



CITY OF CARSON

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: September 8, 2009
 SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09
 APPLICANT: Ren Smith
 450 Washington Boulevard
 Marina Del Ray, CA 90292

REQUEST: To approve a Conditional Use Permit for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located within the RS (Residential, Single Family) zone district

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard

COMMISSION ACTION

- Concurred with staff
 Did not concur with staff
 Other

COMMISSIONERS' VOTE

AYE	NO		AYE	NO	
		Chairman Faletogo			Graber
		Vice-Chair Saenz			Park
		Brimmer			Schaefer
		Brown			Verrett
		Gordon			

I. **Introduction**

The applicant, Ren Smith, is requesting a conditional use permit (CUP) for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling within the RS (Residential, Single Family) zoning district.

II. **Background**

At the August 25, 2009 public hearing, the Planning Commission deadlocked twice on making a decision for this project. The substitute motion failed on a 4-4 vote to approve the project per staff's recommendation; the original motion also failed on a 4-4 vote to deny the project. The Planning Commission ultimately decided on a 5-3 vote to continue the item to the next available meeting with an odd number of commissioners. The minutes, staff report, and proposed resolution for the August 25, 2009 Planning Commission public hearing concerning CUP No. 738-09 have been provided as Exhibit Nos. 1-3, respectively.

III. **Analysis**

The Planning Commission raised concerns regarding the existing parking situation on the subject property, specifically the lack of a covered parking area (garage), and the applicant's inability to provide adequate parking per Carson Municipal Code (CMC) requirements. As stated in the findings contained in Exhibit No. 3, staff finds that the diminutive size of the subject property and the existing dwelling units, which are also considerably under-sized as compared to newer residential development in the area, are prohibitive for providing additional parking onsite.

The Planning Commission also raised concerns regarding the proliferation of second dwelling units within the city, particularly in the Dominguez area, or 'Presidential' tract, in the eastern part of the city. Staff has identified a total of 131 properties that may be required to obtain a CUP for an existing second dwelling unit. Regardless of the lot size or parking situation, second dwelling units that were issued a building permit are eligible for consideration of a CUP. Sixty-one of the properties have been identified as not having a building permit on file with the Building and Safety Division. These second dwelling units are not eligible for a CUP, unless the property owner can prove the unit was in fact permitted legally, or if the property meets the minimum requirements described in Sections 9122.8 and 9125.6 of the CMC. Building permits are on file for the remaining units, but the property owners have yet to obtain a CUP. The CMC requires those owners to obtain a CUP by December 4, 2008.

While many of the properties are located in the Dominguez Tract, there is no real pattern, with the exception that a vast majority of them are located south of Del Amo Boulevard. Staff anticipates an influx of applications for the properties eligible for a CUP. The Planning Commission's decision on the subject request is important because it sets precedence for future CUP applications for second dwelling units.

Staff recognizes that not all existing conditions found among these potentially affected properties will meet applicable zoning codes with respect to location and development standards. The second dwelling unit ordinance was designed in such a manner as to provide flexibility in the strict application of certain location and development standards with respect to existing non-conforming units, provided the benefits of doing so would outweigh the consequences of not implementing such



standards. The ordinance empowers the Planning Commission with the discretion to determine the appropriateness of existing location and development standards, with the presumption that the application of correct standards would place an unreasonable burden and would displace valuable housing units.

Based upon the facts and findings represented in the report prepared for the August 25, 2009 public hearing, staff maintains recommending approval of CUP No. 738-09.

IV. **Recommendation**


That the Planning Commission:

- **APPROVE** the Categorical Exemption;
- **APPROVE** Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 subject to the conditions of approval attached as Exhibit "B" to the Resolution; and
- **WAIVE** further reading and **ADOPT** Resolution No._____, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Carson Approving Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located at 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard."

V. **Exhibits**

1. Planning Commission Minutes, Dated August 25, 2009
2. Planning Commission Staff Report, Dated August 25, 2009 (see exhibits from previous agenda package)
3. Draft Resolution

Prepared by: 
Steven C. Newberg, AICP, Associate Planner

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

Approved by: 
Sheri Repp, Planning Officer

SN: srCUP738-09

11. PUBLIC HEARING

B) Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Ren Smith, is requesting approval of an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located within the RS (Residential, Single-family) zoned district, 754 East Sepulveda Boulevard.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Associate Planner Newberg presented staff report and the recommendation to approve a Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson approving Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located at 754 East Sepulveda Boulevard.

Commissioner Park questioned why the parking standard was not maintained along with other requirements for second units; stated that there is not adequate site circulation if two cars are parked in the right of way, addressing his concern with emergency access; and addressed his concern with too many people living on these small parcels. He stated that these properties should be brought up to residential standards.

Chairman Faleto go opened the public hearing.

Ren Smith, representing the applicant, explained that this property is a bank-owned foreclosure that is currently in escrow; noted that this property has been vacant for over a year, pointing out that potential clients have not wanted to deal with the City's CUP process for these second units; and he mentioned that the client, who is currently in escrow to purchase this property, will live in one unit and rent the second unit.

Ana Esturban, adjacent neighbor, stated that her brother owns the property that shares this driveway and asked if a dividing wall can be placed down the driveway, noting she has young kids who play outside.

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

Commissioner Park expressed his belief that similar properties in this city should not be allowed to deviate from the requirements of the zoning ordinance; reiterated his concern with too many people living on one site, creating a parking and trash problem; commented on over-crowding in the schools and people living in garages; and stated that these ordinances should be enforced.

Commissioner Schaefer pointed out that affordable housing is needed; stated that she visited this site and that she believes there is more than adequate room for traffic circulation; noted that this parcel is a nice looking property; and questioned what the alternative is for this property if it is denied.

Vice-Chairman Saenz echoed Commissioner Schaefer's comments.

Exhibit 1



Senior Planner Signo explained that there is no way for this property to meet the current garage parking requirements due to its size and that this property cannot be brought up to code unless the second unit is torn down.

Associate Planner Newberg stated that the only other alternative would be to build a small nonconforming garage on this small parcel, which staff would not recommend; and explained that staff has addressed this issue similar to an overriding consideration and therefore would recommend approval. He added that the Fire Department also approved this application, noting the Fire Department did not have any concern with emergency service access.

Commissioner Brown stated that he'd like more information on distance from the property lines.

Associate Planner Newberg stated that the property is 40' wide and the parcel is 4,135 square feet.

Commissioner Brimmer stated that the property, along with the adjoining property, looks like it's too small for those buildings.

Commissioner Gordon asked how many other properties in the city have this similar condition.

Staff indicated there are over 100 properties in the city with this condition.

Chairman Faletogo noted that denying these conditions for many properties in the city is a big concern for him, noting he is mindful of the allowances staff is recommending for the current property; and he suggested that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council they address the current codes for these types of houses, noting that additional codes are needed for these circumstances.

Commissioner Schaefer noted that the photograph in staff's report makes this property look more condensed than it really is, reiterating that she visited this site and saw that there is adequate room to maneuver.

Commissioner Brown stated that while he agrees more housing is needed, this should be denied because it does not meet the codes as currently written; and stated that since this has been vacant for over a year, no one will be displaced by eliminating the second unit.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Brown moved, seconded by Commissioner Brimmer, to deny the applicant's request. This motion failed following the failed vote on the substitute motion as follows:

AYES: Brimmer, Brown, Graber, Park
NOES: Faletogo, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Verrett



By way of a substitute motion, Chairman Faletogo moved, seconded by Commissioner Gordon, to approve the applicant's request; and to recommend that City Council update the Municipal Code to address these properties so they can be brought into conformance. This motion failed as follows:

AYES: Faletogo, Gordon, Saenz, Schaefer
NOES: Brimmer, Brown, Graber, Park
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Verrett

Commissioner Brown moved, seconded by Chairman Faletogo, to continue this matter to a meeting wherein a full Commission will be present. This motion carried as follows:

AYES: Brown, Faletogo, Graber, Park, Saenz
NOES: Brimmer, Gordon, Schaefer
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Verrett

11. PUBLIC HEARING

C) Conditional Use Permit No. 740-09

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Susan Mirzaie, is requesting approval of shared parking to facilitate a dance studio and dance hall use in an existing multi-tenant commercial center in the CR-D (Commercial, Regional; Design Overlay) zone and within Redevelopment Project Area No. 4, 860 East Carson Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Assistant Planner Castillo presented staff report and the recommendation to APPROVE Conditional Use Permit No. 740-09, subject to the conditions of approval attached as Exhibit "B" to the Resolution; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 09-2267, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson approving Conditional Use Permit No. 740-09 for shared parking to facilitate a dance studio and dance hall use located at 860 East Carson Street." He noted the following amendment to the Conditions of Approval: Condition No. 16, Units 112 and 113, opening hour of 7:00 a.m. on Fridays and Saturdays.

Assistant Planner Castillo noted for Commissioner Brown that no alcohol will be served.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Susan Mirzaie, shopping center manager, stated that she does not foresee any problem with parking availability, noting that most of these businesses are closed by 6:00 P.M.; and advised that no food or alcohol will be sold.

6



CITY OF CARSON

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING: August 25, 2009

SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09

APPLICANT: Ren Smith
450 Washington Boulevard
Marina Del Ray, CA 90292

REQUEST: To approve a Conditional Use Permit for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located within the RS (Residential, Single Family) zone district

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard

COMMISSION ACTION

- Concurred with staff
- Did not concur with staff
- Other

COMMISSIONERS' VOTE

AYE	NO		AYE	NO	
		Chairman Faletogo			Graber
		Vice-Chair Saenz			Park
		Brimmer			Schaefer
		Brown			Verrett
		Gordon			



I. Introduction

Date Application Received

- July 22, 2009: Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09

Applicant

- Ren Smith
450 Washington Boulevard
Marina Del Ray, CA 90292

Property Owner

- Federal National Mortgage Association
3005 Valley Glen Street
Castaic, CA 91384

Project Address

- 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard, Carson, CA 90745

Project Description

- The proposal is to consider a conditional use permit (CUP) for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling within the RS (Residential, Single Family) zone district.
- The project site is located on a 4,135 square-foot parcel with two dwelling units totaling approximately 1,100 square feet (696 square-foot main residence & 396 square-foot second dwelling unit).

II. Background

History of Property

- Los Angeles County Building and Safety Division's property records for the subject site indicate that the main 696 square-foot single family dwelling unit (752 E. Sepulveda Boulevard) was relocated onto the property from another property in south Los Angeles in late 1955. A few months later in early 1956, the existing 396 square-foot second dwelling unit was relocated onto the subject property. Given that the larger unit was the first of the existing two dwellings to be relocated to the subject property, it follows that the smaller unit is considered the second dwelling unit.

Previously Approved Discretionary Permits

- None. The relocation review permit was not a discretionary permit at the time the buildings were moved (1955/56).

Public Safety Issues

- There is no past or current zoning code enforcement case associated with this property.



III. Analysis/Findings

Location/Site Characteristics/Existing Development

- The subject property is located at 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard. The subject site is compatible with surrounding residential single family uses.
- Surrounding the subject property to the south, east and west are single family residential uses zoned RS (Residential, Single-family). A similar second dwelling unit is located adjacent to the east side of the subject property. To the north, across Sepulveda Boulevard are industrial manufacturing and warehouse buildings zoned MH (Manufacturing, Heavy).
- The subject property consists of a legal non-conforming second dwelling requiring approval of a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section Nos. 9122.8, 9172.21 and 9182.3 of the Carson Municipal Code (CMC). The CMC was amended in 2003 to allow existing legal, nonconforming second dwelling units located in the RS or RA zones to be eligible for a conditional use permit. A 5-year time period is allowed for property owners to submit a conditional use permit application. The owners of the property adjacent to the east side of the subject property, under similar circumstances, along with owners of all other existing non-conforming second dwelling units in the city, have been notified recently that they are required to obtain a conditional use permit for their existing second dwelling unit, pursuant to CMC Section 9121.1 and other Sections noted above.
- Prior to the amendment to CMC Section 9182.3, second units were subject to an amortization period requiring abatement. The city recognized that existing second dwelling units provided an important housing resource and that the units should be preserved if findings could be made regarding the adequacy of the building condition, parking, landscaping and other features needed to meet neighborhood compatibility standards.
- Staff has inspected the property and reviewed all building permit records. The property is well maintained and there are no major identified building code issues. The applicant also contracted an independent licensed property inspector to perform a thorough property inspection and provided a report to staff to ensure that any safety issues pertaining to building, plumbing, electrical and fire code deficiencies are mitigated prior to the issuance of a conditional use permit. The inspection report (Exhibit No. 2) did not indicate that any such deficiencies existed.
- The subject property's parking is legal non-conforming with respect to parking requirements per Section 9162. 21(A)(13) of the CMC. The parking non-conformity is allowed to continue indefinitely, except that an addition to a dwelling may be made without making the parking conforming, provided the number of dwelling units is not increased and the addition does not occupy the only available space on the lot which could be used to meet the parking requirement. There is no planned addition or increase in the existing number of units. Given the diminutive size of the subject property, and the existing dwelling units – which are also considerably under-sized as compared to newer residential development in the area, there is not ample space to provide additional parking onsite.

Zoning/General Plan/Redevelopment Area Designation

- The subject property is zoned RS (Residential, Single-Family) with the adjacent properties to the south, east and west sharing the same the zoning designation. To the north are properties zoned MH (Manufacturing, Heavy).
- The zoning designation for the subject property is consistent with the General Plan Land Use designations of Low Density, Residential and Heavy Industrial for the properties noted above.

Required Findings: Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09

Pursuant to Section 9172.21, Conditional Use Permit, the Planning Commission may approve the proposal only if the following findings can be made in the affirmative:

- a. The proposed use and development will be consistent with the General Plan.
- b. The site is adequate in size, shape, topography, location, utilities and other factors to accommodate the proposed use and development.
- c. There will be adequate street access and traffic capacity.
- d. There will be adequate water supply for fire protection.
- e. The proposed use and development will be compatible with the intended character of the area.

All of the required findings pursuant to Section 9172.21(d), "Conditional Use Permit, Approval Authority and Findings and Decision", can be made in the affirmative, if conditions of approval are implemented. Specific details regarding the applicable findings are incorporated in the attached resolution.

Issues of Concern / Proposed Condition/Change: Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09

- **ISSUE – SECOND DWELLING EXPANSION/ALTERATIONS:** The second dwelling's parking is non-conforming. Any un-authorized expansions and alterations would intensify potential hazards associated with not having sufficient off-street parking area. Therefore, in accordance to Sections 9182.02 and 9182.21 of the CMC, Changes & Alterations, Nonconforming Use Eligible for Conditional Use Permit or Other Approval, and CMC Section No. 9182.3 Non Conforming Residential Density, the following conditions of approval are recommended.

- **Conditions of Approval:**

1. Any changes to any dwelling shall be limited to minor alterations, improvements and repairs which do not increase the size of the dwelling, or changes of use which do not increase the degree of nonconformity present and do not constitute or tend to produce an expansion or intensification of a nonconforming use.
2. Any minor alterations, improvements and or repairs shall require review and approval by the Planning Division and issuance of a building permit if applicable.
3. A property inspection report was prepared by a qualified/certified property inspector that includes plans to eliminate or mitigate any building, plumbing, electrical and fire code deficiencies. The minor corrections recommended in the property inspection report shall be

conducted within 90 days of Planning Commission approval of CUP No. 738-09. The Planning Division shall inspect the property for compliance with the corrective measures. An extension of time to complete necessary corrective measures may be granted for up to an additional 90 days, subject to the discretion of the Planning Division.

4. The parking for the dwelling units is non-conforming. There shall be no un-authorized dwelling expansion or alteration that will intensify the number of bedrooms or other habitable area if the Planning Division determines there will be an impact to off-street parking.

IV. Environmental Review

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15301, Existing Structures or Facilities, the City's approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the proposed project is "Categorically Exempt".

V. Recommendation

That the Planning Commission:

- **APPROVE** the Categorical Exemption;
- **APPROVE** Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 subject to the conditions of approval attached as Exhibit "B" to the Resolution; and
- **WAIVE** further reading and **ADOPT** Resolution No._____, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Carson Approving Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 for an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located at 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard."

VI. Exhibits

1. Draft Resolution
2. Property Inspection Report
3. Land Use Map
4. Sections Nos. 9122.8, 9125.6, and 9182.3 of the CMC
5. Development Plans (under separate cover)

Prepared by: Steven C. Newberg, AICP, Associate Planner

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

Approved by: _____
Sheri Repp, Planning Officer



CITY OF CARSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 09-

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF CARSON APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
NO. 738-09 FOR AN EXISTING LEGAL NON-CONFORMING
SECOND DWELLING LOCATED AT 754 E. SEPULVEDA
BOULEVARD

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON, CALIFORNIA,
HEREBY FINDS, RESOLVES AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. An application was duly filed by the applicant, Ren Smith, with respect to real property located at 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard, and described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, requesting the approval of an existing legal non-conforming second dwelling located within the RS (Residential, Single Family) zoned district.

Planning Commission public hearings were duly held on August 25, 2009, and September 8, 2009, at 6:30 P.M. at City Hall, Council Chambers, 701 East Carson Street, Carson, California. A notice of time, place and purpose of the aforesaid meeting was duly given.

Section 2. Evidence, both written and oral, was duly presented to and considered by the Planning Commission at the aforesaid meeting.

Section 3. The Planning Commission finds that:

- a) The proposed project is identified in the General Plan as a permitted use for this land use category subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. There is no specific plan for this area. The surrounding properties are developed with residential single family dwellings and the second dwelling is compatible with the neighborhood in that it has been located on the property since the mid-1950s with no significant issues or complaints;
- b) The project is compatible in architecture and design with existing and anticipated development in the vicinity, including the aspects of site planning, land coverage, landscaping, appearance and scale of structures and open spaces and other features relative to a harmonious and attractive development of the area;
- c) The property is currently developed with no covered parking area, and is therefore, legal nonconforming as to parking. Given the diminutive size of the subject property and the existing dwelling units, which are also considerably under-sized as compared to newer residential development in the area, there is no adequate space to provide additional parking onsite. There are no records on file to indicate that there are issues associated with the lack of covered parking on the subject property, nor has there been correspondence received in opposition to the project in response to solicitation for comments as noticed on the public hearing notices sent for this project. Thus, the existing non-conforming parking condition is not anticipated to generate significant adverse effects to the existing neighborhood in terms of parking on the public street;



- d) There are no signs intended for the project site as the project is on a residential property;
- e) The proposed project conforms to all applicable design standards and guidelines that have been adopted pursuant to Section 9172.15 of the Carson Municipal Code; and
- f) The existing legal nonconforming second dwelling meets the goals and objectives of the General Plan and is consistent with applicable zoning and design regulations. All of the required findings pursuant to Section 9171.21(d), "Conditional Use Permit, Approval Authority and Findings and Decision" can be made in the affirmative.

Section 4. The Planning Commission further finds that the use permitted by the proposed Conditional Use Permit will not have a significant effect on the environment. The proposed use will not alter the predominantly residential single family character of the surrounding area and meets or exceeds all City standards for protection of the environment. Therefore the proposed project is found to be categorically exempt under the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301 (Existing Structures or Facilities).

Section 5. Based on the aforementioned findings, the Commission hereby approves the categorical exemption and grants Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 with respect to the property described in Section 1 hereof, subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "B" attached hereto.

Section 6. The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of the Resolution and shall transmit copies of the same to the applicant.

Section 7. This action shall become final and effective fifteen days after the adoption of this Resolution unless within such time an appeal is filed with the City Clerk in accordance with the provisions of the Carson Zoning Ordinance.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 8th DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2009.

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

SECRETARY



**CITY OF CARSON
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PLANNING DIVISION
EXHIBIT "A"
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 738-09**

Property Address: 754 E. Sepulveda Boulevard

The land referred to as parcel no. 7404-009-007 is situated in the County of Los Angeles, State of California and is described as follows:

Lots 7 of Block N of Tract No. 5766 in the City of Carson, County of Los Angeles, State of California, As per Map recorded in Book 74, Page 69 of Maps, in the Office of the County Recorder of said County.



CITY OF CARSON
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PLANNING DIVISION
EXHIBIT "B"
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 738-09

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. If Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09 is not used within one year of its effective date, said permit shall be declared null and void unless an extension of time is previously approved by the Planning Commission.
2. The applicant shall comply with all city, county, state and federal regulations applicable to this project.
3. The applicant shall make any necessary site plan and design revisions to the site plan and elevations approved by the Planning Commission in order to comply with all the conditions of approval and applicable Zoning Ordinance provisions. Substantial revisions will require review and approval by the Planning Commission.
4. The applicant shall submit two complete sets of plans that conform to all the Conditions of Approval to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. The applicant and property owner shall sign an Affidavit of Acceptance form and submit the document to the Planning Division within 30 days of receipt of the Planning Commission Resolution.
6. It is further made a condition of this approval that if any condition is violated or if any law, statute, or ordinance is violated, this permit may be revoked by the Planning Commission or City Council, as may be applicable; provided the applicant has been given written notice to cease such violation and has failed to do so for a period of thirty days.
7. The Applicant shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Carson, its agents, officers, or employees from any claims, damages, action, or proceedings against the City or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul, an approval of the City, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning Conditional Use Permit No. 738-09. The City will promptly notify the Applicant of any such claim, action, or proceeding against the City and the Applicant will either undertake defense of the matter and pay the City's associated legal costs or will advance funds to pay for defense of the matter by the City Attorney. The City will cooperate fully in the defense. Notwithstanding



the foregoing, the City retains the right to settle or abandon the matter without the Applicant's consent but should it do so, the City shall waive the indemnification herein, except, the City's decision to settle or abandon a matter following an adverse judgment or failure to appeal, shall not cause a waiver of the indemnification rights herein.

SECOND DWELLING EXPANSION/ALTERATIONS/AESTHETICS

8. Any changes to the second dwelling shall be limited to minor alterations, improvements, repairs, or changes of use which do not increase the degree of nonconformity present and do not constitute or tend to produce an expansion or intensification of a nonconforming use.
9. Any minor alterations, improvements and or repairs shall require review and approval (where applicable) by the Planning Division and issuance of a building permit.
10. The applicant provided a property inspection report prepared by a qualified/certified property inspector that includes plans to eliminate or mitigate any building, plumbing, electrical and fire code deficiencies. The deficiencies described in the property inspection report shall be eliminated or mitigated within 90 days. The Planning Division shall inspect the property for compliance with the corrective measures. An extension of time to complete the necessary corrective measures may be granted for up to an additional 90 days.

PARKING

11. The parking for the second dwelling unit is non-conforming. There shall be no un-authorized expansion or alteration to either unit on the property that will intensify potential hazards associated with not having sufficient off-street parking.

BUILDING & SAFETY

12. All building improvements shall comply with City of Carson Building and & Safety Division requirements.

FIRE DEPARTMENT - COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

13. All requirements by the Los Angeles County Fire Department shall be complied with.

BUSINESS LICENSE DEPARTMENT - CITY OF CARSON

14. Per section 6310 of the Carson Municipal Code, all parties involved in the project, including but not limited to contractors and subcontractors, will need to obtain a City Business License.

