**AGENDA ITEM NO. 7A (SUPPLEMENTAL NO. 1)**

**DATE:** November 4, 2026

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Lee Garcia, Planning Assistant | BGarcia@TorranceCA.gov

**SUBJECT:** 124 Via Sego (APN 7514-011-011)
Precise Plan of Development (PRE25-00004)

Consideration of Precise Plan of Development (PRE25-00004) to allow the construction of a new two-story single-family residence, on property located within the Hillside Overlay in the Single-Family Residential District (R-1) Zone at 124 Via Sego.

## SUPPLEMENTAL

- Staff has received new correspondence regarding the proposed project that requires additional review and assessment. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Commission continue this item to a date uncertain to allow sufficient time to evaluate the information.
- In addition, staff inadvertently left out the Hillside Overlay Substantiation Form. In accordance with Article 41, Chapter 1, Division 9 of the Torrance Municipal Code, the Planning Commission is required to make a series of findings relating to the planning and design of the project and its potential to have a substantial adverse impact on the view, light, air, and privacy of properties in the vicinity. It has been included as an attachment for your review.

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Correspondence
2. Hillside Overlay Substantiation Form

**ITEM 7A**
ATTACHMENT 1

CORRESPONDENCE



**ITEM 7A**
ATTACHMENT 1

Outlook

**PRE25-00004 – Request for Site Visit and Plan Review – 124 Via Sego**

**From** S C [redacted]
**Date** Fri 10/30/2026 12:55 PM
**To** Garcia, Lee <BGarcia@TorranceCA.Gov>

[You don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification ]

Hi Lee,

I am contacting you regarding PRE25-00004 at 124 Via Sego and the November 4 Planning Commission hearing.

I live across and diagonally from the project site, and the story-pole/silhouette installation appears to intrude directly into an existing western view corridor from my home.

I have photographs taken from normal viewing locations on my property showing the existing view and the proposed project silhouette. I am also submitting a separate formal public comment to the Planning Commission.

Before the Commission acts on the application, I would like to request that you or another member of Planning staff visit my property and evaluate the silhouette from the actual affected viewing locations. I would be happy to provide access and show staff exactly where the photographs were taken.

I would also appreciate access to the current PRE25-00004 materials as soon as they are available, particularly the site plan, floor plans, elevations, proposed building and ridge heights, square footage, setbacks, roof configuration, silhouette plan, and Hillside Overlay substantiation.

If staff has already evaluated the project from my property or from this specific view corridor, please let me know what was reviewed.

Thank you for your help.

Scott Cornwall
[redacted]
Redondo Beach, CA 90277









**ITEM 7A**
ATTACHMENT 2

# HILLSIDE OVERLAY SUBSTANTIATION FORM



**ITEM 7A**
ATTACHMENT 2

City of Torrance, Community Development Department, Planning Division
3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, CA 90503, Telephone (310) 618-5990

# Hillside Overlay Substantiation Form

Pursuant to Article 41, Chapter 1, Division 9 of the Torrance Municipal Code, the Planning Commission, or the City Council on appeal, may grant approval of a Precise Plan of Development for residential and commercial development on properties located within the Hillside and Local Coastal Overlay.

Applicants requesting a Precise Plan of Development must provide the facts to substantiate the criteria by which the Planning Commission or the City Council may grant the approval.

**1. PLANNING AND DESIGN (SECTION 91.41.6)**

**a) The proposed development will not have an adverse impact upon the view, light, air and privacy of *other properties in the vicinity based on the following:***

It is lower than the existing SFR we are removing. The existing high/steep garage roof will be replaced with a lower one. Windows on the sides are high off the 2nd floor level, therefore and don't provide viewing of adjacent neighbors.

**b) The proposed development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity based on the following:**

It is lower than the existing SFR we are removing. The existing high/steep garage roof will be replaced with a lower one. Windows on the sides are high off the 2nd floor level, therefore and don't provide viewing of adjacent neighbors.

**c) The design of the proposed development provides an orderly and attractive development in harmony with other properties in the vicinity based on the following:**

The neighborhood is a mix of various architectural styles. Our proposed simple style, materials and colors blend in well.

**d) The design of the proposed development will not have a harmful impact upon the land values and investment of other properties in the vicinity based on the following:**

It will improve the values as a new, attractive home with a ADU/guest house.

**e) Granting approval of the Precise Plan of Development would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare and to other properties in the vicinity based on the following:**

It will replace an abandoned, dilapidated home, therefore be a great improvement of the neighborhood.

**f) The proposed development will not cause or result in an adverse cumulative impact on other properties in the vicinity based on the following:**

It will be an attractive family home like others in the area.

**2. LIMITATION ON INCREASES IN HEIGHT (SECTION 91.41.10)**

This section must be completed if any part of the existing building would increase in height.

**a) It is not feasible to increase the size of or rearrange the space within the existing building or structure for the purposes intended except by increasing the height based on the following circumstances:**

b) **Denial of the Precise Plan of Development would result in an unreasonable hardship to the applicant for the following reason(s):**

c) **Granting approval of the Precise Plan of Development would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare and to other properties in the vicinity for the following reason(s):**

3. LIMITATION ON INCREASES IN BUILDING SPACE LOT COVERAGE (SECTION 91.41.11)
This section must be completed if the addition would increase the net interior floor area of the existing building so that it exceeds 50% of the lot area, except for commercial uses in a commercial zone.

a) **Denial of the Precise Plan of Development would constitute an unreasonable hardship to the applicant for the following reason(s):**

b) **Granting approval of the Precise Plan of Development would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare and to other properties in the vicinity for the following reason(s):**