

August 7, 2003

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

**Regular Meeting of  
August 19, 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**

Direct staff as deemed appropriate.

**Background**

**PROJECT INFORMATION:**

GENERAL PLAN:	Medium Density Residential
ZONING:	R-2
LOT SIZE:	13,188 Square Feet (3 existing lots)
EXISTING USE:	3 Single-Family Dwellings
PROPOSED SQUARE FOOTAGE:	Rear Units: 2,220 square feet Front Units: 2,017 square feet
PARKING REQUIRED:	14 Standard 4 Guest (plus replacement of 1 on-street space)
PARKING PROVIDED:	14 Standard in garages 5 Guest
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:	Negative Declaration Recommended

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 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> 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.

### **Analysis**

The applicant has submitted revised plans to address some of the issues raised by the Commission. The revised plans indicate a 7-unit detached dwelling unit configuration that is similar to the design initially proposed at the meeting on June 17, 2003.

### **Issues**

The Planning Commission's deliberations on the project as previously proposed focused on several issues that are still relevant to the currently proposed project. The issues, and the applicant's proposed design changes to address the issues, are as follows:

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

The applicant proposes flipping the floor plan of one of the rear units, but otherwise has not changed the exterior appearance of the rear building elevations along the alley.

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

The new project design complies with all setback requirements. A setback of 7.5 feet is provided on 20<sup>th</sup> Street, and a 5-foot setback is provided along the alley to comply with zoning requirements for side yard setbacks. Staff has examined the prevailing setback in the neighborhood to the east along 20<sup>th</sup> Street, which is exclusively R-1 zoned, and the setback is approximately 10 feet. Unlike the majority of condominium cases that have a prevailing setback issue where the surrounding neighborhood shares the same zone, the proposed project does not share the same zoning as the rest of the properties along 20<sup>th</sup> Street. Also, the setback along 20<sup>th</sup> Street for the existing residence is 6.75 feet. Staff has also re-examined the prevailing setback issue for the neighborhood to the east along 20<sup>th</sup> Street in regards to required open space. If the Commission requires the applicant to provide a 10-foot front setback on 20<sup>th</sup> 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 dimension required for the proposed on-site parking configuration is 25 feet. The revised site plan indicate a 25-foot turning radius for the alley units and a 29-foot turning radius for the PCH units, which meets the turning radius requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. However, the section drawings shown on the revised plans indicate a 22-foot turning radius for the alley units. Staff believes the section drawings can be changed as a Condition of Approval.

#### **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 14.25 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. However, the City has typically required a driveway with a minimum width of 18 feet for condominium projects with greater than 5 units.

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

The applicant proposes to put two small (4-foot wide by 6-foot deep) trash areas adjacent to the driveway in the rear yard area of the northernmost units. Given the extra amount of common open

space provided on the site plan, the proposed locations of the trash enclosures are adequate. With the new trash enclosure configuration as shown, a better mixture of common open space areas are provided. Now a third common open space area is provided in the separation between the two innermost alley units, which allows for better access to common open space for the alley units in comparison to the previously proposed plans. However, Staff thinks the common trash areas are not large enough for the disposal needs of all 7 units and recommends that each unit also have a private trash storage area as well. Each of the 4 rear units has space available in the proposed garages for trash storage, but the front units do not have proposed individual trash areas.

Staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the completed plans provide a trellis structure to cover each of the proposed exterior trash enclosures.

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 site plan notes the use of ‘Turf Cell’ pervious paving product for the proposed guest parking areas, but not for the driveway. 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

Pursuant to Section 17.12.050 (Lot Area Per Dwelling Unit) of the Zoning Ordinance, the revised plan proposes the construction of 7 units based on the density requirement that the minimum lot area per dwelling unit shall be not less than 1,750 square feet for the R-2 zone. The Commission has discussed reducing the dwelling unit density for the project from 7 units to 6 units. If the Commission has concerns regarding environmental or zoning issues relating to the density of the proposed project, the Commission has the authority to reduce the density as a constraint on development.

**Zoning Requirements**

The revised project generally complies with the R-2 requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The lot coverage calculates to be 58%, which is under the 65% maximum allowable. All the buildings have the required 6-foot building separation for detached dwelling units.

The buildings are designed to comply with the 30’ maximum height limit for the R-2 zone. Construction of the new buildings as revised will still result in a higher building profile than the existing one-story single-family dwellings, and will modify or obstruct views from properties to the east. The applicant has provided a revised view analysis that shows the proposed buildings will still significantly impact the views from two properties immediately to the east. Based on staff’s previous review and massing study of the project configuration, the currently proposed detached building configuration provides more view corridors than a configuration using larger buildings with attached units.

Sufficient open space is supplied for each unit and for the total project. A substantial portion of the required private open space for each unit is provided directly accessible to second story living areas (200 square feet for the rear units and 245 square feet for the front units) with the balance of open

space provided on roof decks. Additional yard area along the 20<sup>th</sup> Street frontage and 3 common open space areas (located between each of the Pacific Coast Highway frontage units and between the two innermost alley units), containing a total of 980 square feet, are provided to comply with the requirement for an additional 100 square feet of “common recreation” area per unit for projects of 5 or more units.

Substantial landscaping is provided, as shown in the landscape plan. This includes substantial landscaping on the street frontages, and in the rear yard and common open space areas, with 15 king palms and 12 “fruitless” olive trees. However, the landscaping plan does not specifically identify which trees will be 36-inch box trees. Staff recommends that this information be provided on a more detailed landscaping plan indicating the quantity, type and spacing of the proposed planting.

Based on the Commission’s direction for this item, staff will return with a resolution at the next meeting.

CONCUR:

---

Scott Lunceford  
Planning Associate

---

Sol Blumenfeld, Director  
Community Development Department

Attachments

1. Revised Height Calculations

Con2006 (03-4) final