

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 10, 2008**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 10th day of December, 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: Richard Thompson, Community Development Director
Angelica Ochoa, Assistant Planner
Erik Zandvliet, Traffic Engineer
Recording Secretary: Sarah Boeschen

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 12, 2008

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that line 3 of the last paragraph on page 7 of the November 12 minutes be revised to read: “. . . however, the City has become trapped ~~by the fact that~~ in a situation where private parties have not been able to reach an agreement. She said that she does not have sufficient information regarding the dedication.” She said that the owner now objects to the dedication, and she is not certain whether there is a legal basis for the City to impose on the applicant the condition that the land ~~to~~ be dedicated to widen the street. She indicated that she is concerned that the property owner is now requesting that the wording regarding the dedication be stricken . . .”

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that wording be added to the second sentence of paragraph 11 on page 9 to read: “She said that she would support the item being continued and for their to be a period of time for the applicant to consider its position.”

Commissioner Powell requested that page 4, paragraph 6 of the November 12 minutes be revised to read: “In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, Mr. Sims said that they would not have an objection to alcohol service beginning at 11:00 a.m. rather than 6:00 a.m. as proposed.”

Commissioner Powell requested that the last sentence of paragraph 3 on page 16 of the minutes be revised to read: “. . . and he would question whether it would be beneficial to lose such a large amount of ~~downtown~~ parking to accommodate two units.”

Commissioner Powell requested that the second sentence of paragraph 2 on page 8 be revised to read: “He said that the hours for alcohol service should only be permitted from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. . . .”

Commissioner Fasola requested that the fourth paragraph on page 5 be revised to read: “Commissioner Fasola commented that although the dedication would be ~~up to~~ 3 feet from the subject building, the roadway of Sepulveda Boulevard would not necessarily be built up to that point because the sidewalk would be between the roadway and the dedication line.”

Commissioner Fasola requested that the first sentence of the third paragraph on page 9 be revised to read: “Commissioner Fasola pointed out that the City of Los Angeles ~~does require~~

often requires dedications as well as payments for improvements for change of uses.”

Commissioner Fasola requested that the third sentence of the first paragraph on page 13 be revised to read: “He commented that the development pattern along The Strand used to include homes . . .”

Chairman Lesser requested that the third sentence of paragraph 3 on page 8 be revised to read: “He said that staff has made a ~~cohesive point~~ strong argument regarding the dedication . . . “

Chairman Lesser requested that CEQUA be corrected to “CEQA” on page 12 paragraph 2 of the minutes.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Powell/Paralusz) to approve the minutes of November 12, 2008, as amended.

AYES: Fasola, Paralusz, Powell, Seville-Jones and Chair Lesser

NOES: None.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

C. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS (CONTINUED)

1. Consideration of a Use Permit for an Expansion at 1826-1832 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, of an Existing School (Manhattan Academy) Located at 1740 and 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard

Assistant Planner Ochoa summarized the staff report. She said that staff received a letter of opposition which has been provided to the Commissioners from a resident on 10th Street with concerns regarding the traffic impacts and additional cars of parents and employees from the school parking on the adjacent residential streets. She said that at the last Planning Commission meeting on September 10th the Commissioners did not feel an adequate number of parking spaces were provided based on the number of employees. She said that there was also discussion regarding placing a maximum on the number of students and employees to minimize parking and traffic impacts. She indicated that there were also concerns raised regarding the loading and unloading zones and the impact to traffic on Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She commented that the City’s Traffic Engineer is in support of the operation of the loading and unloading zones as proposed.

Assistant Planner Ochoa indicated that the number of employees has been reduced with the revised proposal from 25 to 20, and the number of parking spaces has increased from 18 to 20. She said that the total capacity of students for the three sites as proposed remains at 282 with an increase of up to 246 for the first year and 282 for the second year. She commented that the applicant is proposing to allow up to three parking spaces at 1826 Manhattan Beach Boulevard to be used as a play area during the off peak times and in the event that there is a decrease of employees due to low enrollment. She commented that the applicant would be required to maintain the existing ride share program in order to be entitled to a 20 percent reduction in the amount of parking to 20 spaces, which is supported by the City’s Traffic Engineer. She indicated that the applicant would also be required to submit frequent reports to the City in order to maintain the 20 percent reduction for parking. She commented that in the event that

the parking reduction is approved by the City Traffic Engineer, a minimum of 17 parking spaces would need to be maintained by the applicant with 12 spaces at 1740 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, 2 spaces at 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, and 3 spaces at 1826-1832 Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She pointed out that the applicant had previously requested to share the trash enclosure with 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard but that Public Works was still requiring a trash enclosure at 1826-1832 Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She stated that Title 10.60.100 of the Zoning Code states that all residential and commercial uses provide a refuse storage area, and Title 5.24.030 of the Municipal Code regulates the size, storage, and collection of trash, which is enforced by the Department of Public Works. She stated that the applicant has agreed to provide a refuse area with a minimum of 100 square feet within the building at 1826-1832 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, which is supported by the Director of Public Works and the Director of Community Development. She indicated that staff is recommending approval of the subject application.

Cheryl Vargo, representing the applicant, said that they are in agreement with the conditions with the exception of the definition of the peak times for the loading and unloading zones in Conditions 10 and 15. She said that the staff report defines the morning peak hours as being between 7:30 to 9:00 a.m., and they are recommending hours between 7:45 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. She indicated that they are recommending that the peak hours in the afternoon be defined as between 2:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. rather than between 2:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m.

Rich Barretto, the applicant's traffic consultant, showed a video of the drop off and pick up operation within the loading zones at the 1740 and 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard buildings. He commented that the video helps to demonstrate that the drop off and pick up operation is adequate for vehicles entering and exiting back into the queue of traffic on Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He said that the video observation of the loading area was filmed in November, and the footage was condensed from about 1 ½ hours to 2 hours of filming into three minutes. He indicated that the loading operation is successful in escorting children to and from their vehicles and allowing for vehicles to merge back into the flow of traffic.

Evan Levy, the owner of Manhattan Beach Academy, said that currently there is a maximum of 16 staff members at any one time, and the proposal is to have a maximum of 20 employees.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, **Mr. Levy** said that the school currently has 14 employees, and the number of teachers drops to under 10 after 3:00 p.m. He stated that there is a maximum of 2 volunteers at the school at any one time.

In response to a question from Commissioner Powell, **Mr. Levy** indicated that the enrollment has dropped from 207 as originally shown on the proposal to 194 as a result of current economic conditions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Levy** stated that they currently have 7 parking spaces at the 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard building and 12 spaces at the 1740 Manhattan Beach Boulevard building. He added that the seven parking spaces at the 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard building are currently not used because of the ride share program.

Commissioner Paralusz asked regarding the reason for the objection to keeping the peak hour times from 2:30 to 5:30.

Mr. Levy commented that there are three staff members outside to supervise the children at the loading area at 1740 Manhattan Beach Boulevard in the morning, and they cannot maintain the same number of staff members to supervise the children later in the afternoon when there are

fewer students.

Commissioner Paralusz pointed out that the condition does not require a certain number of adults but rather only that adult supervision be provided.

Marsha Mar, representing the applicant, commented that three staff members are outside at the loading area in the morning to assist the children from the vehicles into the school. She indicated that they would not want the teachers to be required to remain outside along the street in the afternoon to wait for cars to pick up the students between 2:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. and would prefer that they be able to supervise the children inside the building.

Ms. Vargo pointed out that the wording of the condition requires that adult supervision be provided along Manhattan Beach Boulevard during peak hours. She said that their concern is with adult supervision being required outside along the street until 5:30 p.m.

In response to a question from Chairman Lesser, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said he is not aware of other instances where credit for a parking requirement has been given because of a ride sharing program. He indicated, however, that ride share programs have been required as a mitigation measure for prior projects. He commented that the AQMD Southern California program for ridesharing allows for a 20 percent reduction in the parking requirement, which is the standard that was used for the subject proposal.

Chairman Lesser commented that his understanding is that there would be a larger parking requirement for a public school than is proposed for the subject school. He asked the reason why the standard of 2.25 parking spaces for each teaching station that is used for public schools by the State of California Department of Education Schools Facility Planning Division would not also be applied to the subject proposal.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet indicated that there are several differences between public schools and the subject school. He pointed out that there are a larger number of support staff members at public schools.

Chairman Lesser commented that the applicant has committed to phasing in the increase of employees and students. He asked whether the second phase of the increase in students and teachers would be predicated on the success of the first increase.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet commented that the applicant is required to conduct annual monitoring, and they would not be allowed to have a further increase in students if they are not able to meet the required conditions after the initial increase.

In response to a question from Chairman Lesser, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet indicated that his opinion is that the increase in the number of cars using the loading zone as a result of the proposed expansion would not significantly impact the eastbound lanes of traffic on Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Commissioner Paralusz commented that a letter was received from a resident on 10th Street stating that parents from the school park throughout the adjoining neighborhood while they wait to pick up their children. She asked whether staff has observed parents of students parking in the adjacent area and whether it is a problem.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet commented that he cannot deny or confirm the claim of the resident that parents park on adjacent streets while waiting to pick up their children.

Commissioner Fasola indicated that he is concerned that the proposal includes only 17 regular parking spaces and 3 handicapped parking spaces although the enrollment is proposed to increase 50 percent. He said that 4,500 square feet of classroom space is proposed to be added; however, only one additional parking space is being included. He pointed out that the revised proposal includes only one additional parking space from the previous proposal.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said that there would be a concern if it is determined that 17 spaces are necessary for the existing use and that the parking could not support an increase in the number of students and staff members. He indicated that staff's observation is that there are currently unused spaces and that the demand for the existing operation is 11 spaces rather than 17 spaces. He commented that a condition would be included that the applicant will lose their Use Permit if staff finds that parents or teachers are parking on the adjacent streets.

Commissioner Fasola asked if staff has a concern with having three separate loading areas with driveways between them where cars would be pulling out against traffic.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet indicated that the rate at which cars enter and exit the driveways is very low and is accommodated within the function of the street. He said that most of the teachers already arrived before the parents drop off their children. He indicated that it would be preferable for any parent who did need to park to use a standard space in a parking lot rather than park on Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said that he would recommend 25 parking spaces and no parking reduction for the rideshare program if the proposal were for new construction with the same number of classrooms and teachers. He commented that quite a few conditions are being imposed on the subject development in order to reduce the parking demand because of the limited amount of space.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she has a concern because there are already letters that have been received regarding the existing parking situation.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet commented that there are many businesses along the south side of Manhattan Beach Boulevard as well as a middle school in the adjacent area that could contribute to people parking on the adjacent streets. He said that staff cannot confirm or deny whether people are parking on the adjacent streets for Manhattan Academy or for other uses. He commented that no complaints were received before the subject application.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said that staff has observed that the existing parking is not currently fully utilized by the school employees.

Ms. Mar pointed out that 10th Street is two streets away from the school, and no parent would park that far away to wait for their child as is claimed by the resident in the letter. She said that they are often accused of problems that are due to the adjacent middle school. She indicated that they are adamant with new parents that they are not to interfere with the operation of the school or create problems with the neighbors. She pointed out that they move their larger events to other venues so that they do not impact the neighborhood. She commented that their loading zones at 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard are often impacted by customers of Tomboys.

Mia Levy, representing the applicant, pointed out that they would have fewer students at the new site than at the existing building at 1740 Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She indicated that

the unloading and loading of students is currently very smooth at the 1740 Manhattan Beach Boulevard building. She also stated that 282 students would not result in 282 cars dropping off and picking up students, as several families have more than one student at the school. She said that they plan to initiate a family carpool program for the next school year. She indicated that students who live near to each other would be matched in order to encourage carpooling. She commented that they have been an upstanding member of the community for 30 years and have provided an important service.

Chairman Lesser opened the public hearing.

There being no one wishing to speak, Chairman Lesser closed the public hearing.

Discussion

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson said that the entitlement that is approved with the Use Permit remains with the property. He stated that a future owner of the business would need to have a similar operation and comply with the conditions of approval if they wish to use the entitlements of the Use Permit without an amendment.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson indicated that if there was a parking impact to the neighborhood, a new owner would be required to create a new ride sharing program or else would have to come back before the Commission.

Commissioner Paralusz commended the applicant for their work on the project. She said that she is in favor of the proposal with several changes. She stated that she feels the applicant has addressed concerns addressed at the previous hearing regarding parking, reducing the number of employees, and accepting the trash enclosure requirement. She indicated that the video of the loading zone operation presented by the applicant's traffic consultant was helpful. She indicated that she does not have a concern with changing the beginning of the peak hours for dropping off as defined in Condition 10 of the Resolution from 7:30 a.m. to 7:45 a.m. She said that she has more of a concern with changing the evening peak hours. She suggested keeping the definition of peak hours in Conditions 10 and 15 until 5:30 p.m. but deleting the words "along Manhattan Beach Boulevard" from Condition 15 so that adult supervision is not required to be outside along the street until 5:30 p.m. She indicated that she is in favor of the annual reporting requirement as included in Condition 14. She stated that she also has a concern as to what would happen if the ride share program terminates in the future after the parking reduction is granted. She recommended inserting language at the end of Condition 12 to read: "If such reduction is granted but the ride share program is later terminated, the 20 space requirement will be automatically reinstated." She suggested adding wording to Condition 13 to read: "A potential temporary reduction of up to 3 additional parking spaces if the school has fewer than 20 full-time employees . . ."

Commissioner Fasola indicated that he is uncomfortable with supporting the proposal because of the parking. He commented that the goal of providing outdoor space is critical. He stated that there is at least a perception that employees or parents are parking on the adjacent streets. He said that 25 spaces should be the requirement for the subject proposal, as it is the number that the Traffic Engineer indicated would be required for a new project of the same size. He commented that the proposal is based on the best case for the parking situation and does not address the conflicts with the residents. He said that there are no spaces allocated for visitor parking as proposed, and visitor spaces should be included. He said that he would support the proposal with 25 spaces and reducing it to 20 later if there are no concerns.

Commissioner Powell commended the applicant for their work on the project. He indicated that the plans have been scaled down from the original proposal, and most of the concerns raised by residents have been incorporated in the revisions. He indicated that he would like for Condition 6 on page 2 of draft Resolution under "Operational Conditions" to include phasing in with a maximum of 246 students for the first year and a maximum of 282 students for the second year. He indicated that he feels Condition 10 adequately addresses the loading and unloading zones; Conditions 11, 12 and 13 address the parking spaces; Conditions 14 and 19 address enforcement in the event the share program is not continued; and Conditions 15, 16, 17, and 18 address the loading zones. He commented that the Traffic Engineer has indicated that the video that was shown was compiled over a period of time and is consistent with the actual traffic pattern. He said that the proposal meets the required findings and is consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan; is consistent with the CL Zoning Designation; and does not present a detriment to the health, safety and public welfare of the community. He indicated that he would support the proposal.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that it is a very close call as to whether or not she can support the proposal. She said that the school has made some efforts to address the concerns that have been raised; however, she is still struggling regarding the parking requirement. She indicated that the fact that staff has observed that the existing lots are currently not fully utilized is helpful in addressing the concerns. She commented that there have been a few complaints from neighbors regarding car parking on the adjacent streets; however, it is difficult to determine if the problem is directly related to the school. She said that she also has a concern regarding whether enforcement would work. She said that there does not appear to be a clear method to measure whether or not the ride share program is effective. She stated that she supports an approach that would phase in the additional number of students. She said that she would be more comfortable in supporting the project if she were certain that the phasing in of additional students would adequately test the effectiveness of the ride sharing program and the viability of the expansion. She suggested the possibility of having a scheduled hearing regarding the results after the first phase of the expansion. She indicated, however, that the difficulty with an additional hearing is that there may be adjacent residents who complain about cars parking in the adjacent neighborhoods that are not necessarily linked to the school. She stated another possibility would be to have a more thorough study from the Traffic Engineer and further reports from the school. She suggested that a review after the initial increase in students be included as a condition. She said, however, that there is a risk to the applicant that they would not be able to increase the number of students further to 282 if concerns are raised after the initial increase. She indicated that she would want to be certain that adult supervision was provided outside along Manhattan Beach Boulevard during the peak hours between 2:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. She suggested adding language requiring that adult supervision be provided along Manhattan Beach Boulevard between 2:30 and 3:30 and requiring that supervision continue to be provided until 5:30 p.m. but not necessarily outside.

Chairman Lesser said that he wants to support the school and the proposed expansion; however, there is a concern with its location along the perimeter of a residential neighborhood. He pointed out that the Commission is being asked to evaluate the impact to the surrounding area. He indicated that he would defer to the recommendations of the Traffic Engineer, although he has a concern with increasing the total capacity of the school up to 282 students given the potential impact to the adjoining neighborhood and to traffic on Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He commented that he has concerns regarding the adequacy of the reduction that is being granted due to the ride share program; however, the Traffic Engineer feels a reduction of 20 percent is appropriate. He indicated that he feels that some sort of evaluation after the first increase of students to 246 should be included in the Resolution. He commented that it was helpful to see the video of the current operation of the loading zone; however, the concern of the Commissioners is with the operation of the loading area after the proposed increase in

students.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she agrees with the suggestion of Commissioner Seville-Jones regarding defining the peak hours in the afternoon to be between 2:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. She indicated that she would not have a concern with changing the beginning of the peak hours during the morning to 7:45 a.m.

Director Thompson pointed out that the draft Resolution grants the applicant an entitlement to expand to a maximum of 282 students, and it does not give the authority for the expansion to be phased in initially up to 246 students. He said that the Commission could chose to allow the applicant to increase to 246 students and then have another public hearing to reevaluate the issue in order to allow a further increase to 282 students. He said that another possibility would be for the Commission to approve 246 students and allow staff the authority to approve an increase to 282 students if the applicant is able to demonstrate that they are able to accommodate the further increase.

Chairman Lesser commented that he would be willing to defer the decision to the Community Development Director of allowing a further increase in students from 246 to 282, but he feels there should be an evaluation after the initial increase that provides for some authority in addressing any concerns.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she would support requiring an evaluation after the initial increase in students; however, she would like for the item to be brought back before the Commission for a further hearing at that time. She stated that the Commissioners all share the concern regarding the parking. She indicated that she would like for the item to come back to the Commission after the initial increase in students so that they are able to evaluate whether it is working and to allow the public an opportunity to bring forward any concerns.

Commissioner Powell indicated that he also feels there should be a review after the initial increase in students; however, he does not feel it should be required to include an additional full public hearing before the Commission. He commented that he would like for the evaluation to be conducted by staff with noticing being provided to the neighboring residents. He said that the issue could then be scheduled for another public hearing if any issues arise.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she supports the suggestion of Commissioner Powell.

Director Thompson said that the easiest option would be for the Commission to approve an increase to 246 students and for the applicant to then apply for an amendment to allow for more students at a later time. He stated that staff would be willing to draft language that would allow them to approve an additional increase from 246 to 282 students provided that it is demonstrated that the applicant is in compliance with the conditions. He said, however, that he would want for the item to be brought back before the Commission at that time if complaints are received from the neighbors.

Commissioner Fasola indicated that he would suggest that the item be brought back before the Commission for an evaluation after the initial increase in students, as staff would most likely prefer that the item to be brought before the Commission rather than make the determination administratively.

Chairman Lesser pointed out that the operators of the school must know the number of students that may be admitted in advance of the fall semester. He indicated, however, that the Commission wants to be certain that a thorough analysis is conducted between the initial and

second increase in students.

Ms. Vargo pointed out that they would not have a problem with phasing in the increase of students and meeting the requirements of staff. She stated, however, it would not be worth making the improvement to the site if they are only allowed a maximum of 246 students rather than 282. She stated that they would lose a great deal if they did not comply with the requirements of the Use Permit, as the improvements would be a major investment. She commented that she felt the Traffic Engineer has addressed the issue regarding the parking requirement very well. She asked that the Commission not require another hearing after the initial increase in students unless there are complaints by the residents or an issue with Code enforcement. She commented that there is a great burden on them to receive time on the agenda and prepare for a hearing.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet pointed out that the number of students at the school is irrelevant to the issue of parking, as there would not be an increase in the parking demand provided that the number of employees remains at the same level. He said that it would be appropriate for the Commission to request an evaluation after the initial increase of students if their concerns are regarding the operation of the loading area and complaints of the neighbors. He indicated, however, that it does place a burden on the City staff in order to monitor the site and determine whether the applicant is in compliance.

Chairman Lesser said that the number of trips by parents as visitors to the school would increase by virtue of an increase in the number of students.

Commissioner Fasola commented that he could support allowing the school to increase to 282 students with a requirement that they provide 25 parking spaces. He indicated that it would then be left up to the applicant to determine the best option for providing the spaces. He said that he feels a review after an initial increase of students would not help the applicant. He said that staff can be given the ability after a year to reduce the parking from 25 to 20 spaces if it is demonstrated that the parking is not fully utilized.

Chairman Lesser commented that although the parking may be under utilized with the current operation, he has a concern that the parking supply would not be sufficient with the increase in students to 282. He said that he also is concerned about the operation of the loading area if the number of students is increased to 282.

Commissioner Paralusz pointed out that the Traffic Engineer has indicated that he is comfortable with the number of parking spaces as proposed. She commented that she is sympathetic to the economic concerns of the applicant if they are only able to expand to 246 students rather than 282. She commented, however, that a review after the initial expansion to 246 students would provide an incentive to the applicant to meet the required conditions in order to be permitted to have the additional increase. She said that she would like a phasing to require another hearing before the Commission, as she feels it is the role of the Commission to evaluate whether the expansion is working.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that a review process would only solve the issue for the first year and would not solve the fundamental problems of an expansion up to 282 students regarding parking.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the applicant does not feel providing 25 parking spaces is economically viable.

Director Thompson suggested that the Commission not allow an increase of students up to 282 if they are not comfortable with an expansion to that level.

Mr. Levy pointed out that the number of students is not related to the issue of parking. He pointed out that an increased enrollment would also result in more students carpooling. He indicated that the Traffic Engineer has stated that he is comfortable with allowing the 20 parking spaces as proposed. He indicated that they have not utilized all of the existing parking for the past nine years, and they feel the proposed number of parking spaces is sufficient with the increased enrollment. He said that they cannot put tandem parking spaces at the site at 1826 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, as the parking lot does not have sufficient width. He indicated that they also are not able to put additional parking in the yard area. He pointed out that one of the main reasons for the expansion is that they are losing students because of the lack of an outdoor play area at the 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard building. He indicated that they will provide reports to staff to demonstrate that the ride share program is successful. He stated that they would not be able to meet the timing requirements for enrollment if they are required to have an additional hearing in a year in order to increase to 282 students. He commented that they pay for their teachers to ride share and are very involved in reducing the number of cars on the street. He said that they are good neighbors. He indicated that the complaints that were received are from residents from approximately two blocks from the site, and parents would not park that distance from the school.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she feels the concerns have been addressed, and she trusts the judgment of the Traffic Engineer who has indicated that he does not have a concern with the parking as proposed.

Commissioner Fasola commented that he would be satisfied with approving the expansion as proposed with allowing staff the ability to increase or reduce the amount of parking based on the annual review.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she is concerned with allowing the 20 percent reduction for the ride sharing program and with the fact that such a reduction has never been granted for another project in the past.

Director Thompson suggested that wording of the last sentence of Condition 14 be revised to read: “The ~~City Traffic Engineer~~ Director of Community Development shall designate the exact criteria for the report and shall determine if it is appropriate to reduce the number of parking spaces to less than 20 or limit the number of employees and/or students based upon the findings of the report.”

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet commented that Condition 10 refers to the hours during which the loading zone would be effective, and he would not recommend any changes. He indicated that he would be in support of reducing the hours of active supervision in Condition 15 from 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. He stated that he feels it is appropriate for the peak hours in the morning to be defined as beginning at 7:30 a.m. rather than 7:45 a.m. He said that staff wants to encourage a larger time period for the loading and unloading of students in order to reduce the impact to traffic.

Commissioner Paralusz commented that she still would prefer language in Condition 15 to require adult supervision between 3:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. although not necessarily along the street.

Commissioner Powell stated that he would support the change to Condition 14 as suggested by Director Thompson and the change to Conditions 10 and 15 as suggested by Traffic Engineer

Zandvliet.

Commissioner Fasola requested that Condition 18 include that all school volunteers as well as employees are required to park at the school.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet commented that the words “loading lots” should be corrected to “parking lots” in Condition 18.

Action

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Fasola/Paralusz) to **APPROVE** a Use Permit for an Expansion at 1826-1832 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, of an Existing School (Manhattan Academy) Located at 1740 and 1808 Manhattan Beach Boulevard with a revision to Condition 14 to state: “The Director of Community Development shall designate the exact criteria for the report and shall determine if it is appropriate to reduce the number of parking spaces to less than 20 or limit the number of employees and/or students based upon the findings of the report; with the revision to Condition 15 to state that adult supervision shall be provided along Manhattan Beach Boulevard between 7:30 and 9:00 a.m. and 2:30 to 3:30 p.m.; and the revision to Condition 18 to state: “All school employees and volunteers shall be required to park in the school ~~loading~~ parking lots. . .”

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

Director Thompson explained the 15-day appeal period and stated that the item will be included on the City Council’s Consent Calendar for their meeting of January 6, 2009.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she cannot support the proposal because of her concern with allowing a 20 percent reduction in parking for the ride sharing program and with the difficulty of enforcing of such a program.

E. BUSINESS ITEMS

None.

F. DIRECTORS ITEMS

None.

G. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Commissioner Powell thanked staff, the City Council, and his fellow Commissioners for their hard work and efforts. He also expressed gratitude for the local residents and representatives of the local businesses who have provided valuable input for the Commissioners to help them in making their decisions.

Chairman Lesser also thanked staff for their dedication and hard work.

H. TENTATIVE AGENDA December 24, 2008

I. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m. to Wednesday, December 24, 2008, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

RICHARD THOMPSON
Community Development Director