Honorable Chairman and Members of the Hermosa Beach Planning Commission

Regular Meeting of June 17, 2003

SUBJECT:	HEIGHT EXCEPTION 03-1 CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 20, 2003 MEETING
LOCATION:	321 MONTEREY AVENUE
APPLICANT:	DENNIS NIVENS
REQUEST:	A HEIGHT EXCEPTION TO 35 FEET, ABOVE THE STANDARD MAXIMUM OF 30 FEET, IN ORDER TO ALLOW A NEW SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING

Recommendation

Approve the request by adopting the attached resolution or direct staff as deemed appropriate.

Background

At the May 20, 2003 meeting the Planning Commission continued the request to allow full Commission review of the project. At this time, the applicant has not provided any further information regarding the request.

Analysis:

Please refer to the attached May 20, 2003 staff report for the analysis of the project.

Based on the analysis presented in the previous staff report and the hearing conducted at the previous Commission meeting, the following alternative actions are available:

- 1. Approve the height exception as submitted.
- 2. Approve a height exception to allow the roof deck to extend to a height of 33 feet at its critical point ("CP1" on the plans), but deny the exception for the remainder of the building, i.e. the front portion with the pitched roof.
- 3. Deny the height exception.

The Commission may adopt the attached resolution approving the request or staff will return with an alternative resolution for adoption at the next Commission meeting.

Sol Blumenfeld, Director Community Development Department

<u>Attachment</u> May 20 Staff Report with attachments

		P.C. RESOLUTION 03-	
1		r.c. RESOLUTION 03-	
2		RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY F HERMOSA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A HEIGHT	
3	E N	XCEPTION FOR A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AT 321 IONTEREY BOULEVARD, LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THE	
4	E	ASTERLY 50 FEET OF LOT 19, TRACT 1073.	
5	The Planni	ng Commission of the City of Hermosa Beach does hereby resolve and order as follows:	
6 7 8	Section 1. An application was filed by Dennis Nivens, owner of property located at 321 Monterey Boulevard, seeking approval of a height exception to allow a proposed single family residence to extend above the 30-foot height limitation applicable to the property.		
9	Se	ction 2. The Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing to consider the	
10	subject application on May 20, and June 17 2003, at which testimony and evidence, both written and oral, was presented to and considered by the Planning Commission.		
11	orai, was p	resented to and considered by the Flamming Commission.	
12	the following factual findings:		
13	1	The applicant is proposing to demolich the ovisting residential building on the property and	
14 15	1.	The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing residential building on the property and construct a new single family dwelling in the R-3 District which extends above the 30-foot height limitation for the District.	
16			
17	2.	The subject property contains 1500 square feet, is designated High Density Residential on the General Plan Map, and is zoned R-3 on the Zoning Map.	
18	Se	ction 4. Based on the foregoing factual findings, its review of the application, and submitted	
19 20	written and	d oral testimony, the Planning Commission makes the following findings pertaining to the for a Height Exception:	
21	1		
22	1.	surrounding structures, which are already constructed above thirty (30) feet in height. Said	
23		structures already in excess of thirty (30) feet would otherwise significantly obstruct the proposed project's view potential;	
24	2	The proposed development is located between and adjacent to two or more continuous	
25	2.	The proposed development is located between, and adjacent to, two or more contiguous lots with buildings constructed in excess of the thirty (30) foot height limit;	
26	3.	The structural extension above thirty (30) feet will not adversely impact the available views,	
27		and access to sunlight and air of adjacent and surrounding properties;	
28 29	4.	The planning commission has reviewed the following design features of the portion of the building above thirty (30) feet in determining if an exception should be granted:	
		1	

1	a. The style and pitch of the roof;	
2	b. The mass and bulk of the proposed structure above thirty (30) feet (in order to minimize bulk of the upper floor),	
3	c. The architectural appearance, as exhibited by the type, style, and shape of the	
4	structure and the proposed exterior materials.	
5	5. The project is Categorically Exempt from the requirement for an environmental assessment	
6	pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15303, Class 3(a): New Construction of Single Family Residences and 15305, Class 5: Minor Changes in Land	
7	Use Limitations, because the application is for an exception to building height limitations in	
8	order to allow construction of a single family residence	
9	Section 5. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves the subject	
10	Height Exception, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:	
11	1. The development and continued use of the property shall be in conformance with	
12	submitted plans received and reviewed by the Commission at their meeting of May 20, 2003. Any minor modification shall be reviewed and may be approved by the	
13	Community Development Director.	
14 15	2. The maximum height of the building shall be 35-feet, with height to be determined	
16	based on a topographical survey which specifically identifies the corner point elevations.	
17		
18	3. Two copies of final construction plans, including site, elevation and floor plans, which are consistent with the Conditions of Approval of this Conditional Use Permit, shall be	
19	reviewed and approved by the Planning Division for consistency with Planning	
20	Commission approved plans prior to the submittal to the Building Division for plan check.	
21		
22	4. This Height Exception shall be null and void twelve (12) months from the date of approval unless a building permit has been obtained.	
23	Each of the above conditions is separately enforced, and if one of the conditions of approval is found to	
24	be invalid by a court of law, all the other conditions shall remain valid and enforceable.	
25	The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, it agents, officers, and employees from	
26	any claim, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employee to attack, set aside,	
27	void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of the State Government Code. The City shall promptly notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and	
28	the City shall cooperate fully in the defense. If the City fails to promptly notify the permittee of any claim,	
29	action or proceeding, or if the City fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the permittee shall no thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the City.	
	2	

1	The permittee shall reimburse the C	City for any court and attorney's fees which the City may be required	
2	to pay as a result of any claim or action brought against the City because of this grant. Although the permittee is the real party in interest in an action, the City may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own		
3	expense in the defense of the action, but such participation shall not relieve the permittee of any		
4			
5	Pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure 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.		
6			
7	VOTE: AYES:		
8	ABSTAIN		
9	ABSENT:	·	
10		CERTIFICATION	
11 12	I hereby certify the foregoing Resol	lution P.C. No. 03- is a true and complete record of the action	
12	June 17, 2002	of the City of Hermosa Beach, California at their regular meeting of	
13			
15			
16	Peter Hoffman, Chairman	Sol Blumenfeld, Secretary	
17		Sof Blanchick, Secteury	
18	June 17, 2003		
18 19	June 17, 2003 Date		
	June 17, 2003 Date	1.doc	
19	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	1.doc	
19 20	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
19 20 21	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
19 20 21 22	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
19 20 21 22 23	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
19 20 21 22 23 24	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	-1.doc	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	1.doc	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 	June 17, 2003 Date F:\B95\CD\PC\2003\05-20-03\NivensReso03-	1.doc	