needs to wait and see what is proposed before making any judgments.

MOTION: Commissioner Weideman moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Skoll and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Skoll voiced his opinion that the character of this neighborhood must be maintained and indicated that he would not support a project that exceeds an FAR of 0.50.

MOTION: Commissioner Skoll moved to deny PCR12-00001 and WAV12-00005 without prejudice and discussion briefly continued.

Commissioner D'anjou related her understanding that the applicant had agreed to a continuance so the project could be revised.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that if the Commission continues the hearing rather than denying the project without prejudice, the applicant will be able to submit new plans at a later date without having to pay new application fees.

Chairperson Uchima stated that he favored continuing the hearing so Mr. Manalo could work with neighbors to see if he can resolve their concerns without having to pay additional fees.

Commissioner D'anjou stated that she also favored a continuance because it seems that Mr. Manalo may not have fully appreciated the historical significance of this area and how strongly residents feel about it. She offered the following substitute motion.

MOTION: Commissioner D'anjou moved to continue the hearing on PCR12-00001 and WAV12-00005 indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Polcari and passed by a 4-3 roll call vote, with Commissioners Gibson, Skoll and Weideman dissenting.

12B. CUP12-00013: RICHARD L. PARR (CLARIFY HOLDINGS, LLC)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of an indoor sport and training facility within an existing industrial building on property located in the M-2 Zone at 444 Alaska Ave.

Recommendation: Approval.

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

Commissioner Rizzo disclosed that he went to high school and is a member of the same church as Mr. Waylon, who is seated with the proponents of this project, however, this will not affect his decision this evening.

Richard Parr, South Bay Surf LLC, applicant, briefly described the proposed indoor baseball training facility, which includes 15 batting cages, noting that the facility will be used by ballplayers of all levels from professional to Little League.

Commissioner Polcari disclosed that he has worked with Mr. Parr in conjunction with his employment at Northrop Grumman, but it would not affect his decision in this case.

In response to Commissioner Weideman's inquiry, Mr. Parr reported that the hours of operation will be 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. He explained that during the school year, youths will be the primary customers from 3:00 p.m. to closing; that adults will use the facility prior to that time; and that during summer and school breaks, the facility will offer youth camps from 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Commissioner Skoll expressed concerns about potential safety issues related to the access easement this property shares with De Lorenzo Marble & Tile, 450 Alaska Avenue.

Mr. Parr related his understanding that trucks associated with De Lorenzo Marble use the access on the other side of their property near the railroad tracks and the shared easement is only used to access customer parking. He reported that the blacktop in the easement area will be redone and the "No Parking or Stopping" area will be repainted with cross-hatching so it will be clearly identified. He offered his assurance that youths will not be allowed to loiter in the parking lot or easement area. He noted that De Lorenzo Marble closes at 4:30 p.m. and most school children will not arrive until 4:00 p.m. so there will only be a brief overlap.

Commissioner D'anjou requested clarification regarding access to De Lorenzo Marble because the staff report mentions that the shared easement is the only access to 450 Alaska Avenue, however she observed a second driveway when visiting the site.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that the secondary access in the railroad right-of-way has evolved into a driveway but there is no approved curb cut for this access and this is probably due to legal issues involving the ownership of the property.

Associate Civil Engineer Symons reported that the land in question is owned by the railroad company.

Jon Corcoran, South Bay Surf LLC, applicant, offered his assurance that the project was designed with the safety of children in mind. He explained that the facility will offer one-hour lessons with professional coaches and it includes waiting areas for parents to wait for their children and for children to wait for their rides.

Mr. Parr stated that he intends to be at the facility on a daily basis and managing it will be his second career when he retires from Northrop Grumman in three years.

Chairperson Uchima asked about the possibility of installing a closed-circuit camera to monitor the parking lot and Mr. Parr reported that this is a condition of approval (No. 15).

Joe De Lorenzo, Lorenzo Marble & Tile, 450 Alaska Avenue, noted that he submitted a letter detailing his concerns along with photographs and documentation (supplemental material). He contended that the shared driveway would pose a definite safety hazard for children using the facility because large trucks carrying slabs of stone use this driveway. He related his understanding that the applicant intends to offer summer camps for 50-100 children. Additionally, he explained that the site is located in a major flood zone, which could create problems because rainy days are prime time for indoor sports facilities. He reported that the company had to relocate 8 years ago when M-1 properties surrounding their previous location in west Torrance were rezoned to R-3.

Chairperson Uchima asked about the timing of deliveries. Mr. De Lorenzo explained that he has no control over the delivery of containers from the port; that slab deliveries are usually late in the day; and that deliveries are handled by shipping companies that use trucks of various sizes depending on the load.

Commissioner Skoll pointed out that the documentation submitted by Mr. De Lorenzo concerning the recorded easement clearly states that there shall be no parking or stopping of any vehicle at any time in the shared access easement area. He expressed concerns about flooding in this area because the photos submitted by Mr. De Lorenzo are quite dramatic.

Associate Civil Engineer Symons advised that the flooding is due to an undersized storm drain owned and maintained by L.A. County that gets overwhelmed during large storms; that it is unlikely to be replaced due to the tremendous expense involved; and that the flooding will be alleviated as properties are redeveloped and they are required to restrict the amount of water that drains from their property.

In response to Commissioner Gibson's inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan provided information about Soccer City's recent approval to operate a school.

Commissioner D'anjou questioned whether the secondary driveway is used by delivery trucks because it seems to align perfectly with the drop-off point at De Lorenzo Marble and

trucks using the shared driveway have to make a sharp right turn and go through a fairly narrow opening.

Mr. De Lorenzo stated that some drivers use the secondary driveway, but he tries to discourage them because it was not designed for this purpose. He confirmed that the primary access is the shared driveway.

Commissioner Weideman requested clarification regarding the site's zoning.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that the property is zoned M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, but the General Plan Designation is Light Industrial and recreational facilities are allowed with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. He explained that the site is part of the City's central manufacturing district, which stretches from Maricopa to 190th Street; that due to a variety of factors, including the downturn in the economy and the movement of industrial uses away from the L.A. basin, some buildings in this area have been remodeled or demolished and rebuilt to provide a more business park type atmosphere; and that staff views alternate uses such as the one proposed as interim uses with the hope that manufacturing will return in the future.

Commissioner Skoll indicated that he liked the project but was concerned about safety issues.

Mr. Corcoran stated that he is a safety professional currently working for Sony pictures and he appreciates the importance of safety. He pointed out that the majority of the parking is at the rear of the property away from the shared driveway and there is another entrance to the building convenient to this parking. He suggested that if there is flooding like what is shown in Mr. De Lorenzo's photos, the facility will be closed because no one, including the people who work there, would be able to enter the site.

Mr. Parr clarified that a condition has been added that Mr. Corcoran was not aware of, which requires that there be only one entry point into the building and it will likely be the front entrance because the handicap access and the elevator are located there.

Chairperson Uchima suggested that providing another entrance away from the shared easement would alleviate concerns about the safety hazard to children.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana advised that the Police Department believes having only one entrance will make it easier to monitor children entering and exiting the facility, but the condition does not specify which entrance so any of the entrances could be used.

Mr. Parr explained that changing the entrance to the side or rear of the building was not feasible because another ADA approved access would have to be constructed and parking spaces would have to be eliminated to make room for the ramping, which means that the facility would have to be downsized.

Mr. Corcoran offered his assurance that children's safety was a primary consideration in the design of the project and emphasized that there will be cameras monitoring the parking lot and children will not be allowed to loiter there.

Commissioner D'anjou commented that she believes Mr. De Lorenzo's concerns are legitimate because he operates heavy machinery that could potentially injure children and his company would be liable if such injury occurs. She noted that the documentation he submitted

indicates that this building was intended for use as office or warehouse space and the proposed use is much different so he needs to be assured that it will be properly managed.

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

Commissioner Skoll stated that he was in favor of the project because he was convinced that the applicants understood the concerns about children's safety and would do everything possible to protect the safety of everyone who uses the facility.

Commissioner Weideman disclosed that he visited the site earlier in the day but did not speak with anyone. He related his observation that large trucks using the shared driveway have to do a lot of maneuvering to get to Mr. De Lorenzo's business and expressed concerns about their use of the railroad right-of-way because it could be unstable since it was not designed for this purpose.

Commissioner Gibson expressed support for the project, noting that she is strong proponent of children's safety.

Commissioner Rizzo stated that he also supports the project and believes it will be a good use for this site as long as the applicants are mindful of the neighboring business and try to accommodate it. He strongly encouraged the applicants to look into creating two entry points into the facility, one for handicapped access and one for day-to-day operations.

Chairperson Uchima asked about the possibility of requiring a second entry point.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana recommended modifying Condition No. 14 to allow a second entry point and advised that staff will work with the Police Department to ensure that it meets with their approval.

Chairperson Uchima stated that he would support the project with this modification.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to approve CUP12-00013, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff with the following modifications:

Modify

No. 14 That the applicants shall control public access ~~through a single entry point via lobby or staff desk~~ to the satisfaction of Torrance Police Department.

Add

- That the hours of operation shall be 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-048.

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 12-048 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Skoll and passed by unanimous vote.

*

The Commission recessed from 10:30 p.m. to 10:35 p.m.

12C. CUP12-00011, DVP12-00006, WAV12-00009: BEHROUZ ELIASSI (GLUKEL, LLC)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Development Permit to allow the expansion of an existing auto repair facility with retail, in conjunction with a Waiver to allow a reduction of the setback requirement on property located in the H-MP Zone at 22707 Hawthorne Boulevard.

Recommendation: Denial without prejudice.

Sr. Planning Associate Santana introduced the request.

Behrouz Eliassi, 22707 Hawthorne Boulevard, applicant, expressed his willingness to correct the deficiencies in the parking and landscaping as discussed in the staff report and indicated that the Waiver was necessary to comply with these requirements. He stated that he has been trying to obtain a permit to develop the vacant portion of his property for nine months in order to create more jobs and enhance the area.

Commissioner Skoll noted that staff has determined that the project does not meet the hardship criteria for granting a Waiver of the setback requirement.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that staff is also concerned about the access to the site and circulation because under the proposed plans, five more tenant spaces would be added, with roll up doors serving as the main access, and cars parked in front of one of the tenant spaces could block access to the rest of the lot. He explained that staff has recommended that the applicant demolish the existing building rather than building around it because it really constrains what can be done with this site.

Chairperson Uchima disclosed that he recently bought tires at the existing tire store on this property but it would not affect his decision. He voiced his opinion that the buildings the applicant proposes to add are too close to Hawthorne Boulevard and would severely limit on-site circulation.

Commissioner D'anjou asked about the possibility of moving some of the repair bays to the rear of the property, and Planning Manager Lodan reported that staff had suggested that to the applicant.

Commissioner D'anjou questioned whether Mr. Eliassi would consider moving units 2 through 5 to the rear of the property in order to improve on-site circulation.

Mr. Eliassi stated that he would have to discuss this with the owner of the property.

Chairperson Uchima asked if Mr. Eliassi would like to continue the hearing so he could work with staff on revising the plans, and Mr. Eliassi agreed to do so.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Polcari moved to continue the hearing on CUP12-00011, DVP12-00006 and WAV12-00009 indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Weideman and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

13. RESOLUTIONS – None.

14. PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS – None.

15. **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS** – None.

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 September 5, 2012 Planning Commission meeting.

18. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2**

18A. Commissioner Weideman requested an excused absence from the September 5, 2012 Planning Commission meeting.

Chairperson Uchima, seconded by Commissioner Polcari, so moved and the motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

18B. Commissioner Weideman stated that he was surprised that the school at Soccer City was approved administratively due to the parking situation.

18C. Chairperson Uchima asked about the new staff member present at the meeting, and James Gorbin, Structural Plans Examiner, introduced himself.

18D. Commissioner Skoll asked about the status of the commercial project at the corner of Pacific Coast Highway and Hawthorne Boulevard.

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the project is in plan check and the Public Works Department is in the process of going to bid for roadway improvements at this intersection.

19. **ADJOURNMENT**

At 11:08 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, September 5, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

| |
|--|
| Approved as Submitted October 3, 2012 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk |
|--|