

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH**  
**[DRAFT]MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING**  
**COMMISSION**  
**JUNE 27, 2007**

1 A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach was held on  
2 Wednesday, June 27, 2007, at 6:35p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland  
3 Avenue.  
4

5 **ROLL CALL**

6  
7 Chairman Bohner called the meeting to order.  
8

9 Members Present: Lesser, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner  
10 Members Absent: Schlager  
11 Staff: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development  
12 Dan Moreno, Associate Planner  
13 Sarah Boesch, Recording Secretary  
14

15 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

16  
17 **A. Minutes of Planning Commission Meeting of May 23, 2007**

18  
19 Commissioner Lesser said that he is satisfied with the additions to the minutes as long as staff is  
20 satisfied that the discussion which occurred at the meeting has been accurately captured.  
21

22 Director Thompson said that staff attempted to capture the discussion in the revisions and is  
23 satisfied with the additions to the minutes.  
24

25 Commissioner Seville Jones suggested that page 14, line 30 be revised to read: “. . . the use as 53  
26 ~~condominium ownership medical use~~ individual condominiums, ownership, medical use and  
27 parking demand . . .”  
28

29 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Seville-Jones/Lesser) to **APPROVE** the minutes of  
30 May 23, 2007, as amended.  
31

32 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner  
33 NOES: None  
34 ABSENT: Schlager  
35 ABSTAIN: None  
36

37 **B. Minutes of Planning Commission Meeting of June 13, 2007**

38  
39 Commissioner Seville Jones requested that a semi-colon be added after the word “location” in  
40 the sixth line on the first paragraph on page 1 of the June 13 minutes.

**D R A F T**

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 2

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

Commissioner Seville-Jones suggested that the second paragraph on page 2, be revised to read:

”Commissioner Seville-Jones related her agreement with the idea of the recording secretary amending the minutes to more accurately capture the essence of the discussion without being verbatim. She observed that there is a complete absence of the discussion referred to above by Commissioner Lesser; that the minutes should ~~always include~~ reflect that Commission questions were directed to staff; . . .”

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the fifth paragraph on page 4, be revised to read:

“Commissioner Seville-Jones recalled that the applicant was resistant to addressing issues on this very large project (such as bulk/density and impact on traffic) ~~but was~~ and only willing to address some smaller issues (such as vents). She commented on the importance of the Planning Commission listening to issues, and not to be distracted by allegations of unfairness.”

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that language be added to the last sentence on the third paragraph on page 9 to read: “. . . but the applicant should be allowed to proceed in accordance with the approval and not conditioned on actions by other tenants.”

Commissioner Powell requested that the third line of the second paragraph on page 9 be revised to read:

“Commissioner Powell agreed with Commissioner Lesser’s comments. He felt that the sign facing Sepulveda Boulevard would not have a detrimental impact since it would be ~~setback~~ set back and buffered due to its isolation from residential properties.”

Commissioner Powell requested that the minutes reflect on the fifth line of the motion on page 10 that it was seconded by Commissioner Schlager.

Commissioner Lesser requested that the parenthesis be removed from lines 8 and 11 of paragraph 3 on page 4 to read: “He recalled that the applicant was unwilling to make changes or hear concerns such as the scale of the building on the lot, the buffer with adjoining residences; the potential impact on neighbors and traffic; ingress and egress, including the driveway on Sepulveda Boulevard; compact vs. standard parking spaces; and whether the topography makes the scale look larger from the east; . . .”

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **APPROVE** the minutes of June 13, 2007, as amended.

AYES: Lesser, Powell, Seville Jones, Chairman Bohner

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 3

- 1 NOES: None
- 2 ABSENT: Schlager
- 3 ABSTAIN: None

4  
5 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** None

6  
7 **BUSINESS ITEMS**

8  
9 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

10  
11 **06/0726.1 Consideration of Proposed 30-Unit Mixed-Use Medical and Retail**  
12 **Commercial Development at 1008 Sepulveda Boulevard**

13  
14 Commissioner Lesser disclosed that he is a friend of the architect, but he has no personal interest  
15 in the project and feels he can consider the item fairly.

16  
17 Associate Planner Moreno summarized the staff report. He said that concerns were raised at the  
18 previous meeting regarding the location of a commercial loading space; installing a traffic signal  
19 at the intersection of 10<sup>th</sup> Street and Sepulveda Boulevard; security for the parking garage; hours  
20 of operation; and placing a red curb to restrict parking on 10<sup>th</sup> Street. He commented that  
21 concerns were raised at the last hearing that the proposed location of the commercial loading  
22 space would cause circulation, parking, and safety concerns and that a separate loading space be  
23 provided. He indicated that the applicant has provided a separate loading area adjacent to the  
24 building. He said that the loading space is deficient in length by 4 feet; however, staff has  
25 evaluated the location and finds the design of the space to be appropriate. He pointed out that  
26 Condition 17 of the draft Resolution prohibits larger delivery vehicles that cannot fit into the  
27 loading space after 7:30 a.m. daily, and no deliveries would be allowed on Sundays or holidays.  
28 He said that three compact spaces are proposed to be provided, which would each only be  
29 deficient in width by 6 inches. He said that staff and the City’s Traffic Engineer have found the  
30 parking layout to be appropriate. He indicated that the Commissioners expressed concern to  
31 staff that a study should be conducted for installing a traffic signal at Sepulveda Boulevard and  
32 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and the applicant has agreed as reflected in Condition 18 of the draft Resolution to  
33 provide a fair share contribution towards a future traffic study to determine the feasibility and  
34 impact of a traffic signal at the intersection. He commented that the applicant would also be  
35 required to pay a fair share for installing a signal if it is determined that it should be required.  
36 He said that the Traffic Engineer does not recommend that the signal be installed at this time.

37  
38 Associate Planner Moreno indicated that the Commissioners expressed concern at the last  
39 meeting regarding security with the parking garage remaining open 24 hours. He said that the  
40 applicant has proposed two security gates at the two main entry points off of Sepulveda  
41 Boulevard. He commented that Conditions 19 to 23 provide detailed requirements for the

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 4

1 operation of the lower parking area. He said that an intercom system from the garage to the  
2 individual units and automatic exit using a vehicle detection system would be provided. He said  
3 that the applicant is requesting hours of operation for the coffee shop use of 5:30 a.m. to 11:00  
4 p.m. seven days a week; for the pharmacy of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; and  
5 for the medical offices of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 2:00  
6 p.m. on Saturday. He indicated that Condition 16 of the draft Resolution addresses the hours of  
7 operation. He commented that staff feels the hours are adequate for the proposed uses on the  
8 site. He said that the Commissioners also suggested placing a red curb on the southerly curb of  
9 10<sup>th</sup> Street between the driveway for the development and Sepulveda Boulevard. He said that  
10 there currently is a red curb on the area of concern, and Condition 41 also restricts vehicles  
11 exiting the project driveway onto 10<sup>th</sup> Street from turning left toward the residential area. He  
12 stated that the traffic engineer is recommending that the existing red curb remain in the area.

13  
14 Commissioner Lesser asked the impact if the applicant decides to change the retail component.

15  
16 Associate Planner Moreno said if it is determined that a pharmacy would not be successful at the  
17 site, staff would work with the applicant to produce a type of business that would work. He  
18 pointed out that a pharmacy would only be about 700 square feet. He said that a change in the  
19 type of business from a pharmacy would not necessarily come back before the Planning  
20 Commission.

21  
22 Commissioner Lesser said that he has a concern that a security gate at the entrance of the parking  
23 structure from Sepulveda Boulevard could create an issue with stacking of cars. He asked  
24 whether staff feels one gate would be sufficient.

25  
26 Associate Planner Moreno said that the traffic engineer indicated that he did not feel the backing  
27 up of cars on Sepulveda Boulevard to enter the parking structure would create an issue.

28  
29 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno said that the  
30 parking a requirement for the site is 127 spaces. He indicated that 119 parking spaces are  
31 proposed to be provided, of which 3 would be compact. He commented that staff feels that  
32 compact spaces normally are not very functional; however, staff feels in this case they act more  
33 as full size spaces and are only 6 inches narrower than a full size space. He said that the  
34 compact spaces have been located in strategic areas where they can be more easily accessed.

35  
36 Commissioner Lesser asked staff's policy regarding compact spaces.

37  
38 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno indicated that  
39 the consideration of incorporating compact spaces is determined on a case by case basis  
40 according to the circulation and design of the parking area.

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 5

1 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno said that there  
2 would not be a right turn deceleration lane from Sepulveda Boulevard to the project. He pointed  
3 out that the size of the development is not sufficient to justify a deceleration lane. He  
4 commented that the driveway would be made wider to allow easier access from Sepulveda  
5 Boulevard.

6  
7 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno said staff feels  
8 the length of the loading area as proposed would be sufficient to allow for deliveries to the  
9 development, and staff feels the types of delivery vehicles visiting the site can be controlled. He  
10 indicated that restricting larger vehicles accessing the site after 7:30 a.m. will also help to  
11 mitigate concerns.

12  
13 Commissioner Powell stated that page 2 of the staff report indicates that Condition 18 of the  
14 draft Resolution prohibits larger delivery vehicles that cannot fit into the loading space after 7:30  
15 a.m. daily and that no deliveries shall be permitted on Sundays and holidays. He pointed out that  
16 the condition referred to actually is Condition 17 rather than 18. He indicated that he has a  
17 concern with deliveries occurring on Saturdays. He asked whether a photometric plan had been  
18 submitted and whether it is part of the total lighting plan.

19  
20 Associate Planner Moreno said that the photometric plan is handled as part of the plan check  
21 process. He indicated that there is a condition requiring that a complete plan be submitted to the  
22 City which meets Code requirements. He commented that the photometric plan is a component  
23 of the overall comprehensive lighting plan. He said that there is very low level lighting proposed  
24 that would be shielded away from the residential properties to the east.

25  
26 Commissioner Powell asked whether a signage plan is included as part of the conditions.

27  
28 Associate Planner Moreno said that there is a condition requiring a signage program for the site.

29  
30 Commissioner Powell asked about hours that have been approved for other medical offices and  
31 pharmacies within the City.

32  
33 Associate Planner Moreno said that hours for offices vary according to the type of use. He  
34 indicated that closing hours for coffee shops within the City vary based on location from  
35 approximately 11:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. He said that the pharmacy is in conjunction with the  
36 medical office use.

37  
38 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she felt the proposal for large deliveries to occur before  
39 7:30 a.m. would work when the office building was proposed to begin operating hours at 8:00  
40 a.m. because patients would arrive after deliveries occur. She indicated that with operating  
41 hours now proposing to begin at 7:00 a.m., she has a concern that large deliveries would occur

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 6

1 while patients are parking during the same time. She said that she is concerned that patients  
2 would park at the upper level and large trucks would not be able to pull into the loading area.  
3 She indicated that the trucks would instead park on 10<sup>th</sup> Street, which could disturb the  
4 neighbors.

5  
6 Associate Planner Moreno said that the applicant intends to control the size of delivery vehicles  
7 that visit the site. He indicated that the applicant does not anticipate large vehicles coming to the  
8 site. He commented that staff also does not anticipate that there would be large delivery vehicles  
9 visiting the site. He stated that the CC&Rs could control any conflict between patient parking  
10 for the medical offices and delivery vehicles.

11  
12 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked whether some parking spaces on the upper level could be  
13 possibly be restricted for parking and allocated for deliveries during early morning hours. She  
14 asked whether any other coffee shops located near residences open at 5:30 a.m.

15  
16 Associate Planner Moreno commented that the only coffee shop that staff is aware of that opens  
17 at 5:30 a.m. near residences is the Manhattan Bread & Bagel at 1800 Sepulveda Boulevard.

18  
19 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno said that  
20 119 parking spaces are proposed for the site.

21  
22 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that one of the fundamental premises for allowing the  
23 requested zoning change was that a large commercial structure could not be built directly behind  
24 the existing residences as part of any future development. She asked whether it can be ensured  
25 that the zoning change will not result in any future large commercial development on the site  
26 abutting up to the property line and that the setbacks and landscaping as proposed would  
27 continue to remain.

28  
29 Associate Planner Moreno pointed out that any new project would need to go through the public  
30 hearing process, and staff would take into consideration the sensitivity of any future project to  
31 issues concerning the adjacent residences to the east.

32  
33 Director Thompson commented that documenting the intent of granting the Zoning Change can  
34 be included in the findings of the Use Permit as well as in the Zoning Change Amendment. He  
35 said that a condition of approval can also be included which specifies the importance of  
36 maintaining the setback to the adjacent residences.

37  
38 **Louie Tomaro**, the project architect, said that the compact parking spaces would be 8 feet wide  
39 by 18 feet long between the columns and have an additional width that is part of the area behind  
40 the column. He indicated that the analysis by their traffic engineer show a peak demand of 109  
41 parking spaces, and 119 are proposed. He indicated that two gates to the parking garage are

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 7

1 proposed to have key codes. He stated that the loading zone as proposed would be sufficient for  
2 the intended use, and they would not anticipate any trucks larger than could be accommodated.  
3 He commented that they do not anticipate any trucks larger than UPS type delivery trucks at any  
4 time. He said that if the Commission felt that 35 feet is necessary for a loading area, another  
5 parking space could be eliminated to lengthen the loading zone which would eliminate the need  
6 for a Variance. He said that the loading area would be in a strategic spot to allow for easy  
7 access to speed up deliveries and for trucks to maneuver with a large turning radius. He stated  
8 that in talking to potential tenants, they felt office hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday  
9 would be more appropriate than 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

10  
11 **Jeff Captain**, the project architect, showed an animation of the proposed building design.

12  
13 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Tomaro** said that the glass used on  
14 the structure would be non reflective.

15  
16 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked whether opening at 5:30 a.m. is necessary for the commercial  
17 feasibility of a coffee house use in the development or whether a later opening time would be  
18 acceptable to the applicant.

19  
20 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **George Apostol**, 1000 block of 6<sup>th</sup>  
21 Street, said that no specific tenant is proposed at this time, and they wanted to allow the most  
22 flexibility in order to maximize the potential viability of the space. He indicated that they felt  
23 any limitation would potentially limit the ability to operate a business at the site, and they  
24 wanted to offer the maximum for hours of operation. He commented that employees of major  
25 chains of coffee shops tend to arrive fairly early in order to prepare to open. He indicated that  
26 people will sit at some coffee shops until midnight or 1:00 a.m.; however, they decided to  
27 request hours for the proposed use until 11:00 p.m. because of the close proximity to residences.  
28 He stated that the physicians who perform outpatient procedures tend to begin seeing patients at  
29 earlier hours. He indicated that he has spoken with a pediatrician who prefers to offer hours until  
30 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays when children are not at school. He said that they would like for the  
31 office hours to be permitted from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. during the week and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00  
32 p.m. on Saturdays in order to allow doctors the flexibility to see patients after working hours. He  
33 said that they would like the coffee shop to have the flexibility of being open seven days a week.

34  
35 **Steve Taylor**, a resident of the 1100 block of 10<sup>th</sup> Street, said that he likes the design of the  
36 project. He indicated that his concern is regarding larger delivery trucks visiting the  
37 development that would park on 10<sup>th</sup> Street adjacent to his driveway. He commented that it is  
38 difficult to exit from his driveway with a large truck blocking the view along Sepulveda  
39 Boulevard.

40  
41 Director Thompson said that staff can evaluate the subject section of 10<sup>th</sup> Street and have

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 8

1 portions of the curb painted red to increase visibility if there is an issue. He commented that  
2 staff does not feel it would be appropriate to require placing an additional area of red curbing on  
3 10<sup>th</sup> Street as a condition, as it is important to have flexibility for changes to the public right-of-  
4 way when the need arises. He commented that in some cases there is an issue with the loss of  
5 parking resulting from increasing the amount of red curb on a street, but it may not be as much  
6 of an issue in the subject area.

7  
8 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, Director Thompson said that staff will work  
9 with **Mr. Taylor** to evaluate the incorporation of additional red curbing.

10  
11 Chairman Bohner closed the public hearing.

12  
13 Commissioner Lesser indicated that the proposed design takes advantage of existing topography,  
14 and the scale does not overwhelm the neighboring properties. He said that he would be in favor  
15 of the zoning change from residential to commercial as proposed. He commended the architect  
16 and applicant for trying to work with the neighbors. He also commended the architect in  
17 arriving at a design which complies with the General Plan and takes advantage of the Sepulveda  
18 Boulevard guidelines, which has resulted in a better project. He said that he appreciates the full  
19 size parking spaces and the incorporation of a small retail use. He said that he can make the  
20 findings to support the project.

21  
22 Commissioner Powell said that he concurs with the comments of Commissioner Lesser and  
23 commended the architect for working with the neighbors and providing more than the required  
24 setbacks. He said that he feels the design is outstanding and that the concerns expressed at the  
25 last meeting have been appropriately addressed. He said that he feels the findings can be  
26 sustained, and the project is in compliance with the General Plan. He said that he also has a  
27 concern with maintaining the buffer to the neighboring residential properties into the future, and  
28 he would want to be sure that the buffer as proposed remains permanently in order to conclude  
29 that it is appropriate to rezone. He commented that the buffer to the adjacent residential  
30 properties provided by the setback and landscaping allows him to support the project, and he  
31 would hate to see it lost in the future. He said that that as long as it is clearly specified in the  
32 findings, the buffer should remain for future developments. He said that he feels all of the  
33 findings can be sustained for the Variance, the Zoning Code Amendment, the General Plan  
34 Amendment, and the Conditional Use Permit. He indicated that he supports the project.

35  
36 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she also supports the project. She indicated that she agrees  
37 with the comments of the other Commissioners regarding the project and the manner in which  
38 the architect has worked with the community. She said that she has a concern with  
39 memorializing the determinations with respect to why the zoning change is being permitted. She  
40 suggested adding wording to finding E on page 1 of the draft Resolution for the Zoning Change  
41 to state: “The effect of the proposed amendment is to provide for the underlying General Plan



**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 9

1 and Zoning land use designations to accommodate a request to allow the development of a mixed  
2 use office/retail use for the site with low impact structures and setbacks from the residential area  
3 on the rezoned property.” She suggested adding language to Finding F to read: “The changes are  
4 consistent with the existing development patterns on the subject site and on the surrounding sites  
5 as the area has historically been, and is currently used as a commercial parking lot, which is also  
6 compatible with the property located south of the subject site. The new building will be 42 feet  
7 form the rear property line with an 8 foot wide landscaped area and a driveway ramp on the rear  
8 of the property that would step down the intensity of the use from the commercial district to the  
9 MR district on the east, and this was an important consideration of the Planning Commission.”

10  
11 Chairman Bohner suggested placing the language in the Resolution for the Use Permit as well as  
12 the Resolution for the Zone Change Amendment.

13  
14 Commissioner Lesser asked whether the additional language as suggested may be too specific.

15  
16 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson commented that  
17 the Commissioners can propose specific language to the draft Resolution, with the understanding  
18 that staff may edit it. He said that the language as proposed would provide justification for the  
19 Commission allowing the Zone Change, and it would also be appropriate to include in the  
20 findings for the Use Permit. He commented that staff might suggest including language in the  
21 findings of the Zone Change Amendment that was more general and including more specific  
22 language for the Use Permit.

23  
24 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she would like the language to be included in the findings  
25 for the Zoning Change Amendment as well as the Use Permit.

26  
27 Director Thompson commented that the language in the Zoning Change may not be as specific  
28 as in the Use Permit. He suggested language to state that the majority of the property that is  
29 being rezoned is being dedicated to a separation between residential and commercial activities  
30 and buildings, and landscaping is provided in this area.

31  
32 Chairman Bohner said that he agrees with the other Commissioners that it is appropriate to make  
33 sure that any future project on the site not become a large commercial development that  
34 encroaches into the residential area. He commented that he feels it is appropriate to include  
35 language in the findings for the Use Permit and Zoning Change Amendment to clarify the  
36 concern expressed by the Commission that the buffer which is provided by the subject project be  
37 maintained in the future. He stated that he feels the applicant has worked well with the staff and  
38 community to address the concerns previously expressed by the Commission at the prior hearing.  
39 He said that the loading dock area has been addressed adequately. He commented that he does  
40 not believe that large delivery trucks would visit the site very often given the nature of the  
41 project, and he does not feel that an issue would arise with the restriction that any large

## PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

June 27, 2007

Page 10

1 deliveries are to occur before 7:30 a.m. He said that he does not oppose opening hours for the  
2 coffee shop at 5:30 a.m. He commented that he would not anticipate that there would be many  
3 customers at that hour but rather only a few employees. He commented that considering the  
4 possibility of placing a red curb along the east side of the building would address **Mr. Taylor's**  
5 concern. He said that he does not oppose hours of operation for the offices of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00  
6 p.m. on Saturdays. He stated that he feels security for the garage has been addressed. He said  
7 that the scale of the development would fit in with the neighborhood; the building would not be  
8 overly bulky; and the project would be a great addition to the community.

9  
10 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she imagines there would be some large deliveries, and she  
11 is still concerned with large trucks visiting the site. She commented that having large deliveries  
12 occur early in the morning in order to not interfere with parking on the upper level is a good  
13 solution. She said that she would want to restrict deliveries from occurring too early in order to  
14 avoid disturbing the neighboring residences. She suggested restricting parking in two of the  
15 parking spaces on the upper level to allocate them for delivery trucks during early morning  
16 hours. She commented that she is concerned that deliveries occurring up to 7:30 a.m. would  
17 overlap and conflict with parking for the medical offices with hours beginning at 7:00 a.m. as  
18 proposed.

19  
20 Chairman Bohner said that he does not imagine that the development would have large deliveries  
21 except on a very infrequent basis, and he is not sure it is necessary to limit parking spaces on the  
22 upper level. He commented that he would support restricting deliveries from occurring too early  
23 and suggested permitting hours for deliveries between 6:30 a.m. and 7:30 a.m. He said that he  
24 has not seen any evidence that large delivery trucks are anticipated to visit the site.

25  
26 Commissioner Lesser said that he shares the concerns of Commissioner Seville-Jones, but he  
27 feels the Commissioners should defer to whether staff is comfortable that large delivery trucks  
28 would not become an issue. He commented that he imagines that any moving trucks that would  
29 visit the site would use Sepulveda Boulevard during hours when they would not impact traffic.

30  
31 Director Thompson stated that typical complaints staff receives regarding deliveries are when  
32 they occur too early and generate noise. He commented that a coffee shop use might have  
33 deliveries with larger trucks. He said that he would suggest that large deliveries be permitted to  
34 occur between 6:30 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. He pointed out that the management of the building  
35 would place restrictions on large delivery trucks if they do interfere with the office uses.

36  
37 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she is concerned that large delivery trucks would park on  
38 10<sup>th</sup> Street because they could not be accommodated in the loading area with patients parking at  
39 the same time. She questioned the reasoning behind the conflict of restricting large deliveries to  
40 occur before 7:30 a.m. and allowing hours for the offices to begin at 7:00 a.m. She said that she  
41 would rather have the findings specify that no large deliveries to the site shall occur unless it is

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 11

1 off of Sepulveda Boulevard during appropriate hours. She said that it appears inconsistent to  
2 allow deliveries until 7:30 with people parking for the offices at 7:00 a.m.

3  
4 Director Thompson said that staff does not feel a conflict would occur during early hours at 7:00  
5 a.m. He pointed out that allowing operating hours at 7:00 a.m. for the offices does not  
6 necessarily mean that there would be a large number of patients arriving at that hour. He said  
7 that the large majority of patients would arrive at 9:00 a.m. or 10:00 a.m., which are the hours  
8 that any large trucks should be restricted. He suggested that the deliveries be restricted to occur  
9 no earlier than 7:00. a.m. to avoid creating a noise concern to the neighbors. He indicated that  
10 the building managers would restrict deliveries from occurring during later hours if it becomes a  
11 conflict. He pointed out that it would not be a facility that would have many large deliveries.  
12 He said that most complaints staff receives are regarding deliveries occurring too early.

13  
14 Chairman Bohner suggested restricting deliveries before 7:00 a.m.

15  
16 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she would suggest restricting parking in two parking  
17 spaces on the upper level between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and designate them for loading only  
18 in order to accommodate larger trucks.

19  
20 In response to a comment from Commissioner Powell, Director Thompson said that a  
21 requirement for appropriate signage restricting parking and designating the spaces for loading  
22 only between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. can be included as part of the condition.

23  
24 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked regarding the latest time which deliveries would be  
25 permitted.

26  
27 **Mr. Apostol** stated that he has researched the loading zone and has spoken with representatives  
28 of UPS, Federal Express, and the U.S. Postal Service. He indicated that the size of delivery  
29 trucks that visit the site would be the same as those that deliver in residential neighborhoods,  
30 which are no more than 21 feet in length and 7 ½ feet in width. He commented that it would not  
31 be feasible for a 35 foot vehicle to drive in and back out of the upper parking area. He indicated  
32 that he would prefer to permanently remove a parking space and make the loading area 35 feet  
33 rather than restrict parking in two spaces. He indicated that it would be very difficult to enforce  
34 a condition allocating two parking spaces for loading only during early hours. He said that he  
35 does not feel there is a problem with restricting delivery hours to not intrude on the neighbors,  
36 but he would not perceive a need to designate additional parking spots for loading only.

37  
38 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, **Mr. Apostol** said that the units would have  
39 fresh items that are replenished often which only requires smaller deliveries. He stated that he  
40 feels the space would be adequate for deliveries as proposed. He pointed out that delivery  
41 companies use smaller vehicles as much as possible in order to avoid high fuel costs.

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 12

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

Chairman Bohner commented that he does not feel there would be any issue of deliveries occurring late at night given the anticipated use of the building only opened for a limited period of time.

**Mr. Apostol** commented that deliveries would occur only when occupants of the building are present to receive them, and it is unlikely that any would occur late in the evening. He indicated that they would also have a concern with the prime spaces on the upper level being further limited, as it could restrict the coffee shop tenant’s ability to run their business. He suggested possibly painting a yellow curb on the eastern portion of 10<sup>th</sup> Street to allow for loading and unloading only.

Commissioner Seville-Jones stated that the Commissioners comments are on the record as having struggled with the issue of parking for large delivery trucks, and the solution is not really known. She pointed out that it has been presented that large deliveries are not anticipated for the site. She commented that the Commissioner’s comments are on record, and the residents understand that the Commission has a concern. She stated that the issue can be addressed in the future if it turns out there are complaints. She commented that she would prefer not to lose a handicapped or other parking space located close to the building in order to allow for deliveries.

Commissioner Seville-Jones suggested including wording in the findings to state that the project as presented to the Commission as proposed does not include large delivery trucks.

Director Thompson stated that staff does not feel that large delivery trucks would create a problem. He suggested including a finding that a reason the project is compatible with the area is that it is anticipated the development would not generate large deliveries as proposed, which staff could then refer to if a problem does arrive with large trucks. He pointed out that there are other sections of the Code which restrict noise. He suggested no deliveries occurring between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that 5:30 for the restaurant seems early, and she would be more comfortable with opening hours of 6:00 a.m. or 6:30 a.m. given that the lot is adjacent to residences.

The Commissioner expressed support for opening hours for the coffee shop at 6:00 a.m..

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson stated that the intent of the wording in Conditions 20 and 21 of the Use Permit is to encourage employees to park in the lowest levels of the parking area. He pointed out that no spaces are proposed to be assigned to specific offices, and Condition 20 includes that there be no assigned parking.

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 13

1 Commissioner Seville-Jones suggested adding a finding that rooftop equipment be screened.  
2

3 Commissioner Lesser summarized that the commissioners suggested changes to include wording  
4 to item E on page 1 of the draft Resolution to include: “. . . with low impact structures and  
5 setbacks from the residential area on the rezoned property.”  
6

7 Director Thompson suggested language be included in item F to read: “. . . The project as  
8 proposed provides that the majority of the area being proposed for rezoning is open space which  
9 is set back substantially to provide landscaping and a separation between commercial and  
10 residential buildings.”  
11

12 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **ADOPT** the draft Resolution to  
13 **APPROVE** Amendment No. 2007-1 to the Land Use Policy Map of the City of Manhattan  
14 Beach General Plan amending the Land Use Designation from “Medium Density Residential” to  
15 “General Commercial”; and Amendment to the City Zoning Map Amending the Zoning  
16 Designation from “RM” (Residential Medium Residential) to “CG” (General Commercial) for  
17 the rear 50 feet of the property located at 1000 Sepulveda Boulevard, with an amendment to  
18 include the additions to Items E and F as proposed.  
19

20 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner  
21 NOES: None  
22 ABSENT: Schlager  
23 ABSTAIN: None  
24

25 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **ADOPT** the draft Resolution to  
26 **APPROVE** a Master Use Permit and Parking Reduction for a 25,350 Square Foot Medical  
27 Office, Retail, and Restaurant Center, Variance for Size Reduction for a Commercial Loading  
28 Space, Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 68175 for Office Condominiums, and an Initial Study  
29 and Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts at 1000 Sepulveda Boulevard, with  
30 amendments to include the addition of a finding with similar language to the Zoning Change  
31 Amendment regarding maintaining a buffer and setback between commercial and residential  
32 properties; to include a finding that the project will not attract large delivery trucks; to include a  
33 restriction of deliveries between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.; to include a requirement that the  
34 rooftop equipment be screened; to include changes in the hours of operation of the coffee shop to  
35 be permitted from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. daily and medical offices to be permitted from 8:00  
36 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays; and that 119 parking spaces be provided.  
37

38 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner  
39 NOES: None  
40 ABSENT: Schlager  
41 ABSTAIN: None

**PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES**

June 27, 2007

Page 14

1  
2 Director Thompson said that the project will be scheduled for a public hearing before the city  
3 Council on July 17, 2007.

4  
5 **DIRECTOR'S ITEMS**

6  
7 Director Thompson commented that staff and the City Council had a meeting which included a  
8 tour of 35 residential developments built under different regulations. He said that the City  
9 Council has provided direction for staff to bring forward the recommendations of the  
10 Mansionization Committee, and the presentations will be made to the Commission in July and  
11 August.

12  
13 **PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

14  
15 **TENTATIVE AGENDA: July 11, 2007**

16  
17 **ADJOURNMENT**

18  
19 The meeting of the Planning Commission was **ADJOURNED** at 8:25 p.m. in the City Council  
20 Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, to Wednesday, July 11, 2007, at 6:30 p.m. in the  
21 same chambers.

22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 RICHARD THOMPSON  
25 Secretary to the Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_

SARAH BOESCHEN  
Recording Secretary