

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMISSION
JANUARY 23, 2008

1 A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach was held on
2 Wednesday, January 23, 2008, at 6:35p.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: Fasola, Lesser, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner
10 Members Absent: None
11 Staff: Laurie Jester, Senior Planner
12 Daniel Moreno, Associate Planner
13 Sarah Boesch, Recording Secretary
14

15 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** **January 9, 2008**

16
17 Commissioner Lesser requested that wording be added on page 8, line 38 of the January 9
18 minutes to read: “He indicated, however, that the language of the current Ordinance was adopted
19 by the City Council less than two years ago to be more proactive to be preserving trees.”
20

21 Commissioner Lesser requested that the wording be revised on page 9, line 4 to read: “He said
22 that he feels there has been sufficient information presented that there are alternatives alternative
23 designs for the home that could allow the tree to be preserved and the City’s tree arborist
24 supports its preservation. He said that he cannot support the tree being replaced based on the
25 language of the Ordinance but defers to Council to decide if other factors support the
26 application.”
27

28 Commissioner Powell requested that the word “arborist” be corrected to “arborists” on page 8,
29 line 1 of the minutes.

30
31 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Powell) to **APPROVE** the minutes of January
32 9, 2008, as amended.
33

34 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Bohner
35 NOES: None
36 ABSENT: None
37 ABSTAIN: Fasola
38

39 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** None

40
41 **BUSINESS ITEMS**

1
2 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
3

4 **06/0726.1 Consideration of a Use Permit for a Proposed New 18,000 Square Foot**
5 **Education Building and a Variance to Allow Relief from Maximum**
6 **Allowable Building Height, for an Existing Religious Facility Located at 1243**
7 **Artesia Boulevard (Journey of Faith)**
8

9 Commissioner Lesser said that over 10 years he was affiliated ago with a law firm that
10 represented the chairman of the building committee for the applicant. He said that he has no
11 interest in the project and feels he can consider the item fairly.
12

13 Senior Planner Jester indicated that an e-mail was received after the staff report was written
14 which has been provided to the Commissioners.
15

16 Associate Planner Moreno summarized the staff report. He indicated that the properties
17 surrounding the site north of Tennyson Street are zoned single family residential; properties off
18 of Prospect Avenue are zoned high density residential; and Mira Costa High School is located
19 off of Meadows Avenue. He commented that the south portion of subject property is zoned high
20 density residential and the north portion is zoned single family residential. He indicated that the
21 public and semi-public standards apply because the property is over two acres. He commented
22 that the proposed building would be located approximately 64 feet away from the property line
23 off of Tennyson Street on the north side of the building and 87 feet away from the property line
24 on the west side of the building. He commented that with the public and semi-public standards,
25 the building is permitted to have a height limit of 30 feet based on finished grades around the
26 perimeter of the building. He commented that the applicant is requesting an additional 3 feet
27 above the height limit to allow for an elevator shaft. He indicated that the applicant is asking for
28 relief from the height limit because they believe the location of the elevator shaft and mechanical
29 equipment on the roof would have a minimal visual impact; the building appears as two stories
30 from the north and west; placing the HVAC equipment would allow additional space on the
31 ground to provide landscaping; and the proposed building would not be taller than the existing
32 church building.
33

34 Associate Planner Moreno commented that 181 parking spaces are required on site. He said that
35 the Traffic Engineer is suggesting that a condition be imposed that a parking management plan
36 for parking on Sundays be submitted to the City and approved prior to occupancy with
37 unrestricted parking of all on-site spaces; that an agreement between the applicant and the
38 School District be provided to allow for off-site parking at the high school on Sundays; that time
39 limits be placed on the parking; that a designated parking area be provided for employees, staff
40 and visitors; that valet and loading areas be provided for off-site parking; and that appropriate
41 signage be provided. He said that a condition is included that an off-street parking agreement
42 shall be maintained for use of the Mira Costa parking lot on Sundays. He stated that there are

1 110 existing spaces on the east side of the property and 47 existing parking spaces on the
2 northwest portion of the property. He indicated that the new proposal would include 24 new
3 parking spaces on the north side of the site which would buffer the building to the residential
4 neighbors to the north. He commented that the property was noticed to properties within 500
5 feet of the property and published in the Beach Reporter. He indicated that staff received one
6 letter in opposition to the proposal and four letters in support which are included with the staff
7 report. He commented that an e-mail was also received that has been provided to the
8 Commissioners which raises concerns regarding parking. He stated that minor comments were
9 received from other City departments that can be addressed during the plan check process.

10
11 Chairman Bohner commented that there does not appear to be any features of the property that
12 present special circumstances with the nature or topography of the site to justify granting the
13 Variance to exceed the height limit.

14
15 Associate Planner Moreno stated that there are changes in the topography of the site from the
16 south to the north side of the property. He indicated that staff feels the location of the HVAC
17 equipment above the height limit would be shielded from view from the public right-of-way and
18 would be enclosed within a structure.

19
20 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, Associate Planner Moreno commented that the
21 applicant has had an agreement with the School District for the use of the parking at Mira Costa
22 High School on Sundays since 1997. He indicated that at that time the applicant was granted
23 relief for two parking spaces during the peak hours on Sunday, and it was an important
24 consideration that they had the agreement. He said that staff's understanding from the applicant
25 is that they have a long standing agreement with the School District.

26
27 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno commented that
28 typically the elevator shaft must extend above the level of the roof line in order to meet Code
29 requirements. He commented that the HVAC units are often located on the ground; however, the
30 applicant chose to locate the equipment on the roof in order to provide additional landscaping
31 around the perimeter of the building.

32
33 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno indicated that
34 there is not a condition regarding the preservation of the two existing mature trees off of
35 Tennyson Street. He said that staff is conscious of the fact that they should be protected and
36 will probably request that additional landscaping be required within the public right-of-way on
37 Prospect Avenue.

38
39 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno commented that
40 activities of the church that generate a larger parking demand such as weddings occur on the
41 weekends rather than during the week.

January 23, 2008

Page 4

1 Commissioner Powell pointed out that the applicant's report refers to the mechanical equipment
2 exceeding the height limit by 5 feet as opposed to 3 feet as indicated in the staff report.

3
4 Associate Planner Moreno said that the equipment would exceed the height by 3 feet based on
5 the applicant's plans that were submitted to staff.

6
7 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno said that
8 it would be difficult to meet Code requirements for disabled access if the elevator were not
9 provided. He indicated that lowering the height of the structure 3 feet in order to meet the
10 requirement would not allow sufficient height for the ceilings. He commented that there is not a
11 large change in topography in the area of the proposed structure.

12
13 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno
14 commented that the site is very large, and there is a change in topography with a higher elevation
15 on the southeast and southwest corners.

16
17 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she understands that the fact that the site is large
18 mitigates the impact of the project to the neighbors, but she is not certain how the fact that the
19 project is large presents difficulty in placing the elevator shaft and air conditioning unit within
20 the height limit.

21
22 Associate Planner Moreno indicated that the HVAC equipment could be placed on the ground.
23 He stated that the applicant chose to place it on the roof in order to gain more area for
24 landscaping around the perimeter of the building.

25
26 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she is focused on the wording of the findings that
27 must apply to the project and asked whether staff feels that a peculiar or exceptional difficulty
28 exists for the site which can justify granting the Variance.

29
30 Associate Planner Moreno indicated that staff feels the finding can be met because of the fact
31 that the structure is located away from residential properties and the fact that potential noise
32 would be mitigated by the mechanical equipment being enclosed.

33
34 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she understands the reasoning as to why allowing the
35 proposed Variance would not hurt the neighbors, but she is having difficulty in reaching a
36 determination that the site presents a peculiar and exceptional circumstance.

37
38 Senior Planner Jester indicated that staff also feels an exceptional circumstance is created
39 because the building is being designed on a developed site and is being incorporated within the
40 site that has topography set by the existing buildings and other site improvements that will
41 remain.

January 23, 2008

Page 5

1 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno stated
2 that the proposed structure would be 6 feet higher than the buildings that it would replace.
3

4 Commissioner Fasola commented that the site is one of the largest in the City which should
5 make it easier to comply with height limits because there is more flexibility for designing
6 structures within the site. He commented that the height measured from the entry on Meadows
7 Avenue is 39 feet from grade to the top of the screen around the mechanical equipment and the
8 elevator shaft, which is 9 feet higher than the standard height limit. He commented that the top
9 of the structure would be visible from the homes on Tennyson Street. He said that the permit is
10 for a building of 18,000 square feet; however, his measurement of the proposal arrives at a total
11 of 21,000 square feet.
12

13 Associate Planner Moreno said that the plans have always been for a structure that is 18,000
14 square feet. He said that 18,000 square feet is the figure that was evaluated in calculating the
15 parking requirement and is the limit that would be permitted if the project is approved.
16

17 Commissioner Fasola commented that the existing parking area on the northwest side of the site
18 extends up to the sidewalk with no buffer. He commented that there is a buffer adjacent to
19 Tennyson Street that is part of the project that includes 2 feet of landscaping. He asked whether
20 consideration was given to providing a buffer for the parking lot adjacent to Prospect Avenue.
21 He commented that this project is the last that will be built on the site for many years and it is the
22 last opportunity to bring the parking area up to the current Code requirements.
23

24 Associate Planner Moreno indicated that the problem with including additional landscaping in
25 the parking area to provide a buffer is that it would reduce the amount of space available to
26 provide for parking. He indicated that providing perimeter landscaping for the parking area
27 impacts the parking spaces, aisle dimensions and circulation for the parking area. He said that
28 staff would prefer that the proposed amount of parking be provided rather than have it be
29 reduced to accommodate landscaping. He commented that it may be possible to include a
30 requirement for landscaping to be provided within the public right-of-way on Prospect Avenue.
31

32 **Doug Joyce**, the architect for the project, said that the proposed structure attempts to expand the
33 campus feel of the site. He commented that the center courtyard is a very important aspect of the
34 project which can help to mitigate noise of church activities from the adjacent neighbors and
35 provide an area for members of the church to gather. He indicated that reducing the building
36 height would result in the ceiling height being reduced to 9 feet, which is not sufficient for
37 classroom space. He commented that the view of the building height would be very limited
38 along the street and from any adjacent residences. He indicated that they would like to work
39 with the Public Works Department to improve the parkway along the northern side of the
40 property. He stated that they want to incorporate landscaping into the parking areas.
41

42 In response to questions from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Joyce** indicated that there is a drop of

1 topography on the site from the southwest corner to the northeast corner, which limits the
2 configuration of the design. He stated that the proposed building would not be very visible from
3 the street because it would be well set back. He commented that they would like to work with
4 the Public Works Department to determine the types of street trees that may be appropriate.

5
6 **Jim Van Zanten**, representing the applicant, indicated that there are some large trees on the
7 north side of the property that they would not be opposed to retaining; however, the space
8 necessary for keeping them would reduce the amount of parking by one or two parking spaces.

9
10 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Joyce** indicated that they have not
11 done an analysis as to whether any trees would need to be removed in order to meet the parking
12 requirement.

13
14 Mr. Lesser stated that the Commission has received the directive from the City Council to
15 preserve the existing tree canopy. He asked if the applicant would be opposed to a condition
16 requiring preservation of the existing trees on the site.

17
18 Senior Planner Jester suggested including a flexible condition that specifies the intent to preserve
19 the mature trees on the site to the extent feasible and have the City's arborist work with the
20 applicant and the Public Works Department to provide additional landscaping and preserve
21 existing landscaping.

22
23 **Mr. Joyce** commented that their intent is to replace, meet or exceed the existing tree canopy.

24
25 In response to a comment from Commissioner Fasola, **Mr. Van Zanten** indicated that they are
26 proposing to replace an existing 16,000 square feet building with a new 16,000 square feet
27 building. He said that an additional 2,500 square feet is hallways, storage, elevators, and
28 restrooms. He indicated that they are simply proposing to replace the area that would be
29 removed. He commented that they would be happy to provide landscaping for the public right-
30 of-way area along Prospect Avenue.

31
32 **Mr. Joyce** said that they would not be opposed to a condition requiring that the square footage
33 of the project be verified by the City prior to construction.

34
35 In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, **Mr. Joyce** indicated that mature trees
36 could be planted that could shield the proposed mechanical equipment on the roof from the
37 neighboring properties.

38
39 Senior Planner Jester commented that wording could be added to the condition regarding
40 landscaping that there is an intent to screen the mechanical equipment from the neighbors.

41
42 In response to a question from Chairman Bohner, **Mr. Van Zanten** said that there are not

1 activities during weekdays that would require additional parking. He stated that there is a
2 preschool and some educational use, but their parking lots are half empty during weekdays.

3
4 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Van Zanten** said that the
5 purpose of the height limit requirement is to protect the neighbors from any negative impacts
6 such as blocking of light or having a view of a massive structure. He stated that the proposed
7 building would be located in the interior of the property away from neighboring residents. He
8 indicated that they are attempting to meet the spirit of the height requirement. He said that the
9 proposed structure would not be visible from the street and could only be seen from the second
10 story of a home on the west side of Tennyson Street.

11
12 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she still does not feel the question has been
13 answered regarding the difficulty in this circumstance of designing a structure that meets the
14 height requirement.

15
16 **Mr. Van Zanten** stated that they do not want to place any of the structure below grade because
17 it provides difficulty for handicapped access and can create issues with mold and moisture. He
18 commented that they need the height of the building as proposed in order to provide a sufficient
19 height for the ceilings of the classrooms.

20
21 **Mr. Van Zanten** stated that the project is simply replacing an existing building. He indicated
22 that the structure would be built with modern materials and would include an elevator to provide
23 handicapped access. He said that it would be energy efficient, sound proof, fire resistant, and
24 earthquake resistant, which is not true of the existing structure. He said that their intention is to
25 make the project attractive from the exterior. He indicated that they contacted the neighbors on
26 Tennyson Street and invited them to a community meeting. He stated that about 10 neighbors
27 attended the meeting, and they received many positive comments. He stated that they were
28 asked not to build a parking structure off of Prospect Avenue, which they did not include as part
29 of the project. He commented that it is their intent to continue to work with the neighbors.

30
31 Chairman Bohner opened the public hearing.

32
33 **Richard McCullen**, a resident of the 1200 block of Tennyson Street, said that the church is a
34 good neighbor, and they appreciate the lengths the applicant has gone in making a good project.
35 He said that they welcome the reconstruction. He indicated that they are not concerned with the
36 height variance, and the structure would not be visible from their property. He commented that
37 the street parking in the area is utilized by people attending the church on Sundays from
38 approximately 9:00 a.m. until noon. He indicated that he does not believe there is a solution to
39 the parking situation. He stated that there is a smaller peak time on Wednesday evenings. He
40 said that he is not sure that anything can be done to help the parking, and he would be opposed to
41 building a parking garage on the property. He commented that the overflow parking lot is a
42 significant distance from the church, and people are more likely to utilize street parking on

1 Tennyson Street, Meadows Avenue, and Prospect Avenue before they utilize the overflow
2 parking area. He indicated that they would want to be sure that the parking is monitored,
3 particularly if there are additional peak times for use of the church.

4
5 Chairman Bohner closed the public hearing.

6
7 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that the application is made difficult because the church
8 has been a very good neighbor and has a facility that is serving an important social function in
9 the community. She commented that it is important for young people to have activities when
10 they are not in school and for community members to have a place to congregate. She indicated
11 that she feels the design of the building is very attractive and well articulated. She commented
12 that the critical consideration for granting the Variance request is not the impact of the extra 3
13 feet in height on the neighbors, as she feels that the impact from the additional height to the
14 neighbors has been mitigated. She pointed out, however, that there needs to be a compelling
15 reason for granting an exception from the community standards. She said that in order to grant
16 the Variance there needs to be peculiar and exceptional difficulties or hardships on the owner of
17 a property that justify granting an exception to the standard of a 30 foot height limit. She
18 indicated that the information presented does not allow her to make the finding. She said that
19 she does not feel there is proof that there are exceptional circumstances and that there are not
20 other acceptable design alternatives. She commented that she would welcome discussion of
21 possibly considering allowing the exception from the height requirement for the elevator shaft
22 but not the air conditioning equipment.

23
24 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she also feels it is unattractive to have the parking area
25 located right next to the street and would like for language to be included that trees and a setback
26 be incorporated to provide a buffer. She commented, however, that providing an area for
27 landscaping would reduce the area for parking. She commented that reducing the amount of
28 parking would need to result in either reducing the size of the building or incorporating some
29 compact spaces. She stated that the question is the extent that providing a setback and
30 landscaping for the parking area would impact the amount of parking and proposed design of the
31 building. She indicated that she would not support granting the Variance as proposed. She
32 pointed out that the proposed building is a new development that needs to adhere to the current
33 standards and is the last opportunity for a long period of time to make the site more attractive.

34
35 Commissioner Fasola said that he agrees with the comments of Commissioner Seville-Jones. He
36 commented that there is nothing unusual about the topography of the site that justifies exceeding
37 the height limit, and having a slope should make it less rather than more difficult to comply. He
38 commented that the project does reach the height limit and is located directly adjacent to
39 Tennyson Street. He indicated that the parking situation on Prospect Avenue has not been
40 addressed by the project. He said that the property possibly has more square footage than it can
41 support with the parking that is available. He said that he cannot make the first finding and has
42 concerns with the overall size of the project.

1
2 Commissioner Lesser said that he supports the application with some of the conditions that have
3 been discussed. He indicated that he appreciates that the applicant has worked with staff and has
4 been responsive to their requests. He indicated that he also appreciates that the applicant has
5 done a great deal of outreach to the surrounding neighbors, and he is sympathetic regarding the
6 issues that the applicant has had to address in arriving at the design. He said that there would be
7 an agreement for parking at the high school which is included as a condition of the project and
8 which has been a long standing agreement with the School Board. He stated that the fact that
9 staff has found that the special circumstances can be met to grant the Variance from the height
10 limit helps to address his concerns. He commented that he feels it is important for the
11 Commission to push staff and the applicant on being specific as to the reasons that there are
12 special circumstances in this case. He indicated that staff believes there are issues with the
13 topography that are sufficient to make the finding. He said that he also takes into account that
14 the proposed structure would be located within the interior of the site and at a significant
15 distance from any adjacent residences. He stated that he can make the required findings to
16 support the Variance request. He said that he would welcome further discussion regarding
17 providing appropriate landscaping and setback around the perimeter of the property.
18

19 Commissioner Powell said that he is in favor of the project. He commented that the Commission
20 previously approved a project for a church that was somewhat similar to the subject proposal.
21 He said that the language of the findings does not indicate that the property must be
22 extraordinarily sloped but rather indicates that applying the strict interpretation of the Code
23 requirements would create a hardship due to conditions on the property. He commented that the
24 subject property is large and does have changes in elevation which makes it difficult to design a
25 structure without some portion being exposed. He pointed out that the elevator is required to
26 allow for disabled access. He said that he does have a concern with the location of the HVAC
27 equipment on the roof; however, the applicant is proposing to provide screening. He stated that
28 the building itself would not exceed the height limit. He commented that he agrees with the
29 applicant that the proposal is to replace an existing unsafe building with a new structure. He said
30 that a much larger building would be allowed for the site. He stated that the project does provide
31 open space and accomplishes a community objective. He indicated that mature trees which
32 shield the rooftop equipment would mitigate any concerns of visual bulk. He commented that
33 the applicant has worked with staff and the neighbors, including holding a community meeting
34 and listening to the concerns of adjacent residents. He said that the HVAC equipment could be
35 placed on the ground which would minimize the open space. He indicated that he would support
36 the proposal. He requested that the word "elevation" be corrected to "elevator" in item H (1) on
37 page 1 of the Resolution.
38

39 Chairman Bohner said that he has questions as to whether or not there is a physical condition of
40 the subject property that provide a basis for allowing an exception to the Code requirements. He
41 indicated that he believes there are circumstances that sway him in making the finding, although
42 it is very close. He said that there has been testimony by the applicant that there is some

1 topography changes from the west to the east side of the property which he feels is sufficient to
2 make the finding. He commented that he is not certain if placing the air conditioning equipment
3 in an alternative location off of the roof would lower the height.
4

5 **Mr. Joyce** commented that placing the air conditioning equipment off of the roof would
6 decrease the amount of area that they are requesting to exceed the height limit from 350 square
7 feet to approximately 80 square feet but would not eliminate the need for a Variance.
8

9 Chairman Bohner said that he feels he can make the first finding, although it is close. He said
10 that he feels the other necessary components for making the findings for the Variance are
11 present. He commented that there is a requirement for a recorded easement for agreements to
12 provide off site parking unless the City is involved. He said that the School District is equivalent
13 to a government entity, and the spirit of the statute is met by allowing the parking without a
14 recording of the entitlement. He commented that there has been a relationship between the
15 School District and applicant for the last 20 years, and he does not feel there will be a problem.
16 He indicated that he would agree that additional landscaping should be provided around the
17 perimeter to minimize the impact of the additional parking on the property. He commented that
18 he believes the testimony regarding the topography change on the site is sufficient for him to
19 make the findings for granting the Variance.
20

21 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she does not feel she can support the project because she is
22 not able to make the Variance finding. She commented that if the proposal is supported by the
23 other Commissioners, she would encourage that the intrusion over the height limit be minimized
24 to 80 square feet to include only the elevator rather than over 300 square feet to also include the
25 air conditioning equipment. She indicated that there is a question as to whether or not there is an
26 additional setback area from the street to provide a landscaping buffer so that the parking area is
27 not directly abutting the street.
28

29 Commissioner Lesser asked about possible language of a condition regarding providing a
30 setback area between the parking area and the street.
31

32 Chairman Bohner said that he could support a condition requiring a setback between the parking
33 area and the street.
34

35 **Mr. Joyce** indicated that they would not be opposed to a condition requiring a 5 foot landscape
36 setback off of Tennyson Street.
37

38 Senior Planner Jester indicated that there is an opportunity to provide a landscape buffer in the
39 public right-of-way off of Prospect Avenue, and staff can work with the applicant and the Public
40 Works Department to arrive at a landscaping plan. She indicated that language could be
41 included that the applicant provide perimeter landscaping around the property to be reviewed
42 and approved by the Planning and Public Works Department to include mature shade trees; that a

1 5 foot landscape buffer be placed along Tennyson Street; that the existing mature trees be
2 preserved to the extent feasible; and that new trees be incorporated within the parking area as
3 feasible. She indicated that a condition could also be included that the elevator shaft be screened
4 with landscaping and that the HVAC equipment be moved off of the roof to an alternate location
5 within the interior portion of the property and away from the public view area.

6
7 Commissioner Fasola commented that the air conditioning equipment would not be required to
8 be move off of the roof provided that it remains within the permitted height limit. He said that
9 the decision to provide an elevator to build a three story structure is a choice and not a
10 requirement. He pointed out that the topography actually helps the height of the structure, and
11 the elevator shaft would extend much further above the height limit if the lot were flat. He
12 indicated that he does not feel the topography of the site results in an exceptional circumstance
13 as required for approving the Variance.

14
15 In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Joyce** said that they would not be
16 opposed to a condition that the HVAC equipment not be placed on the roof. He commented that
17 they decided to place it on the roof to mitigate any noise concerns and to reduce the cost. He
18 said that they would prefer to either have the option of placing the equipment elsewhere on the
19 property or to locate it on the roof provided that it remain under the height limit.

20
21 In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Senior Planner Jester indicated that staff's
22 understanding from the building safety requirements is that an elevator would be required for a
23 two or three story building for this type of use.

24
25 **Mr. Joyce** pointed out that having a two story building without an elevator would most likely
26 require a disabled person to travel the entire length of the lot in order to travel from one level to
27 the next. He believes that the elevator only needs to be about 12-18" above the height limit.

28
29 Senior Planner Jester suggested including language that the elevator shaft extend over the height
30 limit the minimum amount required by building safety regulations up to a maximum of 3 feet.

31
32 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Powell/Lesser) to **APPROVE** Use Permit for a
33 Proposed New 18,000 Square Foot Education Building and a Variance to Allow Relief from
34 Maximum Allowable Building Height, for an Existing Religious Facility Located at 1243
35 Artesia Boulevard subject to additional conditions that there be a 5 foot setback maintained from
36 the parking area to Tennyson Street; that existing mature trees on the site are protected to the
37 extent feasible; that the applicant work with the Public Works Department to provide trees in the
38 public right-of-way; that the HVAC equipment be placed lower on the roof or taken off of the
39 roof and placed at a location away from public view; that the elevator shaft be the minimum
40 height required by Code but not extend beyond 3 feet over the 30 foot height limit; and that the
41 word "elevation" be corrected to "elevator" in item H(1) on page 1 of the draft Resolution.

- 1 AYES: Lesser, Powell, Chairman Bohner
- 2 NOES: Fasola, Seville-Jones
- 3 ABSENT: None
- 4 ABSTAIN: None

5
6 Senior Planner Jester explained the 15 day appeal period and stated that the item will be placed
7 on the City Council's Consent Calendar for their meeting of February 19, 2008.

8
9 **DIRECTOR'S ITEMS** None

10
11 **PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

12
13 Commissioner Lesser welcomed Commissioner Fasola. He indicated that he appreciates
14 Commissioner Fasola's experience as an architect and has enjoyed working with him on the
15 Mansionization Committee for over 1 ½ years. He also acknowledged former Commissioner
16 Jim Schlager for his contribution to the Commission.

17
18 Commissioner Seville-Jones commended staff on their work on the Mansionization Ordinance
19 and answering the questions of the City Council over an extremely long meeting.

20
21 Commissioner Powell also commended staff for their work on the Mansionization Ordinance
22 and indicated that most of the planning staff was at attendance at the City Council hearing.

23
24 Commissioner Powell commented that Richard Frank, the founder and publisher of the Beach
25 Reporter, is retiring. He indicated that Mr. Frank will be presented with a certificate from the
26 American Planning Association on behalf of the Manhattan Beach Planning Commission.

27
28 **TENTATIVE AGENDA: February 13, 2008**

29
30 **ADJOURNMENT**

31
32 The meeting of the Planning Commission was **ADJOURNED** at 8:30 p.m. in the City Council
33 Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, to Wednesday, February 13, 2008, at 6:30 p.m. in
34 the same chambers.

35
36 _____
37 RICHARD THOMPSON
38 Secretary to the Planning Commission

35
36 _____
37 SARAH BOESCHEN
38 Recording Secretary