

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT]MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMISSION
APRIL 9, 2008

1 A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach was held on
2 Wednesday, April 9, 2008, at 6:35p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland
3 Avenue.
4
5
6

7 **ROLL CALL**

8
9 Chairman Lesser called the meeting to order.
10

11 Members Present: Bohner, Fasola, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Lesser
12 Members Absent: None
13 Staff: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development
14 Daniel Moreno, Associate Planner
15 Esteban Danna, Assistant Planner
16 Sarah Boeschen, Recording Secretary
17

18 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** **March 12, 2008**

19
20 Commissioner Bohner requested that that “Highland” be corrected to “Haaland” on page 2 , line
21 5 of the March 12 minutes.
22

23 Commissioner Powell requested that the word “comment” be changed to “question” on page 5,
24 line 10 of the minutes.
25

26 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Powell/Seville-Jones) to **APPROVE** the minutes of
27 March 12, 2008, as amended.
28

29 AYES: Bohner, Fasola, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Lesser
30 NOES: None
31 ABSENT: None
32 ABSTAIN: None
33

34 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** None
35
36
37
38

39 **D R A F T**
40
41

1
2 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

3
4 **08/040901 Consideration of the Southerly Building Façade of an Approved Use Permit**
5 **for a Proposed Rite Aid Store Located at 1100 Manhattan Beach Blvd.**
6

7 Associate Planner Moreno summarized the staff report. He indicated that the Commission
8 previously considered the application for the Rite Aid store and had denied it because of concerns
9 with the building height, and the applicant filed an appeal of the Commission's decision to the City
10 Council. He commented that the Council approved the appeal with the condition that the applicant
11 redesign the façade of the southerly wall to reduce the appearance of building mass subject to
12 review by the Commission. He indicated that the applicant has provided a redesign of the westerly
13 and southerly elevations. He said that a planter has been included in front of the structure which
14 provides additional articulation of the building. He commented that the applicant has made an
15 effort to include additional landscaping with the redesign. He described the redesign of the
16 proposal.

17
18 Associate Planner Moreno commented that a pedestrian walkway has been eliminated to allow for
19 a planter on the south portion of the building.
20

21 Chairman Lesser indicated that his understanding was that the main purpose of positioning the
22 building as proposed was because of the Sepulveda Corridor Guidelines which call for pedestrian
23 access from Sepulveda Boulevard.
24

25 Associate Planner Moreno said that a pedestrian walkway was previously proposed on the side of
26 the structure but did not provide access to the entry area. He said that there is a pedestrian access
27 area on the southeast corner of the property.
28

29 Commissioner Bohner commented that his understanding is that the charge of the City Council is
30 for the Commissioners to only consider whether or not there has been sufficient articulation and
31 landscaping incorporated on the south side to break up the appearance of bulk, and issues such as
32 the height of the structure and regarding the Sepulveda Corridor Guidelines are not under
33 consideration.
34

35 Director Thompson indicated that the City Council supported the project but directed that the
36 applicant return to the Planning Commission with a redesign of the south elevation for further
37 review.
38

39 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that the impact to the Sepulveda Boulevard Guidelines
40 because of the elimination of a sidewalk is an issue that is now before the Commission as a result
41 of the new proposal and was not before the City Council. She stated that she challenges whether
42 the Commission should take into consideration the Sepulveda Boulevard Guidelines with respect to

1 the new changes.

2
3 Director Thompson commented that staff would agree that the guidelines should be taken into
4 consideration if the subject sidewalk was an integral part of the plan and provided pedestrian access
5 from Sepulveda Boulevard to the front entry of the store, which is not the case.

6
7 In response to a question from Commissioner Bohner, Director Thompson commented that the City
8 Council did approve the height of the structure and the silhouette of the building but felt that more
9 could be done to break up the massing on the south elevation particularly when viewed from
10 Sepulveda Boulevard. He indicated that staff does not feel more could be done to break up the
11 mass than is proposed without completely redesigning the structure.

12
13 Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she would like further information from the architect on
14 their thought process of using height, framing, paint, and landscaping in order to reduce bulk.

15
16 Commissioner Fasola indicated that he does not have a concern with the bulk of the proposed
17 structure. He commented, however, that since it is a single tenant building, there are no entrances
18 off of Sepulveda Boulevard that would be pedestrian oriented. He stated that the structure basically
19 would appear as a large structure with ornamentation along the sides. He commented that the
20 design includes a Styrofoam cornice, imitation stone, false windows, large overhangs, and concrete
21 roof tiles. He said that the structure and design do not seem appropriate for the site. He stated that
22 he would like for the design to be more uniform around the entire structure. He said that the design
23 features applied to the structure to him does not address the issue of mass and bulk.

24
25 Commissioner Powell requested that the gable in the center of the west elevation be painted a
26 separate color from the building as originally proposed rather than to match the building as
27 proposed with the redesign.

28
29 **John Kanig**, representing the applicant, said that he is proud of the redesign. He indicated that
30 they made changes in response to the comments of the Commission. He commented that the City
31 Council supported the design of the north, west, and east elevations but had a concern regarding the
32 southern elevation. He indicated that they agreed that the southerly elevation fell short of the
33 design of the rest of the structure. He commented that the redesign of the southerly elevation
34 results in it being consistent with the other elevations. He indicated that the windows on the
35 southerly elevation are actually windows and will allow light into the pharmacy area. He pointed
36 out that there are two landscaped areas along the southerly wall and along 11th Street which are not
37 depicted on the drawings.

38
39 **Bob Superneau**, the project architect, described the proposed redesign. He commented that they
40 are limited as to the types of trees along the side of the building because of the size of the planter.
41 He said they selected palm trees because they felt they would be the most likely to successfully
42 grown in the planter and would break up the massing.

1
2 Commissioner Fasola indicated that he has a concern that there is a lack of coherence of the entire
3 structure. He indicated that he does not feel the proposed design meets the standard for a structure
4 that will be located on the corner for many years. He said that he feels the gable placed on the wall
5 as proposed will look fake. He indicated that the redesign of the south elevation is more coherent
6 with the rest of the building; however, he is concerned with the design from all of the elevations
7 which appears simply to be applied ornamentation to the structure.
8

9 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Superneau** indicated that they are
10 limited in the type of tree that can be used next to the building because of the size of the planter.
11 He indicated that they can look at other options for the types of trees that can be used. He
12 commented that there will also be landscaping along the westerly elevation along Sepulveda
13 Boulevard.
14

15 Commissioner Bohner commented that the only methods for reducing the bulk appear to be with
16 landscaping and providing articulation on the front of the building. He asked if there were any
17 other methods of reducing bulk without having to redesign the entire structure.
18

19 **Mr. Superneau** said that they felt they did everything possible with the existing proposal to break
20 up the mass without redesigning the building. He said that they did not have much room to expand
21 any of the design elements further without impacting the parking. He indicated that they would be
22 happy to eliminate any of the design elements if it is the desire of the Commission.
23

24 Commissioner Powell commented that he would like for additional landscaping to have been
25 included instead of some of the concrete. He said that he has a concern that the type of trees that
26 are depicted in the drawings may actually grow taller than the roof line of the structure with only
27 the trunk in front of the building which would not break up the bulk. He asked if there is any
28 articulation that can be provided between the trees.
29

30 **Mr. Superneau** commented that they can work with their landscape architect to see if there are
31 other types of trees that would be full grown at the appropriate height in relation to the building.
32 He indicated that they felt that the palm trees which are depicted in the drawings would be the most
33 appropriate for the planter.
34

35 **Mr. Kanig** indicated that said that they would be willing to discuss the landscaping further with the
36 appropriate representative of the City. He said that he hopes that they can proceed with the overall
37 project.
38

39 **Gerry O'Connor**, a resident of the 500 block of Harkness Street, said that he previously expressed
40 his opinion when the project was originally proposed that he felt it is too large for the site. He
41 indicated that he feels the Commission did an extremely thorough effort in originally considering
42 the project. He said that the applicant then appealed the decision of the Commission and came

1 back from the City Council with approval that included a charge to the Commission. He indicated
2 that the criteria to judge whether the appearance of bulk has sufficiently been reduced is not clear.
3 He commented that although the Commission previously denied the entire project, they are now
4 asked to be an art jury on whether they feel the design is sufficiently improved. He stated that the
5 fact that the Commission was not given any information before the hearing regarding the new
6 proposal is outside of the normal process. He indicated that no new information was provided prior
7 to the hearing, and the residents must be provided with information before hearings as well as the
8 Commissioners if there is any hope to have any public participation. He indicated that he feels the
9 issue should be sent back to the City Council for clarification on their direction or for them to pass
10 judgment if they have specific criteria that they are not able to specify to the Commission clearly.
11 He suggested that the Commissioners at least continue the item to allow themselves time to fairly
12 and adequately evaluate the changes to the proposal.

13
14 Director Thompson stated that the plans were available to the public, however the site plan was not
15 included in the Commissioners' packets. He pointed out that the responsibility of the Commission
16 is simply to review the south elevation.

17
18 **Kathy Clark**, stated that she is pleased that the applicant has made an effort to include
19 landscaping in the design. She commented that with the upscale materials typically used with
20 new development in the City, she is surprised that the materials proposed to be used for the
21 project are faux rather than real. She stated that labor is typically the greatest portion of the cost
22 for construction, and she is not certain of the reason for using false stone rather than real stone.

23
24 Chairman Lesser closed the public hearing.

25
26 Commissioner Bohner commented that the charge of the Commission is only to pass judgment
27 on whether the articulation and landscaping on the south elevation is appropriate or provide
28 guidance as to how it should be changed. He indicated that he would be satisfied by the design
29 as proposed but would welcome suggestions from the other Commissioners as to possible
30 improvements. He stated that the City Council has approved the design, and the jurisdiction of
31 the Commission is only regarding the proposed changes to the south elevation.

32
33 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she does not feel the Commission should take action
34 without input from the public and without knowing that the public would also be satisfied by the
35 changes. She stated that she does feel comfortable in proceeding because there was proper
36 notice; but she believes that the public has a very important role in the process of building
37 design. She said that the Commission does have a very narrow charge from the City Council.

38
39 Commissioner Powell commented that in this case the site plan for the project is very important
40 for consideration of the proposed revisions. He commented that he frequently will take the site
41 plans and visit the property in order to visualize a project. He requested that for future projects
42 the Commissioners be provided with the site plan prior to the hearing. He stated that he agrees

1 that they are limited in their evaluation to considering the south elevation, and they should state
2 any changes that they feel should be made to the elevation. He indicated that it is difficult to
3 approve one elevation without considering the entire structure. He commented that he realizes
4 that the applicant has worked to reduce the massing of the south elevation. He said that the
5 Commission has been charged to consider only the south elevation, and they should express their
6 opinions on changes they feel should be made.

7
8 Commissioner Fasola commented that the project is large for the City. He stated that he does
9 not want to be in the position of being an art jury and passing judgment on the design. He
10 commented that the applicant has taken materials and placed them on the building. He said that
11 the south elevation is a reflection of the features which he finds unsatisfying with the design. He
12 commented that the applicant has simply taken materials and pasted them on the building. He
13 indicated that the design is consistent if the materials are used around the building, but it does
14 not satisfy the intent of making the south elevation more attractive or reducing the appearance of
15 bulk.

16
17 Commissioner Bohner commented that if the Commission provides their opinions that they do
18 not like the design, they should suggest alternatives that they feel would be preferable in order to
19 provide direction to the applicant.

20
21 Chairman Lesser indicated that he also does not want to be in the position of placing judgment
22 on the design. He said that the City Council has determined that the Variance factors for
23 approval have been met and that the height is acceptable, and the Commission has a very narrow
24 charge in reconsidering the project. He stated that the Commission does not have any criteria to
25 base their opinion. He said that the Commission may decide that they are unable to reach a
26 conclusion on whether the south elevation is satisfactory because they feel the scale of the
27 building is too large.

28
29 Commissioner Bohner said that he would accept the design as proposed but he would also not be
30 opposed to the Commissioners suggesting any changes. He commented that considering the
31 redesign of the south elevation is subjective and he is not in a position to instruct the applicant
32 regarding the design of the façade. He said that he feels the applicant has met the charge of the
33 City Council of reducing the appearance of bulk. He commented that he would agree that the
34 design is very busy, and he would be willing to consider suggestions for alternatives. He said
35 that he would not support the Commission stating that they do not like the proposal and not
36 providing any direction.

37
38 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that the applicant has attempted to reduce the bulk on
39 the south elevation by adding the stone planter and by adding the trellises which does break up
40 the height of the building. She stated that she would like more trees to be included, which add a
41 natural element that would be more attractive. She commented that the appearance of the glass
42 as proposed is not attractive although it is consistent with the approval of the City Council. She

1 indicated that the gable may add to the appearance of bulk rather than reducing it. She stated
2 that she would like to see an additional landscaping plan with other types of trees that may be
3 used. She commented that she would like to see the trellises with plants that reach up the side of
4 the building. She commented that the design of the south elevation must remain consistent with
5 the other sides of the structure. She said that she would support the item being continued to
6 allow the Commission more of an opportunity to consider the redesign. She indicated that she
7 would like to see an improved landscape plan with options for the types of trees that could be
8 used. She commented that she would also like for the gable to be redesigned.

9
10 Commissioner Powell also said that the purpose of the Commission is not to act as an art jury.
11 He commented that the subject site is located at a very prominent intersection of the City. He
12 indicated that the redesign does reduce the appearance of bulk on the south wall. He indicated
13 that the Commission should be specific in their direction to the applicant regarding changes they
14 feel should be made to the south elevation. He commented that there should be more
15 landscaping and that it should not be a type that would grow above the roof line of the structure.

16
17 Commissioner Bohner commented that his understanding is that the Commissioners would like
18 to see additional landscaping which would be a more natural approach to reducing the
19 appearance of bulk.

20
21 Commissioner Fasola said that he would like a more coherent design that is more consistent
22 around the building and that would include appropriate landscaping.

23
24 In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Commissioner Fasola indicated that
25 the left side of the north and west elevations that include stone around the windows be continued
26 around the building.

27
28 Chairman Lesser commented that he would be in favor of providing direction to the applicant
29 which is the direction of the Council. He said that the issue should be returned to the City
30 Council if the Commission is unable to reach a conclusion.

31
32 Director Thompson pointed out that the responsibility of the Planning Commission is simply to
33 consider the issue of whether the appearance of mass has been reduced on the south elevation
34 and not to provide an opinion on the architectural design.

35
36 Commissioner Powell commented that he particularly likes the stonework on the west elevation
37 and east elevation and would like it to continue around the structure. He commented that he also
38 likes the design of the stone around the windows rather than simply attaching gables. He
39 suggested that for any redesign that the stonework be carried around to the south elevation.

40
41 **Mr. Superneau** indicated that they could continue the stonework around the windows to the
42 south elevation. He pointed out that it is the feature that is the tallest portion of the building. He

1 commented that their charge was to reduce the appearance of bulk on the south elevation, and it
2 may make the south elevation appear higher rather than lower. He commented that they are
3 willing to look at options for the design of the south elevation; however, they are very limited in
4 time for approval of the project and moving forward. He said that they would need specific
5 direction from the Commissioners on any changes they would like. He indicated that they felt
6 they addressed the issue of breaking up the massing as directed by the Council. He commented
7 that it would be difficult to change the materials for only the south elevation that would not
8 effect the design of the entire building.

9
10 Commissioner Fasola indicated that he would like for the gable to be redesigned and for the front
11 and the back of the structure to be made consistent.

12
13 Commissioner Powell said that he agrees with the suggestions of Commissioner Fasola. He
14 stated that he would also like for additional landscaping to be added and that would remain at an
15 appropriate height and not grow beyond the roof line. He indicated that he would like for
16 additional stonework to be included.

17
18 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she would like for the gable to be removed; for additional
19 stonework to be incorporated; and for additional landscaping to be provided. She requested that
20 a visualization of the shrubbery in the planter and one or two additional trees along Sepulveda
21 Boulevard.

22
23 Commissioner Bohner said that he would want the additional shrubbery to be incorporated; for
24 the gable to be removed; and for additional stonework to be incorporated.

25
26 Chairman Lesser said that he would concur with the suggestions of the other Commissioners.
27 He commented that he hopes the applicant will return at the next meeting with the current plans
28 as well as with any additional changes so that the Commissioners are able to compare the
29 differences. He indicated that it is possible that the Commission will return the item to the City
30 Council to make the final determination.

31
32 Director Thompson pointed out that the item will not be presented to the City Council. He
33 commented that staff can implement the changes suggested by the Commission with the item not
34 returning to the Commission if they are comfortable leaving the final determination to staff.

35
36 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would like the item to come back before the
37 Commission. She commented that they have arrived at suggestions for possibly approving the
38 massing; however, the applicant has indicated that the suggestion of removing the gable may
39 actually make the building look larger. She stated that she trusts the opinion of staff but would
40 be more comfortable having another opportunity to review any new changes.

41
42 The other Commissioners agreed with Commissioner Seville-Jones that they would also like to

1 review any new revisions.

2
3 Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would like for the site plan with an explanation
4 of any new changes to be available to the Commissioners before the next meeting.

5
6 The Commission agreed to **CONTINUE** the hearing regarding the southerly building façade of
7 an approved Use Permit for a Proposed Rite Aid Store Located at 1100 Manhattan Beach Blvd to
8 April 23, 2008.

9
10 **08/040902 Consideration of a Master Use Permit Amendment to Allow the Incidental**
11 **Sale of Alcoholic Beverages for Off-Site Consumption at an Existing Grocery**
12 **Store Located at 1830 N. Sepulveda Blvd.**

13
14 Chairman Lesser indicated that he and his wife are customers of the applicants. He said that the
15 applicant contacted him to discuss the application, and he directed them to work with staff and
16 their neighbors. He stated that he has no financial interest in the project and feels he can
17 consider the application fairly.

18
19 Assistant Planner Danna summarized the staff report. He stated that the current Master Use
20 Permit does not allow the sale of alcohol for off site consumption at the subject site. He stated
21 that the applicant is proposing to amend the current Use Permit to allow the sale of beer and
22 wine for off site consumption. He indicated that approximately 7 to 8 percent of the total shelf
23 area is proposed to be dedicated to the sale of alcohol. He indicated that conditions are included
24 that alcohol sales shall be limited to 10 percent of the total floor area and permanent sign
25 notifications or additions to advertising the sale of alcohol will not be permitted. He commented
26 that Conditions 37 through 39 have been added to the Resolution, and all of the other conditions
27 will remain the same. He said that the Traffic Engineer has concluded that the proposal would
28 not result in a negative impact to the parking demand. He said that the Police and Fire
29 Departments as well as the Public Works and Building Safety Departments have expressed no
30 concerns. He indicated that the applicant has submitted a petition with the signature of 407
31 customers and residents in support of the proposal. He stated that notice was mailed to property
32 owners within 500 feet of the site and was published in the Beach Reporter. He said that staff
33 did not receive any public comments regarding the proposal.

34
35 In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, Director Thompson pointed out that the
36 land use entitlement would remain with the property if the operation were changed. He said that
37 any new use would have to comply with the same conditions as the subject business.

38
39 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked why there is a distinction between temporary and permanent
40 signs in Condition 39 of the draft Resolution.

41
42 Director Thompson commented that the second sentence of Condition 39 is redundant because

1 temporary signs are not allowed throughout the City without a permit. He said that the wording
2 is intended to ensure that the property owner is aware of the restrictions on temporary signs.

3
4 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked whether temporary signs advertising alcohol would be
5 allowed with a permit.

6
7 Director Thompson indicated that language could be added to state that temporary signs as well
8 as permanent signs advertising alcohol sales would be prohibited.

9
10 Commissioner Seville-Jones asked if allowing alcohol on up to 10 percent of the sales floor
11 would expand to 10 percent of the square footage of any additional area if the applicants
12 expanded into the neighboring store.

13
14 Director Thompson commented that he is not certain that staff has a concern with allowing an
15 expansion of 10 percent of the total floor area to apply to the new size if the store were to grow
16 in the future. He indicated that 10 percent is very minor even if the store is doubled or tripled in
17 size.

18
19 Commissioner Seville-Jones pointed out that Manhattan Bread and Bagel has a condition
20 prohibiting the service of alcohol. She asked whether the condition would also apply to
21 prohibiting someone from purchasing a bottle of wine at the grocery store and consuming it on
22 the patio of Manhattan Bread and Bagel.

23
24 Chairman Lesser asked whether language could be added without noticing to Condition 30 of the
25 original Resolution 05-06 to clarify that there shall be no alcohol served or consumed at
26 Manhattan Bread and Bagel Company.

27
28 Director Thompson indicated that the language could be added which would clarify the concern.

29
30 Commissioner Fasola asked regarding how staff arrived at the condition of allowing 10 percent
31 of the floor area to be devoted to alcohol sales.

32
33 Director Thompson said that staff arrived at the figure after discussions with the applicant. He
34 stated that the intent was to place a reasonable limit on the amount of space that could be
35 devoted to alcohol sales while satisfying the needs of the applicant. He indicated that such a
36 condition is enforceable if a complaint is received that a larger amount of the store's floor area is
37 devoted to alcohol sales.

38
39 Barry Fisher, the applicant, submitted additional signatures of 87 people to the petition
40 supporting the proposal to staff. He indicated that they sent letters to everyone within 500 feet of
41 the site inviting them to an open forum on March 19. He indicated that none of the neighbors
42 attended the forum. He stated that they also were not certain whether 10 percent being devoted

1 for alcohol sales is typical for space of a similar type of store, but they feel it would be
2 sufficient. He said that they would want the 10 percent to also apply to any new area of the store
3 if they are to expand in the future. He asked whether the alcohol permit would apply to the new
4 address if the store were to expand.

5
6 Director Thompson said that he would have to consider **Mr. Fisher's** question further to provide
7 an answer. He said that the worst case would be that they would be required to come back to the
8 City for an amendment to the Use Permit if they were to expand to include an additional address.

9
10 Chairman Lesser opened the public hearing.

11
12 **Karol Wahlberg** said that the store is a great addition to the community and should be
13 supported. She said that 10 percent is minimal and she supports the proposal.

14
15 Chairman Lesser closed the public hearing.

16
17 Commissioner Powell stated that he is in favor of the proposal and would like for the store to
18 grow. He pointed out that typically there is concern expressed when a project is noticed
19 regarding the sale of alcohol. He indicated that in this case, however, there was a petition signed
20 by many people in support. He indicated that he feels the required findings can be met for
21 approval.

22
23 Commissioner Fasola said that he would support the proposal and would support allowing 10
24 percent of the floor area for alcohol sales to also apply to any future expansion of the store.

25
26 Commissioner Bohner said that he agrees with the comments of the other Commissioners. He
27 said that he supports the proposal. He said that he would support adding language to Condition
28 30 to clarify that there shall be no alcohol served or consumed at Manhattan Bread and Bagel
29 Company.

30
31 Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she supports the project. She commented that she would
32 like for there to be clarification that temporary signs promoting alcohol sales would be
33 prohibited.

34
35 Chairman Lesser said that he also supports the project. He said that the applicants have opened a
36 small grocery store in the face of huge competition. He said that the proposal is reasonable
37 request to help their business survive. He indicated that the applicant serves the local
38 community, as many residents prefer a small store to the larger grocery stores. He indicated that
39 they have worked with staff and have contacted and provided notice to the neighbors regarding
40 the proposal.

41
42 The Commissioners agreed not to add language to Condition 30 to clarify that there shall be no

1 alcohol served or consumed at Manhattan Bread and Bagel Company.

2
3 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Powell/Bohner) to **APPROVE** a Master Use Permit
4 Amendment to allow the incidental sale of alcoholic beverages for off-site consumption at an
5 existing grocery store located at 1830 N. Sepulveda Blvd. with the addition that the condition
6 allowing up to 10 percent of the floor area for alcohol sales also apply to any future expansion of
7 the business.

8
9 AYES: Bohner, Fasola, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chairman Lesser

10 NOES: None

11 ABSENT: None

12 ABSTAIN: None

13
14 Director Thompson explained the 15-day appeal period and stated that the item will be placed on
15 the City Council's Consent Calendar for their meeting of May 6, 2008.

16
17 **DIRECTOR'S ITEMS** None

18
19 **PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

20
21 Chairman Lesser asked regarding correspondence the Commission received regarding the
22 property at 511 Pacific Avenue.

23
24 Director Thompson indicated that the City is currently in litigation with the property owner
25 regarding the issue, and the Commissioners should not communicate with the applicant
26 regarding the issue. He said that the correspondence was provided to the Commission for their
27 information.

28
29 Commissioner Bohner commented that Commissioner Powell has written an article regarding the
30 Commission and their role in the City which has been published in the Manhattan Beach Sun.

31
32 Chairman Lesser said that he and Director Thompson attended the California League of Cities
33 Planners Institute on March 26 to March 28 in Sacramento. He commented that the conference
34 was particularly interesting and useful, with a focus on implementing and complying with
35 California's new regulations for reducing carbon dioxide emissions. He indicated that he also
36 attended a session regarding providing incentives to property owners to preserve historic
37 buildings.

38
39 **TENTATIVE AGENDA: April 23, 2008**

40
41 a. Use Permit / 24-Hour Retail Drugstore at 2400 Sepulveda Blvd.

1 b. Code Amendment / Medical Marijuana Dispensaries

2

3 **ADJOURNMENT**

4

5 The meeting of the Planning Commission was **ADJOURNED** at 9:00 p.m. in the City Council
6 Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, to Wednesday, April 23, 2008, at 6:30 p.m. in the
7 same chambers.

8

9

10 _____
11 RICHARD THOMPSON
Secretary to the Planning Commission

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary