Honorable Chairman and Members of the
Regular Meeting of Hermosa Beach Planning Commission June 15, 2004

SUBJECT: NONCONFORMING REMODEL 04-4
LOCATION: $21833^{\mathrm{RD}}$ STREET

APPLICANT: STEVE MIZUKI<br>$21833^{\text {RD }}$ STREET<br>HERMOSA BEACH, CA 90254<br>REQUESTS: ADDITION AND REMODEL TO AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITH NONCONFORMING FIREPLACE ENCROACHMENT, AND FRONT AND SIDE YARDS RESULTING IN A GREATER THAN 50\% INCREASE IN VALUATION AND EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING NONCONFORMING SIDE YARD

## Recommendation

To approve the expansion subject to the conditions in the attached resolution.

## Background

LOT SIZE 2,475 square feet
EXISTING FLOOR AREA
PROPOSED ADDITION

PERCENT INCREASE IN VALUATION
ZONING
GENERAL PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

1,294 square feet
831 square feet
448 square feet deck
73.1 \%

R-2
Medium Density Residential
Categorically Exempt

The existing one-story dwelling was constructed in 1922. The dwelling is nonconforming to current garage setback, front and side yard standards, fireplace encroachment requirements, and parking requirements as only 1 parking space is currently provided. The existing front yard is 1.5 feet rather than the required 5 feet, the westerly and easterly side yards are 2.7 (at the garage) and 2.4 feet (respectively) rather than the required 3 feet, the existing fireplace is 1.7 feet from the westerly property line and encroaches closer to the westerly property line than the 30 inches allowable, and the garage is setback 2.3 feet from the alley rather than the distance required to provide the minimum turning radius for a 15 foot wide alley pursuant to Section 17.44 .090 of the Zone Code. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing garage rebuild a new one to provide the required 2 standard parking spaces and one guest parking space, and comply with the turning radius and garage setback requirements so that only the front and side yard nonconformities will remain.

The front entry of the dwelling takes access from an off-site walkway on an adjacent commercial property. If the adjacent commercial property were to be redeveloped in the future utilizing the area
currently occupied by the walkway between the commercial building and the common property line, then access to the front entry would be eliminated along the $33^{\text {rd }}$ Street frontage. Instead access to the front entry would only be taken from the rear of the lot along the west side yard. The access along the west side yard would have a width of 3.35 feet, except where the nonconforming fireplace encroaches into the side yard.

## Analysis

Chapter 17.52 of the Zoning Ordinance requires Planning Commission approval when an expansion/remodel of a nonconforming building exceeds $50 \%$. Pursuant to Section 17.52.030.B (Expansion, Remodeling, and Alteration of Nonconforming Buildings) of the Zoning Ordinance, existing nonconforming side yards may be continued and extended subject to Planning Commission approval. The applicant is proposing to construct an addition of 831 square feet on the basement and first and second floors, and deck additions on the first and second floors totaling 448 square feet. The proposed addition complies with the 30 -foot height limit. Also, the existing deficient easterly side yard will be continued 9.3 feet on the second story for a closet expansion. The project also entails remodeling 461 square feet of existing livable floor area. The expansion will increase the living area of the house from 1,294 square feet to 2,125 square feet. The expansion and remodel results in a $73.1 \%$ increase in valuation.

The proposal generally conforms to planning and zoning requirements, except the proposed guest parking space is 21.75 feet long instead of the required length of 22 feet. Pursuant to Section 17.44.100, Guest parking spaces situated parallel to alleys and located behind garage doors with a 9 -foot setback shall have a minimum length of 22 feet. Staff believes this problem can be resolved as a Condition of Approval.

Planning staff issued a memo to both the Building Division of the Community Development Department and the Public Works Department for review of the subject project. The comments provided by the Building Division and Public Works Department will not significantly affect the proposed project design.

Based on visual inspection by staff, the nonconforming front and side yards are not unusual conditions given the age of the subject dwelling, and the amount of expansion is moderate. The project is therefore consistent with Chapter 17.52 of the Hermosa Beach Zone Code.

## CONCUR:

Scott Lunceford<br>Planning Associate

Sol Blumenfeld, Director<br>Community Development Department<br>Attachments<br>1. Proposed Resolution<br>2. Location Map<br>3. Photographs<br>4. Zoning Checklist \& Height Calculation<br>5. Valuation Worksheet
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$21833^{\text {RD }}$ STREET

## P.C.RESOLUTION NO. 04-

## A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH, CALIFORNIA APPROVING AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITH NONCONFORMING FIREPLACE ENCROACHMENT, AND FRONT AND SIDE YARDS RESULTING IN A GREATER THAN 50\% INCREASE IN VALUATION AND EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING NONCONFORMING SIDE YARD AT $21833^{\text {RD }}$ STREET

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

Section 1. An application was filed by Steve Mizuki, owner of real property located at 218 $33^{\text {rd }}$ Street, requesting an addition to an existing nonconforming single-family residence, which results in a greater than $50 \%$ increase in valuation and extends an existing nonconforming side yard, pursuant to Chapter 17.52 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 2. The Planning Commission conducted a hearing to consider the application on June 15, 2004, at which testimony and evidence, both written and oral, were presented to and considered by the Planning Commission.

Section 3. Based on the evidence received at the public hearing, the Planning Commission makes the following factual findings:

1. The applicant is proposing an 831 square foot livable floor area expansion of an existing 82-year-old single-family dwelling with nonconforming front and side yards, resulting in an increase of valuation of $73.1 \%$ while extending a less than required side yard setback.

Section 4. Based on the foregoing factual findings, the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

1. The existing nonconformities are not severe or unusual.
2. The scale of the proposed expansion is reasonable, and is consistent with planning and zoning requirements for the R-2 zone and does not warrant requiring the current nonconforming side yard be brought into conformance;
3. Approval of the expansion 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.

Section 5. Based on the foregoing, the Planning Commission hereby approves an extension of a nonconforming side yard, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

1. The project shall be consistent with submitted plans. Modifications to the plan not involving any further expansion shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
a) The roof plan shall be revised to label all property corner points.
b) The proposed guest parking shall be 22 feet long by 9 feet wide.
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 incorporated on construction drawings. This may require further additional structural pest inspections and/or an inspection by a structural engineer.
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.

VOTE: AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

## CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution P.C. 04- 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 June 15, 2004.

