

I N D E X

Torrance City Council - January 12, 1988

<u>SUBJECT:</u>	<u>PAGE:</u>
<u>OPENING CEREMONIES:</u>	
1. Call to Order	1
2. Roll Call	1
3. Flag Salute/Invocation	2
4. Approval of Minutes/Motion to Waive Further Reading	2
5. Motion re Posting of Agenda	2
6. Withdrawn or Deferred Items	2
7. Council Committee Meetings	3
<u>8. COMMUNITY MATTERS:</u>	
8a. Resolution 88-3	3
8b. 11th Annual William Olsten Award	3
8c. Commission Vacancies	4
<u>10. TRANSPORTATION/PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:</u>	
10a. Vacation of Right-of-Way N/W Corner Del Amo and Prairie	26
10b. Award of Contract for Street Improvements	26-28
<u>14. PERSONNEL MATTERS:</u>	
14a. Recruitment for Position of City Attorney	28-30
<u>15. APPEALS:</u>	
15a. W87-31: Jim York	31
15b. R3 Development Standards and Nonconforming Use Provisions Amendments	5-25
<u>17. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u>	
17a. Executive Session	31
17b. Modification of Paragon Communications Torrance Cable TV Franchise and Certain Leases	31-34
<u>20. CONSENT CALENDAR:</u>	
20a. Award of Contract - Street Sweeper	34-35
20b. Award of Contract - Repainting of Fire Station	35
20c. Renewal of Annual Contract for Trophies	35
<u>22. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:</u>	
22a. City Manager re Appreciation to Finance Department	36
22b. City Manager re Light Rail System	36
22c. Councilman Wirth re Light Rail System	36
22d. Mayor re Association of Chambers Meeting Notice	36
22e. Mayor re Provisos for Light Rail Project	37
22f. Councilman Applegate re Terminus for Rail System	37
22g. Councilman Walker re Light Rail System Terminus	37
22h. Councilwoman Hardison re Madrona Marsh Landscaping	37
22i. Councilman Nakano re Vacant Properties	37
22j. Mr. Dick Johnson re Item 10b	37
22k. Mr. Dick Johnson re Prairie Avenue Pavement	37
22l. Mr. Dick Johnson re Comments of Mr. Applegate	38
<u>23. ADJOURNMENT:</u> 12:45 a.m. January 13, 1988	

Marlene Lewis
Minute Secretary

* * *

City Council
January 12, 1988

January 12, 1988

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE TORRANCE CITY COUNCIL

OPENING CEREMONIES:

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The Torrance City Council convened in a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 12, 1988, at 7:06 p.m., in the Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

* * *

Mayor Geissert announced with great sadness the passing of George Stevens, who served as Torrance's first City Manager.

The Mayor, City Manager Jackson and City Attorney Remel-meyer, in turn, paid tribute to Mr. Stevens and related his role in the development of the City.

It was Mayor Geissert's request that this meeting be ad-journed in memory of former City Manager Stevens.

* * *

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Councilmembers Applegate, Hardison,
Mock, Nakano, Walker, Wirth and
Mayor Geissert.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Manager Jackson,
City Attorney Remelmeyer, and
Staff Representatives.

City Council
January 12, 1988

3. FLAG SALUTE/INVOCATION:

The salute to the Flag was led by Boy Scout Troop 310, James Gordon, Scoutmaster.

At the Mayor's invitation, Mr. Phil Tamoush briefly commented on the new St. Matthews Orthodox Church Parish in Torrance and introduced Father Paul Doyle and Parish Council Chairman Emil Ciontea. Father Doyle provided the invocation for this meeting.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES/MOTION TO WAIVE FURTHER READING:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to approve the City Council minutes of December 8, 1987, as written. His motion was seconded by Councilwoman Hardison and carried by unanimous roll call vote.

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved that after the City Clerk has assigned a number and read title to any resolution or ordinance on tonight's agenda, the further reading thereof be waived, reserving and guaranteeing to each Councilmember the right to demand the reading of any such resolution or ordinance in regular order. Councilman Mock seconded his motion and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

5. MOTION RE POSTING OF AGENDA:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilman Mock, moved to accept and file the report of the City Clerk on the posting of the agenda for this meeting. The motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

6. WITHDRAWN OR DEFERRED ITEMS:

15a. W87-31: Jim York:

Postponed indefinitely at the applicant's request; for formal action see Page 31.

17a. Executive Session Discussion re Clare Rose and Lawrence Wheeler v. City of Torrance, et al:

Continued one week at the City Attorney's request.

City Council
January 12, 1988

7. COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

Citizen Development and Enrichment Committee:
(to meet with two members of the School Board)

Date: Thursday, January 14, 1988

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Subject: Victor School Lighting; Magruder School Access.

8. COMMUNITY MATTERS:

8a. RESOLUTION 88-3:

At the Mayor's request, City Clerk Wilson assigned a number to Resolution No. 88-3.

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved to adopt Resolution No. 88-3. His motion, seconded by Councilwoman Hardison, carried by unanimous roll call vote.

It was explained by Mayor Geissert that the title of this resolution was not read aloud at this time in order to preserve the element of surprise when it is later presented.

8b. PRESENTATION OF 11TH ANNUAL WILLIAM OLSTEN AWARD:

On behalf of Mr. William Olsten, Christine Frangis, Olsten Services Area Manager, and Pam Hunter, Account Representative, presented the 11th Annual William Olsten Award for excellence in records management to the City Clerk's Office of the City of Torrance.

Recognized during the presentation were Dr. Donald E. Wilson for his direction, Dora Hong for her efforts and leadership, and the hard work given by Margaret Johnston, Debby Thompson, Peggy Heisner, and Barbara Feuerstein.

Present to accept this honor with expressed gratitude on behalf of the City Clerk's Office were City Clerk Donald E. Wilson and Deputy City Clerk Dora Hong.

City Council
January 12, 1988

8c. COMMISSION VACANCIES:

Applicants for each of the Commission and Board vacancies were invited to speak and the City Council made the following appointments by unanimous ballot:

Airport Commission:

A. Gary Kovacs

Cable TV Advisory Board:

Suzan Van Pelt

Civil Service Commission:

Dick Cahill
Marcia Cribbs

Disaster Council:

Steven Whitehead

Environmental Quality and Energy Conservation Commission:

James Aviani
Steven Skoll

Fine Arts Commission:

Dorothy Baker
Paul Maddox

Human Resources Commission:

John Nushy
Charles Hosler

Library Commission:

Paul Crossman

City Council
January 12, 1988

Parks and Recreation Commission:

Helen Brock
Donald Lee

Planning Commission:

George Brewster
Jack Messerlian

Traffic Commission:

Stanford Orfila, Jr.

Water Commission:

Gerald Alter
Eleanor Brogdon

City Clerk Wilson administered the oath of office to the new appointees.

* * *

Mayor Geissert announced that Item 15b would be considered next out of order.

The Council took a brief recess at 8:14 p.m., returning at 8:30 p.m.

* * *

Considered next out of order:

15b. AMENDMENTS TO THE R3 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND NONCONFORMING USE PROVISIONS:

Mayor Geissert announced that this was the time and the place for a public hearing on Council consideration of ordinances to amend the R3 Multi-Family Residential Development Standards and to amend the Nonconforming Use Provisions dealing with reconstruction of any or all land uses in the event of catastrophic damage.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Proof of publication was provided by the City Clerk and it was filed without objection.

With the aid of slides, an overview of this matter (essentially as presented in the staff material) was provided by Planning Associate Janet Pryor, who advised that the ordinances under consideration were prepared by the City Attorney as directed by the City Council at the last public hearing on this matter held on December 1, 1987 and reflect the recommendations of the Planning Commission and Planning Department.

Ordinance A, Planning Associate Prior explained, would amend the existing R3 Multi-Family Residential Development Standards adopted by Emergency Ordinance No. 3191 as follows:

1. Amend the floor area ratio (FAR) from 0.5, to 0.6 floor area to 1.0 land area.
2. Require Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval to allow the FAR to exceed 0.6 to 1.0.
3. Require minimum parking of two spaces per unit.
4. Decrease the minimum yard dimension requirement (from 15' x 15') to 10' x 15'.
5. Require CUP approval to allow R3 development higher than two stories or 27 feet.

The amendment would not change the existing maximum 35 foot height limit, it was explained by Ms. Pryor, but it would allow a public review of requests for a third story to conditionally permit development of more than 27 feet.

Three alternatives for measuring the 27 foot height control were set forth by Planning Associate Pryor, and she explained that these options are the only differences between Ordinances A-1, A-2 and A-3 prepared by the City Attorney.

The height control options, per agenda material, are essentially as follows:

Ordinance A-1 would establish the height control from existing grade.

Ordinance A-2 would establish the height control from the lowest point of the building exposed above the ground in order to include a subterranean/semi-subterranean garage level.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Ordinance A-3 would interpret a subterranean/semi-subterranean garage as a story relative to proposed height and mass.

Providing an account of Ordinance B, Ms. Pryor said it relates to amendments to the Nonconforming Use provisions of the Torrance Municipal Code presented in response to community concerns and would allow for the repair and rebuilding of properties damaged in the event of a major catastrophe (to 1972 development standards).

An explanation of how Ordinance A would change the existing R3 Development Standards was also provided by Ms. Pryor and reflected:

1. That land area of 27 dwelling units per acre would not be changed from the 1972 provision.
2. That FAR would be changed (from the emergency ordinance requirement of 0.5 floor area to 1.0 land area) to 0.6 floor area to 1.0 land area with a premium by CUP approval.
3. That the open space requirement of 0.5 square feet for each 1.0 square foot of dwelling area with a maximum of 600 square feet would not be changed.
4. That the minimum yard requirement would decrease to 10' x 15'.
5. That the minimum of two parking spaces per unit would be restored; two spaces would be required for less than three bedrooms; three spaces would be required for more than two bedrooms; and the requirement that one and one-half of those spaces be provided in a garage would continue, with flexibility of providing the remaining required parking as open spaces; the guest parking requirement would remain unchanged at one space for each five dwelling units, minimum of one space per proposal, and spaces must be open.
6. That storage requirements would remain the same at 200 cubic feet per dwelling unit.

In conclusion, Ms. Prior related staff's recommendation for the adoption of Ordinances A and B with implementation of height control by alternative A-1.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Responding to inquiries, Ms. Prior clarified:

Per Questions by Councilman Nakano

- That storage space may be provided in a garage, but that it is not required to be in a garage.
- That the Windsong and Windemere townhouse developments are between 27 and 34 feet in height (confirmed by Planning Director Ferren).

Per Questions by Mayor Geissert:

- That these standards would apply to all R3 Zones.
- That Height alternative A-1 would provide for measuring the height of the development from existing grade -- the same method used in the Hillside District and the option recommended by staff and the Planning Commission; alternative A-2 would take into consideration subterranean or semi-subterranean garage levels, as was the concern of the Council at the December 1 hearing, and measure from the lowest point of the building exposed above the ground; and A-3 would re-define a "story" to include the semi-subterranean or subterranean garage level as a story for the purpose of height control review, only (it would not change the definition of a story as provided by the Building Code).

Per Questions by Councilman Walker

- That these ordinances would apply to all R3 lots regardless of lot size.
- That there is no mechanism to exempt any lot by size with the exception of the CUP process.

Councilman Walker indicated that it would be his preference to have a mechanism in place to exclude larger lots from these standards.

The possibility of bifurcating the issue of exempting larger lots from certain of the standards in Ordinance A for consideration at another time was suggested by Ms. Prior.

Ms. Prior continued to answer questions by the Council:

City Council
January 12, 1988

Per Questions by Councilman Mock

- That the provisions of Ordinance B would apply to all land uses: residential, commercial and industrial.
- That in the R3 Zone, the provisions for rebuilding and repair would revert back to the original 1972 ordinance.
- That with other land uses there are other ordinances that apply.
- That if a building that was built prior to 1972 were to be destroyed by a major catastrophe, without intervention by the City Council at the time of the catastrophe, the ordinance would require that the property be repaired or rebuilt to the 1972 standards.

Per Questions by Mayor Geissert:

- That if the Council had not discussed R3 standards and a year ago a building had been more than 50 percent destroyed by a major catastrophe, that building would have had to have been rebuilt to 1972 standards.
- That if an apartment that was built in 1930 had been destroyed by a disaster six months ago, the owner would not be allowed to rebuild to 1930 standards regardless of the action taken by the Council at this meeting.

Comments by the Public:

Mayor Geissert entertained comments from the public at this time.

Mr. Sanford Cohen, 3407 West 190th Street, Torrance, apprised those present that Ordinance A would not be modifying the 1972 ordinance, it would modify the temporary ordinance adopted some time ago that imposed severe restrictions compared to the 1972 ordinance. This proposal, Mr. Cohen therefore alleged, represents a much more massive change than was portrayed.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Relative to the parking layouts presented in the agenda item, Mr. Cohen suggested there is a difference on the impact to development of properties with alleyways, specifically with reference to restricting the front yard to the 25 percent of the open space. Further, Mr. Cohen suggested that these requirements would probably result in the elimination of two on-street spaces in order to get one required parking space on-site -- "what you are saying is that you want part of the front yard, even if there is an alley, to be used for parking."

Concluding his statement, speaker Cohen opined that the ordinances presented address the problems of certain areas of the City, but are unduly restrictive to other areas that are not experiencing the same problems. It was his strong recommendation that the matter be returned to staff for further study or, at the very least, that an exception to the 25 percent open space limit on front yards be allowed if alley access is from the back and that a credit of one guest space be granted if a driveway is not installed on the street.

Mr. Steward Preston, 2130 Santa Fe Avenue, questioned how catastrophic destruction of property is determined and received clarification from City Attorney Remelmeyer that such would be determined by the City Council at the time. Mayor Geissert noted the Code requirements for rebuilding and that at least 50 percent of the structure must be destroyed to qualify.

Having received clarification, Mr. Preston went on record as opposed to Ordinance B and stated his opinion that this issue should be studied further.

Mr. George Schwartz, owner of property at 25538 January Drive, told of his efforts to develop his property with units and the obstacles presented because of changes to the R3 standards.

Based on his personal experiences as the father of six children, Mr. Schwartz said he took umbrage to the requirement for one parking space per bedroom for three bedrooms. (Mayor Geissert clarified the recommendations of the Planning Commission and Planning Department relative to parking and clarified the height control proposed for Mr. Schwartz' benefit.)

Mr. Jed Webster, 2108 Santa Fe Avenue, said he purchased his property in 1977. In 1980 Mr. Webster said his neighbor sold adjacent property to a developer and it was his understanding

City Council
January 12, 1988

that condominiums would be built. Depending on the height of the structure to be erected, Mr. Webster expressed concern that he would lose sunlight during half of the day.

Discussing development in the City and in his area, speaker Webster addressed: the increase in condominiums and apartments (Toledo is just a "large ghetto," as far as he is concerned); the resultant increase in traffic (Mr. Webster said he had to install double glazed windows in his house to get peace from the street noise); and problems with traffic shortcutting through their area to get to the Southern California Regional Occupational Center.

In summation, Mr. Webster said he favored more strict development requirements to curb building.

Mr. R. S. Collins, 352 Paseo de la Playa, said he is the owner of "two small buildings" built in the 1950's that are adjacent to larger buildings. Noting that he would be limited to rebuilding a lesser number of units per structure in the event of a major catastrophe according to his understanding of what is proposed, Mr. Collins suggested his rebuilt structures would "stand out like a sore thumb" against larger adjacent buildings and stated his opinion that "living under that threat is an unjust situation."

Clarifying his position, speaker Collins suggested any changes adopted should be universally imposed. (Councilman Walker clarified the intent of Ordinance B for the benefit of this speaker.)

Observing that the majority of concern was being directed toward Ordinance B, Mayor Geissert called upon Fire Chief Adams to review the history of major catastrophes in the City. Chief Adams advised those present that there has never been such a situation in the City according to the living memory of his staff.

Unassuaged, Mr. Collins requested that Council "find some wording" to provide assurance that he would be allowed to rebuild to size.

Were a property owner to find himself in an untenable situation, City Attorney Remelmeyer explained that fairness and equity would dictate that he be given relief and the Council has the ability to grant a variance. An ordinance cannot be constructed, he said, that would deal with all possible situations that may result in unfairness.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Mr. Donald Witty, 2112 Santa Fe Avenue, (a 40-year resident of the City) registered his total opposition to Ordinance B.

Mr. Donald Witty, 2112 Santa Fe Avenue, a 40-year resident of the City, registered his total opposition to Ordinance B.

Mr. Witty described current problems in his area because of an adjacent football field that brings traffic, parked vehicles (that sometimes block his driveway) and people.

Ultimately this speaker clarified that, along with 18 to 20 other members of the audience, he was present to address a proposed condominium at 2104 Santa Fe Avenue, which he felt would bring tremendous traffic to the area.

Mayor Geissert and various other members of the Council clarified the matters under consideration for the benefit of Mr. Witty and Planning Director Ferren agreed to contact this speaker regarding the status of the condominium project of concern. Mayor Geissert requested that a memorandum from staff in this regard be placed in Council boxes.

Mr. John Corter, 1952 237th Street, said he is the owner of rental property on Amapola Avenue in Torrance which he purchased in 1972 with the idea that this would be his retirement. Mr. Corter expressed his opposition to Ordinance B as proposed because it did not include a grandfather clause to allow for the reconstruction of properties built prior to 1972 in the event of a major catastrophe.

Mr. David Jabar, 3520 Maricopa Street, observed that the City does not regulate parking space on the street and suggested the uniform spacing of street parking and provision for City parking lots in dense areas to mitigate the parking problem.

Ms. Nancy Sherwood, 2413 Andreo, a resident of the Downtown Torrance area for the past year and a half, stated her concurrence with the recommended amendments to R3 development standards.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Expressing her annoyance with the "scare tactics" relative to the loss of property value, loss of retirement, and lenders being leery of the area, Ms. Sherwood said she refinanced both of her properties within the past few months and has experienced no problems with lenders or renters.

In conclusion, Ms. Sherwood opined that there should be open space, room for children to play, and parking places. She felt the recommendations proposed represent "middle ground" with priority placed on the long-term interests of the City and the quality of life therein.

Mr. Norm Quient, 2121 West Carson Street, distributed copies of a document (letter of record from Clarence E. Clark, owner of property at 2360, 62, 64, 2400 and 2402 Apple Avenue, expressing opposition to Ordinance 3191 and indicating that it is in violation of State law) which he read aloud for the record.

Asked by Councilman Wirth what State law Ordinance 3191 violates, Mr. Quient said he could not say.

Mr. George Reese, 3507 West 171st Street, described his property and stated his desire that there be a grandfather clause added to the proposed ordinance that would allow the reconstruction of his building in the event of major catastrophe.

Mr. Bob Cousins, 2960 235th Street, said he constructed a 14-unit building at that address in 1968-69, and was required to purchase down-zoning insurance when he refinanced the property with Coast Federal Savings and Loan in October, 1987. Mr. Cousins said he had been in contact with the City Attorney in this regard.

During his lengthy discourse, Mr. Cousins indicated that wrong information had been given to his lender by a City official (whom he could not identify) and he made other statements that called into question the City's propriety.

These accusatory remarks were refuted by Councilman Applegate, who stated his opinion that Mr. Cousins presentation was inappropriate. Mr. Applegate expanded at length on the misconceptions surrounding the issue at hand.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Ms. M. Bacon, 5316 Lenore Street, indicated that her concern, and that of other small apartment owners, involved the ability to rebuild in the event of a major catastrophe. This speaker suggested: that developers be addressed relative to the opposition to new construction; that the problems associated with over building in the Downtown and Santa Fe areas be considered as a separate issue; and that there be two separate ordinances, one with standards for new construction and one with standards for rebuilding in the event of a major catastrophe (Mayor Geissert explained that the latter was the intent of Ordinances A and B). Ms. Bacon urged the Council not to adopt measures that would impact the financial status of her property.

Identifying himself as the owner of two small apartment buildings across from Alondra Park, Mr. Bob McNair, 345 Calle Mayor, said he agreed with the need to impose new rules. However, given the unlikelihood a major catastrophe would never occur in the City, he suggested a grandfather clause to include all structures rather than inflicting a "threat on the entire community."

Mayor Geissert again reminded those wishing to address the Council to direct their comments to the ordinances under consideration.

Mr. Howard Sashare, 22636 Ocean Avenue, Redondo Beach, said he favored some form of grandfather clause, or ordinance, that would provide protection for people who have been in the City a long time so they would not be tied to the 1972 Ordinance.

Assuming by implication that each time an R3 ordinance is passed existing structures become legal nonconforming, Mr. Sashare drew attention to Torrance Municipal Code (TME) Section 92.22.4 regarding the termination of nonconforming uses and the schedule therefor, and Section 92.22.12, regarding time extensions for abatement.

It was affirmed by City Attorney Remelmeyer that the City Code does contain a Nonconforming Use Ordinance, adopted in 1958; that this ordinance sets limitations on various types of structures based upon Building Code designations and types of use; and that in many of these cases the abatement period may have expired. However, Mr. Remelmeyer elucidated that this ordinance has never been enforced with regard to abatement. He agreed that this Code should be amended and said it would be his recommendation that limitation periods be extended to allow the Council an opportunity to thoroughly analyze the whole subject.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Mayor Geissert requested the City Attorney coordinate with the City Manager and return this issue to Council for informational purposes.

Mr. Tony Kriss, member of the Torrance/Lomita/Carson Board of Realtors, 25416 Crenshaw Boulevard, reiterated the position taken earlier by Mr. Cohen (see Page 9) that the proposed ordinance would make changes to the emergency ordinance, not the 1972 ordinance.

Indicating his uneasiness with the definition of "emergency" as "anything that the City Council declares to be an emergency," Mr. Kriss invited the Council to consider establishing the definition of an emergency in order to give an accounting to the citizens as to what is an emergency and why the Council may "deny property rights and impact property values."

Relative to the Nonconforming Use Ordinance, Mr. Kriss said he endorsed the recommendation of the City Attorney. This Code section was deemed "a worthless piece of paper" by this speaker pursuant to TMC Section 92.22.5, which stipulates that any time an ordinance is passed creating a nonconforming condition the City Manager or his designee is obliged to send notice to all affected people.

Having conducted extensive research with the help of two title companies, the scope of which he described at length, Mr. Kriss reported that he found no evidence that this Code was ever applied.

It was pointed out by speaker Kriss that such information is critical to property owners and to the buying and selling public. He discussed the agents' and sellers' responsibility to disclose all material facts relative to the sale of property and noted that ignorance of the law does not excuse agents from liability in this regard.

Mr. Kriss recommended that all R3 property be exempted from the nonconforming condition until the City has had time to review this ordinance; and, if the ordinance is applied, that proper notice be given as prescribed.

In substantiation of the allegation he set forth at a previous Council meeting, that the City is not in compliance with State law, Mr. Kriss distributed copies of correspondence (of record) dated December 15, 1987, sent to City Manager Jackson from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). According to Mr. Kriss, the Department of Housing and Community

City Council
January 12, 1988

Development declared in this letter that Torrance is not in compliance with the Government Code because the Housing Code has never been approved by HCD and because the City has not complied with a law that requires a job/housing balance.

Mr. Kriss said he met with the City Manager and City Attorney to discuss the contents of the subject letter and it was their opinion it would not be necessary to rewrite the entire ordinance. He mentioned case histories wherein actions have been brought against cities that have not complied with the codes in question. In order to avoid such problems, it was Mr. Kriss' request that the Mayor and Council require the City Manager and the City Attorney to confer with the Department of Housing and Community Development to resolve the issue of compliance.

Responding to the accusations by speaker Kriss, City Attorney Remelmeyer disclosed:

- That the statute under which the Department of Housing and Community Development operates does not give it the authority to approve or disapprove the findings of the City Council as to whether or not the Council has complied with State Law regarding the Housing Element of the General Plan of the City.
- That the statute does give the Department of Housing and Community Development the right to review the draft and provides that the City shall submit a draft of its Housing Element for review before it is adopted by the City Council.
- That the statute also states that HCD shall review such draft and report its findings to the Planning Agency (City) within 90 days of its receipt of the draft.
- That the City did send a draft of the Housing portion of the General Plan to the State within the time limits prescribed; but, as the letter from HCD admits, HCD did not review the Housing Plan:

We chose not to review the element at that time due to workload constraints.

City Attorney Remelmeyer read the following information aloud at this time:

City Council
January 12, 1988

The Department shall review the draft and report its findings to the Planning Agency within 90 days of receipt of the draft in the case of adoption of the Housing Element pursuant to this article.

The legislative body shall consider the Department's findings prior to final adoption of the Housing Element unless the Department's findings are not available within the above described time limits.

Since the Department of Housing and Community Development's findings were not available within the 90 days prescribed, Mr. Remelmeyer explained that the City Council proceeded to adopt the Housing Element of the General Plan and complied with the law as seen by the staff and the City Council at the time.

City Attorney Remelmeyer went on to explain:

- That the Department of Housing and Community Development states in its letter that they finally did review the draft Housing Plan and found deficiencies, and also states that if the City does certain things it will be in compliance.
- That these findings are the opinion of the Department of Housing and Community Development. It does not have the authority to approve or disapprove and therefore the City's Housing Plan is not in violation of the State Law unless a court would overrule the City's judgment and say that the City did not consider certain things adequately.
- That anything the City does can always be questioned by a court -- as to whether or not the Housing Plan might be found by the court to be in noncompliance is the type of chance the City takes with everything it does.

In conclusion, Mr. Remelmeyer stated his opinion that it cannot be said that at the present time the City's Housing Element is invalid or is in violation of State Law. However, he felt the City should address the concerns of the Department of Housing and Community Development as expressed in its letter.

It was noted by the Mayor, and confirmed by the Planning Director that the Planning Department is in the process of upgrading the entire General Plan.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Relating his concept of the sequence of events, Mr. Kriss alleged:

- That when the City submitted its draft of the Housing Element, The Department of Housing and Community Development did review it and designated by notation those areas of the Element that were not in compliance with State law.
- That before the draft was returned to the City, the City adopted the Housing Element.
- That it was the "adopted" Housing Element that HCD said it did not have time to review at the time.
- That HCD's letter indicates the City has an "opportunity" to conform its Housing Plan for the benefit of the community at large.

The R3 Ordinance under consideration, Mr. Kriss opined, acts to reduce the possibility of providing housing in compliance with existing law. Mr. Kriss quoted HCD's position as set forth in the subject correspondence (of record):

We have been informed that the City may be considering an ordinance to increase its development standards, including increased setbacks. If and when this is done, the Housing Element should be updated to analyze the ordinance as a potential constraint to the development of affordable housing. If the ordinance is found to be a significant constraint, steps to mitigate its adverse effects may be necessary.

Mr. Kriss alleged that the City is indulging in practices that place it at risk, as identified by HCD, and that "one of those risks is the restraints on the opportunities that people have to develop property in accordance with the zoning that existed at the time that they purchased it."

City Manager Jackson stated his opinion that the intent of the paragraph quoted by Mr. Kriss is not to restrict the adoption of an ordinance, but rather to require an assessment by the Council at a later date to determine if this is a significant constraint on meeting the City's housing goals and to come up with an alternative means to achieve that end if it is found to be such. Mayor Geissert agreed that the paragraph contained "permissive language" indicating the Housing Element "should be" updated and steps to mitigate its effects "may be necessary."

City Council
January 12, 1988

In listening to what Mr. Kriss was saying, Councilman Wirth questioned if he was inviting an outside State agency to come to Torrance and tell the City it needs low income housing. Mr. Kriss clarified that the language used was "affordable."

Councilman Walker reviewed the intent of Ordinances A and B and commented on the public's misunderstanding of what is proposed. It was his observation that the problem being addressed by most speakers came about when the ordinance was changed in 1972.

Regarding the letter under discussion from the Department of Housing and Community Development, Mr. Walker remembered the City's earlier stand regarding low-cost family housing and expressed his discontent at having received correspondence which makes reference to the State analyzing special housing needs and the development of housing for all income levels.

Mr. Tony Kriss returned to the podium to pursue the need for assurances to R3 property owners relative to their ability to rebuild in the event of a major catastrophe and relative to the impact of the Nonconforming Use Ordinance. Responding to an inquiry by the Mayor, Mr. Kriss maintained that Torrance was not "singled out" and that the Nonconforming Use Ordinance became of issue because of the changes to R3 standards.

Mr. George Mobley, 415 Via Mesa Grande, (Redondo Beach mailing address), President of the Torrance, Lomita, Carson Board of Realtors for 1988, advised that their organization is representing the property owners in the United States and the protection of property rights. Mr. Mobley verified that the Board was responsible for notifying 2,000 people of this proposal after it came to their attention.

Ms. Sherrie Silver, 22628 Juniper Avenue, agreed that density has to be contained, but expressed personal fears relative to protecting her investment in an apartment building that was built prior to 1972. This speaker indicated that she may not have purchased this property if she been informed of the 1972 ordinance at the time of purchase. Assurance that she would be allowed to rebuild in the event of a disaster was requested by Ms. Silver.

There being no further speakers from the audience, Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilman Mock, moved to close the public hearing. Roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Council comments were entertained by the Mayor.

Councilman Walker said he felt the City needed some controls on development standards on small lots but expressed concern that the ordinance offered did not contain a written provision allowing for the bifurcation of small lots from other lots in the City.

In looking at the various options, Mr. Walker said he concurred with the staff recommendation for Ordinance Option A-1, using existing grade as the level from which height is measured.

Mr. Walker acknowledged that Mr. Cohen made some good comments with regard to square footage applicable to open space in front yards, but overall this speaker indicated that he felt the City was doing the right thing by making the changes proposed.

Councilwoman Hardison reflected on the year-long process in developing the ordinance under consideration and the conditions that led to this consideration. The legal nonconforming issue, Ms. Hardison observed, dated back to 1972 and should be considered as a separate issue, in her opinion.

Stating her agreement with the height of 27 feet from the natural grade, Mrs. Hardison said she would be supporting Ordinance Option A-3 because she felt subterranean or semi-subterranean garages should be reviewed as a story in the height review process.

With the proposed ordinances, Councilman Wirth said he felt staff had found a good answer to address the concerns of the general public and assure the rights of property owners and it was his hope the ordinance would be put into action at this time.

Councilman Mock complimented staff for doing a "fantastic" job of dealing with the public and compiling information and stated his preference for Ordinance Option A-3 in agreement with Councilwoman Hardison.

MOTION: Councilman Mock moved to approve Ordinance A-3, seconded by Councilman Wirth. (This motion ultimately carried; see Page 24.)

Council discussion continued.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Having received clarification from staff relative to the measurement standard used for measuring the height of the Windsong Development, Councilman Nakano said he would be in favor of Ordinance Option A-1 knowing that the City has had projects with that kind of a height measurement, which he felt were reasonable.

Mr. Nakano said he was glad to see Ordinance B to provide property owners with the option of building to 1972 standards if a disaster takes place. It was Mr. Nakano's expressed hope that action be taken at this meeting.

Councilman Applegate observed that each of the Ordinance options contained minimum accessibility criteria or turnaround for parking, a subject which had neither been addressed by staff nor discussed by Council.

After receiving clarification from staff relative to how such criteria would be enforced, Mr. Applegate deemed the minimum accessibility criteria "impractical" and stated his opinion that it would be an unnecessary waste of space and might compound a particular parking situation. It was his recommendation that this portion of the Ordinance be eliminated.

(Given the Planning Director's confirmation that it would be very difficult to build two floors over parking with the 27 foot height limitation) Mr. Applegate suggested the 27 foot height control would be too restrictive, would prohibit rather than check development, and suggested increasing this number.

Regarding parking, Councilman Applegate submitted that the requirement for a third parking space for a third bedroom would be "a major stumbling block" to family housing, involving larger costs and resulting in higher rent. This, he felt, would be "a step in the wrong direction"; would result in a preponderance of two-bedroom units because anything larger would not be cost effective; would place an unfair and unrealistic burden on people building such units as an investment; and would ultimately cut back on the new supply of family housing.

As his last point, Councilman Applegate addressed the issue of setbacks. It being his personal belief that buildings set further back from the street are more aesthetically pleasing, Mr. Applegate pointed out that allowing 100 percent credit for front yard setback toward open space served as an encouragement to this end. The proposed ordinance change allowing only 25 per-

City Council
January 12, 1988

cent credit for front yard setback toward open space requirements would reverse this direction, in his opinion, and encourage minimum front yard open space.

Councilman Applegate said he would like to see some changes along the lines mentioned.

Discussion returned to the issue of height. Planning Director Ferren clarified, in response to a question by Mayor Geissert, that two stories over a garage can be achieved quite easily within the 27 foot height restriction using the A-1 option and with a semi-subterranean or subterranean structure. However with the A-2 option this would be very difficult, if not impossible, he said.

Mr. Ferren noted that concerns voiced during meetings on the R3 standards regarding the impact on adjoining properties served as the reference point from which staff chose the A-1 option as their recommendation.

Based on the Planning Director's comment and noting that the A-1 option provides more design latitude while maintaining a lower silhouette respective of neighbors, Councilman Walker offered the following action.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Councilman Walker moved for approval of Ordinance A-1. As part of his motion, Mr. Walker requested that this be returned with the second reading bifurcating the R3 lots in question from those 14,000 square feet or less. This action, Mr. Walker said, would exclude roughly 19 percent of the lots in the City and exclude the larger properties, which in fact the Council was not initially developing this Ordinance to address. The remaining lots, Mr. Walker proposed, would all fall under the CUP (Conditional Use Permit) process to lessen the chasm between small lots and developments of 100 units, heretofore the mechanism for triggering a CUP. This action, Mr. Walker felt, would give the City control, address part of the concerns and would not make nonconforming a vast number of properties in the City. (This motion failed to carry; see Page 24.)

City Attorney Remelmeyer clarified that this approach to modifying the ordinance would, in effect, result in a new ordinance which would require a third reading.

As an option, it was suggested by the Mayor and clarified by the City Attorney that the first reading could be postponed one week to allow staff to modify the ordinance per Mr. Walker's direction.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Councilman Walker said it would be his preference to approve Ordinance A-1 in concept and direct the City Attorney to bring it back in the proper form (per his substitute motion above); however, he indicated that either approach would be acceptable to him.

Councilman Nakano seconded the substitute motion, indicating that either alternative suggested would be acceptable.

Subsequently, Councilman Walker voiced his desire to pass the ordinance, have it modified the following week, and have another (third) reading of it in order to take action at this meeting and not leave people hanging.

Mayor Geissert clarified that it was Mr. Walker's intent in making his substitute motion to adopt Ordinance option A-1 and direct the City Attorney to come back next week with a modification that would exempt R3 properties of 14,000 square feet or more from this ordinance and require the CUP process on those properties excluded.

Urged by the Mayor to provide instructions to staff relative to the exempted properties that would fall under the CUP process, Councilman Walker said that parking requirements should be equally applied, his concern being that he did not want to see a 27 foot height restriction mandated on larger properties.

It was suggested by Mayor Geissert that Mr. Walker's concerns could be addressed by modifying Section 7d of the Ordinance to require the CUP process on larger properties.

Planning Associate Prior clarified that the ordinances were written to apply to all R3 properties and that amending Section 7 as suggested would not exempt larger properties from the other Ordinance provisions.

Planning Director Ferren stated his understanding that it was Mr. Walker's intent to have the exempted properties fall under the existing R3 standards. Councilman Walker confirmed this to be correct with the exception that he wanted the new R3 parking requirements to be applied and the CUP process to be required on the larger properties.

The City Attorney clarified that every section of the ordinance proposed would have to be modified to provide two categories, one under 14,000 square feet and one above. The City Manager added that this modification would take several weeks.

City Council
January 12, 1988

It was Councilman Walker's expressed desire that the matter be returned as soon as possible.

Discussion continued.

Voicing her support for the main motion (Option A-3) Councilwoman Hardison said she was bothered by the suggestion that this matter, which had been under consideration for some time, should be brought back with changes without any input from staff. If it proved to be the Council majority's decision to bifurcate the ordinance as to referenced lot sizes, Mrs. Hardison said she would request that this matter be returned as an agenda item. (Mr. Walker indicated that he had no objection to her request).

Councilman Wirth stated his preference for the main motion (Option A-3), preferring, he said, a "simplified process." It was his feeling that larger properties would be addressed through the CUP process. Mr. Wirth later clarified that given the choice between A-1 and A-3, A-1 would be his second choice, but not with the modifications proposed.

The Council returned to consideration of the three options. Planning Associate Pryor noted that Option A-3 takes into consideration the mass with subterranean or semi-subterranean and alleviates the possibility of encouraging flat-roof architecture.

Voicing her support of the Substitute Motion for Ordinance A-1 with requested modifications, Mayor Geissert said she believed this option addresses the concern of extreme height differentials, particularly on the recycling of smaller lots. However, the Mayor was not sure she could support all of the modifications requested, and said she would reserve judgment pending a staff report on same.

The SUBSTITUTE MOTION (Option A-1 with the Ordinance to be returned bifurcating lots over 14,000 square feet) failed to carry by roll call vote as reflected below.

AYES: Councilmembers Nakano, Walker and Mayor Geissert.

NOES: Councilmembers Applegate, Hardison, Mock and Wirth.

City Council
January 12, 1988

The MAIN MOTION (for Ordinance A-3) then carried by majority roll call vote as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Hardison, Mock, Nakano*, Walker, Wirth and Mayor Geissert.

NOES: Councilman Applegate.

*Having originally voted "no," Councilman Nakano immediately requested that his vote be changed to "yes."

At the Mayor's request, City Clerk Wilson assigned a number and read title to Ordinance Option A-3:

ORDINANCE NO. 3217

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE MAKING CERTAIN CHANGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR THE R-3 MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLING ZONE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 91.7.2, 91.7.9, 91.7.11, 93.2.3, 93.5.2, 93.5.11 AND 95.3.28 OF THE TORRANCE MUNICIPAL CODE

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved to approve Ordinance No. 3217 at its first reading. Seconded by Councilman Walker, the motion carried by majority roll call vote with Councilman Applegate (only) voting "no."

Planning Director Ferren clarified, per Councilmen Nakano and Walker, that this action included the incorporation of revised Section 7 per supplementary material (No. 2) on Agenda Item 15b.

City Clerk Wilson then read number and title to Ordinance B:

ORDINANCE 3218

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE ADDING SECTION 92.22.16 TO THE TORRANCE MUNICIPAL CODE PROVIDING AN EXCEPTION TO THE NONCONFORMING USE PROVISIONS IN THE EVENT OF CATASTROPHIC DESTRUCTION OR DAMAGE TO BUILDINGS

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved to approve Ordinance No. 3218 at its first reading. His motion, seconded by Councilman Walker, carried by unanimous roll call vote.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Mayor Geissert clarified the Council's request that the City Attorney analyze the Nonconforming Use Ordinance and confer with the appropriate departments to come forward with recommendations for modification.

City staff was commended by the Mayor for doing an excellent job on this matter.

* * *

Mayor Geissert called for a recess at 11:22 p.m. The Council reconvened at 11:47 p.m. and returned to regular agenda order.

* * *

10. TRANSPORTATION/PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS:

10a. SUMMARY VACATION OF EXCESS RIGHT-OF-WAY AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF DEL AMO BOULEVARD AND PRAIRIE AVENUE:

Upon request by the Mayor, City Clerk Wilson assigned a number and read title to:

RESOLUTION NO. 88-4

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE ORDERING THE SUMMARY VACATION OF THE EXCESS RIGHT-OF-WAY AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF DEL AMO BOULEVARD AND PRAIRIE AVENUE

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved to adopt Resolution No. 88-4. Councilman Walker seconded the motion and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

10b. AWARD OF CONTRACT AND TRANSFER OF GAS TAX FUNDS:

Improvement of:

- a) Plaza Del Amo from Maple Avenue to Crenshaw Boulevard;
- b) 229th Place west of Arlington Avenue; and
- c) Four various locations along Arlington Avenue.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Transfer of Gas Tax Funds:

Transfer of \$27,000 in Gas Tax Funds from Prairie Avenue Project Account for construction costs on Arlington Avenue.

Reference: B87-87.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Engineering Department recommends:

1. That a contract be awarded to Shawnan Corporation for the improvement of: a) Plaza Del Amo from Maple Avenue to Crenshaw Boulevard; b) 229th Place west of Arlington Avenue; and c) four various locations along Arlington Avenue (B87-87); and that all other bids be rejected;
2. That the actual street plan engineering design costs for Plaza Del Amo be added to the total project cost and be shared as required in the Park Del Amo Development Agreement; and
3. That \$27,000 in Gas Tax Funds be transferred from the Prairie Avenue (190th Street to 182nd Street) project account for construction costs on the Arlington Avenue segment of the contract.

Supplementary material consisting of the resolution on this matter was noted by staff.

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to concur with the City Engineer's recommendations. His motion was seconded by Councilman Mock. Roll call vote was unanimously favorable, Mrs. Hardison voting "yes" with a question.

Councilwoman Hardison requested information from City Engineer Burt regarding the scheduling of the Arlington portion of this project. The City Engineer offered his assurance that homeowners in the subject area would be kept apprised of the contractor's schedule and that Mrs. Hardison would be informed as well.

City Clerk Wilson read number and title to:

City Council
January 12, 1988

RESOLUTION NO. 88-5

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE AWARDING A CONTRACT TO SHAWNAN CORPORATION, AUTHORIZING ITS EXECUTION, APPROVING THE SHARING OF ENGINEERING COSTS, AND APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS

MOTION: Councilman Nakano, seconded by Councilman Walker, moved to adopt Resolution No. 88-5. Roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

14. PERSONNEL MATTERS:

14a. RECRUITMENT FOR THE POSITION OF CITY ATTORNEY:

RECOMMENDATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ADMINISTRATOR:

The Civil Service Administrator recommends:

Development of Search Criteria

That the consultant personally meet with the Council, as required, to develop a consensus on the recruitment criteria; that development of criteria include discussions with the City Manager, City Attorney, and key department heads as designated by the Council; and that written selection criteria be subject to Council approval.

Frequency of Feedback

That biweekly written progress reports be required.

Recruitment

That the scope of recruitment be specified and be focused in California, including both public advertising and direct contact; and approval by the City Manager be required for all written advertising.

Reference Checking

That questions to be asked in the reference check process be reviewed in advance with the City Council.

City Council
January 12, 1988

Contact with Applicants

That the level of contact with an applicant be left to the consultant's judgment.

Final Selection

That the consultant recommend a list of not less than eight qualified candidates from which the City Council can select those to interview; that all appropriate background information on the finalists be provided to the Council; and that the consultant provide a "finalists interview guide" for the Council's use.

Time Frames

That a completion date for the selection of finalists be set no more than 120 days from the signing of the agreement; and that the consultant, in turn, provide milestone dates for the accomplishment of specific steps.

Budget

That the consultant's proposal be on a fixed fee basis with a stated ceiling on any variable expenses.

Staff Assigned

That the proposal name the staff member(s) to be assigned to the project and specify the person to be liaison with the Council; and that resumes and references (prior projects) be required for each of the assigned personnel, as well as an outline of concurrent projects assigned.

Proposals

That proposals for conducting a recruitment for the position of City Attorney be sought from Korn-Ferry International and Ralph Anderson and Associates, and that these proposals address each of the specific staff recommendations (above).

City Council
January 12, 1988

CITY ATTORNEY'S NOTE:

Recruitment must be limited to California due to Bar requirements.

Stating his agreement with the overall recommendation by staff, Councilman Applegate referred to the development of search criteria wherein discussions with key department heads as designated by the Council were suggested. He mentioned the Police Department because of their relationship with other departments and asked for some direction from the City Manager relative to departments with the greatest need for close contact with the City Attorney.

Mayor Geissert addressed her concerns.

Relative to "Contact with the Applicants," Mayor Geissert said she agreed in concept that "the level of contact with an applicant should be left to the consultant's judgment," but felt that a determination in this regard should not be made at this time.

Relative to "Recruitment," the Mayor said she had a problem with the recommendation that "All written advertising would require approval by the City Manager." It was the Mayor's suggestion that advertising be reviewed by the City Manager and the City Attorney with final approval by the City Council. Upon explanation by the City Manager that such an approval process would be prohibitive to meeting magazine publication deadlines, the Mayor acquiesced, requesting at the outset that proposed advertising be placed in Council boxes.

Referring to his previously expressed concern, Councilman Wirth said he did not object to the recommendation for a final list of no less than eight qualified candidates ("Final Selection"); however, it was his request that Council be provided with a brief synopsis of all candidates that apply for the position.

Without further comment from the Council, the following was offered at this time.

MOTION: Councilman Wirth moved to concur with the staff recommendations on Agenda Item 14a, as modified by the comments made. His motion, seconded by Councilwoman Hardison, carried by unanimous roll call vote.

City Council
January 12, 1988

15. APPEALS:

15a. W87-31: JIM YORK:

Proof of publication, as provided by the City Clerk, was filed without comment.

The applicant's request for an indefinite postponement relative to Council consideration of an administrative appeal of a Planning Commission approval of a Waiver to allow construction of a single-family residence with a detached double garage with less than the Code required back yard setback in the R-1 Zone at 24255 Park Street was announced earlier (see Page 2).

MOTION: Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilman Wirth, moved to grant the postponement in the matter of W87-31, Jim York. Roll Call vote was unanimously favorable.

The City Attorney received affirmation from the Planning Director that the Planning Commission's approval of this Waiver will be held in abeyance pending Council action on the appeal.

17. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

17a. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Due to the lateness of the hour, City Manager Jackson suggested the matters that were to be discussed during executive session be carried over to the next meeting (January 19, 1988). There were no objections voiced.

17b. MODIFICATION OF PARAGON COMMUNICATIONS TORRANCE CABLE TV FRANCHISE AND CERTAIN LEASES WITH THE CITY:

RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY MANAGER, CABLE TELEVISION ADMINISTRATOR AND CITY ATTORNEY:

That the City Council adopt the resolution approving and authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute and attest the Memorandum of Understanding between the City and Paragon Communications.

City Council
January 12, 1988

CITY MANAGER'S NOTE:

It is the recommendation of the City Manager and the Finance Director that the \$1,000,000 be placed in an interest bearing trust account and used for debt service on the Certificate of Participation issued for construction of the Telecommunications Center. Without commitment of these funds for payment of debt service, the General Fund would be required to subsidize such payments.

The City Manager provided a brief overview of this item per the staff report of record.

City Manager Jackson reported that through discussions with Paragon relative to a conflict over the lease of the cable facilities in the Stanley E. Remelmeyer Telecommunications Center an agreement was developed whereby the City would buy out leased facilities for \$1,000,000.

The Agreement, as described by Mr. Jackson, would allow the City to continue with rental payments pursuant to bond covenants for the facility; gives the City use of the facility minus a small part of the facility that will be retained by Paragon; would modify the access fees to a flat yearly rate with provision for escalation; and contains language that would protect the City from litigation by Paragon on the various provisions of this agreement.

In conclusion, City Manager Jackson noted the recommendation of the City Manager, City Attorney, and Cable TV Administrator that Council take the necessary action to approve this Agreement.

Mr. Jerome Ramsey, 1511 Cravens Avenue, commented that the Agreement under consideration would preserve local programming for the City of Torrance. Two reasons for Paragon's support of the Agreement, despite recent court decisions relative to the payment of access fees, were conveyed by Mr. Ramsey: 1) They feel local programming enhances the quality of life in the community and is an attractive incentive from a business standpoint; and 2) As people who live and work in the Torrance, they value having a good, strong working relationship with the City and their constituents. Mr. Ramsey urged Council support of the Agreement and complimented City staff for a competent and professional job in representing the interests of Torrance.

City Council
January 12, 1988

For the record, City Attorney Remelmeyer advised that there would be some small modifications to the Agreement, to which Paragon has agreed, and he felt there was total agreement on the subject matter between Paragon Communications and the City.

Councilman Applegate questioned the terms relative to Paragon's use of the studio, receiving clarification from the City Manager that Paragon will have a total of 24 hours per week of access programming and up to 12 of those hours may be used for non-access purposes.

Mayor Geissert invited members of the audience to speak at this time.

Mr. Tom Rische, 22920 Carlow Road, Torrance Cable TV Advisory Board Chairman, clarified the intent of actions taken by the Board in conjunction with the proposed Agreement stating that it was their intent to suggest the City Council refer this matter to the Advisory Board to explore alternatives for disposition of funds, not to ask that the whole \$1,000,000 be allocated for public access activities.

The City Manager directed attention to his note (above) stating that the \$1,000,000 is a prepayment of certain lease obligations which will be passed through the City to the Public Facilities Corporation as rental payments on the building. The Council is also asking for ways to guarantee those funds are set aside, the City Manager mentioned.

It was suggested by Councilman Wirth that, in the future, Advisory Board recommendations be signed by the Chairman, as is the practice with other bodies, to prevent such misunderstandings.

Councilman Applegate said it would have been his preference to use the \$1,000,000 to pay off a portion of the bond, but such action is precluded by constraints thereon. The Council is looking at ways to safeguard the money for the purpose it was intended he confirmed.

Next to speak from the audience was Mr. Joe Arciuch, 23521 Kathryn Avenue, who indicated that the Cable TV Advisory Board agrees the City should go forward with the Agreement. However, it was his opinion that the Agreement represents a loss in the public access area and he echoed Mr. Rische's request that the Board be allowed to discuss the disposition of funds. (The City Council's concern that this money be preserved for bond repayment was reiterated by the Mayor.)

City Council
January 12, 1988

In response to Mr. Arciuch's concerns regarding funds for public access, the City Manager explained that a request for a General Fund expenditure for this purpose would be reviewed by the City Council in the same manner as a budget request from any other City body.

Councilman Wirth noted the Council's past commitment to public access and voiced assurance that the Council would support this activity.

Responsible City staff members and Paragon Communications representatives were commended by Councilman Walker for their efforts in arriving at this Agreement.

Mayor Geissert asked City Clerk Wilson to assign a number and read title to:

RESOLUTION NO. 88-6

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORRANCE AND THE CITY COUNCIL ACTING AS THE TORRANCE CABLE TELEVISION PUBLIC ACCESS FOUNDATION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CITY AND PARAGON COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO THE TERMINATION OF A CERTAIN SUBLEASE AND MODIFICATION OF A CERTAIN LEASE BETWEEN THE CITY AND PARAGON AND TO CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS OF PARAGON'S CABLE TELEVISION FRANCHISE FOR THE CITY OF TORRANCE

MOTION: Councilman Nakano moved to adopt Resolution No. 88-6. Councilman Walker seconded the motion and roll call vote was unanimously favorable.

20. CONSENT CALENDAR:

20a. AWARD OF CONTRACT: Re Purchase of a Budgeted Replacement new Street Sweeper as a "special opportunity" purchase based on bid price received by the City of Arcadia.

Reference: Arcadia Contract No. 57067

Expenditure: \$73,485.00

City Council
January 12, 1988

RECOMMENDATION:

The Purchasing Division recommends the City Council authorize the purchase of a new 1987 budgeted mobile street sweeper utilizing a bid price previously submitted to the City of Arcadia earlier this year (as a "special opportunity purchase") from the Nixon-Egli Equipment Company, the sole Southern California dealer, in the bid amount of \$69,000.00 plus tax (\$73,485.00 including tax).

- 20b. AWARD OF CONTRACT: To Repaint the Interior and Exterior of City Fire Station No. 1.

Reference: Bid B87-74

Expenditure: \$9,540.00, including tax

RECOMMENDATION:

The Purchasing Division recommends the City Council award a contract for repainting the interior and exterior of City Fire Station No. 1 to the low responsible bidder, E. Bitsakis Painting Company of San Pedro, California, in the total amount of \$9,540.00, including tax.

- 20c. RENEWAL OF ANNUAL CONTRACT: To Furnish Trophies for use in the Recreation Department's Sports Programs.

Reference: Bid B87-4

Estimated Expenditure: \$21,281.36, including tax

RECOMMENDATION:

The Purchasing Division is recommending that Council authorize the renewal of the City's annual trophy contract (with pricing, terms and conditions based on Bid 87-4) with the LOS ALTOS TROPHY COMPANY of Los Alamitos, in the anticipated amount of \$21,281.36, including tax.

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to concur with the staff recommendations on Consent Calendar Item Nos. 20a through 20c. His motion, seconded by Councilman Walker, carried by unanimous roll call vote.

City Council
January 12, 1988

* * *

At 12:25 a.m. (on Wednesday, January 13, 1988), Councilman Applegate, seconded by Councilwoman Hardison, moved to adjourn as the City Council and, remaining in their seats, reconvened as the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Torrance for the January 12, 1988 meeting.

Upon the conclusion of Agency business at 12:27 a.m., the Redevelopment Agency meeting was adjourned and the regular City Council order of business was resumed.

* * *

22. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

22a. City Manager Jackson expressed his appreciation to the Finance Department for their help in providing information for discussions with Paragon Communications.

22b. Based on information he received indicating the possibility of moving forward on the Hawthorne Boulevard leg of the light rail project in the South Bay, City Manager Jackson recommended that an agenda item be brought forward at the January 19, 1988 meeting, specifically as to whether an Environmental Impact Report should be explored for the southern end of the South Bay corridor.

22c. Councilman Wirth agreed with the need for an agenda item concerning the light rail project; expressed concerns regarding the dissemination of information thereon and relative to where the light rail system would terminate; and asked that sufficient back-up information be provided to the Council and staff.

22d. Mayor Geissert expressed dismay that Torrance City Council was not notified regarding the South Bay Association of Chambers' meeting featuring speakers who addressed the light rail project.

City Council
January 12, 1988

22e. Mayor Geissert stated her desire that staff return with a request to participate in an EIR for the light rail project in the South Bay, but only with strict provisos supporting a route that would terminate with a park-and-ride facility at the Palos Verdes Landfill.

22f. Councilman Applegate indicated he would not support a light rail system down Hawthorne Boulevard unless there is allowance for a terminus on the hill and requested that specific information be included in the agenda item brought forward.

22g. Councilman Walker said he would not agree with the concept of a light rail system down Hawthorne Boulevard that would terminate at Pacific Coast Highway.

22h. Councilwoman Hardison requested and received information from staff that the Madrona Marsh landscaping plan would be brought forward at the January 19, 1988 meeting.

22i. Councilman Nakano requested information from staff regarding vacant properties at Crenshaw and Sepulveda Boulevards; Sepulveda and Kent (as requested by Mr. Wirth); and on the southwest corner of Crenshaw and Torrance Boulevards. The City Manager will follow through.

22j. Mr. Dick Johnson, 23059 South Nadine Circle, expressed concern regarding the transfer of funds in Agenda Item 10b, noting the need for street improvements on Prairie Avenue. City Engineer Burtt offered assurance that this transfer of funds would not delay the improvement of Prairie Avenue, which he estimated to be two years away.

22k. Mr. Dick Johnson, 23059 South Nadine Circle, requested that the Street Maintenance Superintendent investigate the possibility of interim measures to "smooth" the pavement finish on Prairie Avenue pending improvements thereto.

City Council
January 12, 1988

221. Mr. Dick Johnson, 23059 South Nadine Circle, complimented Councilman Applegate for his response to the inappropriate presentation by one of the speakers during the discussion on R-3 development standards, Agenda Item 15b.

23. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Councilman Applegate moved to adjourn the January 12, 1988 meeting of the City Council at 12:45 a.m. (January 13, 1988) to January 19, 1988 at 5:30 p.m. His motion was seconded by Councilman Wirth and carried without objection.

Adjournment was dedicated to the memory of:

George Stevens

* * *



Mayor of the City of Torrance



Clerk of the City of Torrance

Marlene Lewis
Minute Secretary

City Council
January 12, 1988