Honorable Chairman and Members of the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission

Regular Meeting of October 16, 2001

## SUBJECT: NONCONFORMING REMODEL 01-3

LOCATION: $11241^{\text {st }}$ Street
APPLICANT: John Mason
$11241^{\text {st }}$ Street
Hermosa Beach

REQUESTS: ADDITION AND REMODEL TO AN EXISTING NONCONFORMING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING RESULTING IN A GREATER THAN 50\% INCREASE IN VALUE

## Recommendation/Alternatives:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission:

1. Determine by minute order whether this project qualifies for small lot status and thereby a reduction in required open space.
2. Determine by minute order whether this project may exceed the maximum exterior wall removal of $30 \%$.
3. Continue this request with required renoticing and that a variance request be included for exceeding the maximum valuation of $100 \%$.

## OR

4. Continue this matter to a date certain and require revised plans in compliance with all zoning standards and with the Planning Commission's determination regarding open space and exterior wall removal.

## Background:

LOT SIZE
EXISTING FLOOR AREA
PROPOSED ADDITION:
PROPOSED REMODEL
PERCENT INCREASE IN VALUATION
ZONING:
GENERAL PLAN:
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

2,119 square feet
1,331 square feet
1,269 square feet
774 square feet
118\%
R-1
Low Density Residential
Categorically Exempt

## Analysis:

The existing two-story dwelling was constructed in 1963. The dwelling is nonconforming to current parking setback and guest parking requirements. The existing 2-car garage is set back 9.82 feet from the sidewalk and no guest parking is available.

Chapter 17.52 of the Zoning Ordinance requires Planning Commission approval when an expansion/remodel of a nonconforming building exceeds $50 \%$. The applicant is proposing to expand at the first, second and third levels, and do renovations to the existing interior at two levels. The expansion will increase the dwelling from 1,331 square feet to 2,601 square feet. The expansion and remodel taken together exceed by $18 \%$ the maximum valuation of $100 \%$, and remove $41 \%$ of the existing exterior walls. Pursuant to Section 17.52.030B.1.c. Planning Commission approval is required to remove more than $30 \%$ of the existing exterior walls.

The proposal generally does not conform to planning and zoning requirements as follows:
$>$ Lot coverage will exceed the maximum of $65 \%$ by $.5 \%$.
$>$ Open space does not meet the minimum 400 square foot requirement (It is 234 square feet) and will have a dimension of 7 feet rather than the required dimension of 10 feet. However, pursuant to Section 17.08.030L.1., lots between 2,101 to 2,310 square feet may qualify for small lot status which allows open space to be reduced to 300 square feet and have a dimension of 7 feet, if found justifiable by the Planning Commission for any of the following reasons:

- To achieve a consistent and comparable amount of indoor living space with existing dwelling units in the immediate neighborhood;
- To allow design flexibility in the application of the open space standard in conjunction with the remodeling and expansion of existing structures;
- To allow an innovative design which otherwise is consistent with the goals and intent of the open space and development standards for the R-1 zone;
- To address unusual lot configurations or topography, as compared with surrounding lot and development patterns.
Based on the above criteria, staff finds no justification to allow for reduced open space and even if the Planning Commission confirms the project qualifies as a small lot and approves the reduction in open space, as the project will still be 66 square feet under the minimum of 300 square feet.
$>$ Based the submitted plans the proposed expansion may be over height, although the roof plan denotes that the proposed expansion is exactly at the maximum height allowed. The proposed elevation plans appear to show finished $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ level floor elevations to be only 7.44 feet apart. The Building Code minimum floor-to-ceiling height for the proposed rumpus room is 7.5 Feet. The $1^{\text {st }}$ floor level could possibly be lowered to meet the Building Code floor-to-ceiling height. Also, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ level floors-to-ceiling heights appear to be at the minimum, and the scaled height of the proposed structure added to the noted first level floor elevation exceeds the maximum allowed height. It should be noted that the submitted roof plan lacks the required data, i.e. property corner point elevations, lot length and width, and has inconsistent roof critical point elevations/locations vis-a-vis the submitted plan elevations.

Mike Schubach, City Planner

## CONCUR:

Sol Blumenfeld, Director
Community Development Department

Attachments<br>1 Location Map<br>2. Photographs

3. Zoning Analysis

$11241^{\mathrm{ST}} \mathrm{St}$.
