October 1, 2002

# Honorable Chairman and Members of the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission

Regular Meeting of October 15, 2002

SUBJECT: NONCONFORMING REMODEL 02-11

LOCATION: 624 24<sup>TH</sup> STREET

APPLICANT: KELLY AND NANCY AMATO

624 24<sup>TH</sup> STREET

REQUEST: ADDITION AND REMODEL TO AN EXISTING NONCONFORMING SINGLE

FAMILY DWELLING RESULTING IN A GREATER THAN 50% INCREASE IN

**VALUATION** 

# Recommendation

To approve the expansion and remodel, subject to conditions.

## **Background**

LOT SIZE 6,225 square feet EXISTING FLOOR AREA 1,100 square feet PROPOSED ADDITION: 929 square feet

PERCENT INCREASE IN VALUATION 97.2% EXISTING PARKING: 3

PROPOSED PARKING: No Change

ZONING: R-1

GENERAL PLAN: Low Density Residential ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Categorically Exempt

The existing one-story dwelling was constructed in 1954. The dwelling is nonconforming to current side yard requirements. The westerly side yard is 2.9 feet rather than the required 4.1 feet.

### **Analysis**

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 remodel and expand the building by adding a great room, office, master bedroom suite and sun porch, and remodeling the majority of the existing floor area. Also, the applicant proposes to move the garage from the rear of the residence to the front with a 17-foot setback to comply with current setback requirements. The expansion will increase the living area from 1,100 to 2,029 square feet. The

expansion and remodel taken together results in a 97.2% increase in valuation, and includes removing approximately 60% of existing exterior walls.

The proposal generally conforms to planning and zoning requirements, as adequate open space is provided in the rear yard. Lot coverage is 45% and the addition will comply with all yard requirements. The residence with the proposed addition will be maintained as a single-story building, and therefore will comply with the 25 foot maximum height requirement.

The applicant is proposing to add a second garage space, stepped back from the existing single-car garage to comply with the 17-foot setback requirement. While the nonconforming setback at the existing one-car garage will remain, this improvement will bring the property into conformance with parking and guest parking requirements.

While nonconforming side yard of the building will be maintained, it is not severe or out of character with the neighborhood. The proposal is reasonable in scope, and would not seem to warrant correcting this nonconformity.

	Scott Lunceford
CONCUR:	Planning Assistant
Sol Blumenfeld, Director	
Community Development Department	

### Attachments

- 1. Proposed Resolution
- 2. Location Map
- 3. Photographs
- 4. Zoning Check List

nr624



624 24<sup>th</sup> Street

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	fo
8	lo
9	n
10	
11	C
12	
13	n
14	
15	
16	
17	fo
18	
19	

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

29

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 02-**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH, CALIFORNIA APPROVING A GREATER THAN 50% EXPANSION AND REMODEL TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING WHILE MAINTAINING A NONCONFORMING SIDE YARD AT 624 24<sup>TH</sup> STREET

The Planning Commission of the City of Hermosa Beach does hereby resolve and order as follows:

<u>Section 1</u>. An application was filed by Kelly and Nancy Amato, owners of real property located at 624 24<sup>th</sup> Street, requesting a greater than 50% expansion and remodel to an existing nonconforming single family dwelling, pursuant to Chapter 17.52 of the Zoning Ordinance

<u>Section 2</u>. The Planning Commission conducted a hearing to consider the application on October 15, 2002, at which testimony and evidence, both written and oral, were presented to and considered by the Planning Commission.

<u>Section 3</u> Based on the evidence received at the public hearing, the Planning Commission makes the following factual findings:

1. The applicant is proposing a 929 square foot expansion to a single-family dwelling, resulting in an increase of valuation of 97.2% while maintaining a nonconforming side yard.

<u>Section 4.</u> Based on the foregoing factual findings, the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

- 1. The existing nonconforming side yard to be maintained is not significant or unusual in regards to compatibility with neighboring properties;
- 2. The scale of the proposed expansion is reasonable, and is consistent with planning and zoning requirements for the R-1 zone and does not warrant requiring the current nonconforming condition to be brought into conformance;
- 3. Approval of the expansion/remodel is consistent with the intent and goals of Chapter 17.52 of the Zoning Ordinance;
- 4. The project is Categorically Exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to CEQA guidelines, Section 15301 e(2) with the finding that the project is in an area with available services and not in an environmentally sensitive area.

<u>Section 5</u>. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves a greater than 50% expansion, subject to the following **conditions of approval:** 

- 1. The development and continued use of the property shall be in conformance with submitted plans received and reviewed by the Planning Commission at their meeting of October 15, 2002.
- 2. Prior to issuance of building permits for demolition and construction, the contractor shall verify the structural integrity of the proposed walls to be retained with a structural inspection approved by the Community Development Director, with details

2	incorporated on construction drawings. This may require further additional structural pest inspections and/or an inspection by a structural engineer.
3 4 5	3. Upon issuance of building permits the project shall proceed in compliance with the scope of work outlined on the plans and any further demolition or construction contrary to said plans will result in project delays in order for the City to review project modifications, and may require new plan submittals and Planning Commission review to proceed with construction work.
6 7 8 9	Section 6. Pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedures Section 1094.6, any legal challenge to the decision of the Planning Commission, after a formal appeal to the City Council, must be made within 90 days after the final decision by the City Council.  AYES: NOES: ABSENT:
11	ABSTAIN:
12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATION  I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution P.C. 02- is a true and complete record of the action taken by the Planning Commission of the City of Hermosa Beach, California at their regular meeting of October 15, 2002.
16	Ron Pizer, Chairman Sol Blumenfeld, Secretary
17 18 19	Date nrr624
20	
21	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
2. 7	
	1