

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 11, 2009**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 11th day of February, 2009 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: Paralusz, Powell, Seville-Jones, Chair Lesser
Absent: Fasola
Staff Present: Richard Thompson, Community Development Director
Laurie Jester, Planning Manager
Recording Secretary: Sarah Boeschen

B. REORGANIZATION

Reorganization of Commission Officers

Commissioner Lesser thanked the City Council for allowing him the opportunity to serve on the Commission and his fellow Commissioners and staff for their service. He indicated that as Chairman he has attempted to facilitate a proactive discussion among the Commissioners and with the public when there have been policy issues where there has been disagreement. He said that he has been helped by a very able group of Commissioners and staff.

Chairman Powell indicated that Commissioner Lesser has served as a role model; has kept the meetings moving at a rapid pace; and always has allowed everyone an equal opportunity to speak. He presented Commissioner Lesser with a plaque from the Commissioners, City Council and staff as well as a certificate from the Southern California Chapter of the American Planning Association in recognition of his service as Chairman.

Commissioner Seville-Jones also thanked Commissioner Lesser and stated that it has been a pleasure serving on the Commission with him as Chairman. She said that Commissioner Lesser has great compassion for members of the public; has great wisdom; and has always been prepared for discussions. She said that Commissioner Lesser's questions have helped to define the issues, and he has set an example for working with staff.

Commissioner Paralusz echoed the comments of the other Commissioners and thanked Commissioner Lesser for his leadership.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

1. Regular Meeting of January 28, 2009

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the spelling of the word “licence” be corrected to “license” in the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 4 of the January 28 minutes.

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the spelling of “Planning Manger” be corrected to “Planning Manager” on the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 5 of the minutes.

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that “Carol Wahlberg” be corrected to “Karol Wahlberg” in the last paragraph of page 6 of the minutes.

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the spelling of “Culligan” be corrected to “Colligan” on paragraph 8 on page 12 of the minutes.

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the wording of the third paragraph on page 12 be revised to read: “~~She stated that if unlicensed general contractors are on the City’s list of tree trimmers~~ She would suggest that the website indicate that trimmers listed on the website ~~they~~ are not necessarily trained in the ANSI A300 standards ~~or are an arborist.~~”

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the wording of paragraph 7 on page 13 be corrected to read: “Commissioner Powell said that ~~she~~ he agrees with the comments of Chairman Lesser”

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Paralusz) to **APPROVE** the minutes of January 28, 2009, as amended.

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

2. Special Adjourned Meeting (Housing Element Workshop) - January 29, 2009

Regarding page 3 of the January 29 minutes listing the proposed sites that were considered for additional housing, Commissioner Lesser said that his recollection is that the Commission had an open conversation about the sites as possibilities but did not make a formal decision on them. He said that he would propose that the wording of the minutes be changed from “all Commissioners Opposed” to “all Commissioners Reviewed.”

Commissioner Paralusz said that she would be in favor of the change suggested by

Commissioner Lesser. She stated that she feels the word “reviewed” would be more appropriate, as no official action was taken at the meeting.

Commissioner Lesser commented that he would agree with the suggestion of Gary Osterhout in his e-mail to the Commissioners that the term “second family units” should be referred to as “second units.”

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Paralusz/Lesser) to **APPROVE** the minutes of January 29, 2009, as amended.

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

D. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS

01/28/09-1 City Council 2008-2009 Work Plan Item: Zoning Code Amendment to the Tree Preservation Regulations (Section 10.52.120 of the Zoning Code) and Related Code Sections, to Revise the Tree Preservation Regulations, to Provide More Flexibility and to Require a Tree Trimmers Permit

Planning Manager Jester summarized the staff report. She indicated that staff’s understanding after the last hearing was that there was general support for the proposed revisions but that the Commission wanted to be certain that there was consistency throughout the document. She said that there was particular concern expressed by the Commissioners regarding the sentence stating that residential buildings taking priority over tree preservation. She indicated that the sentence has been moved from section D and added to the purpose section of the Ordinance. She summarized the changes to the language of the Ordinance that have been made since the last hearing. She indicated that staff received suggested changes from Ron and Nancy Howell who are residents of Pacific Avenue. She indicated that they are suggesting that the second paragraph of the purpose section be revised to include the words “and location appropriate” immediately after the word “healthy” each time it appears. She said that there are already a number of criteria, and staff does not feel it is necessary to add the suggested wording. She indicated that they also are suggesting that item 2 of section G be revised to read: “The tree is a health or safety hazard ~~or is structurally unstable~~ or is a threat to an existing structure such that trimming or pruning the tree to avoid structure impingement would significantly risk the health of the tree.” She pointed out that the issue is covered in item 5 which includes language regarding trees causing damage to private property. She said that they are also suggesting that

language be added to the end of item 4 of section G to read: “. . . are not feasible or property development is limited to criteria significantly less than otherwise would be permitted by the applicable building codes and regulations.” She commented that the purpose section is very clear with the language regarding residential buildings taking priority over tree preservation.

Planning Manager Jester indicated that Gary Osterhout also sent an e-mail to staff with suggested changes to the language of the Ordinance. She commented that he suggested changing some of the wording such as “feasible,” “reasonable,” and “generally.” She pointed out that staff intentionally included the words in order to provide balance and flexibility. She commented that trees are living organisms, and it is difficult for regulations to cover every situation. Regarding additional comments in Mr. Osterhout’s e-mail, she said that four members of the Tree Committee were involved with staff in developing the tree trimmers permit and who were provided with the proposed tree ordinance revisions. She commented that staff has purchased a number of booklets and handouts that are available to the public at City Hall and the website.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, Planning Manager Jester stated that people can be forwarded on the City’s website to information regarding tree pruning requirements by typing in “tree pruning” in the search bar.

Commissioner Paralusz pointed out that Mr. Osterhout indicated that he typed “tree trimming” in the search bar and was not able to find any information. She asked whether the website could be updated to provide a link rather than requiring people to search for tree pruning or trimming in order to find information.

Planning Manager Jester said that she can discuss the issue of updating the website with the City’s IS Department.

Commissioner Paralusz suggested having a link on the website under “going green.”

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked about the reasoning for the requirement in the Tree Trimmers Permit Application of 24 hours notice before a tree is trimmed rather than 48 or 72 hours. She said that she understands at the last meeting staff had indicated there are issues with the time frame in which tree trimmers schedule jobs.

Planning Manager Jester indicated that increasing the time for notice was discussed at the last meeting, but the time was left at 24 hours because of the issue of scheduling jobs. She indicated that having a requirement of 48 hours would be feasible; however, a noticing requirement of 72 hours probably would be too long of a time period.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Planning Manager Jester stated that Section M of the Ordinance addresses the violation of any portion of the tree preservation regulations. She said that the penalty for violation of the standards would depend on the

situation and the nature of the violation.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she understands that any tree trimmer who performs a job over \$500.00 is required by the State to have a license. She asked whether staff has considered also requiring that tree trimmers who perform jobs under \$500.00 have a State certification.

Commissioner Paralusz pointed out that she is not certain that it would be legal for the City to have requirements for tree trimmers that are more stringent than the State.

Director Thompson stated that the City cannot require someone to receive a State license.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she would think that the City should be able to choose to issue permits to only those who have a State license.

In response to a question from Chairman Powell, Planning Manager Jester said that the City Attorney has reviewed the proposed changes as to form.

Chairman Powell opened the public hearing.

Marcia Hopwood said that she appreciates the improvements from the original Ordinance and the renovations discussed at the last meeting. She indicated, however, that she does not feel the new language addresses the issue of homeowners who live on properties with older trees which are dying. She said that she still feels the proposed language of the Ordinance imposes penalties and discourages the removal of trees that are dying because of the necessity of receiving a permit, paying a fee, and finding a replacement of a 36-inch box tree. She commented that some of the proposed language has made the Ordinance difficult to understand and to administer. She indicated that the language of the Ordinance as proposed sets the foundation for implementing more fees. She commented that although there is no fee proposed currently for licensing tree trimmers, there is the possibility of such a fee in the future. She said that it should be made easier to replace trees that have major branches which are dead and would be appropriate to replace.

Chairman Powell closed the public hearing.

Discussion

Planning Manager Jester pointed out that Section G does allow for removal of trees that are dying or in marginal condition where there are not alternatives for preservation. She indicated that the fee for removal of a dead or dying tree was reduced to \$100.00 recently by the City Council. She commented that there was an extensive fee study that was done which was not implemented by the City Council until July of last year. She said that the fees only cover the cost of services provided by the City arborists time and staff's time. She indicated that staff

had proposed a fee of \$65.00 for the Tree Trimmers Permit, and the Council determined that they did not want to charge a fee. She commented that staff would be happy for suggestions from the Commissioners to make any further revisions in order to clarify the language. She pointed out that the Ordinance is not as straight forward as other sections of the Code because trees are complex living organisms and it requires a balance of maintaining the neighborhood character while allowing people to develop their property.

Commissioner Lesser commented that he is concerned regarding the density of conflicting goals in the Ordinance as it has been revised. He indicated that he supports the overall goal of giving greater flexibility to the Community Development Director in reviewing tree removal permits. He said that he is concerned with residents being able to understand the language of the Ordinance, and he would like for it to be further streamlined. He stated that he understands the reason for moving the sentence from Section D (7) into the purpose section which states: "Residential buildings shall take priority over tree preservation, however alternative designs and materials shall be considered and implemented, as feasible, with the proposed overall design of the project." He said that he would suggest that the sentence should be cut down to the first clause if it is in fact intended as part of the purpose of the Ordinance. He indicated that it otherwise may be more appropriate for the sentence to be placed back in item D(7) as it is currently worded. He indicated that he is concerned that the purpose section is not very clear as currently proposed.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would have a concern with returning the sentence to item D(7), as that section specifically relates to preservation of trees during grading and construction operations. She said that she also feels tree preservation should be considered but not necessarily take away from the ability to build a residential structure except in minor ways, and she would have a concern with including only the first portion of the sentence. She suggested moving the sentences in the purpose section that relate to the design of the residences into a separate paragraph. She suggested starting a new paragraph in section A with the first sentence to read: "The intent of this section is the reasonable retention and preservation of healthy trees while considering and balancing the reasonable enjoyment of private property." She suggested that the second sentence of the new paragraph then read: "Residential buildings shall take priority over tree preservation, however alternative designs and materials shall be considered and implemented, as feasible, with the proposed overall design of the project." She suggested that the third sentence of the paragraph read: "The design of residences, including grading, driveways, walkways, patios, utilities and right-of-way improvements, shall consider and accommodate existing healthy protected trees as reasonably feasible."

The Commissioners agreed with the wording of a new paragraph as suggested by Commissioner Seville-Jones.

Commissioner asked whether it would be more appropriate to relocate the second sentence in item G which reads: "The Director shall also consider the age, species, history, and location of the tree in relationship to other trees, and existing and proposed surrounding structures, utilities

and other improvements.” He suggested possibly moving the sentence to the purpose section of the Ordinance.

Planning Manager Jester commented that the statement does relate to the purpose of the Ordinance but also is specific to the tree permit.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she also feels the sentence may be more appropriate to be place in the purpose section. She suggested that language be revised to read: “The Director shall consider a range of factors including the age species, history, and location of the tree in relationship to other trees, and existing and proposed surrounding structures, utilities and other improvements when considering issues under the Tree Ordinance.”

Director Thompson indicated that section G relates to the process of issuing a tree permit. He commented that the intent of including a purpose section is to better explain the Ordinance. He said that he would not want the language regarding the process of issuing a permit to be confused with the purpose. He suggested that section G begin with a sentence that reads: “When reviewing a Tree Permit application, the Director of Community Development will do the following.”

Commissioner Paralusz suggested changing the title of section G from “Tree Permit Criteria” to a title which better relates to the process of issuing a tree permit.

Planning Manager Jester suggested breaking down the section into the three separate areas. She indicated that the first step in issuing a tree permit is to determine if the application is consistent with the purpose of the Ordinance. She said that then staff determines whether the application meets the criteria as specified in section G. She indicated that staff then considers the age, species, history, and location of the tree in relationship to other trees and existing and proposed surrounding structures, utilities and other improvements.

Commissioner Lesser said that he would support breaking the section into three elements as suggested by Planning Manager Jester with the first relating to whether an application is consistent with the purpose; the second relating to the Director considering the age species, history and location of the tree in relationship to other trees; and the third relating to whether the application meets the criteria for removal as listed in the section.

Commissioner Lesser suggested that the second sentence of item 5 under section G be revised as suggested by Director Thompson at the last meeting to read: “Trees causing ~~minor~~ damage to sewers, water lines, or other similar private underground utilities, in and of itself generally shall not be considered to meet the criteria for removal and replacement.” He commented that the word “minor” can be very subjective, and homeowners with tree roots intruding into their sewer lines would not consider the damage minor.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Director Thompson commented that

enforcement of people complying with the ANSI A300 standards depends on whether it can be established that there was intent in violating the requirements. He said that the largest fines have been issued in instances where it is obvious that the intent was to remove the tree regardless of the requirements. He said that the main concern staff had is regarding developers removing trees to build new homes. He said that staff discovered that it was not necessarily the developers that were removing trees in violation of the requirements but rather homeowners who were not aware of the regulations. He commented that the developers and homeowners are now aware of the Ordinance, and people will check with the City before removing a tree. He said that staff has always had a concern with enforcement of complying with the ANSI A300 standards, and it was felt by the Tree Committee that the proposed language of the Ordinance was the best means of applying the standards. He indicated that simply preventing trees from being topped and preventing the pruning of more than 25 percent of the live foliage would achieve most of the desired effect. He said that it would be difficult to achieve 100 percent compliance with the ANSI A300 standards; however, the proposed language would help in informing people that there is a standard.

Commissioner Lesser commented that he is concerned with homeowners that engage tree services to cut trees who do not comply with the ANSI A300 standards or homeowners who aspire to comply with the standards themselves but still do not trim their trees properly.

In response to a question from Chairman Powell, Director Thompson said that responsibility for further educating the public regarding the new standards once the proposed revisions are passed would be shared by staff and the Tree Committee.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked whether there would be support for requiring 48 hour notice before a tree is trimmed rather than 24 hours as currently included in the Tree Trimmers Permit.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she would not be opposed to requiring 48 hours notice before a tree is trimmed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Planning Manager Jester indicated that there is an exemption for emergency removal of a tree.

Commissioner Seville-Jones suggested requiring 48 hours notice before pruning of a tree. She pointed out that the notice for removal currently is for a longer period. She indicated that she has been troubled about whether or not every tree trimmer understands the ANSI A300 standards because it is the guideline on which the City is depending. She indicated that she is willing to support the proposed language of the Ordinance which would not require a State license for tree trimmers to perform jobs under \$500.00, as she would not want for small operators to be excluded from working in the community. She said that she hopes that the City can monitor smaller jobs to determine if there is a correlation between not having a State license and violating the standards.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she feels the revised language attempts to provide flexibility in balancing the private property rights of residents with the interests of the community. She stated that she has a concern that there may be too much flexibility provided with the revised language which could result in more trees being lost and necessitate another shift toward preservation. She indicated that she would like for the Commissioners to review the Ordinance in six months or a year to look at the number of tree permits that were issued in order to monitor the tree population. She stated that it is important to determine whether trees are being saved and whether the City's tree canopy is improving. She said that she would like for the possibility to be considered of developing a tree inventory for public and private trees. She indicated that she would also like for further consideration to be given to improving the tree canopy in public areas including parking lots. She suggested that the possibility be considered of developing tree canopy regulations for parking lots. She indicated that she would also like for the possibility to be considered of adding flexibility in the building guidelines to allow some leeway for setbacks in order to preserve an existing tree. She stated that she also would like further consideration of establishing minimum landscaping requirements for walk-streets. She also suggested that the City website include a list of trees that grow well in the City's climate. She said that she would also hope that incentives will be provided to encourage people to put more than the minimum number of trees in their front yards.

Commissioner Paralusz commented that she also would like for the Commission to have the opportunity to revisit the Ordinance after six months or a year. She indicated that hopefully the revised language will help to balance the interests of the community and private property owners more appropriately.

In response to a comment from Chairman Powell, Director Thompson said that the language does specify a review period for the Ordinance.

Chairman Powell indicated that he feels the revised language is a great step in providing flexibility for homeowners while providing adequate protection of the City's tree canopy. He stated that he supports the proposed changes as suggested. He commented that he also supports further consideration of the suggestions made by Commissioner Seville-Jones, and he would like for them to be included as recommendations for the City Council to consider.

Chairman Powell reopened the public hearing.

Gerry O'Connor suggested that the term "Tree Permit" be changed to "Tree Removal Permit" for clarification in sections E, F and G. He stated that the language as proposed is divided into separate sections regarding tree permit applications without building permits and tree permit applications with building permits. He commented that the City has control in instances where tree permits accompany building permits because they cannot issue the final inspection certificate of occupation until the tree plan is properly executed. He said that in situations

where there is no accompanying building permit, staff is required to follow up to verify that a replacement tree has been provided. He commented that there are several instances in his neighborhood where protected trees have been removed and have not been replaced as required. He said that it is an unrealistic expectation of staff to follow up on all tree permits to ensure that a replacement tree is planted. He suggested that item 3 under section E regarding Tree Permit Applications without a Building Permit be revised to read: “A bond, cash deposit or other financial security, ~~may~~ shall be required to ensure required replacement trees are planted and/or that existing protected trees are properly protected, as determined to be appropriate by the Community Development Director.”

Mr. O’Connor commented that the first sentence of section H regarding replacement trees reads: “Required replacement trees shall be minimum 36-inch box trees for each protected tree removed of an appropriate species and must be planted prior to final inspection.” He pointed out that there is no final inspection in instances where a tree is removed and there is no accompanying building permit which requires an inspection. He suggested that wording be added to the end of the first sentence of section H to state: “. . . must be planted prior to final inspection in the case of an associated building permit or within 90 days in the case of no associated building permit.” He suggested that the responsibility of following up on whether a replacement tree has been planted in instances where a tree permit does not accompany a building permit should be removed from staff.

Chairman Powell closed the public hearing.

Planning Manager Jester commented that she does not feel there has been an issue with staff following up on the planting of required replacement trees. She said that the Tree Permit Application specifies that the location and species of replacement tree must be approved by the Planning Department. She stated that three months after a permit is issued, the City’s Code Enforcement officer inspects the site to make sure that the replacement tree has been planted. She suggested that **Mr. O’Connor** provide staff with a list of properties that he is aware of where replacement trees have not been planted.

Commissioner Lesser said that the enforcement of the regulations should possibly be addressed if it is a problem. He said that he would welcome further information regarding any violations of providing replacement trees when the item comes back before the Commission.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Planning Manager Jester said that there is a concern in the community regarding the City imposing fees, and staff would be concerned with implementing an additional bond as suggested by **Mr. O’Connor**. She indicated that property owners already are required to pay for removal of a tree, the fee for the permit, and the cost of a replacement tree.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would not support requiring a bond for replacement of a tree. She commented that failure to provide a required replacement tree is an

issue of enforcement, and she does not feel residents should be required to pay a bond in order to remove a dying tree. She said that she would be in favor of including a time requirement for planting a replacement tree in section H as suggested by **Mr. O'Connor**. She suggested adding wording to the first sentence of section H to read: “. . . must be planted after final building inspection or 90 days after removal of the tree.”

Planning Manager Jester commented that people may have a tree removed and then wish to take time in finding an appropriate replacement or else need time to address any other issues on the property before planting a replacement.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that it is difficult to enforce failure to plant a required replacement tree when there is no specified time limit. She said that it does seem reasonable to specify a certain amount of time by which a replacement tree must be planted. She said that a time limit may not work in the case of a dead tree or when a tree must be removed immediately, but in other instances the property owner should be able to remove the original tree in a close time frame to planting a replacement.

Commissioner Paralusz suggested adding wording to the sentence to state: “. . . must be planted after final inspection of the permit.”

Planning Manager Jester indicated that 90 days would be a short period for requiring that a replacement tree be planted.

Commissioner Seville-Jones suggested wording be added to the sentence to read: “. . . must be planted after final building inspection or 90 days after removal of the tree subject to extension at the discretion of the Community Development Director.”

Director Thompson said that he would not be opposed to a time limit of 90 days for planting of a replacement tree. He commented that a property owner should be able to replace a tree that is removed within 90 days. He said that specifying a time limit would allow for easier enforcement of the requirement as it would clearly specify when someone is in violation. He suggested that the time limit also be put on the tree permit application.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Director Thompson indicated that he would support changing “Tree Permit” to “Tree Removal Permit” in sections E, F and G as suggested by **Mr. O'Connor**. He said that he would not support changing item 3 under section E as suggested by **Mr. O'Connor**, as he would not want for an additional burden to be placed on homeowners by requiring a bond in order to ensure that a replacement tree is planted. He said that the City continues to do better in enforcing the requirement.

Commissioner Lesser said that a follow-up report in a year to the Commission would be helpful in order to address any enforcement issues that may arise and any further change to the Ordinance that may be appropriate.

Planning Manager Jester summarized the suggested revisions to the language of the Ordinance. She indicated that it was suggested that the purpose section be reworded to include a new paragraph to read: “The intent of this section is the reasonable retention and preservation of healthy trees while considering and balancing the reasonable enjoyment of private property. Residential buildings shall take priority over tree preservation, however alternative designs and materials shall be considered and implemented, as feasible, with the proposed overall design of the project. The design of residences, including grading, driveways, walkways, patios, utilities and right-of-way improvements, shall consider and accommodate existing healthy protected trees as reasonably feasible.”

Planning Manager Jester stated that it was suggested to change the term “Tree Permit” to “Tree Removal Permit” in sections E, F and G. She indicated that it was also suggested to restructure item G into three elements, with the first regarding the determination as to whether an application is consistent with the purpose section; the second regarding whether the application meets the listed criteria for removal; and the third regarding the Director considering the age species, history and location of the tree in relationship to other trees. She said it was also suggested that the second sentence of item 5 under section G be reworded to read: “Trees causing ~~minor~~ damage to sewers, water lines, or other similar private underground utilities, in itself generally shall not be considered to meet the criteria for removal and replacement.”

Planning Manager Jester suggested that the first paragraph under item 6 beginning with the sentence “The Director of Community Development may require the applicant to submit a report from a ISA certified arborist. . .” be split into two separate paragraphs. She indicated that it was suggested to change the first sentence of section H to read: “Required replacement trees shall be minimum 36 inch box trees for each protected tree removed of an appropriate species and must be planted after final building inspection within 90 days after removal of the tree or prior to building permit final.”

Action

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Seville-Jones/Lesser) to **APPROVE** Zoning Code Amendment to the Tree Preservation Regulations (Section 10.52.120 of the Zoning Code) and Related Code Sections, to Revise the Tree Preservation Regulations, to Provide More Flexibility and to Require a Tree Trimmers Permit with the changes as specified by Planning Manager Jester and with a change in the Tree Trimmers Permit Application to require 48 hours notice prior to pruning of a tree in place of 24 hours.

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

F. BUSINESS ITEMS

None.

G. DIRECTORS ITEMS

Director Thompson indicated that the League of California Cities Planners Institute is scheduled for March 25-27 in Anaheim, California

Director Thompson said that the APA 2009 National Conference is scheduled for April 25-29 in Minneapolis, Minnesota

Director Thompson indicated that the environmental impact scoping session for the Manhattan Village Mall expansion is scheduled for Thursday, February 12 at the Police Fire Facility at 6:30 p.m.

H. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Chairman Powell commented that the Manhattan Beach Coordinating Council will be holding their monthly luncheon on Thursday, February 19 at 11:30 a.m. at the Belamar.

I. TENTATIVE AGENDA February 25, 2009

1. Housing Element

I. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m. to Wednesday, February 25, 2009, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

RICHARD THOMPSON
Community Development Director