

**CITY OF MONTEBELLO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

September 15, 2020

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

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

6:32 p.m. by Chair Lomeli

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Chair Lomeli, Commissioner Aliksonian, Commissioner Mooradian, and Commissioner Ramirez

Absent: Vice-Chair Briseno

Also present:

Director of Planning and Community Development – Joseph Palombi

Planning Commission Legal Counsel – Gloria Ramirez

Staff - Maria Roman, Saara Chaudry and Josephine Pham

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Mooradian

4. PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY –CORRECTION TO AGENDA

None

5. STATEMENT OF PUBLIC ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Director Palombi - Good evening, Madam Chair and Members of the Commission.

Members of the public wishing to speak or provide public comments during today's Planning Commission meeting were allowed to submit a public comment card via telephone and/or email per the Executive Order issued by the Governor. For the record, staff did not receive any comment cards or requests to speak in connection with today's Planning Commission meeting.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. September 1, 2020 – Approved

7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS ON ITEMS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST

None

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Site Plan Review and Zone Variance - continued (Case No.PC-2020-0013-SPR-ZV/ ENV No. 18-20-CE)

A Site Plan Review and Zone Variance to permit the improvement, use, and maintenance of the 1.52 acre site for the construction of a new two-story commercial medical building at 111 W. Beverly Boulevard for Beverly Oncology Health Foundation.

Director Palombi – Madam Chair and members of the Commission, Item 8.A. relates to a request for Site Plan Review as well as a Zone Variance to allow the construction of a new two-story commercial medical building for the property located at 111 W. Beverly Boulevard. Josephine Pham will be providing you with a brief presentation regarding this item. The applicant is also available. Thank you.

Josephine Pham - Good evening, Commissioner Chair Lomeli and members of the Planning Commission. I will be presenting entitlement number PC-2020-0013-SPR-ZV for Beverly Oncology Health Foundation located at 111 W Beverly Boulevard.

The existing underutilized vacant lot is located south of West Beverly Boulevard and west of Poplar Avenue at approximately 66,000 square feet or 1.53 acres. The property is located in a C-2 General Commercial zone surrounded by other C-2 zones. The immediate surrounding uses are General Commercial as well, which is compatible with the commercial designated land use and will not have an adverse impact on adjacent or abutting properties. The applicant is proposing to construct a new, two-story, commercial medical building for Beverly Oncology Health Foundation on an underutilized existing vacant lot. The Beverly Oncology has been providing community-based cancer treatment for over 37 years, with the highest quality cancer treatment with innovative medical technology. The Proton Center will support two proton treatment rooms that deliver radiation therapy through an external proton beam. Proton Therapy is the most advanced radiation treatment using high energy proton beams to deliver high doses of radiation to a precise location without affecting the surrounding tissue. Proton Therapy is non-invasive, painless, safer, and more effective than traditional radiation therapy treatment. The business will operate with approximately 20-25 employees operate Monday through Sunday from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. They plan to treat up to 12 patients per hour by appointment only.

The project requires a Site Plan Review for the review of the new two-story, commercial medical building and a Zone Variance to allow parking

based on the proposed Project's actual need as an alternative to the Montebello Municipal Code requirements. Back in July of 1985, the project site was improved with a 25,000 square foot pharmaceutical office building shown below. In 2016, the building was demolished. And in August of this year, the applicant submitted a complete application, requesting the Planning Commission to review the project for Site Plan Review and Zone Variance. We will begin the Site Plan Review with our first slide, the site plan. The proposed Project is adequate in size and meets the minimum side, front, and rear yard setbacks in the C-2 zone. The lot shall be striped and landscaped with detailed irrigation plans conditioned to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department. The Floor Area Ratio for C-2 zoned properties is 3:1. Through thorough calculation, the Floor Area Ratio is 2:1, which is well within the requirements.

The first level floor plan to the left, and the second level floor plan is to the right. Approximately 22,000 square feet of the building, indicated in red, is used for medical office-related uses which include a family lounge, patient rooms, MRI/CT, consultation rooms, small offices, infusion rooms, outdoor balconies on the second floor, and staff lounges. The blue areas indicate the location of the Proton Vaults on both levels at approximately 8,500 square feet and there is a subterranean, unoccupied basement level at approximately 5,000 square feet directly underneath the same foot print.

Here is the Conceptual Rendering of the north west elevation of the building. The proposal features contemporary style architecture and will be a precedent for the future of Beverly Hospital Campus. The building will feature copper panels and precast concrete along the base of the building with a substantial number of windows for natural light. All exterior building materials were reviewed by the Planning Division and it has determined that the submitted Building and Material Board conform and exceed the Montebello Municipal Code's minimum standards. Here is the south east elevation of the building. Per Montebello Municipal Code, all new commercial developments shall be 35 feet in height. The height of the proposed building will be 28 feet measured from the ground level grade to the roof. Mechanical screening is provided within an additional 13-foot-3-inch parapet, which is permitted to exceed the maximum building height per MMC Section 17.50.020. Therefore, the building height and development standards for screening mechanical equipment and utilities conform with Montebello Development Standards. Here is the North East Elevation of the property, which showcases the balconies on either side of the building. Thorough review of the lot coverage, building height, floor area ratio, off-street parking and loading, landscaping, and building materials, as noted above, have been determined to conform and exceed the MMC's minimum standards. The applicant is requesting a Zone Variance to deviate from MMC Section 17.52.050 (Off-Street Parking Standards), which requires one parking stall for every 200 square feet of

gross floor area for Medical Office. The required parking for the 22,848-square-foot of patient occupied areas of the building equates to 115 spaces. The applicant proposes 54 parking spaces, complete with 38 standard stalls, 3 electric vehicle charging stations, 4 ADA parking stalls, 3 loading stalls, 2 patient drop-off stalls and 4 ambulance stall. Based on the Parking Variance Memorandum conducted by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., peak parking demand for the proposed facility shall be considerably lower than the required 115 stalls due to the unique characteristics of the project. They have concluded that there may be upwards to 25 employees at 12 patients per hour for approximately one-hour services at the facility. Therefore, it has been concluded that 37 parking stalls is all that is required, resulting in a surplus of 17 parking stalls.

The project is Categorically exempt from CEQA per Class 32 of Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Pursuant to MMC Section 17.78 (Public Hearings, Notices, and Appeals), the following noticing was performed on August 20, 2020, the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Daily Journal (Whittier Daily News). On August 18, 2020, the Public Hearing Notice was mailed to owners/occupants within the 300-foot radius from the exterior boundaries of the subject property.

Staff consulted with various departments and have not received any comments. With that, staff recommends approval of Case No. PC-2020-0013-SPR-ZV. If there are any other questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Chair Lomeli – Do you have any comments as to the obligations for the proposals this evening?

Darcy Hernandez (Applicant Representative) – No, other than the applicant is excited to see this project move forward.

Chair Lomeli – Does any of the Commission have questions for Darcy?

Commissioner Ramirez – I have a few questions. For the parking study, the reduced parking, I wanted to verify these numbers. We are saying that there are 54 stalls provided, but 3 of those are loading and 2 of those are drop off. So the 3 that are for loading, I think it's mandated by code, that's just for commercial loading of items for the facility, and the drop off is for patients that are getting dropped off to the facility, is that correct?

Darcy Hernandez (Applicant Representative) – Yes, there are 3 loading stalls in the back that are required by code for vehicular delivery of supplies. There are 2 parking stalls in the front that would be designated for patient drop-off for anyone who is making a quick visit or dropping off a patient to have close

access to the entry door and be able come around and park in a normal parking stall. That is kind of a temporary loading and unloading for patient purposes.

Commissioner Ramirez – I feel like these parking spots that are being included in the count don't count as permanent parking spots, but it doesn't affect my decision to be okay with the reduced parking only because of the parking study with your consultant. I just wanted to make note that I would not normally count these as parking in the parking count. Instead of 17 being surplus, it's more like 8 that are surplus because 4 of those would also be designated for ambulances to park. I just wanted to note that.

Darcy Hernandez (Applicant Representative) – That is a fair assessment, and we can modify the count according to what you are articulating.

Commissioner Ramirez – Yes, I think just so people can understand what we are saying when we have this surplus amount of parking when in actuality, we don't. My next question is, is there a similar proton radiation facility that we can compare this to where they did this study, and we have a set number of employees, and the parking was not impacted?

Darcy Hernandez (Applicant Representative) – Not verbatim, a similar study, but other type facilities have similar patient volume and flow. Specifically, radiation oncology centers would have similar patient flow, so our parking consultants did take a look at those medical facilities that were looked at. They weren't specific to proton therapy because proton therapy is a pretty unique technology. There are limited proton centers across the United States, but the patient volume and patient load would be comparable to other radiation oncology facilities. Those were a couple of examples that were noted by the parking consultant Kimley-Horn for comparison. This is a pretty unique facility in itself, and that majority of these larger radiation oncology and proton therapy centers are interval into a much larger medical campus like Loma Linda, UCSD, and Stanford. So the comparison of a campus would not be apples to apples.

Commissioner Ramirez – Thank you for that. I'm glad that you incorporated bike racks into the design because of the reduced parking requirement. I'm curious to know how many bike racks are going to be installed.

Darcy Hernandez (Applicant Representative) – In just looking at this, it will be a rack or two. The reality is that majority of the population, whether staff or not staff, patients are not likely to ride, staff would likely utilize them, so there would be a few bike racks for access. We do medical buildings all over the country, and we provide bike racks with all of our projects. There would probably be 2-4 total.

Commissioner Ramirez – My next question would be for staff. Under the conditions of approval, I wanted to confirm that number 6, which requires any changes ownership for lease of written notice. I want to confirm that condition will take care of somebody not being able to grandfather in this reduced parking requirement, say another tenant came in afterward under a medical office use.

Director Palombi – We can clarify that condition to make it clear that it is specifically for the proton center.

Commissioner Ramirez – The last question I had is if we can also include in the conditions of approval the maximum number of employees that are allowed because I know it's mentioned in the description. There's nothing holding this facility because it does tie the parking into this, so the number of parking spaces it changes, so include that number. Sometimes technology changes, or something can happen within a space where more employees are needed and require more cars to come in.

Director Palombi – We can add that to the conditions as well.

Commissioner Ramirez – Just for clarification, under the PDF page 12, it says that the way the site plan is required it says for all residential projects over 5,000 square feet. I don't know if that was to be included in the verbiage, but it was something that I found.

Director Palombi – That is not correct, and it should be for commercial projects over 5,000 square feet. We will make that correction to make sure that it is clear.

Commissioner Mooradian - I got kicked off. The last thing I heard was commissioner Ramirez requesting language to ensure there are no more than 25 employees because of the parking issue. If they hire more, then parking might be an issue. Is that correct?

Director Palombi – Yes.

Commissioner Mooradian - We shouldn't restrict the number of employees that the entity could hire due to parking. What could be done, perhaps, is to identify the parking spots and limit those. So later, if more employees, whether they are full-time or part-time, the entity is allowed to hire for jobs and shouldn't be restricted based on parking alone. I don't feel comfortable restricting them to the number of employees. I don't know if Commissioner Ramirez has an objection.

Commissioner Ramirez – I don't have an objection, sometimes in the health care industry, and I have worked on healthcare facilities too, the technology

can't keep up with us where we need to be flexible with the building. There may be a chance where they can add employees. This area is notorious for the residential area that has a lack of parking on the street. Because they are asking for a reduced parking variance, I know they have the bike rack, and there is the stop there too, I'm okay with designating employee parking due to the fact that we have public transportation right there as well.

Commissioner Mooradian – My concern is not to limit the number of employees because now, with Uber and other means of transportation, especially when you are going to get treatment, you probably have someone driving you there. I don't feel comfortable limiting employees. I'm okay with limiting the number of parking versus the number of employees. I also have a question for the applicant. Since we are talking about parking and employee count, are there any plans or recommendations that local employees will be hired for the facility, or do you already have designated employees? Is there going to be recruitment for the City of Montebello residents?

Dr. Thropay (Applicant Representative) – Yes, we will be hiring people from Montebello. Our company currently does that. We have one employee that lives just around the corner from our office. Yes, we would be doing that. We have not hired the employees yet.

Legal Counsel Ibarra - I want to make sure our records with the public hearing are clear. Before we state that vote on the motion, I would recommend Chair that you confirm with staff if there is any public testimony on this public hearing item. If there is or isn't, we proceed to close the public hearing, and then we proceed to take that vote or discuss that item.

Chair Lomeli – Staff, are there any comments?

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) – No, there are no public comments.

MOTION: Commissioner Mooradian motions to approve a Site Plan Review and Zone Variance to permit the improvement, use, and maintenance of the 1.52 acre site for the construction of a new two-story commercial medical building at 111 W. Beverly Boulevard for Beverly Oncology Health Foundation.

SECOND: Commissioner Ramirez

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

B. Conditional Use Permit

(Case No.PC-2020-0015-CUP/ ENV No. 110-20-CE)

A Conditional Use Permit to allow the use of a Medical Clinic within an existing commercial building at 2417 & 2425 W Whittier Blvd.

Director Palombi - Madam Chair and members of the Commission, Item 8.B relates to a proposed conditional use permit to allow the continued use and maintenance of a Medical Clinic within an existing commercial building located at 2417 and 2425 W. Whittier Blvd. within the City of Montebello. Saara Chaudry who is an Assistant Planner and one of the newest members to the Planning team, will be providing you with a brief presentation regarding this item.

Saara Chaudry (Assistant Planner) - Good evening, Chair Lomeli, and members of the Planning Commission. I'll be presenting the project submittal for Conditional Use Permit PC-2020-0015-CUP for a Medical Clinic at 2417 & 2425 W. Whittier Blvd. 2417 & 2425 W. Whittier is a lot with pre-existing structures. The lot is located towards the western edge of Montebello, and it's generally located south of Beverly Boulevard and north of W. Olympic Boulevard. The subject property has a lot-area of approximately 17,700 square feet. The existing building is approximately 12,700 square feet, with no new developments planned for the proposed project.

The applicant proposes to operate a medical clinic at an existing structure on W. Whittier Blvd. The Applicant, South Central Family Health Centers, is a family of clinics that currently have 9 existing facilities. South Central Family Health Centers was founded in 1981 to meet the needs of vulnerable residents and new immigrants to the United States. They will be operating the new location under a Health Resources and Service Administration (HRSA) grant, established for the purpose of meeting health service disparities. The facility will consist of an integrated primary care clinic with co-located dental and behavioral health services. The subject property is located in the C-2, General Commercial zone, requiring this Conditional Use Permit. The immediate surrounding uses are zoned for General Commercial as well, which is compatible with the Medical Clinic use, and therefore it will not have an adverse impact on adjacent or abutting properties.

To give you some background, in April of 2019, Planning Commission approved Lot Line Adjustment No. 02-19. This item permitted the modification of existing lot lines to consolidate four (4) adjacent lots into two (2) larger lots on Tract No. 10083. This consolidation was in

preparation for potential new development. This exhibit from Lot Line Adjustment No. 02-19 shows the consolidation of the four lots (Lots 14 through 17) into two lots; known here as Lot 1 and Lot 2. An additional Lot Line Adjustment was approved on the same day. Planning Commission approved the second LLA, known as Lot Line Adjustment NO. 03-19. LLA No. 03-19 modified the lot lines of the newly consolidated Lot 1 of tract NO. 10083 and Lot 13 of the same tract, which you will see in the next slide.

As you can see, this is the second Lot Line Adjustment. This exhibit from Lot Line Adjustment 03-19 shows the modification of existing lot lines for the two adjacent lots in Tract No. 10083. One of which was consolidated under the previous Lot Line Adjustment. This modification created the now present protrusion along the lot line. Together, Lot Line Adjustment 02-19 and Lot Line Adjustment 03-19 established the context for the currently existing lot layout.

This slide is the proposed site plan for the Medical Clinic. Because the structures are all pre-existing, Development Standards are easily met. The proposed project would provide 60 off-street parking spaces. The 12,700 square foot building only requires 53 parking spaces, based on size and use-type. Therefore, the site would provide seven (7) additional parking spaces to accommodate the proposed use. In addition, there are a few unique conditions required for approval of the CUP. These conditions relate to: Mechanical Equipment, A compliance review, landscaping, and a parking covenant. They are all included within the Resolution. Here is the existing structure on the lot. There will be limited adjustments made to the existing structure. The Project will not include any exterior modifications. All proposed changes will be done to the interior of the existing structure and will consist of; new interior finishes, new plumbing and lighting, and minimal demolition of interior walls.

In regard to CEQA guidelines, the project is Categorically exempt per Class 1 of Section 15301, as it is an Existing Facility. 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 September 1, 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 approval of Conditional Use Permit PC-2020-0015-CUP. If there are any other questions, I will be happy to answer them and the applicant will be available to answer them as well.

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner)- We have Richard Veloz who is the Chief Executive Officer of South Central Family Health Center on the line.

Chair Lomeli – Do any of the commission have any questions or comments?

Commissioner Ramirez – I would like to thank this facility for coming to our City because there are not enough this type of service. I'd like to thank your company for considering our City. The question that I have would be the parking lot. I know there is an incorporated alley there, and I didn't see a plan or photometric incorporated. Is that something that will be included in the conditions because it's a residential area, or is it because it's already done that it's not going to be needed?

Josephine Pham (Associate Planner) – The parking lot has been redone already. There is a Wing Stop and a bank currently existing right now, where it used to be all parking stalls. There is sufficient lighting from what we see, but we can add a condition to ensure that there is no light nuisance to the residential areas nearby.

Commissioner Ramirez – Thank you for that. I know that there are residential properties right there, and it can affect them. My second question is that I didn't see in the conditions of approval a provision for graffiti removal. Is that something that staff can add to the conditions of approval?

Saara Chaudry (Assistant Planner) – Yes, that can be added to the conditions.

Chair Lomeli – Are there any public comments?

Saara Chaudry (Assistant Planner) – There are no public comments.

MOTION: Commissioner Ramirez motions to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow the use of a Medical Clinic within an existing commercial building at 2417 & 2425 W Whittier Blvd.

SECOND: Commissioner Mooradian

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

B. Conditional Use Permit Modification
(Case No. CUP 07-19-M1)

A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application to modify and existing Conditional Use Permit and include indoor cannabis Cultivation to a

previously approved CUP that allowed cannabis Manufacturing and Non-Store Front delivery, within an existing commercial building on the property located at 728 Vail Avenue, APN 6353-002-005.

Director Palombi - Madam Chair and members of the Commission, Item 8.C on tonight's Planning Commission Agenda will be continued to October 6, 2020, due to a technical discrepancy in the staff report. Thank you.

9. CONSENT ITEM (S)

None

10. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

A. General Plan Update – Advisory Committee

Director Palombi – Item 10.A is intended to request direction from the Planning Commission to identify two commissioners who would be willing to commit to participate in the General Plan Advisory Committee or “GPAC”. The Advisory Committee will meet periodically in a community setting during the course of the General Plan Update to gather information from the community and provide input and recommendations to city staff, the consultant team, and ultimately the City Council on key components of the General Plan Update such as the vision, opportunity areas, housing element, and land use plan. In addition to members of the commission, there will be two members of the City Council as well as members and stakeholders from the community.

Commissioner Aliksanian – I can do it.

Commissioner Ramirez – I can volunteer for this. I have some experience for in planning updates, working for a planning firm and various other city planning designs. I would like to volunteer.

Commissioner Mooradian – These are meetings that are going to be during the day and prescheduled?

Director Palombi - Yes, that is correct. They could be pop-up meetings in the community, and typically there are between 6 to 10 meetings throughout the course of the General Plan Update process. Montebello is a relatively large city, so I would say closer to 10 meetings.

Commissioner Mooradian – Commissioner Aliksanian also wanted to volunteer, and I have no objections to that. I was curious if we could also designate a stand-in to incase if one of them cannot make it to a meeting.

Director Palombi – Yes, I believe there is an option for an alternate. We can add that to the committee list.

Commissioner Mooradian – I do not mind being an alternate.

Chair Lomeli – I can be an alternate as well.

Chair Mooradian –What if we do an alternate as far as anyone of us 3 and not name a commissioner. Just have a standing alternate, and we'll have the two main ones, which is Commissioner Ramirez and Commissioner Aliksanian.

Chair Lomeli – I don't oppose, and I agree.

Director Palombi – As part of the committee, we have Commissioner Ramirez and Commissioner Aliksanian, and the alternates would be Commissioner Mooradian and Vice-Chair Briseno. Would you also like to be an alternate Chair?

Chair Lomeli – Yes. How do we get notified of these meetings? Do we get emailed? Does it get posted in Whittier Daily News?

Director Palombi – As far as noticing it would be Citywide for these meetings, it would go to the Whittier Daily News. I still have to confirm with the consulting team, but I think we would also use information put out into the communities that we were targeting for that specific workshop, whether it be posting them at the local Starbucks, just making sure that we are making every effort to advise the community of these meetings that would be coming up.

11. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS –CONTINUED

None

12. PLANNING COMMISSION ORALS

Chair Lomeli

Vice-Chair Briseno

Commissioner Aliksanian

Commissioner Mooradian

Commissioner Ramirez - The October 6 meeting, we are going to have a meeting at 5 p.m. and then a regular planning commission after that. So does that mean that the people that volunteer today have to go to the 5 p.m. meeting? I don't understand how that is going to work.

Director Palombi – It would be a special Council meeting from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. on October 6, and as it stands right now and we are waiting for confirmation. But the goal is to have the meeting at a large enough location to accommodate both bodies meaning Planning Commission and City Council. We did not want to, and this is direction from City Manager, have the Commission, for example, in the audience here in the Council Chambers because of the social distancing requirement. So we are looking to have this meeting potentially at the Quiet Cannon Sky View Room, where we would be able to see both Planning Commission and City Council. Then it would be a joint meeting specifically for the General Plan Update process. Then we would take a break for 30 minutes, and the Planning Commission would reconvene at the same location and conduct Planning Commission business there.

Commissioner Ramirez – I see, so all of us would attend the 5 p.m. meeting and then stay for our regular Planning Commission meeting.

Director Palombi – That is correct.

13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.



Joseph Palombi, Planning Commission Secretary