

MINUTES

CITY OF CARSON PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CARSON CITY HALL

*701 East Carson Street, Second Floor
Carson, CA 90745*

January 25, 2011 – 6:30 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** Chairman Faletoogo called the meeting to order at 6:37 P.M.
 2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** Commissioner Diaz led the Salute to the Flag.
 3. **ROLL CALL**

Planning Commissioners Present: Diaz, Faletoogo, Goolsby, *Gordon, Park, Schaefer, Saenz, Verrett

*(Commissioner Gordon arrived at 6:45 P.M.)

Planning Commissioners Absent: Brimmer

Planning Commissioners Departed Early: None

Planning Staff Present: Planning Officer Repp, Senior Planner Signo, City Attorney Wynder, Associate Planner Gonzalez, Associate Planner Newberg, Associate Planner Song, Assistant Planner Castillo, Contract Planner Ketz, Recording Secretary Bothe
 4. **AGENDA POSTING CERTIFICATION** Recording Secretary Bothe indicated that all posting requirements had been met.
 5. **AGENDA APPROVAL** Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to approve the Agenda as submitted. This motion was superseded by the substitute motion.
- By way of a substitute motion, Vice-Chairman Park moved, seconded by Commissioner Schaefer, to consider Item No. 11C as the first order of business. Motion carried, 7-0 (Commissioner Gordon had not yet arrived; absent Commissioner Brimmer).

6. **INSTRUCTIONS TO WITNESSES** Chairman Faletogo requested that all persons wishing to provide testimony stand for the oath, complete the general information card at the podium, and submit it to the secretary for recordation.
7. **SWEARING OF WITNESSES** City Attorney Wynder
8. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS** For items **NOT** on the agenda. Speakers are limited to three minutes.
- Jules Manson, resident and City Council candidate, introduced himself and highlighted the efforts he will undertake if elected to City Council.
- Larry Grant, resident, noted his opposition to any candidate using this forum to further their political interests.

9. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A) **Minutes:** January 11, 2011

MOTION: Commissioner Diaz moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Park, to approve the January 11, 2011, Minutes as presented. Motion carried, 7-0 (Commissioner Gordon had not yet arrived; absent Commissioner Brimmer).

10. **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

- A) **Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09 and Variance No. 506-09**

Applicant's Request:

The City is requesting revocation of permits for SW Suits to construct a freeway-oriented sign and exceed the maximum allowable sign area for the Avalon Plaza shopping center. The subject property is located at 20761-20775 South Avalon Boulevard.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Senior Planner Signo presented staff report and the recommendation to consider one of two options:

Option A

AMEND Resolution No. 09-2274 approving Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09 and Variance No. 506-09 by adding the following condition:

"The applicant shall not reinstall a sign on the back wall of the building until such time as it can be demonstrated that all the conditions of approval relating to site improvements,

landscaping, and architectural embellishments contained in Resolution No. 09-2274 be complied with and completed to the satisfaction of the Planning Division. Failure to complete the conditions of approval within six (6) months shall render these permits null and void"; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT a minute resolution amending Resolution No. 09-2274.

Option B

REVOKE approval of Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09 and Variance No. 506-09; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2362, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson revoking approval of Design Overlay Review (DOR) No. 1337-09 and Variance No. 506-09 for a freeway-oriented wall sign and a variance request to exceed the total allowable sign area for a shopping center located at 20761-20775 South Avalon Boulevard."

Planning Officer Repp advised that the Sign Subcommittee met today to discuss the long-term banner proposal submitted by Mr. Dupetit, a proposal that, if accepted, would require an ordinance amendment; and stated that the subcommittee directed staff to bring this matter before the Planning Commission for consideration.

David Dupetit, applicant, stated that no one is more disappointed than him with the 3-foot channel letter sign being barely visible from the freeway, noting that sign was \$15,000; advised that he had zero response from that channel letter sign and that this sign is useless at this location. He advised that he is not interested in reinstalling those 3-foot channel letters on the rear wall of this building. He stated that the rear wall banner is essential to the success of this business and that it is bringing in enough customers to keep his business open; added that his customers also do business with the other establishments in this plaza; and stated that he'd like the City to address his long-term banner proposal in a timely fashion. He mentioned that he is the anchor tenant in this plaza, paying the highest rent, and that the banner display is essential to the financial health of not only his business, but also the other businesses in this shopping center.

City Attorney Wynder clarified for Mr. Dupetit that if he does not wish to reinstall the 3-foot channel letters on the rear wall, it leaves the Commission with no alternative but to revoke his permit for those channel letters.

Mr. Dupetit commented on the Sign Subcommittee's direction for the Planning Commission to soon consider his proposal to extend the time banners can be displayed to help out small businesses especially during these difficult economic times. He asked that his banner be permitted to be displayed until consideration has been made to change the banner ordinance.

City Attorney Wynder stated that it typically takes six months for an ordinance amendment process.

Commissioner Goolsby stated he also has seen that the 3-foot channel letters are barely visible from the freeway and stated that a mock-up of the proposed size should have been conducted to make the determination they were large enough to be seen from the freeway.

Vice-Chairman Park stated that the applicant should abide by the approved conditions of the resolution.

Because the applicant has indicated he is not interested in reinstalling the 3-foot channel letters, Planning Officer Repp suggested another option for the Commission to consider, to revoke the DOR permit that allows the channel letter sign but to maintain the variance which would allow his banner to be displayed for 60 calendar days.

Senior Planner Signo clarified that the variance allows the banner to be displayed even though it exceeds the total signage permitted for this shopping center.

Commissioner Verrett stated that some of the window signs have been removed and that it looks much nicer.

Mr. Dupetit stated that he remodeled the inside of the store and removed some of the window signs and reiterated that the small businesses are struggling and need the City's assistance in allowing to advertize with banners.

Ronald Shimokaji, resident, stated that serious consideration needs to be given to allowing a larger permanent sign on the rear wall and possibly changing the color palette to enhance visibility from the freeway; and suggested that in the next 60 days, staff and the applicant work on sign design modifications that will enhance visibility from the freeway.

Terri Forsythe, resident/business operator, stated it is unfair that such a large business as IKEA is permitted to have permanent banner signage, yet the small businesses are not given the same opportunity; urged the City to allow the banner displays to be up longer than the 60-day period especially during these difficult economic times, noting the need to support the small businesses in this community; stated that the City should be negotiating a favorable result for all parties involved; and pointed out that increased sales for small businesses means increased revenue for the City.

Larry Grant, resident, noted his concurrence with the speakers who are in support of helping small businesses survive during this economy; and noted that while he was having his suits altered, a new suit client of Mr. Dupetit indicated that she saw the rear wall banner from the freeway; and he urged the Commission to allow the banner to stay up.

Adrian Twombel stated that these suits are affordable and good quality and that the City should be helping businesses to be successful.

There being no further input, Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Gordon moved, seconded by Commissioner Schaefer, to revoke Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09; to allow Variance No. 506-09 to stay in effect, allowing the banner to be displayed for 60 days in a calendar year. (This motion ultimately carried).

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Goolsby, to revoke Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09; to allow Variance No. 506-09 to stay in effect, allowing the banner to be displayed for 60 days in a calendar year and to allow an additional 60-day extension if desired. (This motion was ultimately withdrawn).

City Attorney Wynder explained that the Planning Commission does not have the authority to grant an additional 60-day extension.

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Diaz moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Park, to revoke Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09 and Variance No. 506-09, Option B. (This motion ultimately failed).

By way of an amended substitute motion, Commissioner Verrett withdrew her motion for an extension on the additional 60-day banner display.

Staff explained that Commissioner Verrett's amended motion basically accomplishes the same as Commissioner Gordon's original motion.

Commissioner Diaz called for the vote on his substitute motion.

Commissioner Verrett withdrew her motion.

The substitute motion put forth by Commissioner Diaz failed, 2-6, as follows:

AYES: Diaz, Park
NOES: Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer, Verrett
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer

City Attorney Wynder explained that if the original motion passes, a resolution reflecting the decision to revoke Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09 and allowing Variance No. 506-09 to stay in effect would have to be prepared and presented to the Commission at the next meeting.

The original motion put forth by Commissioner Gordon carried, 6-2, thus revoking Design Overlay Review No. 1337-09, but allowing Variance No. 506-09 to remain in effect, directing staff to prepare the resolution for the next meeting, adopting Resolution No. 11-2363:

AYES: Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer, Verrett
NOES: Diaz, Park
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer

(Commissioner Schaefer recused herself from consideration of this item due to a possible conflict of interest.)

11. PUBLIC HEARING

A) Amended Specific Plan No. 10-05 and the First Amendment to Carson Marketplace Development Agreement

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Carson Marketplace, LLC, is requesting to amend Specific Plan No. 10-05 Carson Marketplace (The Boulevards at South Bay) and adopt the First Amendment to the Development Agreement. The subject property is 168 acres located southwest of the San Diego Freeway (I-405), north of Avalon Boulevard interchange, east of Main Street and north and south of Del Amo Boulevard.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Contract Planner Ketz presented staff report and the recommendation to RECOMMEND AMENDING the proposed The Boulevards at South Bay Specific Plan 10-05 to add the following language to Section 6.2:

“C. Once the property is built out, the allowed units and/or square footage will be reduced to that built plus 10% additional square footage or units, provided the total number of residential units does not exceed 1,550. The site will be considered built out when all the building pads have been identified with substantial compliance with the illustrative plan dated July 22, 2009.”

RECOMMEND AMENDING the proposed The Boulevards at South Bay Specific Plan 10-05 to add the following language to Section 6.1:

“D. When the Development Agreement expires on March 21, 2021, any development proposed for the 168 acres, known as The Boulevards at South Bay, shall be subject to environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.”

RECOMMEND AMENDING the proposed The Boulevards at South Bay Specific Plan 10-05 to add the following language to Section 6.7.2 C:

“Lighting shall be constructed and directed so that adjacent residences are not impacted by light or glare coming from the project site. Lights must be shielded so residents cannot see the light from their properties.”

RECOMMEND APPROVAL to the City Council, Amended The Boulevards at South Bay Specific Pan No. 10-05 and First Amendment to the Carson Marketplace Development Agreement; WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2364, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson recommending approval to the City Council of the Amended Specific Plan No. 10-05 The Boulevards at South Bay and the first amendment to the Development Agreement.”

Commissioner Diaz asked if the workforce was being paid prevailing wages.

Contract Planner Ketz indicated that the prevailing wages were only required to be paid on the remediation work, that they were not required to pay prevailing wages on the remainder of the work.

Contract Planner Ketz noted for Vice-Chairman Park that the 70-foot high pylon sign will require a conditional use permit; and explained that the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Environmental Quality Act law will govern future development.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Seely Arms, representing the applicant, stated that prevailing wages are required for public improvements but are not required on the rest of the work to be done. He noted his concurrence with the conditions for approval.

There being no further input, Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Gordon moved, seconded by Commissioner Verrett, to approve the applicant's request, thus adopting Resolution No. 11-2364. Motion carried, 7-0, as follows:

AYES: Diaz, Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Park, Saenz, Verrett
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer, Schaefer

11. PUBLIC HEARING

B) Conditional Use Permit No. 846-10

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Juliette Vo, is requesting to approve a CUP for an existing second dwelling unit located within the RS (Residential, Single-Family) zoning district. The subject property is located at 2661 East Adams Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Assistant Planner Castillo presented staff report and the recommendation to APPROVE the Categorical Exemption; APPROVE Conditional Use Permit No. 846-10 subject to the conditions of approval attached as Exhibit "B" to the Resolution; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2365, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson approving Conditional Use Permit No. 846-10 for an existing second dwelling unit located at 2661 East Adams Street." He added two conditions: The existing front fence to be no higher than 3.5 feet; and, Garage storage is to be kept at a minimum so as to allow the parking of a vehicle.

Assistant Planner Castillo noted for Vice-Chairman Park that the first 20 feet of the side yard fencing is also to be no higher than 3.5 feet.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Suzanne Gornick, applicant, noted her concurrence with the conditions of approval and stated that this property is in escrow.

There being no further input, Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chairman Park stated this is a densely populated neighborhood, noting his concern this will end up being a rental property that will bring in more traffic.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Gordon moved, seconded by Chairman Faletogo, to approve the applicant's request; and to add: The existing front fence to be no higher than 3.5 feet; and, Garage storage is to be kept at a minimum so as to allow the parking of a vehicle. (This motion ultimately carried).

By way of a substitute motion, Vice-Chairman Park moved, seconded by Commissioner Diaz, to deny the applicant's request. This motion failed, 2-6, as follows:

AYES: Diaz, Park
NOES: Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer, Verrett
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer

The motion to approve the applicant's request carried, 6-2, Resolution No. 11-2365, as follows:

AYES: Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer, Verrett
NOES: Diaz, Park
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer

11. PUBLIC HEARING

C) Relocation Impact Report No. 8-2010

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Carson Redevelopment Agency, is requesting Relocation Impact Report No. 8-2010 for the closure of the Dominguez Trailer Park with 29 units and 31 spaces located in the RS (Residential Single-Family) zone. The subject property is located at 2666 East Dominguez Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Associate Planner Gonzalez presented staff report and the recommendation to WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2362, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson approving Relocation Impact Report No. 8-2010 for the closure of Dominguez Trailer Park pursuant to conditions providing relocation assistance to displaced residents." He highlighted the following changes to the resolution: 1) Change reference to "off-site" values" to "on-site" values; 2) Section 5g, the last sentence should read, "The non-resident owners shall be eligible for last resort benefits based upon an on-site appraisal method"; 4) Subparagraph h, delete the second and the third sentence; 5) Triangle 38, under "Payment to Non-Resident Mobile Homeowners" should read , "If the mobile home cannot be moved to a replacement site, the non-resident's mobile homeowner may elect to sell the home to the agency for its appraised 'on-site'"; 6) Triangle 40, last paragraph, replace the word "three" with "five."

In response to Vice-Chairman Park's request for clarification on the payments, Brian Everett, principal/vice-president of Overland, Pacific & Cutler, explained that they will be able to choose from the comparable housing and will receive up to the maximum allowed under their chosen stock.

Sr. Redevelopment Project Manager Sztorch explained for Commissioner Verrett that should this site be converted to below to moderate income housing for rent, they would have the opportunity to move to those units if done within a certain period of time.

Commissioner Verrett asked if there were any responses to the letters delivered to the tenants.

Sr. Redevelopment Project Manager Sztorch stated he is not aware of any responses to those notices.

Commissioner Schaefer asked if any financial package offers have been made at this time to the tenants/owners.

Brian Everett, principal/vice-president of Overland, Pacific & Cutler, stated that no financial package offers have been made at this time; and advised that one resident has already moved with the knowledge that this park would eventually be closed.

Planning Officer Repp explained the distinction of benefits that can be offered from a private party owner who is closing a park versus the City's ownership of a park closure, noting that it is being closed because of its blighted conditions and belief it's in the best interest of the City to close this use and convert it to something more in keeping with the surrounding area. She explained that because of the need to consider the property/land owner's rights, there are certain limitations that can be placed on a private property owner for relocation benefits; that in this case, the RDA is the property owner and that the RDA can offer maximum benefits over and above what can be required of a private party property owner to pay.

Mr. Everett explained that there are two types of tenants: those who own the mobile homes and those who are tenants renting the mobile homes, pointing out that both parties will receive the same benefits. He noted that the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) will cover the cost of the rent increases for 42 months (3.5 years); that the tenants will either receive replacement into another mobilehome park with their unit, if possible, or be taken up to the next level of benefit, such as an apartment or multi-family duplex; and reiterated that the RDA will cover the price differential for 3.5 years. He stated they need to do an updated cost analysis of the different variables, which cannot take place until this RIR is approved.

Responding to Commissioner Verrett's inquiry regarding notification, Mr. Everett advised that following the delivery of the notices, bilingual representatives from his firm went to speak to the park residents to mitigate any concerns; and stated it is his agency's job to find the housing for these residents.

Commissioner Verrett stated she does not believe 3.5 years is adequate to be paying these residents' rents that is above their current rates.

Mr. Everett mentioned that these residents also have an opportunity to utilize this money for a down payment on their own property and that the benefits being offered provides them opportunities they otherwise likely wouldn't have had. He reiterated that it is his agency's responsibility to find comparable replacement housing for these residents, not going below what they currently have.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Patricia Schelest, park resident, Space 27, noted her opposition to the park closure, stating she is concerned with affordability because of her being disabled and on a fixed income; and noted her concern she may not be able to afford anything better in the long run. She stated that the RIR has errors in it that need to be addressed; and stated that the residents should have received this document much sooner. She stated that the certified letters were signed by one person, not individual park residents, and placed in their mailboxes. She stated that the age of some of the coaches is incorrectly reflected in the document and also site errors with their value; stated the first page of the cover letter says they're going to be building units for rent, but in another part of the document says these future units will be for sale units; and pointed out that there is a proposal for 20 future units, not enough to accommodate the 30 displaced residents of this park. She noted her opposition to placing in the public record her private information, such as monthly rental rate and appraised coach value. She stated that the paperwork seems to require the residents do the legwork for this relocation.

Erica Delgado, park resident, stated that the majority of the park residents speak Spanish and this information should be translated for them.

Mr. Everett pointed out that all the information has been in English and Spanish and added that 30 percent of the employees at his agency are bilingual and have translated all the information in Spanish; and added that those from his agency who visited this property were all bilingual. He explained that until the RIR is approved, they are not able to do more definitive studies on the final appraisals and benefits, that they are in a holding pattern until this approval is complete. He pointed out that his agency will be doing all the legwork for the residents.

Sr. Redevelopment Project Manager Sztorch added that they met with these residents at the Community Center in October 2010 and that Spanish translation was provided at that meeting as well as many of the management team members being bilingual; and added that a lengthy explanation of these efforts were exclusively done in Spanish. He echoed Mr. Everett's comments that certain things cannot be performed until this document is officially approved, noting they're not in a position to make any offers or explain individual benefits until the RIR is approved. He added that the benefits will be explained on a case-by-case basis, each being based on individual needs of the tenants and owners. He stated that he reviewed the returned certified letter notice and believes it was signed by multiple people.

Planning Officer Repp advised that the RIR requires a relocation specialist be hired who is experienced in this effort and stated that the City has found Overland, Pacific & Cutler to be the best company in this field; and she advised it is staff's belief these residents will receive extremely high value and one-on-one service once this document is approved. She pointed out the goal is to provide these residents with comparable or better housing than what they currently have. She noted that Overland, Pacific & Cutler will be able to start the definitive process once the 15-day appeal period has successfully passed. She reiterated that these residents/owners will be receiving the highest values they have been able to identify and recommended approval of the RIR this evening.

Ronald Shimokaji, resident, urged the City to give these residents the best possible benefits.

There being no further input, Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Verrett stated she has not had enough time to go over the materials provided to the Commission and that she believes this matter should be continued. She stated she is not in any hurry to make a decision on this matter and that the City should be taking its time and meeting with the residents as much as they request. She stated

that definitive answers should be provided before the RIR is approved and each individual should know what they'll be receiving.

City Attorney Wynder reiterated that the law requires an RIR be approved before giving authorization to make binding offers on relocation assistance and other benefits; and pointed out that the longer this Commission takes to make a decision, the longer these residents live with this uncertainty.

Commissioner Verrett stated that she would like more time to review the materials and conduct a few more meetings to discuss this RIR to make sure everyone understands what is taking place.

Chairman Faletogo stated that after reading the materials and listening to the testimony this evening, he believes the residents are being appropriately informed and being offered above-average benefits and that City staff and Overland, Pacific & Cutler are doing a fine job up to this point and offering the best that is allowed; and that there is a lot of consideration that is going into this process and a lot of compassion being extended to these residents. He pointed out that the City will be paying the difference on their rents for 3.5 years, offering a very good deal to these residents. He added that the assistance may also provide the residents an opportunity to put a nice down payment on their own property. He stated he does not wish to drag this issue on, noting it's not in the best interest of the residents; pointed out that this process remains on hold until the RIR is approved; and expressed his belief that as soon as this document is approved, he is sure this agency will be on site in full force speaking with these residents and conducting one-on-one benefits discussions.

Commissioner Verrett stated there are no guarantees on how much the residents will receive at this point and that there is no hurry to get this approved.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the resident's comment about the certified mail not being individually signed has any implications.

City Attorney Wynder pointed out that the speaker had, in fact, stated she received the notice; and stated he would be more concerned with any claims of not receiving the notice, pointing out that no one at this evening's meeting or any other time that he's aware of complained about not receiving the notice.

Vice-Chairman Park stated he is satisfied with the benefits that are being proposed for these residents, noting it's far more than what other park residents have received with prior closures.

Commissioner Diaz stated that the City has met the required timetable for this park closure and have met all the requirements under the law; expressed his belief this issue is not being rushed through; and advised that he has read the materials and listened to the testimony this evening and is prepared to render his decision. He stated that while the RIR is not perfect, it is a working document that will likely require some minor corrections and updated financial figures.

Commissioner Saenz stated that the City is not likely to change anything even if these meetings are continued, noting the City is already offering the residents great benefits.

City Attorney Wynder pointed out that the City has decided to adopt a substantially generous appraisal method with this park than would be seen with closure of a private park ownership.

Commissioner Verrett reiterated her belief 3.5 years is not long enough to be paying the difference on their rents, highlighting the poor economy.

Planning Commission Decision:

Chairman Faletogo moved, seconded by Commissioner Goolsby, to approve Relocation Impact Report No. 8-2010 for the closure of Dominguez Trailer Park, with the following amendments: 1) Change reference to “off-site” values” to “on-site” values; 2) Section 5g, the last sentence should read, “The non-resident owners shall be eligible for last resort benefits based upon an on-site appraisal method”; 4) Subparagraph h, delete the second and the third sentence; 5) Triangle 38, under “Payment to Non-Resident Mobile Homeowners” should read, “If the mobile home cannot be moved to a replacement site, the non-resident’s mobile homeowner may elect to sell the home to the agency for its appraised ‘on-site’”; 6) Triangle 40, last paragraph, replace the word “three” with “five.” This motion carried, 7-1, adopting Resolution No.11-2362:

AYES: Diaz, Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Park, Saenz, Schaefer
NOES: Verrett
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer

11. PUBLIC HEARING

D) Conditional Use Permit No. 848-10

Applicant’s Request:

The applicant, Maurice Refoua/Eli Mashiach, is requesting to approve an auto repair business on a site located in the CR-D (Commercial Regional, Design Overlay) zoning district. The subject property is located at 655 East Carson Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Associate Planner Song presented staff report and the recommendation to APPROVE Conditional Use Permit No.848-10; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2366, entitled, “A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson approving Conditional Use Permit No. 848-10 to permit an auto repair facility located at 655 East Carson Street.”

Associate Planner Song noted for Chairman Faletogo that Ed’s Auto Repair moved from this site because their lease had expired.

Planning Officer Repp added that the property owner chose to lease to another automotive tenant; and mentioned that Ed’s Auto did have an application in the process to remain at this site before the property owner selected the other auto business. She explained that staff is recommending approval with the understanding that in the long term, the vision for this site is not for automotive related uses.

Associate Planner Song noted for Commissioner Schaefer that the landscaping will continue to be nonconforming even with the additional landscaping that is being required at the corner, pointing out the short-term plans for this use.

Commissioner Diaz pointed out that the membership of this body is likely to be different in five years and noted his hope that something more in line with the Carson Street Master Plan locates to this site.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Benny Natazi, operator of the Chevron station, noted his concurrence with the conditions of approval.

There being no further input, Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Goolsby, to approve the applicant's request, thus adopting Resolution No. 11-2366. Motion carried, 6-2, as follows:

AYES: Faletogo, Goolsby, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer, Verrett,
NOES: Diaz, Park
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Brimmer

12. NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION None.

13. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS None.

14. MANAGER'S REPORT

Planning Officer Repp advised that a joint meeting with the Public Works Commission will be scheduled to discuss truck routes.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to conduct that joint meeting at a regular Planning Commission meeting.

15. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Chairman Faletogo thanked everyone for their efforts this evening.

16. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:20 P.M. the meeting was officially adjourned to Tuesday, February 8, 2011, City Council Chambers.

Chairman

Attest By:

Secretary