

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT]MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMISSION
AUGUST 8, 2007

1 A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach was held on
2 Wednesday, August 8, 2007, at 6:35 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400
3 Highland Avenue.

4
5 **ROLL CALL**

6
7 Chairman Bohner called the meeting to order.

8
9 Members Present: Lesser, Powell, Schlager, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner
10 Members Absent: None
11 Staff: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development
12 Laurie Jester, Senior Planner
13 Daniel Moreno, Associate Planner
14 Angelica Ochoa, Assistant Planner
15 Sarah Boesch, Recording Secretary
16

17 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** **July 25, 2007**

18
19 Commissioner Lesser requested that page 11, line 3 of the July 25 minutes be revised to read:
20 “Commissioner Lesser commented that part of the reason why the length of the extension was
21 felt necessary may be to allow space for the maintenance trucks to extend the arms into the open
22 hole when the covers are open.”

23
24 Commissioner Lesser requested page 12, line 23 be revised to read: “He indicated that he would
25 feel more comfortable supporting the motion to demand that the county reduce the size of the
26 pad with some rational basis for supporting the necessary length.”

27
28 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that a hyphen be added to her name on page 1, line 9.

29
30 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the comma be removed after the words “Master Use
31 Permit” on page 3, line 19.

32
33 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that page 5, line 5 read: “. . . a masonry block wall that
34 would be built on the property ~~which~~ would provide . . . ”

35
36 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that page 6, line 12, read: “. . .the garage would be
37 ~~access~~ accessed.”

38
39 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that page 9 line 33 read: “He indicated that staff did not
40 have much information with respect to the previous project . . . ”

41
DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 2

1 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the word “off” be corrected to “of” on page 17, line
2 3.

3
4 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that page 18, line 17, wording be added to read:
5 “Chairman Bohner said that as long as representation is made in the Resolution that the
6 aesthetics of the structure will be addressed, he is satisfied.”

7
8 Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that page 21, line 8 read: “He commented that his clients
9 are not generally aware of how the Code regulations impact their project.”

10
11 Commissioner Powell requested that page 23, line 20, read: “Commissioner Powell pointed out
12 that searching on Google Earth helps to provide a perspective of the relative layout and size of
13 lots within the City.”

14
15 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **APPROVE** the minutes of July 25,
16 2007, as amended.

17
18 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Schlager, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner
19 NOES: None
20 ABSENT: None
21 ABSTAIN: None

22
23 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** None

24
25 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

26
27 **07/0808.1 Consideration of a Variance and Coastal Development Permit for a Proposed**
28 **New Single Family Residence to Project into a Required Front Yard Setback**
29 **on a Portion of a Lot Located at 124 21st Place (Graham)**

30
31 Associate Planner Moreno summarized the staff report. He indicated that the request is to allow
32 habitable area projections on the second and third levels within a required front yard setback for the
33 subject half lot as permitted on full sized lots. He commented that the purpose of the Variance
34 application is to allow additional livable area due to the small size of the property. He indicated
35 that such a projection is permitted on a full sized lot in the beach area of 30’ by 90’. He said that
36 the applicant feels the Code restrictions limit the ability to provide a reasonable amount of living
37 area. He commented that the Commission has considered other proposals and has granted
38 Variance applications for half lots on the basis that the smaller properties warrant some special
39 circumstances; that there is no detriment to the public good; and that a special privilege is not being
40 granted. He indicated that notice was sent to property owners within 500 feet of the site, and the
41 public hearing was advertised in the local newspaper. He indicated that the Commissioners have

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 3

1 been provided with a drawing that shows the location of the homes of property owners who have
2 expressed support and those who have expressed opposition to the proposal.

3
4 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno said that staff can
5 support the findings in light of the similar Variance requests that have been approved by the
6 Commission.

7
8 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno said that based on
9 previous applications, staff feels this request is similar to others that have been approved by the
10 Commission and that it warrants approval.

11
12 In response to a comment from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno commented that
13 the subject alley is 20 feet wide, which is standard. He indicated that some of the existing
14 projections may extend out 1 foot and others may extend out 2 feet.

15
16 In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, Associate Planner Moreno said that the Code
17 requires an 8 foot vertical clearance for emergency access. He indicated that the space between the
18 buildings is sufficient to allow access for emergency vehicles.

19
20 In response to a question from Commissioner Schlager, Associate Planner Moreno said that
21 projections could be placed much closer to the setback on a full sized lot up to 2 feet from the
22 property line.

23
24 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, Associate Planner Moreno indicated that all of
25 the lots in the area have a two-story projection.

26
27 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno stated that
28 the applicants for the previous proposal on 12th Place were not requesting to add habitable area but
29 rather only a balcony projection.

30
31 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that her understanding with the last Variance application
32 for a balcony projection on 12 Place is that the Commission suggested that the City Council
33 consider changing the Ordinance to specifically address half-lots.

34
35 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno indicated
36 that the applicant feels there are peculiar and exceptional circumstances for approving the Variance
37 because they are penalized from having a fair amount of living area for their property.

38
39 **Elizabeth Srour**, representing the applicants, indicated that the predominant character of
40 properties in the area is to have second and third level projection encroachments, and the additional
41 amount of square footage that is being proposed with the Variance request is minimal. She

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 4

1 commented that a home of such a small size results in the actual usable living area being
2 diminished. She indicated that the proposal is 83 percent of the amount that could be built on the
3 site. She stated that their interest was having a home that would provide articulation which can
4 only be achieved with some relief from the Code requirements. She commented that they believe
5 the special circumstance relates to the size and slope of the lot. She stated that the current
6 residence has nonconforming setbacks to the east. She indicated that the proposal is in full
7 compliance with the Code requirements except for the portion of living area that would encroach as
8 proposed by the Variance. She indicated that most of the lots in the area are condominium units.
9 She pointed out that the side yard on a corner lot can be built out to 1 foot of the property line.

10
11 **Ms Srour** indicated that the predominant character on 21st Place is one of second and third level
12 encroachments. She stated that it is very critical that the first story maintain a 5 foot setback to
13 provide space for the garage and access to the property. She said that the alley is a typical width of
14 20 feet, and the first level must maintain a setback of 5 feet. She stated that the setback of the
15 subject proposal at grade ranges from 5 feet on the east side to 5’10” on the west side. She
16 indicated that the front yard is critical in terms of maintaining light and air, which is the reason for
17 the 5 foot setback requirement in the beach area. She commented that the request is not unique for
18 the beach area and the immediate neighborhood, and it is important for the Commissioners to
19 consider the neighborhood character. She pointed out that the applicant has not requested an
20 encroachment to within 2 feet to the property line. She stated that complying with the Code would
21 limit the amount of living space and would limit the articulation of the design. She indicated that
22 the concern expressed in the letter of the adjacent neighbor actually relates to the portion of the
23 proposed structure furthest from his westerly elevation, and his property would benefit from the 10
24 foot separation between the proposed structure and the other half lot. She also pointed out that
25 there are no decks on the side of the proposed structure adjacent to the neighbor’s property and no
26 windows on the upper level. She commented that staff has indicated that the necessary findings
27 can be made; that there are unique circumstances in this case; and that strict interpretation of the
28 Code would be a detriment.

29
30 **Chris Graham** the applicant, said that they wish to stay in the City, and their existing home has
31 become too small for their family. He said that they managed to design three bedrooms on the
32 second level, and they feel the home would suit their long term needs. He indicated that they
33 attempted to provide articulation to the second and third floors. He said that the neighbors are in
34 favor of them moving forward with the project. He indicated that the majority of the homes from
35 Highland Avenue to Ocean Drive cantilever into the setback, which is permitted by the Code for
36 every home on the south side of the street. He pointed out that they could build a structure with no
37 articulation that would not require a Variance for much cheaper. He indicated that they received
38 several signatures from the immediate neighbors in support of the proposed design. He pointed out
39 that the subject alley is standard in width. He commented that there are people who park in front of
40 their garage which limits access, but they do not believe approving the Variance would change
41 people parking on the street. He indicated that they would maintain Code requirements on the

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 5

1 street level which is for a 5 foot setback. He stated that their design is not extravagant; would not
2 provide a great amount of extra square footage; and is consistent with the development pattern in
3 the neighborhood.

4
5 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Graham** said that they are comfortable
6 in their home, and their neighbors would like for them to stay. He indicated that they did not
7 specifically discuss the bulkiness of the home; however, their project is less bulky than what could
8 be built on the site.

9
10 **Mandy Graham**, the applicant, pointed out that their neighbor who lives one home to the east and
11 across the street from their property expressed his appreciation for the attractiveness of the
12 proposed design. She pointed out that many of the homes on the north side of the street have not
13 been redeveloped. She indicated that they have chosen not to construct an elevator and to include
14 only one closet in order to help maximize the square footage as much as possible.

15
16 **Mr. Graham** said that a home built with no articulation and no design would appear bulkier than
17 the proposed structure.

18
19 **Richard Sprang**, a resident of the 200 block of 21st Place, commented that the existing home
20 currently has three bedrooms, as would the new design. He pointed out that the proposal would
21 only increase the amount of square footage by 6.9 percent, and the home would still be less than
22 1,800 square feet. He stated that the applicant should have been aware of the limitations of
23 substandard lots when they purchased the property. He commented that the structure to the east of
24 the subject property will eventually be redeveloped, and their property value would be negatively
25 impacted by the proposal. He indicated that he does not feel there is any public merit in the
26 proposal. He stated that it would not improve any property value except for that of the applicants,
27 and it would negatively impact the value of the properties to the east of the subject property. He
28 said that the street is extremely crowded, and the proposal would add to the density on 21st Place.
29 He pointed out that the previous proposals for similar variance requests had no opposition. He
30 indicated that there typically are cars parked up and down the street, and it would be impossible to
31 get a fire truck up the street in an emergency. He stated that variance requests are discretionary,
32 and he does not see the merit to the proposal given that the proposal would result in an increase of
33 only 7 percent of square footage and the value of the adjacent properties would be decreased.

34
35 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Sprang** said that property owners
36 should be permitted to build within the zoning regulations, but any Variance request must have
37 public merit in order to be approved.

38
39 In response to a question from Commissioner Schlager, **Mr. Sprang** said that people buy homes
40 in the area to be close to the beach and because of the view to the ocean. He stated that there is
41 an ocean view down the street, and allowing the encroachment would depreciate the value of the

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 6

1 properties up the street because their view would be obstructed. He said that currently the
2 zoning regulations protect views, which acts in lieu of a view ordinance. He indicated that it is
3 possible to see the ocean down the street with the existing two and three story homes.
4

5 In response to a question from Commissioner Schlager, **Mr. Sprang** commented that when he
6 bought his home, the encroachments that existed were legally permitted in the 1960s.
7

8 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Sprang** stated that the entire
9 encroachment as proposed would obstruct the view down the street. He commented that he
10 could support having the setback encroachment be articulated on the second floor and having the
11 third floor set back to the current zoning requirements because it would not change the current
12 situation.
13

14 **Patrick Kuren**, a resident of the 100 block of 21st Place, said that the proposed structure would
15 look like all of the other homes on the block. He commented that the neighborhood has been
16 built up in the past 14 years since he has lived on the street. He indicated that the applicants
17 need the extra living space. He stated that he is afraid the applicants would move if the Variance
18 request is not approved.
19

20 **Greg Binani**, a resident of 21st Place, stated that the applicants are very good friends with their
21 family. He said that he understands the need of the applicants to expand their home, and they
22 welcome the applicants to build the home that they wish. He commented that if any view would
23 be directly impacted on the street from the proposal, it would be theirs. He stated that they have
24 an ocean view above their home; however, they welcome the applicants to build the home they
25 wish in order for them to stay in the neighborhood.
26

27 **Jim Youngblood** said that they do not have an issue with the proposal, and they would not want
28 the home to appear as a box with no articulation. He stated that they do not feel the proposed
29 structure would create a great impact. He commented that they would prefer a well designed
30 structure be constructed rather than a home that is built out to the maximum permitted on the lot.
31

32 **Ms. Srour** stated that the proposal will conform with the new development that is occurring on
33 the street.
34

35 Chairman Bohner closed the public hearing.
36

37 Commissioner Powell stated that a box like bulky structure could be built on the site with no
38 articulation. He stated that the lot size of the subject property is skewed and is a half lot. He
39 said that the alley is considered the rear of the home on a full lot and is considered the front of
40 the home on a half lot. He commented that the existing homes on the street project into the alley.
41 He said that the proposed design would provide articulation; would remediate the substandard

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 7

1 setbacks on the sides; and would be an improvement to the existing structure. He stated that the
2 amount of encroachment into the setback would be minimal. He indicated that he feels the
3 required findings can be met for granting the proposed Variance.

4
5 Commissioner Lesser said that he is concerned with bulk and density in the beach area. He
6 commented that it is brave for a neighbor to raise objections, and it is important for the
7 Commissioners to hear such concerns. He stated that he is concerned with how the Code
8 unfairly treats half lots. He indicated that designs such as the subject proposal are less bulky and
9 provide more articulation which improves the neighborhood. He said that the proposal is up to
10 84 percent of the allowed BFA and would provide articulation. He commented that he would
11 like the City Council to address the issue of half lots. He stated that the project has the support
12 of staff and several neighbors. He also pointed out that the Fire Department has indicated that
13 they would be able to access the street with the proposed projection. He said that he would
14 support the proposed Variance application.

15
16 Commissioner Schlager stated that half lots are penalized by the Code, and three or four previous
17 similar requests have been approved in the past. He indicated that articulation of the subject
18 proposal would create a much better architectural design and would increase the values of the
19 surrounding homes. He said that he would support the Variance request.

20
21 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she agrees that there needs to be better direction from
22 City Council regarding half lots. She stated that it will become more difficult to make the
23 finding for “peculiar and exceptional circumstances” as the Commission hears more Variance
24 requests. She said that she is satisfied that the findings can be made in this case because of the
25 lot pattern in the neighborhood. She indicated that while she understands that the opponent’s
26 view may be obstructed somewhat by the project, she does not feel it would weigh against
27 granting of the Variance. She indicated that she is in general agreement with the comments of
28 the other Commissioners.

29
30 Chairman Bohner said that he also feels the findings can be met for special circumstances
31 including the topography, the sloping and steepness of the lot. He said that to grant the relief as
32 requested would not cause a substantial detriment to the public good. He said that he does not
33 feel any views would be materially obstructed by granting the Variance, and emergency vehicles
34 would not be obstructed from accessing the alley. He said that granting the Variance would
35 make the subject property consistent with other properties in the City that have similar
36 limitations and would not change the nature of the neighborhood. He stated that the structure
37 could have been designed as a box. He indicated that the proposal meets all of the criteria for
38 granting the Variance.

39
40 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **APPROVE** a Variance and Coastal
41 Development Permit for a Proposed New Single Family Residence to Project into a Required Front

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 8

1 Yard Setback on a Portion of a Lot Located at 124 21st Place as presented by staff.

2

3 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Schlager, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner

4 NOES: None

5 ABSENT: None

6 ABSTAIN: None

7

8 Director Thompson explained the 15 day appeal period and stated that the item will be placed on
9 the City Council’s Consent Calendar for their meeting of September 4, 2007.

10

11 **07/0808.2 Consideration of a Master Use Permit Amendment for Proposed On-Site Wine**
12 **Tasting Within an Existing Supermarket Located at 2700 Sepulveda**
13 **Boulevard (Ralph’s)**

14

15 Assistant Planner Ochoa summarized the staff report. She indicated that the subject proposal is
16 to add a Type 42 license to allow consumption of alcohol on-site for the Ralph’s supermarket in
17 the Manhattan Village Center. She stated that the location for the proposed wine tasting would
18 be in the existing wine cellar room at the rear of the store. She commented that the proposal
19 does require a Use Permit Amendment to the Master Use Permit of the Manhattan Village
20 shopping center to add a Type 42 license for consumption of alcohol on-site. She indicated that
21 the existing Type 21 license only allows the sale of alcohol for off-site consumption. She
22 commented that the wine tasting would be conducted only within the existing 131 square foot
23 wine cellar room; would be limited to 2 ounces per glass per person; would allow for no food
24 service and no seating; and would be limited to the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. She said
25 that no minors would be permitted in the area. She indicated that notice was provided to
26 properties within a 500 foot radius. She stated that staff feels that the addition of wine tasting
27 would not be an intensification of use; would be for on-site consumption only during limited
28 hours; and would be incidental to the current use.

29

30 Commissioner Lesser asked for further information on the hours of other businesses that offer
31 wine tasting within the City and asked whether staff has a concern with allowing wine tasting
32 from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

33

34 Director Thompson stated that staff feels that the existing Ralph’s is very well managed, and
35 they do not have any concerns with the proposed request. He indicated that the Commission can
36 request that the hours of operation be changed if they have concerns. He commented that the
37 permitted hours of operation depend on the site location.

38

39 Commissioner Lesser asked if staff felt there was sufficient space in the wine cellar room to
40 allow for wine tasting.

41

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 9

1 Assistant Planner Ochoa stated that the proposal is for an informal type of tasting for people who
2 wish to sample a wine before they make a purchase, and the intent is not for people to sit and
3 sample many different wines.

4
5 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked regarding the number of existing Type 21 licenses in the City
6 where there is a potential for the business to make a similar requests to add wine tasting.

7
8 Director Thompson stated that the conditions for the subject proposal are intended to be
9 consistent with other businesses that allow wine tasting that have been approved in the past. He
10 indicated that a chart has been provided to the Commissioners showing what other businesses in
11 the City that sell alcohol.

12
13 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson said that any
14 future request for wine tasting would be evaluated on a case by case basis.

15
16 **Art Rodriguez**, representing the applicant, said that Ralph's is a solid company which has an
17 outstanding record for complying with the rules of cities and the Department of Alcoholic
18 Beverage Control (ABC). He commented that this is the third instance where they are applying
19 for wine tasting. He said that the purpose for the request is to allow people to have a sample
20 before they decide to buy a case of wine for a wedding or party. He pointed out that BevMo
21 stores allow wine tasting. He said that the ABC does not grant a license for wine tasting, and
22 any business that wants to conduct wine tasting must apply for a bar license. He stated that they
23 are in agreement with all of the conditions in the staff report. He indicated that they did have a
24 concern with only allowing one sample of wine per person, which would make it very difficult to
25 for customers to compare wines. He commented that no letters in opposition to the proposal
26 were received by neighbors or other City agencies. He stated that they provided notification to
27 the neighbors in addition to the notice from the City. He pointed out that the subject area for
28 wine tasting is a separate room, only 131 square feet, which includes wine storage.

29
30 In response to questions from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Rodriguez** pointed out that the
31 Sepulveda Wine Company has hours from 9:00 a.m. to midnight for wine tasting. He stated that
32 the area would have to be roped off and appropriate signage would need to be provided
33 restricting the area from access to anyone under 21 years of age.

34
35 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, **Mr. Rodriguez** said that there would be no
36 signage to advertise the wine sampling. He indicated that the customer would have to approach
37 an employee if they were interested in wine tasting, and the wine would have to be poured by an
38 employee.

39
40 In response to questions from Commissioner Powell, **Mr. Rodriguez** said that they are hoping
41 that word of the service would spread to residents in the area, and he does not believe the wine

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 10

1 tasting would draw a crowd. He said that with the area being cordoned off from the rest of the
2 store, people would need to wait for someone else to leave before entering the wine cellar area if
3 the room were crowded, only 3 or 4 people can fit inside. He pointed out that they are not
4 requesting to expand the existing wine cellar room.

5
6 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Rodriguez** said that he is only
7 a consultant and cannot state that Ralph's would not have an objection to including a condition
8 restricting advertising in print.

9
10 In response to a comment from Commissioner Schlager, Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated
11 that the Commission only has the word of the applicant that the wine tasting would be very low
12 key with only one sip being permitted per person, which would be important factors in her
13 allowing longer hours of 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

14
15 Chairman Bohner opened the public hearing.

16
17 **David Wachtfogel** pointed out that it would be difficult to stop people from walking away from
18 the wine cellar area and then coming back for a second sample.

19
20 **Martha Andreani**, commented that there are estate homes behind the Manhattan Village, and
21 she is not certain whether they were provided notice of the hearing. She said that a hardship
22 must be shown in granting a Type 42 license. She indicated that the proposed hours of 10:00
23 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. are excessive. She said that the proposal would set a precedent for other
24 businesses with existing Type 21 licenses to make similar requests to add wine tasting. She
25 pointed out that the Type 42 license stays with the property, and future businesses on the site
26 could also serve alcohol. She indicated that there are no restrictions preventing people from
27 coming back and having multiple samples. She also commented that there are children in the
28 store, and it is not an appropriate location for wine tasting.

29
30 In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, Director Thompson said that the
31 entitlement for the Type 42 license would stay with the property; however, Condition 2 in the
32 draft Resolution requires any future use to have the same type of characteristics as the subject
33 store. He said that residents adjacent to the Manhattan Village were provided notice. He said
34 staff is recommending that the samples be increased to three 2 ounce glasses in order to allow
35 customers to compare wines. He indicated that it is probably unreasonable to think that wine
36 tasting should be restricted to one 2 ounce glass.

37
38 Chairman Bohner closed the public hearing.

39
40 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she expects Ralph's is feeling pressure from competition
41 in the industry, and she feels they should be granted the request in order to compete. She stated

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 11

1 that she would prefer the hours permitted for wine tasting be limited from noon until 8:00 p.m.
2 She stated that she would support allowing three 2 ounce samples. She indicated that she does
3 not feel a precedent would be set for other stores with existing Type 21 licenses to make similar
4 requests for a Type 42 license. She stated that the store is quite large, and only a very small
5 portion would be dedicated to wine tasting. She indicated that she would not expect other liquor
6 stores to make similar requests. She commented that she would prefer a condition restricting
7 advertising.

8
9 Commissioner Schlager stated that he is in agreement with approving the permit including the
10 limitation to three 2 ounce glasses. He stated that wine tasting would fit in with the ambiance of
11 the store. He indicated that it would be appropriate to allow people to sample wines before they
12 purchase a case for a wedding or party. He stated that the wine tasting would be very limited,
13 and he supports the hours of 10:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. as proposed.

14
15 Commissioner Lesser said that he supports the opportunity to allow tasting wine before it is
16 purchased. He stated that it would be helpful to know the hours that other businesses in the City
17 allow wine tasting, however he will defer to staff on what they feel is reasonable. He indicated
18 that he has a concern with the amount of space in the wine cellar room for customers; however,
19 he would also defer to staff's opinion that they feel it is adequate. He indicated that he is
20 sensitive to the concern with the addition of opportunities to obtain liquor in the City. He
21 indicated, however, that he does not believe such a concern applies in this situation because the
22 store currently sells alcohol. He said that he could support granting the subject draft Resolution.

23
24 Commissioner Powell said that he concurs with the comments of the other Commissioners. He
25 indicated that he would support hours for wine tasting of 12:00 p.m. until 8:00 p.m. Monday
26 through Saturday and 12:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays. He said that he would also like to
27 know the hours of the other businesses that offer wine tasting.

28
29 Chairman Bohner commented that he has no problem with allowing wine tasting from 10:00 a.m.
30 to 10:00 p.m., which he feels is reasonable. He indicated that he does not believe that the wine
31 tasting would be heavily advertised. He said that the intent of the request is not for people to
32 become drunk but rather simply to sample wine. He indicated that he believes the conditions
33 would be strictly enforced.

34
35 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she feels the issue regarding the permitted hours is not that
36 people would become drunk but rather that the community standard for appropriate hours of
37 drinking alcohol is maintained. She indicated that she does not believe 10:00 a.m. is an hour that
38 wine tasting needs to be available.

39
40 Commissioner Schlager said that he does not feel morning or afternoon hours are appropriate for
41 drinking alcohol, but someone else may wish to sample wines during those hours. He indicated

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 12

1 that he feels allowing people to sample wine at 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is reasonable.

2
3 Commissioner Lesser requested that his feeling is that there should be consistency between the
4 hours permitted for wine tasting at the subject store and the hours permitted for wine tasting at
5 other businesses in the City. He asked that staff provide further information regarding the hours
6 permitted for wine tasting for other locations that have been approved by Council.

7
8 Director Thompson commented that staff would be willing to determine the hours permitted for
9 wine tasting for other stores in the City during a recess of the meeting. He pointed out that
10 every location is unique, and this is a very large supermarket where wine tasting is clearly
11 ancillary.

12
13 Commissioner Schlager commented while there is some consistency, there are different hours for
14 businesses that serve and sell alcohol within the City. He said that he does not feel there is a
15 concern with a grocery store allowing a sip of wine between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.

16
17 At 8:30 p.m., a 10-minute recess was taken.

18
19 Director Thompson indicated that the other approvals are for wine stores. Bacchas is permitted
20 to serve five 1 ounce servings per customer between 11:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. He indicated that
21 wine tasting is permitted at Sepulveda Wine Company from 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Tuesday
22 through Saturday and noon to 5:00 p.m. Sundays and Mondays. He stated that the Sepulveda
23 Wine Company is also permitted hours for private events between 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

24
25 Commissioner Lesser suggested allowing increasing the number of samples to three or five per
26 person.

27
28 Director Thompson suggested possibly permitting 1 ounce rather than 2 ounce samples.

29
30 Commissioner Powell said that he would agree with permitting three to five 1 ounce samples per
31 person and hours for wine tasting of Monday through Saturday between 11:00 and 8:00 p.m. and
32 Sunday between 12:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.

33
34 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that allowing five 1 ounce servings is a reasonable
35 compromise and would be consistent with other businesses that offer wine tasting in the City.

36
37 **Mr. Rodriguez** commented that although Ralph's is open 24 hours, customers generally shop
38 between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. which is the reason for the requested hours. He commented
39 that the intent is for people to taste the wine and not to sit and drink. He indicated that he does
40 not feel the proposal would hurt the City or impact the neighborhood. He said that they would
41 accept 1 ounce servings if it is felt appropriate by the Commission.

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 13

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 Schlager said that he would support allowing five 1 ounce servings, and he would support the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. as originally proposed. He commented that he does not feel there is any real basis for mandating the hours.

Chairman Bohner said that he would support hours of 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. for wine tasting, and changing the hours would be arbitrary. He indicated that he could support permitting five 1 ounce servings.

Commissioner Lesser commented that the subject business is a supermarket as opposed to a wine store, and he does feel there is a connection with buying wine as opposed to a place to gather. He said that he would like for some restriction to be placed on the hours. He said that he would support of hours for tasting beginning at 11:00 a.m. and ending at 8:00 p.m., although he has no specific rationale other than it seems to him to be reasonable.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **APPROVE** a Master Use Permit Amendment for proposed on-site wine tasting within an existing supermarket located at 2700 Sepulveda Boulevard with the hours limited to between 11:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and between 11:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on Sundays, and with five one ounce glasses being permitted per person.

- AYES: Lesser, Powell, Schlager, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner
- NOES: None
- ABSENT: None
- ABSTAIN: None

Director Thompson explained the 15 day appeal period and stated that the item will be placed on the City Council’s Consent Calendar for their meeting of September 4, 2007.

PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

06/0725.4-3 Consideration of City Council 2005-07 Work Plan Item to Address Mansionization in Residential Zones

Director Thompson commented that staff’s plan is to have a comprehensive presentation at this hearing with discussion focused on the remodel ordinance. He suggested possibly scheduling a special meeting for discussion regarding lot mergers and new development standards.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she has a concern that many people tend to take vacations on the last week of August, and she would not want for the important issue of lot mergers to be discussed while a large number of interested people may not be able to attend. She indicated

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 14

1 that she would prefer to have the special meeting on cable so that people who may be interested
2 can watch the broadcast.

3
4 The Commissioners agreed to hold a special meeting regarding Mansionization on Wednesday,
5 September 5, 2007, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Hall chambers with discussion regarding lot mergers
6 and new development standards for open space and setbacks.

7
8 Senior Planner Jester summarized the staff report. She said that items that are being considered
9 are 1) encouraging the retention of smaller homes; 2) the accessory use of adjacent common
10 ownership parcels; 3) new development standards increasing open space and increasing setbacks
11 for any new construction; and 4) restricting lot mergers. Regarding questions raised at the last
12 Planning Commission meeting, she indicated that people will construct planters in the side yards
13 to raise the grade of the yard so that the bottom level of the structure is defined as a basement
14 rather than a story by Building Codes which requires them to have only one rather than two
15 exits. She commented that the term “typical lot size” is a conglomerate of lot sizes which
16 depends on the area. She commented that a chart of lot sizes has been provided to the
17 Commissioners with the staff report. She indicated that the term “minimum lot size” is the
18 minimum lot size as defined by the Zoning Code. She said that a minimum lot in the Beach Area
19 is 2,700 square feet (30’ by 90’), although there are also larger lots. She said that allowing only
20 two lots of 30’ by 90’ to be merged when considering lot mergers regulations would mean that
21 lots which are 33 1/3’ by 105’ could not be combined. She said that staff used the term “typical
22 lot size” to accommodate lots that are slightly larger than the minimum.

23
24 Senior Planner Jester indicated that basement areas were previously very limited, with small
25 rooms of 70 square feet and 7 foot ceilings, which would not count toward buildable floor area
26 (BFA). She indicated that it was determined with the Bulk Volume Amendments that any size
27 basement area which is exposed less than 2 feet above ground should not be counted toward
28 BFA because it is not visible from the street. She indicated that people began building much
29 larger basements, 1,000’s of square feet in area as a result of the new Bulk Volume Ordinance.
30 She indicated that wells are required for basements in order to allow exit in the event of an
31 emergency as well as providing light and ventilation, and more wells were being placed within
32 the side yard setback as the size of basements became larger. She indicated that the Code was
33 then revised to prohibit wells within the side yard setback. She commented that staff has not
34 really observed a reduction in the amount of BFA in the upper levels with the increased size of
35 basements as they anticipated would happen. She pointed out that the basement area is counted
36 toward the parking requirement, and with the amendments staff is suggesting that basements also
37 be counted toward the open space requirement.

38
39 She commented that a “setback” is the distance between a building and the property line. She
40 indicated that new development must conform to current standards regardless of the size of the
41 lot, and the proposed amendments would not allow any new development to be built according

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 15

1 to previous development standards. She said that any new development on existing unmerged
2 developed lots would need to comply with the new standards including number of units, open
3 space, and parking. She indicated that the proposal regarding lot mergers would limit the
4 number of lots that can be merged to two lots. She pointed out that existing lots which are
5 currently not legally merged but used as one large lot would be permitted to remain, which
6 would not change the pattern of development of a neighborhood because they are already
7 developed as one large lot. Any new development on these larger lots, and all lots, would need
8 to conform to the new standards. What could potentially be “grandfathered” is the size of the lot,
9 not new construction.

10
11 Director Thompson indicated that any new development would be required to meet the new
12 standards regardless of the size of the lot.

13
14 Senior Planner Jester indicated that the Mansionization Committee and City Council felt it was
15 better to allow additions to existing smaller homes with non-conformities than to have a home be
16 demolished and rebuilt to the maximum allowed. She said that safety requirements would need
17 to be in compliance as much as possible. She stated that it is important that the amount of garage
18 parking space increases with larger homes. She said that allowing some flexibility for the front
19 yard setback requirement would acknowledge that it is difficult in some cases to provide the
20 required setback in the front yard for remodels. She said that staff is asking the Commission to
21 consider administratively allowing a 100 percent remodel with maximum BFA of up to 66
22 percent in Area Districts III and IV and up to 75 percent in Area Districts I and II or 3,000
23 square feet, whichever is less. She indicated that currently there is a limit of 2,000 square feet
24 for remodels which is done with neighborhood notification. She said that the Council is asking
25 the Commission to determine whether they feel the percentage of BFA is appropriate and
26 whether a 3,000 square foot limit is appropriate. She stated that the Council is also asking the
27 Commission to determine if it is appropriate for homes that are larger than 3,000 square feet to
28 be approved administratively with neighbor notification. She stated that there is a smaller
29 percentage of allowable BFA proposed for remodels in the beach area because people tend not to
30 develop to the maximum because of the open space and parking requirements. She indicated
31 that the proposal is to allow a 100 percent remodel with a requirement that 10 percent of the
32 original structure be maintained. She pointed out that currently 25 percent of the existing
33 structure is required to be maintained for a remodel. She commented that the proposal is to
34 require a single car garage for homes up to 2,000 square feet; two car parking for homes up to
35 2,800 square feet; a two car garage with both spaces enclosed for homes up to 3,600 square feet;
36 and a three car garage for homes larger than 3,600 square feet.

37
38 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, Senior Planner Jester indicated that currently
39 remodels are approved administratively with neighbor notification. She indicated that such
40 decisions can be appealed to the Commission.

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 16

1 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she would like more information regarding the
2 thought behind requiring 10 percent of the existing structure to remain for remodels rather than
3 maintaining the current requirement of 25 percent. She commented that a requirement of
4 maintaining 10 percent of the existing structure seems like a very low percentage.

5
6 Senior Planner Jester pointed out that the percentage of the home that is retained with a remodel
7 is based on Building Code valuation rather than the actual percentage of the structure that
8 remains intact. She clarified that the requirement is that 10 percent of the value of the home be
9 retained rather than 10 percent of the physical structure.

10
11 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Senior Planner Jester said that a 100
12 percent remodel consists of maintaining the exterior walls of a structure and completely
13 remodeling the interior.

14
15 In response to a comment from Commissioner Lesser, Senior Planner Jester stated that there
16 currently is a regulation that all existing nonconformities must be brought into compliance if the
17 value of any remodel or addition to a home exceeds 50 percent of the Building Code valuation of
18 the existing structure, with a few exceptions.

19
20 Commissioner Lesser commented that the 50 percent requirement has encouraged property
21 owners to demolish existing structures and build new homes.

22
23 In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, Senior Planner Jester indicated that
24 currently a two car enclosed garage is required for any home under 3,600 square feet and a three
25 car garage is required for any home over 3,600 square feet. She said that the proposed
26 requirement for a two car enclosed garage for homes over 2,000 square feet is to allow some
27 flexibility to acknowledge that it might not be feasible to add a two car garage with a remodel on
28 a smaller lot with smaller homes.

29
30 Commissioner Lesser commented that the goal of the Mansionization Committee was to reach a
31 compromise for people who feel very strongly there should be no limits on property rights and
32 for other people feel that there is a fundamental problem with new large homes changing the
33 character of neighborhoods that must be addressed for the interest of the community. He said
34 that the ultimate recommendations represent a compromise, and the issue now is to determine
35 whether the recommendations are appropriate. He said that the limit of 3,000 square feet for
36 remodels was a good balance between people who wanted a lower threshold and those that felt a
37 greater threshold was appropriate.

38
39 Senior Planner Jester indicated that the proposal is to allow the additional front setback to be
40 distributed to other areas besides the front adjacent to a property line and to increase the required
41 percentage if provided in other areas. She commented that the intent is to provide open area in

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 17

1 the exterior of the home where it is most beneficial to neighboring properties along the side yard
2 rather than in interior areas of the property. She indicated that the proposal is to allow the
3 required percentage of open space to wrap around the corner of the property on corner lots so
4 that the open space is distributed to the front as well as the side yard along the street. She
5 commented that currently the open space requirement is for the front yard. She commented that
6 the concern of the City Council was to provide some building wall articulation, and they would
7 like the Commission to consider the percentages that would be appropriate to wrap around the
8 corner in order to provide additional articulation.

9
10 Senior Planner Jester commented that currently only non-structural items such as decks, patios
11 and gardens are permitted unless there is also a primary residence located on a lot. She said that
12 the proposal would allow for accessory structures such as a pool house, guest house, extra
13 garages or workshop without a home being located on a lot. She said that allowing accessory
14 structures as proposed would allow for more open space and would maintain the ability of the
15 owner to sell the parcel. She indicated that the proposal would provide for better use and more
16 flexibility for commonly owned adjacent lots. She commented that a covenant would be
17 required to be recorded that the lots be tied together and not be sold until such time as the
18 undeveloped lot is redeveloped with a primary residence. She stated that the covenant would
19 address the concern that the lots be sold off with only a garage and pool or with a guest home
20 that includes no garage as required for a primary home.

21
22 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, Director Thompson said that the undeveloped
23 property could be sold to someone who planned to develop the property.

24
25 Chairman Bohner commented that his understanding was that much of the concern previously
26 raised regarding front yard setbacks was related to the appearance of bulk from the street side of
27 the property. He asked whether the elimination of open space from the front yard to be placed
28 on the side yards of corner properties would have an impact on the appearance of bulk from the
29 front.

30
31 Senior Planner Jester commented that the proposed regulation would only apply to corner lots in
32 order to wrap the open space around the street side and would not apply to interior lots. She
33 indicated that the City Council and Mansionization Committee have considered reducing the
34 percentage of required front yard setback from 8 percent to 6 percent. She indicated that
35 consideration could be given to requiring 8 percent of open space for corner lots.

36
37 Director Thompson indicated that wrapping the open space around the side yard for corner lots
38 would still meet the intent of mitigating the impact of bulk from the street, but at some point the
39 effect of the setback is diluted. He stated that the intent of requiring 8 percent of open space for
40 corner lots is to mitigate any impact from the loss of open space from the front yard. He said
41 that 6 percent is probably appropriate for interior lots.

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 18

1
2 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, Director Thompson said that discussion of
3 encouraging the retention of smaller homes and the accessory use of adjacent commonly owned
4 parcels will be continued to September 12, 2007. He said that the special meeting scheduled for
5 September 5th will be regarding lot mergers and new development standards.

6
7 Commissioner Lesser said that he would like more clarification regarding the specific questions
8 the Council is asking the Commission in order for them to be considered individually and have
9 members of the public be able to address the specific points as the first two proposals are
10 discussed.

11
12 Director Thompson stated that the City Council basically supported the proposed amendments
13 and wanted the Commission to focus on the variables that have been pointed out.

14
15 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that there did not appear to be any negatives in the staff
16 report regarding the proposed amendment for accessory uses on adjacent parcels. She indicated
17 that she feels noise impacts could be a consideration.

18
19 Senior Planner Jester said that the proposed amendment regarding accessory uses does not
20 change the development standards for such properties. She indicated that the only difference for
21 such properties with only accessory structures is that they would not include a primary residence.

22
23 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson indicated that
24 the current standards would protect neighboring properties from impacts such as lighting spilling
25 over from a basketball court. He stated that no special standards are being proposed for such
26 accessory uses.

27
28 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Senior Planner Jester indicated that
29 there currently are not standards specifically regulating basketball courts. She said that such a
30 use could not be built within the required setbacks, but any light poles would need to meet
31 setbacks.

32
33 Director Thompson pointed out that there are current regulations to prevent lighting from shining
34 directly into the yards of adjacent properties. He commented that there is not much difference
35 from a basketball court being located on a separate lot as opposed to being located on a single
36 larger lot which includes a primary residence.

37
38 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she is wondering if the proposed amendment takes
39 into consideration the compatibility of an accessory structure to the adjacent neighbors as a
40 factor in determining whether such a use would be permitted.

41

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 19

1 Senior Planner Jester commented that a basketball court could be placed on a property whether
2 or not a house was also located on the lot. The location and setbacks for a basketball court
3 would be the same whether or not the lot has a house on it.
4

5 Director Thompson said that accessory structures would only be approved that are appropriately
6 located within a residential area.
7

8 Commissioner Powell asked whether there would be any restrictions for building a concrete pad
9 for parking a motor home or boat or for placing a skateboard ramp.
10

11 Director Thompson pointed out that no new standards are being proposed under the new rule.
12 He indicated that no such requests as suggested by Commissioner Powell have been received,
13 and they would most likely be denied. He indicated that staff is very careful with their
14 approvals.
15

16 Senior Planner Jester said that it is anticipated that people will continue to build on commonly
17 owned adjacent lots as currently occurs on merged lots with swimming pools, gardens, guest
18 houses, or outdoor rooms.
19

20 Chairman Bohner opened the public hearing.
21

22 **Paul Gross** stated that there is no disadvantage to granting the amendment regarding accessory
23 structures on adjacent properties. He said that the intent of the proposed amendment is to avoid
24 overbuilding by providing incentives to retain lots that have no structures. He indicated that
25 such properties will most likely eventually be sold, but it can be delayed by making the
26 properties more useful to the owners. He indicated that the mansionization issue is complex
27 because there are so many situations throughout the town, and the different area districts must be
28 considered. He said that all four issues under consideration overlap. He commented that it is
29 appropriate to divide the discussion as has been done. He indicated that allowing remodels up to
30 a maximum BFA of 66 percent or 3,000 square feet in Area Districts III and IV is appropriate.
31 He stated that the purpose is to encourage fewer people to tear down existing homes and rebuild
32 to the maximum that is allowed. He said that there is hardly any remodeling done in the Sand
33 Section, and the majority of the construction is for new homes. He stated that a larger incentive
34 is needed in order for fewer homes to be demolished and rebuilt. He indicated that 66 percent or
35 3,000 square feet allows for a sufficient enough increase in space to provide an incentive to
36 remodel. He pointed out that the new portion of the remodel would be required to meet all
37 standards including setbacks.
38

39 **Martha Andreani** said that remodeling of homes up to 3,000 square feet cannot be considered
40 small homes, and the character of the neighborhoods would be changed if the proposed
41 amendment is approved. She said that what is appropriate for each district needs to be

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 20

1 considered. She pointed out that one of the goals is to preserve neighborhood character. She
2 commented that she feels there does need to be regulations regarding accessory structures on
3 commonly owned adjacent properties so that staff has clear direction. She asked whether a
4 basketball court would be considered a structure or whether it would be allowed to be built
5 without a permit. She stated that the structures that are placed on the undeveloped lot are
6 important and will impact the neighborhood. She said that she feels the most important item for
7 discussion is the consideration of new residential development standards. She commented that
8 the residential development standards are the reason mansionization has become an issue in the
9 first place with older homes being torn down and new larger homes being built. She pointed out
10 that selling of lots for new construction cannot be dictated; however, the redevelopment of the
11 lots can be regulated. She indicated that she feels the second issue for consideration should be
12 lot mergers; the third issue should be to encourage the retention of existing smaller homes; and
13 the fourth issue should be accessory structures on commonly owned adjacent parcels.
14

15 **Jim Fasola** indicated that the Commission should be encouraged to accept staff's proposals. He
16 said that it is an issue of economics, and it is more viable to tear down a small home that is 80
17 years old rather than to remodel. He indicated that encouraging the retention of existing smaller
18 homes may make remodeling more viable for some projects.
19

20 **Robert Schuman** said that the increase in square footage to 3,000 square feet should be
21 supported, although it has come too late. He commented that the goal of the City for many years
22 has been to retain the small town atmosphere; however, the development standards for
23 remodeling has discouraged the retention of smaller homes. He indicated that the new standards
24 probably would not affect a large number of projects, but they would help. He said that he also
25 feels the different area districts should be considered separately. He stated that homes in Area
26 Districts III and IV are in danger of having their building envelope reduced to the point at which
27 the structures are too small, and he hopes that those areas would be considered separately from
28 Area Districts I and II. He pointed out that there is a significant difference in the size of lots in
29 the different area districts, as the largest standard lot in the Sand Section is almost 3,500 square
30 feet and the largest standard lot in Area Districts I and II is 7,500 square feet.
31

32 Commissioner Powell said that he is in favor of the Minor Exception. He indicated that he
33 believes incentives should be provided for remodels to discourage lots from being scraped and
34 rebuilt to the maximum allowed. He commented that he would support providing notification to
35 neighbors for remodel projects over 3,000 square feet. He stated that he also agrees that the
36 proposal regarding accessory structures is not controversial, and he feels staff would administer a
37 reasonable standard for the types of structure that can be built. He said that he feels an
38 additional front yard setback requirement of 6 percent is acceptable. He requested further
39 information from staff regarding the number of homes that fit into each of the categories listed
40 on the chart which shows the minimum and typical lot sizes according to area district. He
41 commented that he has a question regarding the number of 33' by 105' lots are in Area District

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 21

1 III. He stated that he initially had a concern regarding remodeled homes under 2,000 square feet
2 being permitted to have a one car garage. He commented that often times a one car garage is
3 used for storage space rather than parking, and he has a concern that the new regulation could
4 result in more people parking on the street. He indicated, however, that he can support the
5 proposed standards if they encourage remodels.

6
7 Commissioner Lesser stated that there is support for the Minor Exception rule to move forward.
8 He indicated that he wants to be sure to address the Council’s concerns. He said that he wants to
9 ensure that the Minor Exception does not in fact end up resulting in larger nonconforming
10 homes. He stated that he supports the proposed amendment regarding accessory structures.

11
12 Commissioner Schlager commented that staff presented pictures at a previous meeting with
13 examples of homes in different areas before and after the ZORP requirements, and he feels it
14 would be helpful to again see those pictures. He indicated that he feels it would be helpful to
15 have pictures that show examples of setbacks and of remodels that are consistent with the current
16 criteria.

17
18 Director Thompson indicated that the pictures referenced by Commissioner Schlager would be
19 most beneficial for the discussion regarding new development standards. He indicated that in
20 preparation for continuing the discussion of encouraging the retention of smaller homes, staff
21 can provide pictures with good examples of Minor Exceptions and substandard setbacks that
22 have been approved.

23
24 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she is also in favor of encouraging the retention of
25 smaller homes. She commented that she is not certain whether allowing remodels to 3,000
26 square feet would be too great. She stated that she would also like to have further discussion
27 regarding providing no cap on square footage with neighborhood notification and the idea that
28 structures could be capped at the 66 percent or 75 percent limit. She stated that she would like to
29 have more granularity with respect to the proposals for the different districts. She indicated that
30 she also would like more discussion regarding the parking requirements. She commented that if
31 the goal is to retain older homes, it might be beneficial for an additional parking space to be
32 required when a certain amount of square footage is added rather than once a certain threshold
33 for square footage is reached. She commented that although it is important not to over legislate,
34 she would like to be certain that any abuse regarding accessory structures can be addressed. She
35 said that she would like to consider a condition that accessory structures be required have a
36 permit. She suggested that the page for the Planning Commission on the City’s website include
37 the dates and the topics for the meetings regarding mansionization.

38
39 Director Thompson said that the meeting schedule will be placed on the community calendar.
40 He commented that notice of the meeting schedule and topics for discussion will also be sent to
41 everyone on the mailing list who has expressed an interest in the mansionization issue.

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 22

1
2 Chairman Bohner said that there should be more discussion on issues including whether a certain
3 square foot cap is appropriate for the entire City for remodels or whether it should be adjusted
4 according to the different areas. He indicated that he would like to have further information on
5 whether the 3,000 square foot limit for remodels is appropriate or whether it would actually
6 result in larger homes. He indicated that he would rely on staff to ensure that accessory
7 structures which are permitted on lots are in keeping with the neighborhood.

8
9 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Schlager/Lesser) to **CONTINUE** Consideration of City
10 Council 2005-07 Work Plan Item to Address Mansionization in Residential Zones to September 5,
11 2007, at 6:00 p.m. regarding lot mergers and new development standards, and September 12, 2007,
12 at 6:30 p.m. regarding remodels and accessory uses on commonly owned parcels.

- 13
14 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Schlager, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner
15 NOES: None
16 ABSENT: None
17 ABSTAIN: None

18
19 **DIRECTOR’S ITEMS** None

20
21 **PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

22
23 Commissioner Powell indicated that the third annual Leadership Manhattan Beach Alumni
24 concert in the park and picnic will take place on Sunday, August 19, 2007.

25
26 **TENTATIVE AGENDA: August 22, 2007**

- 27
28 A. Use Permit & Vesting Tentative Parcel Map for Proposed Construction of a Mixed-Use
29 Condominium Building at 930 Manhattan Beach Blvd.
30 B. Amendment to Use Permit for a Previously Approved Variance for a Church at 303 S. Peck
31 Avenue

32
33 **ADJOURNMENT**

34
35 The meeting of the Planning Commission was **ADJOURNED** at 11:00 p.m. in the City Council
36 Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, to Wednesday, August 22, 2007, at 6:30 p.m. in
37 the same chambers.

38
39 _____

PLANNING COMMISSION [DRAFT] MINUTES

August 8, 2007

Page 23

1 RICHARD THOMPSON
2 Secretary to the Planning Commission

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary