

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF STANTON
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2019**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The members of the Planning Commission of the City of Stanton met in regular session in the City Council Chambers at 6:30 p.m., Chair Ash presiding.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by Commissioner Moua.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Ash, Commissioner Moua, Commissioner Grand.

Absent: Vice Chair Frazier, Commissioner Marques.

Excused: None.

Also Present: Contract City Planner Amy Stonich and Senior Planner Rose Rivera

4. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

None.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission approved minutes for the Regular Meeting of April 3, 2019.

Motion/Second: Moua/Ash

Motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

AYES: Moua, Ash, Grand

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Frazier, Marques

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

7A. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER PRECISE PLAN DEVELOPMENT PPD-797, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP TM19-02 AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PDP19-01 TO SUBDIVIDE A 17,500 SQUARE FOOT SITE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF SIX TOWNHOME UNITS, A PRIVATE DRIVEWAY, AND COMMON OPEN SPACE FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7320 KATELLA AVENUE, IN THE HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (RH) ZONE.

Senior Planner Rose Rivera presented the project. She noted that the 17,500 square foot parcel currently houses a single-family residence and the Applicant is proposing to demolish the residence in order to develop two buildings consisting of six townhomes requiring an application for a tentative parcel map, a precise plan of development, and a planned development permit.

Senior Planner Rivera stated that the property is in the high-density residential zone and carries a General Plan designation of high-density residential. Surrounding zoning and uses include a mobile home park to the north in the medium density residential zone, a condominium subdivision to the west and south in the high-density residential zone, and a Motel 6 to the east in the commercial neighborhood zone.

She provided a picture of the subject site and also of the surrounding uses.

Senior Planner Rivera outlined the proposed site plan and indicated the project site would have access to Katella Avenue from the common drive aisle which would provide access to all six units. She noted that the Zoning Code requires that each two-bedroom home provide three parking spaces, and one guest parking space is required for every three dwelling units.

Due to this requirement, the Applicant is proposing a two-car garage with one additional parking space adjacent to each garage per unit. She noted the required two guest parking spaces are located adjacent to the open space area at the rear of the development.

Senior Planner Rivera noted that sufficient common and private open space is provided for each unit, the Zoning Code requires a minimum of 250 square feet of private open space for each residence which the applicant is providing for through a private yard and a balcony for each unit. The Zoning Code also requires 5% of the total site to be usable active and passive open space. In this case, 875 square feet is required for the proposed development and the applicant is providing 933 square feet of common open space.

Senior Planner Rivera also outlined the proposed floor plan and noted that the six units consist of three stories. The first floor consists of a main entry, bathroom, loft, garage and private yard whereas the second-floor consists of a living room, dining room, powder room, laundry space, and kitchen. Finally, the third-floor contains a master bedroom and master bathroom, a second bedroom, bathroom, and a den.

Senior Planner Rivera provided a snapshot of the elevations and stated that the proposed units feature modern architecture with an earth tone palette and elevations are enhanced with wall offsets, significant vertical and horizontal articulation and special architectural elements and materials. She stated each unit would provide a private outdoor fenced yard/patio and two balconies on the third-floor level; she stated that the balconies face

inward to the development. She also outlined the height limitations and details of the two buildings.

Senior Planner Rivera noted for the Commission that as part of the proposal, the Applicant is requesting a Planned Development Permit which would allow for greater flexibility from the Zoning Code in order to provide a high-quality development. She confirmed that the project meets the Planned Development Permit requirements by providing high quality architecture and enhanced landscape and open space elements. The Applicant is requesting to allow for modified setbacks and separation distance between the two buildings. The modifications requested are a 12 foot sideyard setback where the code requires a 15 foot setback and a separation distance between buildings of 25 feet instead of the 30 feet.

Senior Planner Rivera stated that City staff has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that based on environmental assessment, the project has been determined to be categorically exempt for an infill development.

As such, Senior Planner Rivera indicated the recommended action was that the Commission conduct a public hearing, declare that the effects of the proposed project are categorically exempt from the requirements to prepare additional environmental documentation per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects), that the Commission adopt Resolution No. 2498 approving Precise Plan of Development PPD-797, adopt Resolution No. 2499 approving Tentative Map TM19-02, and adopt Resolution No. 2500 approving Planned Development Permit PDP19-01. She noted the Applicant is in attendance to answer any questions.

Chair Ash asked regarding the parking report which outlined the requirements. She confirmed whether there would be six off-street parking spaces provided.

Senior Planner Rivera clarified there would be a total of twenty off-street parking spaces provided.

Chair Ash opened the floor a public hearing on the project.

A neighboring resident [NAME AND ADDRESS WERE UNINTELLIGIBLE] spoke in opposition of the project due to on-street parking concerns and impacts of construction.

The Developer spoke during public comment. [PORTIONS OF HIS COMMENTS WERE UNINTELLIGIBLE]. He spoke of the history of the site and the existing condition of the property, and the impact the project would have on the site.

Commissioner Grand asked regarding the time frame of the project.

The Developer spoke about the entitlement process and the length of time that takes. Then a few months for the actual architectural plan design and acquiring permits. He also spoke about the tenants who are currently occupying the property and how they have been working and communicating with them.

Commissioner Moua asked about the proposed wall height and the noise during construction.

The Developer answered the wall height is six feet throughout and noted they would comply with every requirement.

Chair Ash commented that what the developer can and cannot do is very explicit and that the Stanton Municipal Code is very specific about requirements to minimize the negative impacts of construction to the surrounding properties.

Chair Ash closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Grand asked to see the site plan again and asked some questions regarding parking.

Senior Planner Rivera noted that might have been an earlier rendition of the site plan.

Chair Ash described the way in which the Commission considers new projects and makes decisions based on staff's recommendations and regulations of the Stanton Municipal Code.

Commissioner Grand also asked regarding the construction and timing requirements.

Senior Planner Rivera clarified that the standards condition is that no construction can begin before 8 a.m.

Motion/Second: Grand/Moua

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES:	Moua, Ash, Grand
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Frazier, Marques.

ACTION TAKEN:

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing; found that the effects of the proposed project are Categorically Exempt from the requirements to prepare additional environmental documentation per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15332, Class 32 (In-fill Development Projects); adopted Resolution No. 2498 approving Precise Plan of Development PPD-797; adopted Resolution No. 2499 approving Tentative Map TM19-02; and adopted Resolution No. 2500 approving Planned Development Permit PDP19-01.

Chair Ash announced the 10-day period during which the Planning Commission's decision on this matter may be appealed to the City Council via written appeal submitted to the City Clerk's Office.

7B. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER PRECISE PLAN DEVELOPMENT PPD-796, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP TM19-01 AND VARIANCE V19-01 TO SUBDIVIDE A 0.51 ACRE SITE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A HOUSING SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF FOUR CONDOMINIUM UNITS, A PRIVATE DRIVEWAY, COMMON OPEN SPACE AND A VARIANCE FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE MINIMUM PRIVATE DRIVEWAY LENGTH FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7162 KERMORE LANE IN THE MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (RM) ZONE

Chair Ash would need to recuse herself for this item due to her proximity to the project and there weren't enough members of the Commission to reach quorum.

A motion was made to continue Agenda Item No. 7B to the next Planning Commission meeting on November 20, 2019.

Motion/Second: Grand/Moua

Motion passed unanimously by the following vote:

AYES:	Moua, Ash, Grand
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Frazier, Marques

8. NEW BUSINESS

None.

9. OLD BUSINESS

None.

10. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

None.

11. PLANNER'S REPORT

City Planner Amy Stonich noted that Kelly Hart had put tours together in the past and invited the Planning Commission to join Staff for a walking tour for the Active Transportation Plan, which will be open to the public.

Chair Ash welcomed City Planner Amy Stonich to the department.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commission adjourned at 7:20 p.m.



Amy Stonich, AICP
Contract City Planner