AGENDA
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
JUNE 10, 2020
6:00 P.M.
COMMUNITY ROOM, 30940 HAWTHORNE BLVD
RANCHO PALOS VERDES

Pursuant to Section 3 of Executive Order N-29-20, issued by Governor Gavin Newsom on March 17, 2020, the special meeting of the TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE for Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 6 P.M. will be conducted via teleconference using the Zoom platform. These measures are to protect the public and City employees, and to do our part to help ‘flatten the curve’ and slow the spread of COVID-19. For public participation options please see separate cover.

6:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

FLAG SALUTE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR’S COMMUNICATION

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Recommendation: Approve the Meeting Minutes for the April 28, 2020 special meeting.

SHERIFF’S STATUS REPORT

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(This section of the agenda is designated for audience comments for items not on the agenda.)
OLD BUSINESS

1. **Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Rivera Vehicle Gap**

   **Recommendation:** Defer this item to the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Ingress/Egress and Sight Distance at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East**

   **Recommendation:** Receive the following consultant reports and approved the recommendation in each report:

   - Report dated June 1, 2020, by Rigg Consulting, options for Ingress and Egress at 28160 PVDE
   - Report dated June 2, 2020, by Willdan Engineering, 28160 PVDE Sight Distance

2. **FY 2020-21 TSC Work Plan**

   **Recommendation:** Review, discuss and approve the proposed TSC Work Plan.

3. **Installation of one Permanent Radar Detection Unit on Palos Verdes Drive East at Calle Aventura and two units along Palos Verdes Drive East at Bronco Drive**

   **Recommendation:** Install permanent speed radar detectors that alert drivers of excessive speed as a “Traffic Calming” measure in 3 locations.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

1. **Red Curb Painting Near Palos Verdes Drive South and Forrestal Drive**

   **Recommendation:** Review and discuss issued work order.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORAL REPORTS

(This section of the agenda is designated for oral reports from Committee Members.)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(This section of the agenda is designated for individual Committee Members to request that an item be placed on a future TSC meeting agenda.) (10 minutes)

F.1. Raising Cane’s Drive-Thru Restaurant at Trudie Drive and Western Avenue
F.2. Speed Study along major arterials including PVDE switchbacks from Crest Road (East) to PVDS
F.3. Adding capacity to left turn pocket along Hawthorne Boulevard southbound onto Highridge Road
F.4. Installation of new guardrails on PVDE and PVDE switchbacks
F.5. Study regarding pedestrian crossing at PVDW and Berry Hill
F.6. Hawthorne Boulevard Frontage Road study
F.7. PVDS and Forrestal Drive traffic signal warrant analysis

ADJOURNMENT:

Adjourn to a time and place certain only if the Committee wishes to meet prior to the next regular meeting.

American with Disabilities Act: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you require a disability-related modification or accommodation to attend or participate in this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please call Public Works (310) 544-5252 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

NOTE: Staff reports are available for inspection at City Hall, 30940 Hawthorne Boulevard, during regular business hours, 7:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. Monday – Thursday and 7:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. on Friday.

Written materials, including emails, submitted to the City are public records and may be posted on the City’s website. In addition, City meetings may be televised and may be accessed through the City’s website. Accordingly, you may wish to omit personal information from your oral presentation or written materials as it may become part of the public record regarding an agendized item. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the TSC after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the front counter of the lobby of the City Hall, 30940 Hawthorne Boulevard, Rancho Palos Verdes during normal business hours. You can also view the agenda and staff reports at the City’s website: http://www.rpvca.gov/772/City-Meeting-Video-and-Agendas
Pursuant to Section 3 of Executive Order N-29-20, issued by Governor Gavin Newsom on March 17, 2020, the special meeting of the TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE for Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 6 P.M. will be conducted via teleconference using the Zoom platform. These measures are to protect the public and City employees, and to do our part to help ‘flatten the curve’ and slow the spread of COVID-19.

To maximize public safety while still maintaining transparency and public access, those members of the public wishing to participate may do so in the following ways:

1. **Viewing the live meeting**: Members of the public wishing to view and/or participate must do so remotely via Zoom electronic meetings by filling out the online request form at [https://www.rpvca.gov/participate](https://www.rpvca.gov/participate). Upon successful submission, you will receive an email with further instructions on how to connect to the meeting. It is best to fill out the form prior to the start of the meeting.

2. **Comments on non-agenda and specific agenda item(s)**: If you wish to make a comment, please submit via email to traffic@rpvca.gov or by mail to 30940 Hawthorne Blvd., Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275. Comments received prior to the meeting will be forwarded to the Chair Larry Liu at traffic@rpvca.gov for consideration. Otherwise, they will be included as late correspondence the following day. Any comments received prior to the meeting will not be read during the meeting.

3. **Comments on non-agenda and specific agenda item(s) during the live meeting**: If you are watching the meeting live and wish to make a comment on an agenda item as it is being heard, you may submit your brief comment using the following methods below. Please note that there is a maximum allowance of 3 minutes per individual comment, subject to the Chair’s discretion. Your comment will be read or heard during the meeting if received in real time prior to the commencement of that item. Otherwise, it will be included as late correspondence the following day.
   a. **Email**: Comments will be accepted via email to traffic@rpvca.gov during the meeting, prior to the close of the public comment portion on an item, or during public comments for non-agenda items, and read aloud into the record with a maximum allowance of 3 minutes per individual comment, subject to the Chair’s discretion.
   b. **Telephone**: If you wish to speak during the meeting, please fill out the online request form at [https://www.rpvca.gov/participate](https://www.rpvca.gov/participate). Upon successful submission, you will receive an email with further instructions on how to connect to the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you require a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the City at least 48 hours prior to the meeting via email at adarequests@rpvca.gov or 310-544-5252. Staff will use their best efforts to provide reasonable accommodations to provide as much accessibility as possible while also maintaining public safety.
The City of Rancho Palos Verdes thanks you in advance for your cooperation and reminds you that abiding by the March 19, 2020 orders issued by Governor Newsom and the County of Los Angeles mandating that all residents stay home except for essential needs is the best and most effective tool to slow the spread of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus).
CALL TO ORDER:
Chair Liu called the special virtual meeting to order at 4:04 P.M. conducted via teleconference using the Zoom platform.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Members Colville, Fox, Guerin, Tye and Chair Liu

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Elias Sassoon, Director of Public Works; Ara Mihranian, City Manager, Lukasz Buchwald, IT Manager; Nasser Razepoor, Associate Engineer; Lauren Ramezani, Senior Administrative Analyst and Acting Recording Secretary, Public Works Department; Cheri Bailiff, Permit Technician; Vanessa Nunez, Willdan Engineering, Consulting Traffic Engineer; Bob Merrill, Ardurra Group, Consulting Engineer; Deputy Patrick Duran, LA County Sheriffs

FLAG SALUTE:
Member Fox led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Member Tye moved to approve the agenda, and Chair Liu seconded the motion.

Motion Approved: Ayes 5, Nays 0

CHAIR’S COMMUNICATION:
Chair Liu thanked everyone for joining the meeting through the new teleconference platform. The list of the names of all interested parties were read aloud to see if they had joined the meeting.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCTION
Chair Liu welcomed new member Martin Fox. Member Fox commented that he looked forward to seeing everyone in person.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Member Tye moved to approve the minutes of the January 16, 2020 special meeting, and Chair Liu seconded it. Member Fox abstained since he was not a member of TSC at that time.

Motion Approved: Ayes 4, Nays 0, Abstain 1 (Fox)

SHERIFF’S STATUS REPORT:

The Sheriff’s Deputy was not in attendance but had submitted his report that was distributed as Late Correspondence. Later during the meeting, Deputy Patrick Duran joined the meeting and provided a briefing on the traffic accident at Hawthorne and PVDN and the reckless driving incident on Hawthorne Boulevard and PVDW.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR NON-AGENDA ITEM):

Marie Chura- She sent in a request to get more information on the illegal car gathering at PVDW and Hawthorne Boulevard the prior week. Chair Liu commented that during the Mayor’s Breakfast event this incident was discussed. City Manager Mihranian added that he was at the office when the incident happened and contacted the Sheriff’s office immediately. He had asked for increased deputy presence in the City at nighttime. Member Tye added that the Sheriff’s office is taking this type of illegal vehicle activity very seriously.

OLD BUSINESS

1) PVDE Roadway Widening from Bronco Drive to Upper Headland Drive and Decomposed Granite (DG) Pedestrian/Equestrian Path from Bronco Drive to Sunnyside Ridge Road - Review consultant drawings, review input from public-outreach meeting held on March 10, 2020, and discuss.

Action Taken:

Chair Liu mentioned that this item was brought before the TSC several times and public input had been taken. A revised PowerPoint presentation was distributed earlier in the day as late correspondence. Consulting Engineer Merrill presented the revised project layout and alignment and answered questions.

Sheri Felmann- She said that they had surveyed the property and the boundaries were slightly different from what was presented by the City. She was strongly in favor of “emerging driveway” signage close to their house.

Jeff Felmann- He wanted the fence to be 6 feet tall rather than 4 feet to provide more privacy.

Pam Guttish- She mentioned that there is an illegal light placed in a tree by 28527
PVDE that is distracting and dangerous. She asked for it to be removed.

Evie Hunter- Agreed with Mr. and Mrs. Felman. She is concerned that a third lane will cause drivers to speed or pass other vehicles. She would like to see something that would make drivers keep to a speed of 30 mph. She liked the DG equestrian trail and pedestrian path. She also would like to know cyclists’ opinions about the bike lane.

Sarah and Robert Gonzalez- They expressed concern around the turn since the crosswalk and driveway were close, which could be hazardous. They suggested maybe a flashing light should be installed.

Chris Engen- Commented that the vegetation by the Headland roadway exit needs regular trimming.

Discussion ensued. Director Sassoon commented that if the City Council authorizes the project, a survey will be conducted which would be more accurate than the Felmann’s drone conducted survey. He added that the illegal light would be removed from the tree.

Consulting Traffic Engineer Nunez commented that excess signs creates sign fatigue and does not improve safety. She said speeding is a problem everywhere and that enforcement is the key solution.

Sister Tracy Sharp – She mentioned difficulty getting in and out of her property.

Chair Liu moved that the TSC recommends the installation of permanent radar units on either side of the Bronco curve showing posted and actual vehicular approached speeds to be, and that the radar be installed without delay. Motion was seconded by Vice Chair Colville.

**Motion Approved: Ayes 5, Nays 0**

Chair Liu moved that the TSC recommends against the installation of individual signage warning of “hidden driveway” along PVDE in that section of the road, and Member Fox seconded it.

**Motion Approved: Ayes 4, Nays 1 (Colville)**

Chair Liu moved that TSC approves staff recommendation for PVDE Roadway Widening from Bronco Drive to Upper Headland Drive and Decomposed Granite (DG) Pedestrian/Equestrian Path from Bronco Drive to Sunnyside Ridge Road

**Motion Approved: Ayes 5, Nays 0**

2) **Park Place Parking** - Discuss agenda item from the City Council meeting held on March 17, 2020.

**Action Taken:**
Director Sassoon comments that Dr. Olson had appeared before the TSC at the last meeting and had made some requests. He added that this item was presented to the City Council on 3/17/20 and a lengthy staff report was prepared and a decision was made. Therefore, there was no need to agendize this item again. Member Tye concurred that Dr. Olson’s requests were addressed.

NEW BUSINESS

1) **Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Rivera Vehicle Gap** - Review consultant report, discuss, and make recommendations to City Council.

   **Action Taken:**

   Chair Liu commented that the City was going through cost savings options and that the CIP for FY 20-21 reviewed the previous night had included that particular traffic light and budget of $300,000. Associate Engineer Razepoor presented the item. Discussion ensued.

   Mrs. Butterfield- commented that she would support the temporary signage when school begins and requested increased enforcement due to speeding around Via Rivera area.

   Members discussed recommending that a no right turn on red sign at the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard and PVDW for northbound right turns onto Hawthorne Boulevard, during peak hours as determined by staff be installed. Chair Liu moved to defer this item until the next TSC meeting and that item to be placed on the agenda. This was agreed by all.

   **Motion Approved: Ayes 5, Nays 0**

2) **PVDW at Via Lorado Curb Painting** - Review consultant exhibit, discuss, and make recommendations to City Council.

   **Action Taken:**

   An item of late correspondence was distributed regarding this item. Associate Engineer Razepoor presented the item and asked TSC to approve the consultant’s recommendation to paint the curb red. He added that this item was on the March 23, 2020 TSC agenda.

   Ramtin Vahadi- He shared pictures of that curb and proximity to his house. He added that if the curb was painted red, with the lack of a sidewalk, walking to his house would be problematic. Additionally, there would be no place for service or delivery people to park.

   Mr. McKellen and Mrs. Butterfield- Commented that due to the speed on the
roadway, nature of the right turn and the short acceleration lane, having a car parked at that curb was very dangerous and there were several near hits.

Discussion ensued. Director Sassoon commented that the property has a three-car garage and a driveway so visitors could park in the driveway.

Chair Liu moved to approve staff’s recommendation for the existing red curb be maintained and extended to the bike path. Member Tye seconded it.

Motion Approved: Ayes 4, Nays 1 (Liu)

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS (II)
Due to the late hour, this item was not discussed.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ORAL REPORTS
None

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
The installation of a no right turn on red sign at the intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard and PVDW.

ADJOURNMENT:
Chair Liu moved to adjourn the meeting to Tuesday May 26, 2020 at 6:00 P.M. and Member Tye seconded it. The meeting would be a virtual meeting. The meeting adjourned at 7:42 P.M.

Motion Approved: Ayes 5, Nays 0
DATE: JUNE 10, 2020

TO: CHAIR LIU AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: ELIAS SASSOON, PE, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM OB 1 - Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Rivera Vehicle Gap

RECOMMENDATION

Defer this item to the next TSC meeting.

Attachments: none
DATE: JUNE 10, 2020

TO: CHAIR LIU AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: ELIAS SASSOON, PE, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NB 1 — INGRESS/EGRESS AND SIGHT DISTANCE AT 28160 PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST

RECOMMENDATION

Receive following consultant reports and approve the recommendation in each report:

- Report dated June 1, 2020, by Rigg Consulting, options for Ingress and Egress at 28160 PVDE
- Report dated June 2, 2020, by Willdan Engineering, 28160 PVDE Sight Distance

Staff recommends the following based on the two reports:

1. Eliminate the circular drive and east approach.
2. The singular west approach to be constructed with a positive slope from the outer edge of the trail toward the pavement and with a down-slope of 10% from the outer edge of the trail toward the house.
3. A center lane to be constructed along the curved portion of PVDE.

DISCUSSION

This item was initially presented to the TSC on November 25, 2019. The City Planning Commission (CPC) was presented with this proposed development on May 12, 2020 and several comments were raised regarding the sight visibility of the proposed two approaches and the proposed encroachment onto Public Right-of-Way.

Attachments: Initial Staff Report to TSC
Staff Report to CPC
Allan Riggs Report Dated June 1, 2020
Willdan Engineers Report dated June 2, 2020
MEMORANDUM

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
FROM: ELIAS SASSOON, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR
DATE: NOVEMBER 25, 2019
SUBJECT: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 28160 PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST

I. SCOPE OF REVIEW

Review the Applicant's requested Encroachment Permit pursuant to City Council Policy No. 31 to allow construction in the Public Right-of-Way, and forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission for its consideration as part of the Applicant's requested development application for a new single-family residence.

II. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

On May 16, 2018, the Planning Department received an application for the construction of a new single family residence on an undeveloped lot located at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East. The proposed project involves improvements in the Public Right-of-Way (ROW) in which an Encroachment Permit from both the Public Works Department and Planning Division are required. The location of the proposed project is on a tight hairpin curve where vehicular and pedestrian safety concerns have been raised. The proposed structure is situated at the Property Line and approximately 25 feet of the Public ROW is proposed to be used to provide driveway access to the residence.

Pursuant to City Council Policy No. 31, page 4, "The Planning Commission may refer a request to the Traffic Safety Committee for recommendation, if traffic safety is involved." In order to avoid further delays and to preemptively address the potential traffic safety concerns, Staff seeks the Traffic Safety Committee's (TSC) input to forward to the Planning Commission for their consideration as part of the proposed development application.

The Applicant's original request for an encroachment permit for the following improvements to be constructed within the Public ROW:

TSC 11/25/19 Item 1
- Grade Beam
- Decked Driveway
- Caisson abutting the property line.

There were some concerns regarding the access and the proposed development in the Public ROW. Based on several meetings held between the Fire Department, Planning Department, Public Works Staff and the Applicant the project design was revised on several occasions. This is because the Applicant is required to clear different requirements and conditions to bring the proposed project in compliance with current rules and regulations. This included meetings with the City and Fire Department to obtain clearances for the proposed driveway and encroachment into the Public ROW. The most recent copy of the application was submitted to Public Works in November 2019, to be forwarded to the Traffic Safety Committee.

This submittal was reviewed by an independent Engineer (Willdan), and a response was provided (Attachment A) regarding the above mentioned items. Subsequently, on November 13, 2019, the City met with the Applicant and his architect to review the plans prior to the Traffic Safety Committee meeting. Based on this meeting, Staff is recommending, and the Applicant is in agreement, to make the following changes to the proposed improvements in the Public ROW:

- Remove Grade Beam
- Fill the space under the proposed decked driveway with dirt and make compaction in accordance with the requirements set by Public Works.
- Remove the structured decked driveway and replace with a concrete driveway.
- Construct a caisson a minimum of 1 foot away from the property line to support the fill.

There is an 8-foot wide equestrian trail that is planned along Palos Verdes Drive East on the same side where the house is proposed to be constructed. With the current design, it would be impossible to construct this trail, along the frontage of this property. Further, the analysis by the traffic engineer for the sight-visibility, regarding the approaches, was based on the posted 25 mph and not the 85th percentile operating speed of the vehicular traffic, which is almost 40 mph. To date, not all the needed revisions regarding these changes have been submitted to the City. However, Staff recommends that revised plans be submitted to the Public Works Department prior to the scheduled Planning Commission public hearing. Staff also recommends the following conditions be placed on the entitlements to be issued by the Planning Commission:

- Locate and verify all existing utilities and show them on the Site Plan.
- Applicant to provide confirmation from all franchise utilities affected that they do not have any issue with the proposed development.
■ Construct a Retaining Wall (Caisson) at least 1 foot away from the Property Line.
■ Construct Retaining Walls along the East and West sides of the lot to the edge of the roadway.
■ Provide Certified Backfill, with compaction, in the area encompassed by the East and West Retaining Walls and along the lot line.
■ A width of 8’ of the driveway will be constructed as a trail, per Attachment B - Cross Section of Proposed Development.
■ Obtain LA County Fire Department approval of the revised package.
■ Install and maintain “Right Turn Only” signs at both driveway approaches. (Right In-Right Out circulation).
■ Execute a Covenant and Agreement for the property owner to assume responsibility regarding patching and general maintenance of the proposed driveway, public trail, and retaining walls within the Public ROW. If the City or any franchised utility company has to remove all or any portion of the driveway or trail, the City/Utility Company will replace/repair the damaged/removed driveway with asphalt. The property owner will have to make the permanent repairs using concrete. This Covenant Agreement will be prepared by the City Attorney’s Office and will include the necessary provisions regarding the items encroaching in the Public ROW, as well as signage by the approaches. The cost of the preparation of this agreement, and filing costs, shall be paid by the Applicant from Trust Deposit funds. The Covenant and Agreement will be filed with Los Angeles County and will be attached with the property.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is in support of encroachment permit, to allow mentioned retaining walls, the driveway, and signs within the Public ROW, with all the mentioned conditions.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Traffic Safety Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their consideration regarding the requested encroachment permit.

Attachments:
■ Attachment A – Independent Traffic Engineering Report
■ Attachment B – Cross Section of Proposed Development
■ Attachment C – Site Plan exhibiting proposed locations of Retaining Walls and Driveway Circulation
TO: Elias Sassoon, Director of Public Works
FROM: Vanessa Munoz, PE, TE, PTOE
Traffic Engineer
DATE: November 13, 2019
SUBJECT: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East – De Langis Residence

The City of Rancho Palos Verdes has requested we review the site plan being proposed by the residents of 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East and the encroachment of the structural deck for the driveway into public right of way and review the sight distance memorandum prepared by JMC² dated June 7, 2019.

Deck in Public Right of Way Discussion

The structural deck for the driveway being proposed is approximately 27-feet into the public right of way. It is costumery not to construct within the public right of way as public works improvements are routinely being performed within the public right of way, such as regular roadway maintenance, roadway improvements, roadway widenings, new trails, utility repairs, installation of new utilities, emergency repairs and others to name a few. When these improvements are performed, damage or complete disturbance to improvements (such as what is being proposed) is a possibility and the improvements must be replaced in kind and any damaged infrastructure must be repaired. In this case, the deck encroaches completely into the public right of way and would burden public works projects financially, would generate construction delays, and create an unsafe condition. Should the deck construction be permitted, the City would end up being financially responsible for any damages to the deck or caisson when performing routine maintenance work, roadway widening, emergency repairs or implementing other project such as a trail. Any project would be required to coordinate with the residents and have special time frame consideration since removal of the deck would limit access into their garage and would limit access in an out of the property, creating an unsafe condition. Furthermore, the City is in the process of planning a trail project that will be implemented within this area and would impact the trail design and would create a gap in the trail system.

Sight Distance Memorandum Discussion

The sight distance memorandum utilized an incorrect prevailing speed of 25 mph for vehicles driving along Palos Verdes Drive East, the 85th percentile speed along that segments is 38 mph and a 25-mph warning speed limit sign shown at the curve is not an acceptable method to measure the 85th percentile or does it set a maximum speed limit. Based on the 85th percentile of 38 mph the stopping sight distance should be at least 305’, therefore the sight distance shown on the exhibits does not meet the minimum requirements and the driveway locations being proposed are not acceptable.
Based on my review of the structural deck impacts to the public right of way and the lack of sight distance being provided at the driveways, I do not recommend the improvements be accepted as proposed at this time.
City of RANCHO PALOS VERDES
Attn: Mr. Jason Caraveo
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

RE: SIGHT DISTANCE AT 28160 PALOS VERDES DR EAST - RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA (PLANNING CASE NO. PLVA2018-0001)

Dear Mr. Caraveo,

This sight distance has been prepared based on Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) Topic 200 section 201.1 Sight Distance and Table 405.1A, and the CA MUTCD standards of sight distance analysis, Caltrans Safety System Guidance, 2017 based on maximum speed limit sign postings of "25 MPH". The City of Palos Verdes provided a RADAR speed survey collected at RPV Dr East and Headland Drive showing an 85th mile of 38 MPH (prevailing). While it is not collected along the curve, it is still prudent to use this as the approach speed and speed within the curve for evaluation of conditions.

We were asked to address the following questions:

Q1. Are the proposed driveways safe for operation?

Conditionally Yes. While they are not at optimal location, the driveways still meet a safe minimum standard assuming posted speeds. Neither driveway meets the desired decision sight distance standard of 7 seconds, which is a driver’s perception, but they still maintain adequate stopping sight distance assuming posted speeds. The constraining movement is the southbound LT into the westerly driveway (left driveway per plan). Stopping sight distance is just above standards for posted speed, but in inadequate for prevailing speed. In order to mitigate this condition, it will be recommended to the owner that the driveway be restricted to in/out configuration with the easterly driveway being the entrance and the westerly but the driveway serving as the exit, along with a restrictions that left turns in/out of the driveway be not allowed. Again, while this configuration will meet all minimum standards, the perception of entering/exiting the driveway will be difficult, but acceptable. Physical limitations to the driveway are not proposed as this is a private driveway, therefore the owner will have to be cognizant of this restriction and self limit the turning movement.
Q2. Is metal beam guardrail (MBGR) needed?

No. Per Caltrans Safety System Guidance, Section 3.1, one must ask *is striking the guardrail is less severe than striking fixed objects or slopes behind the MBGR?* The pre-existing site condition had a steep drop off along a roadway with a left curve after a tangent section, something that commonly requires MBGR protection. With construction of the new building pad, thus removal of the steep drop off, the need for the rail is eliminated, creating the situation of the MBGR becoming a fixed object. It is recommended to remove the MBGR to the property line, with a new end section. It is further recommended that all chevrons and delineators remain in place unless relocation is required due to sight distance limitations entering/exiting the driveway is created by sign placement. This condition will be verified and corrected, if necessary, during construction.

Should you have any questions, please contact Khaled Abdo, PE, Sr. Project Manager, at 310.214.6550 x 308.

Best regards,

JMC2 Civil Engineering + Surveying

Richard C. Tippett, (TR 2119)
Traffic Engineer

Enclosures: Sight Distance Plan dated 02/28/2019
TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: TERRY RODRIGUE, INTERIM DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DATE: MAY 12, 2020
SUBJECT: HEIGHT VARIATION, MAJOR GRADING PERMIT, VARIANCE, SITE PLAN REVIEW, AND ENCROACHMENT PERMIT (CASE NO. PLVA2018-0001)
PROJECT ADDRESS: 28160 PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST
APPLICANT: LUIS DE MORAES
LANDOWNER: DAVID DE LANGIS
STAFF COORDINATOR: JAEHEE YOON, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

REQUESTED ACTION: A REQUEST TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 5,923FT² (GARAGE INCLUDED), 3-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ANCILLARY SITE IMPROVEMENTS WITH 1,517YD³ OF ASSOCIATED GRADING ON A VACANT LOT.

RECOMMENDATION: 1) REVIEW THE PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN AS IT RELATES TO STAFF'S RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO ADDRESS NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY AND GRADING CONCERNS; 2) PROVIDE THE APPLICANT WITH INPUT; AND, 3) CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JUNE 23, 2020, PROVIDED THAT THE APPLICANT AGREES TO A TIME EXTENSION PURSUANT TO THE PERMIT STREAMLINING ACT.

ZONING: SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (RS-2) / OPEN SPACE HAZARD (OH)
LAND USE: SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
CODE SECTIONS: 17.02, 17.48, 17.64, 17.70, 17.56.030, 17.76.030, 17.76.040, 17.80.090, 17.96 AND CITY COUNCIL POLICY NO. 31
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
MAY 12, 2020
PAGE 2

GENERAL PLAN: RESIDENTIAL 1-2 DU/ACRE / OPEN SPACE HILLSIDE
TRAILS PLAN: C18 UPPER PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST SEGMENT
SPECIFIC PLAN: N/A
CEQA: CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT (§15303 – NEW CONSTRUCTION)
ACTION DEADLINE: JUNE 1, 2020

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS RESIDING WITHIN 500’ OF PROPERTY: NONE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS RESIDING BETWEEN 500’ AND 1,000’ OF PROPERTY: NONE

BACKGROUND

On May 16, 2018, the Applicant submitted Height Variation, Major Grading Permit, Variance, Site Plan Review, and Encroachment Permit applications requesting approval to construct a new 3-story residence and ancillary site improvements with associated grading.

On June 13, 2018, Staff met with the Applicant to discuss the project and revised plans were submitted on June 14, 2018. On July 13, 2018, Staff completed an initial review of the application and revised plans, at which time the application was deemed incomplete due to missing information on the project plans. As part of the incomplete letter, Staff raised concerns with the bulk and mass of the proposed residence on a steep hillside area. In addition, Staff raised concerns with the amount of grading proposed for the pool/spa and east side yard improvements which appeared to be excessive.

On January 24, 2019, a public notice was issued by the City, which informed the public that the proposed project was to be reviewed by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2019. The Applicant built the project silhouette and requested that the application be considered by the Planning Commission for a preliminary review of the proposed project prior to deeming the application complete. However, the Planning Commission dismissed the request on the basis that a project should be reviewed by the Planning Commission once it is deemed complete for processing by City Staff.

On November 25, 2019, the proposed project was presented to the Traffic Safety Committee (TSC) for their review as part of the Encroachment Permit. At the meeting, the TSC adopted a motion to recommend to the Planning Commission, based solely on traffic safety considerations, to proceed with the proposed project as set forth in the Public Works Department Staff Report (attached).

On April 2, 2020, Staff deemed the application complete for processing, setting the action deadline to June 1, 2020. On that same day, a public notice was mailed to property owners within a 500’ radius of the project site and published in the Palos Verdes Peninsula News, providing a 30-day time period to submit comments and concerns. Staff received 5 public comment in response to the notice, which are attached and discussed throughout this Staff Report.
PROJECT SITE

The project site is a vacant 27,837ft² down-sloping lot that is located on the south-side of Palos Verdes Drive East between Headland Drive and Sunnyside Ridge Road. With an average slope steepness of 43%, the overall elevation difference between the street of access (Palos Verdes Drive East) and the rear property line is approximately 75' in height. Due to the steepness of the slope, the project site is considered a hillside property which allows for a reduced front yard setback per Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code (RPVMC) §17.48.030(C)(1). The project site's General Plan land use and Zoning designations are Residential 1-2 D.U./AC and Single-Family Residential (RS-2), respectively. In addition, nearly half of the southern portion of the project site’s General Plan land use and Zoning designations are Open Space Hillside and Open Space Hazard (OH), respectively. Surrounding land-uses include single-family residential homes and there is an unnamed tributary of the Miraleste Canyon Creek that borders the rear property line.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project consists of the following:

- Construction of a new 4,613ft² 3-story residence with an attached 1,310ft² 2-story garage, resulting in a total structure size of 5,923ft²;
- Construction of 965ft² of balcony areas along the east and rear façade of the proposed residence;
- Construction of improvements in the public right-of-way to provide access to the proposed residence including, a two-way driveway, curb cuts, retaining walls, and planters;
- Construction of ancillary site improvements including a pool/spa, trash enclosure, planters, stairways, and mechanical equipment;
- Construction of freestanding walls, combination walls and retaining walls up to 9' in height to support the proposed improvements; and,
- 571yd³ of total grading on the project site consisting of 75yd³ of cut and 496yd³ of fill with a maximum cut and fill height of 9' each, as well as 946yd³ of total grading in the public right-of-way consisting of 946yd³ of fill with a maximum fill height of 14'-6" to accommodate the proposed improvements.

The height of the proposed residence will be 32', as measured from the average elevation of the setback line abutting the street access (elev. 638.50') to the highest proposed roof ridgeline (elev. 670.50'); and an overall height of 44.5', as measured from the lowest finished grade adjacent to the structure (elev. 626.00') to the highest proposed roof ridgeline (elev. 670.50').

A summary of the critical project statistics for the RS-2 zoning district are described in Table No. 1 below:
Table No. 1: Project Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>CODE REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED RESIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>20,000ft²</td>
<td>27,837ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Size (garage included)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5,923ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks (Minimum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (Hillside)</td>
<td>10'-0&quot;</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; (Variance Req.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (west)</td>
<td>5'-0&quot;</td>
<td>12'-3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (east)</td>
<td>5'-0&quot;</td>
<td>44'-9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>15'-0&quot;</td>
<td>76'-2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (Maximum)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed Parking</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
<td>6 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Height (Maximum) : Down-sloping Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average elevation of the setback line abutting the street access to the highest roof ridgeline</td>
<td>16'-0&quot; (26' with Height Variation)</td>
<td>32'-0&quot; (Variance Req.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest finished grade adjacent to the building foundation/slab to the highest ridge of the building</td>
<td>30'-0&quot;</td>
<td>44'-6&quot; (Variance Req.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CODE CONSIDERATIONS & ANALYSIS

The following is Staff’s analysis on the requested Height Variation, Major Grading Permit, Variance, Site Plan Review, and Encroachment Permit applications, as it relates to the required findings for each application. Staff’s analysis includes the concerns expressed in the public comments. Public comments that are not germane to the respective application findings are addressed under the ‘Additional Information’ section of this Staff Report.

HEIGHT VARIATION

RPVMC §17.02.040(B)(1) allows any person desiring to build a new structure on a down-sloping lot to build up to 16’ in height by-right, as measured from the average elevation of the setback line abutting the street of access to the ridgeline or the
highest point of the structure; and 30' in height, as measured from the point where the lowest foundation or slab meets finished grade to the highest point of the structure. RPVMC §17.02.040(B)(1) allows the height measured from the average elevation of the setback line abutting the street of access to the ridgeline or the highest point of the structure to be increased to a maximum height of 26' with the approval of a Height Variation. Since the proposed 3-story residence exceeds the 16'/30' building envelope, a Height Variation is required. In addition, a Variance is also being requested as the proposed residence exceeds the 26'/30' height limit that is permitted through a Height Variation. The Variance request is further discussed in the 'Variance' section of this report.

Pursuant to RPVMC §17.02.040(C)(1)(a)(iv), Planning Commission review is required when the portion of the structure which exceeds the 16' "by-right" height limit is being developed as part of a new single-family residence. As the proposed project is for a new single-family residence, Planning Commission review is required. The RPVMC §17.02.040(C)(1)(e) sets forth the following findings (in bold type) required in order for the Planning Commission to approve a Height Variation:

1. **The Applicant has complied with the early neighborhood consultation process established by the city.**

The Applicant is required to take reasonable steps to consult with the property owners within 500' of the project site per RPVMC §17.02.040(C)(1)(b). Early neighborhood consultation may be deemed adequate by the Planning Commission if the signatures of at least 60% of the landowners within 500'; or 70% of the landowners within 100' and 25% of the total number of landowners within 500' (including those within 100') are obtained; and proof of notification of the homeowners' association, if one exists. The Applicant obtained 7 signatures (70%) from properties within 100' and 20 signatures (40%) within 500' of the project site. In addition, there is no active Homeowners Association existing in the neighborhood from which proof of notification is required. Therefore, the Applicant has complied with the early neighborhood consultation process and this finding can be made.

2. **The proposed new structure that is above 16' in height or addition to an existing structure that is above 16' in height does not significantly impair a view from the public property (parks, major, thoroughfares, bike ways, walkways, or equestrian trails) which has been identified in the City's General Plan or Coastal Specific Plan, as city-designated viewing areas.**

The City's General Plan identifies viewing points as turnouts along vehicular corridors for the purposes of viewing and viewing sites as public site areas, which due to their physical locations on the Peninsula, provide a significant viewing vantage. Views in the area are observed in a southeasterly or southwesterly direction, consisting of the harbor, ocean, and pastoral view of the canyon. The proposed residence will be visible from the vehicular view corridor along Palos Verdes Drive East and the C18 Upper Palos Verdes Drive East Trail Segment, as it directly abuts the street and trail in which
the topographic conditions in the immediate area generally slope down in a southerly direction into a canyon area located on the south side of Palos Verdes Drive East. While the proposed residence will be visible, it should be noted that the design of the proposed project will require the structure to be notched into the existing slope and appear as a single-story residence rather than a 3-story home from the street of access. Furthermore, as the location and vicinity of the project site is not a public viewing area or viewing site, as defined by the General Plan, there will be no significant view impairments from public property caused by the proposed project. Lastly, the project site is not located within the City's Coastal Zone or any other City specific plan. Therefore, this finding can be made.

3. The proposed structure is not located on a ridge or promontory.

A ridge is defined as, “an elongated crest or a linear series of crests of hills, bluffs, or highlands” (RPVMC §17.96.1610). A promontory is defined as, “a prominent mass of land, large enough to support development, which overlooks or projects onto a lowland or body of water on at least two sides” (RPVMC §17.96.1480). The proposed project is not located on a prominent mass of land that overlooks or projects onto a lowland or body of water on two sides. Therefore, this finding can be made.

4. The area of a proposed new structure that is above 16’ in height or an addition to an existing structure that is above 16’ in height, as defined in Section 17.02.040(B) of the Development Code, when considered exclusive of existing foliage, does not significantly impair a view from the viewing area of another parcel.

The proposed project will not significantly impair a view from the viewing area of another parcel due to the orientation and location of the lots and topography of the area. Based on Staff’s view assessment through aerial surveys and site visits along the public right-of-way, the views from the residences located along Palos Verdes Drive East are oriented in the southwesterly or southeasterly direction towards either the harbor, ocean, or the pastoral environment of the nearby canyon area, depending on which side of the hairpin curve they are located. The properties to the east and west of the project site are at similar elevations with views of the pastoral environment in their rear yards that will not be significantly impaired as the proposed residence will be in the far periphery of their view frames. In addition, the properties to the south will not be impacted as they are located at approximately 30’ higher in elevation than the project site. Lastly, the properties to the north are located at least 20’ higher in elevation and at a minimum 160’ away from the project site. Therefore, the protected views from the viewing area of another parcel will not be impacted by the proposed new structure over 16’ in height, and this finding can be made.

5. If view impairment exists from the viewing area of another parcel but is determined not to be significant, as described in Finding No. 4, the proposed new structure that is above 16’ in height or addition to an existing structure that is 16’ in height is designed in such a manner as to
reasonably minimize impairment of a view.

As mentioned above, there will be no view impairment resulting from the proposed project due to the location of the site and topography in the area. Therefore, this finding is not applicable to the project.

6. There is no significant cumulative view impairment caused by granting the application. Cumulative view impairment shall be determined by: (a) considering the amount of view impairment that would be caused by the proposed new structure that is above 16’ in height or addition to a structure that is above 16’ in height; and (b) considering the amount of view impairment that would be caused by the construction on other parcels if similar new structures or additions that exceed 16’ in height.

As previously stated, there will be no view impairment for portions of the structure which exceed 16’ in height as seen from the viewing area of another parcel. Nonetheless, Staff considered similar construction to adjacent properties at 28150 Palos Verdes Drive East and 28180 Palos Verdes Drive East, and is of the opinion that due to the orientation of the available views previously stated in Finding No. 4, similar structures on these properties would not present a significant cumulative view impairment. Specifically, given the unique development of residences on sloping lots at varying elevations and the existing topography in the area, structures notched into the slope that appear single-story in height from the street level will not cause significant view impacts in the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff believes this finding can be made.

7. The proposed structure complies with all other code requirements.

The proposed residence does not comply with all Code requirements as follows: the hillside front yard setback, minimum landscaping within the front yard setback, maximum allowable wall height within and outside of the front yard setback, structures within the required setback, and overall structure height deviate from the Code requirements, which are subject to the pending Variance discussed separately below. Unless the Planning Commission is able to make all applicable findings for the Variance request, this finding cannot be made.

8. The proposed structure is compatible with the immediate neighborhood character.

The City’s Neighborhood Compatibility finding is intended to ensure projects are designed in a manner that allows the expansion or new construction, while preserving the character of the existing neighborhood. Pursuant to RPVMC §17.02.040(A)(6), "Neighborhood Character" means the existing characteristics in terms of the following (in **bold** type):

A. **Scale of surrounding residences**, including total square footage and lot coverage of the residence and all ancillary structures.
Compatibility with neighborhood character is based on a comparison of the proposed project to other existing structures located within the immediate neighborhood, which is comprised of the 20 closest properties located within the same zoning district. Table No. 2 below compares the lot size, structure size, and number of stories of the residences found within the immediate neighborhood.

Table No. 2: Neighborhood Compatibility Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Lot Size (ft²)</th>
<th>Structure Size (ft²)</th>
<th>No. of Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Coach Road</td>
<td>32,230</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Coach Road</td>
<td>43,560</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28077 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>21,720</td>
<td>5,946</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28095 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28111 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>20,040</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28121 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>20,414</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28136 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>29,185</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28150 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28180 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>49,658</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28182 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>35,720</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28191 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>22,359</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28208 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28209 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>23,520</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28210 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>23,520</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28214 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>19,170</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28215 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>43,560</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28217 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>43,560</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28240 Palos Verdes Drive East</td>
<td>22,220</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2615 Sunnyside Ridge Road</td>
<td>20,038</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2636 Sunnyside Ridge Road</td>
<td>19,980</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28160 Palos Verdes Drive East</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vacant</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,837</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,923</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The above calculations for structure size are based on building permits on file with the City and include the garage area, which, if garage area was not documented on the building permit, was calculated based on the Development Code's requirement for two (2) parking spaces with minimum dimensions for each individual parking stall being 9'x20' (180ft²).*

As reflected in Table No. 2 above, the immediate neighborhood is comprised of both single-story and two-story homes that range in total structure size between 1,770ft² and 5,946ft². As proposed, the structure size of the residence will be the second largest in the immediate neighborhood at 5,923ft² and the only structure to be designed in a three-floor configuration. At the time the application was submitted, Staff raised
concerns with the project regarding compatibility with the immediate neighborhood as it relates to the size of the lot and its structure in which the lot size is slightly below the average of 28,069ft², while the structure size will be substantially larger than the average of 3,094ft². However, as the largest in the immediate neighborhood is similar in that it is built on a smaller lot with a considerably larger home, Staff believes the proposed residence is in scale in terms of the structure size. Additionally, although the proposed residence will be the only 3-story home, it will be notched into the existing hillside to appear as a single-story residence from the street of access like most of the homes in the immediate neighborhood and compatible with the scale of the neighborhood. Lastly, approximately 20% (1,310ft²) of the structure size is for a 6-car garage over two-levels in order to provide adequate parking on the site which cannot accommodate on-site or off-site parking elsewhere due to the circular two-way driveway proposed in the public right-of-way at the tip of a tight hairpin curve.

In terms of lot coverage, the proposed project is within the maximum allowable lot coverage in the RS-2 zoning district (40%), as the project is proposed at 32.25% lot coverage. An aerial survey of the immediate neighborhood determined that several properties have lot coverage that may exceed 40% as the steep topography in the area requires more hardscape surface than properties on relatively flat terrain.

B. Architectural styles, including facade treatments, structure height, open space between structures, roof design, the apparent bulk or mass of the structure, number of stories, and building materials.

The immediate neighborhood consists of irregularly shaped lots that are improved with custom designed homes that incorporate various design elements and façade treatments from both modern and traditional architectural styles in terms of the building design, materials, and colors. More specifically, the neighboring homes are designed with a wide range of building materials that include stucco, batten board, horizontal wood sidings with brick, wood, and stone veneer accents. With respect to roof design and materials, homes in the immediate area are improved with a mix of gable, hip and shed roof designs with shingles, tiles, and gravel. As a result of the custom designed nature of the immediate neighborhood, there is no uniform architectural style commonly found throughout the area. Aside from the standing seam metal roof with a combination of a butterfly roof and a flat roof design, the proposed residence incorporates a number of similar architectural features commonly found within the immediate neighborhood. Specifically, the exterior finishes to the residence and ancillary site improvements include stucco façades with wood siding and stone/tile veneer accents. Although the proposed roof material and design will be a new element introduced in the neighborhood, Staff believes that the muted grey color and low pitch design will be compatible with other roof designs and colors in the immediate area. In terms of open space, the proposed project exceeds the required minimum setbacks between adjacent properties that allow sufficient air, light, and privacy between structures.

The proposed residence includes design features to articulate the building façades along the front, rear and east side elevations that are intended to help minimize the
apparent bulk and mass, including varied ridgeline elevations, recessed upper floor areas, and inclusion of balconies and a roof deck that serve as visual breaks. However, Staff is of the opinion that the west side elevation presents some bulk and mass concerns. Specifically, the proposed overall height and 3-story design along the west elevation present a partially solid façade that is visible from certain angles of the public right-of-way that create bulk and mass concerns. Staff is of the opinion that the bulk and mass concern will be addressed and may be considered compatible with the immediate neighborhood by reducing the overall height of the proposed residence, providing more articulation through undulated setbacks between floor levels, and incorporating different materials and accents to act as visual breaks. As such, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission provide input regarding the reduction of plate height and/or the entire height of the structure, and additional articulation along the west side façade through varied setbacks and materials.

C. Front, side, and rear yard setbacks.

According to the Municipal Code, structures in the RS-2 zoning district shall maintain the following minimum setbacks for lots created prior to the City’s incorporation: 20’ front yard setback, 5’ side yard setback, and 15’ rear yard setback. However, as described in the ‘Project Site’ section of this report, the project site is considered a hillside property, which affords it a reduced front yard setback of 10’. Nonetheless, the project proposes a 5’ front yard setback through a Variance, which is discussed in a separate section below. As noted in Table No. 1 above, the proposed residence meets all of the minimum setback requirements, given that the Variance for the reduced 5’ front yard setback is granted. Staff received a comment letter (attached) from the neighboring property to the south (13 Coach Road) expressing, among other things, a concern with the reduced front yard setback, which may distract drivers along Palos Verdes Drive East as the proposed structure will be close to the street. According to the plans, the distance between the edge of the existing street to the closest front façade will be approximately 31’, which is similar to a number of homes within the vicinity that are accessed from Palos Verdes Drive East. Based on an aerial survey, the setbacks in the immediate neighborhood vary with a mix of nonconforming setbacks which are also 5’ or less to significantly larger ones due to the topography and layout of the homes primarily developed prior to City incorporation. Hence, the proposed setbacks will be compatible with other homes in the immediate neighborhood.

Notwithstanding that the proposed residence is compatible in regards to scale, architectural style, façade treatments, open space between structures, and setbacks; Staff believes that the overall height of the residence and the design of the west side façade create bulk and mass concerns. In order to address the neighborhood compatibility concerns described above, Staff recommends that the following design modifications be considered by the Planning Commission:

- Reduce the plate height for each floor and/or overall building height.
- Provide additional articulation along the west side façade that include undulated setbacks between floor levels.
- Incorporate different materials to create visual breaks.

9. The proposed new structure that is above 16’ in height or addition to an existing structure that is above 16’ does not result in an unreasonable infringement of the privacy of the occupants of abutting residences.

The RPVMC defines privacy as, “reasonable protection from intrusive visual observation.” The Height Variation Guidelines state, “given the variety and number of options which are available to preserve indoor privacy, greater weight generally will be given to protecting outdoor privacy than to protecting indoor privacy.” The proposed residence includes a number of balconies, roof deck, and windows throughout the facades that are placed above 16’ in height. However, these elements primarily face the steep down-sloping canyon located to the rear of the property that is improved with mature foliage on both side yards. Based on aerial surveys and analyzing the surrounding topography, there is no unreasonable infringement of privacy due to obstructions caused by the steep topography, existing vegetation, and the layout of the adjacent homes, which have little to no useable outdoor space that can be seen from the proposed features exceeding 16’ in height. The property owner to the east of the project site at 28150 Palos Verdes Drive East raised concerns (attached), among other things, with potential privacy impacts from the east side façade balcony and windows into their rear yard and patio area. Specifically, the property owner is concerned that removal of any of the dense foliage between the shared side property line in the future will provide views into their private outdoor area. It should be noted that according to RPVMC §17.02.040(B)(4) & §17.02.040(C)(2)(c)(v), unreasonable invasion of the privacy of the occupants of the property on which the foliage exists will be a factor considered in requesting such foliage in question to be removed or trimmed. As such, this finding can be made.

MAJOR GRADING PERMIT

Pursuant to RPVMC §17.76.040(B)(2)(b), a Major Grading Permit is required for projects that result in an excavation, fill or combination thereof, in excess of 50yd³ in any 2-year period or projects that result in an excavation or fill greater than 5’ in depth. Since the Applicant is proposing 1,517yd³ of grading (75yd³ of cut and 1,442yd³ of fill with 1,367yd³ of import) over an extreme slope (i.e., slope steepness 35% or greater) with a maximum depth of cut and fill of 9’ each on the project site and a 14'-6" cut in the public right-of-way, a Major Grading Permit is required. RPVMC §17.76.040(E) sets forth the criteria (in bold type) required in order for the Planning Commission to approve a Major Grading application:

1. The grading does not exceed that which is necessary for the permitted primary use of the lot.
“Primary use” means the most important purpose for which a particular zoning district was established. For example, in a residential district this would be considered a dwelling. The permitted primary use in the underlying Single-Family Residential (RS-2) zoning district is single-family residential. The Applicant is proposing to conduct grading in the public right-of-way and on the private property in order to accommodate the proposed residence and ancillary site improvements. Specifically, 75yd³ of excavation is proposed to notch the proposed residence into the existing slope, while 496yd³ of fill is proposed to accommodate the ancillary site improvements such as the terraced retaining walls along the side and rear yards, as well as to expand usable private outdoor area in the east side yard. In addition, 946yd³ of fill is proposed in the public right-of-way in order to accommodate a circular two-way driveway approach which will provide the required Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) access. The proposed grading to notch the residence into the existing steep slope is necessary for the primary use of the property in order to address bulk and mass concerns with the design of the structure. In addition, the proposed grading to accommodate the driveway is also warranted to provide ingress and egress from the project site, as well as to accommodate fire department emergency access. Staff is of the opinion that the proposed grading along the easterly side yard to accommodate ancillary site improvements that include a pool/spa and patio/deck areas can be considered excessive, given that the site’s existing constraints as a steep sloping lot will need to be disturbed beyond which is necessary for a single-family residence. Although ancillary improvements related to the primary use are acceptable to a certain degree, the proposed project is requesting a Variance to encroach into the side yard setback and create a larger usable outdoor area in the middle of an extreme slope where most homes with similar topographic features are rarely granted. As such, Staff believes that if the Applicant reduces the size of the private outdoor usable area with respect to the easterly side yard, which will in turn also reduce the amount of grading involved and avoid a Variance, this finding can be affirmatively made. Hence, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission provide such input regarding the ancillary site improvements in the east side yard so as to reduce the scope of work and the amount of grading required to accommodate the proposed improvements. Based on this information, this finding cannot be made.

2. The proposed grading and/or related construction does not significantly adversely affect the visual relationships with nor the views from the viewing area of neighboring properties. In cases where grading is proposed for a new residence or an addition to an existing residence, this finding shall be satisfied when the proposed grading results in a lower finished grade under the building footprint such that the height of the proposed structure, as measured pursuant to Section 17.02.040(B), is lower than a structure that could have been built in the same location on the lot if measured from pre-construction (existing grade).

Staff has determined, based on field observations and aerial surveys, that the proposed residence and related construction will not impact the neighboring properties, as discussed under Height Variation Finding No. 4. Due to the topography of the
neighborhood on sloping lots along a curving street, the proposed grading and retaining walls will not impact visual relationships nor the views from the viewing area of neighboring properties. Specifically, the proposed residence and ancillary site improvements will be notched into the down-sloping lot and appear as a single-story residence from the street level. Moreover, the proposed grading results in a lower finished grade to accommodate a split-story residence rather than a conventional 3-story structure. By doing so, nearly two-thirds of the proposed square footage (4,370ft²) will be constructed below grade which allows the Applicant to reduce visual and potential view impacts of the proposed 3-story residence. Therefore, Staff believes that the proposed grading and related construction will not affect the visual relationships with, nor the views from the viewing area of neighboring properties, and this finding can be made.

3. **The nature of the grading minimizes disturbance to the natural contours and finished contours are reasonably natural.**

The proposed project involves excavation under the building footprint and some grading to support the proposed residence with terraced retaining walls along the side and rear yards, as well as grading to connect the proposed residence to the street of access. While minimum grading is proposed underneath the building footprint to preserve the natural contours through the creation of crawl spaces instead of fill and the grading in the public right-of-way is necessary for access purposes, Staff believes excessive grading is proposed in the east side yard area to accommodate an expansive private outdoor useable area on an extreme slope. As such, the proposed grading in the east side yard will result in unnecessary disturbance to the natural contours and finished contours will not be reasonably natural with the existing slope conditions. As previously mentioned, Staff is of the opinion that if the Applicant reduced the scope of the ancillary site improvements along the easterly side yard, this finding can be made. As such, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission provide input to reduce the size of the private outdoor usable area with respect to the easterly side yard, so as to reduce the amount of grading. Based on this information, this finding cannot be made.

4. **The grading takes into account the preservation of natural topographic features and appearances by means of land sculpturing so as to blend any man-made or manufactured slope into the natural topography.**

As the project site is a vacant lot that has not yet been developed since its creation, all proposed grading will be conducted on areas that have not been previously disturbed. However, the visible finished contours surrounding the proposed residence will appear natural and blend seamlessly with the contours created around the adjacent sites that have been developed. Specifically, terraced retaining walls will be constructed along the side and rear yards that descend with the down-sloping contours and improved with landscaping. In addition, the proposed fill in the public right-of-way to create access into the proposed residence will be level with the existing street (Palos Verdes Drive East), providing adequate passage that appears more natural adjacent to the proposed
residence. The remaining slopes beyond the proposed project will be preserved and will not be altered. Therefore, Staff believes that this finding can be made.

5. **For new single-family residences, the grading and/or related construction is compatible with the immediate neighborhood character.**

As discussed in Height Variation Finding No. 8, Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission provide input to the Applicant on certain modifications to be made to the proposed project in order to be more compatible with the immediate neighborhood. If the proposed project is revised to address the concerns referenced in Height Variation Finding No. 8, this finding can be made.

6. **In new residential tracts, the grading includes provisions for the preservation and introduction of plant materials so as to protect slopes from soil erosion and slippage and minimize the visual effects of grading and construction on hillside areas.**

The proposed grading does not involve a new residential tract and therefore, this finding does not apply.

7. **The grading utilizes street designs and improvements which serve to minimize grading alternatives and harmonize with the natural contours and character of the hillside.**

The proposed project involves improvements in the public right-of-way where 946yd³ of fill is proposed to provide access to the project site from the street of access (Palos Verdes Drive East). The original design of the residence included the use of a grade beam and a structural deck in the public right-of-way that was to be elevated from the existing grade and thereby minimize grading. However, due to the constraints of the proposed structural features that would hinder upon the City's efforts for routine or necessary maintenance in the public right-of-way, among other public health and safety concerns, additional grading has been proposed as an alternative to create a relatively flat surface for adequate ingress and egress purposes between the street of access and the proposed residence. As the proposed grading involves modifications to the street that best reflect the needs of the Applicant and the City, while attempting to harmonize with the natural contours though terraced retaining walls along the sides that descend in the direction of the existing contours, Staff is of the opinion that this finding can be made.

8. **The grading would not cause excessive and unnecessary disturbance of the natural landscape or wildlife habitat through removal of vegetation.**

Based on the City's NCCP/HCP (Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan) vegetation map, nearly half of the southern portion of the lot is designated OH, which appears to be located within an area identified as containing California Coastal Sage Scrub habitat. However, according to the biology report
prepared by the Applicant and reviewed by the City’s Biologist, the proposed grading area does not contain natural landscape or wildlife habitat and therefore, this finding can be made.

9. **The grading conforms to the following standards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>Does the Proposed Project meet the standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Grading on slopes over 35% steepness</td>
<td>Permitted on lots created prior to the City’s incorporation, not zoned OH, based upon a finding that the grading will not threaten public health, safety and welfare</td>
<td>No. Lot is partially zoned OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Maximum finished slopes</td>
<td>35% steepness, unless next to a driveway where 67% steepness is permitted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Maximum depth of cut or fill</td>
<td>Except for the excavation of a basement or cellar, a fill or cut not exceeding 5’ depth, unless based upon a finding that unusual topography, soil conditions, previous grading or other circumstances make such grading reasonable and necessary</td>
<td>No. Maximum depth of 9’ cut and fill each on project site and 14’-6” fill in public right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Restricted grading areas</td>
<td>No grading on slopes over 50% steepness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| e) Retaining walls | One 8’-tall upslope wall (unless in front yard or street side setback)  
One 3½’-tall downslope wall  
Lots sloping with the street and other configurations, one 3½’-tall up or downslope wall on each required side yard  
One 5’-tall up- or downslope wall adjacent to driveway  
Retaining walls within building footprint may exceed 8’ | Not applicable                             |
| f) Driveways | 20% maximum slope permitted, with a single 10’-long section up to 22%  
67% slopes permitted adjacent to driveways | Not applicable                             |
Based on the table above, the proposed project meets standards (b), (d), and (f) and does not meet standards (a), (c), and (e). However, per Municipal Code §17.76.040(E)(10), the Planning Commission may grant a grading permit in excess of standard standards (a), (c), and (e) upon making the following findings:

a. Criteria 1 through 8 are satisfied;

Criteria 1 through 8 are not satisfied and therefore, this finding cannot be met.

b. The approval is consistent with the purposes set forth in subsection A of this section (RPVMC §17.76.040 Grading Permit);

The purpose of grading is to permit reasonable development of land, ensuring the maximum preservation of natural scenic character of the area consistent with reasonable economic use of such property; and that each project complies with all goals and polices of the General Plan, any specific plan and any amendments. The proposed grading will occur on extreme slope (proposed average 43% steepness) with nearly half of the lot zoned OH, albeit no improvements are proposed on such zoning district. That being said, the property owner at 13 Coach Road also expressed concerns with construction within the OH zone. According to the proposed plans, there will be no construction activity within the OH zone. Due to the steepness of the existing slope, the maximum depth of grading will exceed 5' (proposed 9' of cut and fill each for the residence and a maximum depth of 14'-6" of fill in the public right-of-way) to accommodate the proposed residence and create a circular two-way driveway access from the street. In addition, the existing down-sloping lot configuration requires multiple retaining walls in and around the project site that will exceed one 3'-6" downslope wall (proposed 9') and a 5' retaining wall adjacent to the driveway (proposed up to 16'). Given the unique topography and conditions of the existing project site consisting of an average slope steepness of 43%, which begins from the edge of the public right-of-way at least 25'-6" from the front property line, Staff believes the deviations are necessary and consistent with the purposes of the grading permit. As such, this finding can be made.

c. Departure from the standards in criterion 9 will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity; and

Although grading is proposed on an extreme slope, the proposed grading will not occur on the area of the project site that is zoned OH and will be preserved in its existing condition. The retaining walls that will exceed 3.5' in height (proposed up to 9') for a downslope wall and 5' in height (proposed up to 16') adjacent to the driveway are due to the topography and layout of the residence with a direct access circular two-way driveway. As the properties in the vicinity have similar topographical constraints which will require adequate access into their respective
residences as well due to LACFD access requirements, the retaining walls and maximum depth of fill of 14'-6" in the public right-of-way cannot be considered a special privilege but rather a necessary means to accommodate the site's circumstances. The maximum depth of cut and fill that exceeds the 5' limit (proposed 9' cut and fill each on project site) is required to notch the proposed residence into the existing slope and fill in the terraced retaining walls, as well as grading to allow an expansive patio area in the east side yard. While most of the properties south of Palos Verdes Drive East share comparable topographical conditions, the proposed grading to expand usable private outdoor area in the east side yard will constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity. Based on an aerial survey of the vicinity, the building footprint and usable private outdoor area are mostly limited to a portion of the lot as they are encumbered by extreme slope. Hence, as the east side yard requires grading on extreme slope which is not typically granted for other homes to accommodate expansive ancillary site improvements, this finding cannot be made.

d. Departure from the standards of criterion 9 will not be detrimental to the public safety nor to other property.

The proposed grading on extreme slope where a portion of the lot is zoned OH will not result in adverse impacts as that portion of the lot will be preserved and remain untouched. The maximum depth of cut and fill and related retaining walls proposed as part of the project will be terraced and descend with the slope including railings along the walkways to prevent hazardous conditions. The property owner at 13 Coach Road also raised concerns related to public safety such as dust caused by major grading, wall heights that exceed code requirements, and traffic impacts associated with import and export of soil. It should be noted if the project was to be approved, a condition would be imposed on the project that requires the employment of effective dust control techniques. Furthermore, the proposed project will have to comply with all requirements of the Building Code, obtain the City geotechnical consultant's approval, and once a building permit is issued, a series of inspections will be required throughout project construction. Lastly, the Public Works Department will require a review of the traffic control plans prepared by a Traffic Engineer as part of their Encroachment Permit to address traffic impacts of the proposed construction. Therefore, the proposed deviation will not be detrimental to the public safety nor to other properties, and this finding can be made.

e. Notice of such decision shall be given to the applicant and to all owners of property adjacent to the subject property.

If the Planning Commission approves the Major Grading Permit, appropriate parties will be notified and therefore, this finding can be made.

Based on the above, Staff believes that the findings for the requested Major Grading Permit cannot be made to support the proposed project and suggests that the Planning
Commission provide input on the proposed grading in terms of the ancillary site improvements in the east side yard where it is considered excessive for the project site. Specifically, Staff recommends that the following design modification be considered by the Planning Commission:

- Reduce the scope of the proposed ancillary site improvements to accommodate usable private outdoor area, thereby reducing the amount of proposed grading on an extreme slope.

VARIANCE

Pursuant to RPVMC §17.64.010(A), a Variance may be granted when practical difficulties, unnecessary hardships or results inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of Title 17 occur by reason of the strict interpretation of any of its provisions. The Planning Commission, upon verified application of any interested persons, shall initiate proceedings for consideration of a Variance from the development provisions of Title 17.

The Applicant is requesting a Variance to deviate from Municipal Code requirements related to setbacks, front yard setback landscaping, wall heights, and building height for the following reasons:

Setbacks

The Applicant is requesting two Variances related to setback, which are further described below:

(1) Pursuant to RPVMC §17.48.030(C)(1), any lot having a grade of more than 25%, as measured from the curbline to a point midway between the side lot lines and over a distance of 50' from the front lot line, may have a front yard setback which is not less than 50% of the depth required for a front yard setback in the district in which said lot is located. Garages with driveways which directly access the street shall not be less than 20' from the front or street side property line. As the project site was created prior to City incorporation, the required hillside front yard setback can be reduced from 20' to 10'. However, the Applicant is proposing to further reduce the front yard setback to 5' and the proposed direct access garage from the front property line to 17'-9". This is due to accommodate the LACFD emergency access requirements and the location of the front property line which starts in the middle of an extreme slope averaging 43% in slope steepness, approximately 25'-6" in distance and 14'-6'' in height from the edge of the street improvements along Palos Verdes Drive East.

(2) Pursuant to RPVMC §17.48.030(E)(6), decks (including any railing), 6" to 30" in height (as measured from adjacent finished grade), may be permitted in any setback area upon determination by the Director that no significant adverse impacts will result. The Applicant is proposing to build a stairway and pool
patio/deck that exceed 30" in height (proposed up to 8'-8" in height) within the required 5' east side setback area to accommodate useable private outdoor area in the middle of an extreme slope averaging 43% in slope steepness.

Front Yard Setback Landscaping

Pursuant to RPVMC §17.48.030(D), all of the required front setback area shall be landscaped in single-family residential districts, except for driveways, paved walkways, and parking areas which shall not cover more than 50% of the required front setback area. The Applicant is proposing to reduce the required landscape area within the front yard setback from 50% to 27% due to the reduction in the front yard setback area itself caused by a reduced 5' setback. The property owner at 13 Coach Road also raised concerns with the reduced front yard setback landscaping which could have an adverse impact to the neighborhood. While landscape is being reduced, the Applicant is proposing to maximize landscaping opportunities with planters along the side and rear yards.

Wall Heights

Pursuant to RPVMC §17.76.030(C)(1)(a) & (b), fences, walls, and combination walls located within the front yard setback area shall be permitted up to 42" in height, while those located outside of the front yard setback area shall be permitted up to 7' in height. The Applicant is proposing to build a wall up to 6' in height within the front yard setback and a wall up to 24' in height outside of the front yard setback area due to the existing elevation difference between the edge of the street improvements along Palos Verdes Drive East and the project site's front property line which is approximately 14'-6" in height.

Building Height

Pursuant to RPVMC §17.02.040(B)(1), the Applicant may build up to the 26'/30' building envelope with a Height Variation for sloping lots. The Applicant is proposing to build a 32'/44'-6" residence on a down-sloping lot which exceeds the Height Variation Permit limits as the site contains an average slope steepness of 43%, which is not a condition that is present in other neighboring properties as most have been previously graded to allow developments on a portion of the lot that is relatively flat. The project site is proposed as a split-story residence that will be notched into the existing down-sloping lot in order to minimize grading, appear as a single-story home from the street with an at-grade street access, and achieve Code requirements to notch a portion of the residence into the existing slope.

Table No. 3 below identifies the required findings set forth in RPVMC §17.64.050 for the Planning Commission to grant a Variance, which also includes assessments of the requested Variances and whether the findings can be made.

Table No. 3. Variance Criteria
### Variance Request & Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Findings</th>
<th>Reduce Setbacks</th>
<th>Reduce Front Yard Setback Landscaping</th>
<th>Exceed Wall Height</th>
<th>Exceed Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions exist applicable to the property, or to the intended use</td>
<td>Yes, existing topography and location at hairpin curve</td>
<td>Yes, reduction in front yard setback</td>
<td>Yes, existing topography and direct access driveway</td>
<td>Yes, existing topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right</td>
<td>Yes, to allow feasible improvements on irregularly shaped lots with topographic restrictions</td>
<td>No, see description below table</td>
<td>Yes, commonly found within vicinity</td>
<td>Yes, to provide at-grade access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property and improvements in the area</td>
<td>Yes, Geology and Biology Report reviewed. All construction to adhere to the California Building Code. Conditions related to traffic safety will be imposed by the Public Works Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not contrary to the objectives of the general plan or the policies and requirements of the coastal specific plan</td>
<td>Yes, consistent with the General Plan Land Use Policy No. 3 (p. L-7), to “encourage and assist in the maintenance and improvement of all existing residential neighborhoods so as to maintain optimum local standards of housing quality and design.” The project site is not subject to the coastal specific plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table No. 3 above, Findings No. 1 & 2 for the Variance request regarding ancillary site improvements encroaching into the 5’ east side yard setback cannot be made at this time. By encroaching into the side yard setback, the amount of grading necessary to accommodate the improvements will increase as well, resulting in what is considered excessive for a steep sloping lot where such improvements are not common
in the vicinity with similar lot figuration and topography. Therefore, Staff believes there is no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved, as other properties under like conditions in the same zoning district are generally prohibited from developing expansive private outdoor areas on extreme slope that encroach into the required setbacks. As such, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission provide input to the Applicant with respect to reducing the scope of usable private outdoor area so as not to encroach into the required side yard setback and minimize grading on extreme slope by considering the following modification:

- Reduce/revise the scope of the proposed ancillary improvements in the east side yard so as not to encroach into the required side yard setback and minimize grading on an extreme slope.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

The Site Plan Review procedure enables the Planning Commission to check development proposals for conformity with the provisions of the Municipal Code, or the manner in which they are applied when no other application is required (RPVMC §17.70.010). The proposed project includes a pool/spa with related equipment, trash enclosure, stairways, patio, decks, balconies, and all other ancillary site improvements not addressed under the applications discussed in this Staff Report. While the proposed pool/spa and related equipment meet all of the Municipal Code requirements with respect to setback requirements; other ancillary site improvements such as the proposed trash enclosure exceed the 42" structure height limit within the front yard setback. Furthermore the proposed stairway and pool patio/deck encroach into the required 5' east side yard setback. Provided that the Planning Commission is unable to make all applicable findings for the Variance request related to the proposed ancillary site improvements in the east side yard, the proposed project does not comply with the provisions set forth in the Municipal Code.

ENCROACHMENT PERMIT

In 1984, the City Council adopted a policy to allow certain privately-owned improvements to encroach into the City’s public right-of-way. The policy has been amended several times, with the last amendment approved in 2017. The policy sets forth the findings that must be made by either the Director or the Planning Commission to approve fences, walls, pilasters or other similar structures in the public right-of-way.

According to the policy, encroachments extending more than 6' into the public right-of-way, and whose height without decorative features exceeds 60" are subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission. The proposed project involves the construction of a circular two-way driveway that extends up to 25'6" from the front property line, retaining walls up to 9' in height with 946yd³ of associated grading, a 5' self-latching gate and freestanding walls, planters, and 24" light fixtures in the public right-of-way (Palos Verdes Drive East). In granting the requested Encroachment Permit, the Planning Commission must find the following:
1. The encroachment is not detrimental to the public health/safety, and that the Public Works Director has made a written determination that the encroachment does not pose a hazard to vehicular traffic, pedestrians, or equestrians; and further that all other requirements for issuance of a Public Works Department encroachment permit are met. The Community Development Department review shall be concurrent with the Public Works Department review to the greatest degree possible.

City Council Policy No. 31 states that “the Planning Commission may refer a request (for an Encroachment Permit) to the Traffic Safety Committee (TSC) for recommendation, if traffic safety is involved.” The Public Works Department reviewed the proposed project and expressed traffic safety concerns due to the occurrence of vehicular accidents at the hairpin curve abutting the project site. As a result, the proposed project was presented to the City’s TSC on November 25, 2019, for consideration. The Staff Report by the Public Works Department (attached) to the TSC determined that the proposed driveway approach related to safety will be acceptable under the sight distance analysis utilizing the prevailing 85th percentile speed of 38mph for vehicles driving along Palos Verdes Drive East, if the project is conditioned to install right-turn only signs at both driveways for right-in and right-out circulation. In addition, the Public Works Department has imposed a number of conditions to the proposed project to support the Encroachment Permit that include, but are not limited to, providing an 8' wide delineated passage way for trail connectivity and executing a covenant and agreement for the property owner to assume responsibility regarding general maintenance of the proposed encroachment. The property owner at 13 Coach Road raised concerns with the proposed improvements in the public right-of-way that may limit the visibility at the end of a tight hairpin curve. As reviewed by the Public Works Department and TSC, the improvements encroaching into the public right-of-way will be acceptable from a traffic safety standpoint. In addition, the property owner at 28150 Palos Verdes Drive East raised concerns with the proposed encroachments in the public right-of-way that may affect the use of the pathway enjoyed by both pedestrians and for equestrian use. As previously noted, there will be a condition imposed to delineate an 8’ passage way for trail purposes so as to continue providing trail connectivity. Therefore, as conditioned, the proposed project would not pose a hazard to vehicular traffic, pedestrians or equestrians. It should be noted that traffic safety concerns related to the construction of the proposed project in the future will be reviewed by the Public Works Department’s Encroachment Permit process which will require a traffic control plan prepared by a traffic engineer. As such, this finding can be made.

2. The encroaching structure cannot be reconfigured or relocated due to practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship, including economic hardship, so as to either,
   a. Locate the structure on the Applicant's property in accordance with provisions of the Municipal Code; or,
   b. Adhere to the criteria set forth for a Planning Director Level Review
The Applicant cannot reconfigure or relocate the proposed structures entirely onto the project site nor adhere to the criteria set forth for a Director-level review due to practical difficulties that will cause more concerns related to bulk and mass, overall height, and grading. More specifically, relocation of the proposed driveway and ancillary site improvements onto the property would require the proposed residence to be shifted at least 25'-6" to the rear of the property from its current location that will entail costly development. Furthermore, the reconfiguration or relocated improvements will result in additional grading and higher retaining walls, which in turn may intensify bulk and mass concerns as the overall height will increase with the creation of a lower finished grade covered by the structure. Lastly, it will result in the residence and ancillary site improvements encroaching into the Open Space Hazard Zone at the southern portion of the property, which is designated to prevent unsafe development of hazardous areas that must be preserved or regulated for public health and safety purposes. As such, this finding can be made.

3. The encroaching structure is not inconsistent with the general intent of the Development Code.

The proposed driveway and ancillary structures that encroach into the City’s public right-of-way are not inconsistent with the general intent of the Development Code. By allowing the proposed structures to encroach into the public right-of-way, the proposed improvements help define the driveway entrance/exit and enhance vehicular circulation to and from the property. In this sense, the proposed project is consistent with the general intent of the Municipal Code to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare while accommodating reasonable development and minimizing hazards. As such, this finding can be made.

4. Illuminating elements of the encroaching structure are configured in a manner that minimizes impact to neighboring properties or vehicular traffic, and prevents direct or indirect illumination of a property other than the Applicant’s, as determined by the Director of Community Development.

The proposed project includes low voltage light fixtures up to 24" in height in the public right-of-way for landscaping purposes. Project plans indicate that the proposed light fixtures will be shielded, so as to minimize direct illumination impacts to neighboring properties and vehicular traffic. Furthermore, a condition will be imposed to ensure that the proposed project and lighting fixtures comply with §17.56.030 (Outdoor lighting for residential uses) of the RPVMC, which establishes illumination standards for residential uses. As such, this finding can be made.

5. The encroaching structure does not significantly impair a protected view from any surrounding property.

As previously mentioned, due to the nature of the existing project site that slopes down significantly from the edge of the paved street and topographic conditions in the area,
the encroaching structure will not significant impair a protected view from any
surrounding property. More specifically, properties in the vicinity generally do not
observe a view in the direction of the encroaching structures along the front façade as
the protected views of the properties to the east and west are primarily viewed along
their rear yards of the canyon’s pastoral environment. In addition, the properties to the
north of the project site are at least 20’ higher in elevation that can look over the
encroaching structures with no impairments. As such, this finding can be made.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Environmental Assessment

The proposed project is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15303(a) of the CEQA
Guidelines, new construction of a single-family residence. Specifically, the project
involves the construction of a single-family residence in the RS-2 zoning district, which
is a residential zone.

Public Comments

As previously noted, Staff received 5 comments (attached), of which 1 is from the
property owner at 13 Coach Road (located at the southwest of the project site), 2 are
from the property owner at 28150 Palos Verdes Drive East (located east of the project
site), 1 from the property owner at 8 Coach Road (located 3 properties south of the
project site), and 1 which did not identify an address. The comments were submitted in
response to the silhouette and public notice raising concerns with public safety, privacy,
construction, and Neighborhood Compatibility. Additional concerns or comments that
have not been already addressed in this Staff Report are discussed below:

Request for Information on the Proposed Project

The property owners at 28150 Palos Verdes Drive East and 8 Coach Road requested
information on the project plans, application package, and applicable code sections for
the proposed project to which Staff provided.

Impacts of the Project on Legal Nonconforming Structure

The property owner at 28150 Palos Verdes Drive East also raised concerns about the
project’s impact on their existing legal nonconforming corral and barn during
construction given the close proximity to the project site and within the public right-of-
way. It should be noted that the City’s Code and required findings do not require an
assessment of the proposed project’s impacts during construction on neighboring
properties or structures in analyzing development projects. However, if the project is
approved there will be conditions imposed that will regulate construction hours, site
maintenance, and related operations during project construction.
Pool Failure

The property owner at 13 Coach Road also expressed concerns related to failure of the proposed pool which may cause damages to the adjacent properties. As previously mentioned in the Major Grading Permit Finding No. 9, the proposed project will be required to meet all requirements of the Building Code, obtain the City geotechnical consultant's approval, and once a building permit is issued, a series of inspections will be required throughout project construction.

Conceptual Trails Plan

According to the City's Conceptual Trails Plan, the Upper Palos Verdes Drive East Trail Segment (C18) is located along the northbound side of Palos Verdes Drive East, adjacent to the project site which is for pedestrian and equestrian uses. This trail segment is located in the public right-of-way in an area where the Applicant is proposing improvements to accommodate a circular two-way driveway and ancillary site improvements. The proposed project has the potential to impact the trail in terms of use and access as it connects to other trails in the vicinity. As such, the Public Works Department has imposed a condition, which was reviewed by the TSC, requiring that the Applicant set aside an 8' wide passage way as part of the improvements in the public right-of-way so as to accommodate trail access and not create a gap in the trail system.

Foliage Analysis

On April 10, 2020, Staff conducted a foliage analysis of the subject property and revealed no existing foliage that significantly impairs the protected view from any surrounding properties.

TSC Meeting

On November 25, 2019, the proposed project was presented to the TSC to address traffic safety concerns, and to conduct a preliminary review of the proposed encroachment in the public right-of-way. Regarding the encroachment, the Public Works Department raised a number of public health and safety concerns as the original proposal in the public right-of-way included grade beams, a structural deck, and caissons abutting the property line. Initially as designed, the encroachment in the public right-of-way was considered excessive, in conflict with future maintenance of underground utilities running along Palos Verdes Drive East, and a negative impact on future plans to widen the street and connect trails. However, upon several discussions with the LACFD, the Public Works Department and Planning Staff, the Applicant revised the improvements in the public right-of-way to accommodate the circular two-way driveway by eliminating the grade beam and structural deck. The revised plans propose grading to create a concrete surface and the caisson constructed a minimum 1' away from the property line to support the proposed 946yd³ of fill. Based on the revisions and conditions that will be imposed to the Planning case by the Public Works Department,
the TSC moved to adopt the Public Works Department Staff’s recommendation to support the encroachments.

It should be noted that the Public Works Department received 3 public comments (attached) for the TSC meeting regarding the proposed project along with 2 follow-up comments. The comments raised concerns with the safety of the public regarding the driveway improvements in the public right-of-way and trail improvements in the future. As a follow-up to the TSC meeting, 2 comments were received to confirm whether an updated report was available by the City’s traffic consultant that concurs with the Public Works Department to support the Encroachment Permit with specific conditions tailored to the proposed project. There was no addendum to the report by the City’s traffic consultant as their agreement with the Public Works Department was verbally communicated during the meeting.

Equestrian Overlay District

The project site is located within the City’s Equestrian District. According to RPVMC §17.46, properties within an Equestrian Overlay (Q) District may be used for the keeping of horses and other large domestic animals by property owners or lessees, where incentives are provided to encourage property owners to set aside property for future equestrian use. The Applicant was provided with the information pertaining to the applicability of the Q-District and has confirmed no interest in setting aside an area for equestrian use at this time.

Permit Streamlining Act

Pursuant to the Permit Streamlining Act, Staff deemed the application complete for processing on April 2, 2020, setting the action deadline to June 1, 2020. Continuance of the item beyond June 1, 2020, will require the Applicant to agree granting up to a 90-day time extension. Thus, creating a new action deadline in order to provide the Applicant sufficient time to address any concerns or direction provided by the Planning Commission.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission: 1) review the proposed project design as it relates to Staff’s recommended modifications to address neighborhood compatibility and grading concerns; 2) provide the Applicant with input; and, 3) continue the public hearing to June 23, 2020 provided that the Applicant agrees to a 90-day time extension pursuant to the Permit Streamlining Act.

ALTERNATIVES

In addition to Staff’s recommendation, the following alternatives are available for the Planning Commission to act on:
1. Direct Staff to prepare a Resolution, to be brought back to the Planning Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting, approving, with conditions a Height Variation, Major Grading Permit, Variance, Site Plan Review, and Encroachment Permit applications (Case No. PLVA2018-0001).

2. Direct Staff to prepare a Resolution, to be brought back to the Planning Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting, denying, without prejudice, a Height Variation, Major Grading Permit, Variance, Site Plan Review, and Encroachment Permit applications (Case No. PLVA2018-0001).

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Traffic Safety Committee Staff Report and Meeting Minutes
- Public Comments
- Project Plans
MEMORANDUM

TO: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: ELIAS SASSOON, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

DATE: NOVEMBER 25, 2019

SUBJECT: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 28160 PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST

I. SCOPE OF REVIEW

Review the Applicant’s requested Encroachment Permit pursuant to City Council Policy No. 31 to allow construction in the Public Right-of-Way, and forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission for its consideration as part of the Applicant’s requested development application for a new single-family residence.

II. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

On May 16, 2018, the Planning Department received an application for the construction of a new single family residence on an undeveloped lot located at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East. The proposed project involves improvements in the Public Right-of-Way (ROW) in which an Encroachment Permit from both the Public Works Department and Planning Division are required. The location of the proposed project is on a tight hairpin curve where vehicular and pedestrian safety concerns have been raised. The proposed structure is situated at the Property Line and approximately 25 feet of the Public ROW is proposed to be used to provide driveway access to the residence.

Pursuant to City Council Policy No. 31, page 4, “The Planning Commission may refer a request to the Traffic Safety Committee for recommendation, if traffic safety is involved.” In order to avoid further delays and to preemptively address the potential traffic safety concerns, Staff seeks the Traffic Safety Committee’s (TSC) input to forward to the Planning Commission for their consideration as part of the proposed development application.

The Applicant’s original request for an encroachment permit for the following improvements to be constructed within the Public ROW:
- Grade Beam
- Decked Driveway
- Caisson abutting the property line.

There were some concerns regarding the access and the proposed development in the Public ROW. Based on several meetings held between the Fire Department, Planning Department, Public Works Staff and the Applicant the project design was revised on several occasions. This is because the Applicant is required to clear different requirements and conditions to bring the proposed project in compliance with current rules and regulations. This included meetings with the City and Fire Department to obtain clearances for the proposed driveway and encroachment into the Public ROW. The most recent copy of the application was submitted to Public Works in November 2019, to be forwarded to the Traffic Safety Committee.

This submittal was reviewed by an independent Engineer (Willdan), and a response was provided (Attachment A) regarding the above mentioned items. Subsequently, on November 13, 2019, the City met with the Applicant and his architect to review the plans prior to the Traffic Safety Committee meeting. Based on this meeting, Staff is recommending, and the Applicant is in agreement, to make the following changes to the proposed improvements in the Public ROW:

- Remove Grade Beam
- Fill the space under the proposed decked driveway with dirt and make compaction in accordance with the requirements set by Public Works.
- Remove the structured decked driveway and replace with a concrete driveway.
- Construct a caisson a minimum of 1 foot away from the property line to support the fill.

There is an 8-foot wide equestrian trail that is planned along Palos Verdes Drive East on the same side where the house is proposed to be constructed. With the current design, it would be impossible to construct this trail, along the frontage of this property. Further, the analysis by the traffic engineer for the sight-visibility, regarding the approaches, was based on the posted 25 mph and not the 85th percentile operating speed of the vehicular traffic, which is almost 40 mph. To date, not all the needed revisions regarding these changes have been submitted to the City. However, Staff recommends that revised plans be submitted to the Public Works Department prior to the scheduled Planning Commission public hearing. Staff also recommends the following conditions be placed on the entitlements to be issued by the Planning Commission:

- Locate and verify all existing utilities and show them on the Site Plan.
- Applicant to provide confirmation from all franchise utilities affected that they do not have any issue with the proposed development.
Construct a Retaining Wall (Caisson) at least 1 foot away from the Property Line.
Construct Retaining Walls along the East and West sides of the lot to the edge of the roadway.
Provide Certified Backfill, with compaction, in the area encompassed by the East and West Retaining Walls and along the lot line.
A width of 8’ of the driveway will be constructed as a trail, per Attachment B - Cross Section of Proposed Development.
Obtain LA County Fire Department approval of the revised package.
Install and maintain “Right Turn Only” signs at both driveway approaches. (Right In-Right Out circulation).
Execute a Covenant and Agreement for the property owner to assume responsibility regarding patching and general maintenance of the proposed driveway, public trail, and retaining walls within the Public ROW. If the City or any franchised utility company has to remove all or any portion of the driveway or trail, the City/Utility Company will replace/repair the damaged/removed driveway with asphalt. The property owner will have to make the permanent repairs using concrete. This Covenant Agreement will be prepared by the City Attorney’s Office and will include the necessary provisions regarding the items encroaching in the Public ROW, as well as signage by the approaches. The cost of the preparation of this agreement, and filing costs, shall be paid by the Applicant from Trust Deposit funds. The Covenant and Agreement will be filed with Los Angeles County and will be attached with the property.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is in support of encroachment permit, to allow mentioned retaining walls, the driveway, and signs within the Public ROW, with all the mentioned conditions.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Traffic Safety Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their consideration regarding the requested encroachment permit.

Attachments:
- Attachment A – Independent Traffic Engineering Report
- Attachment B – Cross Section of Proposed Development
- Attachment C – Site Plan exhibiting proposed locations of Retaining Walls and Driveway Circulation
TO: Elias Sassoon, Director of Public Works

FROM: Vanessa Munoz, PE, TE, PTOE
Traffic Engineer

DATE: November 13, 2019

SUBJECT: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East – De Langis Residente

The City of Rancho Palos Verdes has requested we review the site plan being proposed by the residents of 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East and the encroachment of the structural deck for the driveway into public right of way and review the sight distance memorandum prepared by JMC dated June 7, 2019.

Deck in Public Right of Way Discussion

The structural deck for the driveway being proposed is approximately 27-feet into the public right of way. It is costumery not to construct within the public right of way as public works improvements are routinely being performed within the public right of way, such as regular roadway maintenance, roadway improvements, roadway widenings, new trails, utility repairs, installation of new utilities, emergency repairs and others to name a few. When these improvements are performed, damage or complete disturbance to improvements (such as what is being proposed) is a possibility and the improvements must be replaced in kind and any damaged infrastructure must be repaired. In this case, the deck encroaches completely into the public right of way and would burden public works projects financially, would generate construction delays, and create an unsafe condition. Should the deck construction be permitted, the City would end up being financially responsible for any damages to the deck or caisson when performing routine maintenance work, roadway widening, emergency repairs or implementing other project such as a trail. Any project would be required to coordinate with the residents and have special time frame consideration since removal of the deck would limit access into their garage and would limit access in an out of the property, creating an unsafe condition. Furthermore, the City is in the process of planning a trail project that will be implemented within this area and would impact the trail design and would create a gap in the trail system.

Sight Distance Memorandum Discussion

The sight distance memorandum utilized an incorrect prevailing speed of 25 mph for vehicles driving along Palos Verdes Drive East, the 85th percentile speed along that segments is 38 mph and a 25-mph warning speed limit sign shown at the curve is not an acceptable method to measure the 85th percentile or does it set a maximum speed limit. Based on the 85th percentile of 38 mph the stopping sight distance should be at least 305’, therefore the sight distance shown on the exhibits does not meet the minimum requirements and the driveway locations being proposed are not acceptable.
Based on my review of the structural deck impacts to the public right of way and the lack of sight distance being provided at the driveways, I do not recommend the improvements be accepted as proposed at this time.
June 7, 2019

City of RANCHO PALOS VERDES
Attn: Mr. Jason Caraveo
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

RE: SIGHT DISTANCE AT 28160 PALOS VERDES DR EAST - RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA (PLANNING CASE NO. PLVA2018-0001)

Dear Mr. Caraveo,

This sight distance has been prepared based on Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) Topic 200 section 201.1 Sight Distance and Table 405.1A, and the CA MUTCD standards of sight distance analysis, Caltrans Safety System Guidance, 2017 based on maximum speed limit sign postings of “25 MPH”. The City of Palos Verdes provided a RADAR speed survey collected at RPV Dr East and Headland Drive showing an 85th mile of 38 MPH (prevailing). While it is not collected along the curve, it is still prudent to use this as the approach speed and speed within the curve for evaluation of conditions.

We were asked to address the following questions:

Q1. Are the proposed driveways safe for operation?

Conditionally Yes. While they are not at optimal location, the driveways still meet a safe minimum standard assuming posted speeds. Neither driveway meets the desired decision sight distance standard of 7 seconds, which is a driver’s perception, but they still maintain adequate stopping sight distance assuming posted speeds. The constraining movement is the southbound LT into the westerly driveway (left driveway per plan). Stopping sight distance is just above standards for posted speed, but in inadequate for prevailing speed. In order to mitigate this condition, it will be recommended to the owner that the driveway be restricted to in/out configuration with the easterly driveway being the entrance and the westerly but the driveway serving as the exit, along with a restrictions that left turns in/out of the driveway be not allowed. Again, while this configuration will meet all minimum standards, the perception of entering/exiting the driveway will be difficult, but acceptable. Physical limitations to the driveway are not proposed as this is a private driveway, therefore the owner will have to be cognizant of this restriction and self limit the turning movement.
Q2. Is metal beam guardrail (MBGR) needed?

No. Per Caltrans Safety System Guidance, Section 3.1, one must ask *is striking the guardrail is less severe than striking fixed objects or slopes behind the MBGR?* The pre-existing site condition had a steep drop off along a roadway with a left curve after a tangent section, something that commonly requires MBGR protection. With construction of the new building pad, thus removal of the steep drop off, the need for the rail is eliminated, creating the situation of the MBGR becoming a fixed object. It is recommended to remove the MBGR to the property line, with a new end section. It is further recommended that all chevrons and delineators remain in place unless relocation is required due to sight distance limitations entering/exiting the driveway is created by sign placement. This condition will be verified and corrected, if necessary, during construction.

Should you have any questions, please contact Khaled Abdo, PE, Sr. Project Manager, at 310.214.6550 x 308.

Best regards,

JMC2 Civil Engineering + Surveying

Richard C. Tippett, (TR 2119)
Traffic Engineer

Enclosures: Sight Distance Plan dated 02/28/2019
New location of proposed Retaining Wall (Min from EL)

This space to be filled with dirt and compacted.

To Be Removed
Concrete Driveway
Existing Guard Rail

Attachment B Item 1
Hi Madeline:

Thanks for reaching out to us.

Your email will be included in the late correspondence regarding this item.

Regards,

Elias K. Sassoon, Director
Department of Public Works
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
Tel: 310-544-5335
Fax: 310-544-5292

Dear Chairman and Committee Members -

I cannot fathom why City Staff is in support of an encroachment permit of 25'–27' of Public ROW for the purpose of developing a private driveway at street level vs just access to the property, as many homeowners on PVDE have.

While the owners will benefit from these dual driveways, the public receives no benefit at all! Not even a guardrail for protection while traversing this area with its sharp turns and motorists exceeding the posted limits and the 85th percentile speed of 38 mph. In addition, PVDE is a favorite among groups of bicyclists and motorcyclists who tend to hug the shoulder of the lanes. Without a barrier in this particular location (on a curve) there is absolute potential for accidents involving equestrian/pedestrians and the 'cyclists.
Even the opinions of Willdan Engineering and JMC2 Civil Engineering seem to be in conflict. The safety for all users, including the homeowner exiting either driveway, is questionable.

We are experiencing a renaissance of interest from Public Works in recapturing encroached upon Public ROWs to widen and make safer trail passage for the equestrians/pedestrians in this Equestrian Overlay Zone area of RPV. I refer to the PVDE Widening Project that is still being discussed and reworked and the newly renovated Connestoga Project.

Thank you for seeing the obvious outrageousness of this request.

Madeline Ryan
28328 Palos Verdes Drive East

"May the Trails be with you..." Madeline
Hi Madeline,

I can't think of any more to say to the Traffic Safety Committee, specifically. This is just another case of Staff feeding "the public" a little piece of a much bigger plan with no opportunity for even this Advisory Committee to influence the quality or advisability of said "bigger plan". Even the PVDE Roadway Safety Project is a fragmented piece of a bigger plan which Staff has not presented to anyone in relation to the Updated General Plan and the NCCP which they have been implementing since 2004.

Item H on the December 3, 2019 Council Consent Calendar essentially authorizes payment for what could have been a much better infrastructure project for a lot less money. It is not as though you and I and some other people did not show up and speak up when we had a chance. Keep asking about the Bronco to lower Headland piece of the project. If the funding for the construction drawings shows up on the Council's Consent Calendar without further public review, we will all get screwed, again. Or, has it?

I sent "my epiphany of 2018" about this lack of master planning to the City Council and a lot of other people. Just last week, I sent it again with the observation that the Council and the Public are still being excluded from the decision making process. Even the City Clerk cannot produce signed records of what Staff instructs our Consultants to accomplish. That email follows. The PVDE Roadway Safety Project and the lack of a functioning Trails Network Plan continue to be the best examples of how the residents of the City Rancho Palos Verdes are being physically misled and fiscally drained even though Staff is claiming that the NCCP has nothing to do with it.

Thank you for being willing the attend the Traffic Safety Committee Meeting. Be very careful about saying anything that Staff might construe as your being in support of any part of this design or encroachment permit. Even indicating an 8 foot wide trail is bogus until Staff discloses how it fits with the continuity of the PVDE Roadway Safety Project and the Peninsula Wheel Trails Network.

SUNSHINE, RPV, 310-377-8761
This to you people who have and are volunteering your time and skills on behalf of the residents of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. Please hang in there from either side of the dais. The two new faces on the City Council may be able to get public input to mean something. But, they will need your help.

'Tiz the Season to consider the difference between an epiphany and The Epiphany.

Dear friends, neighbors and people all over the world,

I am happy to report that I am alive, back to being ambulatory and still interested in more than my own life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. I am ever so sorry to report that most of the people who feel the same way have passed away.

The non-religious definition of the word epiphany is... a moment of sudden revelation or insight.

My epiphany of 2018 appears to have fallen on deaf ears as revealed by the RPV City Council's unanimous votes on several Agenda Items on November 19, 2019. So, I am repeating it. It is not just my expectation of enjoying my private property and my expectation to circulate freely on community/government owned property which has been given away, it is yours, too.

"Local Control" is gone. The 2020 elections will reveal whether or not we have any "National Control" left. My gift to you all is the attached "World's Smallest Political Quiz". It all comes down to your personal and economic preferences. You need to know which political direction you want your votes to encourage.

Being in favor of "open space", "world peace", "sustainability", "free trade" and "human rights" means nothing until you have that epiphany which defines how much you, personally, are willing to pay to not only give up some of them for yourself but, for most everyone else.

The US of A is not a "Democracy". You pledge allegiance to a Republic which as lasted more than the average lifecycle of a "civilization". The only "do something" that anyone can do is start paying attention to the facts that are available only if you go looking for them.

I suggest taking the time to rummage around www.votesmart.com and emailing questions to your "electeds". They are no longer allowed to answer however, your questions go into the Public Record so that you can testify that you brought it up.

If you want to opt-out of my world, please have the courtesy to send me an email saying so. Going "silent" is getting tempting. The PVDE Roadway Safety Project and so many others are going to continue to happen with or without our quality control and cost savings public input unless we find a better way to speak up.

Silence is forever. I wish you a noisy rest of your life. ...Sunshine 310-377-8761

July 21, 2019

It all comes down to how our affairs are micromanaged. A big example of my epiphany
Subject: It all comes down to how our affairs are micromanaged. A big example of my epiphany

Date: 7/21/2019 8:53:03 PM Pacific Standard Time

From: sunshinerpyv@aol.com

To: cc@rpvca.gov, pc@rpvca.gov, imac@rpvca.gov, epc@rpvca.gov, fac@rpvca.gov, tsc@rpvca.gov, info@pvpwatch.com, mickeyroichi@gmail.com, wgg@squareoneinc.com, emenhsier@aol.com, hvybgs@cox.net, momofyago@gmail.com, leneebliski@hotmail.com, jeanlongacre@aol.com, pvpsofino@yahoo.com, bssi.campbell@gmail.com, smhvaleri@cox.net, ksnell0001@aol.com, theyorkproperties@gmail.com, gardner4@earthlink.net, j1000@cox.net, carolynn.petrue@gmail.com, george.fotion@homeispalosverdes.com, EZStevens@cox.net, jessboop@cox.net, direne1@aol.com

Sent from the Internet (Details)

Dear RPV residents,

My big epiphany of 2018 is that the RPV City Manager and his employees are conscientiously obstructing the public's participation in the decision-making process. That reduces our "local control" and facilitates the spending of our money on frivolous, poorly designed and/or otherwise uncoordinated activities.

I am big on the One World Order Conspiracy Theory. If this does not explain why Staff is doing things the way they do, one certainly cannot blame it on incompetence. It takes serious skills to obfuscate and omit the facts.

This big example is the Palos Verdes Drive East Roadway Safety Project which has now come a long way toward becoming a "debacle". Like with so many in the past, it started with a poorly written Grant Application which the City Council authorized based upon very limited analysis and public review.

The grant divided and prioritized this project into nine sub-projects. Two of them have been completed to the dismay of the roadway and roadside users. One is now under construction despite objections by the public. (Most of which were not disclosed to the City Council.) Another, now called variations of a Bronco to Lower Headland Roadway Widening Project, is in its fourth metamorphosis.

A recent review by The Traffic Safety Citizen Advisory Committee (TSC) essentially sent the whole "concept" back to "square one". According to the Power-Point Presentation and the minutes of their June 24, 2019 meeting, the project now includes a redo on the completed PVDE/Bronco Intersection Project, the directives in the RPV Trails Network Plan have not yet been considered and the Committee thinks that the City Council should be given the opportunity to consider several different options in the effort to accomplish several overlapping and not clearly defined objectives. Widening the roadway (and the project name change) is a recently proposed solution to the reduce head-on collisions and lack of line-of-sight near-misses objective.

According to the Agenda for the TSC's July 22, 2019 meeting, Staff will be presenting another concept, anyway. And, said presentation/Staff Report is not available which precludes any comments in the form of "late correspondence".

Council rejected Staff's recommended version 3 ish and approved Staff's recommendation to return the grant money. The east side people are now getting jerked around using our local money.

Other than sending out infomercials such as this, I am at a loss as to how we can get our Staff to think of the Palos Verdes Peninsula as an interconnected community which will be populated by more than birds, plants and butterflies for at least a few more decades.
Thanks for taking your time to read this. Should I send another example based on the draft NCCP? ...S 310-377-8761

In a message dated 11/24/2019 6:13:05 PM Pacific Standard Time, pypasofino@yahoo.com writes:

Dear Chairman and Committee Members -

I cannot fathom why City Staff is in support of an encroachment permit of 25'-27' of Public ROW for the purpose of developing a private driveway at street level vs just access to the property, as many homeowners on PVDE have.

While the owners will benefit from these dual driveways, the public receives no benefit at all! Not even a guardrail for protection while traversing this area with its sharp turns and motorists exceeding the posted limits and the 85th percentile speed of 38 mph. In addition, PVDE is a favorite among groups of bicyclists and motorcyclists who tend to hug the shoulder of the lanes. Without a barrier in this particular location (on a curve) there is absolute potential for accidents involving equestrian/pedestrians and the 'cyclists.

Even the opinions of Willdan Engineering and JMC2 Civil Engineering seem to be in conflict. The safety for all users, including the homeowner exiting either driveway, is questionable.

We are experiencing a renaissance of interest from Public Works in recapturing encroached upon Public ROWs to widen and make safer trail passage for the equestrians/pedestrians in this Equestrian Overlay Zone area of RPV. I refer to the PVDE Widening Project that is still being discussed and reworked and the newly renovated Connessota Project.

Thank you for seeing the obvious outrageousness of this request.

Madeline Ryan
28328 Palos Verdes Drive East
"May the Trails be with you..." Madeline
Hi Jean:

Thanks for reaching out to us.

Your email will be included in the late correspondence regarding this item.

Regards,

Elias K. Sassoon, Director
Department of Public Works
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
30940 Hawthorne Blvd.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
Tel: 310-544-5335
Fax: 310-544-5292

From: jeanlongacre@aol.com <jeanlongacre@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 23, 2019 6:00 PM
To: Elias Sassoon <esassoon@rpvca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East

Dear Elias,
I sent this letter to the Traffic Safety Committee. I believe this project is too dangerous.
Jean

-----Original Message-----
From: jeanlongacre@aol.com <jeanlongacre@aol.com>
To: TSC <TSC@rpvca.gov>
Sent: Sat, Nov 23, 2019 5:30 pm
Subject: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East

Dear Traffic Safety Committee Members:
After taking into consideration the word "Safety" in your title, I could not come up with any reason why this house should be allowed to be built. Even if the builder could make some profit after expenses, the danger to the public and the liability to the City do not make it a good idea.

According to records on the internet, this lot (with the house plans) was purchased in 2017 for $130,000. Before the owner invests a lot of money and before the City invests a lot of staff time and meeting time, I would like to suggest that the City offer to purchase this lot from the buyers for their purchase price.
The County never should have made this a legal lot!

We could:
Offer the lot to adjacent property owners at a reasonable price,
Ask the county to help clean up their mess,
Apply for a grant to finish this portion of the trail,
Keep the lot open so the fire department can access the canyon in the event of an emergency,
Keep it as habitat and ask the Land Conservancy for help
Just say NO

In short, any use is better than the creation of another death trap on Palos Verdes Drive East.

Sincerely,

Jean Longacre
6 Martingale Drive
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
310-544-0105
Hi Madeline,

Thank you for your email.

To my knowledge, there is no updated report from Wildan as the engineer who attended the meeting verbally communicated that the project as revised with the City imposed conditions such as right-turn in and right-turn out signs will be acceptable.

I have cc'd the Public Works Department who may have more up to date information on the report.

Thank you.

Jaehee

---

Hello Jaehee -

I attended the TSC meeting wherein the topic was the permitting of 25-27’ of Public Right of Way for the purpose of constructing a driveway from proposed development.

Has the City received the updated Willdan Engineering report? Can I access this new report or other reports pertaining to this development from the City's website?

Madeline Ryan, resident (310) 940-0563
Hi Jean,

Thank you for your email.

The project at 28160 PVDE has not been scheduled for the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow or anytime soon. The application is still pending geotechnical review by the City’s Geologist at this time. Once they receive approval or conditional approval on their geo report and adjust their silhouette to accurately reflect the project, a notice will be sent out for comments including the date when the item will go before the Planning Commission.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jaehee Yoon

Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
www.rpvca.gov
(310) 544-5224

---

Hi Elias,

According to previous information, the issue of the house at 28160 Palos Verdes East was scheduled to go to the Planning Commission tomorrow night. I do not see it on the agenda, nor do I see it on the tentative future agendas.

When is this project scheduled to go to the Planning Commission?

The first report by Willdan Engineering found a problem with the traffic safety of this project. I understand that they have submitted a revised report. Would you please send me a copy of the revised Willdan Engineering report.

Thank you.

Jean Longacre
6 Martingale Drive
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
310-544-0105
Hi Jason,

Thanks for your help in discussing with me the property at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East last month.

As a resident on Martingale Drive, I am deeply concerning about the potential to build at this location for the following reasons:

1. It is on a very tight curve on Palos Verdes Drive East (PVDE). Even in good weather, it is a challenge since there is no visibility around the curve until in the middle of it;
2. PVDE is the only corridor off the hill for vehicular traffic for a large portion of residents;
3. There is no alternate route to get to this property. If construction would occur, it would completely shut down one lane of traffic on PVDE – either onto or off of the hill;
4. During an emergency, this lane closure could be catastrophic;
5. Currently, we are being informed of the dangers of fire in the upcoming season and years. Allowing someone to close a lane at this very precarious location is a danger that seriously concerns me;

Due to the above reasons, I do not believe that building on this location should be allowed unless there was a way to access it from a different way than PVDE.

Please feel free to contact me either via email or my cell phone should you care to discuss.

Thank you for your help,

Elizabeth Sala
310.503.6699
Jayhee,
I have just received the notice of public hearing for 28160 PVDE variations and permit as my property is within 500' of the proposed project.

I would like to receive a copy of the application package and proposed plans.

Can you please let me know what I need to do to obtain these document?

Can you pleas also let me know where I can find the building code to check the applicable rules?

Thank you

David Lukac

310.748.9243
Hi Jaehee,

I live at 8 coach rd.

Can you please send me the application package and proposed plans for 28160 Palos Verde Drive East?

Thank you.

--
Terry Balog
Home 310-521-9082
I have reviewed the notice dated 2 April 2020 concerning the height variation, major grading permit, variance, site review, and encroachment permit for the property at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East. As my property is tangential to this projected development I have a number of concerns.

* Mitigation of major dust from the massive grading operation

* The overheight walls up to 24 feet create a threat to public safety and surrounding areas

* Reduction of the required front yard setback would put the building structure too close to the road, Palos Verdes Drive East (PVDE), which would prove a distraction to drivers on the two lane road

* Landscape reduction could have an adverse impact on neighborhood and surrounding areas

* Two driveways, retaining walls, and planters with limited visibility at the property's location on PVDE would endanger ingress and egress from the property since the property is located on a significant curve on PVDE which is a major thoroughfare

* Pool failures due to land movement, settlement, and cracking would cause major damage to the land and properties located adjacent to and below this project

* Freestanding and retaining walls up to 9 feet in height far exceed height limitations established by local and State of California building code requirements

* The movement of the massive amount of soil for this project will have a serious and major impact on traffic on PVDE which is a major access point for the east side of the peninsula

* Advisability of allowing construction on land at 28160 PVDE which is designated as a "hazard land use" designation in the city's General Plan

Thank you for your consideration,

JoAnna M. Kerrigan
13 Coach Road
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA
Jaehee Yoon

david lukac <david.lukac.us@gmail.com>

Tuesday, May 5, 2020 10:53 AM

Jaehee Yoon

Re: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East concerns and comments for planning commission

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jachce,

I took some pictures from the back yard, the deck and from the street to demonstrate how tall the proposed structure is and how high it sits above my house. Please see below. The pictures from the back yard have a line showing the position of the flags on the closest side of the silhouette as these are hard to see through the trees that currently provide privacy.

Please give me a call so that we can discuss what other pictures you need or if a visit tomorrow morning would be best. We have access to the patio and back yard without coming through the house, so this should be safe to do.

Thank you

Back yard
Street view to demonstrate that the proposed structure is as tall as the trees providing privacy at the moment (at least 30 ft tall) on the adjacent wall side and taller at the highest center part.
On May 5, 2020, at 5:45 AM, Jaehee Yoon <jyoon@rpvca.gov> wrote:

Hi David,

Thank you for your comments.

Although it’s common practice to conduct a site visit to properties with comments on privacy and views, site visits are quite difficult at this time due to the COVID-19. As such, it would be very helpful in understanding and addressing your concerns with additional information from you.

Please find attached document that contains an aerial view of your property and old floor plan from the 70s. In it, I’ve requested several pictures be taken from a standing position inside the living room, dining room, kitchen, and master bedroom towards your view frame. This will help us determine your viewing area and primary view frame which will help address your view concerns. Please ensure to label/name each picture file with the location from which they were taken. In addition, I’d like to clarify if your concern regarding view restoration is referring to a situation where if you proceed with restoring your view, it may require trimming trees and in turn that will impact your privacy as the proposed residence is too tall.
Lastly, could you please send pictures from the back yard and deck which raise privacy concerns with the pictures labeled/named from the location it was taken?

If you are having trouble with taking the pictures and submitting them, I can schedule a quick site visit limited to the outdoor areas this Wednesday morning at 8am. The staff report will need to be finalized no later than close of business this Wednesday, May 6, 2020, so your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Jaehee Yoon

Associate Planner
Community Development Department
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
www.rpvca.gov
(310) 544-5224

In light of COVID-19 response measures from the Governor of the State of California and the Los Angeles County Public Health Department, commencing Tuesday, March 17 through at least Friday, May 15 the City of Rancho Palos Verdes will only be providing Essential City Services that are necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of our community and City Employees. To facilitate these measures, all non-essential staff will be working remotely. Inquiries will be reviewed daily and will be responded to on a case-by-case basis. Please note: our response to your inquiry could be delayed.

From: david lukac [mailto:david.lukac.us@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:38 PM
To: Jaehee Yoon <jyoon@rpvca.gov>
Subject: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East concerns and comments for planning commission

Jaehee,

After reviewing the building permit application, the renderings of the proposed residence and putting that in context of the scale of the silhouette standing at the proposed building site, I have the following concerns and questions I would like to bring to your and the planning commission’s attention:

Privacy concerns for my back yard and patio area:
The silhouette is towering over the level of my back yard and the patio that runs along the south side of my residence. With two levels of windows and balconies planned on the east side of the proposed residence, I am concerned for privacy of my back yard and deck.
The solution cannot be a standard height fence, as the approximate angle from the top of my fence facing the roof line of the proposed residence in the back yard area is 45%, so a 6 ft tall fence does not provide any privacy for areas farther than 6 ft from the fence.
My back yard and patio areas are currently protected by tall trees/vegetation which would provide a level of privacy, but any trimming or removal of trees/vegetation on the side of the
proposed building site would remove most of that protection. Adding additional tall trees/vegetation to the project on the other hand would ensure privacy.

**View restoration concerns:**
Any request for "view restoration" on my property would also impact the privacy of my property due to the height of the proposed residence which is disproportionate to the height of my and other residences in the neighborhood.

**Proximity to an existing horse barn and corral question:**
There is a horse barn and corral in active equestrian use on my property. This barn and corral were grandfathered in so any current setback regulations do not apply to my or my neighbor's existing residences. Has the proximity to this existing barn and corral been taken into consideration as part of the planning and permitting process? I would like to be assured that there will be no impacts from this new construction on this existing horse barn and corral.

**Encroachment on PVDE pedestrian/equestrian pathway concerns:**
The sidewalk along PVDE is in active uses as a pedestrian and equestrian pathway. Residents including my family are using this pathway to walk/ride horses, walk, jog, walk dogs and other activities. Parts of the pathway have been recently improved by the city and fitted with new softer footing and rails to make human and equestrian use of this pathway more comfortable and safer. My concern is that with the proposed improvements in the public right of way, requiring an encroachment permit, the usability of the entire pathway may be affected for human and equestrians users.

I would like to discuss these concerns and ask my questions in the virtual planning commission meeting on May 12, 2020 at 7 PM PST.

Can you please confirm receipt of this email so that I can be assured that my concerns and questions get on the planning commission meeting agenda?

Thank you

David Lukac

<28150 PVDE.PDF>
DeLANGIS RESIDENCE
28160 PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST
RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA 90275

CIVIL ENGINEER
JMD INC.
411 NORTH HARBOUR BLVD., SUITE 201
GARDENA, CA 90248
ATTN: JOHN DRUCKHAN

ARCHITECT
RPMB TECHNOLOGY ARCHITECTURE, INC.
13101 WASHINGTON BLVD., #404
LOS ANGELES, CA 90066
ATTN: LUIS DE MORAES

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
The full and legal description of the property is as follows:

OWNER
Dave DeLangis
6975 Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90802

GENERAL NOTES
1. PRIOR TO BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL JOINT CONDITIONS FOR GRADING, DRAINAGE AND UNDERGROUND FACILITIES TO THE S (or D) TIE-IN LOCATION AND ELEVATION OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND FACILITIES, IF CONDITIONS DIFFER FROM THOSE SHOWN ON THE PLANS OR IF CONDITIONS ARE NOT AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS, ALL DIFFERENCES SHALL BE CONSTRUED IN WITNESS OF THE CHANGES SHOWN.

2. THE EXISTENCE, LOCATION AND CONDITIONS OF UNDERGROUND PLUMBING, GAS, ELECTRICAL, TELEPHONE, OR WATER MAINS, ALL OTHER UTILITIES AND SERVICES, OR EXISTING ABOUT LAND, SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN ON THE PLANS, ARE TO BE CONSIDERED AS BEING IN THE RIGHT PLACE; THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE LOCATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ANY OUTSIDE UTILITIES OR SERVICES, AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

AIR QUALITY NOTES
1. DURING CONSTRUCTION, EXPOSED ARTIFICIAL SURFACES SHALL BE SPRAYED WITH A 1/4% LIQUID NAPHTHALENE CONCENTRATE TO AVOID DUST GENERATION ON TEMPORARY DUST COVER.
2. THE PROPERTY OWNER CONSTRUCTION SHALL KEEP THE CONSTRUCTION AREA CLEAN AND FREE OF DEBRIS AND MISHANDLED MATERIALS.
3. ALL TIME PERIODS REQUIREMENT CONTROL OF DUST BY USE OF FILTERED AIR.
4. THE OWNER OR CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

STORMWATER POLLUTION CONTROL NOTES
1. PRIOR TO BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL JOINT CONDITIONS FOR GRADING, DRAINAGE AND UNDERGROUND FACILITIES, TO THE S (or D) TIE-IN LOCATION AND ELEVATION OF EXISTING UNDERGROUND FACILITIES, IF CONDITIONS DIFFER FROM THOSE SHOWN ON THE PLANS OR IF CONDITIONS ARE NOT AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS, ALL DIFFERENCES SHALL BE CONSTRUED IN WITNESS OF THE CHANGES SHOWN.

2. THE EXISTENCE, LOCATION AND CONDITIONS OF UNDERGROUND PLUMBING, GAS, ELECTRICAL, TELEPHONE, OR WATER MAINS, ALL OTHER UTILITIES AND SERVICES, OR EXISTING ABOUT LAND, SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN ON THE PLANS, ARE TO BE CONSIDERED AS BEING IN THE RIGHT PLACE; THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE LOCATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ANY OUTSIDE UTILITIES OR SERVICES, AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

5. EXCAVATION OR MISHANDLING OF MATERIALS MAY BE CONTINUED ONLY IF PROPERLY CONTROLLED BY SPRAYING ARTIFICIAL SURFACES WITH A 1/4% SOLUTION OF NAPHTHALENE.

6. ANY TIME PERIODS REQUIREMENT CONTROL OF DUST BY USE OF FILTERED AIR.

7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

13. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

15. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

16. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

17. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

18. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

19. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.

20. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ANY SUBSURFACE UTILITIES OR SERVICES.
June 1, 2020

Rigg Consulting
6415 Via Canada
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Attention: Elias Sassoon
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Re: Options for Ingress and Egress at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East

Dear Mr. Sassoon,

The property at 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East is currently vacant and a new home has been proposed. Due to the slope of the property and its location on the outside of a sharp curve, the location of the driveway(s) for the property is a critical issue. This report will review the potential location of two driveways, either individually or working together, access from the neighboring driveway apron, and the associated advantages and disadvantages of each regarding encroachments into the right of way, the height/mass of the home, and heights of perimeter walls, and will provide a recommendation.

Palos Verdes Drive East in the area of this property is characterized with steep slopes and steep driveways to access the single-family residences along the roadway. Most of the driveways do not have standard approaches and start their ascent/descent at the edge of the existing asphalt. Although there is significant unused right of way which could accommodate a future widening of the asphalt and to add additional lanes of traffic, these existing driveways and the steep slopes within the right of way would seem to make widening at many locations, including this one, impractical.

The subject property has approximately 25 feet of two to one slope within the right of way, which is shown in the following exhibit taken from the architect’s plans. Please note that this slope causes an elevation at the potential building line to be around 16 feet lower than the asphalt. As driveway slopes can only have a maximum slope of 20%, some type of non-typical work is needed in the public right of way to accommodate the construction of a home.
The architect originally designed the section shown above to provide for the right of way to be flat and which would provide for the potential expansion of Palos Verdes Drive East. The design also had proposed driveways at both the east and west property lines. In order for this design to be built, a large amount of fill material as well as caissons would need to be built. Although there are several advantages with this approach, there have been concerns raised about it by staff and by the public.

Staff and I discussed several times how to approach the ingress and egress in the right of way for this property with the known constraints and potential impacts on the mass of the home. It seemed there are four possible design scenarios. Each is listed below with results, advantages, and disadvantages. Please note that there will be changes and refinements during final design due to vehicle turnarounds and other details. Also, I have calculated the results for each design based on slope of the driveway varying from 5% to 20%. For the ease of comparing the different designs I have used a slope of 10%, which is typically the maximum slope for short lengths as it does not require transitions and is comfortable for drivers.

**Singular Driveway Near East Property Line**

The driveway is shown in the attached “East Driveway Exhibit”. This option begins the driveway from the lower portion of the adjacent right of way. The driveway would begin 10 feet from the existing guardrail in order to provide for a trail in the public right of way. A flat pad would be built in order for drivers to have the maximum visibility of traffic coming from each direction. The driveway would then slope down parallel to the building towards the west and the entrance to the home. After the entrance to the home the driveway would slope up towards the west and the existing garage. The difference between the finished floors of the home and the garage was kept at 2.2 feet per the current design of the home.
Advantages:
- The finished floor of the home can be reduced 8.1 feet. This will decrease the mass of
  the home and view impacts from the public right of way.
- The walls along the adjacent property lines can be similarly reduced.

Disadvantages:
- Walls in the public right of way are extensive with a maximum height of 6.3 feet near the
  garage.
- These walls could inhibit the installation of utilities in the public right of way.

Singular Driveway Near West Property Line

The driveway is shown in the attached “West Driveway Exhibit”. This option begins the
driveway from the higher portion of the adjacent right of way at the west end of the property.
The driveway would begin 10 feet from the existing guardrail in order to provide for a trail in the
public right of way. The driveway would then slope down at 10% to the entrance of the garage.
The difference between the finished floors of the home and the garage was kept at 2.2 feet per
the current design of the home, resulting in a reduced finished floor of the home of 3.4 feet. It is
assumed that the trail will be built only adjacent to the apron and that the remainder of the right of
way will remain at its existing grade.

Advantages:
- The finished floor of the home can be reduced 3.4 feet. This will decrease the mass of
  the home and view impacts from the public right of way.
- The walls along the adjacent property lines can be similarly reduced.
- The lengths of walls in the public right of way are minimized, but to a maximum height
  of 13 feet.

Disadvantages:
- The finished floor is not reduced as much as the design with the driveway entering from
  the east side.

Dual Driveways from Both the West and East Property Line

The driveways are shown on the attached “East and West Driveway Exhibit”. Driveways would
be built at each end of the property and would be connected with a 20-foot wide driveway
parallel to Palos Verdes Drive East. At both locations the driveway would begin 10 feet from the
existing guardrail in order to provide for a trail in the public right of way. A flat pad would be
built in order for drivers to have the maximum visibility of traffic coming from each direction.
Rigg Consulting

The driveway would then slope down parallel to the building/road towards the east from the west. The slope from the garage to the entrance is set at the 10% rate, with the resulting slope from the entrance to the east driveway being 5%.

Advantages:
- The finished floor of the home can be reduced 1.2 feet. This will decrease the mass of the home and view impacts from the public right of way.
- Fire Department access can be from this driveway and not impede the travel lanes on Palos Verdes Drive East.

Disadvantages:
- The costs for an on-site retaining wall to support the driveway are extensive, as well as the costs for filling the public right of way.
- In order to provide for both the trail as well as the 20 feet of Fire Department access, the home will be pushed down the hill which will effectively increase the heights of walls and the mass of the building.

Shared Driveway Approach with 28180/28182 Palos Verdes Drive East

The properties to the west of the subject property are 28180 and 28182 Palos Verdes Drive East. Their driveway apron is west of the existing guardrail and could be also used to access the subject property. A driveway parallel with the street would be needed to access the home, similar to a frontage road.

I evaluated if there would be an increase in visibility from the driveway to see westbound traffic. It seems per the following exhibit and per my field visit that there is no increase in visibility to see westbound traffic and that these two homes have the same limited visibility as the subject property. There would also not be the ability for a fire engine to pull into the driveway per the other three options to access the subject property. Finally, the frontage road would have significant privacy and aesthetic impacts on the property at 28180 Palos Verdes Drive East. As such I did not evaluate the impacts to the public right of way and building heights as there does not seem to be any significant advantage to this option.
Recommendation

In terms of minimizing the work and intrusion into the public right of way, the singular west driveway access is the preferred option. Please note this option does not provide for the expansion of the trail and the needed wall for its construction.

Each option has a variety of impacts on the finished floors of the garage and the home. Although I have calculated different reductions in finished floor elevations, the owner/architect could modify each with a different design. Also the reduction in the finished floor also comes with the increase of walls within the public right of way.

My understanding is that a separate report will evaluate the traffic-related impacts of each driveway, including visibility.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Sincerely,

Allan Rigg, PE AICP

Attachments:
A – East Driveway Exhibit/Sections
B – West Driveway Exhibit/Section
C – East and West Driveway Exhibit/Section
D - Calculations
Attachment A – Section at Building with East Driveway
Attachment A – Section at Street Entrance with East Driveway
Attachment B – Section at Garage with West Driveway
Attachment C – Section at Building with East and West Driveways
### Entry from east driveway with slope towards the west/garage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade at East Driveway Pad (A)</th>
<th>Distance from Driveway Pad to Entry (B)</th>
<th>Slope from Driveway Pad to Entry (C)</th>
<th>Calculated New FF at Entry (D)</th>
<th>Current FF at Entry (E)</th>
<th>Reduction of Home FF (F)</th>
<th>Current Grade at 2.2 Feet Above New Entry FF (G)</th>
<th>Garage FF at Wall Height at Edge of Trail at Garage (H)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>648.75</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>650.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>646.5</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>648.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>644.25</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>646.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entry from west driveway with direct access to garage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Grade at Edge of Trail at Garage (A)</th>
<th>Distance from Trail to Garage (B)</th>
<th>Slope from Trail to Garage (C)</th>
<th>Calculated New FF of Garage (D)</th>
<th>Current FF of Garage (E)</th>
<th>Reduction of Garage FF (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>654.41</td>
<td>654.8</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>653.41</td>
<td>654.8</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>652.41</td>
<td>654.8</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>651.41</td>
<td>654.8</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entry from both driveways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade at West Driveway Pad (A)</th>
<th>Distance from Driveway Pad to Entry (B)</th>
<th>Slope from Driveway Pad to Entry (C)</th>
<th>Calculated New FF at Entry (D)</th>
<th>Current FF at Entry (E)</th>
<th>Reduction of Home FF (F)</th>
<th>Current Grade at Edge of Trail at East Driveway (G)</th>
<th>Distance from Driveway Pad to Entry (H)</th>
<th>Calculated Slope from Entry to East Driveway (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>654.41</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>653.41</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>652.41</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>651.41</td>
<td>654.6</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FF** = Finished Floor

Attachment D - Calculations
Memorandum

TO: Elias Sassoon, Director of Public Works

FROM: Vanessa Munoz, PE, TE, PTOE
Traffic Engineer

DATE: June 2, 2020

SUBJECT: 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East—Sight Distance

The City of Rancho Palos Verdes has requested we review the sight distance for a vehicle traveling westbound (Vehicle A) as it approaches a vehicle (Vehicle B) making a westbound left turn into the 28160 Palos Verdes Drive East property and assess if adequate sight distance is available between vehicle B and vehicles A and if vehicle A can notice vehicle B and if vehicle A has adequate reaction time to come to a complete stop without colliding with vehicle B.

A speed radar survey was collected on Wednesday May 20, 2020 for the speeds being driven by vehicles around the curve. The 85th percentile which is the speed utilized to set speed limits and used to calculate sight distance came out to be 30 mph. Per the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) the stopping sight distance for 30 mph is 200-feet. A layout of a vehicle turning left into each of the driveways is shown in Exhibit A and Exhibit B. The Exhibits depicts there is not adequate sight distance for either driveway. The minimum sight distance that can be provided ranges between 156-158-feet which is below the 200-feet required. Since adequate sight distance cannot be provided for the left turn vehicles, the following are a list of recommendations with the benefits and disadvantages for each to improve safety:

Alternative 1 - Prohibit the left turn movement for the westbound direction into 28160 - This alternative requires the installation of two signs per driveway for "No left turn". One sign shall be installed on the right side of the roadway and the second on the left side by each driveway within the public right of way, these signs would be accompanied by "Right turn only" signs that shall be installed out of each driveway as you exit the property. Installing the signs will notify drivers that the left turn movement is illegal and will provide the tool for enforcement by the Sheriff's department should someone be in violation of the movement. The advantage of installing the signs is the driver has been notified it’s illegal to make this movement, however most drivers tend to not always obey signs and would tend to violate them if they perceive they can make the turn safely. Exhibit C provides a layout of the proposed signs.

Alternative 2 - Shared driveway – This alternative requires the property located to the west at 28180 Palos Verdes Drive East share their driveway with the 28160 residents. This would require a frontage road be constructed from the new property to the driveway. The benefits of the shared driveway would be to increase the sight visibility, however a quick review, depicts the sight distance for 30 mph would provide about 152-feet turning into the property which is not an improvement on the sight distance from the proposed driveways 156-158 feet, therefore the sight distance requirement of 200-feet is not met. Additionally Alternative 2 would require consent
from the neighbor and the frontage road would create challenges for the fire protection of the proposed house. For a layout of the sight distance See Exhibit D.

**Alternative 3 - Install a two way left turn lane fronting 28160 Property** — Installing a two way left turn lane (center lane) for the length of the street will allow vehicles turning left into the property to utilize this center lane as a refuge and then make the left turn into the property safely without blocking the thru traffic, therefore eliminating the possibility of the rear end collision and remediating the lack of sight distance. Furthermore, this center lane can serve as a refuge for vehicles leaving the house and merging with thru traffic. Consequently, the use of this center lane eliminates the need for No Left Turn and Right Turn Only signs. Additionally, if the property driveways are consolidated and the west driveway is left in place and the most easterly driveway removed it would reduce the conflict point in and out of the property from two locations to one which would increase safety. This alternative requires additional assessment to verify impacts to existing conditions within the public right of way and develop probable cost and timeline. See Exhibit E for conceptual layout of center lane.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The three Alternatives discussed have both advantages and disadvantages, however Alternative 3 is the preferred and recommended alternative. Alternative 3 provides the greatest safety to drivers in and out of the driveway as well as those traveling along Palos Verdes Drive East. Furthermore, as part of the recommendation, the Alternative shall be implemented prior to the beginning of construction of the property to provide a refuge for construction vehicles in and out of the property therefore not just increasing safety when the house is occupied but also during the construction phase.
DATE: JUNE 10, 2020

TO: CHAIR LIU AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: ELIAS SASSOON, PE, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NB 2 – FY 2020-21 TSC Work Plan

RECOMMENDATION

Review, discuss and approve the proposed TSC Work Plan.

DISCUSSION - Review consultant report, discuss, and make recommendations to City Council.

Attachments: FY 2019-20 TSC Work Plan
             FY 2020-21 TSC Work Plan
MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Traffic Safety Committee shall be to provide community input by advising the City Council on traffic issues, development proposals and special projects as assigned by the City Council. Review and advise on neighborhood traffic calming guidelines and proposed projects, and collaboratively work with staff to address residents' requests for improving livability and drivability of neighborhood streets in Rancho Palos Verdes. (Resolution No. 2008-77)

SPECIFIC 2019-20 ASSIGNMENTS

During the 2019-2020 fiscal year, the TSC will continue to implement its mission, with emphasis upon the following goals:

   a. Provide support and collaborate with Staff and the selected consulting firm to develop a Peninsula-Wide Safe Routes to School Plan to improve mobility and accessibility for students and their families to safely walk or bike to school.
   b. Participate in the community and stakeholder engagements/workshops to solicit both general comments and site-specific input related to the needs and concerns for each of the neighborhood/school area.
   c. Assist with the development of a Peninsula-Wide priority project list for each school.

2. Provide support as desired by the Staff to implement the design and construction of the recommended improvements at various intersections along Palos Verdes Drive South and Palos Verdes Drive East.

3. Review and assess any item requested by the residents, members of the City Council, Traffic Safety Committee, and City Manager's Office.

4. Explore possible means, options, and opportunities to control or reduce vehicular traffic speeds throughout Rancho Palos Verdes.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL

As an advisory body, the TSC has the ability to bring comments, ideas, and recommendations to the City Council for consideration. If a majority of Committee members are in agreement and have voted accordingly to move the topic forward, Staff will work to agendize the matter on the City Council's calendar. The Chair of the Committee, or his/her designee, will present the item before the City Council at the meeting. Staff will be available to assist the Committee on preparing the staff report and related materials for the agenda.
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE  
FY 2020-21 WORK PLAN

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Traffic Safety Committee shall be to provide community input by advising the City Council on traffic issues, development proposals and special projects as assigned by the City Council. Review and advise on neighborhood traffic calming guidelines and proposed projects, and collaboratively work with staff to address residents’ requests for improving livability and drivability of neighborhood streets in Rancho Palos Verdes. (Resolution No. 2008-77)

SPECIFIC 2019-20 ASSIGNMENTS

During the 2019-2020 fiscal year, the IMAC will continue to implement its mission, with emphasis upon the following goals:

   a. Provide support and collaborate with Staff and the selected consulting firm to develop a Peninsula-Wide Safe Routes to School Plan to improve mobility and accessibility for students and their families for a safer route to school (pedestrians as well as cyclists).
   b. Participate in the community and stakeholder engagements/workshops to solicit both general comments and site-specific input related to the needs and concerns for each of the neighborhood/school area.
   c. Assist with the development of a Peninsula-Wide priority project list for each school.

2. Review and assess any item requested by the residents, members of the City Council, Traffic Safety Committee, and City Manager’s Office.

3. Explore possible means, options, and opportunities to control or reduce vehicular traffic speeds throughout Rancho Palos Verdes.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL

As an advisory body, the TSC has the ability to bring comments, ideas, and recommendations to the City Council for consideration. If a majority of Committee members are in agreement and have voted accordingly to move the topic forward, Staff will work to agendize the matter on the City Council's calendar. The Chair of the Committee, or his/her designee, will present the item before the City Council at the meeting. Staff will be available to assist the Committee on preparing the staff report and related materials for the agenda.
DATE: JUNE 10, 2020

TO: CHAIR LIU AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: JUAN HERNANDEZ, MAINTENANCE SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NB 3 — INSTALLATION OF ONE PERMANENT RADAR DETECTION UNIT ON PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST AT CALLE AVENTURA AND TWO UNITS ALONG PALOS VERDES DRIVE EAST AT BRONCO DRIVE

RECOMMENDATION

Install permanent speed radar detection units that alert drivers of excessive speed as a "Traffic Calming" measure in 3 locations.

DISCUSSION

On May 14, 2020, a severe traffic collision took place on PVDE and Calle Aventura. This collision caused severe injuries to the drivers, passengers and their respective vehicles. Lomita Sheriff's office reported that excessive speed was a major contributing factor to the cause of the collision. In reaction to this accident Lomita Sheriff's office has requested the City to install a permanent speed radar detection unit as a "Traffic Calming" measure to reduce the speed of vehicular traffic along PVDE in this area. After much review and positive feedback the community, the Department of Public Works now recommends the installation of this radar unit.

The DPW recommends the attached model/type to be used. Further, Department of Public Works will be utilizing the same model radar unit to be installed in two locations along PVDE at Bronco Drive as part of the PVDE widening project as recommended by TSC.

Attached to this staff report are the specifications and cost estimates associated with the installation of the chosen model.

Attachment: VER-MAC PLVV-1LM48X32B
- Estimated Cost of Equipment and Installation
- Radar Detection Unit – PVDE and San Ramon Drive (Image 1)
- Radar Detection Unit – PVDE and San Ramon Drive (Image 2)
- Radar Detection Unit – PVDE and Bronco Drive (Image 3)
PLW-1L  48X32B

POST-MOUNTED VARIABLE SPEED LIMIT SIGN

Ver-Mac's PLVW-1LM48X32B is a post-mounted variable speed limit sign with a full-matrix display of 32 x 48 pixels. The PLW-1LM48X32B displays the maximum speed limit, which can be changed based on weather, traffic conditions, etc. The PLW-1LM48X32B features our V-Touch controller and Jamlogic® software. It's the perfect system to use to slow traffic and avoid stop-and-go conditions which often end-up causing rear-end collisions.

V-TOUCH CONTROLLER

- Easy-to-read, 7-inch (178 mm) color LCD pressure-sensitive display screen
- User-friendly, one-click icon-based menu items
- Time-saving, preloaded speed limits
- Simple to operate - the intuitive point-n-go icons ensure quick and easy commands to change maximum speed limits
- Additional functionalities - scheduling, sign diagnostics, pin-protected security, and much more

PLVV-1 LM48X32B
JAMLOGIC® FLEET MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE

- Monitor, maintain, and manage your signs from any PC, laptop, tablet, or smartphone.
- View your equipment in a list and GPS map view.
- Change the maximum speed limit on one or more signs simultaneously with a simple click.
- View your current speeds and battery voltages.
- Group your signs in folders (by customer, location, project, you choose).
- Receive email or text alerts-optional (low battery, cellular failure, etc).

APPLICATIONS

- Highway construction
- City and county (urban areas)
- School zones
- Smart work zones

HIGH-QUALITY CONSTRUCTION

- Weather-proof design (IP 45)
- Sealed power supply for marine environments
- Easy access for maintenance

OPTIONS

- Beacons
- Sensors

Other options are available to meet your needs.

DISPLAY

- High-resolution full-matrix of 32 x 48 pixels
- 17.7 mm pixel pitch
- 15' visibility
- 16 x16 pixels swappable LED modules
- Choice of fonts
- Manual and photocell-controlled brightness
- Ethernet and RS-485 serial communication ports
- 120V 60Hz

DIMENSIONS AND WEIGHT

- 150 lb (628 kg)

1-year warranty on complete signs
2-year warranty on electronic components manufactured by Ver-Mac
# Quotation

**City of RPV PW**

**Address**

30940 Hawthorne Blvd Rancho Palos Verdes

**Date** 6/3/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salesperson</th>
<th>P.O. Number</th>
<th>Ship Date</th>
<th>F.O.B. Point</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Tuxubic?</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vermac Radar Head Unit</td>
<td>$ 6,800.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$ 6,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Solar Panel Option</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mounting Pole and Accessories</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>$ 2,400.00</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$ 2,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal    | $ 13,200    |
| Tax Rate    | 1000%      |
| Sales Tax   | $ 1,080.00 |
| Other       |            |
| **TOTAL**   | $ 14,280.00 |


DATE: JUNE 10, 2020

TO: CHAIR LIU AND MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

FROM: ELIAS SASSOON, PE, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM INFORMATIONAL – Red Curb Painting Near Palos Verdes Drive South and Forrestal Drive

RECOMMENDATION

Review and discuss issued work order.
Due to recent demonstrations, a work order has been issued to paint the curbs red at the following locations (please see attached map):

- Southwest and southeast corners at Palos Verdes Drive South and Trump National Drive
- Northwest and northeast corners at Palos Verdes Drive South and Forrestal Drive
- North corner at Aqua Vista Drive and Forrestal Drive
- Palos Verdes Drive South turnout (directly south of PVDS and Conqueror Drive intersection)

DISCUSSION - Review issued work order.

Attachments: Map of locations of red curb painting near PVDS and Forrestal Drive