



CITY OF CARSON

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: December 9, 2014

SUBJECT: Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10

APPLICANT: Reggie Guinto
3341 E. 61st Street
Long Beach, CA 90805

REQUEST: To consider revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 21012 South Main Street

COMMISSION ACTION

☐ Concurred with staff
☐ Did not concur with staff
☐ Other

COMMISSIONERS' VOTE

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

Item No. 10-A

I. Introduction

Property Owner:

Mariechelle Guinto, 21012 South Main Street, Carson CA 90745

Applicant:

Reggie Guinto, 21012 South Main Street, Carson CA 90745

Project Address:

21012 South Main Street, Carson CA 90745

Project Description

Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 831-10 was originally approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2011. The approval allowed the existing auto repair business located less than 100 feet from residential property to continue to operate subject to certain conditions of approval. The conditions required the property owner to demolish unpermitted structures or obtain proper permits within a given period of time as described in the performance schedule (Exhibit 2).

On July 24, 2012, the Planning Commission considered revoking the CUP because the applicant did not comply with the requirements in the performance schedule. Ultimately, the Planning Commission amended the conditions to allow additional time, however, the applicant was unable to meet the extended schedule and the item was brought back again for consideration on October 9 and November 13, 2012.

On November 13, 2012, the Planning Commission granted the applicant a second amendment of the performance schedule to comply with the approved conditions of approval.

II. Background

The subject property is located at 21012 South Main Street. The applicant, Mr. Guinto, leases the property to an operator to perform general repair and body work including paint.

The Planning Commission has approved multiple amendments to performance schedules to provide the applicant additional time to comply with conditions of approval:

- Original approval – December 13, 2011
- 1st Amendment – July 24, 2012
- 2nd Amendment – November 13, 2012

In spite of the multi-year extensions, the applicant has not completed all the performance standards as approved by the Planning Commission on November 13, 2012.

In a letter dated June 23, 2014, staff informed the applicant that the deadline for compliance has passed. On August 6, 2014, staff met with the applicant to discuss the progress of the performance standards. Exhibit 1 provides the status for all of the performance standards. Below is a summary of the performance standards completed by the applicant:

- Demolition of portion of the rear yard encroachment (Jul 2012);
- Submittal of a site plan, floor plan, and landscape plan (Jul 2012);
- Recordation of a restrictive covenant limiting the use of the property to auto repair only (Jul 2012);
- Repair of concrete/asphalt damage (Jul 2012);
- Demolition of canopy encroaching onto the neighbor's property to the north (Aug 2012); and
- Application for building and demolition permits (Aug 2012; Aug 2014).

Exhibit 2 provides a list of performance standards required by the conditions of approval that have not been completed. Below is a summary of items required by the conditions of approval that have not been completed by the applicant:

- Demolition of unpermitted canopy and rear bathroom within the rear setback
- Construction of a two-hour fire-resistant wall along the eastern property line (adjacent to existing residential use) and one-hour fire-resistant wall along the northern property line (adjacent to existing commercial use);
- Obtain building permits for the unpermitted portion of the canopy;
- Obtain mechanical and electrical permits for the spray booth; and
- Discontinue residential use in compliance with the signed covenant.
- Completion of façade improvements to improve the aesthetics of the property;
- Modification of full bath to half bath to discourage residential use of the property; and
- Installation of landscaping inconsistent with approved plans.

III. Analysis

The applicant has prepared plans and obtained a building permit to correct many of these deficiencies. However, the applicant has not initiated the construction of the improvements. According to the applicant the cost of improvements are prohibitive and at this time cannot be completed. The applicant has stated that they would like to keep the property at its existing condition. However, staff has no choice but recommend the revocation of the CUP since the applicant has not complied with the conditions of approval adopted by the Planning Commission. CMC Section 9172.28 Revocation stipulates that a Conditional Use Permit may be revoked through the following procedure:

Planning Commission Staff Report
December 9, 2014
CUP No. 831-10



A. Initiation. Revocation proceedings may be initiated by the Council, Commission or Director.

B. Commission Hearing and Notice. The Commission shall conduct a hearing with notice in the same manner as for a Conditional Use Permit (CMC 9172.21(C)), except that notice to the owner of the subject property shall be given by service in the manner of a summons or by registered mail.

C. Commission Decision. After the hearing, the Commission may, by resolution, revoke the permission for the use or development if any of the following are found:

1. Approval was obtained by fraud, deceit or misrepresentation.
2. The property is or has in the recent past been used or developed in violation of the conditions of approval or of other laws or regulations.
3. The property is or has in the recent past been used or developed in a manner materially detrimental to public health, safety or welfare, or constitutes a public nuisance.

In reference to finding number 2 above, as summarized in Exhibit 2, the property has been used in violation of the conditions of approval. In addition in reference to finding number 3 above, many of the performance standards that have not been completed pose a health and safety risk to the community. For example, the unpermitted canopies, which represent approximately half of the entire building, present a hazard to the auto repair workers that must work beneath the unpermitted canopy. Furthermore, the walls holding up the canopy do not meet building code standards and need to be replaced with fire-resistance rated walls. The building code requires these walls to protect the adjacent properties and their occupants from an auto repair use.

In addition, Conditions 39 and 40 state:

39. The Planning Commission may revoke this conditional use permit pursuant to this resolution if the application fails to satisfy the performance standards within the allotted time.
40. The applicant may not submit for an extension of time.

Staff has followed the revocation process procedure. As described in Condition 40 above, an extension of time may not be granted because of the prior history, lack of good-faith compliance by the applicant, and applicant's statement that the improvement costs are beyond what he can and is willing to spend in the near future, the only option is revocation. It is staff's opinion that the Commission has provided the applicant with ample time to bring the property into compliance with the conditions of approval. Staff believes the Planning



Commission has sufficient cause to revoke the CUP at this time and forward the outstanding violations to code enforcement for abatement.

IV. Recommendation

That the Planning Commission:

REVOKE Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10; and


WAIVE further reading and **ADOPT** Resolution No. 14-____, entitled "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON REVOKING APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 831-10 FOR A VEHICLE SERVICE AND AUTO REPAIR USE LOCATED AT 21012 SOUTH MAIN STREET."

V. Exhibits

1. Status of Performance Standards
2. Performance Standards Not Completed
3. Draft Resolution for Revocation
4. Approved Resolution No. 11-2412
5. Planning Commission Minutes, dated November 8, 2011
6. Planning Commission Minutes, dated December 13, 2011
7. Planning Commission Minutes, dated July 10, 2012
8. Planning Commission Minutes, dated July 24, 2012
9. Planning Commission Minutes, dated October 9, 2012
10. Planning Commission Minutes, dated November 13, 2012

Prepared by: 
Richard A. Rojas, AICP, Associate Planner

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

Approved by: 
Saied Naaseh, Planning Manager

**Exhibit 1 – Status of Performance Standards (Amended 7/24/12,
11/13/12)**

COA No.	Deadline	Performance Standards	Status
20-22	7/24/13	Submit CUP to Planning for full review	Incomplete - CUP has not been presented for full review.
23	7/26/12	Sign and record a restrictive covenant	Complete - Copy of signed and recorded covenant (dated 7/23/12) received on 8/2/12.
24	8/24/12	Remove unpermitted signs	Complete – Unpermitted signs removed
25	10/11/12	Submit to B&S for demo and/or building permits for unpermitted structures (rear additions, rear bathroom, removal/modification of front full bath to half bath, side (north) addition, unpermitted roof, canopy addition, and interior improvements.	Complete – Demo permits submitted on 8/21/12 (expired). Demo/Building permits re-submitted on 8/25/14
26	4/24/13	Remove unpermitted structures (rear additions, rear bathroom, and side (north) addition.	Incomplete – Unpermitted structures have not been removed
27	10/11/12	Submit a floor plan, site plan, and landscape/irrigation plan to the Planning Division for review and approval.	Complete – Floor plan, site plan, landscape/irrigation approved
28	10/24/12	Repair all broken concrete/asphalt on-site and level the parking area.	Complete – All concrete/asphalt on-site repaired and parking area has been leveled.
29	10/24/12	Install landscaping according to the approved plan	Complete – Landscaping installed according to the approved plan
30	4/24/13	Modify/remove the full bath to a half bath	Incomplete – Full bath has not been modified/removed.
31	4/24/13	Stripe parking spaces and provide bumper stops	Incomplete – Bumper stops not provided.
32	4/24/13	Submit requirements to B&S for spray booth	Incomplete – Requirements for B&S have not been submitted.
33	4/24/13	Obtain all permits for the spray booth.	Incomplete – Air quality, mechanical electrical permits have not been issued.
34	4/24/13	Obtain building permits for the unpermitted roof and canopy addition.	Incomplete – Building permits for the unpermitted roof and canopy addition have not been obtained.
35	10/11/12	Obtain demolition permits for the removal of the partitions within the building and addition within the rear yard setback.	Complete – Demo permits submitted on 8/21/12 (expired). Demo/Building permits re-submitted on 8/25/14
36	7/24/13	Complete construction and tenant improvements (doors, walls)	Incomplete – Construction and tenant improvements not completed
37	7/24/13	Complete façade improvements (gates, fences, painting) affected by construction	Incomplete – Façade improvements not completed
38	7/24/13	Request and pay for final inspection	Incomplete – Final inspection not requested
39	7/24/13	PC may revoke CUP if the applicant fails to satisfy the performance standards within allotted time.	
40		The applicant may not submit for an extension of time	




Exhibit 2 – Performance Standards Not Completed

COA No.	Deadline	Performance Standards	Status
20, 21, 22	7/24/13	Submit CUP to Planning for full review	Incomplete - CUP has not been presented for full review.
26	4/24/13	Remove unpermitted structures (rear additions, rear bathroom, and side (north) addition.	Incomplete – Unpermitted structures have not been removed.
30	4/24/13	Modify/remove the full bath to a half bath	Incomplete – Full bath has not been modified/removed.
31	4/24/13	Stripe parking spaces and provide bumper stops	Incomplete – Bumper stops not provided.
32	4/24/13	Submit requirements to B&S for spray booth	Incomplete – Requirements for B&S have not been submitted.
33	4/24/13	Obtain all permits for the spray booth.	Incomplete – Air quality, mechanical electrical permits have not been issued.
34	4/24/13	Obtain building permits for the unpermitted canopy and roof addition.	Incomplete – Building permits for the unpermitted roof and canopy addition have not been obtained.
36	7/24/13	Complete construction and tenant improvements (doors, walls)	Incomplete – Construction and tenant improvements not completed.
37	7/24/13	Complete façade improvements (gates, fences, painting) affected by construction	Incomplete – Façade improvements not completed.
38	7/24/13	Request and pay for final inspection	Incomplete – Final inspection not requested.
39	7/24/13	PC may revoke CUP if the applicant fails to satisfy the performance standards within allotted time.	
40		The applicant may not submit for an extension of time	

CITY OF CARSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 14-

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF CARSON REVOKING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
NO. 831-10 FOR A VEHICLE SERVICE AND AUTO REPAIR
USE LOCATED AT 21012 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

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

Section 1. An application was duly filed by Reggie Guinto, with respect to real property located at 21012 South Main Street, and described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, requesting the approval of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 831-10 to authorize the continued operation of an existing auto repair use in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light - Design Overlay) zoning district. The use is within 100 feet of a residential zone and thus requires approval of a CUP per Section 9138.2 of the Carson Municipal Code (CMC).

On December 13, 2011, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing at 6:30 p.m. at City Hall, Council Chambers, 701 East Carson Street, Carson, California. The Planning Commission opened the public hearing, received public testimony, considered the issues discussed, and at the conclusion of the public hearing adopted Resolution No. 11-2412 approving CUP No. 831-10. The approval included conditions of approval that required certain performance standards be met within an allotted period of time. Failure to meet those performance standards are grounds for revocation.

On July 24, 2012, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing. The Planning Commission opened the public hearing, received public testimony, considered the issues discussed, and at the conclusion of the public hearing approved Modification No. 1 to CUP No. 831-10 by minute resolution. The modification included amending the conditions of approval to allow the applicant additional time to meet requirements.

On October 9, 2012, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider revocation of CUP No. 831-10 and at the conclusion of the public hearing approved Modification No. 2 to CUP No. 831-10 by minute resolution. The modification included amending the conditions of approval to allow the applicant additional time to meet requirements.

On December 9, 2014, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to consider revocation of CUP No. 831-10. 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) Pursuant to Planning Commission Resolution No. 11-2412, the Planning Commission may conduct a meeting for revocation if any of the conditions of approval are found to be in violation. Included in the conditions are performance standards that must be satisfied within an allotted time.
- b) Pursuant to Section 9172.28, The Planning Commission finds that the applicant has been given ample time, but has failed to meet the requirements in the conditions of approval within the allotted time. Condition nos. 20, 21, 22, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, and 38 of Resolution No. 11-2412 state:



20. Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 shall be subject to a full review by the Planning Commission no later than twelve (12) months from July 24, 2012. The applicant shall submit a request for review of the CUP. Review of the CUP will be pursuant to CMC Section 9172.21(G) – Subsequent Modifications of Conditions. The Planning Commission shall consider the continuation of the auto repair use to determine compatibility and appropriate operating conditions or standards after the 12-month period. A public hearing need not be required unless requested by the applicant, Director, Commission or Council. Applicable fees shall apply.
21. If a request for review of the CUP is not submitted to the Planning Division within twelve (12) months from the date of Planning Commission approval, the CUP pursuant to this resolution may become null and void and any auto repair use on site must be vacated within 30 days from the date the CUP is deemed invalid.
22. Upon activation, the conditional use permit pursuant to this resolution shall become null and void if the applicant fails to satisfy the performance standards within the allotted time. If the CUP is deemed null and void, all auto repair activities must be vacated within 30 days from the date the CUP is deemed invalid.
26. Within 60 days from the issuance of the building permit, the property owner shall remove the unpermitted bathroom in the rear, remove the unpermitted additions within the rear yard setback, and remove the addition to the north that is extending to the neighboring property.
30. Within 90 days from the date of site plan approval, the applicant/owner shall modify/remove the full bath to a half bath.
31. Within 180 days from the date of site plan and floor plan approval, the owner/applicant shall stripe parking spaces for the appropriate number of parking spaces and bumper stops per the approved site plan and as required in the Carson Municipal Code. All ADA requirements must also be satisfied.
32. Within 60 days from July 24, 2012, the owner/applicant must submit remaining requirements to the Building and Safety division to obtain proper permits for the unpermitted spray booth.
33. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012, the applicant must obtain a permit for the spray booth from the Building and Safety division.
34. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012, the owner/applicant must submit remaining requirements to the Building and Safety division to obtain proper permits for the unpermitted roof, canopy addition, and complete any remaining construction.
36. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012, the owner/applicant must complete any remaining construction and/or tenant improvements. All interior improvements such as closing off doors, repairing walls must meet building code requirements.



37. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012, the owner/applicant must complete any necessary façade improvements, such as installing gates, fences, repairing/painting areas that were affected by construction.
38. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012, the owner/applicant must request and pay for a site inspection to the Planning Division.
- c) Pursuant to Condition 40, the applicant may not submit for an extension of time.
- d) The applicant was made aware of the required conditions of approval at the Planning Commission hearing on December 13, 2011, July 24, 2012 and November 9, 2012.
- e) On November 19, 2014, planning staff notified the applicant and property owner by registered mail of the violations and referral to the Planning Commission for possible revocation.

Section 4. Pursuant to Section 15321(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the enforcement action by a regulatory agency to revoke entitlements is categorically exempt.

Section 5. Based on the aforementioned findings, the Commission finds the applicant is in violation of the conditions of approval included in Resolution No. 11-2412 and hereby revokes approval of CUP No. 831-10 with respect to the property described in Section 1 hereof. The applicant shall cease all auto repair activities and the property must be vacated within 30 days of the adoption of this Resolution.

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 9th DAY OF December 2014

CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

SECRETARY



**CITY OF CARSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 11-2412**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF CARSON APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
NO. 831-10 TO PERMIT AN EXISTING VEHICLE SERVICE AND
REPAIR USE LOCATED AT 21012 SOUTH MAIN STREET**

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

Section 1. An application was duly filed by Marichelle Guinto, with respect to real property located at 21012 South Main Street, and described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, requesting the approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 to authorize the continued operation of an existing auto repair use in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light - Design Overlay Review) zoning district.

A public hearing was duly held on December 13, 2011, 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. Evidence, both written and oral, was duly presented to and considered by the Planning Commission at the aforesaid meeting.

Section 2. The Planning Commission finds that:

- a) The property lies within the area designated on the General Plan as available for Light Industrial uses and bears a consistent zoning classification of ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay). The existing auto repair business adheres to the goals and policies described in the Land Use Element of the General Plan for the Light Industrial designation and is also a permitted use in the ML-D zone with the approval of a conditional use permit, subject to the requirements of Carson Municipal Code (CMC) Section 9138.2.

The project site is located within 100 feet of residential uses, therefore under CMC Section 9138.2 is required to obtain a conditional use permit.

- b) The subject site is square, flat, and located within a built and urbanized environment with adequate utilities to accommodate the existing use and development. With the implementation of conditions of approval and correction of code violations, the subject property will have sufficient space to accommodate the proposed use and provide adequate driveways and access.
- c) The project involves acquiring a CUP for the operation of an existing auto repair facility. The site will continue to provide adequate street access and traffic capacity. With the implementation of conditions of approval, the site will provide adequate parking spaces and not have a significant impact on traffic. Designated driveways and parking areas will provide adequate and safe circulation of vehicles and pedestrians on site and serve the facility.



- d) The applicant has submitted plans for improvements, which include repairing of parking area, restriping of the parking areas, removal of unpermitted structures, construction of landscaping, and removal of unpermitted signage. These improvements will improve the general area and be compatible with the intended character of the area.
- e) The existing facility provides adequate access for emergency vehicles, including the Fire Department and adequate water supply is provided in the area for fire protection.
- f) Conditions of Approval are included in Exhibit "B" of this Resolution which identify performance standards and a schedule for implementation to improve the site and meet all code requirements within twelve (12) months from the date of site plan approval.
- g) The applicant acknowledges that if any performance standard is not satisfied within the schedule time period or the site does not satisfy all requirements within twelve (12) months from the date of site plan approval, the CUP may become null/void and any auto repair use on site must vacate within 30 days from the date the CUP is deemed invalid.
- h) If all performance standards are completed within the time allowed, the Planning Commission shall review the CUP to determine if an extension of time can be authorized pursuant to the applicable findings to ensure the use is still consistent with the existing and intended character of area. The CUP may expire at the end of the twelve (12) month term unless the Planning Commission is able to make affirmative findings to support an extension to the permit.
- i) The use will comply with the City's development standards for auto repair facilities as outlined in Section 9138.2 of the CMC, unless modified by the conditions of approval set forth in Exhibit "B" attached hereto.

Section 3. The Planning Commission further finds that the proposed use will not have a significant effect on the environment. The proposed use will not alter the character of the surrounding area and will meet or exceed all City standards for protection of the environment. Therefore, the proposed project is found to be categorically exempt under Section 15301(a) of the CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) Guidelines.

Section 4. Based on the aforementioned findings, the Commission hereby approves Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 with respect to the property described in Section 1 hereof, subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "B" and "C" attached hereto.

Section 5. The Secretary shall certify to the adoption of the Resolution and shall transmit copies of the same to the applicant.

Section 6. 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 13th DAY OF DECEMBER, 2011


CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:


SECRETARY

EXHIBIT "A"

DESCRIPTION:

THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED REAL PROPERTY IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

THE WESTERLY 125 FEET OF LOT 36 OF TRACT NO. 5927, IN THE CITY OF CARSON COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 64, PAGE 58 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY

EXCEPT 50 PER CENT OF ALL OIL, OR MINERALS, OR OTHER REMOVABLE NATURAL PROPERTY OF VALUE THAT MAY EXIST BELOW THE SURFACE OF SAID DESCRIBED PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHTS OF NECESSARY INGRESS AND EGRESS, OVER AND ACROSS THE SURFACE OF SAID DESCRIBED PROPERTY FOR THE PURPOSE OF EXPLORATION, DEVELOPMENT AND OR DISPOSITION OF ANY DISCOVERED NATURAL RESOURCES THIS 50 PERCENT RESERVATION SHALL EXTEND TO AND BECOME A PART OF ANY COMMUNITY LEASE, GROUP AGREEMENT, OR OTHER AGREEMENT THAT THE GRANTEE MAY ENTER INTO AS RESERVED BY RAY DEWANE AND REGINA DEWANE, HUSBAND AND WIFE, IN DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 23, 1951 IN BOOK 35637 PAGES 53 AND 54 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO EXCEPT ALL OIL AND MINERAL RIGHTS TOGETHER WITH THE RIGHT OF INGRESS AND EGRESS FOR THE PURPOSES OF EXPLORATION, DISCOVERY, PRODUCTIONS, DELIVERY, OR ANY OTHER ACT THAT MAY BE NECESSARY TO DEVELOP, TO PRODUCE AND DISTRIBUTE ANY OIL, OR MINERAL THAT MAY BE DISCOVERED BELOW THE SURFACE OF SAID DESCRIBED PROPERTY AS RESERVED BY A E HAYES AND MARY PAULINE HAYES, HUSBAND AND WIFE, IN DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 28, 1951 IN BOOK 35679, PAGE 217, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

APN: 7334-001-041

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

All that certain real property in the County of LOS ANGELES, State of California, described as follows:

THE SOUTH HALF OF THE WESTERLY 125 FEET OF LOT 35 OF TRACT NO. 5927, IN THE CITY OF CARSON, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 64, PAGE 58 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

APN No: 7334-001-051

06 2512477



CITY OF CARSON
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
EXHIBIT "B"
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 831-10

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. Upon activation, the Conditional Use Permit pursuant to this resolution shall become null and void if any of the conditions of approval and/or performance standards are not satisfied or completed within the allotted time.
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. Any minor revisions shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to Building and Safety plan check submittal.
4. 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.
5. It is further made a condition of this approval that if any condition is violated or if any law, statute 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.
6. The property owner and/or tenant shall comply with the city's standard requirements for a business license prior to the transferring of an existing or establishment of a new auto repair business. The Planning Division shall review any business license application to ensure the new use does not result in a substantial change from the current auto repair use. Substantial changes shall require a modification from the Planning Commission prior to the approval/issuance of the business license.
7. All operations such as work or repair on vehicles must be conducted on-site within an enclosed building, not visible to the public.



8. All damaged or wrecked vehicles awaiting repair shall effectively be screened so as not to be visible from surrounding property or from any adjoining public street or walkway.
9. No residential use shall be permitted on-site at any time.
10. All repair activities shall be confined to the hours between 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. daily.
11. No auto repair activities are permitted in areas visible to the public.
12. All display and storage shall be located within an enclosed building. Vehicles awaiting service may be parked in an unenclosed area for a period not to exceed seventy-two (72) hours.
13. Prevent storm water pollutants of concern such as oil and grease, solvents, car battery acid, coolant and gasoline from entering into the storm water conveyance system.
14. Avoid hosing down work areas. If work areas are washed, collect and store wash water and dispose appropriately, according to state law. Use dry sweeping if possible.
15. Designate a special area to drain and replace motor oil, coolant, and other fluids, where there are no connections to the storm drain or the sanitary sewer, and drips and spills can be easily cleaned up, if applicable.
16. Post signs at sinks to remind employees not to pour wastes down drains.
17. The owner/applicant shall provide for public use storage tanks to hold used automotive oil for recycling purposes in accordance to industry "Best Management" practices. The Planning Division shall approve the location for company "used oil recycling" services.
18. In accordance with Ordinance No. 04-1322, the applicant has provided a property inspection report for the site which identify potential plumbing, electrical and fire code deficiencies. The report also includes plans to eliminate or mitigate any deficiencies identified. The mitigation measures in such report shall be hereby incorporated in these conditions of approval within 120 days from site plan approval, permitted to allow for the mitigation measures, if any, to be completed subject to the Planning Division's review and approval.
19. Applicant shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Carson, its agents, officers, or employees from any claims, damages, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul, and approval of the City, its advisory agencies, appeal boards, or legislative body concerning Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10. 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.

Performance Standards – *The applicant shall be responsible for satisfying the following performance standards within the allotted time (performance schedule is provided below):*

20. Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 shall be subject to a full review by the Planning Commission no later than twelve (12) months from July 24, 2012 the ~~date of Planning Commission approval~~. The applicant shall submit a request for review of the CUP. Review of the CUP will be pursuant to CMC Section 9172.21(G) – Subsequent Modifications of Conditions. The Planning Commission shall consider the continuation of the auto repair use to determine compatibility and appropriate operating conditions or standards after the 12-month period. A public hearing need not be required unless requested by the applicant, Director, Commission or Council. Applicable fees shall apply.
21. If a request for review of the CUP is not submitted to the Planning Division within twelve (12) months from the date of Planning Commission approval, the CUP pursuant to this resolution may become null and void and any auto repair use on site must be vacated within 30 days from the date the CUP is deemed invalid.
22. Upon activation, the conditional use permit pursuant to this resolution shall become null and void if the applicant fails to satisfy the performance standards within the allotted time. If the CUP is deemed null and void, all auto repair activities must be vacated within 30 days from the date the CUP is deemed invalid.
23. Within 2 days from July 24, 2012, the owner/applicant shall sign and record with the Los Angeles County Recorder a restrictive covenant limiting the site to be used as an auto repair only, unless additional parking is provided to accommodate an alternate or additional use in accordance with the parking requirements of CMC Section 9162.2.
24. Within 30 days from the date of CUP approval, the applicant shall remove all unpermitted on-site signage. The owner/applicant shall apply for a separate sign and/or banner permits, if applicable. Approval of said permit shall be subject to Planning Division's review and approval for proper size, height, type, material, and design standards to be applied consistently with the ML-D (Industrial, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district.



25. Within 30 days from July 24, 2012 ~~the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant shall submit to Building and Safety for demolition and/or building permits for all unpermitted structures including, the unpermitted additions to the rear, unpermitted bathroom in the room, removal/modification of the full bath to half bath, unpermitted addition to the north, unpermitted roof, canopy addition, and interior improvements.
26. Within 60 days from the issuance of the building permit, the property owner shall remove the unpermitted bathroom in the rear, remove the unpermitted additions within the rear yard setback, and remove the addition to the north that is extending to the neighboring property, ~~modify/remove the full bath to a half bath~~.
27. Within ~~30~~ 60 days from July 24, 2012 ~~the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant shall submit a floor plan, site plan, and landscape/irrigation plan to the Planning division for review and approval.
28. Within ~~90~~ 60 days from the date of site plan and floor plan approval, the applicant/owner shall repair all broken concrete/asphalt on-site and level the parking area. The applicant must also obtain any grading permits, if necessary.
29. Within ~~90~~ 60 days from the date of landscape plan approval, the applicant/owner must install landscaping according to the approved plan. All landscaping shall be maintained by an automatic drip irrigation system.
30. Within 90 days from the date of site plan approval, the applicant/owner shall modify/remove the full bath to a half bath.
31. Within ~~180~~ 90 days from the date of site plan and floor plan approval, the owner/applicant shall stripe parking spaces for the appropriate number of parking spaces and bumper stops per the approved site plan and as required in the Carson Municipal Code. All ADA requirements must also be satisfied.
32. Within 60 days from July 24, 2012 ~~the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant must submit remaining requirements to the Building and Safety division to obtain proper permits ~~from Building and Safety~~ for the unpermitted spray booth.
33. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012, the applicant must obtain a permit for the spray booth from the Building and Safety division.
34. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012 ~~180 days from the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant must obtain building permits for the unpermitted roof, canopy addition, and complete any remaining construction.
35. Within 30 days from July 24, 2012 ~~8 months from the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant must obtain proper demolition permits from Building and Safety for the removal of the ~~begin demolition/construction of all unpermitted partitions within the building and~~, unpermitted additions in the rear yard setback. ~~to the rear~~

~~and north. The owner/applicant must obtain proper permits from Building and Safety prior to any construction/demolition.~~

36. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012 ~~11 months from the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant must complete any remaining construction and/or tenant improvements. All interior improvements such as closing off doors, repairing walls must meet building code requirements.
37. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012 ~~the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant must complete any necessary façade improvements, such as installing gates, fences, repairing/painting areas that were affected by construction.
38. Within 12 months from July 24, 2012 ~~the date of CUP approval~~, the owner/applicant must request and pay for a site inspection to the Planning Division.
39. The Planning Commission may revoke this conditional use permit pursuant to this resolution if the application fails to satisfy the performance standards within the allotted time. If the CUP is deemed null and void, all auto repair activities must be vacated within 30 days from the date the CUP is deemed invalid.
40. The applicant may not submit for an extension of time.

BUSINESS LICENSE DEPARTMENT – CITY OF CARSON

41. All construction must be completed by a licensed contractor.
42. 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.

EXHIBIT "C"

Updated Performance Schedule

<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Performance Standards</u>
<u>July 26, 2012</u>	<u>Owner/applicant shall sign and record a restrictive covenant.</u>
<u>August 24, 2012</u>	<u>Owner/applicant submits for Building and Safety permits.</u> <u>Owner/applicant shall submit a floor plan, site plan, and landscape/irrigation plan to the Planning division for review and approval.</u> <u>Owner/applicant must obtain demolition permits for the removal of the partitions within the building and addition within the rear yard setback.</u>
<u>September 24, 2012</u>	<u>Owner/applicant must submit remaining requirements to Building and Safety for the unpermitted spray booth.</u>
<u>Within 60 days from issuance of the building permit</u>	<u>Remove the unpermitted bathroom in the rear, remove the unpermitted addition in the rear yard setback, and remove the addition to the north that is extending to the neighboring property.</u>
<u>Within 90 days of landscape plan approval and site plan approval</u>	<u>Owner/applicant shall install landscaping according to the approved plan.</u> <u>Modify/remove the full bath to a half bath.</u>
<u>Within 180 days of site plan and floor plan approval</u>	<u>Owner/applicant shall stripe parking spaces and provide bumper stops.</u>
<u>July 24, 2013</u>	<u>Obtain building permits for the unpermitted roof and canopy addition. Construction must be complete.</u> <u>Obtain building permits for the unpermitted spray booth.</u> <u>Request and pay for site inspection.</u> <u>CUP up for full review.</u>

<u>Deadline</u> <u>(From the date of CUP approval, unless otherwise noted)</u>	<u>Performance Standards</u>
30 days <u>Completed</u>	Remove all unpermitted signage. <u>Completed</u>
30 days <u>Completed</u>	Remove all unpermitted signage. <u>Completed</u>
30 days	Submit to Building and Safety for demolition and building permits, if not already done so.
60 days from the issuance of the demolition permit	Remove/modify the full bath to a half bath. Remove the unpermitted bathroom in the rear.
60 days	Submit a landscaping and irrigation plan.



60 days	Submit a site plan and floor plan to Planning Division.
60 days from the date of site plan and floor plan approval.	Repair all broken concrete/asphalt. Level parking area. Obtain any grading permits, if necessary.
60 days from the date of landscape plan approval	Install landscaping and irrigation.
60 days	Obtain permits from Building and Safety for the spray booth.
90 days from the date of site plan and floor plan approval.	Provide striping for parking spaces and meet ADA requirements.
120 days	Satisfy the recommendations and safety concerns identified in the Property Inspection Report.
180 days	Obtain building permits for the unpermitted roof.
8 months	Begin the demolition of unpermitted partitions, unpermitted addition to the rear, and unpermitted addition to the north. Must obtain proper permits from Building and Safety prior to any construction/demolition.
11 months	Complete any remaining construction and/or tenant improvements. Complete any interior improvements such as closing off doors, repairing walls, etc. to meet building code requirements.
12 months	Complete any necessary façade improvements. Install gates, fences, etc. (if necessary). Request a site inspection to Planning and pay applicable fees.

21

Commissioner Goolsby asked why this applicant is being directed to reduce the height of her fence.

Senior Planner Signo explained that the fence height at this property is being addressed because of the CUP process now under consideration.

Chairman Faletofo noted his support of allowing this applicant additional time to reduce the height of this fence.

Chairman Faletofo closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to approve the applicant's request, thus adopting Resolution No. 11-2409. (This motion ultimately passed.)

Commissioner Verrett expressed her belief that 90 days may not be enough time for the applicant to reduce the height of the fence.

By way of a friendly amendment, Chairman Faletofo suggested giving the applicant 180 days to reduce the height of the fence.

Discussion ensued with regard to applying for a variance to allow for the height of the existing fence and addressed their interest in an ordinance amendment to increase the allowable height of fences.

Vice-Chairman Gordon suggested asking the applicant if more time is needed.

Senior Planner Signo pointed out that there needs to be a finding to support a variance, stating he does not believe a variance would be supported by staff for this address.

Chairman Faletofo re-opened the public hearing.

Ms. Holguin stated she does not need the additional time.

Chairman Faletofo closed the public hearing.

The motion carried, 7-1 (Diaz voted no; absent Commissioner Williams).

11. PUBLIC HEARING

B) Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Mariechelle Guinto, is requesting to approve an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district. The subject site is located at 21012 South Main Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

DENY Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-____, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city



of Carson denying Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for this continued vehicle service and repair use located at 21012 South Main Street."

Chairman Faletogo advised that he had visited this site and spoke with the owner and asked for input on what Associate Planner Song had discussed with the owner.

Associate Planner Song stated that she apprised the owner of all the outstanding violations; advised that staff would be recommending denial; and that if the Planning Commission were to support a denial, the owner would have three to six months to relocate his business. She pointed out that with the exception of the last two weeks, this property owner has made no effort to work with staff and conform to the City's Municipal Code.

Senior Planner Signo highlighted the long history of communications with this property owner.

Associate Planner Song stated that the property owner was advised to pull a demolition permit for the illegal addition; that after being advised a demolition permit was necessary, the owner tore down the attached illegal unit without pulling a permit; advised that there is an unpermitted restroom which is located within the setback area; and advised that part of the building has been built over the property line onto the neighboring property.

Commissioner Schaefer noted her appreciation of all the documentation that was provided in staff report; highlighted the recent CUP approval at 20922 South Main Street and expressed her concern with the inconsistencies in the recommendations for these similar properties along Main Street. She advised that she also had visited this site and spoke with Mr. Gutierrez.

Senior Planner Song pointed out that one of the major differences with this property is the residential use on site.

Commissioner Saenz stated that the extra restroom should be maintained for the employees.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Pat Brown, applicant's representative, advised that the improvements were not being done on this property because the property owner did not have the funds to do the repairs; and stated that since the property owner's daughter got involved last August, she is now getting some of the improvements made. He asked that this applicant be given 12 months to complete the improvements, adding that the applicant has hired a structural engineer to get this through the building and safety process.

Anthony Rockhold, at the request of Commissioner Brimmer, commented on some of the code enforcement issues at this site and stated that he took the photographs of this site that are included in the planning packet.

Vice-Chairman Gordon asked why the applicant has just now started working on making the improvements when staff has been trying to get the applicant to make the improvements for a year and a half.

23

Mr. Brown advised that some work has been done since last August.

Vice-Chairman Gordon asked if anyone is currently living on this site and asked what assurance there is that the work will be done in the next 12 months.

Mr. Brown stated that he does not know about the living situation but advised that the living quarters will be vacated from this point forward.

Commissioner Diaz echoed Vice-Chairman Gordon's concern with why the work wasn't started earlier and completed by now.

Mr. Brown reiterated that the finances were not available to make the improvements.

Mariechelle Guinto, property owner, stated that since she became aware of the issues, she has been working to make some of the improvements; advised that a site plan has now been given to staff; and stated that because of limited funds, she needs more time to complete the improvements. She advised that her father stays in the unit on site from time to time but that he does not live there permanently. She added that it will cost approximately \$50,000 to complete the improvements and that she has taken out a loan from family members to do the work. Ms. Guinto stated it would be beneficial for someone to stay on this property at all times to keep it from becoming vandalized. She added that her father gave her this property in 2004.

John Abella, Yorba Linda, stated that he owns the adjacent property to the north, and commented on the nice improvements being made to the applicant's property; and noted that it is one of the better looking properties on this street. He stated that the applicant should be given two years to comply.

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

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Verrett, to approve the applicant's request and to give the applicant two years to make the improvements. (This motion was ultimately superseded.)

By way of a friendly amendment, Commissioner Verrett suggested limiting the time to 18 months for completing the improvements.

Commissioner Saenz agreed with the friendly amendment.

Vice-Chairman Gordon commented on the need to be consistent with the decisions being made for these businesses on Main Street and stated that the Commission should adhere to 12 months as was given at the last meeting to the business at 20922 South Main Street.

Commissioner Saenz stated that because this use has a large number of violations to address, they should be given more time to complete the improvements.

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Brimmer, to prepare a resolution of approval for this applicant. (This motion was ultimately superseded.)

City Attorney Wynder clarified that if the Commission's intent is to approve the applicant's request and to put a stop to the use of the residential unit, the motion should be to direct staff to prepare a resolution of approval, along with conditions of approval, and that evidence be presented to prove the residential unit is not being used.

Chairman Faletogo moved, seconded by Commissioner Verrett, to direct staff to prepare a resolution for approval, along with conditions; and that this applicant be given 12 months to correct the violations. (This motion was ultimately amended.)

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Diaz moved to concur with staff recommendation for denial, stating that if the property owner is able to immediately remove the residential use, address all code enforcement issues, and adequately correct violations, they may be eligible to reapply for a conditional use permit for an auto repair use at a later time. (This motion died due to the lack of a second).

City Attorney Wynder stated that further clarification is needed on the motion, asking if it is the Commission's intent that the applicant be given 12 months to complete the improvements and that a resolution of approval, with conditions, be drafted once the residential use has ceased.

Chairman Faletogo and Commissioner Verrett indicated yes and accepted City Attorney Wynder's clarification on the motion.

Senior Planner Signo suggested that a performance schedule be implemented for that 12-month period, noting that several of the improvements can be done within the span of those 12 months.

Chairman Faletogo and Commissioner Verrett accepted Senior Planner Signo's suggestion for a performance schedule for that 12-month period.

The motion carried as follows:

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

12. NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION	None.
------------------------------------	-------

13. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS	None.
-----------------------------------	-------

14. MANAGER'S REPORT	
-----------------------------	--

Senior Planner Signo distributed to the Commission a memo regarding quality assurance conditions for the 2535-2569 East Carson Street condo project, and commented on the possibility of applying quality assurance conditions to future condominium projects.

25

Planning Officer Repp stated that staff would allow an additional 60 days for the removal of the storage container.

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

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Diaz, to approve the applicant's request, thus adopting Resolution No. 11-2411. Motion carried, 8-0 (absent Commissioner Williams).

11. PUBLIC HEARING

B) Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10

Applicant/Property Owner:

The applicant, Mariechelle Guinto, is requesting to approve an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district. The subject property is located at 21012 South Main Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Associate Planner Song presented staff report and the recommendation to DENY Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2412, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson denying Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for this continued vehicle service and repair use located at 21012 South Main Street."

Chairman Faletogo highlighted the applicant's letter (of record) to the Commission which addresses the applicant's belief they have been unfairly treated by city staff.

Associate Planner Song listed and addressed each item the applicant has yet to complete, including those processes required by the Building and Safety Department. She added that the applicant also failed to obtain permits for some of the work they undertook; and noted that the violations are outlined in a table on Page 14 of staff report.

Planning Officer Repp explained that it is always difficult when a property owner/business owner has a number of violations that need to be addressed and struggling to come up with the financing to comply. She reminded the Commission that the auto repair use ordinance was first adopted in 2009 and that there have been several property owners who have complied with the new ordinance; however, there are still some businesses and property owners who have not fully complied. She stated that there have been several workshops and code enforcement actions in order to gain compliance; and that when a more assertive approach becomes necessary, sometimes the property owners/business owners become protective and defensive. Planning Officer Repp stated that Associate Planner Song has been diligent in doing her job, and that she believes staff has done everything this Commission has deemed necessary in order to gain compliance; and she encouraged the Commission to maintain the adopted standards for compliance. She pointed out the issues concerning the safety standards on this site, noting that allowing these issues to go on for another 12 months is considered very lenient and generally not a good policy.

City Attorney Wynder added that this site is a chronic code violation property, expressing his belief that staff has exercised remarkable restraint and that, in his opinion, they do not deserve to do business at this location if they continue to not comply with these standards. He added that another remarkable showing of restraint is the prosecutor has only charged them with a misdemeanor. He added that staff has done its job and because of the chronic nature of these violations, staff is reminding them of each of the steps in the process. He stated that the applicant cannot go halfway through the list of violations and think the problems at this site are cured and that acting without the benefit of permits is not the way an orderly development in a community exists. He stated he is troubled by this applicant's nonconforming activities. He pointed out that a letter from staff stating that if they do not comply with the law, they will face legal action is not considered a threat, it is a letter that is sent to obtain compliance with the City's codes; and that giving an applicant a deadline with which to comply is a legal standard by which a legal prosecutor enforces the law.

City Attorney Wynder also added that Carson's businesses must comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, which controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into waters of the United States. He added there are some serious consequences to violating this program, not only for the businesses but also for the city of Carson.

Commissioner Saenz stated there are a lot of businesses on Main Street that are not complying with the City's codes and that this applicant feels this is selective enforcement.

City Attorney Wynder pointed out that every city is facing the impacts of limited financial resources to bring businesses into compliance, but added that when the City finds violations, it must address those violations; and concluded this has all been done appropriately with this site.

Commissioner Verrett stated that the most serious violations should be dealt with as soon as possible and that the applicant should be given adequate time to comply with the nonconformities.

Commissioner Diaz stated that the Commission directed staff at the prior meeting to return with a resolution the Commission could vote on; that the Commission gave clear direction and instructions to staff to prepare a performance schedule to complete the conditions of approval in the next 12 months; he expressed his belief that what staff has presented this evening has concisely met what the Commission asked of staff; and he stated that this matter should move forward.

Commissioner Schaefer expressed her belief staff is doing exactly what the Commission directed staff to do as residents of the community and stated she feels uncomfortable with the applicant's letter; and expressed her belief that staff deserves the Commission's compliments for the work they have done to get this property into compliance.

Associate Planner Song reiterated that staff is continuing to recommend denial of the CUP because of lack of compliance and a lack of good faith effort to meet the standards.

27

Commissioner Diaz advised he visited with the business operator who showed him around the site, noting his appreciation of the operator's time.

Commissioner Goolsby stated that he also visited the site and looked from the front, noting this site looks better than most on Main Street.

Commissioner Verrett noted she would support extending the time given to the applicant to complete any necessary improvements.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Mariechelle Guinto, property owner, stated it is her intent to comply and fix the violations that were presented to her from the last meeting, but stated that there are additional items on the performance schedule she was not aware of and that she feels she needs more time to determine the cost to fix those violations, such as the roof. She stated she is overwhelmed with the number of violations that need to be fixed; advised that she does not know how much all of this will cost; and that she feels uncomfortable in saying what she will ultimately be able to complete given her finances. She stated that the largest expense will likely be to fix or remove the roof structure; and stated that while she will agree to fix the nonconformities, she is not sure if she will have the finances to complete the list. She also addressed her concern that many unforeseen things can happen within the next 12 months and that if she needs a little additional time, she would like to ask for that extension if need be.

Ms. Guinto noted for Commissioner Brimmer that her father operated the business from this site for many years up until last year and confirmed that she is now the property owner. She reiterated that she became aware of all these issues about four to five months ago and that she feels overwhelmed. She stated that she received a letter from the City's prosecutor's office after the last hearing and that she is confused with the timing of that letter. She advised that no one is living on site at this time. She reiterated that her biggest concern is the cost of bringing the roof structure into compliance and believes she hasn't been given enough time to research how much all of these repairs are going to cost her.

Planning Officer Repp pointed out that the roof is a very large unpermitted structure that must be brought up to code, and if the applicant does not have the funds to bring it up to code, then the next option would be to remove the structure.

Commissioner Diaz asked the applicant if she is in concurrence with the conditions of approval and the performance schedule.

Ms. Guinto stated she is in concurrence with everything except with the roof structure because of its unknown cost to bring it into conformance.

Vice-Chairman Gordon asked staff why the applicant was only notified of the roof a few weeks ago.

Associate Planner Song explained that the applicant was made aware that any unpermitted structure would need to be addressed and has been included in the performance schedule. She added that up to a certain time, staff was working with her father, who was aware of the roof condition.

28

Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Diaz, to adopt Resolution of Approval No. 11-2412 to approve the applicant's request for a conditional use permit. (This motion ultimately carried.)

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to adopt Resolution of Approval No. 11-2412, giving the applicant 18 months to comply with the roof requirements. (This motion was ultimately withdrawn.)

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Verrett moved, seconded by Chairman Faletogo, to adopt Resolution of Approval No. 11-2412, allowing the applicant to return to the Planning Commission with a request for extension of time if the roof is still not in full compliance. (This motion was ultimately withdrawn.)

Planning Officer Repp advised that anyone may seek an extension of a discretionary permit.

The original motion to approve carried, 8-0 (absent Commissioner Williams).

11. PUBLIC HEARING

C) Design Overlay Review 1428-11

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Vintage Real Estate, LLC, is requesting to construct a new 7,537-square-foot restaurant building on the Sears parcel at the South Bay Pavilion shopping center. The subject property is located at 20700 South Avalon Boulevard.

Staff Recommendation:

Senior Planner Signo presented staff report and the recommendation to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of Design Overlay Review No. 1428-11 to the Redevelopment Agency, subject to the conditions attached as Exhibit "B" to the Resolution; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 11-2314, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson recommending approval to the Carson Redevelopment Agency of Design Overlay Review No. 1428-11 for the design and development of a new restaurant building at the Southbay Pavilion located at 20700 South Avalon Boulevard."

Commissioner Verrett stated that some of the signage lighting at this mall needs attention, noting that several are not working properly.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Jerry Garner, representing the applicant, commented on the Sears shopping center upgrades that will take place at the same time this restaurant is being built. He noted there is likely going to be another restaurant chain applying for the second pad.

29

Planning Officer Repp advised that the valuation threshold issue will be presented at a separate public hearing later this year.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Pilar Hoyos, representing Watson Land Company, addressed her concern with the Edison easement that runs the entire length of Watson Industrial Center South; advised that DWP recently optioned those properties for lease; and given Watson's investments in this area and concern for compatible uses with all of these properties along this corridor from the north end of the DWP strip to the south end along Sepulveda, Watson is requesting that this entire easement area be included in the design overlay zone, from 223rd to Sepulveda. She expressed concern that DWP could potentially allow a use that would negatively impact Watson's ability to market those adjoining properties. She stated that while Watson Land Company is not completely on board with this change to its properties, Watson understands staff's interest and desire to protect the residential areas across the street from those properties. She stated that Watson Land Company has high standards and that the company is here for the long term and doesn't want to jeopardize Watson's interest with the community, but stated they understand and will not object to this proposed change. She reiterated that Watson is concerned with delays in having to go through this design review process in being able to deliver a building for the desired user in an efficient timeframe. She reiterated her request to have the DWP easement property included in this change. She mentioned that their buildings are designed to respond to commercial needs.

Rev. Joe Hernandez, representing Mission Eben-Ezer Family Church, asked if his church property is included in this change.

Planning Officer Repp advised that Project Area 1 has never been exempt and is not part of this proposal.

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

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Williams, to concur with staff recommendation, including the addition of all Department of Water and Power easement property between 223rd Street and Sepulveda Boulevard; and moved to adopt Resolution No. 12-2439. Motion carried, 8-0 (absent Commissioner Diaz).

11. PUBLIC HEARING

C) Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Reggie Guinto, is requesting to consider revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district. The subject property is located at 21012 South Main Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Senior Planner Signo presented staff report and the recommendation to 1) REVOKE Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 12-___, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson revoking approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for a vehicle service and auto repair use located at 21012 South Main Street"; or 2) Modify Resolution No. 11-2412 by adding a condition to require the removal of the unpermitted canopy and to continue the public hearing until August 14, 2012, to allow the applicant to demolish the canopy and demonstrate compliance with all outstanding conditions of approval.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Senior Planner Signo explained for Chairman Faletogo that the restrictive covenant would allow the applicant to continue to do auto repair on site and to keep the canopy that has been constructed without the benefit of permits as long as the applicant completes the permit process on this canopy; noted that if the use ever changes on site, the parking requirements must meet code or parking must be provided offsite no more than 400 feet from this property; and if that parking can't be accomplished, the canopy will need to be removed. He stated the 1,400-square-foot canopy requires an additional 3 parking spaces.

Chairman Faletogo stated that the Commission received a letter dated June 27, 2012, from the applicant highlighting a list of 14 improvements he has made on site.

Commissioner Saenz stated that the residential neighbor at the back of this property has built their garage to the fence line of this business's property, noting this property owner currently has an 8-foot setback to that rear fence. He stated that the main reason for the applicant not signing the covenant is that Associate Planner Song will not release the site plan and permit for the canopy until the applicant signs the restrictive covenant. He stated that the applicant cannot get the permits until he has an approved site plan from planning and that this has caused him to get behind in the timeline to complete the work.

Senior Planner Signo stated that staff is holding off on the site plan until the restrictive covenant is signed, pointing out that the site plan currently indicates the canopy is permitted, which is not correct.

Planning Officer Repp advised that residential property owners are allowed by code to build garages within the rear yard setback/property line by one inch or 3 feet in this zone; and that the code requires a 10-foot setback for any industrial buildings that are adjacent to residential. She added that this property has had a series of buildings that have filled the entire rear yard and are not permitted, noting the 10-foot setback requirement must be maintained. She explained that it is only through this CUP process that they can allow for a deviation on the parking requirements; that once this use changes, more parking will be required to meet code; and that as long as this site remains an auto use, this site can maintain the parking deviation through the CUP.

Commissioner Saenz stated that a lot of businesses use Main Street for their parking and noted that business is slow during this economy.

Commissioner Goolsby questioned why staff is recommending to revoke the CUP, noting his understanding this applicant had one year to comply with the performance standards.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Reggie Guinto, applicant/owner, stated that he is not able to comply with the performance standards because his site plan is being held up pending his signing the restrictive covenant, noting he is willing to get the necessary permits. He stated the canopy area is now being used for parking and not a work area since business has been very slow.

Chairman Faletogo highlighted the applicant's letters to the Commission wherein he states he has spent nearly \$50,000 trying to comply with the requirements of the performance standards; stated that the letter also addresses that the work has been put on hold because the site plan has not been approved; and he asked the applicant why he has not signed the restrictive covenant.

Mr. Guinto stated that his lawyer told him that if he signs that covenant, a lien will be placed on his property and that he will then need the City's permission to change the business on this property and be forced to tear down the canopy, noting his concern with the City not agreeing to any proposed change. He noted for Chairman Faletogo that this site is completely auto repair related.

Chairman Faletogo noted that should the Commission give the applicant more time to complete the requirements, how much more time would the applicant need.

Mr. Guinto stated that he is currently out of money and that he would now have to seek financial assistance from his family members; and added that he is only making enough money to pay the mortgage on this property. He stated he needs additional time to seek financial assistance from his family.

Chairman Faletogo asked if the applicant would be able to make the improvements one year from now.

Mr. Guinto stated that is a good timeline for him.

Vice-Chairman Gordon stated that at issue is the applicant's unwillingness to sign the restrictive covenant, noting that this can't move forward until that document is signed.

Justin Benson, applicant's nephew, explained that his uncle's reluctance in signing the restrictive covenant is because his uncle was instructed by an attorney friend against signing the document, stating they believe it is similar to placing a lien on the property and also his concern with the future use of this property should he change the use.

Assistant City Attorney Sultani explained that the covenant is very clear and stated that it is not a lien on the property; that it clearly states the property shall be restricted to the use of an auto repair business unless additional onsite parking is provided to accommodate an alternate or additional use in accordance with the parking requirements; noted that the restriction is binding on all successive businesses, as it runs with the land; reiterated that it is not a lien; and stated that if a user of the property wants to do anything other than auto repair, then they have to comply with Carson's Municipal parking requirements.

Vice-Chairman Gordon asked the applicant if he showed his attorney the paperwork he received from the City.

Mr. Guinto indicated that no, he did not show any of the documents to his lawyer friend; and stated he is concerned with using/selling this property in the future if he signs the agreement and the City not removing the covenant in the future.

Staff reiterated that if the auto repair business goes away in the future, that canopy has to come down if parking cannot be provided.

37

Planning Officer Repp stated that as long as the requirements are met, it would not come before the Planning Commission unless there are going to be exterior modifications that require design review.

Mr. Benson stated that given this evening's explanation of this covenant, his uncle will sign the agreement.

Senior Planner Signo stated there is an issue with the performance standards timeline now that this has been held up pending the applicant's signature, stating the deadlines are off because of this delay and as a result, those deadline dates will need to be altered.

Assistant City Attorney Soltani stated that the Commission could recommend staff bring this matter back in 2 weeks to allow the applicant time to file the covenant and that it return to staff to alter the dates of the timeline in accordance with the delay timeframe.

Planning Officer Repp stated that staff recognizes the applicant now wishes to sign the covenant after this evening's meeting and because of the applicant's misunderstanding of the covenant, out of fairness, the Commission may want to modify the timeline due to this delay; and she advised that staff can shift the deadlines forward to match what he should have accomplished by now.

Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chairman Gordon noted his desire to see the required work completed along this stretch of Main Street.

Chairman Faletogo stated that this applicant has misunderstood the intent of the covenant; that the applicant has done a lot of work on site to conform to code; pointed out that this economy has been rough on businesses; and stated that he'd like to give this applicant a year to make the necessary changes.

Commissioner Williams stated that it should be made clear this delay was not a delay because of staff, that it was due to this applicant getting incorrect advice from an attorney friend who was not provided adequate information from this applicant. He pointed out that staff did the right thing in holding back the site plan for leverage in the event things did not work out.

Planning Commission Decision:

Chairman Faletogo moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to not revoke Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10, allowing the applicant one year to complete the performance standards. (This motion was ultimately amended.)

Assistant City Attorney Soltani asked for clarification on when the Chair wants the year to commence given the performance standards have been in place for a while.

Chairman Faletogo stated from when the site plan is released.

The motion carried but ultimately was amended and voted on again:

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

Commissioner Williams stated that he voted to abstain because he does not understand the motion.

Commissioner Verrett stated that the applicant should be signing the covenant tomorrow.

Planning Officer Repp explained that the performance standards guidelines were set in motion last year.

Chairman Faletogo re-opened the public hearing.

Mr. Guinto stated that he will sign the covenant this week.

Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Goolsby stated it's necessary to be more lenient in these poor economic times.

Planning Officer Repp stated that staff would recommend starting off with where the applicant left off on the list, but adding a couple of months to the deadline timeframe.

Commissioner Verrett stated that staff should work with the applicant to get this work done in the next year.

Chairman Faletogo pointed out that the applicant stated he has limited funding and suggested the applicant be able to first complete the remaining projects on the list that he can afford to accomplish, doing the projects out of deadline order. He stated that as long as he completes the work in one year, staff should be working closely with the applicant to completion.

By way of an amended motion, Chairman Faletogo moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to not revoke Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10, allowing the applicant one year to complete the performance standards, starting with the release of his site plan; and moved that staff revise the timeline appropriate with this delay. This motion carried as follows:

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

12. NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION None

13. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS None

14. MANAGER'S REPORT

- Construction contract for the commercial façade improvement project located at 225 East Carson Street, Carson Carwash

Planning Officer Repp advised that City Council approved the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) monies that have been given to the City to address blighted areas; and advised that these funds will be used for a commercial façade improvement project for Carson Carwash located at 225 East Carson Street.

- August 26, 2012 Planning Commission meeting proposed to go dark for summer schedule

34

11. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**B) Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10**Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Reggie Guinto, is before the Planning Commission to consider revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light — Design Overlay) zoning district. The subject property is located at 21012 South Main Street.

Commissioner Saenz noted that a letter from the applicant indicates that watering his minimal landscaping only takes two to three minutes and that he does not feel an irrigation system is necessary.

Commissioner Goolsby noted his concern that businesses are struggling in this poor economy and stated that the City should be more lenient and flexible, suggesting this applicant be given more time to comply.

Senior Planner Signo stated that the applicant will have a year from this evening to complete the requirements.

Reggie Guinto, property owner, stated that he signed the covenant agreement; advised that his tenant uses the canopy for auto use; and asked if they can keep the second restroom on the east side for the use of the workers who typically have grease on them, noting he'd like to keep the main restroom clean as possible.

Commissioner Diaz stated that the bathroom on the east side needs to be removed because it does not comply with code; and noted his concern with the applicant not meeting the deadlines for compliance. He advised that he received the applicant's letter and noted that he does not agree with everything the applicant wrote.

Senior Planner Signo noted for Commissioner Goolsby that the tenant is allowed to use the canopy for auto related purposes.

Mr. Guinto stated that the full bath is for use by the caretaker of the property.

Commissioner Schaefer stated that she also received the letters from the applicant and stated that from what he has written, she questions his sincerity in his intent to comply. She stated that both staff and this Commission have worked with the applicant, yet the applicant has continued to write another letter.

Mr. Guinto stated that he plans on complying and that he only voiced his opinions in his letters.

Senior Planner Signo stated that this property has historically been used as a residence/caretaker unit, as mentioned by the applicant this evening; and stated that staff does not want it converted back to a residence.

Commissioner Williams pointed out the need for an applicant to seek professional advice when dealing with code compliance issues they do not understand.

35

Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing. Chairman Faletogo reopened the public hearing.

Chairman Faletogo asked the applicant if the direction is clear on what he needs to do to be in compliance.

Mr. Guinto stated that yes, he does now understand.

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

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Schaefer, to approve Modification No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10, amending Resolution No. 11-2412 to allow the applicant more time to complete the performance standards. Motion carried as follows:

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

12. PUBLIC HEARING

**A) Design Overlay Review No. 1454-12 and
Conditional Use Permit Nos. 907-12**

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, WIN Hyundai, is requesting to construct a new WIN Hyundai Automotive dealership building and remove an existing freeway pylon sign to be replaced with an electronic message center sign located in the CA (Commercial, Automotive) zoning district. The property is located at 2201 East 223rd Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Associate Planner Gonzalez presented staff report and the recommendation to WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 12-2442, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson approving Design Overlay Review No. 1454-12 and Conditional Use Permit No. 907-12 for a new Win Hyundai automotive dealership and a new electronic message center pylon sign to be located at 2201 East 223rd Street." He highlighted the following changes to the Conditions of Approval: delete Condition Nos. 26, 29, 43, 44, 47; amend Condition No. 45, "The owner shall annex the area to the L.A. County Lighting Maintenance District, for the purpose of operating and maintaining the streetlights to be installed. The annexation shall be to the satisfaction of L.A. County and shall be completed prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. Additional streetlight installation or upgrade to existing streetlights may be required as part of the annexation. (annexation procedure is approximately 12 months) Contact LACDPW Traffic Lighting Joaquin Herrera (626) 300-4770. If Certificate of Occupancy is requested prior to the completion of the annexation procedure, the City may issue a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (Typically good for six months). A final Certificate of Occupancy will be issued when the annexation procedure is completed"; and amend Condition No. 49, "Paint curbs red a minimum of 20 feet east of

Associate Planner Song stated that no automotive repair is done at this site, just smog testing; and noted there is an oil collection system on site. She stated that if a car needs work, they are referred to other business establishments.

Associate Planner Song noted for Commissioner Schaefer that the business sign conforms to code.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Ronnie Santos, applicant, noted that if a car does not pass the smog testing, it has to go to a repair facility at another site.

Planning Commission Decision:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Brimmer, to concur with staff recommendation, thus adopting Resolution No. 12-2451. Motion carried, 7-0 (absent Commissioners Diaz, Williams).

11. PUBLIC HEARING

C) Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10

Request:

Staff is asking the Planning Commission to consider revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district. The property is owned by Reggie Guinto and is located at 21012 South Main Street.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Senior Planner Signo presented staff report and the recommendation that the Planning Commission choose one of the following options:

1. REVOKE Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10; and WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 12-__, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson revoking approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for a vehicle service and auto repair use located at 21012 South Main Street"; or
2. CONTINUE the public hearing to November 13, 2012; or
3. DIRECT staff to modify Resolution No. 11-2412 and to continue the public hearing until November 13, 2012, to allow the applicant additional time for compliance with all outstanding conditions of approval and clarify existing language.

Commissioner Gordon asked if this applicant has been cooperative and making progress with meeting the conditions of approval.

Senior Planner Signo stated that the work has been slow; noted that the roof came down just before this meeting; and advised that the applicant is starting to fall behind with the performance timeline.

Planning Officer Repp stated that the applicant seems to only respond when he receives a notice of revocation.

Chairman Faletogo asked if spray booths are permitted in Carson; and he stated he is troubled by the poor economy and the amount of work that is being required of this applicant, noting he'd like to give the applicant a full year to complete the work.

Commissioner Saenz questioned why staff is being so persistent with this applicant, highlighting his concern with the poor economy. He expressed his belief a spray booth permit is not required, that it is under the purview of L.A. County; and stated that other businesses have not been required to pull a spray booth permit in Carson. He added that now the applicant is being required to pay extra school fees and testing of a street fire hydrant.

Planning Officer Repp advised that a spray booth permit is required by the Building Code.

Senior Planner Signo explained that the addition was done without the benefit of a permit and that it is not legal to build across the adjacent property line without approval of a lot line adjustment.

Commissioner Goolsby questioned why this applicant has to pay to have a fire hydrant tested when it is on the other side of the street from his property and not close by.

Senior Planner Signo stated that because of the 2,000-square-foot addition, these requirements are automatically applied by the County.

Planning Officer Repp stated that L.A. County applies the school fees and the fire hydrant requirements and noted that if there is any discrepancy, the applicant needs to directly contact the County.

Chairman Faletogo expressed his belief there is some inconsistency with what is being required of this applicant and other auto repair shops; and stated that this applicant has indicated he has already spent \$50,000 on improvements. He expressed his belief that the added conditions are discouraging this applicant from moving forward.

Senior Planner Signo reminded the Commission that this applicant has been given additional time to meet the performance schedule.

Commissioner Schaefer agreed that this applicant has been given additional time to meet the conditions of approval, noting that this applicant has agreed to the schedule. She stated that if a spray booth permit is required, this applicant should be pulling a permit regardless if other businesses in town have yet to get their permits. She added that this applicant has known of the nonconformities for a number of years.

Senior Planner Signo stated that staff is working with other auto service businesses and that each business will be dealt with on an individual basis.

Commissioner Brimmer stated that she'd like to work with the applicant, but noted the need to work within the boundaries of the law.

38

Commissioner Gordon expressed his belief that the only new issue being discussed this evening is the requirement for testing the fire hydrant across the street. He pointed out that this Commission directed staff to lay out a plan for getting the work completed within a certain period of time and noted the Commission's desire to see this area of Main Street cleaned up; and stated that the applicants need to work with the City/staff and make steady progress in getting this work done on this street.

Vice-Chairman Verrett expressed her belief that the City should be more lenient in these difficult economic times, noting her interest in supporting the struggling businesses in Carson. She stated this applicant was given one full year to complete the work, noting it has not yet been a full year.

Commissioner Schaefer pointed out that the applicant has had at least 18 months to get this work completed; and she noted that the performance schedule was very clear on when the work needed to be done to have it all completed within that time period.

Chairman Faletogo closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Decision:

Vice-Chair Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to remove the performance timeline and deny staff's recommendation for a revocation; and allow the applicant a year and a half to fully comply with code. (This motion was ultimately withdrawn.)

Vice-Chair Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Brimmer, to continue this matter to the November 13, 2012, Planning Commission meeting, allowing time for the applicant and his consultant to work with staff to meet the performance standards described in the conditions of approval within a certain time period.

Chairman Faletogo opened the public hearing.

Motion carried, 6-1, for the continuance (Commissioner Schaefer voted no; absent Commissioners Diaz, Williams).

12.	NEW BUSINESS DISCUSSION	None
13.	WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS	None
14.	MANAGER'S REPORT	None
15.	COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS	

Commissioner Brimmer asked that a workshop be scheduled for the Planning Commission to address issues involving the auto-related properties along Main Street.

Planning Officer Repp stated that there was a prior workshop involving this area of Main Street, but stated that staff will plan a workshop to address basic requirements for setbacks, the process related to compliance issues, policies and procedures, and ethics on how to accomplish compliance. She added that staff will also provide how much success their efforts have gained and how much more needs to be done.

9. CONSENT CALENDAR

A) Minutes: September 25, 2012; October 9, 2012

MOTION:

Commissioner Saenz moved, seconded by Commissioner Diaz, to approve the September 25, 2012 and October 9, 2012 Minutes as presented. Motion carried, 8-0.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

A) **Modification No. 3 to Special Use Permit No. 106-74**

Applicant's Request:

The applicant, Nader Qoborsi, is requesting a one-year time extension for 21 additional mobilehome spaces at the Colony Cove Mobile Estates mobilehome park and adding conditions of approval to address the existing abandoned oil wells on the property. The subject property is located at 17700 South Avalon Boulevard.

Staff Report and Recommendation:

Associate Planner Naaseh advised that this matter is being continued to the Commission's November 27, 2012 meeting.

Planning Commission Decision:

Without objection, Chairman Faletogo continued this matter to the Planning Commission's November 27, 2012, meeting.

10. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

B) **Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10**

Applicant's Request:

Staff is requesting the Planning Commission consider revocation of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for an auto repair business on a site located in the ML-D (Manufacturing, Light – Design Overlay) zoning district. The applicant is Reggie Guinto, and the property is located at 21012 South Main Street.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission choose one of the following options:

1. REVOKE Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10, WAIVE further reading and ADOPT Resolution No. 12-__, entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the city of Carson revoking approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10 for a vehicle service and auto repair use located at 21012 South Main Street;" or
2. CONTINUE the public hearing to November 27, 2012; or
3. DIRECT staff to modify Resolution No. 11-2412 and ADOPT a minute resolution revising the performance standards and conditions of approval to give the applicant additional time.

40
js

Senior Planner Signo stated that while the applicant has made some progress, there are still some major improvements that are required both on the interior and the exterior.

Chairman Faletogo asked staff if they have an estimate of how much more money this applicant has to spend before all the required work is complete, noting the applicant has indicated he's already spent \$50,000.

Senior Planner Signo stated he does not know how much it will cost, noting the applicant will need to get his own estimates of what the work will cost. He added that the applicant can contact the Building and Safety department for any related fees.

Commissioner Saenz expressed his belief a spray booth permit is not required by code, that the applicant only needs an enclosed spray space.

Senior Planner Signo stated that building permits are required for the spray area.

Commissioner Saenz asked that staff provide the Commission with the municipal code language requiring such permits.

Senior Planner Signo explained for Chairman Faletogo that the rear yard bathroom should be set a minimum of 10 feet from the rear residential property line, pointing out it's currently up against the property line.

Commissioner Goolsby reiterated his concern with this client having to pay to test a fire hydrant that is located across the street and not even close to his property; and also noted his concern with having to pay school fees.

Senior Planner Signo explained that had the property owner obtained the proper permits in the beginning, he still would have had to pay these fees.

Zeke Vidarri, representing the property owner, stated that some of the estimates to get the required work done are from \$50,000 to \$60,000; and expressed his belief a continuance is needed so he can continue to work with the property owner and staff on getting the necessary repairs completed, noting he needs more time for a better understanding of what's required. He advised that the property owner is out of money but that he wants to make the improvements.

Commissioner Saenz expressed his opinion that bumper stops are obsolete, questioning why they are being required.

Senior Planner Signo stated they are required when parking is next to a building or wall. He mentioned that as of today, the site is displaying a new, unapproved banner.

Mr. Vidarri expressed his belief that staff continues to pick at such small matters.

Commissioner Gordon pointed out that it's the major work the applicant is not undertaking that keeps bringing this matter back to the Planning Commission. He asked staff for clarification on whether the applicant is required to have a spray booth enclosure.

44

Senior Planner Signo explained that they are required to have a designated spray booth.

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

Discussion ensued with regard to revising the performance schedule.

Planning Commission Decision:

Vice-Chair Verrett moved, seconded by Commissioner Saenz, to continue this matter to the November 27, 2012, Planning Commission meeting, giving the applicant and his representative more time to work with staff on developing revised performance standards for the completion of the work that needs to be completed. (This motion was ultimately withdrawn.)

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Schaefer moved, seconded by Commissioner Diaz, to revoke Conditional Use Permit No. 831-10. This motion died as follows:

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

By way of a substitute motion, Commissioner Brimmer moved, seconded by Chairman Faletogo, to adjust the timeline of the performance standards schedule, Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, completing all the work on the performance standards list by April 24, 2013; that staff and the applicant work to come to a mutual agreement as to completing this work by the April 24, 2013 deadline; that if there is no agreement and the applicant cannot complete the work by that date, this matter will come before the Planning Commission for revocation.

Being in agreement with this motion, Vice-Chair Verrett withdrew her original motion, thus making Commissioner Brimmer's motion the only motion on the floor.

The motion carried as follows:

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

~~11. CONTINUED 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 for the property located at 23601 South Avalon Boulevard.

42