

ITEM 3



Planning & Economic Development Department

205 S. Willowbrook Ave., Compton, CA 90220 (310) 605-5532 Fax: (310) 761-1488 www.comptoncity.org

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, June 9, 2010

7:00 P.M.

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

205 SOUTH WILLOWBROOK AVENUE

1) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** - The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Turner.

2) **ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present:

Juanita Green-Wright

Lillie P. Darden

Cleo Turner

Staff Representatives Present:

Derek Hull

Anita Aviles

3) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** –May 12, 2010. It was moved by Commissioner Turner that the minutes of May 12, 2010 be approved. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

4) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEM(S)**

A. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2637** – A request of T-Mobile to construct a wireless facility consisting of a 65' high mono-flag pole with 6 panel antennas and an equipment enclosure at 1909 W. Compton Blvd., Compton, in the C-L (Limited Commercial) zone.

Commissioner Turner moved that the public hearing regarding Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2637 be opened. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the property is located at 1909 West Compton Blvd. in the Fourth Council District. The nearest intersection is Compton Blvd. and Central Avenue.

The project site land use designation is MU (Mixed Use). The adjacent land uses are to the north, MU (Mixed Use) and LR (Low Density Residential), to the south is MU (Mixed Use), to the east is LR (Low Density Residential), and to the west, MU (Mixed Use).

The project site zoning is C-L (Limited Commercial). The adjacent zonings are to the north, C-L (Limited Commercial) and R-L (Low Density Residential), to the south C-L (Limited Commercial), to the south is C-L (Limited Commercial) and R-L (Low Density

Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 2 of 15

Residential), to the east is R-L (Low Density Residential), and to the west is C-L (Limited Commercial).

The project is located in two overlay districts: the Redevelopment Project Area and Enterprise Zone.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the proposed cell antenna will be a concealed flag pole with a flag.

Staff Representative Hull stated that analysis of the project consist of: a flagpole currently exist on the project site, concealed wireless facilities are considered categorically exempt projects under the CEQA Act, the proposed wireless facility is located in a Redevelopment Project Area, the proposed wireless facility has been designed to lessen impacts to the built out environment as a concealed flagpole, alternative sites were unsuitable for applicant: 1) providing inadequate height or 2) interfered with on-site circulation, the project as proposed will be taller than the existing flagpole, and given additional time, a more suitable design can be achieved. Therefore, the Planning Director recommends to the Planning Commission to continue the item until July 14, 2010 to allow the applicant and staff additional time to finalize the site plan.

Commissioner Turner moved to continue **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2637** to July 14, 2010. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2637** was continued unanimously.

- B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2670/VARIANCE CASE NO. 2671** – A request of Church of Living God to establish a church/public assembly with less parking than required by code at 1901 W. Reeve St., Compton in the C-L (Limited Commercial) zone.

Commissioner Darden moved that the public hearing regarding Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2670/Variance Case No. 2671 be opened. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner and carried unanimously.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the property is located at 1901 West Reeve St., a request to establish a church/public assembly with less parking than required by code.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the Church of Living God is requesting the approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) and a variance to establish a church/public assembly with less parking than required by Code in accordance with Sections 30-26 of the Compton Municipal Code (C.M.C.).



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 3 of 15

Staff Representative Hull stated that according to the applicant, Church of Living God was previously located 2024 W. Compton Blvd. and their facility was acquired in 2008-2009, through eminent domain. According to City records this location was only licensed and doing business as Inspirational Gifts & Portraits (office use). In November of 2009, the applicant purchased the subject site in an attempt to re-establish a church.

The subject site is located on the northwest corner of Reeve Street and Hillford Street. The site consists of an irregularly shaped parcel of land that is approximately 14,500 square feet (.33 acres) in size. The site is currently developed with a 5,692 square foot single and two-story building.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the General Plan designation for the site is General Commercial (GC), to the north is General Commercial (GC), to the South is Low Density Residential (LDR), to the East is Low Density Residential (LDR), and to the West is General Commercial (GC). The zoning for the site is Limited Commercial (C-L), to the North is Limited Commercial (C-L), to the South Low Density Residential (R-L), to the East Low Density Residential (R-L), and to the West is Limited Commercial (C-L).

Staff Representative Hull stated that in 1963, Special Use (SU) No. 503 and 599 approved this site for a church (Double Rock Baptist Church). Then in 1985, Special Use (SU) No. 1218 and Zone Variance (ZV) No. 1253 approved the conversion of this site into a Christian School (for elementary and secondary school). The applicant would re-establish the site as a church. However, the approval of a new conditional use permit and a variance is required to establish a church/public assembly with less parking than required by code.

Staff Representative Hull stated that this project is categorically exempt (Class 1) from further environmental review per Section 15301 the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. Section 15301 suggests, Class 1[exceptions] consist of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond what that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the Code requires that churches or public assembly locations obtain approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The CUP process gives the city an opportunity to thoroughly evaluate each proposal and manage/control potential negative impacts to the surrounding areas by the imposition of conditions of approval as mitigation measures. In this case a conditional use permit is required for the church/public assembly use and a variance is required of less off-street parking



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 4 of 15

Staff Representative Hull stated that the Code requires that churches provide **1 parking space for every 54 inches of bench seating or 1 parking space for every 40 square feet of assembly area, whichever standard is more restrictive**. This standard would require the applicant to provide between 24 and 30 parking spaces, if parking demand were calculated based on bench seating area and gross sanctuary area, respectively. Applying the more restrictive parking requirement, 30 parking spaces are required for the sanctuary. Additionally, the code requires 1 parking space for every 250 square feet of office space. The office use is comprised of 751 square feet. Therefore, three (3) parking spaces are required for office use. A total of 33 parking spaces are required by ordinance and the applicant has 25 existing spaces onsite. The applicant is deficient eight (8) parking spaces. The opportunity for expansion is restricted due to ongoing development activity in the area, including the construction of the new Double Rock Church. These site constraints prohibit the applicant from constructing additional parking spaces. The Variance would allow for the reduction in parking.

In addition, a variance would be required to reduce the required parking stall length from 20 feet to 18 feet in order to accommodate additional parking.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the applicant met with the Planning and Economic Development Director and staff to discuss alternatives to construct additional parking due to project site constraints. The applicant set out to establish shared parking agreements with the shopping center across the street and with Double Rock Church. Despite the applicant's efforts, no agreement was executed with either entity. Since the building was constructed in 1968, and development has been constructed all around the project site, limits the applicant to meet the parking requirement. Given this fact, a variance is appropriate since there are some size constraints with the parcel. This project was properly noticed in accordance with Section 30-26 of Compton Municipal Code. Notices were mailed out to property owners and occupants located within a 500 foot radius. As of June 3rd, no correspondences either for or against the project have been received.

The Planning Director recommends that the Planning Commission approve Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2670 and Variance Case No. 2671 subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained herein.

Deputy City Attorney, Anita Aviles, stated that the existence of the Religious Land Use and Institutional Act as discussed last year. This particular act prohibits zoning and land marking laws that substantially burdens the religious exercise of the churches or other religious assemblies or institutions absent the least restrictive means of furthering a compelling government interest. This particular provision will apply in the situation because it applies to the substantial burden that raises from state or local government formal or informal procedures from making individualized assessments of a property



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 5 of 15

use. What the act says is that government regulations that substantially burden religious exercise are prohibited unless the regulations serve a compelling interest and is the least restrictive means to achieve that interest.

Commissioner Turner asked Deputy City Attorney Aviles if she believed that the conditions of approval could be a burden to the church.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that it will be to the applicant to address that.

The Applicant, Rev. Edward Tate, 1812 West Tichenor St., Compton, (inaudible)

Chairperson Green-Wright asked how far the school was.

Rev. Tate stated that it is on Central Avenue and Poplar St. Rev. Tate stated that he also wants to do tenants improvements to the property.

Chairperson Green-Wright told Rev. Tate that he would have to go to the Building and Safety Department for any tenant improvements to the property.

Commissioner Turner asked Rev. Tate if he read the conditions of approval and if he is in agreement with all of them.

Rev. Tate stated that he did read them and they will comply with them.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles mentioned to Rev. Tate that she noted that he had a problem with the pews which is condition number 8.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked Attorney Aviles if according to the law they really should not go in the back.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that what the law says is that the City can't impose such burden on them that will infringe on their right to exercise a religion unless the City can show that we have a compelling interest and made provision to follow the least restrictive means to achieve that. If you look at the staff report and the information isn't there to support that particular condition you can continue it to see if there is factual evidence to support that or you can modify the conditions or delete them.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked Mr. Hull for clarification of Condition 8.

Staff Representative Hull stated that when staff wrote this it was based upon the site plan that was submitted to make sure that it corresponds with the site plan. Condition 8 reads "That the church's main assembly/sanctuary area shall be limited to 1188



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 6 of 15

square feet and 5-12 foot pews and 5-10 foot pews, as shown on the floor plan provided”, therefore if referred to the site plan there is a delineation of the pews that are already cut down as a result of their location. The ones in the right are shorter.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked Rev. Tate to asked Mr. Hull his question about the pews.

Rev. Tate stated that he wants to leave the pew at 12 feet instead of having them cut.

Commissioner Darden asked Mr. Hull if that would change the area for required parking.

Staff Representative Hull stated that it will change it but it would not be that significant. What staff would have to do is put a notation in the plans or have the applicant submit new plans that would show the 12 foot pews.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the condition of approval can be revised but that the applicant would need to submit a new floor plan to reflect the change.

Rev. Tate asked regarding the parking agreement with the school.

Staff Representative Hull stated that it would not be necessary if the Commission grants the variance. He will not have to meet the parking requirements.

Staff Representative Hull stated that what Rev. Tate did when he was doing his due diligence he contacted the school on Caldwell Street, but unfortunately it out of 500 foot radius so in order to get a recipe cal parking agreement it would have to be within a certain amount of distant and it was actually further than that. Therefore shall the Commission grants the CUP and Variance there would not be a need to get that parking agreement.

Commissioner Turner asked how many spaces they currently have.

Rev. Tate referred the question to Ms. Barbara McCombs.

Applicants Representative, Barbara McCombs, 646 West Caldwell St., Compton, stated that there are 18 parking spaces.

Resident, Arena Copeland, 19307 Gunlock Avenue, Carson, stated she has been a member of the Church of Living God for 20 years. Ms. Copeland stated that she wanted to note for the record that Church of Living God went out into the community on Saturday, June 5, 2010 to talk to the residents of that area to get their opinion and



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 7 of 15

concerns about what they thought about the church. A petition was signed by residents in the area that support the project.

There being no further comments, Commissioner Turner moved to close the public hearing regarding **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2670/VARIANCE CASE NO. 2671**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Darden moved to approved **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2670/VARIANCE CASE NO. 2671** with revisions to Condition 8. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2670/VARIANCE CASE NO. 2671** was approved unanimously.

Staff Representative Hull asked Rev. Tate to bring in the revised plans showing the 12 foot pews.

- C. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2672** – A request of Verizon Wireless to construct a wireless facility consisting of 12 antennas hidden behind a tower element of an existing building and the related equipment to be housed within the building located at 909 S. Central Ave., Compton, in the C-L (Limited Commercial) zone.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the applicant is proposing to install a roof mounted, unmanned wireless facility for Verizon Wireless. The applicant proposes to increase the height of the existing north east tower element by 10 feet to match the existing southeast tower element. Twelve panel antennas will be placed inside the building's northeast tower, a small GPS antenna will be placed on the exterior of tower element and the related wireless facility equipment will be installed inside the building. The applicant is leasing a 364 square foot area (16' x 10'-6") within the building to house the equipment room.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the subject site is located adjacent to the CVS property located on the southwest corner of Alondra Boulevard and Central Avenue. The site is a trapezoid shaped parcel of land approximately 28,000 square feet in size (.64 acres). The site has 128 lineal feet of street frontage along Central Avenue. The site is currently developed with an approximately 7,000 square foot multi-tenant, freestanding building. The building is oriented towards Central Avenue.

This project is considered a Tier II application in accordance with 30-46.11 of the Compton Municipal Code. The nearest three existing Verizon wireless sites are as follows: Central PCS Central located at 1151 N. Central Avenue, Redondo PCS located at 1840 S. Wilmington Ave., and Dominguez PCS located at 17120 S. Main St.



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 8 of 15

Staff Representative Hull stated that the applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the construction/installation of a wireless facility in accordance with Sections 30-26 and 30-46 of the Compton Municipal Code.

Staff Representative Hull stated that General Plan Land Use designation for the property is General Commercial (GC), to the North is General Commercial (GC), to the South is Low Density Residential (LDR), to the East is General Commercial (GC), and to the West is Low Density Residential (LDR). The zoning designation is Limited Commercial, to the North is Limited Commercial (CL), to the South is Low Density Residential (RL), to the East is Limited Commercial (CL), and to the West is Low Density Residential (RL). The existing land use is multi-tenant freestanding building, to the North is single-tenant freestanding building (CVS), to the South are single-family homes, to the East is a commercial strip center and ARCO gas station, and to the West are single-family homes.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the project is categorically exempt from environmental review in accordance with Section 15301 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines which consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency's determination.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the City of Compton requires a conditional use permit for all new personal wireless service facilities (PWSFs), to control and manage the location, siting, visibility, design and safety of all new wireless facilities.

Staff Representative Hull stated that according to the location standards for City's Personal Wireless Service Facilities (PWSF's) ordinance (30-46 C.M.C.), the subject site is not considered an opportunity site or an avoidance area. Opportunity sites are described as follows: a) new utility poles in City owned right of way, provided such utility poles are dedicated to the City of Compton, b) churches, and c) two-story commercial and industrial buildings with screening of the PWSF. Avoidance sites include: a) schools, nursery schools or child care centers, b) single family homes, and c) parks and recreation areas. This site is neither an opportunity or avoidance site. The proposed wireless facility is however located adjacent to single family homes to the south across the alley. The nearest house is approximately 75 feet away.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the siting standards of the City's PWSF's ordinance favor, wireless facilities on existing structures over a new ground-mounted PWSF. However the siting standards also encourage concealment/camouflaging of all new PWSF's to the greatest extent possible. Siting refers to the placement (i.e. roof-mounted vs. ground-mounted, front yard vs. remote corner) of a wireless facility on a



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 9 of 15

given property. As mentioned before the applicant is proposing to install a roof mounted unmanned wireless facility. The antennas will be installed inside the building's northeast tower and the equipment room will be installed inside the building. The wireless facility will be completed concealed within the building; therefore not visible or accessible to the public.

Staff Representative Hull stated that as previously mentioned, the applicant is proposing to increase the height of the existing northeast tower to match the existing tower to the south, not to exceed 35', the height limit. Twelve panel antennas will be installed and concealed inside the northeast tower and the related equipment will be housed inside the building in an equipment room. The equipment room will house the ac unit, cabinets, battery and other related equipment. The design of this wireless facility meets the intent of the wireless ordinance. The only concern staff has is that the original proportions of the building may be skewed due to the height increase of tower. Therefore staff has conditioned that the roof parapet wall be increased to 1) fully screen existing roof mounted equipment and 2) keep the proportions of the building balance subject to Architectural Review Board review and approval.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the fall zone requirement is not applicable to this project in that the fall zone is only applicable to ground mounted PWSF's whereas this project consist of placing the wireless facility within a the building and tower element. The building complies with all required front, side and rear setbacks and by default so does the wireless facility. Additionally the proposed wireless facility complies with the height limit of 35 feet, which is a height restriction imposed to properties located within 1000 feet of the Compton/Woodley Airport.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the applicant provided staff with a list of alternate sites to this project. Most of the locations were not viable options in that the owners were not interested, locations were considered avoidance areas, or sites were unable to meet the space constraints required for such facilities.

This case was properly noticed in accordance with Section 30-26 of Compton Municipal Code. Notices were mailed to both the property owners and occupants located within a 500 foot radius. As of June 3rd, no correspondence either for or against the project have been received. This wireless facility meets both the requirements and the intent of the wireless ordinance.

Staff Representative Hull stated that Staff recommends that Conditional Use Permit Case No. 2672 be approved subject to the findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report.



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 10 of 15

Deputy City Attorney Aviles commented that having to deal with Telecommunications Act 1996 it preserves authority of state or local governments over decisions regarding the placement construction modifications of personal wireless services. There are two limitations 1). Section 704, Sub-section 7b3 which requires any denials in writing and support of substantial evidence, 2). Limitation – Section 704, Sub-section 7b4 which prohibits denials on the basis of radio frequency emissions if those emissions are in compliance with federal regulations.

The Applicant, Justin Robinson for Verizon Wireless, 1750 East Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, stated that he is requesting that Condition 3 be removed.

Staff Representative Hull stated that he had already discussed that with Mr. Robinson and agreed that as long as the antennas were concealed.

Mr. Robinson requested that Conditions 5 be removed.

Staff Representative Hull agreed per discussion with the applicant.

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 8 be removed.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the condensing units shall not have obstruction in order to operate.

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 9 be corrected to Federal Communications Commission (FCC) instead of American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 10 be revised to stated that “That the facility shall be designed, constructed operated and maintained at all times in full compliance with all statutory regulations and standards” only.

Staff Representative Hull stated that for clarification it should only read “That the facility shall be designed, constructed operated and maintained at all times in full compliance with all statutory regulations and standards including those of the Compton Municipal Code and all other applicable statutory regulations and standards.”

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 14 be removed.

Staff Representative Hull agreed that, that condition be removed.

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 17 be removed.

Staff Representative Hull agreed that condition 17 be removed.



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 11 of 15

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 24 be modified to state that plaque to be mounted inside the door.

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 28 be modified to stated that it be inspected every five years.

Mr. Robinson requested that Condition 29 be removed.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that if that condition is part of the code even if it is obstructed from the conditions it still applies because it is part of code.

Mr. Robinson requests that Condition 30 be removed.

Staff Representative Hull stated that applicant just wanted to provide a reductive lease not necessarily indicating the terms of lease and would be acceptable.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles directed Mr. Hull to the code to confirm that is consistent with the code.

Staff Representative Hull stated that basically what Mr. Robinson wants to take is the amount that is negotiated.

Mr. Robinson requested they be given more than 180 days as mentioned in Condition 34.

Commissioner Darden stated that how it has been done in the past is that if the applicant requires additional time they submit an extension in writing.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that under the section for Conditional Use Permits, 30-26.4(d) states that unless otherwise specified in the granting of the conditional use permit or unless extended by the Commission, a building permit or certificate of occupancy shall be obtained, and construction, if any, or actual use shall be begin within one year after the granting of the conditional use permit, or, where no such permit or certificate of occupancy is required, the use granted by the conditional use permit shall be put into effect on the property within such period.

Staff Representative Hull stated that in regards to Condition 30 what it says is that applicant needs to provide the owner lessee, agent, or carrier. It does not specifically say the discussion of the finance, if that is really the critical issue. Mr. Hull stated that Condition 30 should remain as it currently reads.



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 12 of 15

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that Condition 34 should also read that if needed an extension letter should be submitted to the Planning and Economic Development Department.

There being no further comments, Commissioner Turner moved to close the public hearing regarding **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2672**. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

Commissioner Turner moved to approved **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2672** subject to the changes 1). Remove Condition 3, 2). Remove Condition 5, 3). Condition 8 that all roof mounted antennas instead of equipment, 4). Condition 10 to read "That the facility shall be designed, constructed operated and maintained at all times in full compliance with all statutory regulations and standards including those of the Compton Municipal Code and all other applicable statutory regulations and standards". 5). Condition 14 to be removed, 6). Condition 17 instead property to stated project, 7). Condition 23 to read "That all screening must occur to cover antennas from the public", 8). Condition 24 to read "That all weather-proof plaques to mounted inside the door", 9). Condition 28 that it be corrected to 30-46 instead of 30-36, 10). Remove Condition 33, 11). Condition 34 add "to submit a request to the Planning and Economic Development Department for an extension". The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 2672** was approved unanimously.

- D. PLANNING COMMISSION APPEAL CASE NO. 10-01** – A request of Samuel Sherrod to appeal code violations cited by Code Enforcement (CE 10-335) at 937 W. 137th St., Compton in the Low Density Residential (R-L) zone.

Deputy City Attorney stated that this item was pulled per the appellant.

5) **INFORMATIONAL ITEM (A Report of Previously Approved Cases)**

Chairperson Green-Wright went over informational items.

6) **OLD BUSINESS**

Staff Representative Hull thanked the commission for participating in reviewing the essays.

Chairperson Green-Wright asked regarding the unmaintained development on Alondra and Wilmington.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the owners of the development is currently working with another developer.



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 13 of 15

A. Willow Walk Project – Fence relocation and removal of live/work units

Staff Representative Hull stated that the department was contacted by the Olson Group to discuss the final phase of project which included the live-work units. The Commission may recall that when approving the project the live work units that were proposed were going to go in the outside of fence, but due to downturn and the housing industry and marketability and another project that currently have live work units and are having a problem selling those (Alameda Court). He was approached by the developer to consider revising the live work units and put them inside the gate as opposed inside the gate.

The Olson Company Representative (inaudible).

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that she is not familiar show the project came about, but it seems that it is a modification of the CUP. Therefore, there is a procedure in the code for modifying that which will have to be followed, public hearing, before the Commission can take any action.

Staff Representative Hull stated that he did not put this in the Agenda for the Commission to take action because it is basically the move of a fence, he does not know if it is the substantial that it is going to have that big of an impact on the project. When he initially had the discussion he had to make sure that they were not going to delete or remove any units, but in this instance for the Commission they are only moving the location of the fence.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that the Commission has had concerns about plans being changed and in this case this is what is happening. At least the public should know what is going on.

Commissioner Darden stated that the Commission needs something in writing requesting the modification.

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that it will be an amendment to the original CUP.

Staff Representative Hull stated that the City does not have a procedure for that in place.

Deputy City Attorney stated that the case law is clear that when you are dealing with process that requires a public hearing there isn't anything that can be administratively approved. It would have to come to the body that is making the decision and it has to provide for public to be aware what is going on.



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 14 of 15

The Olson Group Representative (inaudible)

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that the Commission wants to make sure that it is done the right way.

Staff Representative Hull stated that Counsel should advise of what needs to be done. The issue that the developer should not have to face, if a new CUP has to reopen then a new public hearing and noticing has to be done. He would have to get the developer to submit that information.

Staff Representative Hull stated that what Counsel is referring to that the use of property shall be substantially in accordance with the staff report and plot plan on file with the CUP. Mr. Hull the applicant to state what exactly they are doing.

The Olson Group Representative (inaudible)

Staff Representative Hull stated that 35 states that substantially in accordance with the staff report and plot plan, so staff needs to determine the level of what is substantial or not.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that if time is an important factor then you can call a special meeting, but you should have the actual CUP that was issued so they can decide what they are being asked to do and have a clear record of what is being done.

Staff Representative Hull stated that it is only a fence and he recommends that Counsel provides additional insight.

Deputy City Attorney Aviles stated that at this time she does not know because she does not have any documentation to say what was originally approved. It is unfair to make a decision based on nothing.

Staff Representative Hull stated that this was not put in the agenda for a decision to be made it was really for information purposes for the Commission.

Staff Representative Hull stated that if the project was complete if they wanted to add a fence then they would only have to file the require permit as a home owner and that will only be with Building and Safety.

Chairperson Green-Wright stated that this should not have come before the Planning Commission it should have been through Building and Safety.

The Olson Group Representative (inaudible)



Planning Commission Minutes

June 9, 2010

Page 15 of 15

7) NEW BUSINESS

Staff Representative Hull introduced Ms. Joyce Mauldin that will be starting a shelter in the City of Compton.

Ms. Joyce Mauldin (inaudible)

8) COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Darden stated that the car wash on Long Beach Blvd. has become very unsightly.

Chairperson Green-Wright requests that a planner mixer be arranged with other cities.

9) AUDIENCE COMMENTS

None

It was moved by Commissioner Turner that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Darden and carried unanimously.

**DEREK R. HULL, DIRECTOR
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**JUANITA GREEN-WRIGHT,
CHAIRPERSON**

