

January 20, 2010

**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, January 20, 2010 in the Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Skoll.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Browning, Busch, Horwich, Skoll, Uchima and Chairperson Weideman.

Absent: Commissioner Gibson.

Also Present: Planning Manager Lodan, Planning Associate Gomez, Civil Engineer Symons, Fire Marshal Kazandjian, Plans Examiner Noh and Deputy City Attorney Sullivan.

MOTION: Commissioner Browning moved to grant Commissioner Gibson an excused absence from this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich 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 Wednesday, January 14, 2010.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Browning moved for the approval of the November 18, 2009 Planning Commission minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS - None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1

*

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

Agenda Item 10A was considered out of order at this time.

10A. WAV09-00011: WILL BASILIO (STEPHEN JANGAARD)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Waiver to allow less than the required rear and side yard setback requirements in conjunction with a garage addition to an existing one-story, single-family residence on property located in the R-1 Zone at 5102 Merrill Street.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request.

Stephen Jangaard, 5102 Merrill Street, applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

In response to Commissioner Browning's inquiry, Plans Examiner Noh confirmed that in areas where the setback will be less than five feet, exterior walls will have to be fire-rated.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the approval of WAV09-00011, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-001.

MOTION: Commissioner Browning moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-001. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

8. TIME EXTENSIONS – None.

9. CONTINUED HEARINGS

9A. CUP09-00021: THE LOFT HAWAIIAN RESTAURANT (MARUMATSU, INC.)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow an on-sale general alcohol license in conjunction with the operation of an existing restaurant use on property located in the C-R Zone at 2210 Artesia Boulevard.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request.

Ted Kawasaki, representing the Loft Hawaiian Restaurant, 2210 Artesia Boulevard, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that the Police Department reviewed the application and had no objections to allowing the sale of alcohol at this location.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Uchima moved for the approval of CUP09-00021, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 09-062.

MOTION: Commissioner Uchima moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 09-062. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

10. WAIVERS

10A. WAV09-00011: WILL BASILIO (STEPHEN JANGAARD)

Considered out of order see page 2.

11. FORMAL HEARINGS

11A. CUP09-00023, WAV09-00010: DEAN REUTER (MEDARD H. CRONIN)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a church with a shared parking agreement in conjunction with a Waiver of the side yard setback requirement on property located in the M-2 Zone at 2911 and 2927 Lomita Boulevard.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request.

Dean Reuter, project architect, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Commissioner Browning noted that staff was recommending that the term of the off-site parking agreement be increased to a minimum of 10 years.

Mr. Reuter stated that he believed the church could obtain a five-year parking lease, relating his understanding that staff wanted a long-term agreement because the existing agreement is month-to-month.

Planning Manager Lodan confirmed that a five-year parking lease would be sufficient.

In response to Commissioner Skoll's inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan provided clarification regarding the parking arrangement and confirmed that churchgoers would be able to exit on Telo.

Commissioner Skoll voiced his opinion that there is a critical need for a traffic signal at Telo and Lomita Boulevard. Noting the many medical facilities in this area, he reported that doctors have expressed concerns about the difficulty patients have making left-hand turns at this intersection due to the traffic.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the church's hours of operation. Planning Manager Lodan advised that in order to allow the church some flexibility in its hours of operation, staff included a condition specifying only that church services shall not take place between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday so as not to interfere with nearby businesses.

Commissioner Busch noted that Condition No. 6 prohibits the operation of a primary school, day care or summer camp at this location and requested that the matter be brought back to the Commission if the church seeks approval for this type of operation in the future.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Browning moved for the approval of CUP09-00024 and WAV09-00010, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, adding a condition that the term for the off-site parking lease shall be a minimum of five years. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 10-002 and 10-003.

MOTION: Commissioner Browning moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 10-002 and 10-003 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Busch and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

11B. CUP09-00013, DVP09-00001, EAS09-00003, MOD09-00003: DEL AMO 5, LLC

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit, Development Permit, and Modification of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP65-38) to allow the construction and operation of a new senior housing development composed of two residential buildings with subterranean parking and a new parking structure on property located in the HBCSP-DA1 Zone at the northwest corner of Carson Street and Del Amo Circle Drive, west of Hawthorne Boulevard.

Recommendation

Denial without prejudice.

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

Commissioner Uchima reported that he leases an office across the street from the subject property, and Assistant City Attorney Sullivan confirmed that he could participate in this hearing because there was no conflict of interest.

Keith Palmer, Bryant Palmer, Soto, Inc., project architect, provided background information about the project site. He reported that a commercial development that included three high-rise office towers was approved for the site in 1965, but only the first phase of the project was built; that recent proposals for an apartment complex (2001) and a condominium complex (2004) were rejected; and that after exploring various options, the current owner of the parcel, Del Amo 5 LLC, has decided that a senior housing complex is the best solution. Referring to renderings, he briefly described the proposed project, which consists of a senior apartment complex and a senior independent living facility totaling 460 units in two buildings each with six levels of living space over two levels of subterranean parking. He noted that approximately 100,000 square feet of the development will be common areas, including dining halls, multi-purpose rooms and various amenities, and the project's FAR (floor area ratio) would be similar to what was approved in 1965 deducting this square footage. He proposed that an exception be made to the City's requirement that units be a minimum of 750 square feet because this is a unique project located within the City's urban core.

With the aid of slides, Tim Fox, representing Senior Resource Group, provided background information about SRG, the developer/operator of the project. He reported that the company has been in business since 1988; that it has been recognized as an innovator in senior living facilities and for its award-winning senior communities; and that it currently has two projects in development in Northridge and Scottsdale, Arizona. He noted that the company's developments offer many amenities, including high quality dining, fitness programs, and various classes and activities designed to enrich the senior living experience.

Commissioner Browning asked if the company is similar to Sunrise Senior Living. Mr. Fox explained that Sunrise is a substantially larger, publicly traded corporation and unlike Sunrise, SRG does not build stand-alone, single-purpose senior facilities and

concentrates instead on large campus senior communities where people can age in place as their needs change. He stated that the company is more focused and has only one or two projects going at a time, whereas, Sunrise at one time had 75 projects under development.

Commissioner Browning questioned how this project site compares in size to the company's other communities. Mr. Fox reported that the company has built projects on sites ranging from 3 acres to 27 acres; that the project currently under construction in Northridge is similar in scale to the proposed project; and that the company's goal is to design a project that complements the surrounding community.

Commissioner Busch stated that he is a strong proponent of senior housing and recognizes the need for senior apartments, especially since it has been 30-35 years since new apartments have been constructed in Torrance, however, he was concerned about the size and scale of this project. He noted that the proposed FAR is more than double the FAR recommended for this area and exceeds the FAR approved for the commercial complex in 1965. He questioned whether other sites in Torrance were considered for this project or if it could be downsized.

Mr. Palmer explained that his firm was hired to design a project for this particular site. He stated that he was aware that there could be objections to the project's density, and the applicants were prepared to deal with this, however other developers besides SRG have looked at the site and felt that they needed the proposed density in order for a project to be viable.

Commissioner Busch asked about a request by a homeowner (supplemental material) that a condition be added requiring the installation of a traffic signal at Del Amo Circle and Carson Street.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that staff was concerned about a signal at this location due to the proximity to the signal at Hawthorne Boulevard and Carson Street, but would be willing to explore the possibility.

In response to Commissioner Skoll's inquiry, Planning Manager Lodan reported on the status of the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). He confirmed that the proposed units would be credited towards the City's RHNA allocation, noting that there is no separate category for senior housing.

Commissioner Browning stated that he believed the applicant had a good concept but in the wrong location and suggested that the project would be better located on the outskirts of the city. Referring to the Initial Study, he questioned how a project with 600 parking spaces could be determined to have no impact on traffic.

Rich Barretto, Linscott, Law & Greenspan, traffic consultant for the project, reported that senior living facilities generate considerably less traffic than typical residential complexes and that an analysis of 11 key intersections revealed that the project's impact would not reach the 2% threshold over which a project is determined to have a significant impact.

Chairperson Weideman expressed concerns that the Commission was not provided with a copy of the traffic study.

Referring to the Initial Study, Commissioner Horwich requested clarification of Item 3(d) – Air Quality, which refers to mitigations for the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Planning Manager Lodan explained that the term “sensitive receptors” refers to children and the elderly who are more susceptible to air pollution and the mitigations proposed are meant to minimize the exposure of students at the nearby school to pollutants from trucks during the construction process.

Commissioner Uchima noted that according to the photographs in Mr. Fox’s presentation, SRG’s other developments are low-rise buildings and expressed concerns that having a six-story building so close to Carson Street could impede visibility for traffic.

Mr. Palmer reported that the Northridge project currently under construction is similar in height to the proposed project. He confirmed that adequate line-of-sight would be maintained for traffic, explaining that the building will be 20 feet away from the street at its closest point and 40-50 feet away as it nears the corner.

Commissioner Busch noted that SRG’s La Vida Real development in San Diego consists of 353 units on 11 acres and questioned whether a vacant parcel of this size was available in Torrance. Planning Manager Lodan stated that he was not aware of any residentially zoned property of this size.

The Commission briefly recessed from 8:32 p.m. to 8:40 p.m.

Chairperson Weideman invited public comment.

Ralph Mangione, vice president of Village Court Del Amo Homeowners Association, 21345 Hawthorne Boulevard, explained that the proposed project is directly across the street from his condominium complex, which is a senior age-restricted development that opened in January 2006. He reported that there are several unsold units in his development and four foreclosures and expressed concerns that the proposed project will further diminish property values. He also expressed concerns that the project would obstruct views from his complex and exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems in the area. He noted that the association’s concerns were detailed in the letter submitted along with a petition (supplemental material).

Commissioner Skoll related his belief that the association’s letter raises some valid concerns about the project.

Commissioner Browning indicated that he shared the association’s concern about the project’s impact on traffic and found it difficult to believe that it wouldn’t worsen traffic congestion in this area.

Commissioner Busch stated that while he was not on the Commission when the project was approved, he is familiar with Village Court Del Amo, which is an attractive, conveniently located complex, and he believes property values will increase as soon as the economy improves. He noted that views are not protected in the complex because it

is not located in the Hillside Overlay, however, the other concerns mentioned about traffic and parking could be considered.

In response to Commissioner Busch's inquiry, Mr. Mangione reported that the developer of the project never contacted his homeowners association.

Donna Spreitzer, president of Southwood Homeowners Association, stated that the association believes the proposal to build senior housing on this site is a step in the right direction, but they are concerned about the density of the project because traffic congestion is bound to increase with 460 units.

Arnold Katz, Village Court Del Amo, related his experience that seniors get a lot of visitors even though they may not drive and expressed concerns about the proposed project's impact on traffic. He pointed out that some of the units are extremely small, with the smallest being only 350 square feet. He questioned whether the fire department would be able to handle the increased volume of emergency calls that would be generated by this facility. He urged the Commission to review the financial stability of the developer to ensure that the project, if approved, will be completed.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan noted that the financial viability of a project was not within the Commission's purview.

Carol Kim, Village Court Del Amo, echoed concerns about the proposed project's impact on traffic. She noted that there are two senior complexes within two miles of the project with unsold units.

Commissioner Uchima clarified that the units would be rentals so they would not be competing with nearby senior condominium complexes.

Robert Thompson, president of Madrona Homeowners Association, expressed concerns about the project's impact on the infrastructure and emergency services. He reported that after the residential development was approved at Jefferson and Oak Street, the City had to install a new sewer line that cost residents almost \$1 million.

Chairperson Weideman questioned whether Development Impact Fees cover all the costs associated with a development when a large complex like this is built.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that there are pro-rated Development Impact Fees for traffic improvements, storm drain and sewer upgrades, and police and fire services and additionally, deficiencies in infrastructure systems would be identified during the Initial Study process and a developer would typically be required to pay for improvements that are necessary to accommodate the development.

Civil Engineer Symons clarified that the City had already planned to upgrade the sewer line when the project at Jefferson and Oak was approved due to existing problems in the area.

Commissioner Busch noted that in addition to Development Impact Fees, new construction generates added revenue for the City and the Torrance Unified School District in the form of increased property taxes.

Richard Beaver, Village Court Del Amo, reported that Village Court, which has only one lane in each direction, can become very congested due to nearby businesses, offices, hotels and restaurants and expressed concerns that adding a facility of this size will lead to gridlock and make it impossible for residents of his complex to exit the driveway. He also expressed concerns about the impact on parking, noting that restaurant patrons sometimes take up all the guest parking for his building.

Charles Deemer, 21225 Talisman, voiced his opinion that the residential and commercial components of a mixed-use project should be developed at the same time and not piggy-backed on an existing complex as proposed in this case. He related his belief that the project's density was not compatible with the community. He asked about the difference between the senior apartments and the senior independent living facility.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Fox explained that senior independent living facilities offer additional services, including meal programs and other amenities, which are not provided for the senior apartments.

Mr. Palmer wanted to make clear that his client owns the subject property and is not interested in looking for an alternative site for this project. Referring to Mr. Beaver's concern about being unable to exit his driveway, he reported that the applicant will be required to install a traffic signal at Village Court and Del Amo Circle in conjunction with the project. With regard to the small size of some of the units, he explained that the small studio units are only in the assisted living/Alzheimer's care area of the facility and the rest of the units are standard sized. He reported that his mother lived for two years in this type of unit and it was a godsend as she was no longer able to live alone and it allowed her an opportunity to interact with other seniors. He suggested that the hearing be continued so Commissioners would have an opportunity to review the traffic study and concerns could be addressed in more detail.

Chairperson Weideman related his belief that there is a need for the smaller, studio units. Mr. Palmer reported that this type of unit is hard to find and there are often long waiting lists to get one.

Commissioner Busch stated that he did not want to deny the project because he believes this type of project is needed in Torrance, but could not support it as proposed due to the density. He expressed the hope that the applicant would be willing to go back to the drawing board and return with a downsized project that will meet the needs of the community.

Mr. Palmer stated that the applicant was willing to consider a reduction in the size of the project but will have to do a financial analysis to determine to what extent it would be feasible.

Commissioner Horwich expressed support for a continuance.

Commissioner Browning recommended that the applicant meet with residents of Village Court Del Amo to get their input on revisions. He requested that information be provided when the project is brought back on the maximum number of employees that will be on-site at one time; the time of shift changes; and the location of employee parking. He expressed concerns about the quality of life for senior residents at this location, especially those in wheelchairs. He indicated that he was also very concerned

about the demand on paramedic services because elderly residents tend to require more services and Torrance has not increased the number of its firefighters for many years.

Commissioner Uchima stated that he was very concerned about having a six-story building 20 feet away from Carson Street, noting that he was on the Commission at the time the Village Court Del Amo project was approved and he was concerned at the time about the height of that building in relation to the structures around it. He pointed out that the existing high-rise office building is set back toward the center of the property with mid and low-rise buildings closer to the street. He related his experience that traffic congestion increases in this area in the morning and in the afternoon when parents are dropping off/picking up children at Jefferson School and during evening hours due to restaurant traffic and expressed concerns that a project of this size would add to the problem. He indicated that he was also concerned about the project's impact on parking and the demand on paramedic services.

Commissioner Skoll indicated that he shared the same concerns as his colleagues and supported a continuance.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved to continue the hearing on this project indefinitely. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

12. RESOLUTIONS

12A. CUP09-00017, DVP09-00002: JOHN PUENTE, IN-N-OUT BURGER (PEYTON CRAMER LINCOLN-MERCURY)

Planning Commission adoption of resolutions reflecting their decision to deny a Conditional Use Permit and Development Permit to allow the construction and operation of a new commercial center composed of a drive-through restaurant, drive-through pharmacy, and retail building on property located in the HBCSP-PR Zone at 20440-20460 Hawthorne Boulevard.

Planning Manager Lodan stated that it had been brought to his attention that the project was denied "without prejudice" and corrected resolutions would be brought back for the Commission's approval at the next meeting.

13. PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS – None.

14. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

14A. MIS09-00279: MICHAEL HALL (MATT SCHNEIDER)

Planning Commission consideration of an appeal of a Community Development Director approval of a Minor Hillside Exemption to allow the construction of a 255 square-foot detached wood deck in the rear yard on property located in the Hillside Overlay District at 22420 Redbeam Avenue.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Gomez introduced the request.

Nova Novobilski, owner of 22419 and 22423 Linda Drive, appellant, voiced objections to the proposed deck, citing the privacy impact on his property and safety concerns. He reported that there have been at least four landslides in his neighborhood over the past 22 years, including one at 22415 Linda Drive wherein 95 tons mud flowed into the pool and backyard. He noted that this neighbor subsequently coated the slope with gunite and erosion underneath the gunite has created gaps large enough to crawl through. He stated that periodically removes the ice plant from the hillside above his property because it's heavy and puts pressure on the slope and expressed concerns that the proposed deck would cause slope failure. He maintained that the deck would not be stable because there was no bedrock to put caissons into to hold it. He submitted photographs as evidence of erosion caused by recent rains. He also expressed concerns that people on the deck could look into his house and backyard thereby impacting his privacy.

Plans Examiner Noh reported that he discussed Mr. Novobilski's concerns with the Grading Division and they indicated that they were not aware of any landslide issues in this area and did not anticipate any problems with the proposed deck. He noted that if the deck is approved, the engineering of the structure will be reviewed during the plan check process and a soils report will be required if there are any concerns about the slope's stability.

Commissioner Browning noted that plans call for the deck to be supported by five caissons which are sunk into the ground until adequate soil compaction is reached to ensure that they provide a stable foundation. He reported that he observed that the hillside appeared to be neglected and suggested that it could be better protected from erosion by planting and maintaining an appropriate groundcover. He voiced his opinion that privacy impact was not an issue because the deck would actually prevent a view into Mr. Novobilski's property that currently exists.

Matt Schneider, project architect, stated that he has worked closely with Planning staff to arrive at an acceptable design and incorporated mitigations to address Mr. Novobilski's concerns. He explained that the lower half of the guard rail will be solid, which will provide more privacy for both parties than currently exists, and that wood siding will be installed on the underside of the deck so the structure will look more appealing when viewed from below. He noted that the stability of the slope is a Building and Safety issue and that the soils engineer will decide whether the slope is suitable for the installation of the deck and make recommendations for erosion control.

Larry Towne, 22402 Redbeam Avenue, reported that he built a two-story addition in 1997, which Mr. Novobilski opposed citing the same concerns about slope stability, and former Planning Manager Jane Isomoto indicated at that time that there had been no slope failures on Redbeam, only minor surface erosion. He noted that he added a deck similar to the one proposed in 2007, which is supported by caissons that were installed as Commissioner Browning described, and there has been absolutely no movement.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Novobilski stated that he felt it was important to have his concerns about the stability of the hillside on the record and just wanted to

make sure that the project is done right. He expressed the hope that he could work things out with his neighbor so there would not be any animosity.

Commissioner Browning offered his assurance that the project will be done correctly, noting that the City has an excellent staff charged with overseeing construction projects.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved to deny the appeal and approve MIS09-00279, as conditioned, including all findings set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Uchima and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

Planning Associate Gomez read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-007.

MOTION: Commissioner Busch moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-007. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Gibson).

15. REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the City Council held the final Public Workshop on the draft 2009 General Plan and EIR on January 19 and a public hearing on the revised draft is scheduled for the February 23 City Council meeting.

Chairperson Weideman agreed to represent the Commission at the February 23 hearing.

16. LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES

Planning Manager Lodan reviewed the agenda for the February 3, 2010 Planning Commission meeting.

17. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2

17A. Commissioner Busch congratulated Chairperson Weideman on being reappointed to the Commission for another term.

17B. Commissioner Busch requested that staff report back to the Commission as to why MIS09-00353: Auto Nation/Mercedes Benz, and MIS09-00334: Safeway Inc., were deemed to be Minor Modifications and approved administratively.

17C. Commissioner Skoll asked about the status of the EIR for the proposed project on Lomita Boulevard, and Planning Manager Lodan advised that the report was still being finalized.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan explained that there are a few issues that need to be resolved and he expected that it would be a couple of months before the case is brought to the Commission.

17D. Commissioner Browning expressed concerns that Edison is installing utility poles in the Hillside Overlay area that impact the views of residents and requested information concerning why Edison is exempt from the City's review process.

17E. Chairperson Weideman questioned when the City will begin using the new notification signs that include the website address where information about public hearings can be obtained. He repeated his earlier request to review the Planning Commission's budget; noted that a request was also made for information on the number of cell towers in Torrance and overriding jurisdictions; and asked about the requirement that the Commission file an annual report since he has never seen one. He suggested that an informational meeting be scheduled before the Commission takes over the responsibility of approving signage.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan reported that several sections in the Torrance Municipal Code must be amended before the Commission takes over the review of signage.

18. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:48 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, February 3, 2010 at 7:00 p.m.

Approved as Submitted March 17, 2010 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
