

January 5, 2005

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Torrance Planning Commission convened in a regular session at 7:08 p.m. on Wednesday, January 5, 2005, in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

**2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Horwich.

**3. ROLL CALL**

Present: Commissioners Botello, Drevno, Fauk, Horwich, Uchima and Chairperson Muratsuchi.

Absent: Commissioner LaBouff.

Also Present: Planning Manager Isomoto, Planning Associate Crecy, Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi, Fire Marshal Carter, Plans Examiner Nishioka, Associate Civil Engineer Symons and Deputy City Attorney Whitham.

Planning Manager Isomoto relayed Commissioner LaBouff's request for an excused absence for this meeting and the January 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Drevno, moved to grant Commissioner LaBouff excused absences for the January 5, and January 19, 2005 Commission meetings; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

**4. POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Uchima, seconded by Commissioner Horwich, moved to accept and file the report of the secretary on the posting of the agenda for this meeting; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Botello moved for the approval of the November 3, 2004 Planning Commission minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich, and voice vote reflected unanimous approval, with Commissioner Drevno abstaining (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

**6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS**

None.

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

7. **CONTINUED HEARINGS**

None.

8. **WAIVERS**

8A. **WAV04-00029: BRIAN LIVINGSTON**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a waiver to allow a reduction of the front and rear yard setback requirements in conjunction with the construction of an addition to an existing single-family residence on property located in the R-1 Zone at 4819 Mayor Drive.

**Recommendation**

Approval.

Planning Associate Crecy introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of an additional Code requirement.

Brian Livingston, applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Faulk moved for the approval of WAV04-00029, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

Planning Associate Crecy read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-001.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-001. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Uchima and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

9. **FORMAL HEARINGS**

9A. **MOD04-00019 (CUP04-00033), DIV04-00022: AP-ESCONDIDO C/O THE ABBEY COMPANY**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Division of Lot to allow the creation of three new parcels, two of which are postage stamp lots and one is a shared parcel, and a Modification of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP04-00033) to reflect the new parcels on property located in the M-2 Zone at 23600 Telo Avenue.

**Recommendation**

Approval.

Planning Associate Crecy introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of a revised partial list of Code requirements.

Mark Hereford, representing The Abbey Company, owner of the property, and Craig Leach, Chief Operating Officer of Torrance Memorial Medical Center, indicated that the conditions of approval were acceptable to both parties.

Mr. Hereford briefly described the proposed project. He explained that the Division of Lot would allow the creation of postage stamp lots for the two existing buildings on this parcel – one for the westerly building, which will be owned and occupied by a group of local physicians, and one for the easterly building, which is being purchased by Torrance Memorial Medical Center for the storage of medical records – and that a third parcel will be created for shared parking and landscaped areas.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commission Fauk, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Uchima moved for the approval of MOD04-00019 and DIV04-00022, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Drevno and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

Planning Associate Crecy read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-002 and 05-003.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Uchima moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-002 and 05-003. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fauk and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

**9B. PRE04-00029: GRACE AND KIERON ROBERT ADHIKARI**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow exterior modifications over 14 feet in height to an existing single-family residence on property located in the R-1 Zone at 22721 Gaycrest Avenue.

**Recommendation**

Approval.

Planning Associate Crecy introduced the request.

Don Hornbeck, project architect, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval with the exception of Condition No. 5, requiring a minimum setback of six feet for the posts supporting the covered patio, explaining that he had hoped to retain the existing posts, which are five feet from the property line.

Planning Manager Isomoto agreed to the deletion of Condition No. 5.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commission Drevno, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Uchima moved for the approval of PRE04-00029, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff with the following modification:

**Delete**

No. 5 That the supports for the proposed cover patio shall be set back a minimum of six feet from the rear property line.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Drevno and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

Planning Associate Crecy read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-004.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Uchima moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-004 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

Commissioner Faulk commented positively on the project, noting that it will correct construction done in the past, which does not meet City standards.

**9C. PCR04-00003, WAV04-00015: SUSAN GARCIA (DANNY OANDASAN)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Planning Commission Review to allow the construction of a second dwelling unit resulting in a Floor Area Ratio above 0.5 and a Waiver to allow a reduction in the side yard setback requirements on property located in the Small Lot, Low-Medium Overlay Zone at 2203 Gramercy Avenue.

**Recommendation**

Approval.

Planning Associate Crecy introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of revised resolutions and public correspondence.

Susan Garcia, owner of the subject property, voiced her agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Commissioner Faulk questioned whether the applicant intends to modify the façade of the existing front house to be compatible with the Craftsman-style architecture proposed for the rear unit.

Ms. Garcia indicated that she plans to do only those modifications required by the City to change the existing duplex into a single-family residence, which includes eliminating one of the two doors and updating windows.

Planning Manager Isomoto related her understanding that staff had discussions with the applicant about redoing the front house to reflect the architectural style of the rear unit and the applicant was not willing to do so at this time.

Commissioner Faulk questioned whether the rear unit will be a rental. Ms. Garcia indicated that her son, who is part owner of the property, will live in the back unit.

In response to Commissioner Faulk's inquiry about the project's phasing, Planning Manager Isomoto advised that the duplex must be converted into a single-family residence before construction can begin on the second unit, noting that Condition No. 7 specifies that a maximum of two units are allowed on this parcel.

Commissioner Botello questioned whether the Commission has the discretion to require a compatible design for the front unit.

Referring to TMC §91.44.3(c), Deputy City Attorney Whitham confirmed that the Commission had the authority to impose a condition requiring the two units to be of compatible architectural style.

Sara Guyan, Gramercy Avenue resident, voiced her preference that the rear unit be designed to be compatible with the Spanish revival architecture of the front house instead of the other way around. She indicated she supports the project except for the differing architectural styles and believes it will be a great improvement.

Bonnie Mae Barnard, representing Save Historical Old Torrance (SHOT), stated that her organization appreciates staff's efforts to encourage projects that are compatible with the old Torrance area, but suggested that there was a miscommunication in this case, because the applicant was under the impression that the second unit had to have a Craftsman-style façade. She noted that there are a variety of architectural styles in the Small Lot Overlay Zone and requested a continuance so that her organization, the applicant, and the Community Development Department could come up with a design that complements the existing structure.

Don Barnard, Save Historical Old Torrance, commented on efforts to preserve historic structures in the old Torrance area, explaining that over the last year, he has been involved in helping architects come up with a compatible design for projects on Gramercy and Andreo, the two oldest streets in Torrance. He expressed confidence that the applicant would be more than willing to modify the project if his organization was given a chance to share information about the history and goals of the neighborhood. He related his understanding that it would be less expensive to match the architectural style of the front house.

In response to Commissioner Botello's inquiry, Mr. Barnard explained that he is part of a committee that meets with property owners in the area to discuss remodeling plans, provide information about the Save Historical Old Torrance, and offer input on the project. He noted that the committee makes no demands and simply offers suggestions.

Commissioner Drevno asked how committee members are appointed, and Mr. Barnard reported that they are homeowners in the neighborhood who are members of Save Historical Old Torrance.

Gene Higginbotham, Arlington Avenue resident, expressed the hope that the existing structure could be preserved and the rear unit designed to blend with its Spanish-style architecture.

Mary Ann Reis, Gramercy Avenue resident, voiced support for preserving the look of the old Torrance area and agreed that the Spanish architecture of the existing structure should be retained.

Liz Fobes, Andreo Avenue resident, reported on a two-year effort to resurrect a movement started 25 years ago to preserve the Olmsted district bounded by Crenshaw, Western, Dominguez and Plaza del Amo, which was designed by world-renown planning and landscape architect, Frederick Law Olmsted, and to have it placed on the national register of historic landmarks. She voiced objections to replacing the existing historic structure with an imitation Craftsman-style development and reported that volunteers would be happy to discuss the project with Ms. Garcia and her architect.

Ms. Fobes noted a discrepancy in the FAR listed in the staff report (0.52) and the FAR listed in Resolution No. 05-005 (0.53). She stated that while she personally supports the project, the City Council recently passed a resolution prohibiting any deviation from the Code, which in this case limits development to an FAR of 0.50.

Commissioner Horwich questioned whether there has been any progress in establishing a historic preservation district. Ms. Fobes reported that the City Council's Planning and Design Committee has held several public meetings to explore the creation of a historic preservation district; that these meetings are scheduled to continue; and that while she felt a great deal of progress has been made, she could not predict how long it would take to accomplish this goal.

Commissioner Horwich pointed out that regardless of how Commissioners may feel about this issue, there is no existing law that gives the Commission authority to require a property owner to preserve an existing structure.

Commissioner Horwich questioned whether this project is subject to the resolution referred to by Ms. Fobes. Planning Manager Isomoto advised that the resolution adopted by the City Council precludes General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes, neither of which is being requested in this case.

Planning Manager Isomoto confirmed Commissioner Horwich's recollection that the Commission approved a project with an FAR of 0.52 in this area within the past several months.

Ms. Barnard wanted to dispel the idea that Save Historic Old Torrance committee members, who meet with property owners to discuss their remodeling projects, are self-appointed, which has a negative connotation. She explained that they are simply Torrance residents who care about their community and they have access to architects who are willing to donate their time to help property owners preserve the historical style of their residences when remodeling.

A brief discussion ensued, and Ms. Garcia expressed her willingness to redesign the façade of the rear unit to be compatible with the existing structure.

Planning Manager Isomoto clarified that the project has an FAR of 0.52.

Commissioner Botello questioned whether the applicant would like a continuance to redesign the façade.

Danny Oandasan, project architect, asked that he be allowed to work with staff to arrive at an acceptable design.

Planning Manager Isomoto reported that in meetings with the applicant, staff has emphasized the importance of a design that reflects the architecture in the neighborhood, as well as the need for compatibility between the front and rear units. She stated that apparently there was some miscommunication and expressed confidence that staff could work with the applicant to arrive at a suitable design.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Uchima, seconded by Commissioner Horwich, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich moved for the approval of PCR04-00003 and WAV04-00015, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the following modification:

**Add**

- That the exterior of the new unit shall be designed to be in conformance with the existing Spanish-style front unit to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Faulk and passed by unanimous roll vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

Planning Associate Crecy read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-005 and 05-006.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Faulk moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-005 and 05-006 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner LaBouff).

**9D. CUP04-00026, EAS04-00006, DIV04-00021: KEITH PALMER – BRYANT PALMER SOTO INC./ LOWE'S SOUTH TORRANCE**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction and operation of a 140,938 square-foot home improvement retail store, with corresponding garden center on an 11.22-acre site. The project includes the division of one leasehold parcel into two parcels, Parcel 1 proposed at 11.22 acres (for proposed Lowe's store) and Parcel 2 proposed at 11.00 acres (for remaining light industrial use) on property located in the M-2 Zone on the south side of Skypark Drive, approximately 1,500 feet west of the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard, at 2700 Skypark Drive.

## **Recommendation**

Approval.

Planning Associate Crecy introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of a revised partial list of Code requirements and revised resolutions.

Keith Palmer, Bryant Palmer Soto Inc., reported that during the planning process, several different configurations for the building and the driveways were considered. He explained that the original proposal included a driveway aligned with Costco's easterly driveway and a signal at this intersection; that City staff subsequently recommended that the signal be located at Skypark Drive and Garnier Avenue; and that the applicant is amenable to installing a signal at either of these intersections, but not both. He noted that a neighboring property owner will be presenting an alternative proposal for a signal at the Costco intersection, which is also acceptable to the applicant. He clarified that the proposed seasonal sales area will be used for winter, spring and fall sales, as well as for Christmas trees. He voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Steve Fechner, President of Surf Management, owner of Skypark Business Center, 2675 Skypark Drive, noted that his family built this business center in 1974 and has owned and managed it ever since. He explained that the City erred in allowing the Costco driveway to be built right next to the driveway for his center; that turning restrictions were placed on the Costco driveway in an attempt to correct the problem; and that motorists ignored these restrictions and they were subsequently removed. He voiced objections to the proposal to install a signal at Garnier and Skypark, maintaining that that the turn restrictions proposed for Lowe's easterly driveway will be ignored, thereby creating chaos and unsafe conditions.

Using slides to illustrate, Mr. Fechner detailed his proposal that a multiphase signal be installed at the matching driveways for Lowe's and Costco, configuring the intersection so that westbound vehicles stop east of the business center's driveway. The signal would include a separate phase for vehicles leaving his property triggered by a sensor in the driveway. He indicated that staff opposes this configuration, however, none of the alternatives suggested are acceptable. He noted that it was suggested that the business park share the Costco driveway, however, his parking lot would then become an overflow parking lot for Costco and mingling Costco traffic with truck traffic from his center does not make sense. He stated that while the proposed signal is not ideal in the textbook sense, it will work safely and efficiently, and that he believes his business will be harmed should a signal be installed at the Costco driveway without access for his driveway.

Commissioner Botello questioned whether consideration was given to locating Lowe's driveway some place other than across from Costco's driveway.

Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi advised that staff prefers to have opposing driveways line up to avoid potential conflicts; that the driveway across from Costco was originally proposed as the primary driveway; and that due to safety concerns, the applicant was asked to make the westerly driveway the primary driveway and limit the driveway across from Costco to right turn ingress/egress only.

Commissioner Botello expressed concerns that people exiting Costco would attempt to go across Skypark into Lowe's despite turn restrictions and suggested the possibility of installing a barrier to prevent this from happening.

Commissioner Drevno voiced her opinion that a signal is needed at the Costco driveway whether or not Lowe's is built across the street, relating her experience that it is very difficult to get in and out of this driveway due to traffic congestion.

Chairperson Muratsuchi asked about staff's objections to the signalized intersection proposed by Mr. Fechner. Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi explained that the stop bars for eastbound and westbound traffic would be too far apart, which could cause motorists to become trapped in the intersection when the signal turns red.

Commissioner Uchima related his understanding that this problem could be avoided if the signal is correctly timed. Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi stated that the problem could be minimized by an all-red phase, but it would extend the wait at this intersection and the potential for cars becoming trapped would still be there. She suggested that a conventional intersection at this location would be a better solution.

Commenting on the traffic congestion at Costco during the holidays, Commissioner Uchima indicated that he agreed with Mr. Fechner that funneling traffic from his business center through Costco's driveway was not a good idea.

Commissioner Drevno questioned whether the majority of the traffic from Mr. Fechner's driveway goes westbound or eastbound, and Mr. Fechner reported that traffic is about equal in both directions

Roger Bernstein, Site Development Manager for Lowe's, stated that Lowe's expects this location to be very successful, however, part of that success was predicated on having a signal at the Costco driveway. He indicated that either a conventional signal or the one proposed by Mr. Fechner was acceptable to Lowe's.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Richard Barretto, traffic engineer with Linscott, Law & Greenspan, provided information regarding the traffic study prepared for this project. He stated that he could not comment on the signalized intersection proposed by Mr. Fechner because another engineering firm prepared the drawings and his firm had not done an analysis. He reported that an analysis of a conventional signalized intersection was done, but Mr. Fechner was opposed to it because his driveway would have to be restricted to right-turn only ingress and egress.

Referring to correspondence from the Department of Transportation (Attachment 4), Commissioner Botello asked about the possibility of relocating the bus stop on the east side of Pacific Coast Highway at Crenshaw as discussed in this letter.

Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi explained that Caltrans is concerned about the addition of a second left-turn lane southbound on Crenshaw because there are only two receiving lanes on eastbound PCH, one of which is blocked when buses stop to pick up or let off passengers. She advised that neither of options mentioned by Caltrans – building a bus bay or moving the bus stop to the west side of the intersection – is feasible, therefore, staff has proposed a more complex solution, reconfiguring the

channelization on PCH to provide three receiving lanes, freeing up the curb lane for bus use.

Mr. Fechner disputed staff's contention that the intersection he proposed was exceptionally large and would take longer than normal to clear, maintaining that the intersection at Torrance Boulevard and Madrona is similarly sized.

Chairperson Muratsuchi questioned whether any of the intersections listed by Mr. Fechner as having staggered signals are five-legged (Torrance Blvd./Madrona; Torrance Blvd./Maple; Torrance Blvd./Anza; Hawthorne Blvd./Emerald; Hawthorne Blvd./Spencer). Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi explained that these intersections are part of synchronized corridors and at certain times the left-turn movements are lead/lag but none is a five-legged intersection. She offered the intersection of Arlington/Washington/Plaza del Amo as an example of a five-legged intersection.

In response to Commissioner Drevno's inquiry, Mr. Bernstein advised that Lowe's hours of operation will be 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. He noted that their peak hours are much different than Costco's and their busiest time is the spring, not the holidays as with Costco.

Commissioner Botello stated that if Commissioners were leaning toward having a signalized intersection at the Costco driveway, he favored requiring a traffic study to be done so the Commission would know what impact the signal would have. He expressed an interest in knowing how much traffic would be diverted to Lomita Boulevard and PCH, due to the installation of this signal because Skypark currently offers a less congested alternative to these streets for those traveling from Crenshaw to Hawthorne Boulevard.

Chairperson Muratsuchi suggested the possibility of continuing the hearing so the applicant could provide this information.

Mr. Palmer indicated that the applicant would prefer to have a decision this evening because of time constraints, noting that it would add weeks to the schedule should the Commission's decision be appealed to the City Council.

Chairperson Muratsuchi expressed concerns about whether the Commission had enough information to make a decision on the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi clarified that staff's recommendation for the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration was based on installing a traffic signal at Garnier and Skypark.

Mr. Barretto stated that from a traffic standpoint, the current proposal to install a signal at Garnier and Skypark works, and it does not change anything at Costco's or the business center's driveways. He noted that plans call for a raised "pork chop" delineator, which would make it physically impossible to make a left turn in or out of Lowe's easterly driveway.

Commissioner Botello stated that he believed people exiting Costco would still try to circumvent the delineator and go straight across into Lowe's driveway.

Noting that the Commission seems to prefer a signal at the Costco driveway, Mr. Palmer indicated that the applicant would agree to a continuance to allow for a traffic study to be completed if an appeal to the City Council could be avoided. As an alternative, he suggested that the Commission approve the project with the five-legged intersection as long as verification can be provided to staff that it would not cause undue delays for Skypark traffic.

Commissioner Botello, echoed by Commissioner Faulk, stated that he could not commit to voting for the project with a signal at the Costco driveway without seeing the traffic study.

Commissioner Horwich indicated that he was prepared to support the project as proposed, with the signal at Garnier.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Botello, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Botello moved to continue the hearing until January 19, 2005, and request that the applicant provide a traffic study for a multi-phased signal on Skypark at the intersection that would be created by Costco's and Lowe's driveways. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Faulk, and discussion continued regarding the scope of the traffic study and who would prepare it.

The public hearing was reopened to allow Mr. Palmer to comment.

Mr. Palmer suggested the possibility that Mr. Fechner's traffic engineer and Mr. Barretto could collaborate on the traffic study.

Associate Traffic Engineer Sedadi stated that she was not sure staff could support a five-legged signalized intersection at the Costco driveway and advised that the design proposed by Mr. Fechner's engineer was not acceptable.

With regard to the scope of the traffic study, Mr. Barretto stated that it was his professional opinion that although the proposed five-legged signalized intersection at the Costco driveway would cause some delay for motorists traveling on Skypark, the delay would not be such that it would cause traffic to be diverted to Lomita Boulevard or PCH.

Commissioner Uchima asked about the possibility that traffic on Skypark would back up to Crenshaw, and Mr. Barretto indicated that he did not think that was likely.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Botello, seconded by Commissioner Horwich, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

Commissioner Faulk withdrew his second of Commissioner Botello's motion, and the motion died for lack of a second.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich moved for the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Faulk, and discussion briefly continued.

Commissioner Botello stated that he could not support the adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration because the applicant was proposing changes to the project that have not been adequately explained or studied. He expressed concerns that the proposed five-legged intersection could seriously impact traffic on surrounding streets.

Planning Manager Isomoto clarified that the project before the Commission, the one for which the Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared, does not include a signalized intersection at the Costco driveway.

In response to Commissioner Uchima's inquiry, Planning Manager Isomoto confirmed that, as currently proposed, there was nothing to prevent someone from exiting the Costco driveway, making a U-turn using the two-way median lane and entering the Lowe's driveway opposite it.

Chairperson Muratsuchi called for a vote on the motion, and the motion failed as reflected in the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Fauk, Horwich and Chairperson Muratsuchi.  
NOES: Commissioners Botello, Drevno and Uchima.  
ABSENT: Commissioner LaBouff.

Deputy City Attorney Whitham advised that the Commission could not take further action on the project because the Mitigated Negative Declaration was not adopted and that the legal effect was denial of the project, which could be appealed to the City Council.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Uchima, moved to reconsider the motion, and discussion briefly continued.

In response to Commissioner Drevno's inquiry, Planning Manager Isomoto provided clarification regarding the length of time it would take for an appeal to be heard by the City Council.

Chairperson Muratsuchi called for a vote on the motion, and it failed to pass as reflected in the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Drevno, Horwich and Uchima.  
NOES: Commissioners Botello, Fauk and Chairperson Muratsuchi.  
ABSENT: Commissioner LaBouff.

**10. RESOLUTIONS**

None.

**11. PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS**

None.

**12. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

None.

**13. CITY COUNCIL ON PLANNING MATTERS**

None.

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

Planning Manager Isomoto reviewed the agenda for the Planning Commission meeting of January 19, 2005.

**15. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**15A.** Planning Manager Isomoto noted that there are three vacancies on the Environmental Quality Commission and asked Commissioners to encourage their civic-minded friends to submit applications.

**15B.** Commissioners extended New Year's greetings.

**15C.** Referring to the Lowe's project, Commissioner Drevno reiterated her position that a traffic signal is needed at the Costco driveway.

**15D.** Chairperson Muratsuchi stated that he relied on the expertise of Transportation Planning staff in making his decision on the Lowe's project.

**15E.** Commissioner Drevno noted that the Torrance Education Foundation is raffling off a Toyota Prius with tickets available at \$20 each.

**15F.** Chairperson Muratsuchi noted that Torrance Sister City Association will be accepting applications for Torrance high school students, who would like to participate in the exchange program with Kashiwa, Japan, until January 11, 2005.

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

At 10:55 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, January 19, 2005.

Approved as Written March 2, 2005 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
--