

July 9, 2003

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

**Regular Meeting of
July 15, 2003**

CONTINUED FROM THE MEETING OF JUNE 17, 2003

SUBJECT: CONDOMINIUM 03-4
PRECISE DEVELOPMENT PLAN 03-5
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP #54429

LOCATION: 2006-24 PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY

APPLICANT: 2024 PCH, HB, LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
C/O NORMAN J. LEBEAU, III
502 ANDERSON
MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266

REQUEST: TO ALLOW A SEVEN-UNIT CONDOMINIUM PROJECT

Recommendations

Continue the item to allow the applicant time to submit completed plans.

Background

At the June 17, 2003 meeting the Planning Commission considered the proposed development of a 7-unit condominium complex on the east side of PCH between 20th and 21st Streets. The Commission continued the hearing on the project and requested the applicant revise the proposed plans to change and enhance the exterior appearance of the building elevations on the alley side, add additional front yard setback to the project for neighborhood consistency, provide adequate turning radius dimensions to ensure use of on-site parking, add guest parking to compensate for the lost on-street parking caused by a proposed curb cut, change the trash area to permit greater open space and cover it with a trellis structure, ensure tree planting will not exceed the height of the buildings, use pervious paving for driveway and parking areas, and provide a house count per block face with an estimate of the prevailing front yard setback. The Commission also discussed the possibility of reducing the density of the proposed project from 7 units down to 6 units.

As a result of the Commission direction, the applicant proposes three separate design options to address the revisions the Planning Commission requested. However, these design options are not completed plan sets, but rather site plans that represent a general overview of the issues the applicant wants the Commission to discuss prior to returning to the Commission with completed plans.

Analysis

The applicant has submitted three preliminary site plans as options to address the issues raised by the Commission. Of the three options, the applicant proposes Option "B" as the most desired design to develop. Staff's main analysis is focused on Option "B" only, with the other two options being considered as alternatives.

Issues

The Planning Commission's deliberations focused on the following issues:

1. Change and enhance the exterior appearance of the building elevations on the alley side

The applicant proposes to change and enhance the exterior appearance of the building elevations on the alley side by combining the four units off the alley into two buildings and flipping the floor plans to provide design symmetry on the exterior elevations.

2. Add additional front yard setback to the project for neighborhood consistency

The new project design complies with all setback requirements. A 10-foot setback is provided on 20th Street, consistent with Commission policy on neighborhood consistency, and a 5-foot setback is provided along the alley to comply with zoning requirements for side yard setbacks. Staff has also re-examined the prevailing setback issue for the neighborhood to the east along 20th Street, which is exclusively R-1 zoned with an approximate 10-foot front setback, in regards to required open space. If the Commission requires the applicant to provide a 10-foot front setback on 20th Street instead of the code required 5-foot setback, then the applicant can use the excess setback as part of the required common open space.

3. Provide adequate turning radius dimensions to ensure use of on-site parking

The turning radius dimensions are not shown on the preliminary site plan. Staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the completed plans provide adequate turning radius dimensions for off-street parking.

4. Add guest parking to compensate for the lost on-street parking caused by a proposed curb cut

The applicant has reduced the size of the driveway curb cut from 18 feet to 12 feet to address the loss of on-street parking. Though this will eliminate the possibility of simultaneous ingress and egress of vehicles using the driveway, the driveway exceeds the minimum driveway width of 9 feet, and as designed the driveway will not affect the required turning radius dimensions for on-site parking.

5. Change the trash enclosure to permit greater open space and cover it with a trellis structure

Though noted on the preliminary site plan as common open space, the applicant proposes to put the trash area between the northernmost and middle units facing PCH. Given the extra amount of common open space provided on the site plan, the proposed location of the trash enclosure is adequate. Staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the completed plans provide a trellis structure to cover the proposed trash enclosure.

With the new building configuration on preliminary site plan for Option "B" as shown, a better mixture of common open space areas are provided. Now a common open space area is in the separation between every building, which allows for better access to common open space for every unit in comparison to the previously proposed plans.

6. Ensure tree planting will not exceed the height of the buildings

Though 36-inch box trees are usually less than 30 feet in height when first planted, the Planning Commission could require mandatory tree trimming to limit the future height of any proposed trees.

7. Use pervious paving for driveway and parking areas

The preliminary site plan does not note pervious paving for the proposed driveway and parking areas. Rather than require a specific pervious paving product, staff recommends that the applicant be allowed to choose from the range of pervious paving products available.

8. Reduce the density of the proposed project from 7 units down to 6 units

The Commission has discussed reducing the dwelling unit density for the project from 7 units to 6 units. The Commission has the authority to reduce the density, but the City Attorney has advised that it must base its decision on environmental or zoning issues as a constraint on development.

Alternatives

Option "A" is substantially similar to the previously proposed design but with increased front and side setbacks to comply with zoning and Commission requirements, and a reduced driveway curb cut to address the loss of on-street parking. Otherwise, option "A" does not address the other concerns noted by the Commission at the June 17, 2003 meeting.

Option "C" is similar to option "B" except that the applicant is considering phasing the construction of the proposed 7 units as a 5-unit project and a 2-unit project on two separate lots. The applicant is currently trying to determine the feasibility of phasing the project.

CONCUR:

Scott Lunceford
Planning Assistant

Sol Blumenfeld, Director
Community Development Department

Con2006 (03-4) cont.