

**UNOFFICIAL MINUTES
MONTEREY PARK PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
June 14, 2016**

The Planning Commission of the City of Monterey Park held a Regular Meeting of the Board in the Council Chambers, located at 320 West Newmark Avenue in the City of Monterey Park, Tuesday, June 14, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice-Chairperson Choi called the meeting to order at 7:14 p.m.

SWEAR IN:

ROLL CALL:

Planner Tewasart called the roll:

Commissioners Present: Ricky Choi, Larry Sullivan, Margaret Leung, Theresa Amador, and Delario Robinson

Commissioners Absent: None

ALSO PRESENT: David King, Deputy City Attorney, Michael A. Huntley, Director of Community and Economic Development, Samantha Tewasart, Senior Planner

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

Speaker Ms. Azadeh Hosseinian of Public Counsel, 610 S. Ardmone Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90005, provided a letter to the Planning Commission regarding Affordable and Supportive Multi-Family Housing Developments in the Monterey Park and summarized that the City should consider reevaluating the current Housing Element, Consolidated Plan, and Municipal Code to further remove barriers to affordable and support multi-family housing developments.

Chair Choi inquired if the item can be discussed since it is not agendized.

Deputy Attorney King replied that if there is a consensus to agendize the item for further discussion it can be done.

Commission Sullivan inquire how much time will be required to get the item on an agenda.

Director Huntley stated that the City's Housing Element has been certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Deputy Attorney King replied that the City Attorney's can bring something back in the next month.

The Planning Commission expressed a consensus to bring the item for further discussion.

AGENDA CHANGES AND ADOPTION:

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 26, 2016 –

Action Taken: The Planning Commission approved the minutes of April 26, 2016.

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Sullivan and seconded by Commissioner Leung, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Choi, Sullivan, and Leung
Noes: Commissioners: None
Absent: Commissioners: None
Abstain: Commissioners: Amador

May 10, 2016 –

Action Taken: The Planning Commission approved the minutes of May 10, 2016.

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Sullivan and seconded by Commissioner Leung, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Garcia, Sullivan, and Leung
Noes: Commissioners: None
Absent: Commissioners: None
Abstain: Commissioners: Amador

CONSENT CALENDAR:

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

3-A. MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND TENTATIVE MAP NO. 073665 – 120 WEST HELLMAN AVENUE (CU-15-07/TM-15-09)

Planner Tewasart provided a brief summary of the staff report.

Chairperson Choi inquired if the parking ratios take into account the employees. Planner Tewasart replied it does not. Generally the parking ratios do not take into account the employees.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that with the prior conditional use permit there was discussion about a 3-way stop at the intersection of the Baltimore Avenue and Hellman Avenue.

Director Huntley replied that the traffic consultant is available to respond to that item.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that the traffic analysis does not discuss overnight parking since the north side of the street is the City of Alhambra and overnight parking requires a permit.

Commissioner Amador also expressed concerns about the parking. She stated that she would like to see restrooms in the common areas for the public to use.

Chairperson Choi opened the public hearing.

Applicant Michael Hamner, 1131 Kenton Drive, Monterey Park, CA 91754, provided a brief history about the project. He stated that the environmental analysis identified that the project has less impacts than the previous project. He stated that even though the parking study with the mixed analysis identified a certain threshold requirement he wanted to be sure that the project was beyond that. The project provides more parking than is necessary by the report to make up for extraordinary circumstances and employee parking. He stated that there may have been some concern about backing up traffic on Baltimore and making sure that northbound traffic could get out. There was discussion about providing clearance, not blocking the intersection, keeping clear. He stated that the minimum size of the units will be dictated by the CC&Rs. He stated that there are no concerns with the conditions of approval.

Chairperson Choi stated that the building has a handsome design, but has concerns about the parking. He inquired about the peak hours for parking and expressed skepticism about the peak hours identified.

Traffic Engineer, Brian Marchetti of KOA replied that saying there is a peak during one period does not imply that there is negligible parking throughout the rest of the day.

Commissioner Sullivan inquired about the parking issue that is inherited from the City of Alhambra. Engineer Marchetti replied that a new development cannot fix existing parking and traffic situations. There are cumulative impacts and project impacts. Under the City guidelines for traffic impacts, project impacts are analyzed. In terms of the parking demand rates, ITE rates, which are survey rates, this is demand altogether, so it includes patients, doctors and staff. The development is not anticipated to create any new parking impacts that would create demand for more on-street parking. It is estimated to contain all the parking on the property with a surplus with the shared parking arrangement. There are no recommendations to mitigate any parking situation on-street with this project.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that Baltimore Avenue is seeing more traffic because people are avoiding Garfield Avenue. Engineer Marchetti replied that at the start of the study the existing uses and what is anticipated is looked at and what the parking supply

is going to be and the initial design in terms of off-street parking provisions and what the development going to need. The project area is surveyed and occupancy is looked at to see if the conditions are going to be exacerbated on the street. In this case the developer is erring on the side of caution and providing a surplus even during peak hours.

Engineer Marchetti stated that a 3-way stop would not be justified by a project of this size. If there is an existing traffic situation that is something that is reviewed by the City based on the City's traffic counts. The bigger issue is that the project is one block from the Garfield Avenue and Hellman Avenue intersection. When there is a green indication for east-west traffic on Hellman Avenue that would back up at the stop sign and potentially degrade the condition at that intersection and affect the interchange.

Commissioner Choi inquired about the impetus for closing the driveway on Hellman Avenue. Applicant Hamner replied that because of the volume of vehicles traveling on Hellman Avenue and Garfield Avenue and potentially any queuing that may occur that there would be less of an impact on a secondary street versus a primary street.

Commission Leung stated that the building is beautiful and expressed concerns about the traffic and parking. She stated that she is still unclear about how the peak hours are determined. Engineer Marchetti replied that the first step is to look at code requirements for medical and retail use. The second analysis adds in more variables based on both the ITE and ULI surveys on these types of uses. The ULI rates get into time of day use and percentage of demand.

Commissioner Leung inquired if the numbers are generic or specific to Monterey Park. Engineer Marchetti replied that they are based on national survey rates of different uses.

Commissioner Leung stated that Monterey Park is unique with residents that start off the day early. The doctors in the Monterey Park take walk-ins on the weekends and there is a line waiting to get into the office. Engineer Marchetti replied that the peaks identified at 8:00 a.m. is similar to the peaks identified at 2:00 p.m. The study acknowledges that appointments are not taken before 8:00 a.m.

Commissioner Leung stated that the municipal code ratio got it right and inquired if more parking can be provided. Director Huntley stated that the code does have generic required parking ratios. These standards were established many years ago. The code also allows flexibility. There is no way that the code can cover every particular type of use and conditions. So cities have adopted an opportunity to evaluate different uses and operations. Applicants can obtain traffic engineers to run traffic counts and parking analysis for projects. Based on the parking analysis 60 spaces will be required and project will provide 83 spaces on-site.

Commissioner Leung stated that cars currently circulate around the block looking for parking spaces and it is dangerous. Applicant Hamner stated that the provided number of spaces is 30 percent more than what the analysis shows. A traffic count was setup

over a series of days and times to justify and identify the level of service conditions that would be based on the number of trips that would occur with this project.

Commissioner Leung stated that it is good to hear that field data was taken to substantiate the report. She inquired if the assessment includes future developments. Engineer Marchetti replied that the standard traffic study looks at what exists, what it is going to be built, and what is in the development pipeline. All of that is factored into the baseline and the project is added on top of that. Everything that is planned within the area is considered.

Commissioner Leung inquired about the traffic conditions placed on the hotel project and inquired if the same conditions can be place on this project. Director Huntley replied that that there has to be some justification or nexus that requires some conditions to mitigate impacts. The size, scale, and demand are not there to warrant the same types of mitigations.

Deputy Attorney King added that as part of this agenda item the Commission is being asked to approve a mitigated negative declaration, which means that an initial study was prepared for this project and an environmental analysis was done. There were no significant impacts identified associated to traffic as part of this report.

Commissioner Leung inquired about the utility easement located along the north property line. Applicant Hamner replied that the easement will be maintained.

Commissioner Leung inquired about the ownership of the common open space. Director Huntley replied that a condition has been added that requires the project to obtain a professional management company.

Opponent Andy Islas, 617 North Baltimore Avenue, Monterey Park, CA 91754 stated that the parking structure south of the project is non-conforming in height and the proposed project must be within height limits. He stated that keep-clear signs do not work in Monterey Park. He stated that the traffic study does not address the items brought up by the Planning Commission. He stated that the medical center has extreme overflow parking. He asked that City indemnify the residents from any issues that may arise from the project.

Chairperson Choi stated that a lot of the concerns raised by the public are existing conditions and inquired if there are any comments from staff. Director Huntley replied that staff is unaware of the issues, which predates the current staff. This project meets the development standards and complies with city codes.

Deputy Attorney King stated that if the Commission were to consider anything outside of the mitigated negative declaration it would have to consider factual evidence that would counteract what is in the initial study prepared on behalf of the city. He stated that he has not seen any conditions to the effect of indemnifying the residents because it would be too broad and almost impossible to enforce.

Applicant Hamner stated that there may have been an action after the project was approved. If stop signs will be required the developer is willing to incorporate the condition as part of the project.

Director Huntley stated that intersections have to meet certain warrants and if the counts are there to justify putting up a stop sign and the applicant is willing to incorporate the condition into the project than that can be done, but cities typically do not put up stop signs unless the counts are there because if an accident were to occur then there is another liability that the city will be faced with. That is why cities rely on the experts to evaluate the intersections.

Commissioner Leung inquired about permit parking for the residents. Director Huntley replied that it is a matter that the City Manager has directed to the Police Chief to look at because it is a part of a bigger issue along the length of Hellman Avenue from New Avenue to Atlantic Boulevard. There is a lot of evaluation that has to be done, such as whether it will be permit parking, how far south, is it charged, and how many are to be allocated to each tenant or property owner. There are preferential parking districts in the city, but the size and scope of this area is just too large.

Chairperson Choi closed the public hearing.

Action Taken: The Planning Commission after considering the evidence presented during the public hearing adopted **Resolution No. 12-16** approving Conditional Use Permit (CU-15-07) to allow a 1.0 floor area ratio and tentative map no. 073665 (TM-15-09) for the subdivision of air-rights for a 12-unit medical office condominium development at 120 West Hellman Avenue, with added conditions.

Resolution No. 12-16

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP-15-07) TO ALLOW A 1.0 FLOOR AREA RATIO AND TENTATIVE MAP NO. 073665 (TM-15-09) FOR THE SUBDIVISION OF AIR RIGHTS FOR A 12-UNIT MEDICAL OFFICE CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT AT 120 WEST HELLMAN AVENUE

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Amador and seconded by Vice-Chair Sullivan, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes:	Commissioners: Choi, Sullivan, Leung and Amador
Noes:	Commissioners: None
Absent:	Commissioners: None
Abstain:	Commissioners: None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

None

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AS DIRECTED BY THE COMMISSION:

STAFF UPDATES:

None

CLOSED SESSION:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for consideration, the meeting was adjourned on June 14, 2016 at 8:54 p.m. to the next regular meeting on June 28, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Michael A. Huntley
Director of Community and Economic Development

Approved on at the regular Planning Commission meeting.