



CITY OF CARSON

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

CONTINUED

NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION: November 13, 2012
SUBJECT: Modification No. 1 to Design Overlay Review No. 958-06
APPLICANT: Hamid Pournamdari
P.O. Box 1627
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
REQUEST: To modify the conditions of approval of Design Overlay Review No. 958-06 for a perimeter wall, fountain feature and stone veneer finish
PROPERTY INVOLVED: 23601 S. Avalon Boulevard

COMMISSION ACTION

____ Concur with staff
____ Did not concur with staff
____ Other

COMMISSIONERS' VOTE

AYE	NO		AYE	NO	
		Chairman Faletogo			Goolsby
		Vice-Chair Verrett			Gordon
		Brimmer			Saenz
		Diaz			Schaefer

Item No. 11A

I. Introduction

The applicant, Hamid Pournamdari, is requesting to modify the conditions of approval to allow for a perimeter wall and to eliminate the construction of a water fountain feature and stone veneer finish along the base of the building for Design Overlay Review No. 958-06 for the property at 23601 S. Avalon Boulevard. The site is in the CN (Commercial, Neighborhood) zone.

On September 25, 2007, the Planning Commission approved Design Overlay Review No. 958-06 and Variance No. 485-06, which included the following:

- Design Overlay Review (DOR) for architectural design of an 8,478-square-foot two-story commercial building on a vacant lot;
- Variance to reduce the required front yard setback.

This request has been referred to the Planning Commission as a minor modification to the DOR with no public hearing required.

II. Background

At the September 11, 2012 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission requested that the applicant provide a materials board and revised plans (Exhibit No. 1) that would show the proposed locations of the wall veneer and landscaping (Exhibit No. 2) and continued the item to the September 25, 2012 Planning Commission meeting. The applicant submitted revised plans on September 20, 2012 but has yet to provide the materials board. At the September 25, 2012 Planning Commission meeting, the item was continued to the November 13, 2012 meeting to allow additional time for staff and the applicant to resolve the design issues. Staff has requested repeatedly to meet with the applicant to discuss the resubmitted materials but has not received a direct response from the applicant.

A recent inspection of the property revealed numerous signs of graffiti along the perimeter wall. The wall shows cracking between the bricks indicating that the quality of construction may be compromised. In addition, the landscape areas are not being adequately maintained.

III. Recommendation

That the Planning Commission:


- CONTINUE the item to a date to be determined by the Planning Commission or;
- CONSIDER further action that would result in the timely processing of the application.



IV. Exhibits

1. Proposed site plan, floor plan and elevation dated September 20, 2012
2. Planning Commission Meeting minutes – September 11, 2012

Prepared by: 
Max Castillo, Assistant Planner

Reviewed by: 
John F. Signo, AICP, Senior Planner

Approved by: 
Sheri Repp-Loadsman, Planning Officer

Mc/d95806_23601Avalon_Mod1_p3



Planning Commission Decision:

Without objection, Chairman Faletogo ordered this matter continued to the October 9, 2012, Planning Commission meeting.

11. PUBLIC HEARING

E) Zone Text Amendment No. 13-12 to Modify Regulations Pertaining to Outdoor Advertising Signs

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, city of Carson, is requesting the Planning Commission consider a city-initiated and citywide zone text amendment amending Section 9146.7.A., Outdoor Advertising Signs and deleting Section 9167.6, Tobacco and Alcoholic Beverage Outdoor Billboard Advertisements. Properties involved are citywide.

Staff Recommendation:

Continue to October 9, 2012.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Without objection, Chairman Faletogo ordered this matter continued to the October 9, 2012, Planning Commission meeting.

12. NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION

A) Modification No. 1 to Design Overlay Review No. 958-06

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Hamid Pournamdari, is requesting to modify the conditions of approval of Design Overlay Review No. 958-06 for a perimeter wall fountain feature and stone veneer finish. The property involved is 23601 South Avalon Boulevard.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Assistant Planner Castillo presented staff report and the recommendation to DENY Modification No. 1 to Design Overlay Review No. 958-06; and ADOPT a minute resolution and instruct staff to make necessary changes to Resolution No. 07-2171.

Chairman Faletogo asked for further input on the security issues with this building.

Assistant Planner Castillo stated that there are no code enforcement reports related to this building, but advised that there has been some graffiti during the construction phase. He noted for Chairman Faletogo that this building is not fully occupied.



Chairman Faletogo asked what other commercial developments have been required to put up stone veneer.

Planning Officer Repp advised that there is limited development in this area and stated that it is unusual to have a plain stucco building, noting the building needs some type of veneer. She noted for Commissioner Goolsby that the applicant is not seeking to install a fountain.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Hamid Pournamdari, applicant, stated that he has had a lot of problems with some of the Scottsdale residents, noting there has been graffiti, break-ins, bullets through the building, and that he has had to call the police many times; and stated that is why he erected the perimeter wall. He stated that he has spent an additional \$25,000 to secure this building and noted that he is having a rough time getting the building fully occupied. He stated that he wants to keep the perimeter wall for security purposes. He noted for Chairman Faletogo that he currently has four or five tenants.

Commissioner Schaefer questioned how this short wall helps to provide security, noting her skepticism that it provides security or protects the businesses.

Mr. Pournamdari stated that since the wall has been up, there has been no graffiti.

Planning Officer Repp stated it is staff's opinion that the wall provides a hiding place and invites graffiti and that it would block landscaping; and added that people can easily jump the low wall. She stated that placing veneer on the building wall would help curb graffiti.

Commissioner Saenz noted his support for keeping the perimeter wall.

Commissioner Gordon asked what the solution is, then, to help this applicant with the problems he is experiencing at this site.

Planning Officer Repp stated it is staff's recommendation for the perimeter wall to be removed, to add veneer to the building wall, install security cameras, and add adequate locks and an alarm system.

Commissioner Schaefer noted that the veneer would improve the appearance of this plain building.

Mr. Pournamdari stated that when the landscaping is installed, it will enhance the aesthetics of this site; and noted that when he gets more funds, he would put up some veneer. He noted for Commissioner Brimmer that his cameras are not hooked up with the Sheriff's Department but that they are monitored and archived on video.

Vice-Chair Verrett asked the applicant how long it would take him to get the additional funding needed to make these improvements.

Mr. Pournamdari stated he'd need another nine months.



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

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Brimmer, to allow the perimeter wall to remain. (Commissioner Brimmer ultimately withdrew her second.)

Commissioner Brimmer offered a friendly amendment for the wall to be removed within a 9-month period.

Commissioner Saenz did not support the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Brimmer's second on the motion was withdrawn.

Chairman Faletogo moved that the applicant be allowed to keep the wall and to replace the fountain area with landscaping. (This motion died due to the lack of a second.)

Commissioner Diaz moved to concur with staff recommendation. (This motion died due to the lack of a second.)

Commissioner Goolsby moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to allow the applicant to keep the perimeter wall; to apply some type of veneer to the perimeter wall; and to install landscaping. (This motion was superseded by the substitute motion.)

Chairman Faletogo offered a friendly amendment that the veneer be placed on the perimeter wall facing Avalon Boulevard.

Commissioners Goolsby and Saenz supported Chairman Faletogo's friendly amendment.

Planning Officer Repp suggested that this matter be continued to the next meeting so the applicant can provide the Commission a proposed materials board and plans as to where he will be placing the veneer and landscaping.

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Brimmer moved, seconded by Vice-Chair Verrett, to continue this matter to the September 25, 2012, Planning Commission meeting so the applicant can provide the Commission a proposed materials board and plans as to where he will be placing the veneer and the landscaping. The motion carried as follows:

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

13. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS None

