## Honorable Chairman and Members of the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission

## Regular Meeting of August 20, 2002

CONTINUED FROM JULY 16, 2002 MEETING
SUBJECT: CONDOMINIUM 02-2
PRECISE DEVELOPMENT PLANS 02-4 VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP \#26262

LOCATION: 300 Hermosa Ave.

APPLICANT: Susan Swerdloff
$146623^{\text {rd }}$ Street
Manhattan Beach

REQUEST: TO ALLOW A 3-UNIT ATTACHED CONDOMINIUM

## Recommendations

To approve the Precise Development Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Tract Map subject to Conditions as contained in the attached Resolution.

## Background

PROJECT INFORMATION:
GENERAL PLAN: High Density Residential
ZONING:
R-3
LOT SIZE:
EXISTING USE:
PROPOSED UNIT SIZES:
4,002 square feet each
Single Family Dwelling
Unit A: 1,892, Unit B: 1,864 Unit C: 2,030 square feet
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Categorically Exempt, Pursuant to Section 15303, Class 3(b) and 15315 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines with the finding that the project is in an area with available services.

At the July 16, 2002 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission continued this project to the August 20, 2002 meeting to review the Planning Commission previous interpretations of the

Zoning Ordinance regarding roof deck open space and side-yard setbacks when access to the front entries is on the side-yard. These items are discussed below.

## Analysis

The proposed project consists of three attached units; two units have 2 bedrooms, mezzanines, and $23 / 4$ baths and the third unit has 3 bedrooms and $31 / b a t h s$. The building is two stories above basement level garages and includes balconies and decks. The buildings are designed in a contemporary architecture with a minimum pitched roof, window and eave trim.

Required parking is provided in three two-car garages, and three open guest spaces. One parking space will be lost on the street. Lot coverage is at $64.8 \%$, under the maximum of $65 \%$. The required front, rear, and side setbacks meet the minimum requirements of 5 feet, 3 feet, and 4 feet respectively. Storage areas for all units are shown.

Units A and B have 200 square feet of open space per unit with direct access from mezzanines. Staff reviewed a previous condominium project at $1068^{\text {th }}$ Street approved on August 21, 2001 and found that the open space areas were the same as proposed for the subject project, i.e. accessed directly from mezzanines. The Planning Commission approved this design as meeting the open space requirements. A copy of the minutes and the mezzanine/open space floor design is attached. Unit A's open space area directly off the primary living area encroaches $1 /$ foot into the front-yard setback and a Condition of Approval has been included to eliminate this encroachment.

The front entries to two of the units are located on the side yard. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the side-yard width to be $11 / 2$ imes the minimum required for "multiple or row dwellings" with front entries facing the side-yard and the Commission has approved an average of $11 /$ times the required minimum yard on previous projects. Staff reviewed a previous condominium project at $1068^{\text {th }}$ Street (as noted above) and found that the Planning Commission determined that the row housing side-yard requirement did not apply when there were less than three units facing the same yard. The proposed project which orients one unit to the street and two units to the side-yard is consistent with this previously approved project. When two units face a common yard and one unit faces a street the Commission has determined that the yard requirement may be relaxed because the multiple unit condition does not occur at the entry to three dwelling units. One distinction between the previous project and the subject project was the previous project is on a corner lot and entrances face the side-street.

The balcony at the first level of Unit A also encroaches into the front setback, is covered by the balcony above, and is less than 7 feet above grade. This balcony will need to be removed. The project calculates to be slightly above the maximum height of 30 -feet at the critical point and must be adjusted to comply with the limit. Provision of an area for forced-air-units, trash facilities and areas for vacuum canisters are not available for Units A and C. Conditions of Approval have been included to address these items and standard Conditions of Approval have been included regarding
trees, landscaping, and decorative paving. In addition the plans must be revised to correctly note all building height information with correct critical point locations on the roof plan.

Michael Schubach, City Planner

## CONCUR:

Sol Blumenfeld, Director
Community Development Department

Attachments:

1. Resolution
2. Location Map
3. Photographs
4. Residential Zoning Analysis/Height Calculation
5. July 17, 2001 Planning Commission minutes
6. Mezzanine/open space floor plan for $1068^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$.
