

**INDEX**  
**TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION – MAY 20, 2015**

<b><u>SUBJECT</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b><u>OPENING CEREMONIES</u></b>	
1. Call to Order	1
2. Flag Salute	1
3. Roll Call/Motions for Excused Absence	1
4. Posting of the Agenda	1
5. Approval of Minutes	1
6. Requests for Postponement	1
7. <b><u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1</u></b>	1
8. <b><u>TIME EXTENSIONS</u></b>	1
9. <b><u>SIGN HEARINGS</u></b>	2
10. <b><u>CONTINUED HEARINGS</u></b>	
10A. MOD14-00013: South Bay Lexus (City of Torrance) <i>Res. 15-013</i>	2-7
11. <b><u>WAIVERS</u></b>	7
12. <b><u>FORMAL HEARINGS</u></b>	
12A. CUP15-00008: Tim Abrams (Marble Park Investment) <i>Res. 15-031</i>	7-8
12B. CUP15-00002, WAV15-00007: H Mart West Inc. <i>Res. 15-032 &amp;-033</i>	8-11
12C. CUP15-00006, DIV15-00002: Icon Planning & Design <i>Res. 15-034 &amp;-035</i>	11-12
13. <b><u>RESOLUTIONS</u></b>	
14. <b><u>PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS</u></b>	12
15. <b><u>MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS</u></b>	
15A. Community Development Director Weekly Summary Reports	12
16. <b><u>CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS</u></b>	12
17. <b><u>LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES</u></b>	12
18. <b><u>ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2</u></b>	12
19. <b><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></b>	12

At 9:35 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, June 3, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

May 20, 2015

**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, May 20, 2015, 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, Herring, Skoll, Tsao and Chairperson Polcari.

Absent: Commissioner Watson (excused).

Also Present: Planning Manager Lodan, Planning Assistant Lang, Associate Civil Engineer Symons, Plans Examiner Noh, Sr. Fire Prevention Officer Kazandjian, 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, May 14, 2015.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved for the approval of the April 1, 2015 Planning Commission minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner D'anjou and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved for the approval of the April 15, 2015 Planning Commission minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner D'anjou and passed by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioners Gibson and Tsao abstaining (absent Commissioner Watson).

**6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENTS – None.**

**7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #1 – None.**

\*

Chairperson Polcari 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. MOD14-00013: SOUTH BAY LEXUS (CITY OF TORRANCE)**

Planning Commission consideration of approval of a Modification of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP05-00041) to allow the operation of an automobile dealership in conjunction with the existing automobile service center and to allow renovations and expansions to the existing building and site on property located in the M-2 Zone at 24777 Crenshaw Boulevard. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15301 – Existing Facilities.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

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

Larry Tidball, Stantec Architects, project architect, reported that Lexus has been in Torrance since the brand was developed; that approximately 10 years ago, the dealership relocated the service department to this site; and that it would like to consolidate sales and service operations at this location because it has outgrown its facility on Pacific Coast Highway. He briefly described the proposed project, submitting renderings to illustrate. He explained that the front third of the existing building will be used to create a showroom with a curved, more modern façade and the area to the south of the building will be developed as a parking lot for the display/storage of new and used vehicles. He noted that surplus soil stockpiled by the City will be removed so the new parking lot will be at roughly the same elevation as the existing parking lot and 14-foot high light standards will be installed with LED lighting designed to shine down on the parking lot, with no glare or spillover light.

In response to Chairperson Polcari's inquiry, Mr. Tidball reported that the project maintains the existing building footprint except for the curved expansion for the showroom and the remodeled building will be approximately 2,500 square feet larger than the existing building.

Commissioner D'anjou asked about the suggestion at the Airport Commission meeting that the west side of the property be used for parking instead of the south side.

Mr. Tidball explained that the west side of the property, which is at the rear of the service building, is used as the staging area for vehicles brought in for service and it is not suitable for the display of vehicles, which needs to be in front along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Steven Jamieson, legal counsel for the applicant, noted his concurrence with the City Attorney's opinion as detailed in the staff report. He stated that the FAA has the exclusive right and the exclusive ability to determine what obstacles are and are not hazards to air navigation per 49 U.S.C. §44718; that the FAA issued a "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation" on July 2013 and an extension in February 2015, which states "This aeronautical study revealed that the structure (parking lot light standards) does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation"; and that the City of Torrance is obligated to rely on that determination.

In response to Commissioner Tsao's inquiry, Mr. Tidball reported that the existing building has a maximum height of 35 feet.

Curt Knepper, Laguna Beach, regional vice president California Pilots Association, reported that the association strongly opposes the proposed project because it is not compatible with the airport. He asserted that the FAA's determination pertains only to the height of the light standards in the new parking area and it did not take into account glare or any other issues associated with the lighting. He expressed concerns that the California Airport Land Use Plan and the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan were not considered in staff's analysis of the project. He stated that there are guidelines in the California Public Utilities statute that cities and counties are supposed to follow; that the City cannot disregard the fact that the Airport Commission unanimously rejected the project; and that the City Attorney erred in his determination that a safety study was not required for this project. He related his understanding that there is an email from the California Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, indicating that that agency also opposes this project and has concerns about the process. He explained that the association's main objection to the project was the City's sidestepping of state and county regulations and it was not about safety per se, noting that the association may seek to legally challenge the City's action.

Commissioner Skoll noted that the architect indicated that parking lot lighting will be directed downward so it should not create a glare that would impact pilots.

Mr. Knepper explained that the problem occurs when there is cloud cover and the lighting reflects off objects on the ground and produces a glare, which could be confusing for pilots flying IFR (instrument flight rules) as they transition from looking at the instruments in the cockpit to looking out the window to locate the runway lights, which is the most critical portion of a flight. He called for the City to work with the county and state to ensure that all safety concerns are mitigated.

Commissioner Skoll asked if Mr. Knepper disagrees with the FAA's determination.

Mr. Knepper stated that the FAA focused on the height of the light poles and there are state and county regulations that must be followed, which may be stricter, and they are not trumped by the FAA. He suggested that the City should be concerned about liability should an accident occur and it becomes apparent that the City ignored these regulations.

Commissioner Gibson asked about Mr. Knepper's assertion that the City has sidestepped state and county regulations.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan reported that he had not seen the state guidelines or the email to which Mr. Knepper referred so he could not comment at this time.

Commissioner Tsao asked if the glare problem was specific to small airports since there is a lot of lighting, including parking lot lighting around LAX.

Mr. Knepper responded that the atmosphere is very different at LAX as opposed to a regional airport where a pilot may be less experienced. He stated that his organization believes a safety study was warranted because there could be potential hazards unique to airports that not have been considered as part of the City's approval process.

Commissioner D'anjou requested clarification of the scope of the FAA study.

Mr. Jamieson reported that the FAA study was conducted according to provisions of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 77, Section 77.29, which calls for the FAA to conduct an “aeronautical study to determine the impact of a proposed structure” and Section 77.31, which calls for the FAA to issue a determination “stating whether the proposed construction or alteration would be a hazard to air navigation.” He explained that Section 77.31 specifies that the aeronautical study must identify: 1) The effect on VFR/IFR aeronautical departure/arrival operations, air traffic procedures, minimum flight altitudes, and existing planned or proposed airports; and 2) The extent of the physical and/or electromagnetic effect on the operation of existing or proposed air navigation facilities, communication aids, or surveillance systems. He noted that a “Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation” can include conditions and/or limitations to minimize potential problems, but the no hazard determination in this case was unconditional.

In response to Commissioner Skoll’s inquiry, Mr. Jamieson confirmed that the project submitted to the FAA was exactly the same project as being considered by the Commission.

Jim Gates, Torrance, vice president of Torrance Airport Association, stated that the only part of the project the association is opposed to is the parking area that extends into the RPZ (runway protection zone) because they are opposed to any assembly of people there for safety reasons. He reported that he contacted Karen McDonald, the FAA obstruction evaluator who reviewed this project; that she was under the misconception that the project was not within the boundaries of the airport; that he provided her with a copy of the layout of the airport showing that the project was within the RPZ; and that she responded that her review was limited to Part 77 standards and concerns about the RPZ were an Airports Division matter. He stated that he subsequently contacted Pat Lammering of the FAA Airports Division who said he was not in favor of any such development in the RPZ. He reported that he received an email yesterday from Ron Bolyard, California Department of Transportation – Office of Aviation Planning, stating that it appears that the development may be incompatible with the airport based on both the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook and the Los Angeles County Land Use Compatibility Plan. He suggested that the consequences of incompatible development in the RPZ can be disastrous, citing the crash of an aircraft into a medical building at the west end of Torrance Airport in 1997.

Commissioner Skoll pointed out according to the City Attorney’s note in the staff report “the Airports Division of the FAA does not have the authority to review or issue any determination on South Bay Lexus’ proposed development. Nor does Zamperini Field appear to have any legally-enforceable federally designated runway protection zone.”

Disputing the City Attorney’s assessment, Mr. Gates stated that RPZs are not a just relic of expired FAA grant assurances, but rather they are a key element in the safe operation of Torrance Airport.

Commissioner D’anjou related her understanding that RPZs were not meant to be devoid of development, but were established to ensure that development is appropriate. She noted that FAA guidelines recommend that RPZs be kept free of developments that create a place of public assembly, such as churches, schools and hospitals, and voiced her opinion that the proposed parking lot does not qualify as a place of public assembly.

Bill Tymczyszyn, Torrance, noted his experience as a private pilot out of Torrance Airport, a retired commercial airline pilot, and a test pilot for the FAA. He explained that the FAA only requires compliance with minimum safety standards and related his belief that minimum

standards are not enough, citing the 1997 crash into the medical building and the crash of two helicopters in 2003. He expressed concerns that the proposed project will move the airport fence closer to the runway thereby encroaching on the airport and reducing the margin of safety in an area where pilots start their final approach. He stated that he was disappointed the City Manager chose to bring this project to the Planning Commission after the Airport Commission voted unanimously to reject it, which makes it appear that the City was shopping commissions until they find one to approve it.

Assistant City Attorney Sullivan clarified that the project was presented to the Airport Commission because it serves as an advisory body to the City Council on airport matters and it was brought to the Planning Commission because it is the body charged with making land-use decisions.

Dave Weir, Torrance, noted that he is a pilot with a PhD in engineering and has studied instrument landing systems (ILS). He expressed concerns that the proposed parking lot could interfere with navigation, explaining that the ILS creates an electronic path in the sky that is defined by the glide slope and the localizer and vehicles and other large objects under the glide scope can distort the electronic beam, which is why the FAA tries to keep approach areas clear. He echoed concerns that parking lot lighting could be a distraction for pilots who are flying IFR and only have a brief time to locate the runway. He voiced his opinion that these are two significant safety problems that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Gibson stated that she found Mr. Weir's comments very interesting and asked if he had any suggestions as how to mitigate the project's impact.

Mr. Weir responded the proposed parking area should be open space, such as a park or grassland.

Commissioner D'anjou questioned how vehicles parked in the proposed parking lot could disrupt the ILS when there is already a lot of vehicular activity on the airfield itself as well as along Crenshaw Boulevard.

Mr. Weir stated that vehicles on the airfield do not affect the ILS because they are not on the approach path to the runway and while vehicles on Crenshaw Boulevard could affect it, he believes this is taken into account when ILS standards are set.

Anne O'Brien, Torrance resident and commercially licensed pilot, expressed concerns that the proposed project's parking lot lighting could distract pilots during one of the most critical periods as they emerge from the clouds just before touch down. She stated that Torrance Airport is well designed and fairly safe and she would like to keep it that way and related her belief that there must be other places in Torrance for Lexus to expand its business.

David Bentley, Rolling Hills, reported that he commutes from Torrance Airport for business and routinely returns after midnight and expressed concerns that the parking lot lighting could cause confusion as he switches from looking at instruments in the cockpit to looking out the window for runway lighting just before landing.

Commissioner Skoll related his understanding that there are restrictions on nighttime flights at Torrance Airport, and Mr. Bentley explained that pilots may land anytime, but cannot take off during certain hours.

Ernst Schubert, Redondo Beach, flight instructor, contended that there should be no extraneous lighting near the runway because it would interfere with ILS and could cause pilot error.

Larry Chapman, Palos Verdes Estates, pilot operating out of Torrance Airport, explained that pilots look for dark areas when searching for airports at night and lighting within the cockpit is kept very low so the glare from ambient lighting can be jarring to a pilot when emerging from the clouds. He noted that the proposed parking lot lighting would be closer to the runway than any other lighting, within an area pilots consider the Runway Protection Zone. He stated that RPZs were created as common sense guidelines for airport development to provide a safe environment for pilots and for the community surrounding them and common sense is not dictated by federal grants.

Laurice Churchill, president of the local chapter of Ninety-Nines, Inc., a women's pilot association, stated that the association is opposed to this encroachment due to concerns about airport safety.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Jamieson stated that the determination of whether a project presents a hazard to navigable airspace is the exclusive province of the FAA; that Congress gave the FAA this authority because they have the education, experience and expertise to make these difficult decisions; and that the statutes enacted to guide the process address all the issues that were brought up at this hearing. He noted that §77.31 specifies that the FAA analysis must include the project's effect on VRF/IFR operations, air traffic procedures and minimum flight altitudes, as well as the physical and/or electromagnetic effect on the operation of air navigation facilities, communication aids and surveillance systems. He reported that he had contacted people higher up in the hierarchy of the FAA than those mentioned by Mr. Gates as recently as today, and the regional manager confirmed that while they had heard from many pilots from Torrance, nothing said had caused them to change their opinion and they had no intention of rescinding their determination that the project presents no hazard to air navigation.

Commissioner Skoll asked if there was anything that could be done to address concerns about parking lot lighting.

Mr. Tidball reported that the lighting complies with all State regulations and building codes, which were recently changed to prohibit any lighting from shining upward or spilling over onto adjacent properties.

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

Commissioner D'anjou stated that she was struck by the comment that pilots look for dark areas when searching for airports at night, because she felt it shows that for a dense urban community, Torrance Airport is unique in that it remains somewhat pristine as opposed to other nearby airports that have many more buildings and structures in the "runway protection zone." She further stated that she did not believe parking vehicles and adding lighting in this area would significantly infringe on what we have, therefore she would vote to approve the project.

Voicing support for the project, Chairperson Polcari stated that he did not believe extending the parking lot would create any more distraction than what has been there for the

past 10 years since Lexus has been at this location and even before that when the site was an aerospace manufacturing business.

Commissioner Herring stated that if he were a pilot, he probably would be standing with the other pilots in opposition to this project, however, as a Planning Commissioner his purview is land use and zoning and the applicant's request for a Modification meets all conditions and requirements set forth by the City of Torrance, therefore he will be voting to approve the project.

Commissioner Tsao explained that he supports the proposed project because he knows how hard it is for businesses to survive these days and believes Lexus' plan to combine sales and service operations at this location is a good idea. He indicated that he did not think the proposed parking lot would be a safety hazard based on what he's seen at other airports. He related his belief that the site will look better with the removal of the surplus soil and expressed confidence that Lexus do a good job and mitigate the impact of the lighting. He stated that he respects the pilots association, but he believes this is the best use for this piece of property.

Indicating that she would not support the project, Commissioner Gibson stated that this was a difficult decision because Lexus is a great company, however, she was swayed by Mr. Weir's comments and felt this was a case where just because you can do something, doesn't mean you should.

Commissioner Skoll noted that the Planning Commission was dealing with this project from a land use perspective, which is different from the Airport Commission, and their action will be forwarded to the City Council.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved to approve MOD14-00013, as conditioned, including all findings set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commission Tsao and passed by a 5-1 roll call vote with Commissioner Gibson dissenting (absent Commissioner Watson).

Planning Assistant Lang read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-013.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-013. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by a 5-1 roll call vote, with Commissioner Gibson dissenting (absent Commissioner Watson).

11. **WAIVERS** – None.

12. **FORMAL HEARINGS**

12A. **CUP15-00008: TIM ABRAMS (MARBLE PARK INVESTMENT)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a private training facility on property located in the M1-PP Zone at 2527 237<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite D. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Section 15301 – Existing Facilities.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

Planning Assistant Lang introduced the request.

Robert Brown, representing Marble Park Investment, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. He explained that the two partners in this business offer one-on-one training sessions by appointment only and they chose this location because their clientele are mainly from South Torrance and the Palos Verdes area.

Chairperson Polcari asked when the business plans to open, and Mr. Brown reported that the applicants are just awaiting a business license, which can't be issued until the appeal period for this hearing has expired.

Commissioner Gibson asked if there are any age limits for clients, and Mr. Brown related his understanding that there are no age limits, noting that he is the real estate agent for this transaction.

Commissioner Tsao questioned how the applicants can make a living with an average of five clients per day (per Operational Summary – Staff Report, Attachment 4).

Mr. Brown explained that the cost for a one-on-one training session is substantially higher than a typical gym workout and the applicants are saving money by leasing an industrial space as opposed to retail.

Commissioner Herring expressed concerns about the adequacy of the parking.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that staff believes the parking will be sufficient due to the limited nature of the business and because its peak time tends to be after business hours.

Mr. Brown reported that most of their clients have daily jobs so they will visit the facility either before or after business hours and noted that the lease includes a condition that the applicants may not exceed four parking spaces to prevent creating a nuisance for other tenants.

John Burdette, another tenant in the complex, stated that he was pleased the applicants were moving into this location.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Brown related his belief that the site was a good fit for this start-up business.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Herring moved to approve CUP15-00008 as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner D'anjou and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

Planning Assistant Lang read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-031.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Tsao moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-031. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

**12B. CUP15-00002, WAV15-00007: H MART WEST INC. (PACOSH, LLC)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a grocery store with restaurant uses within an existing commercial building, in conjunction with a Waiver to allow a wall to exceed the maximum height on property located in the C-2 Zone at 4340 Pacific Coast Highway. This project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Sections 15301 – Existing Facilities and 15303 – New Construction.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

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

Craig McKenna, representing H Mart, reported that the company plans to spend between \$7-8 million to convert the existing commercial building into an international/Asian supermarket with a food court and a bakery. He noted that the company currently has 7 stores in California and it offers a wide variety of items not available at other supermarkets, including 95 types of fresh seafood, 10 types of live seafood and 86 types of rice. He briefly reviewed public outreach efforts, explaining that he initially visited residents who live immediately adjacent to the site to discuss the project and all of them were in favor of it. He noted that one resident requested certain improvements so water from the site will not drain to her property and the applicant has agreed to do them.

Commissioner Skoll commended H Mart for its outreach to neighbors, noting that it was the most extensive he has seen during his almost 8 years on the Commission.

In response to Commissioner Gibson's inquiry, Mr. McKenna reported that the company does not have any stores in Japan, but has 50 stores throughout the United States, noting that the store's owner is Korean.

Commissioner Tsao reported that he has been to H Mart and his only concern was parking, because they tend to be crowded.

Mr. McKenna reported that approximately 74 new parking spaces will be added by converting the Orchard garden area into parking and restriping the parking lot.

Chairperson Polcari noted that the center has another grocery store (Sprouts), and Mr. McKenna responded that there will be some overlap, but H Mart caters primarily to Asian customers.

In response to Commissioner Tsao's inquiry, Mr. McKenna confirmed that there will be no merchandise displayed outside the store and the sidewalk in front will be kept clear.

Commissioner Gibson asked about the hours of operation, and Mr. McKenna reported that the store will be open from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., seven days a week.

Judy Brunetti, co-president of Riviera Homeowners Association, stated that she appreciated the applicant's outreach efforts and believes the market will be a good neighbor, relating her understanding that H Mart has plans to mitigate neighbors' concerns about noise from deliveries and odors from seafood refuse. On behalf of a neighbor unable to attend the

meeting, she asked about the composition of the noise attenuation wall and questioned if there will be weekend deliveries.

David Kim, project architect, reported that the existing 6-foot high block wall will be retained and the existing wrought iron fencing above it will be removed and replaced with 6-foot high insulated panels of galvanized metal and this wall is expected to block up to 80% of the noise from deliveries. He explained that garbage will be stored inside the building in a refrigerated room and picked up daily to control odor. He stated that he could not guarantee that there will be no deliveries on weekends but they will try to avoid them. He noted that the company has its own distribution center so deliveries are limited to one large truck per day instead of several deliveries by vendors using smaller trucks and noise generation will be much less than the existing grocery store in this center.

Robin Cimo, owner of Anza Pacific Barber Salon, related her belief that this center was not large enough to accommodate two grocery stores and expressed concerns about the project's impact on traffic and the potential that she would lose customers due to the lack of parking.

Commissioner Skoll noted that the project actually exceeds parking requirements by a few spaces.

Planning Manager Lodan advised that the applicant worked very hard to provide the necessary parking without disrupting the existing traffic flow within the shopping center and the City's transportation planning/traffic engineering staff have reviewed the plans and they concur that this is the best layout.

Chairperson Polcari asked if improvements will be made to the driveways.

The applicant's traffic/parking consultant (name inaudible/no speaker card) reported that the center's existing five entrances/exits have sufficient capacity so no changes are necessary to the driveways. She noted that more than a year was spent on the traffic circulation and parking plans, which were designed to be respectful of neighboring businesses.

Christine Hapgood, 3844 Newton Street, urged Commissioners to visit the center at its busiest time, which is between 1:00 – 3:00 p.m., before making a decision on this project.

Returning to the podium, Mr. McKenna noted that he reviewed the project with each of the business owners in the shopping center and the response was generally favorable. He reported that the supermarket hopes to open by mid-November 2015.

Commissioner Tsao requested that the applicant try to orient traffic so it exits on Pacific Coast Highway because the exit on Vista Montana gets very congested.

Mr. McKenna offered his assurance that the applicant will work with the property owner to address any problem that might develop.

Chairperson Polcari suggested the possibility of installing a traffic signal on Vista Montana should traffic become a problem.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved to approve CUP15-00002 and WAV15-00007 as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

Planning Assistant Lang read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-032.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-032. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

Planning Assistant Lang read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-033.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Skoll moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 15-033. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Herring and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

**12C. CUP15-00006, DIV15-00002: ICON PLANNING AND DESIGN STUDIO (MARK AWAD)**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow two separate two-unit condominium developments on Parcels 4083-003-009 and 4083-003-010, in conjunction with a Division of Lot for condominium purposes, on property located in the R-2 Zone at 18300 Grevillea Avenue and APN 4083-003-009. The project is Categorically Exempt from CEQA per Guidelines Sections 1503 – New Construction and 15315 – Minor Land Divisions.

**Recommendation:** Approval.

Planning Assistant Lang introduced the request and noted supplemental material consisting of a revised Tentative Parcel Map and Lot Line Adjustment exhibit for the Division of Lot, an additional code requirement and a revised condition of approval, and correspondence received after the agenda item was completed.

Ike Mbelu, Icon Planning and Design Studio, project architect, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval, including the revised condition in the supplemental material. He briefly described the proposed project, which consists of four detached two-story condominiums with semi-subterranean garages.

In response to Chairperson Polcari's inquiry, Mr. Mbelu stated that the project was shared with neighbors and they seemed to be supportive. He confirmed that the project will be consistent with the neighborhood, which is a mix of old bungalows and new two-story homes.

Chairperson Polcari asked about the timeline for the project, and Mr. Mbelu stated that they hope to break ground by the end of July.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Herring moved to approve CUP15-00006 and DIV15-00002 as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

Planning Assistant Lang read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 15-034 and 15-035.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Herring moved to adopt Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 15-034 and 15-035. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Watson).

13. **RESOLUTIONS**- None.

14. **PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS** – None.

15. **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

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

Planning Manager Lodan noted that the Community Development Director Weekly Summary Reports for April 10, April 16, April 24, April 30, and May 8, 2015 were distributed to the Commission.

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

Planning Manager Lodan reported that the City Council approved the Precise Plan of Development proposed for 5356 Doris Way by a split vote of 4-3 at the May 12 City Council meeting.

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

Planning Manager Lodan reviewed the agenda for the June 3, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

18. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS #2**

18A. Commissioner Herring reported that he attended the Armed Forces Day Parade last Saturday, which was well attended, and the highlight for him was the 800+ young men and women who were inducted into the military.

18B. Chairperson Polcari reported that he also attended the parade and greatly enjoyed the demonstration by LAPD motor officers. He wished everyone a happy Memorial Day.

19. **ADJOURNMENT**

At 9:35 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, June 3, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

Approved as submitted July 15, 2015 s/ Rebecca Poirier, City Clerk
--