

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 12, 2009**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 12th day of November, 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: Andreani, Fasola, Lesser, Paralusz, Chairperson Seville-Jones
Absent: None
Staff Present: Richard Thompson, Director Community Development
Eric Haaland, Associate Planner
Recording Secretary: Sarah Boeschen

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 28, 2009

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

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, and Chairperson Seville-Jones
NOES: None.
ABSENT: None.
ABSTAIN: None.

C. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

11/12/09-2 Consideration of a Master Use Permit Amendment for a Reduction of Parking Requirements to Allow an Increased Amount of Medical Office Use, and Less Restaurant Use Based on a Current Parking Study on the Property Located at 500 South Sepulveda Boulevard

Associate Planner Haaland summarized the staff report. He stated that the proposal is for a 32,521 square foot office complex to increase its medical office component from 13,427 square feet to 21,200 square feet. He indicated that one of the two existing restaurant uses on the site is proposed to be eliminated. He indicated that the other existing restaurant use is proposed to be reclassified from a take-out restaurant to a sit-down restaurant use, and it has operated as a sit-down restaurant since approval of the original Use Permit. He pointed out that no exterior changes are proposed on the site but only the uses within the existing buildings. He stated that the Code parking requirement for the proposal is 145 parking spaces, and the existing parking supply is 125 spaces. He indicated that the Commission can approve a parking reduction through the Use Permit process. He commented that to approve the parking reduction, the Commission must find that the realistic parking demand must be less than the Code requirement and that the long-term occupancy of the building will not significantly change. He said that the anticipated long term use of the building is for office use. He indicated that the Code provides for the parking reduction with a parking study verifying that the demand will not exceed the supply. He stated that the Code allows up to a 15 percent parking reduction to be

approved by the Commission for larger commercial sites with multiple tenants, and the proposal is for a 14 percent parking reduction. He stated that the submitted parking study indicates that the anticipated demand for the proposal would be 126 spaces. He indicated that an alternative in order to not exceed the existing supply of 125 spaces would be to reduce the total amount that could be converted to medical office use from 7,453 square feet to 6,453 square feet. He indicated that another alternative would be to eliminate the second restaurant use from the site.

Commissioner Lesser asked regarding using the mix of uses on the site as an approach for reducing the amount of required parking when the type of uses would become less diverse with the proposal to eliminate a restaurant use and add more medical office use.

Associate Planner Haaland indicated that the uses would be less diverse with the elimination of the restaurant use. He indicated, however, that the parking study was done with a standardized analysis of the shared parking. He said that there would still be some alternating peak parking demand for the uses with the significant number of different office tenants. He said that staff is satisfied that the shared parking method is appropriate for this project. He indicated that the City's Traffic Engineer has reviewed the parking study and has found it to be appropriate.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Associate Planner Haaland said that parking for a new project of the size and mix of uses as proposed would require 145 spaces and could be lowered with a shared parking reduction to 123 spaces. He said that parking reductions have been allowed by the old Code of up to 15 percent based on being a large multi-tenant site. He commented that parking studies are conducted for projects where a significant parking reduction proposed. He indicated that staff is comfortable with the shared use of parking as proposed. He commented that staff typically cannot approve a significant change in parking after the project is approved, but in this case, staff is suggesting the addition of language that would allow staff some flexibility to approve an adjustment to the parking plan that was fairly straightforward if handicapped or other requirements cause a loss of parking spaces.

In response to a question from Chairperson Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Haaland commented that the Building Division enforces handicap parking requirements for medical use. He said that the Building Division will review each new medical tenancy as it occurs, and make a determination if handicap access requirements dictate alterations to parking spaces.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, Associate Planner Haaland commented that currently there is only one restaurant operating on the subject site.

Dave Knapp, representing the applicant, said that they are not asking the existing restaurant on the site to leave but rather only want to address that possibility. He said that they have determined that they have sufficient space to provide handicapped parking for the amount of square footage that is anticipated. He said that they have not had a large number of new tenants in the last year. He indicated that their hope is that there will be increased demand for medical space.

Richard Barretto, Linscott Law & Greenspan, stated that their study considered the theoretical shared parking requirements of the project; the current conditions at the site and on the adjacent street; and the Code parking requirements. He indicated that the Code parking requirement with converting 7,453 square feet into medical office use would be 145 parking spaces, which would result in a total of 123 parking spaces after a 15 percent parking reduction. He indicated that they consider the mix of uses on the site but not the specific tenants in their analysis. He

said that they found that parking should be adequate under the shared use. He indicated that if the restaurant use remains, the conversion of space into medical office use would need to be reduced to 6,453 square feet. He commented that 14 percent of the existing parking spaces are compact stalls. He indicated that most of the compact spaces are on the upper deck off of Keats Street. He indicated that they are able to increase the handicapped parking by two or three spaces in order to accommodate the requirements for medical use.

In response to a question from Chairperson Seville-Jones, **Mr. Barretto** said that their findings show that if the number of parking spaces remained at 125, only 6,453 square feet could be converted into additional medical office use. He commented that it would be possible to restripe the spaces to reach 126 in order to accommodate a conversion of 7,453 square feet into medical office use. He said, however, that there may be additional requirements for handicapped spaces.

Chairperson Seville-Jones asked regarding whether any language has been included in the conditions to allow flexibility in the parking design due to handicapped parking requirements.

Commissioner Lesser commented that the current restaurant use has a greater demand for parking in the evening hours, where medical office use has a larger demand during the day. He asked regarding the consideration of shared parking if the restaurant use is replaced by medical use which would result in more of the uses on the site having peak hours during the day.

Mr. Barretto commented that restaurants as well as office uses have different profiles and different peak times. He said that there is some shared use from the office uses and medical office uses. He indicated that if the entire site consisted of medical office use, there would not be an opportunity for shared parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Associate Planner Haaland said that the site was formally remeasured, and there are small variations of the square footages from the existing use permit, the staff report, and table 2 of the parking study.

Chairperson Seville-Jones opened the public hearing.

Jim Kernet said that the parking lot for the subject site currently is full and has become worse over the years. He said that with medical use, people will be parked at the site for a longer period of time. He commented that people who are visiting the subject site do park on the street. He stated that the parking currently is full, and additional medical office space would increase the problem.

Chairperson Seville-Jones closed the public hearing.

In response to a question from Chairperson Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Haaland suggested that if there is a concern regarding compact spaces that language be added at the end of Condition 1 to read: “. . . Parking lot modifications such as restriping or disabled access compliance may be approved by the Community Development Director if corresponding reductions in medical office use are made to satisfy parking demand as identified in the project parking study and the compact parking does not exceed 20 percent of the total.” He commented that the Code allows a maximum of up to 30 percent compact spaces.

In response to a question from Chairperson Seville-Jones, Director Thompson said that staff has encouraged applicants to comply with the parking requirements without providing compact

spaces. He said that such a cap has not been directly stated as a condition for other projects, but compact spaces are limited through in the design process.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Knapp** indicated that providing 20 percent compact spaces does work with the current conditions on the site, but they are uncertain of the feasibility of providing 20 percent compact spaces in the future if the handicapped parking requirements are changed. He said that they would hope that there could be some flexibility in the language to provide for only the number of compact spaces that is necessary to accommodate the required amount of handicapped spaces.

In response to a question from Chairperson Seville-Jones, **Mr. Knapp** pointed out that they would not be able to receive a permit for a specific medical use if they were not able to provide the required amount of handicapped parking. He indicated that it appears they would be able to change to 19 percent compact spaces to be able to accommodate 10 total handicapped spaces. He said that they would be comfortable with the requirement for a maximum of 20 percent compact spaces if the ADA does not change the requirements for handicapped parking in the future.

Discussion

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Associate Planner Haaland said that there were parking spaces available when staff has visited the site. He indicated that there is not a history of complaints regarding parking for the site.

Commissioner Andreani said that she likes the design of the property and likes that it is compatible with the nearby residential area. She commented that she visits an office in the building twice a year and has not had problems parking. She indicated, however, that there is a general parking problem in the City, and an effort needs to be made to prevent people who are visiting businesses from parking in residential areas. She commented that she is concerned with the 125 parking spaces being only slightly above the minimum amount permitted of 123 with the parking reduction. She indicated that she is willing to support the proposal with some restriping of the compact parking spaces if necessary. She asked about the enforcement of employees parking on the residential streets.

Mr. Knapp said that Master Use Permit indicates that tenants are to direct their employees not to park on the street. He said, however, that it is impossible to enforce, as it is difficult to determine which cars on the street belong to people visiting the site.

Commissioner Andreani pointed out that Condition 10 of the draft Resolution states that the facility operator shall prohibit employees from parking vehicles on the surrounding public streets. She asked how such a condition would be enforced.

Director Thompson indicated that enforcement of employees parking on site is done on a complaint basis. He stated that such language is helpful in order to allow for enforcement. He said that the City does follow up with the property owner and tenant if a complaint is received to ensure that employees do park on site rather than on the adjacent streets.

Commissioner Andreani said that she supports staff's recommendation to reduce the amount permitted to be converted into medical office use to 6,453 square feet, which would cap the parking demand at 125 spaces. She said that she would allow some flexibility on the cap for compact spaces to provide for handicapped parking. She commented that she has needed a

handicapped parking space for several weeks and had difficulty finding one at the subject site. She said that it does not seem feasible to ever have enough handicapped parking spaces.

Commissioner Fasola said that he is opposed to allowing additional compact spaces. He stated that compact spaces are tight even with a compact car. He said that conversion of an additional 6,453 square feet into medical office space is the most he would support. He stated that he does not feel that restriping the lot to provide for additional compact spaces would be a good solution.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she agrees with the other Commissioners that conversion of space into additional medical office use should be limited to 6,453 square feet. She said that she is satisfied with the conclusion of the traffic report that the findings are met to approve the reduced number of parking spaces. She commented that she agrees the parking demand would be less than the requirement of the Code, and the probable long term occupancy of the building based on the design would not generate additional parking demand. She indicated that she supports reducing the maximum allowed for conversion into additional medical use to 6,453 square feet.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Director Thompson said that staff does everything it can to reduce the amount of compact spaces that are provided for projects. He pointed out that the design and the ease of flow of the parking lot are factors in allowing compact spaces. He said that it would be appropriate to place a limit of 20 percent compact spaces for the subject lot.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, **Mr. Knapp** indicated that being permitted to convert 6,453 square feet into additional medical office space would be helpful.

Commissioner Lesser said that he would support the project with the additional language suggested by Associate Planner Haaland. He stated that he has a concern with the parking impacts on the neighboring streets. He commented that he sees that the proposal would only be a relatively minor change. He indicated that the methodology used for determining shared parking set forth in the Institute of Traffic Engineers Parking Generation 3rd is the basis for looking at the office and medical use as being like in generating traffic and can justify this shared parking methodology which allows for the reduction. He said that as has been stated by staff, he also has an interest in seeking to avoid approving compact parking spaces, particularly with new construction. He stated that he would be prepared to support the proposal with a 20 percent cap on the number of compact spaces.

Chairperson Seville-Jones said that she would support the proposal. She commented that she also feels it is an attractive development and appreciates that the applicant is attempting to keep it a vibrant addition to the community. She indicated that with additional medical offices, people would be more likely to have more than one doctor at the facility. She commented that the Commission has heard that there is a demand for medical offices along Sepulveda Boulevard, and this proposal would allow an existing development to help meet the demand. She said that she has confidence with the fact that the applicant has submitted a parking study which has also been reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer. She said that she accepts the public testimony that at times the lot may be crowded, but it has also been stated that there are times when the parking is not full. She commented that the project has 125 spaces, and there is evidence that it would be sufficient for the mix of uses. She pointed out that 1/3 of the space in the development would be general office and restaurant. She said that she would support a cap of 20 percent for compact spaces and language as suggested by Associate Planner Haaland.

Commissioner Fasola said that he would still support limiting the conversion into additional medical office use to 6,453 square feet.

Commissioner Andreani said that she would support allowing 7,453 square feet to be converted to additional medical space with the cap of 20 percent on the compact parking spaces.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she also would support the project with allowing an additional 7,453 square feet being converted to medical use. She pointed out that the City's Traffic Engineer also agrees with the parking report. She stated that she would support the project as proposed with the additional language as stated by Associate Planner Haaland including a cap of 20 percent for compact spaces.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Chairperson Seville-Jones commented that her understanding is that up to 20 percent of the parking could be compact spaces only as necessary in order to accommodate the required amount of handicapped parking. She said that the applicant would not have the ability to restripe the lot to provide more compact spaces without changing the handicapped spaces.

Commissioner Lesser commented that the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) standards change, and the subject building is an older structure that was built before the ADA was in effect. He said that he would want to allow the property owner flexibility in providing handicapped spaces, as they are not sure of any new requirements in the future.

Commissioner Andreani commented that the owner of the building has a sincere intention to retain the mixed use of the property and is not attempting to change the entire development to medical use.

Chairperson Seville-Jones said that she is also influenced by the fact that the aisles of the parking lot are quite wide and the parking is not as tight as in many other lots.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Director Thompson stated that a parking reduction could also be granted by the Commission for the project if it were not a mixed use provided that it is demonstrated that the parking demand would be met.

Commissioner Lesser commented that he did not disclose at the beginning of the hearing that he has a dentist in the subject building but does not have any financial interest in the project.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Lesser/Paralusz) to **APPROVE** Master Use Permit Amendment for a Reduction of Parking Requirements to Allow an Increased Amount of Medical Office Use, and Less Restaurant Use Based on a Current Parking Study on the Property Located at 500 South Sepulveda Boulevard with an increase in 7,452 square feet subject to the additional language to Condition 1 as stated by Associate Planner Haaland to state: "Parking lot modifications such as restriping or disabled access compliance may be approved by the Community Development Director if corresponding reductions in medical office use are made to satisfy parking demand as identified in the project parking study and the compact parking does not exceed 20 percent of the total."

AYES: Andreani, Fasola, Lesser, Paralusz, and Chairperson Seville-Jones
NOES: None.
ABSENT: None.
ABSTAIN: None

In response to a question from Director Thompson the Commissioners clarified that they are supporting allowing a conversion of up to 7,452 additional square feet of medical office use for the subject site.

Associate Planner Haaland pointed out that the number stated in Condition 2 of the draft Resolution allowing a cap of 19,880 square feet of medical use would allow for 6,452 square feet to be converted to medical office use rather than 7,452 square feet. He indicated that the number will be changed to a cap of 20,880 square feet to reflect the Commission's motion. He said that the initial proposal was to allow conversion of up to 7,452 additional square feet of medical use, but the recommendation of the applicant's Traffic Engineer was to reduce it to 6,452 square feet, based on the assumption that on-site parking would not be increased.

Chairperson Seville-Jones commented that her understanding is that the applicant may be able to reach a maximum of 7,452 square feet of additional medical office use provided that the parking requirements for the medical use is met with the constraints that have been placed on them by the Commission and provided that they meet the handicapped parking requirements.

Associate Planner Haaland said that it is possible the applicant can reach 126 parking spaces in order to allow for the additional 7,452 square feet of medical office use provided that handicapped requirements are not increased.

Director Thompson said that the number of parking spaces that are able to be provided would control the amount of additional medical office use that would be permitted. He indicated that in order to meet the intent of the approval by the Commission, the cap of medical office use as stated in Condition 2 of the draft Resolution should be changed from 19,880 square feet to 20,880 square feet.

Associate Planner Haaland said that it should also be specified in the findings that achieving the maximum quantity of medical office space approved would depend on the number of on-site spaces increasing to 126.

Director Thompson explained the 15-day appeal period and said that the item will be placed on the City Council's Consent Calendar for their meeting of December 1, 2009.

11/12/09-3 Consideration of a Variance from Building Height and Side Yard Setback Standards for an Existing Single Family Residence Due to a Merging of Parcels on the Property Located at 113/119 South Poinsettia Avenue

Chairperson Seville-Jones indicated that she knows the applicant and feels she can be impartial in the consideration of the application.

Commissioner Lesser stated that he is friends with the applicant and his wife. He said that he has served on the Mansionization Committee with the applicant. He stated that he has no financial interest in the project and feels he can be impartial in considering the proposal.

Commissioner Andreani indicated that she knows and respects the applicant as a City Councilman and member of the community. She commented that she also served on the Mansionization Committee with the applicant. She said that she has no financial interest in the project and believes that she can look at the issue fairly.

Commissioner Fasola said that he is also comfortable that the applicant can receive a fair and impartial hearing from the Commission.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she also knows the applicant and received his vote to be appointed to the Commission. She said that she has no financial interest in the project and feels she can be impartial in hearing the application.

Associate Planner Haaland summarized the staff report. He indicated that the proposal is for a Variance to allow a lot merger resulting in nonconforming height and one side yard setback for an existing single family residence that would be expanded. He commented that the proposal is for approval of the retention of the existing single family residence on the upper lot. He said that the height and north side yard setback of the existing structure on the upper lot would be made nonconforming by the merging with the lower lot. He indicated that the existing building would be remodeled and an addition would be built across the dividing property line to the lower lot, with the square footage of the entire structure totaling 7,534 square feet. He stated that the lowered average elevation of the lot corners with the merger would change the height measurement of the existing structure to 28.4 feet, and the maximum permitted height is 26 feet. He indicated that the added width would make the interior side yard setback requirement 10 feet, and the setback of the existing structure is 5 feet.

Associate Planner Haaland commented that substantial grading is proposed for the new construction with the expansion to the existing structure to make the level of the lower lot more comparable to the upper lot. He indicated that there is an existing planter with a retaining wall in front of the house to remain, with two large trees that is within the Poinsettia Avenue right-of-way. He indicated that the planter is non-conforming with the current encroachment requirements, as the grade has been raised for a level surface. He indicated that staff is suggesting that an exception for the encroachment should be permitted to allow the trees to remain. He commented that there was a Variance approved previously by the City Council for a similar project for the same lot merger proposal. He said that there were also at least three other similar Variance requests approved for lot mergers that were not eligible for minor exceptions at those times. He indicated that the existing structure and proposed addition would be compatible with the neighborhood. He stated that the proposed addition would conform to Code requirements and would step down on the lot. He stated that the existing nonconformities would not be enlarged or extended with the proposal. He also said that modification of the existing structure to bring it into compliance with current Code requirements would be a substantial hardship and would make it difficult to retain the existing home.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Associate Planner Haaland indicated that the amount of soil that will be added on a site is not restricted. He stated, however, that raising the grade roughly 10 feet as proposed is fairly unusual. He said that there are multiple retaining walls which allow the grade to be raised substantially. He said that the grading does conform to Code requirements.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, Associate Planner Haaland indicated that a construction traffic plan is a common requirement for non single family homes. He stated that the plan establishes routes for construction vehicles to enter and exit the site. He said that the City's residential construction officer would review the plan with the contractor and the Traffic Engineer.

In response to a question from Chairperson Seville-Jones, Associate Planner Haaland indicated that the Variance is necessary because of the height of the existing structure and setbacks being out of compliance after the proposed merger. He indicated that all new construction would comply with Code requirements.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, Associate Planner Haaland said that the grade of the property would be raised at least partially within the setbacks. He commented that the setback requirement of 10 percent of the lot width beyond 5 feet only pertains to interior side yards and not corner side yards. He indicated that the 787 square feet of basement area is not counted towards the square footage of the home because it would be located entirely below grade.

Robert Collins, Hayne Architects, representing the applicant, said that there are several examples of other projects that are similar to the subject proposal which have been approved. He stated that the applicant wants to retain the existing house on the subject property. He said that the existing building was renovated less than six years ago, and it would be unfair to require the applicant to demolish it rather than to expand the existing home. He indicated that the proposal is to keep the existing building and provide an addition for a total of five bedrooms. He commented that the applicant also wants to keep the character of the existing house and to minimize bulk. He pointed out that the height as proposed is no taller than the existing building on the site. He indicated that they are providing 15 percent more open space than the minimum requirement, and the building area as proposed is 1,000 square feet less than the existing structures on the site.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fasola, **Robbyn Hayne**, Hayne Architects, said that the upper floor of the existing structure would virtually remain in tact. He said that the walls of the lower floor would be reconfigured. He commented that the shell of the existing structure would remain. He indicated that the level of the rear portion of the first floor would be lowered to meet the grade of the proposed yard.

Chairperson Seville-Jones opened the public hearing.

There being no one wishing to speak, Chairperson Seville-Jones closed the public hearing.

Discussion

Commissioner Lesser stated that he supports the proposal. He indicated that the slope does provide a hardship. He indicated that the Council was previously able to make the Variance findings set forth in the Ordinance which are included in the subject draft Resolution. He said he can make the findings that there are special circumstances applicable to the subject property; that approval of the project may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; and that granting the application is consistent with the purposes of Title 10.84.060(B) of the Code. He said that the proposal is consistent with the neighborhood. He said that he approves of the applicant expanding the home in a manner that is consistent with the existing property and without enlarging the nonconformities. He indicated that he appreciates that the applicant is seeking to retain the existing home rather than to demolish it and built a completely new structure. He stated that he appreciates that the proposal would result in an increase in open space for the two subject properties. He commented that he supports the proposal.

Commissioner Andreani said that she also supports the proposal. She commented that she agrees with staff that the amount of soil that is permitted to be imported should be regulated by the building height maximum for the final project. She stated that she agrees with the recommendation to require a truck management plan. She said that she would also want assurance that on site building inspections would occur during and after construction to be certain that the maximum height of the proposed addition is at 28 feet. She commented that she agrees with allowing the previously approved encroachment onto Poinsettia Avenue in order to preserve the existing mature trees. She indicated that there was an existing height Variance that

was approved for the residence at 113 South Poinsettia. She indicated that she is pleased that there would be terracing from the north to the existing house which would reduce the overall bulk and density. She commented that current Code only requires a 5 foot setback on the south side off of Duncan Place. She pointed out that Duncan Place is an alley and is smaller than a street. She said that she gave a lot of consideration regarding the setback for an alley as opposed to a street and feels such setbacks for projects should be addressed further. She stated that she agrees that there are special circumstances and that the applicant has addressed issues of bulk and open space. She stated that she supports the proposal.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she also supports the proposal. She pointed out that the new construction that is proposed would comply with the Code requirements. She indicated that the Variance for height was previously approved in 2003. She also pointed out that there has been no objection to the project expressed by the neighbors.

Commissioner Fasola said that he has no objection to the project. He stated that he approves of retaining the existing building. He said that although the side yard setback would not be conforming, it would not worsen the existing situation on the property. He stated that the lower height of the proposed new construction would be a benefit. He indicated that he supports the project.

Chairperson Seville-Jones said that she also supports the proposal. She indicated that the project would be an extension of the current home. She said that the home would fit in with the neighborhood. She indicated that if the Variance is not approved, the applicant would need to take 5 feet off of the side and reduce the height of the existing home which would damage the structure. She commented that the applicant has been respectful with providing open space and reducing bulk. She said that the proposed structure would be no higher than the existing building and would maximize open space. She commented that she was originally concerned with the amount of setback to the property to the west of the subject site. She said that she feels the project would not be harmful to the neighbor to the west, as there would be terracing of the subject site and open space would be provided to the south. She stated that she supports the project and feels it would be a good addition to the neighborhood.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani/Fasola) to **APPROVE** a Variance from building height and side yard setback standards for an existing single family residence due to a merging of parcels on the property located at 113/119 South Poinsettia Avenue subject to Conditions 1 through 13 of the draft Resolution.

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, and Chairperson Seville-Jones
NOES: None.
ABSENT: None.
ABSTAIN: None.

Director Thompson explained the 15-day appeal period and stated that the item will be placed on the City Council's Consent Calendar for their meeting of December 1, 2009.

E. DIRECTORS ITEMS

F. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Chairperson Seville-Jones commented that November 12 is the day to make commitments to the Manhattan Beach Educational Foundation.

Commissioner Lesser said that the Cub Scouts are canvassing the neighborhoods of the City to collect food for people in need. He encouraged residents to leave donations in the bags left by the Cub Scouts to be picked up on Saturday, November 21.

G. TENTATIVE AGENDA November 25, 2009

Director Thompson said that the meeting of November 25 will be cancelled due to the Thanksgiving holiday, and the next meeting will be on December 9, 2009.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. to Wednesday, December 9, 2009, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

RICHARD THOMPSON
Community Development Director