

**CITY OF MONTEBELLO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 16, 2020

Planning Commission meets at 6:30 p.m., on the day scheduled in City Hall Council Chambers

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

6:40 P.M. by Chair Mooradian

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Chair Mooradian, Vice-Chair Aliksanian, Commissioner Briseno, Commissioner Lomeli, and Commissioner Ramirez

Absent: None

Also present:

Director of Planning and Community Development – Joseph Palombi

Planning Commission Legal Counsel – Gloria Ramirez

Staff - Maria Roman, Josephine Pham, and Michael Donovan

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Aliksanian

4. ANNUAL REORGANIZATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Director Palombi – We have the annual reorganization. We have prepared a report that outlines the reorganization of today's meeting and rules and guidelines the commission can either direct Staff to refine or adopt. These have been prepared by our City attorney and incorporated into the staff report.

Chair Mooradian – I went through the item in regards to the nominating process, the recommendation and nomination. After reviewing that, I think that I would recommend following the process of the Mayor and the Mayor Pro Tem and their appointee be the Chair and the Vice-Chair unless if they refuse their nomination. Then we can do another nomination, that would be my recommendation.

Director Palombi - Based on the Chairs recommendation, I will open nomination for the position of Chair of the Commission. I will now allow the commission to make the nomination.

Chair Mooradian – I nominate Natalia Lomeli as Chair.

Commissioner Briseno: I'll second that.

Director Palombi – Commissioner Lomeli, you can either accept or decline the nomination.

Commissioner Lomeli - I accept.

MOTION: Commissioner Mooradian motions to nominate Commissioner Lomeli as Chair

SECOND: Commissioner Briseno

ACTION: 5-0-0-0

Director Palombi – We will now open the nomination for Vice-Chair.

Chair Mooradian - I will nominate Alexandra Briseno as Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Ramirez - I will second.

Director Palombi - Commissioner Briseno, do you accept or decline this nomination.

Commissioner Briseno – I accept the nomination.

MOTION: Commissioner Mooradian motions to nominate Commissioner Briseno as Vice Chair

SECOND: Commissioner Ramirez

ACTION: 5-0-0-0

Director Palombi - This reorganization will take effect next meeting.

Chair Mooradian - Do we have to vote on this new process since we are officially creating a process for this system?

Legal Counsel Ramirez – I presented a draft of the proposed rules and resolution. It seems that you all have decided to adopt, which was option 1 in the recommendation. I would have to go back and revise the proposed rules. I would recommend that motion be passed directing Staff to revise the rules to reflect what was adopted today.

Chair Mooradian- When you say revised, I thought we selected option 1?

Legal Counsel Ramirez – Correct, but the rules that are written, the nomination process, are still set up where we have all three options, but if we are going to stick to option one, we would make it clear that's how we are going to move forward.

Director Palombi – We can memorialize that today correct?

Legal Counsel Ramirez – Correct, revise, and reflect today.

Chair Mooradian – It will follow Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem, and if they deny, we do an election. If they are not able to serve the full term, we still do an election, correct?

Legal Counsel Ramirez – Correct.

MOTION: Commissioner Mooradian motions to adopt annual reorganization
SECOND: Commissioner Lomeli
ACTION: 5-0-0-0

5. PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY –CORRECTION TO AGENDA
NONE

6. STATEMENT OF PUBLIC ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Speakers wishing to address the Planning Commission were encouraged to call in and/or email per the Governor's Executive Order No. N- 29-20, those interested in making public comments, were allowed to call on Tuesday, June 16, 2020 between 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. at (323) 887-1200, ext. 493. Staff completed public comment cards in the order received. The public will be called during the Planning Commission meeting that begins at 6:30 p.m. the exact call back time is not predictable due to the nature of the Planning Commission agenda. As a result, you must be available until the end of the meeting to receive a live call from Staff during the meeting. In addition, the City has created an email address pcpubliccomment@cityofmontebello.com where the public can submit public comments from 4:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 16, 2020. These questions will be read out loud and submitted for the record. The email address for Planning Commission meetings can be located on the City's webpage under <https://www.cityofmontebello.com/planning-commission-meeting.html>.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. May 19, 2020 – Approved w/ corrections.

8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS ON ITEMS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST

None

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Conditional Use Permit (CUP 01-20/ENV 04-20-CE)

A Conditional Use Permit to allow construction and operations of a new automated carwash located at 8016 Slauson Avenue.

Director Palombi – This item is for a conditional use permit from the Applicant Cenmill, Inc. at 8016 Slauson Avenue, and we have Josephine Pham, our associate planner, presenting.

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) - Good evening, Chair Mooradian, and members of the Planning Commission. I shall be presenting the project submittal for Conditional Use Permit 01-20 for an Automated Express Carwash at 8016 Slauson Avenue. 8016 Slauson is an existing underutilized vacant lot located towards the southernmost corner of Montebello, generally located east of Slauson Avenue and Telegraph Road. The subject property is east of the i-5 freeway with a huge lot area of approximately 26,000 square feet or 0.6 acres. The new building area shall be approximately 4,500 square feet, which is 17% lot coverage well under the maximum ratio of 2:1. As a result, the site for the proposed use is adequate in size and shape. The subject property is located in the M-2, Heavy Manufacturing, zone. The immediate surrounding uses are heavy manufacturing and compatible with the Industrial designated land use and will not have an adverse impact on adjacent or abutting properties. The new automated carwash with self-service vacuum stations proposes hours of operations from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. daily, with expanded hours through the summer months from May to July to 8 p.m. instead of 7 p.m. The Applicant has stated there will be an adequate amount of staffing throughout the day with more employees during the summer months. Since the business will be new, they would have to adjust this amount daily as operations continue. As of now, the Applicant has forecasted that there will be 5 or 6 at peak usage (weekends and holidays) and at other times, can be as low as three employees.

In November 2017, Planning Commission approved Lot Line Adjustment 01-17. This item permitted a realignment of lot lines to adjust the square

footage of three properties for new development: 8016 Slauson, 8000 Slauson Avenue, 7895 Telegraph. On November 2019, the Applicant filed their CUP to construct the new carwash.

Here is the site plan and circulation path. Setbacks are compliant to our Development Standards, and parking is adequate as the 4,500 square foot building requires 11 off-street parking spaces. There will be 22 vacuum parking stalls, including ADA Parking, Clean Air Vehicle stalls, and Electric Vehicles. Through observation of similar car wash uses within the City having busier than expected car queuing, Staff requested a Traffic Impact Study, which is attached to your packet. Queuing allows for approximately 13 cars before entering one at a time into the Car Wash. Two separate access points that provide egress and ingress from Slauson Avenue and Bluff Road. 2-3 minute washing period and 6-7 minutes optional self-service vacuuming which processes vehicles in under 10 minutes. The peak hour of operation on weekdays and weekends is expected to be between 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., which does not coincide with the adjacent street typical AM & PM peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.). Any conflicts between entering/exiting vehicles on Slauson Avenue left-turn access exiting the car wash may need to be considered. Staff will work with Public Works to come up with a solution for that left turn access on Slauson Avenue going southbound. The Planning Commission can reevaluate this option after the car wash is in operation for a year if desired. Staff has also included Condition of Approval #28 to provide more staffing during Grand Openings, Special Promotions, and other similar events to ensure that the traffic flow leading into the carwash tunnel is continuous and does not encroach into Slauson Avenue.

Here is the Conceptual Proposal. The building shall be monochromatic with various gray and white shades with a blue accent wall depicted on the plans. The proposal is consistent with the surrounding industrial properties and uses. Here are the East and West Elevations, which feature the same elements as the South Elevation. The West Elevation is the view of the building directly facing Slauson Avenue. As CUP 01-20 is considered a "project" per CEQA definition, the project is categorically exempt per Class 32 of Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Staff sent out a 20-Day Public Hearing Notice published in the Whittier Daily News and mailed all owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius on March 7, 2020. To this date, Staff has not received any public comments regarding this project.

Staff consulted with various departments and had a few comments from Building and Safety and Public Works. These comments were more technical conditions about construction and were added to the proposed Resolution. With that, Staff recommends the approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 01-20. If there are any other questions, I will be happy to answer them, and the Applicant will be available to answer them as well.

Chair Mooradian - I have a question regarding the resolution, under section 5, it starts with 21, 22, 23 and then it goes to 4, 5, is that correct? I'm bringing this up because if we're looking through these numbers, there are two fours, two fives, and I want to make sure that is not the case, and if we are making comments, there are duplicates.

Director Palombi - The hardcopy before us is fine, and it may have been a glitch.

Chair Mooradian - The reason I am asking is because there was a comment made on item number 28, if there is a traffic issue, that we make sure that is enough coverage of staffing, correct? And that is condition 28, correct?

Director Palombi - That is correct.

Chair Mooradian - Can we confirm with the commissioners if there is any conflict with this project.

Commissioner Lomeli - I don't have any conflict.

Commissioner Aliksonian - None.

Commissioner Briseno - I don't either.

Commissioner Ramirez - I don't.

Chair Mooradian - I have no conflict either. Can we have the Applicant tell us about the project?

Director Palombi - Mr. Golestian, can we please have you discuss your proposed project a bit?

Armen Gevorkyan (Owner) - This is a conveyer automated self-serve car wash. The customers stay in their vehicles. They get on the conveyer with the assistance of an employee. It washes the car, dries the car, and as they are exiting, they have the option to use the self-serve vacuum, exit, and be on their way. It's a quick way to wash the car.

Chair Mooradian - Are there any questions from the commissioners?

Commissioner Briseno – So your facility is going to have 24 vehicles that can be vacuuming in the vacuuming drying area, plus 24 other vehicles that can be accommodated, some are waiting to be washed, and others are being washed? So you'll be able to accommodate about 46 vehicles on the site, is that right?

Artem Golestian (Applicant) - Not exactly, when people are vacuuming, they are given 5 minutes, providing adequate time for the next car to come in to vacuum. When one car is coming in to vacuum, there is one car leaving, so there is never a backup with the numbers that we have as far as parking and amount of queuing and tunnels. The equipment that we are using inside the conveyer in the tunnel is the top of the line, most recent technology. It washes, dries, and polishes it's an all in one within that tunnel system. So the car leaves dry, and there is no drying to do. All they would need to do is vacuum the interior and be on their way.

Commissioner Briseno – I want to compliment that you have a good amount of vehicles that you can accommodate. Hopefully, that will not cause traffic.

Commissioner Lomeli – You mentioned that it was going to be an automated service. Are you going to have employees onsite monitoring the timing and traffic towards the bigger street on Slauson?

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – There will be two employees before people enter the carwash. There will be two at the exit, and there will be 1 in the parking area, and 99% of the time, these employees are ensuring a smooth operation. People need guidance, such as pulling forward, waiting; they are directing the whole operation.

Commissioner Ramirez – Looking at the traffic on the site plan, it was mentioned that there is access from Slauson and Bluff. Typically, the way the circulation will happen is that someone will enter on Slauson, and per the burgundy arrows, go into a line queue. When exiting the building, the blue arrows indicate that they will exit or park and vacuum. My question is, the access from Bluff, will that be one way or two way because if someone enters through Slauson by mistake and does not want to get their car washed, can they exit through Bluff?

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – Absolutely and what we are going to encourage with all our customers, is once they are done using our facility, that they exit through Bluff.

Commissioner Ramirez – I'm okay with that. My second question was on the landscape plan. You're using some plants listed on the California do not plant list because they are listed in the invasive plant inventory. The one that I saw was the Mexican Fan Palm. I would advise to take off that Mexican Fan Palm and replace it with a different type of drought-tolerant plant or California Native Tree. The other one listed is the Mexican Feather Grass. If you drive along Telegraph on the side, you will see how invasive these plants get when planted in random areas. I would advise you to replace those plants with something else that is not on the invasive list.

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – We will look into that and make sure that pick something that is not on that list.

Commissioner Ramirez – That would be great.

Chair Mooradian – I have a question. Have you ever owned this type of business before, or is this your first?

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – The owner of the business currently owns one and owned three before that, and I have designed and built more than a dozen.

Chair Mooradian – Traffic was my only concern as people try to enter. There is a self-service car wash on Washington currently, and sometimes that gets backed up, people are trying to enter, but there's residential there as well. I see all industrial there and viewed the traffic study. That is not an issue, correct?

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – Correct.

Commissioner Aliksonian – I have a question. I've been looking at property profiles, and this is very similar in property size to the one on Washington that we know causes a lot of traffic. The one on Washington only has one entrance and double the exit, but this is also very similar to the one in Pico Rivera on 8029 Whittier Blvd. That one is similar in size and capacity, and I frequent that one more often than the one on Washington. On the weekends, you can't even drive on Washington Blvd. or Montebello Blvd. This one has a very similar setup, has the same problem. I know there is a traffic study that says there won't be any problems, but there was also a traffic study for the Monterey Park Market Place that said there wouldn't be any problem either, and that was found to be false during the first two weeks. These are very similar, so what can we do if we will be causing more traffic.

Director Palombi – We looked at this location as being unique. We did ask the Applicant to submit a traffic report to support traffic impacts. We can add a condition to come back for compliance review within a year to see if it is functioning properly or if additional mitigation measures need to be incorporated. That would be up to the commission.

Commissioner Aliksonian – Was there nothing like that done to the Washington one? They are still operating, and I can't even drive down the street.

Director Palombi – We did discuss that initially when this application came before us. We used the Washington site because it is within the City of Montebello as sort of a model of what we don't want to do. We were very careful as to how we approached this particular location. I don't believe a traffic study was done for the Washington facility. We wanted to ensure that we addressed this concern up front, which is why we require the traffic study.

Commissioner Aliksonian – I'm going to restate my concern with the traffic study because there are only two lanes on Slauson. If you block one lane because of the queue, that leaves you with one lane, that is better than the zero lanes that you're left with on Montebello Blvd. That is one west lane that you'll have on Washington Boulevard. At least on Washington, you'll have two lanes going westbound when there is traffic built up. This could bring Slauson Boulevard down to a halt. If this is approved, we will not tell the business owners in a year from now that the traffic study wasn't right and then shut down their business, which is not going to happen. So how do we ensure that we are not going to have this situation?

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – The biggest difference between this location and the one on Washington is that here we have double the capacity to expect cars. The conveyer in the tunnel will never reach the capacity to wash thousands of cars in a day, we will never reach that. The issue with backing traffic into the street is because of the payment system, and here we have double the capacity than Washington.

Commissioner Aliksonian – I understand. The carwash in Whittier that is about 2 miles away is very similar in terms of the intake and output of this system. The address is 8629 Whittier Boulevard in Pico Rivera. It has two lanes going in and just as many drying stations. That also has two points of entry and exits, two lanes and they never really run into a problem because like you said because it's the main tunnel and the payment and queue of getting in. They don't have problems with that either. Based on the property detail, it's about the same size. I'm trying to understand what would differentiate this location from that one.

Artem Golestian (Applicant) – I think the other thing is that we have a lot of space within the property itself. If let's say we were to have a half-hour to an hour of

back up for any reason, we can always use the space within the property to organize or ask customers to come back later. It's a matter of managing the carwash. We should never let people stop on the street. That happens to some popular places. I think it's just bad management.

Commissioner Aliksonian - Of course, but some cities don't allow things like that to happen. We can't just take the word of the owner of turning people away. I don't think that business owners will turn business away. I just don't think anyone has an answer to my question.

Director Palombi – I think the answer is that we put a condition in the resolution before you today for a plan compliance review to see how the facility is operating. If there is a backup onto Slauson during peak hours, they would be limited to their capacity. Those are things that we can do and enforce through code enforcement if we receive complaints. These things can be addressed, and they would be conditioned in their approval. They would have to come back in a year and show that they are demonstrating compliance and add that as a continuing condition that they would have to do annually or for the number of years you decide. Those are some of the remedies that we use in other similar situations. But to answer the questions, there is no way to tell that it is going to be a perfect scenario, and it may not be, you may be right.

Chair Mooradian – You mentioned In-n-Out, that is a great example. You see that with In-n-Out everywhere. It generates a lot of revenue, but it also causes a lot of traffic issues. I understand entirely what Commissioner Aliksonian is saying. Still, I also believe that having the conditions allows the City to have the ability to enforce penalties, whether by citations or require them to reassess their hours. Still, we must allow this business to function to know whether it's going to cause traffic or not. The traffic study was done. We have to rely on an expert saying that it shouldn't be an issue, but having this in the resolution gives us the power to enforce the negative impacts that arise after we've allowed the business to flourish.

MOTION: Commissioner Lomeli motions to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow construction and operations of a new automated carwash located at 8016 Slauson Avenue with the comments made regarding the plants and to include a condition to revisit within a year.

SECOND: Commissioner Ramirez

ACTION: 4-1-0-0 (Aliksonian)

B. Site Plan Review (SPR 01-20/ENV 105-20-CE)

A Site Plan Review to allow the construction of a new duplex with an attached 4-car garage and a new detached single-family residence with an attached 2-car garage at 217 E. Victoria Avenue.

Director Palombi – This item is a site plan review for a proposed residential development project consisting of a total of 3 units on a property located on 217 E. Victoria Avenue. Josephine Pham will be presenting.

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) - This project is for Site Plan Review # 01-20 for 217 E Victoria Avenue. The Applicant is Robert Grossi, the Architect on the project. 217 E. Victoria is an existing underutilized vacant lot located towards the middle of Montebello, generally located northeast of Beverly Boulevard and Poplar Avenue. The lot is approximately 9,000 square feet. The new combined building area shall be approximately 4,000 square feet, which is 40% of the total floor area allowed. The maximum lot coverage for R-3 is 60%. As a result, the site for the proposed use is adequate in size, shape, and density. The subject property is zoned R-3, Multiple-Family Residential. The immediate surrounding uses are various residential densities to the north, east, and west. To the south of the property off Beverly Boulevard, there are general commercial properties. The proposed use is consistent with the residential designated land use and will not have an adverse impact on adjacent or abutting properties. As a Project Overview, the Applicant proposes to construct three total units: one 2-story Duplex with an attached 4-car garage, one 2-Story Single Family Residential (SFR) Unit with an attached 2-car garage.

There is quite some history behind this lot. Back in 2003, there was an existing residential home that was damaged due to a fire. In 2004, the property owner, at the time, made attempts to reconstruct/repair the damages- pulling all necessary permits. A year later, all the permits were expired, and all work to reconstruct was never completed. Flash forward to 2009 when the City's Code Enforcement identified unsafe conditions associated with the abandoned structure. The property owner received the notification and complied within a month to demolish and remove everything on the lot. The lot has been vacant and underutilized ever since. In May of this year, the Applicant is here today for the Site Plan Review request for the three units.

The site plan shows the property as an irregular, triangular-shaped lot. Staff reviewed the proposal and made the findings for approval per the Municipal Code for Development Standards on the property. The R-3 zone establishes that all new multiple-family developments provide 3,000 square feet of land for each dwelling unit. The subject site has a lot area of approximately 9,000 square feet and proposes to develop three dwelling units, which is compliant to maximum allowed density. The R-3 zone also establishes a minimum of 300 square feet of open space per each unit provided for each unit in the R-3 zone. The proposed site plan provides 150 square feet of private open space balconies for each unit and a 300-square-foot common space in the rear. The total open space is 750

square feet, which is more than what is required open space for all three units. The code also requires that each dwelling unit have two enclosed parking spaces and one visitor space for every three units. If you're following along with PowerPoint, the proposal consists of a two-car garage for each dwelling unit depicted in yellow and the one visitor parking space in orange. Therefore, the proposal meets the off-street parking requirements as well.

Here are the first floor plans for the three units. Per the PowerPoint, the different units are correlated by color. Blue represents the rear Single Family unit, and the red and purple units are part of the Duplex in the front. The first floor generally has the same setup. The SFR has a living room, kitchen, dining room, and a 2-car garage. The duplex units each have a great room, kitchen, and 2-car garages for both units. Walking up to the second floor, the bedrooms, corresponding closet per room, bathrooms, and one balcony per unit are featured along the plans. In the R-3 zone, the code stipulates that the maximum number of bedrooms cannot exceed one bedroom for every 1,000 square feet of lot area. Of the 9,000 square foot lot, the proposed project will have a total of 9 bedrooms, which meets the bedroom limitation requirement.

Here are the Conceptual Elevations for the rear Single Family Dwelling. We asked the Applicant for more detailed and colored elevations but did not receive them. The proposal features contemporary style architecture with decorative wrought iron placed on each residential dwelling unit's balconies. The dwellings' exterior will have a sand stucco finish and horizontal siding accented throughout the two buildings. The roof shall be flat with a 2 foot, 6-inch parapet for a total of 22-foot height from grade, which is below the 25-foot maximum height limit.

This next slide shows the Conceptual Proposal for the front Duplex. Just like the Single Family Dwelling, the building shall have the same features. The Applicant has stated that the colors shall range within the earth tone colors per Montebello Municipal Code. These colors and materials shall be subject to Planning Department review and approval, as stated in Condition #19. The proposal is consistent with the surrounding residential properties.

As SPR 01-20 is considered a "project" per CEQA definition, the project is categorically exempt per Class 32 of Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Staff sent out a 20-Day Public Hearing Notice published in the Whittier Daily News and mailed all owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius on May 21, 2020. To this date, Staff has received one public comment by a neighboring property in the area concerned about on-street parking. Staff explained the requirements for off-street parking with one guest parking and directed her to Public Works to start a petition if she is

concerned about on-street parking to allow for permit parking. Since then, we did not receive any other comments.

Staff consulted with various departments and has not received any additional comments. With all findings, Staff recommends approval of Site Plan Review No. 01-20. If there are any other questions, I will be happy to answer them, and the Applicant will be available to answer them as well.

Commissioner Ramirez - On the PDF on page 55 in the second paragraph, it says "the height of the existing building," but there is no existing building. It should be "the height of the new building," correct?

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) – Correct.

Director Palombi – Is this in the resolution?

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) – Yes.

Joseph Fierro (Applicant) – The project consists of three units, as mentioned. I want to be consistent with the City building guidelines and design. We want to be consistent to blend in with the City. We would like to build to have more housing for the community. We have been working with doing the project for almost a year now. Thank you so much for having this on the agenda.

Commissioner Ramirez - I appreciate the design and the work. I am happy with your open space and landscape plan work. The only thing I didn't see addressed is if you're going to have an air conditioning unit, and I know you have a flat roof, I'm not sure if it's going to be located on top of that roof. I don't think it could be viewable from the street.

Joseph Fierro (Applicant) – We plan to have an HVAC system, air conditioning unit on there. As far as the condenser's location, I believe it is proposed to be behind the rear of the building where you will not see it from the street.

Commissioner Ramirez – The location of the condenser is fine. It was more of the HVAC main unit, is it sitting on top of the roof? If the parapets are not high enough, it's not going to conceal the unit viewable from the street.

Joseph Fierro (Applicant) – I believe it's proposed to have the HVAC unit on the floor section of the bottom rear.

Commissioner Ramirez – Not the condenser unit, but the HVAC unit?

Joseph Fierro (Applicant) – Yes, I don't know the proper title, but I believe its HVAC for being that it's air-conditioning.

Commissioner Ramirez – So it's not going to be on the roof?

Joseph Fierro (Applicant) – No.

Commissioner Ramirez – Is it going to be viewable from the street?

Joseph Fierro (Applicant) – No, it would be on the rear location of each unit.

Commissioner Ramirez – Typically, they put it either in an attic space or on top of the roof. It's something to keep in mind, adding a condition as long as it is concealed, is fine.

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) – They do have AC units on the sides, and if he were want to put it on the roof, we would have them screen it, and we do that for every application that comes in for HVAC, especially if it's on the parapet.

MOTION: Commissioner Briseno motions to approval A Site Plan Review to allow the construction of a new duplex with an attached 4-car garage and a new detached single-family residence with an attached 2-car garage at 217 E. Victoria Avenue.

SECOND: Commissioner Ramirez

ACTION: 5-0-0-0

C. Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 01-20/ENV 106-20-CE)

A Tentative Parcel Map review to subdivide an approximately 13,878 square-foot lot into two lots within the R-1 (Single Family Residential) zone at 1234 S. Montebello Boulevard.

Director Palombi – Item 9C is a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM 01-20/ENV 106-20-CE) for property located at 1234 S. Montebello Boulevard. The Applicant is Hermine Arakelyan, and we have Michael Donovan to present staffs presentation.

Michael Donovan - Good Evening Commissioners, for today's item, is Tentative Parcel Map 01-20 and is located at 1234 S. Montebello Boulevard. The Tentative Parcel Map is to subdivide and approximate 13, 878 square foot lot into two lots within the R-1 Single Residential Zone. As mentioned, the total lot area is 13,878 square feet. The existing building area is 3,440 square feet with an existing building footprint of 1,996 square feet. To give a brief overview of the zone surrounding the property. Its located in the R-1 zone, to the north, south, and east surround by the R-1 zone, and to the west its surrounded by R-3 zone. As mentioned, the Applicant proposes subdividing the existing 13,878 square lot to create two legal lots for the

property, in the front for lot one, its approximately 6, 500 square feet with an approximately 260 square foot easement which is to be recorded with the parcel map and deed. In lot two, the rear parcel would be approximately 7,087 square feet with an approximately 1,040 square foot dog-leg for access. The access to the rear lot will be supplemented by the easement, which was noted above for lot one. The dog-leg access is to the right of the first property, which will supplement access to the rear. We have noted that the existing garage is to be removed and relocated upon the final parcel map's approval.

In terms of the standards for R-1 zone, the width is supposed to be a minimum of 50 square feet, which it does abide by and a minimum length of 100 square feet, so both properties do meet the Montebello standards. Regarding the environmental review, the project is considered a project by CEQA and is categorically exempt per class 15 of section 15315 minor land divisions. This was published on May 20, 2020, in Whittier Daily News, and the notices were mailed on May 21, 2020, within a 300-foot radius. Staff consulted with various departments within the City. We received comments from the Fire Department as well as Building and Safety and Engineering. The comment that stuck out the most was from the Fire Department, which requires 20-foot fire access to the rear property. After speaking with the Fire Department, we put in condition 16, which states the following, "In the event that the 20-foot wide fire lane cannot be provided, a fire hydrant shall be implemented with the development of this property subject to Planning Department review and approval". Therefore, Staff recommends the approval of Tentative Parcel Map TPM 01-20.

Director Palombi – No public comments were received for this item.

Chair Mooradian – None of the commissioners have a conflict with this project and the previous project that was approved, correct?

Chair Lomeli – None

Chair Ramirez – None

Chair Briseno – None

Chair Aliksanian – None

John Kozakar (Applicant Representative) - The site was developed approximately 40 years ago and was previously industrial zoning. We worked with the planning department for quite a while to come up with the right combination to make both sites work with all zoning and Montebello code requirements. This falls into the R-A, R-1 zone, south of the dividing line of

Montebello, which is why the minimum width of the lot has to be 50 ft, and that is why we made one of those lots 50 feet and the backlot wider. We did a 500-foot mailing list instead of a smaller mailing list to make sure we captured everybody that might be of concern. The homeowner signed the property owner's authorization and had that notarized as proof of ownership and proof of authorization. It did include some neighborhood endorsement letters that we have provided to planning, and the homeowners are friendly with their neighbors.

Commissioner Briseno – On page 6 of the presentation, there is a light blue shaded area and an easement 2 feet x 130 feet. It has to allow a car to get to the back and was wondering the width of that.

Michael Donovan (Staff) - For that 2-foot easement, in condition 27 in the resolution, we included the 10-foot wide by 130-foot long access road, which includes that 2-foot easement shall be utilized for access by both properties on the project site for the lifetime of the approved parcel map. So the easement was more so to make the property 50 width square foot lot.

Director Palombi – If I can add to that, the intent of the 2-foot easement is to satisfy the 10-foot requirement needed to access the rear of the property. So that easement would run in perpetuity with the parcel map as per the condition that would be imposed. So to answer your question, that would be 10-foot wide access with the 2-foot easement.

MOTION: Commissioner Lomeli motions to approve a Tentative Parcel Map review to subdivide an approximately 13,878 square-foot lot into two lots within the R-1 (Single Family Residential) zone at 1234 S. Montebello Boulevard.

SECOND: Commissioner Ramirez

ACTION: 5-0-0-0

10. CONSENT ITEM (S)

None

11. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS –CONTINUED

Commissioner Briseno - I would like to know what are appropriate items for oral communication and items of community interests. Also, I know that we are going to start working on the General Plan, will we hear announcements?

I'd like to listen in on conversations, and if there's going to be conversations with the public or when making General Plan decisions, I would like to know about that.

Director Palombi - Recently, after an RFP process, Council awarded a contract. We do have a consultant on board; we have not had elaborate discussions yet. We are working through some preliminary scheduling, but we anticipate, just to give you sort of a vision of what we are looking at. A joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting is scheduled most likely in late August of 2020. That will sort of be the first kick-off, if you will, of the General Plan Update. We will have the consultant here, and they will be going over what will be involved, the community outreach efforts, and the different levels of outreach that we will be conducting. We will be looking for community members and City staff to be very engaged in this process as we move forward. To answer the question, we are working on getting the information out, and we are very excited.

Chair Mooradian - Also, in the staff communication to the Planning Commission, generally items like grand openings, groundbreaking, and changes in municipal codes related to planning; those are communications that are related to the commission.

Commissioner Briseno - What are the types of things or concerns that we bring up?

Chair Mooradian – Would staff like to address this?

Legal Counsel Ramirez - The Chair is correct during the oral communications that would give the opportunity to bring items related to planning, grand openings, and announcements of that nature. We are actively working on a manual that will outline some of the different components of the Planning Commission meetings. On there, it will address specifically what types of other items can be spoken during that period. I believe the planning division has a draft of that handbook. We can finalize it and include more samples, so whoever takes over the Chair or Vice-Chair position will have a reference. When finalized, I can forward that information.

Chair Mooradian – That would be great. When do you anticipate having that available?

Legal Counsel Ramirez – The Planning Department currently has the draft, as soon as I get that back from them, we should have it ready for everybody.

13. PLANNING COMMISSION ORALS

Chair Mooradian – I want to thank you for allowing me to lead the commission during this time and I want to wish, our soon to be Chair, Commissioner Lomeli luck.

Vice-Chair Aliksanian
Commissioner Briseno
Commissioner Lomeli
Commissioner Ramirez

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.



Joseph Palombi, Planning Commission Secretary