

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
JULY 9, 2008**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 9th day of July, 2008, at the hour of 6:35 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

**A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Fasola, Paralusz, Powell, Seville-Jones and Chair Lesser  
Absent: None  
Staff Present: Laurie Jester, Senior Planner  
Daniel Moreno, Associate Planner  
Recording Secretary: Sarah Boeschen

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 25, 2008**

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Fasola/Seville-Jones) to approve the minutes of June 25, 2008.

AYES: Fasola, Paralusz, Powell, Seville-Jones and Chair Lesser  
NOES: None.  
ABSENT: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.

**C. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

None.

**D. BUSINESS ITEMS**

None.

**E. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)**

**1. Consideration of a Use Permit to Allow an Office Building Located at 818 Manhattan Beach Boulevard**

Chairman Lesser said that he is friends with the applicant's architect. He indicated that he has no financial interest in the project and feels he can consider the issue fairly.

Associate Planner Moreno summarized the staff report. He indicated that the Commission raised a concern at the previous hearing regarding the issue regarding the trash area and hours for trash pickup. He said that staff would not recommend any restrictions on hours for trash pickup, as such times are predetermined by the waste hauler for specific areas. He stated that staff believes the parking space #14 is not in an aisle and is not subject to the Code requirement which states that an aisle at the end of a parking bay providing access to a parking space perpendicular to the aisle shall extend 2 feet beyond the required width of the parking space to allow for back up access, and this interpretation has been used on other projects. He commented that the Commissioners felt at the last hearing that the compact spaces on the exterior of the building would be highly utilized and should possibly be converted to standard

parking spaces. He indicated that staff has included Condition 3 in the draft Resolution which requires the subject spaces to be standard size.

Associate Planner Moreno stated that there was also previously a concern expressed by the Commission regarding noise from the condensing units. He indicated that the building wall has been pushed out an additional 4 ½ feet in order to enclose the condensing units which would mitigate any noise issues to the neighbors to the south. He said that there was a concern expressed that the 15 foot alley is not adequate to provide access for the driveway. He stated that the City's Traffic Engineer has provided input that the width would be adequate to provide access to the proposed driveway. He stated that the Traffic Engineer supports providing a radius on the corner to allow access to exit the property. He said that the Traffic Engineer is not opposed to prohibiting left hand turns from the proposed driveway; however, he would not recommend blocking the alley onto 11<sup>th</sup> Street until the impacts can be further studied. He commented that the neighbors do have the ability to petition the City if they have a concern with traffic, which would be reviewed by the Traffic Engineer. He commented that landscaping with potted plants and trees has been incorporated to provide a buffer from the neighbor to the south. He indicated that staff does not recommend reducing the number of tenants for the proposed structure, as the parking ratio requirement 1/300 for general office use is based on the square footage of the building. He pointed out that Condition 2 prohibits medical office uses that have an increased parking ratio and only allows for general office use.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Associate Planner Moreno indicated that the clearance on the aisles on the north side of the parking area would be compliant with Code requirements.

In response to a question from Chairman Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno commented that staff's position is that the three proposed exterior compact spaces should be converted to standard spaces. He said that staff feels the spaces can be converted by widening the standard spaces to allow a reduction of the backup area requirement of 21 feet. He indicated that staff can approve the revision to standard spaces if it is agreeable to the Commission. He stated that staff does not have a position as to whether the three exterior spaces should be designated for employee parking.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the Parking and Public Improvements Commission on which he previously served always took into account the cumulative traffic impact of existing uses along with future potential projects. He commented that employees do not always follow requirements for employee parking and still park on adjacent streets even if directed to park on site. He indicated that compact spaces often times will remain under utilized because they are too small for average sized vehicles, and employees may choose not to park on site because of the smaller size of the compact spaces. He said that it is also difficult to enforce a requirement that employees park on site.

Senior Planner Jester commented that the Traffic Engineer uses the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) manual in making his determinations on traffic volumes which has standard rates for specific types of uses. She indicated that the Traffic Engineer felt that there would not be a significant traffic impact resulting from the proposal based on the projected traffic generation.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that her concerns are regarding the narrowness of the alley. She said that she has driven down the alley several times and has had a number of near accidents. She indicated that with the number of people who would be visiting the site, the alley width is a concern.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Senior Planner Jester indicated that a traffic study is only generated for a project that is much larger than the subject proposal.

Commissioner Fasola commented that the owner of Old Venice was recently killed when he was riding his bicycle near the subject alley when a car coming from the parking lot of the development to the west of the subject site struck him. He indicated that the area is one of the worst in the City for safety, which is an important consideration. He asked whether the City is considering safety when more cars are put onto Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He stated that he has concerns about the narrowness of the alley. He commented that there are parallel parking spaces on the development to the west of the subject site adjacent to the alley in which parked cars can extend into the alley, which further restricts the space and makes it difficult or impossible for two cars to pass.

Associate Planner Moreno stated that there is a concern with the speed and amount of traffic on Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He said that there is a much greater risk for traffic and pedestrians with access to the proposed development off of Manhattan Beach Boulevard rather than the alley.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that there are developments in the area that do have access from Manhattan Beach Boulevard rather than an alley.

Associate Planner Moreno said that the access from the medical building across from the project was only possible from Manhattan Beach Boulevard because it was the lowest point on the site and it would have required a great deal of grading in order to locate the access off of the adjacent street rather than Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He stated that each project is studied individually and closely by the Traffic Engineer and the project planner. He said that the Traffic Engineer recommends that access be placed off of a side street or alley rather than Manhattan Beach Boulevard when there is an opportunity.

In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, Associate Planner Moreno indicated that the City will study a traffic concern if there are residents of an adjacent neighborhood that are concerned with traffic and file a petition, although he is not certain of the number of individuals who need to sign such a petition. He commented that staff was not aware of any traffic concerns in the adjacent area until they were raised with the subject proposal.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno said that the Traffic Engineer did consider the safety of tenants of a nearby apartment building turning into the alley when cars from the subject development are exiting the exterior compact spaces. He said that the Traffic Engineer does visit the site to determine whether there are safety issues resulting from a proposal with adjacent properties.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that as community planners, she feels the Commission should take into consideration the impact to traffic that the subject project would have in combination with other properties. She asked whether any future development on the property to the west of the subject site would also have access from the alley or Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Associate Planner Moreno commented that he would assume similar consideration would be given to a future development on the property to the west for access off of the alley, based on the input of the Traffic Engineer that access from the alley helps to relieve traffic concerns on Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Moreno

indicated that he believes the Traffic Engineer would still feel that access from the alley would be preferable even if the property to the west were built to the maximum, but that would be reviewed when a project is submitted. He commented that access from Manhattan Beach Boulevard is also a concern because there is also a blind spot for vehicles traveling east on Pacific Avenue onto Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that another possibility is to require a dedication in order to widen the alley. She commented that she would want to be certain about whether the width of the alley is sufficient to provide access. She also asked regarding whether the Traffic Engineer has taken into account the impact of cars traveling northbound in the alley possibly having to back up because a car travelling in opposite direction is unable to pass with cars parked in the parallel spaces to the west of the site.

Associate Planner Moreno indicated that the issue of whether the width of the alley is sufficient for cars traveling in opposite directions to pass.

At 7:10, a five minute recess was taken.

**Louie Tomaro**, the project architect, said that they did achieve an additional 2 feet of back up area for parking space #8. He pointed out that the proposed use as a single tenant office is the least intensive that would be proposed for the site. He commented that the owner plans to occupy the building. He said that providing the exterior compact spots for employees and providing maximum back up space is preferable to having full sized spaces with 20 feet of back up area. He said that the location of the compact spaces at the rear of the property is furthest from the entrance and would be the least convenient for visitors. He indicated that visitors would want to park as close to the elevator as possible. He commented that the owner would be happy to park in the compact spaces. He pointed out that the proposal does meet the City requirement allowing 30 percent of parking spaces to be compact, and they feel the requirement should apply to their project as the proposed use would be the least intensive. He commented that staff did not recommend that they provide all full size spaces and request a parking reduction, as that involves a Variance. He said that the owner will use the property and will want the spaces in the front to be available for his clients. He indicated that they attempt with the design of their projects to provide access from the street or alley with the lowest traffic volume. He said that the lowest point on a property is typically the best point to locate the driveway in order to maximize its use, which is the reason that the medical center across the street from the subject site has access off of Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He pointed out that they chose to locate their driveway off of the alley even though it is the highest point of the lot in order to reduce the safety concerns on Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

In response to questions from Chairman Lesser, **Mr. Tomaro** said that the applicant is requesting that the second sentence of Condition 3 of the draft Resolution be deleted which requires that the three exterior parking spaces be changed to standard size. He commented that a drop off area for delivery vehicles is not provided because of the small size of the building. He said that UPS and Federal Express trucks would stop along Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He indicated that they feel the parking design meets the requirements of the City. He commented that reducing the number of parking spaces would require the reduction of the square footage of the building which is already at the minimum in order for the project to be viable. He said that the owner and his employees would park in the lot early in the morning, and the interior spaces would be available for visitors. He said that designating the exterior spaces as employee parking would help mitigate the amount of traffic entering and exiting from the compact spaces.

Commissioner Fasola commented that he is aware that the owner is attempting to maximize the

use of the property; however, the parking areas seem extremely tight for the project and are at or below the minimum requirements. He said that the project includes the maximum amount of compact parking spaces that are permitted, even though compact spaces are discouraged by the City. He indicated that the square footage of the proposed structure is actually larger than has been indicated which would require more than 21 parking spaces. He said that he feels the number of parking spaces will need to be reduced in order for any of the compact spaces to be changed to standard size. He said that his concern is that cars would end up parking on the street rather than on site because of the tight space for parking. He commented that there is not a large amount of street parking in the area, and the parking along Manhattan Beach Boulevard and along 11<sup>th</sup> Street is fully utilized.

**Mr. Tomaro** commented that they have provided sufficient space for parking. He said that they intend to meet the parking requirements, and he is certain that staff will examine the project closely to ensure that it is in compliance in their review. He said that he is not certain that any changes can be made to improve traffic circulation within the proposed parking structure. He said that 25 ½ feet of back up area would be provided rather than 24 feet which is required, and none of the parking spaces would overlap. He indicated that they will verify that the square footage is as proposed with the City during plan check.

Chairman Lesser opened the public hearing.

### **Audience Participation**

**William Wood**, the owner of the adjacent property to the south of the subject site, said that he appreciates the landscaping buffer that has been provided on the south side and that the position of the air conditioning units has been changed. He commented that there is an issue of traffic in the subject area. He said that he appreciates the suggestions to minimize the number of vehicles that enter and exit at particular areas along the alley. He commented that he would be available if there is any help he may provide in improving the traffic condition.

**Phillip Cook**, the applicant, commented that he has been a resident of the City for 40 years, and his ability to bring business and revenue to the City is tied to the property. He pointed out that the lot could accommodate a 7,000 square foot building, and he would build a structure to the maximum if he were not concerned with the look and feel of the building. He commented that he intends to work and live in the City indefinitely. He stated that he would not be an absentee landlord, and he will ensure that his tenants will not impact the neighbors. He indicated that he would establish penalties in the leases of his tenants if their employees do not park in designated parking spaces. He said that he would be the first one at the building in the morning, and his car as well as the cars of his employees would be parked in the outside parking spaces. He commented that the project is already underdeveloped as proposed given the cost of the land and of building, and he would lose an even greater amount of revenue if he is required to reduce the size of the structure. He indicated that his project should be permitted to have 30 percent of the parking be compact if it is permitted for other properties in the City provided that all of the concerns are addressed.

Chairman Lesser closed the public hearing.

### **Discussion**

Commissioner Powell commended the neighbors for their input and the architect for addressing their concerns. He pointed out that the property would be occupied by the applicant and would be a low intensive use. He stated that the structure is attractive; there are setbacks where none are legally required; the building would be 6,142 square feet and the maximum allowable is

7,051 square feet; the height would be 28 feet and the maximum allowable is 30 feet; and the project would include 9 percent landscaping and 8 percent is required. He indicated that to accommodate full sized spaces would require a reduction of the building size, and it is already lower than the maximum permitted. He pointed out that the Code does allow for 30 percent compact parking, and he is not certain that the Commission has the discretion to require that the applicant not include compact spaces when it is allowed by Code. He said that the project does meet the necessary requirements and is compatible with the City's General Plan. He indicated that it would not be a detriment and would not impact the safety, health or welfare of the community. He commented that there was participation by the community, and the architect took the concerns that were raised into consideration in the design. He indicated that he would be in favor of the project. He stated that he would eliminate the second sentence of Condition 3 on page 3 of the draft Resolution which states: "The proposed exterior parking spaces located adjacent to the alley shall be designated as standard size spaces."

Commissioner Paralusz commended the applicant and architect for working with the neighbors. She stated that she agrees with the comments of Commissioner Powell. She said that she would support the proposal and supports striking the second sentence of Condition 3.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she appreciates the comments of the applicant and that he is investing in the community. She also commented that the architect has done a very nice work with the design. She indicated that she feels that designating the exterior spaces for employees only would help to mitigate concerns by reducing the number of vehicles that enter and exit the spaces adjacent to the alley. She indicated, however, that she has a concern with the narrow width of the alley and that access to the site would not be from Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She indicated that while the Traffic Engineer may have taken into account the impact that a new project would have on the property directly west of the subject site, she is not certain how close the determination was as to whether or not access to the proposed development should be from the alley rather than from Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She commented that she is not sure that the advantages for the access being taken from the alley are so clear cut that access from Manhattan Beach Boulevard should not be considered. She indicated that she is concerned that a decision to allow access from the alley without clearly knowing the traffic impacts would impact the neighbors indefinitely. She stated that she is not certain if there is a close determination on whether the portion of the alley should be vacated and access to the development taken from the alley or Manhattan Beach Boulevard, and she does not feel she has sufficient information at this point to make a determination. She commented that she would like for the hearing to be continued and for the Traffic Engineer to come to the Commission with additional information.

Commissioner Fasola said that the issue of safety on the corner of the subject site is paramount, and the alley would permanently be narrowed to 15 feet once the building is constructed. He commented that the intersection of the alley and Manhattan Beach Boulevard may need to be considered, as cars currently bottom out as they come out of the alley and it is difficult to see driving down Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He pointed out that someone died last week near the alley, and safety is very critical. He commented that in addition to cars traveling very fast on Manhattan Beach Boulevard, children are walking to school in the area. He indicated that a thorough traffic study needs to be conducted before the design of the project is completed. He said that a better option may be to vacate the alley and access be provided at another location as suggested by Commissioner Seville-Jones.

In response to a question from Chairman Lesser, Associate Planner Moreno stated that only a limited traffic study was performed for the Walgreen's project that was recently considered by the Commission, and it is a much larger development than the subject proposal. He indicated that a traffic study typically is not required for a project as small as the subject development.

Senior Planner Jester pointed out that the Traffic Engineer does review all of the projects that come before the Planning Commission and will often provide comments. She said that a project such as the subject proposal does not require a full traffic study. She indicated that her understanding from the discussion is that some of the Commissioners feel there are specific safety concerns about the subject alley which make it unique and necessitate further review because it is narrow; because of potential future development of the property to the west; because of the close proximity to a school and the intersection with Manhattan Beach Boulevard; and because of the topography of the alley and Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Commissioner Seville-Jones pointed out that there is a difference between her suggestion and that of Commissioner Fasola, as she is suggesting that the item be continued and that the Traffic Engineer provide input at the next hearing and Commissioner Fasola is requesting that a traffic study be conducted.

Chairman Lesser said that he wants to be careful not to penalize the subject applicant. He commended the applicant and architect for creating a design for the site. He also pointed out that a much larger building could be constructed on the site. He also commended the applicant for being responsive and addressing the concerns of the adjacent neighbor and the Commission in buffering the appearance of the structure from the south. He stated that traffic is a real problem in the community, and the Commissioners are attempting to govern the direction of the building while addressing concerns of safety and traffic issues. He said that he is concerned that the Commission is holding the applicant more responsible than is appropriate for issues beyond his control, as staff and the Traffic Engineer have already expressed support for the project. He commented that questions regarding the narrow width of the alley were previously raised by the Commissioners at the last hearing. He commented that he still has a concern with the exterior compact parking spaces; however, he does feel the number of cars entering and exiting the spaces would be reduced by designating their use for employee parking. He said that he is not certain if he would want to direct the applicant to designate the spaces only for employee use; however, it would not be a requirement of the Resolution. He commented that he feels it would be appropriate for the Traffic Engineer to begin a study regarding the possibility of restricting left turns onto the alley from the proposed development. He said that he would support the project and would support eliminating the second sentence of Condition 3 in the draft Resolution.

In response to a comment from Chairman Lesser, Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she would like additional input from the Traffic Engineer regarding the amount of traffic that would be anticipated with the subject project and with a future development on the property to the west specifically regarding whether the alley could support traffic for both projects. She commented that there are no other businesses that access such a large number of parking spaces off of an alley as is proposed. She commented that she may balance the concerns of the adjacent neighbors more strongly if she had information that there was not a significant difference in safety between exiting the proposed development from the alley or from Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She pointed out that there is almost no visibility turning right from the alley onto 11<sup>th</sup> Street because of a wall that extends to the end of the alley. She indicated that she has a question as to whether the narrow alley can handle the impact as the amount of traffic is increased with the subject project and a potential future project to the west. She said that she also has a concern with the backup of traffic on Manhattan Beach Boulevard turning onto the alley.

In response to a question from Chairman Lesser, Senior Planner Jester commented that the Commission is considering the subject project, and it is not known what will occur on the property to the west in the future as there are no proposals for that site. She said that the

Commissioners should not base approval of the subject project on the potential impact of an unknown future project to the west. She said that the Traffic Engineer has reviewed the subject proposal and prefers that access for the site be from the alley rather than Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She said that each project needs to be reviewed on an individual basis and considered based on the type of use.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she does not feel she has sufficient information to decide whether or not the neighborhood could be helped by abandoning the alley for traffic and placing access for the subject development and a future development on the property to the west off of Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She said that she does not feel the Commission is being community planners if they do not consider the future impact of the redevelopment of adjacent properties and providing access from the alley.

Senior Planner Jester pointed out that the Engineering Division would not support vacating the alley.

Commissioner Powell indicated that the City Traffic Engineer has indicated to staff that the existing 15 foot alley is adequate to accommodate accessibility to the site. He pointed out that the Traffic Engineer is not opposed to posting a sign to restrict left hand turns as vehicles exit the parking area but does not recommend blocking off the alley to prevent traffic onto 11<sup>th</sup> Street without further study from the City. He said that he can approve the project, as nothing that is determined by a traffic study would change the design but only with the flow of traffic through the alley.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she agrees with the comments of Commissioner Powell. She indicated that she respects the comments of Commissioner Seville-Jones regarding the need to consider the impact of projects into the future and anticipating issues that may arise. She said, however, that she is comfortable that the Traffic Engineer has reviewed the project and feels the 15 foot alley is adequate to accommodate accessibility to the site. She indicated that it is not yet known what may be built on the property to the west, and access from the alley may not be appropriate for that project depending on the type of use. She commented that she feels considering this project based on a project that may or may not occur on the site to the west would be penalizing the applicant for an issue that is beyond his control.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she would have questions as to whether the project should access off of Manhattan Beach Boulevard if the Traffic Engineer provides information that it is unlikely that the alley would support access to an additional project on the property to the west. She said that access to Manhattan Beach Boulevard was provided for other recent projects because of the topography of those properties. She indicated that she feels she does not have sufficient information to balance whether or not it would be appropriate for the subject project to be from Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She commented that she does not feel a requirement restricting left turns from the project would be enforced. She indicated that the decision to provide access to the site from the alley would set a precedent for other projects. She commented that it is not her position that approval of the subject proposal is necessarily wrong but simply that she has a concern that there is not sufficient information to balance the options.

Commissioner Fasola indicated that he does not necessarily feel the property owner would be penalized by addressing safety concerns. He indicated that there are alternatives such as requiring a dedication to provide for a 20 foot alley width. He said that another option would be to provide for the removal of the parking spaces for the lot on the west side of the alley. He commented that the Traffic Engineer has indicated that he feels the 15 foot alley is adequate; however, he is not certain if all of the safety issues at the intersection were considered in the



Traffic Engineer's determination. He indicated that he would be more comfortable with additional analysis from the Traffic Engineer.

Chairman Lesser stated that it is the role of the Commission to review the analysis of staff; however, it becomes necessary for him to defer to the expert opinion of staff on issues for which they have much greater experience. He said that in this instance he is prepared to approve the project with the elimination of the second sentence of Condition 3. He indicated, however, that two of the Commissioners would still like further information from the Traffic Engineer on his thinking on this project, and he would want to provide the opportunity for additional information if they feel it would be helpful.

Senior Planner Jester pointed out that the Traffic Engineer did review the project and did specifically address the 15 foot wide alley as being adequate. She stated that the Traffic Engineer also preferred the option for access to the site being taken from the alley rather than Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Associate Planner Moreno commented that the Traffic Engineer did indicate that access from the alley was adequate although not ideal, and that it would be preferable to access from Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He indicated that safety is of great concern to staff in considering projects, and they rely on the expertise of the Traffic Engineer in arriving at their recommendations.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that if there is support from three of the Commissioners to approve the project, she is satisfied that the comments of the Commissioners are on the record and will be forwarded to the City Council. She said that the City Council can decide if they want additional information, and it is possible some of the issues raised by the Commissioners would be addressed in the information provided to the Council.

Senior Planner Jester said that the concerns of the Commission regarding safety would be included with the information that is provided to the City Council.

Chairman Lesser said that he is not certain if he would support a requirement for a sign restricting left turns from the project; however, he would support the possibility being studied further.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that if the project is approved by the Commission and moves forward to the City Council, she would recommend that the Traffic Engineer study the possibility of restricting left hand turns from the project further to determine if it is necessary. She said that she would not support imposing such a condition on the applicant as part of the approval.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the applicant did not have an objection to a sign restricting left turns from the project. He commented that he would recommend that a further traffic study be conducted without the necessity of the neighbors submitting a petition. He said that he would not want the residents to be forced to submit a petition in order for a further study to be done. He commented that such a study would not have to be a formal report, as it not required as part of the project. He commented that many times measures that are taken to control traffic have the effect of simply shifting traffic problems to other streets, which he believes would be reviewed in such a traffic study.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that if three of the other Commissioners feel there has been sufficient information presented in order to allow them to approve the project, she is satisfied that the comments of the Commissioners are on the record and will be forwarded to the City

Council.

Chairman Lesser said that he is in support of the project; however, he would be willing support continuing the hearing to allow the Traffic Engineer to address the concerns raised by Commissioners Fasola and Seville-Jones if it would be helpful for them in reaching a decision.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she does not feel it is necessary to wait for a unanimous vote and would encourage the Commission to move forward, as the applicant is waiting for a decision and would like for the project to move forward as quickly as possible.

### **Action**

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Paralusz/Powell) to **APPROVE** a Use Permit to Allow an Office Building Located at 818 Manhattan Beach Boulevard with the deletion of the second sentence of section 2, paragraph 3, on page 3 of the draft Resolution; and with a request that the traffic engineer to review whether a “no left turn” sign out of the proposed driveway for the development into the alley is appropriate.

AYES: Paralusz, Powell, and Chair Lesser  
NOES: Fasola, Seville-Jones  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

Senior Planner Jester said that the item will be placed on the City Council’s Consent Calendar for their meeting of August 5, 2008.

### **F. DIRECTORS ITEMS**

Senior Planner Jester indicated that the APA Conference is scheduled to take place on September 21-24, 2008 in Hollywood, and the early registration deadline is July 15, 2008.

Senior Planner Jester commented that the required ethics training for Commissioners is scheduled for September 11, 2008, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

### **G. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

Commissioner Powell commented that the APA Conference is being hosted this year by the Los Angeles Chapter, and there will be many very informative sessions that will be useful to the Commissioners. He said that the website is [laapa.org](http://laapa.org).

Commissioner Powell said that the Manhattan Beach Fire Department Community Emergency Response Team is accepting applications for their next program on disaster preparedness which will begin on September 2, 2008. He commented that there will be six meetings on Tuesday and Thursday evenings from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and one session on Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. He said that registration is available on the City’s website or the C.E.R.T. website at [mbcerta.org](http://mbcerta.org).

### **H. TENTATIVE AGENDA**

### **I. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. to Wednesday, July 23, 2008, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

SARAH BOESCHEN  
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

---

RICHARD THOMPSON  
Community Development Director