

**CITY OF SOUTH EL MONTE
PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICIAL MINUTES
TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2020
THIS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING IS BY TELECONFERENCE ONLY**

*****SPECIAL NOTICE REGARDING COVID-19*****

On March 17, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which authorizes the Local Legislative body to hold public meetings via teleconferencing and waives all requirements of the Brown Act requiring the physical presence of Planning Commissioners, staff, or the public as a condition of participation in or quorum for a public meeting.

Members of the public will have access to listen to and participate in the meeting by calling-in at the information below. Teleconference participation shall be available to the public at the following USA Toll-Free number, 888-204-5987, Access Code: 9671457

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson calls meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Rudy Bojorquez, Vice-Chairperson Larry Rodriguez, Ruby Rose Yopez, Jeff Ortiz and Leo Barrera.

Also Present via teleconference: (Assistant City Attorney) Christy Lopez of Aleshire & Wynder, LLP, (Public Works Director) Rene Salas, (Planning Assistant) Ian McAleese, (Planning Commission Secretary) Angie Hernandez

3. FLAG SALUTE

Chairperson, Rudy Bojorquez led the flag salute.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner Barrera and seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez and carried (5-0) to approve the agenda as-is.

Vote: Approval of Agenda
Ayes: Bojorquez, Barrera, Ortiz, Rodriguez, Yopez
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None
Action: Approved

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairperson Bojorquez requested Any person wishing to address the Planning Commission on any items not on the agenda, or any other matter, is invited to do so at this time. Pursuant to the Brown Act, the Commission cannot discuss or take action on items not on the agenda. Matters brought before the Commission that are not on the agenda may be, at the Commissions' discretion, be referred to staff or placed on the next agenda.

No public comment was noted.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

6.a. Minutes of March 11, 2020

A motion was made by Commissioner Yepez and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz and carried (5-0) to approve Consent Calendar (Minutes of March 11, 2020)

Vote: Approving Consent Calendar – Minutes of March 11, 2020
Ayes: Bojorquez, Ortiz, Yepez, Barrera and Rodriguez
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None
Action: Approved

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

7.a. Consideration of Resolution No. 19-21 approving a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) (No. 19-21) to allow for the construction of 72 attached residential condominiums at 2610-2634 Chico Avenue and 1607-2637 Humbert Avenue, a Subdivision (No. 19-23) to create 72 residential condominiums, common area parcels, and private streets, and Zone Change/General Plan Amendment (ZC/GPA)(No. 19-22) to change the existing zoning of four parcels from Manufacturing “M” to Multi Family Residential “R-3” and change the General Plan designation from Industrial to Medium Density Residential.

The eight parcels that make up the subject site located at 2610-2634 Chico Avenue and 2607-2637 Humbert Avenue (“Property”) measures approximately 187,800 square feet (4.3 acres) and is located at the northern boundary of the City of South El Monte (“City”). The six larger properties made up of 2610, 2630, 2634 Chico Ave, 2607, 2629, and 2637 Humbert Ave were originally developed as multifamily dwellings, and between 1968 to 1973 were demolished to create two large parking lots for the Starlite’s remote parking. The property located at 2621 Humbert Ave is currently developed with eight apartment units. The last property located at 2622 Chico Ave was originally developed as a warehouse in 1965 and continually was utilized until December of 2018 when a fire occurred in the building. Demolition on the burned building occurred in 2019, and the site is currently vacant. The Assistant Planner addressed the square footage of the units, the parking, the landscape and all the specs the project would entail in his presentation.

Housing staff followed up with a short briefing on the outreach to the tenants of Humbert Ave:

- Warmington Residential does not own the property the Humbert Avenue tenants reside at. Mary and Armand Olvera are the property owners.

- Warmington is under contract with the Olvera's to purchase the property subject to us getting an approval for a residential development.
- Warmington's involvement only started on or around our Planning Commission hearing in March once the Olvera's notified their tenants that they were requesting them to move.
- Warmington offered to assist with relocation costs.
- Warmington presented the City with a letter dated April 20th offering the tenants not to pay rent for June & July and if moved out by July 31st they would receive \$2,000. We then modified it to include May. The City also included a certified letter dated May 4, 2020 followed by emails, and voice messages to all the Humbert Tenants.
- The offer Warmington presented equals 3 Month's rent for approximately \$3,000 and \$2,000 additional for a total of \$5,000.
- Warmington has not had any direct conversation with any of the tenants regarding anything different than this offer.
- There seems to be a theme in the recent correspondence that we have been trying to cut deals with individual tenants, which is not the truth. Warmington tried to offer something for all 6 of the remaining tenants that will assist them with their relocation.
- Some of the Tenant response to Warmington offer include two tenants requesting \$10,000 to relocate, two more tenants have requested \$20,000 to relocate, while one tenant has requested \$7,000 to relocate and another has requested more time and more money.
- May rents will be returned to those tenants whom have made their May payment which currently two have been confirmed.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 19-21, approving Conditional Use Permit (No. 19-21), Zone Change/General Plan Amendment (No. 19-22), Subdivision (No. 19-23), and Variance (No. 19-24) as conditioned.

Below are comments that were noted during the public hearing of this item:

1. The Assistant City Attorney added a friendly reminder that anytime a Commissioner talks to, attends, does a site visit or has any type of contact no matter how small or big with any person, business or project that comes before the Commission in a public hearing that the Commissioner would disclose that before the public comment even opens.
2. Question by: Commissioner Barrera to staff, Update on the scheduled meeting with Warmington, the residents and City Staff? Response by: Assistant Planner, the conversation started back in March, there was a tentative meeting scheduled for a Saturday morning meeting at the property, but with the

pandemic, no meetings have panned out, due to health advisories. All the correspondence from the tenants have all been through phone calls and emails. City staff was the only liaison between Warmington and the tenants. Housing staff confirmed this information and included the following statement: One tenant has already moved out and one is pending the conversation of vacating the unit. Currently there are five tenants pending relocation. Were the letters to the tenants certified mail? Housing staff responded: Yes, that is correct, the offer letters were sent certified mail on behalf of the City. I also, followed up with a phone call, and an email to advise and confirm the tenants the communication Warmington was offering.

3. Question/Comment by: Commissioner Yepez to staff, With regard to the repayment of those tenants who have paid their MAY rents, is there a timeline when they will be receiving the refund for that? Housing staff asked commissioner to ask the applicant when he comes up to speak, so that applicant can answer the question directly. What is the applicant's take on the additional funding requests the tenants have asked for? Chairperson Bojorquez stated to hold this question for the applicant directly when they come up to speak.

4. Question by: Chairperson Bojorquez to staff, Is there five tenants we have not heard from? Response by: Housing staff, there are currently five tenants that we are working with to create an offer or agreement with. They do know about the current offer on the table- regarding the \$2,000 move out by July 30, they just have not responded to the offer, correct? Housing staff added, All the tenants have been informed of the offer by Warmington, all of the tenants have responded to the offer by Warmington, and we are now awaiting a response from Warmington on the tenants' request. Do we have a response from everyone? Yes, we have a response from everyone. The letter provided only has one of the tenants information, I don't see the other tenant's letters here. Was this letter only provided to this tenant or was the letter sent to all the tenants? Assistant City Planner responded, Yes the letter in the staff report is a sample letter that was sent out with no personal information.

5. Question by: Commissioner Ortiz to staff, Was there any reasoning or rational of the tenants as to why the increase was much higher than the offer? Response by: Housing staff, the tenants have their specific reasons why their ask is much greater, unfortunately this platform cannot provide the time or details of each tenants requests and in order to maintain transparency Warmington will not make any side offers to any tenant specifically and will propose the same offer to all tenants across the board.

6. Applicant, Jay Deckard, made the following statement: I'm here to answer any questions and I can give you an update from what I know from Angie's presentation. I believe most of the letters started coming in, you know within the last 24 hours. So we had a chance to look at it but not review them. Obviously we'd like to do is try and find something that's representative of equals of all the tenants in there. I am aware of one tenant has moved out we've given her \$2,000 relocation allowance per the agreement we have outlined. I'm unaware of the other person moving out by the end of May, but I'm sure we can review and understand that information. I believe the calls and letters and just start coming in. We haven't had a chance to analyze it, as we are committed to try to work with the Olvera's to try to come up with something that's you know, hopefully fair to everyone when we chose to relocate whenever that time may be. And right now we thought that the offer you know before you, the city and them was fair.

It's tough to relocate and we're willing to sit and talk about it. And I do want to add one thing, I have not had any contact with anyone. We have not reached out to any one individually. I was contacted by Gabriel Moran, twice, the most recent on Saturday, and he called me up and said, you know, if you want me to move out by May then give me \$7,000. And I told him as I said, there's an offer at the table here. You don't have to immediately move toward to live rent-free for May, June and July and they get \$2,000. He wasn't receptive to that. He said that he was filing a lawsuit and all tenants were filing a lawsuit against the Olvera's. At that point and that's when I kind of reminded him that we didn't own the property and he would have to take that up with the Olvera's. That's the only communication that I or anyone from Warmington has had with the tenants specifically. With respect to the reimbursement of the two made payments that were made, I sent an email earlier today to the property management company that works for the Olvera's, ask them to return the money. I will follow up with that and I would assume they would have checks returned back to within the next week. We're willing to work with them (tenants) to try to come up with some type of agreement that's beneficial for everyone and we're going to the City Council. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer.

7. Chairperson Bojorquez asked the applicant, You said you said May did you mean March? Applicant answered, Yes May, not March. To my understanding all but two tenants have not paid their rent in April. And I don't believe the Olvera's will be looking for those payments to be returned. So just an FYI on that.

8. Commissioner Barrera asked the applicant: How are you guys willing to renegotiate or are the Olvera's willing to renegotiate with the remaining tenants that are still there? Applicant answered, If it came down to it. We're willing to talk to them. I mean \$20,000 probably isn't, you know realistic or the right answer but we're more than willing to talk to them. The Olvera's are an older couple I finally meet them about two weeks ago, they live down in San Diego County and they just don't have the ability to come up here and get in middle of this. I told them that I would try to resolve this or work through it for them. And yes, we're definitely open to talk to folks. It's been obviously trying times with covid-19. We can't go sit down and talk to somebody but we are open to doing that. What we want to do is make sure that we're fair to everyone. I mean the one person moves out already. She received \$2,000. She's not getting rent-free for May, June and July because she moved out. And I know each person situations a little bit different. So yes to answer your question we're more than willing to talk to folks.

9. Commissioner Rodriguez asked the applicant: Did any of the tenant retain a council or are they just doing this on their own? Applicant answered, I know Warmington and the Olvera's have not been contacted by any legal counsel from the tenants and I believe most of correspondence came in within the last 24 hours. Housing staff interjected the following- Yes, there's no communication or inclination that the tenants have reached out to legal authorities at this time. Their requests have come in verbally and via email, phone call or a letter.

10. Commissioner Rodriguez asked, Every tenant pays the exact amount of rent, one thousand dollars? Applicant Jay Deckard responded: No, I have a copy of the rent roll and it ranges from nine hundred to a thousand thirty. So I just, you know, we just average it down to one thousand dollars. Looking at the rent roll, there's one tenant who pays eight twenty-five to one thousand thirty dollars. That is way below the rates of the city.

11. Commissioner Yepez asked, So the reimbursement for the May payment/rent that is coming directly from the Olvera's and if so have they agreed to pay that or is that going to be coming from Warmington? Applicant answered, It's actually going to be reimbursement through the Olvera's property management company who the tenants pay their rent to. So it will become directly back in the property management company and the Olvera's have agreed, I spoke with Mary Olvera on Saturday or Sunday. She called me today, and our property management company told us that two people paid rent for May, you need to make sure that they get that back, and I agree. So I've been in contact with their property management company that lady's name there is Mary Bosch and she said earlier today that they would be returning it. I can follow up with Housing Staff, but I believe it would be by next week.

12. Commissioner Rodriguez asked Staff, If they (Tenants) don't accept the offer, the eviction starts and this offer is off the table? City Attorney responded, That is an issue that we can't really opine on the since it's a private landlord-tenant relationship. So how the landlord tenant laws are is based on what the agreement says. Case law says this would not be something that would typical and be able to provide an opinion on. Commissioner Rodriguez made the following statement: you know, three months rent and even if they didn't pay rent this might go into August, you know for all this to move forward and work because of the covid-19, that's four months rent and the \$2,000. It just seems like a fair offer. Now, of course every tenant would want to keep their home. They would not want to move. But I think that they've been more than fair with three months and not paying rent. And if you save that money and you get that \$2,000, I don't see \$20,000 or \$10,000. That's a lot of money, you know to be handing out and I don't think that the prior owners have that type of money to be handing out. Because it wouldn't be Warmington handing it out. It would be the other owners, the sellers, that's my comment.

13. Commissioner Yepez asked the following, So my only concern is you know, the it sounds like the rent that their pain is pretty minimal compared to the average rent. Do we know what average rent numbers are for, what in the area of what they would have to start paying? My only concern is that lets say right now they're paying an average of \$1,000 but where they may look to move to maybe an average of \$1,500 or \$1,750, you know, if we look at them saving 2-3 months rent that puts them at hopefully saving for, first month and last month's down payment for a place to relocate to, but does that constitute them being financially stable to be able to. To afford moving forward when you're rent level has increased, that's my only concern with this situation. Housing staff responded, Rents in the area are literally double of what they currently pay. So a two-bedroom in the area is about two thousand dollars. It will be an adjustment for the tenants to adjust to this new affordable rent. Many of these tenants have

lived at the property for over 20 years. A lot of the tenants have lost their jobs and are solely on one income living off of one income and there's multiple people in the family. It is a hardship on the tenants but rents in the area do range for the units they're currently in at approximately \$2,000 a month for rent.

14. Commissioner Barrera made the following comment, I think it's a good starting point and I can't dictate to the Olvera's and the company about how much they should be offering their current tenants. But because of covid-19, I don't think you can evict anyone right now based on everything that's going on. So this may very well extend in the September/October. In grand, the rates are going to be a lot higher anywhere they go. Maybe this is the way where they can save some money and possibly try to find something reasonable that they can afford within the city. It's hard to say at this time.

15. Chairperson Bojorquez, I understand there's a Moratorium in the City on rent but those rents need to be paid back now. When would that kick in in this situation? Because I think I heard 6 to 12 months you can get to pay back your rent, but then it does have to be paid back. So when exactly will that happen in this situation, if would that be like, in August or so. Assistant City Attorney responded, So the way that the City of South El Monte chose to approach this is pursuant to the governor's order the state of emergency that was declared by the governor and his executive orders that follow that prevented the evictions. The city adopted an ordinance right now. What has happened is that the Governor's Order said that the tenant and the landlord were in charge of setting up their own repayment plans and some cities decided to step in and assess how they were going to establish a repayment plan. If I recall correctly, it's up to the landlord and the tenant to figure out a repayment plan. So for example, if they didn't pay last month's or this month's rent, they can start repaying next month if they're financially capable. What the Ordinance prevents or is specific about is that they can't evict while the state's emergency is pending. Commissioner Bojorquez continued, Now the state's emergency is pending do we have an idea of what the description of that is? Does that mean that everything has to be lifted before the eviction can happen or is there an actual time frame? I heard 12 months. I'm not sure if that's correct. Assistant City Attorney responded, Yeah, that might have been implemented through some of the other County orders. Every City and County have decided to treat the executive order issued by the governor differently in terms of six months or twelve months that's usually in Ordinances because it didn't come from the Executive or County Ordinances, but I believe in our case. It's just between the landlord and tenant in terms of repayment. How long the state emergency last is completely up in the air as you may have seen on the news Governor Newsom seem to have taken sort of a strong a more aggressive approach to the state of California and we're the Federal Administration was really pushing for the reopening. Most recently, it does look like the state is going to start the phasing into the reopening and we're still not clear when that emergency is going to be rescinded by the state, but we do expect to have some sort of warning as it becomes closer to that reopening. We also don't know what the eviction executive order how those orders were going to play out as more and more businesses begin to open back up and people are getting paychecks again and so forth. We'll see how that goes, because it's probably going to be an evolving issue. Commissioner Bojorquez continued,

What were to happen if we vote and this happens to pass, Does it mean come September, technically nobody has to move until the emergency ordinance are lifted and that could be for example 12 months, right? So it's to the benefit of Warmington to come up with a deal to try to get the property empty so they can move forward with what they want to do. Essentially regardless of what happens today, they could still potentially stay there. Assistant City Attorney added, just to be clear the emergency order as well as the city ordinance prohibits evictions that are related to financial impacts as a result of covid-19. So for example, if somebody hasn't been paying rent since last October, well before the pandemic, that wouldn't stop an eviction. Chairperson Bojorquez continued, But if they were current and I was due to this then that would stop the eviction indefinitely until the emergency ordinance was lifted. Assistant City Attorney, Yes, that is correct.

16. Commissioner Rodriguez, What I understand is if we vote Yes on this today, the whole eviction the whole amount of money will continue on and that's their agreement. But what we vote today, will allow Warmington to go ahead and continue on the path to go ahead and start the project. And the tenants wouldn't be allowed to get kicked out due to covid-19 based on the governor's orders, correct? Assistant City Attorney responded, so as long as they can demonstrate a financial impact from covid-19. Yes, they can't be evicted currently. Although I should mention that there are currently lawsuits pending throughout various counties on eviction ordinances that were brought forward by The Landlord Association and the State challenging city ordinances on this issue. So, I don't know if that's a legitimate lawsuit at this point, but assume the ordinance remains effective and that tenants can prove that covid-19 has impacted them financially. Yes, the other thing they cannot be evicted. And that ordinance will remain in place until the governor of this state lifts the emergency. Commissioner Rodriguez continued, If we go ahead and we move forward with this, it's between the State, Warmington and the landlord, correct? Assistant City Attorney responded, Yes and certainly with respect to the negotiations on the relocation assistance, with the not paying any rent and the \$2,000 stipend, those negotiations would be solely between the landlord and the Tenant and would be out of our hands.

17. Chairperson Bojorquez added, Under normal circumstances, you would go through an eviction and whatever the negotiation was there would be an end game to it. So under this circumstance it was kind of a knowing game because essentially they can stay there indefinitely.

18. Commissioner Yopez asked the following, Is there any support that the City can provide in some kind of financial assistance to these tenants if they were to relocate within the city? If we were to move this forward can this project be split up into multifaceted phases where they can start one phase which would not be where these tenants are and eventually once that's worked out, they can move on to a second phase which is where those tenants would be and without having to demo that whole area. Assistant City Planner answered, at the upcoming council meeting on the 26th the City discussing to relocate some CDBG funds to assist local residents for this type of thing. So if it passes, there'd be funds available.

19. Commissioner Barrera, I don't know if it's possible, but can any of these tenants be considered first in line for this type of low housing or affordable housing units that Warmington is offering? Assistant City Planner answered, once these units are built and they start being sold if the current tenants who have moved out qualify for the very low or the low-income units, then yes. They would be able to be considered for purchasing one of the condos.

20. Commissioner Ortiz, Even if this moves forward ~~removed: and the safe~~ the ~~added: State of~~ California eviction process would supersede what we approve. That would still allow the tenants more time. So that's really not going to affect our vote here. Assistant City Planner answered, If this gets voted and passed the next step would be going before city council for approval because the general plan Amendment zone change along with the adoption of the negative declaration has to be or mitigated negative declaration needs to be adopted by city council. So that would go in the first meeting of June and then I would have to go for a second reading for the second meeting of June and then it would go into effect. And the very earliest that the project has been 100% completed or gone through all the approvals would be the end of June. At that point they would start getting the final map together to submit to city council along with starting to acquire the properties that they haven't purchased yet. And so that process would begin then. Commissioner Ortiz continued by stating, Warmington seems to have been trying to meet the demands of the tenants, addressing the school concerns and fearful of getting evicted, ~~added: before the end of the school year~~. So technically it seems like Warmington has done their due diligence as far as stepping up to the plate from what I see. My only issue is the tenants not being able to pay the new rental amounts, so I also understand that hardship, I think Warmington was been patient working on this with us.

21. Tenant from Humbert wanted to make a comment, Edward Montes, we are single family income. My mom is on low-income. It's really hard to get by. My mom just lost her job. How are we supposed to save money if we are not making any money?

With no further questions or comments, a motion was made by Commissioner Rodriguez and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz and carried (5-0) to approve Item # 7.a –recommending that the City Council adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration, General Plan Amendment, and Zone Change (No. 19-22), adopt Resolution No. 19-21, conditionally approving Conditional Use Permit (No. 19-21), adopt Resolution No. 19-23, and conditionally approving Subdivision (No. 19-23), pursuant to the adoption of Resolution No. 19-22.

Vote:	Approving Item #7.a. Resolution No.19-21, 19-22 and 19-23
Ayes:	Bojorquez, Barrera, Ortiz, Rodriguez and Yopez
Nays:	None
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None
Action:	Approved

7.b. Consideration of Resolution No. 20-02 approving a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) (No. 20-02) to allow for the operation of an automotive body shop located at 2022 Seaman Avenue, Unit B, South El Monte CA 91733.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 20-02, approving Conditional Use Permit (No. 20-02), as conditioned.

Assistant City Planner gave a brief description of the project. The applicant, Joel Rangel Zavala (“Applicant”), is applying to operate an automotive body and fender shop (“Project”) at 2022 Seaman Avenue Unit B, South El Monte, California 91733 (“Property”). The Property consists of one parcel having an area of approximately 12,775 square feet (0.29 acres) and three existing attached buildings measuring approximately 1,628, 1,395, and 3,037 square feet. These three buildings are divided up into a total of four units, with the unit that the Applicant will operate in measuring 1,493 square feet. The Property is located on the east side of Seaman Avenue just north of Rush Street and is zoned “M” (Manufacturing). The site has been utilized as manufacturing and wholesale for most of the recent years.

Item was OPENED for public hearing.

Below are comments that were noted during the public hearing of this item:

1. Commissioner Barrera made the following comment, This is a small area, and usually with Body Shops the problem regarding parking becomes an issue, and I see staff has addressed that in the conditions, so great job. Assistant Planner responded by stating, Thank you.

2. Commissioner Ortiz asked if the surrounding residents, tenants we all notified of this project? Assistant Planner responded, Yes all tenants or business owners and residents within 500 feet of this location were notified with a notice of this project.

3. Commissioner Yepez made the following comment, If there are more than five vehicles being worked on, Do they substantial space to accommodate the storage without double parking and overflowing street parking, and the impact on the other businesses in this complex? Assistant City Planner answered, The property owner is aware of the application here and has assigned five spots. So the other spots that are in the center will be for all the other tenants. If the applicant has more than five vehicles he has space inside the building. It looks like he can store around three vehicles inside so that it won't spill into the other tenants parking. Also the applicant can work out with the other tenants, in case he has a vehicle he's working on inside the shop during normal hours, that if overnight parking was needed he could possibly utilize the spots of the other tenants when they're closed and then when they open back up, he moves those vehicles for them, but that's up to the property owner in the tenants to work together on that. Commissioner Yepez continued, just want to make sure there's no double-parking during business hours. What's the security for vehicles that would be left out overnight? Assistant City Planner, we'd have to ask the applicant. Commissioner Yepez continued to ask, Is anything being done to the

building envelope for part of this business to move in? Assistant Planner responded, No, they're going to be doing tenant improvements inside, that will be the extent of it. And the building conditions will cover all the building code and fire codes that needs to be adhered to. Commissioner Yepez asked, Will any of the changes impact the energy code? Assistant Planner responded, When I ask the applicant, they're not installing any large equipment know where anything like that. So it shouldn't affect the electrical load of the building. Commissioner Yepez asked, Are they replacing like the mechanical system or any windows? Assistant Planner responded; We don't know until they submit plans. That's not part of the Conditional Use permit. As part of the tenant improvements, they provide the site plan for plan for the building. So we don't have what their tenant improvements are going to be.

The applicant was not on the line for comments and was not present for questions.

The following verbiage was added to condition #15: At no time shall the applicant permit employees, patrons' agent or any other related to the business to park in any spots designated for the adjoining units. Further, no vehicle shall be parked or stored not designated for parking.

With no further questions or comments, a motion was made by Commissioner Barrera and seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez to Approve Consideration of Resolution No. 20-02 approving a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) (No. 20-02) to allow for the operation of an automotive body shop located at 2022 Seaman Avenue, Unit B, South El Monte CA 91733 and carried a vote of (5-0).

Vote: Approving Item #7.b. Resolution No.20-02
Ayes: Bojorquez, Ortiz, Rodriguez, Barrera and Yepez
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None
Action: Approved

8. COMMISSIONERS' AGENDA

Commissioner Yepez commented that Chicken Koop is now open, she tried their food and it's delicious. She recommends staff and commissioners to try them out.

9. STAFF ITEMS

Planner's Report – No items to report.
Secretary's Report – No items to report.
Director's Report – No items to report.

10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Commissioner Rodriguez and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz and carried (5-0) to adjourn meeting at 7:16 p.m. and reconvene next month on June 16, 2020 at 6:00pm

Vote: Adjourn meeting to June 16, 2020
Ayes: Bojorquez, Barrera, Ortiz, Rodriguez and Yopez
Nays: None
Absent: None
Abstain: None
Action: Approved to adjourn meeting