




**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
STAFF REPORT**

TO: Cultural Arts Commission, Planning Commission, and Library Commission

FROM: Jim Arndt, Public Works Director 
Richard Thompson, Community Development Director 
Richard Gill, Parks and Recreation Director 

DATES: October 11, 12, and 13, 2011

SUBJECT: Status Report of the Manhattan Beach County Library Project (City of Manhattan Beach/Los Angeles County)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission(s) **ACCEPT THE PRESENTATION, DISCUSS, and PROVIDE COMMENTS.**

BACKGROUND

Project History

The County of Los Angeles *owns and operates* the existing 35-year old, 12,188 square feet Manhattan Beach Library located at 1320 Highland Avenue in Manhattan Beach. This location in the County's Library system is extremely popular. Because of its high use, the motivation increased over the years for a greater square footage, more modern design, larger community space, and more advanced technological resources.

As part of its Facilities Strategic Plan which began development in the 1990s and concluded in 2007, the City of Manhattan Beach held discussions with Los Angeles County regarding the renovation or reconstruction of the Library. Conceptual plans were submitted in 2008 by MDA Johnson-Favaro and in 2010 the Manhattan Beach City Council directed city Staff to resume discussions with the Library and hired MDA Johnson-Favaro and Linda Demmers to oversee Pre-Design.

Many Pre-Design decisions have been made including the Library's floor plan, size (21,500 square feet), location (Highland Ave. & Civic Plaza), approximate building height and constructing the Library to a new two-story structure.

The City of Manhattan Beach held a Community meeting on September 13, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a detailed update on the project status and solicit input on items still undetermined. The September 13, 2011 meeting summary is listed as Attachment 1 of this Commission report.

Project Input

Although some areas have been decided upon, there are still several items which need further discussion and decisions. Items allowing for additional input are as follows:

1. Building exterior- windows, treatments are part of Johnson-Favaro schematics, but still accepting comment
2. Building location- basically set relative to Highland and Civic plaza-not much room for comment
3. Landscaping, exterior tie to adjacent facilities-open and available for comment, although architect will have an option at the October 11, 12, and 13th Commission meetings.
4. Ceiling heights are set at 14'-first floor and 10'-second floor. Some input about change of ceiling height is available for input, although changing ceiling height will increase building height.
5. Interim library services- some input available, up to ~\$150,000/year. Likely include a bookmobile (20 hrs./week) and children's story time (waiting for costs from Los Angeles County)
6. Overall building use permit will be reviewed by Planning Commission at a later date

Project Budget and Schedule

Budget

Los Angeles County has established the total project budget at \$22,571,000. This amount will be funded through two sources: funding set-aside from Manhattan Beach property taxes collected for operations/improvements to the Library in the amount of \$11,141,000; and bonding against future tax collections (handled by Los Angeles County Library) in the amount of \$11,430,000.

As decisions are made, the annual Operating budget evolves. In FY2009-2010, the annual Library Operating budget was estimated at \$1,521,000. It is now projected that when the Library project is complete, the annual Operating budget will be \$1,881,000. Revenues are in excess of \$2,600,000 with a balance of revenues and operating costs being put towards project capital.

Schedule

Currently estimated to span a total of three years and four months from start to finish, the project schedule is categorized by project activity. For example, construction is set to begin March 2013 with the new Library Grand Opening scheduled for New Year's Eve 2014.

The complete budget and project schedule may be found in Attachment 2 of this Commission report, under "Attachment A" of the LA County document.

DISCUSSION

The Agenda for the Cultural Arts, Planning, and Library Commission meetings scheduled to be held on either October 11, 12, and 13, 2011 is listed as Attachment 3 in this Commission report. In addition, the Planning Commission minutes from the December 8, 2010 meeting are included as Attachment 4.

Cultural Arts Commission

Los Angeles County requires that 1% of the building construction costs and architectural fees (estimated to be \$13,700,000) be spent on an art component for the new building. The art component can be worked into the architecture of the building or it can be a stand-alone piece in or near the building or a combination of the two. The Los Angeles County Public Library and the Los Angeles County Arts Commission are willing to work with the City of Manhattan Beach to develop an artistic component for the proposed new Library. Representatives from the Los Angeles County Arts Commission will discuss with the City of Manhattan Beach Cultural Arts Commission 1) how the County Arts Commission process works; 2) how the Manhattan Beach Cultural Arts Commission will be involved; and 3) visual examples of how it has worked on other recent County library projects.

This is the first step to developing an art component for the City's new library. The County will continue to work with the City of Manhattan Beach Cultural Arts Commission over the next 6 to 12 months for full implementation of the process for the new Library.

Planning Commission

The City of Manhattan Beach Zoning Code requires the approval of a Use Permit and a Coastal Development Permit for the new Library project. Both applications require noticed public hearings before the Planning Commission, and the public hearings will be held concurrently. The site is zoned Public and Semi-Public, and the General Plan designation for the site is Public Facilities. Findings that the project is consistent with the purpose of the Zone, as well as the goals and policies of the General Plan, will be required. Libraries are classified as Cultural Institution and Chapter 10.28 of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (MBMC), listed as Attachment 5 of this report, requires a Use Permit for a library. This Chapter also indicates that the Use Permit establishes the development standards for the site.

Use Permits are regulated by Chapter 10.84 of the MBMC. This Chapter has Sections that detail the requirements for a Use Permit including the purpose, authority of the Planning Commission, notice and public hearing requirements, duties of the Planning Commission and required findings. Section 10.84.060 - Required Findings of the MBMC requires that the Planning Commission make all of the following four findings in order to approve a Use Permit:

1. *The proposed location of the use is in accord with the objectives of this title and the purposes of the district in which the site is located;*
2. *The proposed location of the use and the proposed conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will be consistent with the General Plan; will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare of persons residing or working on the proposed project site or in or adjacent to the neighborhood of such use; and will not be detrimental to properties or improvements in the vicinity or to the general welfare of the city;*
3. *The proposed use will comply with the provisions of this title, including any specific condition required for the proposed use in the district in which it would be located; and*
4. *The proposed use will not adversely impact nor be adversely impacted by nearby properties. Potential impacts are related but not necessarily limited to: traffic, parking, noise, vibration, odors, resident security and personal safety, and aesthetics, or create demands exceeding the capacity of public services and facilities which cannot be mitigated.*

The City of Manhattan Beach has a certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) and is therefore able to issue our own Coastal Development Permits. The project is not located in the appealable area of the Coastal Zone and therefore is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Chapter A.96 of the LCP details the requirements for the Coastal Permit including the required findings. The adopted Coastal Policies and Implementation Measures are found in Chapter 4 of the LCP.

Through the Use Permit and Coastal Permit process the Commission will evaluate the site plan, circulation; including vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle as well as parking, relationship of the Library to the Civic Center complex and the surrounding neighborhood and environment, exterior site features and building finishes.

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Metlox/Civic Center project, including the Library component, was certified by the City of Manhattan Beach City Council on April 17, 2001, in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City of Manhattan Beach and the County are working together to determine the appropriate environmental review for the Library project. CEQA defines the County as the Lead Agency for the project and they will therefore be responsible for the environmental review. The City as a responsible agency will rely on the environmental documentation prepared by the County.

Library Commission

As the floor plan for the new Library has been established, the role of the Library Commission will focus on programs, the interior furnishings and aesthetics of the building and temporary library services during construction.

The Commission has had an ongoing dialogue with County staff regarding program ideas to meet the community's needs. The program areas have primarily focused on teen and children's areas. They have also discussed the look and feel of the interior of the building. This has been of particular interest to the Commission providing a theme and messages that reflect the culture of Manhattan Beach. One additional programming area to be discussed is the outdoor space on the east side of the Library that opens to the civic center plaza.

Due to the high circulation of materials and overflowing children's story time, the Commission has recommended temporary services during construction of the new library. The Commission will be making recommendations on the staffing levels and frequency of the children's story time program, currently estimated to be \$26,000. This maintains the current service level of two story times per week. They are also considering the use of a temporary bookmobile, at 20 hours per week, to provide a pick-up location for books that are reserved online during construction, estimated to be \$133,000. The total budgeted amount for temporary services is \$150,000.

The Library Commission will be soliciting input from the Friends of the Library to discuss the most effective use of their space and the possibility of continuing their book sales during construction.

County staff, architects Johnson-Favaro, and library consultant Linda Demmers will be discussing these items with the Library Commission at the October 13th Library Commission Meeting.

Attachments:

1. Summary for September 13, 2011 Library Project Community Meeting
2. August 9, 2011 Adopted LA County Project Approval
3. Meeting Agenda for Cultural Arts, Planning, and Library Commissions
4. Minutes for the December 8, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting
5. Chapter 10.28 MBMC – PS – Public and Semi-Public District

**MANHATTAN BEACH LIBRARY
COMMUNITY KICK-OFF MEETING
September 13, 2011
6:30-8:30pm
PD/FD Community Room**

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Public Works Director, Jim Arndt, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the meeting. He then moved in to a brief introduction of the team that has brought the project to where it is to date and those presenting to the community tonight. They included, Architects, Library Consultant, LA County Library Staff, LA County Public Works Staff, Council Sub-Committee Councilmembers, City Staff, and the City Manager.

Arndt spoke briefly about the role of the City Staff, the current status of the project, and how the project came about. Arndt stated the project was a product of ten years of work leading up to where the project is today.

Arndt recapped decisions City Council made previously regarding the cost effectiveness of removing the existing building completely and constructing a brand new building which would be two stories but no higher than existing City Hall.

Arndt addressed briefly the interim service which would be provided during the construction and stated limited budgetary funds would likely provide for a book exchange and drop-off as well as story time for the children.

Arndt then turned the floor over to LA County Library Director, Margaret Todd.

Margaret Todd stated the project was a partnership based on community feedback. She went on to state the County would not be telling residents how the inside of the library would appear, the color palettes used, or exterior colors. She said the County is involved to dictate safety of the building, and ensure the durability of materials suggested for installation. Todd then turned the presentation over to her associate and Assistant Director, Miguel Acosta.

Miguel Acosta presented an overview of some of the new features the library will have including meeting rooms both inside and outside of the building. Acosta went on to say that the libraries of today are no longer musty, old buildings that simply house books and periodicals. Acosta said there goal is to assist in providing a family placed practice which maximizes space usage while providing children's librarians, computers pre-loaded with software for all age groups, including spaces and equipment sized for various ages of children. Acosta indicated there would be a teen area which provides acoustic separation to minimize noise to the other library users as well as community meeting

rooms and study rooms. Acosta envisions a place where an individual could use a workspace or study room for telecommuting a day for their work. Acosta shared a plan to have a laptop vending kiosk for use while in the library. Visitors could check out a laptop using a credit card or their library card, use a laptop, and then return it once done.

Acosta then introduced Library Consultant, Linda Demmers.

Linda Demmers presented a Power Point slideshow which outlines the “Needs Assessment Programming Trends”. She reviewed a timeline from 1995-2012. The outline included such items as the approximate library usage, city population, previous decisions and meeting outcomes regarding the construction of a new library to name a few.

Demmers then went on to discuss what has changed through the years and the core services needed. Demmers expressed a desire to have the library be a magical space for children, a family destination which encompasses a sustainable facility with sustainable materials used in the construction.

Demmers presented a slide showing a “thumbnail” image comparing various existing items to items the new library would have.

Demmers then invited Architect, Jim Favaro to speak.

Jim Favaro introduced himself and his partner, Steve Johnson. Favaro presented a Power Point slideshow beginning with a brief history of where we are today. Favaro indicated multiple meetings with City Staff, City Council, and the community led up to where the project is to date. Favaro indicated a key component of the library project was the Facilities Strategic Plan (FSP) which can be viewed on the City webpage.

Favaro presented an extensive schematic site plan of the existing Library and Civic Center footprint, including building square footage compared to the proposed new footprint and square footage.

Favaro then went on to discuss and present slides showing architecture of other cities such as Santa Barbara, Pasadena, and Palm Springs. He did this to so the community could actually see how some cities have definite architectural styles. Favaro then showed slides of various homes and businesses in Manhattan Beach, while discussing how the city has a great variety of architectural styles.

Favaro then presented actual schematic design slides showing the various elevation levels of the existing land space or footprint, all from a variety of angles and locations, i.e. Civic Plaza level, Highland Avenue, 15th Street, etc.

Favaro spoke briefly about the design thought process and how the team approached and decided the pre-design. Favaro went on to speak on the firm's desire to create a building that is open, light inviting, and part of the community. Favaro showed various slides of

“study models” his staff has constructed. The study models present various options of architectural design. Favaro closed with saying the models were merely options that would enable the creative thinking process to begin.

Jim Arndt then provided a few closing remarks and informed the community it would be open to Q&A.

Vice Chairperson of the Senior Advisory Committee, Dick Zeif

Q: What is the seating capacity of the Public Meeting Room?

A: Approximately 100 people

Q: Is there a prohibition of use of the roof completely?

A: There has been no discussion to date to use the roof space. Neighboring homes along 15th Street have requested their views not be obstructed by equipment or use of the roof space.

Stephanie Chase

Q: Will there be a library entrance on the east side as well?

A: No. The main entrances will be on Highland at the north and south sides. However, the Community Room will have an entrance on the east side.

Madonna Newberg requested the library team includes space not only for caregivers and children but for the adult caregivers as well.

Charles Kohn

Q: Are provisions being made for a temporary library during the two years of construction?

A: Due to budget funds, minimal services at best will be provided; those discussed are a book drop off and pick up location as well as story time. The community will be referred to use neighboring city libraries for that time.

Pete DeMaria

Q: What is the current age of the existing library?

A: It is approximately 45 years old.

Comment: DeMaria believes the building should be iconic. He feels the architects are doing wonderful things. DeMaria suggests letting the library be what it can be and not what a library was in the past. He did express his concerns about the Community Room not being large enough. DeMaria encourages the use of outdoor meeting spaces but he is not in favor of the current Civic Plaza. He said although it is maintained very well and the landscaping is nice, he feels the space is under-utilized. DeMaria urges the team to not construct just a box but to plan for the use of the library 20-30 years from now. His final suggestion was to set the building back 10 feet further than the commercial building to the south.

Jerry O'Connor comment he is thankful for first meeting. He expressed concern over having a two story building. He said the current programs in the City would not warrant the need for that much space. O'Connor felt the walking distance to the library from various parking lots and the need to let light in to the building should not be deciding factors in constructing a two story building. O'Connor went on to say years ago it was determined the citizens were overpaying the County. He said it was the decision of City Council to allow the County to hold on to those funds and use the money for a new library. He urges the City to look at or discussing the need to set aside additional funds for operational costs. O'Connor's final request was to have a discussion at the next Community Meeting about funding, how much there is, where it coming from, etc.

Jim Arndt agreed budget was important information they would share at the next meeting.

George Kauffman commented he loves libraries because they are a place for books. He expressed concern over where the use of physical books would be in the future. Kauffman asked if there was concern on the part of the team about it being able to remain oriented for books.

Margaret Todd responded the library would be a Community Center with books and space to do a variety of things. She went on to say there has been several debates regarding publishing of books, publisher rights, digitizing, etc. Todd said the City should create a place where book lovers can come to talk about books, enjoy books, as well as participate in a wide variety of community events and programs.

Patrick McBride expressed concern over the space being used as a telecommuter's office. He finds this concept worrisome.

Stephanie Chase

Q: How was the design decided?

A: The building footprint was established by LA County Library. The City Council decided the building should be two stories to accommodate the space needed for the various rooms. The City is entering two design phases, the Schematic Design which will conclude in December and the Design Development which will entail a detailed study of the look of the actual building.

Q: Will the new building be sustainable in 40 years?

A: The building will be a LEED Gold building but with the various aspects we are discussing we will likely receive a higher rating.

Gary McAully urges the team and LA County Library to retain the function of preserving rare materials or one of a kind items. McAully requested a room for local history collections or a space to preserve those materials.

Margaret Todd indicated the County does not have staff trained to preserve such materials or a room that is set up to climatically control temperatures to not damage such valuable materials. Todd suggested such materials be sent to a University where they

could be preserved by specially trained individuals in rooms that are environmentally set up to hold this material. Todd said many universities will scan those items to a disk so it can be used by the community it came from. Todd suggested a spate meeting with McAully be arranged to discuss this topic further.

Jack Tarr:

Q: What is the total cost of the project and isn't LEED Gold Certification costly?

A: The project overall cost is \$22 Million. The construction portion is \$12.5 Million. The funds for the Gold Certification have already been built into the budget.

Pete DeMaria

Q: Who determined the entrance placement?

A: The decision was based on recommendation from architects, Johnson Favaro.

Jerry O'Connor requested the presentation material be made available on webpage prior to next Community Meeting so he could study it and better prepare questions and comments.

Jim Arndt noted his request.

Unknown individual commented she would like to see the building pushed back some from Highland Avenue. She is not in favor of buildings that are up next to the sidewalk. She feels this takes away from the look of a building. She is also not in favor of a completely glass building. She would like to see a softer façade.

Councilmember Wayne Powell stated the budget for the library project was discussed during the recent Library Commission meeting. Powell suggested those minutes be posted to the Library Project webpage as well.

Jim Arndt noted his suggestion.

Jim Arndt then closed the meeting and asked the community note the upcoming October 11, 12, and 13 meetings related to the library. He went on to say tonight's slideshow presentation materials by Linda Demmers and Johnson Favaro would be posted to the City Library webpage as well as a summary of the meeting. Arndt indicated the next Community Meeting would likely be held the first week of November and posted to the webpage. Arndt thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

August 9, 2011

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ADOPTED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

20 August 9, 2011

Sachi A. Hamai
SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Dear Supervisors:

**PUBLIC LIBRARY: MANHATTAN BEACH LIBRARY PROJECT
ESTABLISH PROJECT, APPROVE BUDGET AND
RELATED APPROPRIATION ADJUSTMENT
CAPITAL PROJECT NO. 69571
(FOURTH DISTRICT) (4 VOTES)**

SUBJECT

Approval of the recommended actions will establish a capital project for the Manhattan Beach Library Project and approve the related appropriation adjustment.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Find these administrative actions exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act Section 15378(b)(5) of the State Guidelines, because the proposed actions are considered a governmental administrative activity exempt from the definition of a project that will not result in the direct or indirect changes to the environment.
2. Establish the Manhattan Beach Library Project, Capital Project No. 69571 and approve a total budget of \$22,571,000.
3. Approve the appropriation adjustment to transfer \$5,141,000 from Public Library Designation for Program Expansion, to the Capital Project/Refurbishment Budget to fund the Manhattan Beach Library Project.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"

**Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only**

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
August 9, 2011
Page 2

4. Instruct the Chief Executive Officer, in collaboration with the Treasurer and Tax Collector, to develop financing recommendations to fund the remaining cost for the Manhattan Beach Library Project.
5. Approve and delegate authority to the Director of Public Works, or her designee, to accept the assignment and the implementation of a Professional Services Agreement from the City of Manhattan Beach for architectural and engineering services for the Manhattan Beach Library Project for a not-to-exceed fee of \$1,200,000.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approval of the recommended actions will allow the Department of Public Works (Public Works) to proceed with the development of a scoping document for the Manhattan Beach Library Project (Project).

Background

The County owns and operates the existing 12,188 square feet Manhattan Beach Library, which is located at 1320 Highland Avenue in the City of Manhattan Beach (City). The Public Library has been in discussion with the City regarding improvements to this 35-year old facility for many years. In 2008, as a part of the City's Facilities Strategic Plan process, a feasibility study was completed to explore a range of options for the renovation and expansion of the Manhattan Beach Library.

On September 28, 2010, your Board delegated authority to the County Librarian to execute an agreement with the City for the cost reimbursement of City's pre-design work on the improvement and enhancement of the Manhattan Beach Library, given the conceptual library options which resulted from the 2008 feasibility study. The Public Library, in conjunction with the City, reviewed the age and condition of the existing building and determined that the construction of a new facility was the most practical option and would allow full implementation of program requirements and sustainability features.

Proposed Project

The proposed Project scope entails consideration of the demolition of the existing library and the construction of a new 21,500 square feet library facility on the same site. If the new library is ultimately built, it will include adult reading areas, a teen area, and a juvenile/early childhood area with dedicated programming space, a homework center; group study/tutoring rooms; a 100-seat community meeting room; express-service

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
August 9, 2011
Page 3

check-out machines at the lobby; information services desks; public access computers; staff areas; public restrooms; and associated site improvements, including landscaping, walkways, and security lighting.

The Project scope will also include a portion of the furniture, fixtures, and equipment (tables, chairs, built-in casework, book shelving, modular work stations, staff lockers, and book self check-out units) to expedite procurement and installation by the general contractor in coordination with the other finish trades. The remaining furniture, fixtures, and equipment (computers, printers, fax machines, and copier machines), and interior signage will be procured separately by the County with purchase orders through the Internal Services Department.

If the new library is ultimately built, the County and the City will cooperatively work on the implementation of the proposed Project. The City will assist the County by conducting the solicitation of and awarding an architectural and engineering services contract to develop the scoping document for the proposed Project and developing the appropriate environmental documentation on the County's behalf. The County will award and oversee the construction contract and provide overall management of the Project.

The proposed Project will be delivered using the design-build project delivery method. The demolition of the existing library building will be accomplished through a Public Works' Job Order Contract.

Prior to award of the construction contract to a design-build entity, we will return to your Board to obtain approval of the Project scope and budget, and financing recommendations.

Green Building/Sustainable Design Program

The Project will comply with the County's Energy and Environmental Policy. As requested by the City, the Project will be designed and constructed to achieve the United States Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold level certification by incorporating sustainable design features to optimize energy and water use efficiency, enhance the sustainability of the site, improve indoor environmental quality, and maximize the use and reuse of sustainable and local resources.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
August 9, 2011
Page 4

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

The proposed Project supports the County's Strategic Plan Goals of Operational Effectiveness (Goal 1), Children, Family, and Adult Well-Being (Goal 2), and Community and Municipal Services (Goal 3) by investing in public infrastructure that will enhance cultural, recreational, and lifelong learning opportunities for County residents.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The total Project cost, based on conceptual design, including scoping documents, plans and specifications, jurisdictional reviews, consultant services, construction costs, civic art, and County services, is currently estimated at \$22,571,000 (Attachment A).

The proposed Project will be funded by Set Aside Funds in the Public Library Operating Budget designated for the Manhattan Beach Library and long-term bond proceeds. As of July 2011, the total amount of Set Aside Funds in a Designation for Program Expansion in the Public Library's Operating Budget for Proposed Project is \$5,141,000. The Set Aside Funds represent the accumulated difference between annual property tax collected from the City for library services and the actual cost of providing library services in the area, plus operating savings from the closure of the library during construction (Set Aside Funds).

Approval of the attached appropriation adjustment (Attachment B) will transfer \$5,141,000 from the Library Operating budget by reducing the Designation for Program Expansion to Manhattan Beach Library Project, Capital Project 69571.

During the period of the Project's design and construction (August 2011 through December 2014), Public Library will transfer future available Set Aside Funds into the Project Budget. It is anticipated that an additional \$6,000,000 will be directed to offset Project costs during the time period, increasing the total amount of Set Aside Fund commitment to the Project to \$11,141,000.

Once the final Project budget has been determined and prior to the award of the construction contract for the proposed Project, we will develop a financing plan with the Treasurer and Tax Collector recommendations for the balance of the Project budget and return to your Board with recommendations. Debt services on such bonds will be repaid from annual property taxes collected from the City for library services.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
August 9, 2011
Page 5

Operating Budget

The Public Library's Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 operating budget for the Manhattan Beach Library was \$1,521,000. It is anticipated that the new library will begin operation in FY 2014-15. The annual operating budget for the new Manhattan Beach Library is estimated at \$1,881,000 based on increased staffing, support, facility maintenance, and other operating costs that will be required. This represents a net increase of approximately \$360,000. The Public Library projects that the City will have sufficient property tax revenues to cover the increased operating costs for the new Library.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

On September 28, 2010, your Board delegated authority to the County Librarian to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City, which will govern the use of property tax dollars apportioned to the County from property within the City for the purpose of providing library services at the Manhattan Beach Library. The final MOU was executed by the parties on March 31, 2011.

Pursuant to your Board's Civic Art policy adopted on December 7, 2004, the Project budget includes 1 percent of design and construction costs to be allocated to fund Civic Art for the Project.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

It can be seen with certainty that approval of these recommended actions will have no potential environmental impact and accordingly are not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) according to Section 15378(b)(5) of the State CEQA Guidelines. The appropriate environmental documentation will be prepared by the County in conjunction with the City and provided for your Board's consideration when we return to your Board for approval of the Project and to award a design-build contract for the Project.

CONTRACTING PROCESS

On August 2, 2011, the City awarded a Professional Services Agreement to Johnson Favaro to provide architectural and engineering design services for the Project for a not-to-exceed fee of \$1,200,000.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
August 9, 2011
Page 6

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES

The Public Library will develop a plan, in consultation with the City, to provide temporary library services during construction. Any operating cost savings, resulted from the closure of the library during construction, will be allocated to the Manhattan Beach Library Project, Capital Project 69571.

CONCLUSION

Please return one adopted copy of this letter to the Chief Executive Office, Capital Projects Division; Public Library; and Department of Public Works, Project Management Division I.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

WTR:RLR:DJT
DKM:AC:cvb

Attachments (2)

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Arts Commission
Auditor-Controller
Public Library
Public Works
Treasurer and Tax Collector

ATTACHMENT A

**PUBLIC LIBRARY: MANHATTAN BEACH LIBRARY PROJECT
ESTABLISH PROJECT, APPROVE BUDGET AND
RELATED APPROPRIATION ADJUSTMENT
CAPITAL PROJECT NO. 69571**

I. PROJECT SCHEDULE

| Project Activity | Scheduled Completion Date |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Scoping Document Contract Award | 08/31/2011 |
| Prequalify Design-Builders | 01/31/2012 |
| Project Scoping Documents | 06/29/2012 |
| Award Design-Build Contract | 08/31/2012 |
| Construction Documents | 11/30/2012 |
| Jurisdictional Approvals | 01/31/2013 |
| Library Demolition | 01/31/2013 |
| Construction Start | 02/28/2013 |
| Substantial Completion | 06/30/2014 |
| Final Acceptance | 09/30/2014 |
| Library Grand Opening | 12/31/2014 |

II. PROJECT BUDGET SUMMARY

| Budget Category | Proposed Budget |
|--|----------------------|
| Land Acquisition | \$ 0 |
| Construction | |
| Design-Build Contract | \$ 12,500,000 |
| Job Order Contract (demolition & site remediation) | 500,000 |
| Change Orders | 2,500,000 |
| Telecommunication Equip-Affixed to Building | 750,000 |
| Civic Art | 137,000 |
| Other: Utility connections | 100,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 16,487,000 |
| Programming/Development | \$ 0 |
| Plans and Specifications (Scoping Documents) | \$ 1,200,000 |
| Plan Check and Jurisdictional Review | \$ 79,000 |
| Consultant Services | |
| Site Planning (Phase I Site Assessment) | \$ 0 |
| Hazardous Materials (Survey and Monitoring) | 75,000 |
| Materials Testing and Deputy Inspection | 200,000 |
| Cost Estimating | 0 |
| Topographic Surveys | 10,000 |
| Constructability Review | 50,000 |
| Consultant Services (Library Consultant) | 50,000 |
| Geotechnical Survey | 10,000 |
| Environmental Documents (EIR/ND/CE) | 400,000 |
| Other (Building Commissioning) | 75,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 870,000 |
| Furniture, Fixtures, and Equipment | \$ 1,640,000 |
| Miscellaneous Expenditures | \$ 115,000 |
| County Services | |
| Code Compliance and Quality Control Inspection | \$ 550,000 |
| Design Review | 100,000 |
| Contract Administration | 80,000 |
| Project Management | 1,218,000 |
| Project Management Support Services | 0 |
| ISD ITS Communications | 70,000 |
| Project Technical Support | 60,000 |
| Consultant Contract Recovery | 72,000 |
| Office of Affirmative Action | 20,000 |
| PM/CM As-Needed Contract | 10,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 2,180,000 |
| Total Project Budget | \$ 22,571,000 |

ATTACHMENT B

**PUBLIC LIBRARY: MANHATTAN BEACH LIBRARY PROJECT
ESTABLISH PROJECT, APPROVE BUDGET AND
RELATED APPROPRIATION ADJUSTMENT
CAPITAL PROJECT NO. 69571**

**APPROPRIATION ADJUSTMENT
4-VOTE MATTER**

FINANCIAL SOURCES:

PUBLIC LIBRARY

B06-3017
Designation for Program Expansion
DECREASE APPROPRIATION \$5,141,000

Capital Projects-Public Library
Manhattan Beach
A01-CP-96-9919-65044-69571
Operating Transfer In/CP
INCREASE REVENUE \$5,141,000

FINANCIAL SOURCES TOTAL: \$10,282,000

FINANCIAL USES:

Public Library
Operating Budget
B06-PL-6100-41200
Other Financing Uses
INCREASE APPROPRIATION \$5,141,000

Capital Projects- Public Library
Manhattan Beach
A01-CP-6014-65044-69571
Capital Asset – Building & Improvement
INCREASE APPROPRIATION \$5,141,000

FINANCIAL USES TOTAL: \$10,282,000

JUSTIFICATION:

To transfer funds currently in Manhattan Beach Designation account in the Public Library's operating budget, into the Capital Project/Refurbishment Budget to fund the Manhattan Beach Library Project.

PINK (1)

BA FORM 06/09

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OFFICIAL COPY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATION ADJUSTMENT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY

DEPT'S. NO. 461

July 20, 2011

AUDITOR-CONTROLLER:

THE FOLLOWING APPROPRIATION ADJUSTMENT IS DEEMED NECESSARY BY THIS DEPARTMENT. PLEASE CONFIRM THE ACCOUNTING ENTRIES AND AVAILABLE BALANCES AND FORWARD TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR HIS RECOMMENDATION OR ACTION.

ADJUSTMENT REQUESTED AND REASONS THEREFOR

FY 2011-2012

4 - VOTES

| <u>SOURCES</u> | | | <u>USES</u> |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|
| PUBLIC LIBRARY | | | |
| B06-3017 Designation for Program Expansion DECREASE APPROPRIATION | \$5,141,000 | Public Library Operating Budget B06-PL-6100-41200 Other Financing Uses INCREASE APPROPRIATION | \$5,141,000 |
| Capital Projects- Public Library Manhattan Beach A01-CP-96-9919-65044-69571 Operating Transfer In/CP INCREASE REVENUE | \$5,141,000 | Capital Projects- Public Library Manhattan Beach A01-CP-6014-65044-69571 Capital Assets - Building & Improvement INCREASE APPROPRIATION | \$5,141,000 |

SOURCES TOTAL: \$ 10,282,000

USES TOTAL: \$ 10,282,000

JUSTIFICATION

To transfer funds currently in Manhattan Beach Designation account in the Public Library's operating budget, to the Capital Project/ Refurbishment Budget to fund the Manhattan Beach Library Project.

ADOPTED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

20 AUG 9 2011

[Signature]
AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE [NAME]

BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S APPROVAL (AS REQUESTED/REVISED)

[Signature]
SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

REFERRED TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR ---

ACTION
 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVED AS REQUESTED
 APPROVED AS REVISED

AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

BY *[Signature]*

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

BY *[Signature]*

B.A. NO. 006

July 21 20 11

July 27 20 11

AGENDA

CULTURAL ARTS COMMISSION: October 11, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers

PLANNING COMMISSION: October 12, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers

LIBRARY COMMISSION: October 13, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers

INTRODUCTION: Jim Arndt, Public Works Director – 5 min.

COMMISSION ROLE/RESPONSIBILITY: Richard Thompson (Planning Commission) *or* Richard Gill
(Library Commission) – 5 min.

BUDGET/SCHEDULE: LA County Library Representative – 10 min.

PROJECT STATUS: Johnson-Favaro – 20 min.

OPERATIONAL/PROGRAMS: Linda Demmers – 10 min.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION: Richard Thompson (Planning Commission) *or* Richard Gill (Library
Commission) – 35 min.

PUBLIC COMMENT: 30 min.

CLOSE/NEXT MEETINGS: Jim Arndt, Public Works Director – 5 min.

MEETING ADJOURNED

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 8, 2010**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 8th day of December, 2010, at the hour of 6:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola
Absent: None
Staff Present: Laurie Jester, Acting Director of Community Development
Eric Haaland, Associate Planner
Recording Secretary, Sarah Boeschen

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – November 23, 2010

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Seville-Jones/Paralusz) to **APPROVE** the minutes of November 10, 2010.

AYES: Andreani, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: Lesser

Commissioner Lesser said that he was sorry to miss the November 23 special meeting, and it is the only meeting he has ever missed. He indicated that he was unable to attend because he was on vacation that day.

3. GENERAL CONSENT

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

12/08/10-2 Presentation and Status Report of Preliminary Manhattan Beach County Library Project (City of Manhattan Beach/Los Angeles County)

Acting Director Jester stated that it was determined through the Facilities Strategic Plan that the existing library is not accommodating the needs of the City. She indicated that Steve Johnson and Jim Favaro are the architects who are working on the project and will be introducing the

project to the Commission. She indicated that a formal public hearing regarding the project will occur before the Commission next spring.

Jim Favaro, the project architect, stated that the reconstruction of the library is the first major civic project that has been considered in a generation. He pointed out that the new library will be funded by County tax funds, and no money will be taken from the City's General Fund to pay for the project. He said that the Library Commission is considering how library service will be maintained during construction of the project, and they are reaching out for input, particularly to the seniors and parents with children who use the library the most. He stated that they currently are near completion of the pre-design phase, and after City Council approval, they will move the project into the design phase. He indicated that the pre-design phase establishes the scope of the project and a general approach to the design. He said that the cost and scope of the project must be determined prior to the design in order to ensure that it can be funded and built on time. He stated that the design will be refined from January through to the summer of 2011, and the project will come back before the Commission after the first phase of the design. He indicated that construction would occur in March of 2012 if the schedule is met. He indicated that the main concerns expressed have been regarding the look of the library and how much it will cost.

Mr. Favaro commented that the parking lots across Highland Avenue; underneath the civic plaza; and at the surface level of City Hall would service the library. He pointed out that the location of the parking in relation to the front door is an important issue to the viability of the library. He indicated that the slope of Highland Avenue changes 4 feet along the library. He indicated that approximately 40,000 square feet could be built in two stories for the new structure using Downtown Commercial standards, and the existing library is approximately 12,000 square feet. He stated that they feel they can build a 20,000 square foot building that will suit the needs of the City. He indicated that the intent is to have a two story rather than a single story structure. He commented that having a two story building would liberate space on the site for other possibilities such as expanding the civic center plaza with open space. He said that there would also be the possibility in the future of a community theater, a visual arts facility, or further expansion of the library or City Hall. He commented that the project could also help to connect Highland Avenue to the civic center plaza. He also stated that building a single story rather than two story structure would take away valuable land. He said that open space is an important component of any community or civic project.

Mr. Favaro described the initial site plan. He indicated that the main door would face City Hall and would be clearly visible and accessible from the north side off Highland Avenue, and a second entrance would face the downtown area. He indicated that the children's area and community room would be on the first level, and the seating areas, computers and book collections would be on the second level. He commented that a librarian would be located at

the center of the structure at the top of the staircase who would have visual access to the entire floor.

Commissioner Lesser asked how the civic plaza could become more of an active space with the library project; it may be more difficult to achieve if the entrance to the library does not open to the plaza.

Mr. Favaro commented that the mechanical room would sit within the second floor rather than on top of the building, and there would also be a mezzanine between the first and second floor with the electrical room and technology room. He pointed out that they are within the guidelines that were presented to the steering committee for the Facilities Strategic Plan. He said that the design of buildings in the City is very eclectic, and there is not an overriding type of architectural style. He commented that the glass that would be used for the windows of the structure can change as the sun shifts position to block more of the ultra violet rays. He said that they want to achieve integration of the inside and outside. He stated that the technology of glass has also advanced. He commented that there are a variety of choices for the architectural style of the building, and the intent is to integrate the City's identity in the design. He indicated that they feel the design should be transparent, open, engaging with the sidewalk, and compatible with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Lesser asked about placing further information on the City's website to encourage public participation in the design process. He commented that he has received many questions from people regarding the project. He encouraged more outreach for public participation. He stated that the civic plaza currently is not an active space aside from the lunch hour and occasional special events, and there were discussions in the Facilities Strategic Plan meetings regarding the new library being an opportunity to engage the plaza.

Acting Director Jester pointed out that there are meetings regarding the project scheduled before the Cultural Arts, Library Commission, Planning Commission and City Council. She stated that the dates of the meetings regarding the project will be posted on the website. She said that there will also be a tour and community meeting presenting the project.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Favaro** said that a budget has been established for the project. He commented that the library must have one controlled entrance, and the idea was to choose the location that would maximize the potential of the entrance. He said that they decided to choose a location for the entrance that was neither facing Highland Avenue or the plaza but rather facing north toward City Hall, but clearly visible and accessible from Highland Avenue.

Commissioner Andreani said that there is more potential for a pedestrian feel with an entry off of the plaza. She asked about whether allowing for a view on the second level would interfere with incorporating the functional features of the library such as shelves and study areas.

Mr. Favaro commented that he feels the library can be functional at the same time as allowing for a view. He said that one of the most important features of a library is to provide daylight for reading. He indicated that a view of the ocean would be a unique and great City asset.

In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani, **Mr. Favaro** stated that the comments of the Library Commission have been incorporated into their presentation. He said that the focus of the Library Commission is with the functioning of the library.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, **Mr. Favaro** said that the children's area would be approximately 4,000 square feet and the community room would be approximately 1,200 to 1,300 square feet.

Commissioner Paralusz commented that she is excited that the children's area would be a large focus of the library.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, **Mr. Favaro** said that the exterior open space on the site would be approximately 10,000 square feet.

Commissioner Fasola commented that the Police and Fire facility is surrounded entirely by concrete, and he would like for the library to have more of a connection with the earth.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, **Mr. Favaro** stated that construction of the library would take approximately 18 months.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, **Mr. Favaro** said that the technology of glass regarding insulation has improved, and the budget does allow for a high level of technology for the building.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked about the possibility of the windows opening.

Mr. Favaro said that there are security concerns with allowing the windows to open in a library as well as concerns with dust collection.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked about the width of the walkway/vehicle loading area between the library and the adjacent commercial structure to the south. She said that there is a concern with security at night with dark cavernous corridors.

Mr. Favaro commented that a concern had been raised that people would use the area illegally for parking. He indicated that bollards could be used to limit access.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would want to ensure that the walkway would not become a dark corridor at night.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Favaro** indicated that there will be an area of the library for computers.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Favaro** stated that the height of the structure would be approximately 31 feet.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she would have a concern that the activity of people outside would be distracting to people reading inside the library if the walls are all glass. She asked if there were other libraries that have been built using glass walls.

Mr. Favaro commented that the library in Lawndale has been built with all glass and does have issues regarding sunlight coming into the library, and Manhattan Beach can learn from that project.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Favaro** said that the glass that would be used for the library and the angle that they would be installed would prevent sunlight from reflecting back onto the adjacent properties.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Favaro** indicated that the library would not include a restaurant use. He commented, however, that there would be a setback on the ground level next to Highland Avenue that would provide an area for a newspaper stand.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. Favaro** said that there will be a dedicated space for Friends of the Library to have book sales.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked regarding how the determination was made as to the appropriate amount of space for children's use.

Mr. Favaro said that extensive programming would occur for the children's area. He said that the story time program has been so successful with the current library that there is not space to have a special room dedicated for it with the new library. He commented that they have arranged the community room to be accessible from the children's area so that it can be used for story time also. He said that the County and Library Commission have provided their input that 4,000 square feet would be appropriate for the children's area.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, **Steve Johnson**, the architect for the project, said that the first floor ceiling height would be 13'6" and the second floor ceiling height would be 10'.

Chairman Fasola said that he likes that the building would be oriented toward the street. He said that he would support having one main entrance and would prefer not to have the secondary entrance to the south. He commented that he would like for the main reading area on the second floor to become a great space. He said that he would be receptive to approving a Variance to allow for a greater height for the library ceiling in order to allow the structure to stand out.

Mr. Favaro said that the comments from the community are that the height of the building should not reach above that of City Hall.

Chairman Fasola commented that he hopes the children's area and main room can become terrific, grand spaces. He said that most libraries are internalized spaces, and he does not feel that it is that important to him that a view be incorporated.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Favaro** said that the budget for the project is \$16.9 million. He indicated that City would not have any financial obligation for the project, and the funding will come from excess tax payments that have been made to the County.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Favaro** said that the existing coral tree in front of the library will need to be removed or relocated.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Favaro** indicated that libraries are adapting to new technologies and are able to provide for the sharing of information. He indicated that they need to allow flexibility to allow for new technologies.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Favaro** indicated that the perimeter of the building will be outfitted with screens to help protect the books from being damaged by sunlight.

Commissioner Lesser indicated that a feature he likes is to allow spillover into the community room for story time.

Mr. Favaro commented that there will be space in the adjacent open space area for an outdoor amphitheater which could accommodate story time for children.

Attachment 4

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester said that the City Council will have a hearing on the project on January 18, and the Cultural Arts Commission will have a hearing on January 11. She indicated that the Commission will have a hearing regarding the project in April and the City Council will have an additional hearing in May. She indicated that there is not a date for the next Library Commission hearing on the issue, but it will take place in February.

Commissioner Paralusz said that it would be very nice to have an outside view while reading in the library. She indicated that the windows as suggested would make the structure much more inviting than the existing building. She said that bringing people into the Civic Center Plaza is a wonderful part of the concept.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she feels that providing a view for the library is important, as there is a value in being able to gaze out of the window. She pointed out that there would be an ocean view over the parking lot that would not be blocked.

In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani regarding a donation of materials from a City historian, **Mr. Favaro** indicated that such collections are managed by the Library Commission.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, **Mr. Favaro** said that they feel they have arrived at the best configuration for maximizing the use of the site while minimizing the impacts to the neighbors. He said that they are confident that they can create a great room while restricting ceiling height.

Fred Hungerford, the chief deputy County librarian, said that the new library will have 36 public access computers as well as wireless internet access. He indicated that they also have online resources on their website. He stated that they will place the adult area on the upper level to provide an area that is quieter for reading and studying. He commented that they will be sure that the computer screens are oriented to avoid the glare of the sun.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Interim City Manager Richard Thompson said that parking was evaluated through the Facilities Strategic Plan. He stated that the amount of available parking was considered for the site. He indicated that there are options for operating the parking lots to allow for additional library parking. He commented that it is not anticipated that the new library would result in a much greater parking demand.

Jim Arndt, Director of Public Works, pointed out that the project would not require any money out of the City's General Fund. He said that there is a target amount for the project's budget; however, there are several factors that are yet to be determined. He stated that the project is partially being funded by money in reserve that the residents have paid to the County for the

library. He said that the fund is at \$4.25 million and is increasing by \$900,000 per year. He said that a bond would be necessary to fund additional cost, which factors into the size of the project. He indicated that the City Council has directed that they do not want money from the City's general fund to be used for the library. He indicated that the costs will become further clarified as the design progresses.

Mr. Hungerford commented that there would be some additional operating costs with the new structure, as they would need to hire additional library staff and would have additional utility costs with a larger two story building.

Acting Director Jester indicated that the Planning Commission comments would be forwarded to the City Council. The Planning Commission will formally hear the library project at a public hearing in the spring.

At 8:25 a 10 minute recess was taken.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

12/8/10-3 Consideration of a Use Permit Amendment to Reduce the Requirement for a Satellite Parking Facility; Give the Hotel the Option to Charge Overnight Guests for Overnight valet Parking, and Implement a Neighborhood Directional/Parking Signage Program at 3501 North Sepulveda Boulevard (Belamar Hotel)

Acting Director Jester summarized the staff report. She said that staff is recommending that the Commission adopt the draft Resolution approving the proposal. She commented that the hotel has 127 rooms with a lounge, conference room and restaurant. She indicated that there are 74 onsite parking spaces as well as spaces for valet parking in the aisles. She said that there are 17 off-site parking spaces immediately to the north of the subject site as well as an additional 48 offsite satellite parking spaces that are available for use by the hotel. She indicated that the current Use Permit requires that the hotel provide complementary valet parking to all of the patrons and provide for 50 off-site satellite parking spaces. She commented that the applicant is proposing to eliminate the requirement to provide for the additional 50 spaces, as that many spaces are not needed in order to accommodate the parking demand. She stated that the applicant is also proposing to change the permit to allow them to charge overnight registered guests for valet parking. She said that complimentary valet service would be provided for guests that are visiting or attending events at the hotel. She said that the applicant is also proposing to add some parking and directional signs. She commented that they would like to add signs off of Valley to direct drivers to the hotel. She indicated that the applicant has an agreement with the adjacent property owner for the use of 17 spaces, and they currently have an agreement to use 48 additional satellite spaces. She commented that there was a detailed

parking analysis provided by the applicant. She indicated that the City's Traffic Engineer agreed with the analysis provided by the applicant that the parking as proposed would satisfy the needs of the hotel. She commented that the applicant is suggesting that 18 satellite spaces would still be provided.

Acting Director Jester stated that all of the onsite parking is valet, and patrons who are visiting but not staying overnight at the hotel would continue to receive complimentary valet service. She indicated that the Traffic Engineer felt that charging for overnight guests would not change the parking habits of the overnight guests and that it is typical for hotels to charge overnight guests for parking. She pointed out that staff received two letters from residents with concerns that charging overnight guests for parking would result in more people parking in the adjacent neighborhood. She said that the intent of the additional signage is to provide directional signs to the hotel and not to provide advertising. She commented that the signage is specific to the subject use because it is immediately adjacent to residences and there are neighborhood concerns with hotel patrons and employees parking in the adjacent neighborhood. She said that many of the signs would be collocated on existing sign poles to minimize the visual impact. She indicated that the applicant has included information on their website and brochure that complimentary valet parking for events is available. She commented that the hotel subsidizes an employee transit system which has been very successful in reducing the onsite parking demand for employees.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester stated that 50 satellite parking spaces are required under the existing permit and the proposal is to require 17 satellite parking spaces.

Commissioner Lesser commented that the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standard would be to allow for 18 satellite spaces based on the traffic study.

Acting Director Jester said that the ITE standards for the subject site with the mixture of uses at the hotel would be for 18 satellite parking spaces. She indicated that the City's Traffic Engineer, however, felt that 17 spaces would be adequate.

Chairman Fasola commented that his understanding from the traffic count included with the staff report is that the onsite parking has not been fully utilized.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester said that staff wanted to ensure that the signs proposed by the applicant would be simply directional signs and not be used as advertising for the hotel. She commented that the hotel entrance is not visible for cars travelling southbound on Valley from Sepulveda Boulevard, and the signs would help to provide direction to the hotel to avoid people from having to turn around on the adjacent residential streets.

Commissioner Andreani said that the staff report indicates that the hotel has 127 rooms; however, Section 1(B) of the Resolution indicated that the hotel has 128 rooms. She also stated that page 3 of the staff report indicates that there are 48 satellite parking spaces that are available for use by the hotel; however, 14 spaces at 3405 Sepulveda Boulevard, 8 spaces at 3313 Sepulveda Boulevard and 25 spaces at 3215 Sepulveda Boulevard add up to 47 spaces.

Acting Director Jester commented that the applicant can clarify the number of rooms and satellite spaces that are available for use by the hotel.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Acting Director Jester said that the Commissioners felt that they could support allowing a reduction in the number of satellite parking spaces at the last hearing for this project. She indicated that a resolution was not adopted after the last hearing, and language allowing the reduction is included in the subject draft Resolution.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Acting Director Jester indicated that staff was not able to support providing permit parking in the adjacent neighborhood after discussing the possibility with the City's Traffic Engineer and representatives of the Police Department and Public Works. She said that staff does not feel the neighborhood is appropriate for establishing a permit parking district.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, Acting Director Jester said that staff has worked with the applicant to make sure that the directional signage that would be used would be simple and minimize the number and size of the signs. She commented that the hotel is unique in that it is located adjacent to the residential area and staff felt the signs would not set a precedent for other businesses.

Chairman Fasola said that he would have a concern that other businesses would request similar signs if they are allowed for the applicant.

Acting Director Jester said that they feel the subject site is unique because it is immediately adjacent to the residential neighborhood and the signs would address concerns that have been raised by the adjacent residents.

Chairman Fasola opened the public hearing.

Tim McOsker, an attorney with the Mayer Brown law firm, representing the applicant, said that the ITE standard is to provide 145 parking spaces. He commented that they are proposing to meet the ITE standard by providing 127 onsite spaces and an additional 18 satellite spaces. He said that they have proposed to add signage directing people to the hotel and stating that

hotel guests are not to park overnight in the adjacent neighborhood. He commented that the intent of the signage is not to provide advertising but rather to prevent hotel guests from driving into the adjacent neighborhood and to discourage hotel guests from parking on the adjacent street. He pointed out that the City would have the discretion to require that the signs be removed at any time, and the applicant would not claim any vested right to the signs.

Mr. McOsker indicated that their main request is to have the ability to charge overnight guests for valet parking. He commented that the staff report supports the request, and the Traffic Engineer has indicated his opinion that charging for parking would not result in overnight guests choosing to park on the adjacent street. He pointed out that most of their customers are business travelers and would have the information that they would be charged for parking from the hotel's website before they arrive at the hotel. He commented that valet parking is a convenience, and most visitors also would not be familiar with the area to know about parking on the adjacent street to avoid the charge. He stated that the concern is people who are attending events park on the street.

Mr. McOsker pointed out that 20 of their employees participate in a rideshare program. He commented that they also prohibit their employees from parking on the street, and they have the ability to discipline employees who violate the rule. He said that guests and event coordinators that are planning functions at the hotel are given information that parking is to be on site. He said that there is currently a sign at the entrance that valet parking is complimentary. He commented that there will still be customers who chose to park on the adjacent streets, and they will continue to address the concern. He requested that condition 3 of the draft Resolution be changed to state that complimentary valet parking is provided for daytime customers and event patrons and that hotel parking is not permitted in the residential neighborhood. He also requested adding a condition that a valet parking fee may only be charged to overnight guests and that the parking fee shall only be collected at the time that the room charges are collected.

Mr. McOsker suggested allowing a six month trial period to allow the hotel to charge overnight guests for parking. He indicated that there could be an analysis after six months to determine whether charging overnight guests has negatively impacted parking in the adjacent neighborhood. He said that the issue could then come back before the Commission for consideration of modification to the Use Permit if it is determined to be a negative impact. He commented that they would ask for relief from the requirement to provide signage initially if it is decided to allow a six month trial period.

Commissioner Paralusz commented that she would like to hear additional public input but is pleased that the applicant is receptive to a trial period.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, **Mr. McOsker** said that the signage would be a significant cost to the applicant. He indicated that if they are required to add the signage in

exchange for the ability to charge for overnight guest parking, they would not want to invest in the signs if after six months the allowance to charge for overnight guest parking is taken away.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would think that the directional signs would be helpful to the applicant and neighbors regardless of whether or not they have the ability to charge for overnight guest parking.

Mr. McOsker commented that they feel they currently are doing a great job of directing hotel guests and employees from parking on the street.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Mr. McOsker** said that the fee for overnight guest parking has not been established.

John Mackel, general counsel for Larkspur Hotels and Restaurants, representing the applicant, said that it will take some analysis before they arrive at the appropriate amount to charge for overnight guest parking. He commented that the charge would most likely be in the range of \$5.00 to \$15.00 per night.

Commissioner Andreani commented that she does not feel charging for overnight guest parking would result in people choosing to park on the adjacent residential streets. She pointed out that it would be an inconvenience for people to park on the adjacent street and then carry their luggage to the hotel or to unload their bags at the hotel and then park on the street in order to avoid the charge. She commented that paying a reasonable rate for valet overnight parking is almost expected at hotels.

In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani, **Mr. McOsker** indicated that they routinely monitor to ensure that their employees do not park on the adjacent streets.

Jason Love, a resident of the 3500 block of Oak Avenue, said that the applicant has been a good neighbor and has done a great deal to mitigate parking issues and to ensure that their employees do not park on the adjacent streets. He indicated, however, that a future operator of the hotel may not be as diligent at enforcing the employee parking on site which should be a consideration in allowing the subject Use Permit amendment. He suggested the possibility of tying the proposed amendments to the current operator. He requested that the signage that is posted along the east side as well as the west side of Oak Avenue indicate “no hotel parking” rather than “no hotel overnight parking.” He commented that signage stating “no hotel overnight parking” would not discourage people who are visiting the hotel for an event from parking on the street. He stated that he would be in favor of establishing a six month trial review period and requested that there be an opportunity for public input at the end of the period.

In response to a question from Chairman Fasola, Acting Director Jester commented that staff did work with the applicant on the wording of the signage. She indicated that it was felt that there was a difference on the east and west sides of Oak Avenue. She commented that staff would not encourage hotel parking on the east side of Oak Avenue, but they felt that there is a difference in allowing parking on the two sides of the street.

Mark Sasway, a resident of the 3500 block of Elm Avenue, said that hotel staff being present to direct people to park for events at the hotel is a big help. He commented that the hotel has done a good job in ensuring that their employees do not park on the adjacent streets. He said, however, that the only method to enforce that hotel guests do not park on the adjacent street is by establishing permit parking for the adjacent residents. He stated that they are concerned with managing the parking on the adjacent street.

Ann Rose, a resident of the 3500 block of Elm Avenue, commented that she is concerned that there would be a need to provide the additional 50 satellite parking spaces when the economy improves and business at the hotel increases. She said that charging hotel guests for overnight parking would encourage people to park for the hotel on the street. She commented that repeat customers of the hotel would become aware that free parking is available on the adjacent streets and would park there to avoid the valet charge. She commented that signage directing guests to the hotel are crucial, as finding the hotel is confusing once drivers turn from Sepulveda Boulevard.

Josh Cooperman, a resident of the 3500 block of Elm, said that there are some initial signs that have been put in place which have helped. He said that the hotel having staff direct people who are attending events away from parking on the adjacent streets has also helped. He stated that he realizes that it is not possible to prevent all visitors to the hotel from parking on the adjacent streets. He commented, however, that there is a greater issue during larger events. He indicated that many cars were parked along the adjacent streets for a Chamber of Commerce meeting which occurred at the hotel. He said that the additional signage would provide a reminder to people that they are not to park for the hotel on the adjacent streets. He commented that the applicant has solved issues with employees parking on the street. He indicated that he feels the applicant has managed their onsite parking effectively and should not be required to pay for additional satellite parking spaces that are not used. He said that there is an issue with charging overnight guests for parking. He pointed out that posts on travel websites would advise people who are planning to stay at the hotel that the valet fee can be avoided by parking on the adjacent streets. He said that the only way to avoid overnight guests from parking on the street to avoid the parking charge would be to establish permit parking for the adjacent residents.

Mr. Cooperman commented that he would support allowing a trial period for the applicant to be allowed to charge for overnight guest parking, but he would like for standards to be specified

in order to determine any impact to the neighbors during that period. He indicated that he would support the trial period on the stipulation that the hotel no longer charge for overnight parking if at the end of the period it is determined that there is a significant impact to the neighbors. He suggested that a group consisting of the adjacent residents, staff and representatives of the hotel be formed that would work together. He said that he feels the additional signage as proposed is very important. He also requested that any changes to the conditions apply to the current operators of the hotel.

Acting Director Jester pointed out that Use Permits are attached to the property and cannot be limited to apply to a specific business operator. She said that Use Permits include certain conditions that apply which must be reviewed if they are proposed to be significantly changed by a future operator.

Mr. Mackel stated that they had proposed wording for the signs on the east side of Oak Avenue to state “no overnight hotel parking” rather than “no hotel parking” because they felt that they should not be strictly prohibited from allowing hotel visitors to park on the east side of Oak Avenue. He stated, however, that they would be willing to place signs on both sides of Oak to state “no hotel parking.” He commented that they do not feel the additional signage is necessary with regard to managing the perceived risk of charging for overnight valet parking. He indicated that they are confident that charging for overnight guest parking would not have an impact to the neighborhood. He said that they would be willing to install the signs if a six month trial period were implemented.

Chairman Fasola closed the public hearing.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester indicated that she believes the hotel has a good relationship with the neighbors and would not disagree if the neighbors feel that charging guests for overnight parking has impacted parking on the adjacent streets.

Commissioner Lesser asked about how a six month trial period would be implemented if the Use Permit is adopted.

Acting Director Jester indicated that language could be added to state that the condition will be reviewed in six months.

Commissioner Paralusz suggested that the permit be reviewed periodically so that any impacts could be determined if there is a change in ownership.

Acting Director Jester pointed out that staff reviews Use Permits on an annual basis to determine if there are any issues regarding compliance with the conditions. She said that

requiring additional hearings before the Commission would be a different type of review process and would be burdensome. She commented that she would have a concern with requiring an annual review before the Commission as a condition of the Resolution.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she would like for some type of periodic review process to be considered. She commented that the current operator has a good relationship with the neighbors, but she would want the Commission to have the opportunity to review the permit if the ownership of the hotel changes.

Commissioner Andreani said that there has been collaboration between the applicant and the neighbors. She suggested that the satellite parking requirement be reduced; that valet parking remain complementary for all hotel patrons including overnight guests; and that an appropriate signage program be implemented. She commented that if the conditions are placed in the Use Permit, any future operators of the hotel would need to meet the conditions or else would be in violation.

Commissioner Paralusz stated that she would support a pilot program to allow the applicant to have the ability to charge overnight guests for parking. She indicated that she believes that the hotel guests would choose to pay for valet parking for convenience rather than park on the adjacent streets. She said that she would have more concern if the allowance for the applicant to charge for overnight parking were permanent and did not include an opportunity for review.

Chairman Fasola commented that he feels allowing a private business to place signage on City sign posts would set a precedent. He commented that the City should have the funds to put up directional signs. He indicated that he would want for the signs to be red and white and to only provide directions. He commented that he would not want to set a precedent of allowing private businesses to place signs on City sign posts. He indicated that other businesses in the City may want similar signage if they are approved for the applicant. He commented that he does feel that the applicant should place signs on their property to direct people to the hotel from Valley.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that the applicant is willing to pay for the signage, and the City is currently in a budget crisis. She commented that she also feels that the number of signs should be reduced.

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she would like for the signs to be generic, and she is pleased that they would be paid for by the applicant.

Commissioner Andreani said that she also would like for the signs to be generic and likes that the applicant would pay for them. She indicated that she feels there are too many signs. She commented that she does not feel that any signs should be placed on Sepulveda Boulevard.

Acting Director Jester stated that staff will work with the City's Traffic Engineer to determine the appropriate locations for the signs.

Commissioner Lesser said that he would prefer for the signs to be placed on the hotel's property rather than on public property.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that incorporating generic signs would mitigate the concern regarding allowing a private business to place signs on City sign posts.

Acting Director Jester said that her understanding is that the Commission would support generic signage; reducing the number of signs; and requiring that the hotel pay for the signage. She indicated that staff will utilize opportunities to place the signs on the hotel's property.

Commissioner Andreani commented that she would agree to a reduction in the satellite parking requirement but would ask whether the number should be greater than 18 in order to prevent the hotel from having to come back to the City in the future if more parking is needed.

Commissioner Seville-Jones pointed out that the applicant would only need 18 satellite parking spaces to meet the ITE standards. She said that the parking count also demonstrates that the hotel would be able to manage the demand for parking with 18 additional spaces.

The Commissioners agreed to allow a reduction in the number of required satellite parking spaces to 18.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she would not object to allowing a six month trial period for the applicant to have the ability to charge for overnight guest parking.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she is not in support of allowing the applicant to have the ability to charge for overnight guest parking. She commented that charging hotel guests for overnight parking would add to the number of cars that park in the adjacent neighborhood. She said that it would be difficult to measure the impact to the neighborhood with a six month trial period. She said that there is also a concern with future operators of the hotel having the ability to charge overnight guests. She commented that there currently is a problem with parking in the neighborhood, and allowing the charge for overnight hotel guest parking would add to the problem. She indicated that business travelers may choose to use the valet service; however, guests of local residents who stay at the hotel may choose to park on the street. She said that she would not support allowing a six month trial period for the hotel to have the ability to charge for overnight guest parking.

Attachment 4

Commissioner Lesser stated that there was a reason that the original Use Permit required complimentary valet parking for the hotel. He indicated that the current owner has been very responsible; however, the conditions would also apply to all future owners. He said that he would also want for criteria to be established for determining any impacts to the neighbors if a six month trial period were allowed. He said that he would be reluctant to allow the applicant to charge for overnight guest parking.

Commissioner Andreani stated that she would like for the applicant to have the opportunity to receive additional revenue by charging for overnight parking. She indicated, however, that she would prefer that valet parking remain complimentary for all hotel guests, which has been a longstanding benefit of the hotel. She commented that discouraging parking for the hotel in the adjacent neighborhood and having complimentary valet service for all hotel guests minimizes the impacts to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that she could accept allowing the applicant to charge for overnight guest parking if permit parking were established in the adjacent neighborhood. She commented that she is not clear on the reason why a parking overlay would not be appropriate for the subject neighborhood. She said that there is no City enforcement of the signs indicating that guests of the hotel are not to park on the street.

Chairman Fasola indicated that charging overnight guests for valet parking would result in more cars parking on the adjacent streets. He indicated that he understands that charging guests for overnight parking would result in a great increase in revenue for the hotel. He commented that he would much prefer that the rate of the hotel rooms be increased rather than having a charge for valet parking. He indicated that he would not support allowing a trial period for the applicant to have the ability to charge for overnight guest valet parking.

Commissioner Paralusz said that she will defer to the position of the other Commissioners to not support allowing the applicant the ability to charge guests for overnight valet parking.

Acting Director Jester indicated that staff was clear that the parking directional signs should be generic design and colors, as few as possible, and on private property not in the public right-of-way whenever possible.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani/Fasola) to **APPROVE** draft Resolution PC 10-XX for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment for an Existing Hotel Located at 3501 Sepulveda Boulevard.

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Acting Director Jester explained the appeal process and indicated that the item will be placed on the City Council's Consent Calendar for their meeting of January 18, 2011.

6. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

7. DIRECTORS ITEMS

Acting Director Jester said that the remodel project at 3404 The Strand/3405 Ocean Drive has been appealed to the City Council by the neighboring resident and will be heard at their meeting of December 21.

Acting Director Jester indicated that David Carmany has been selected as the new City Manager, and his contract has been approved by the City Council. She indicated that he will start with the City on January 10, 2011.

Chairman Fasola commented that it has been a pleasure working with Acting Director Jester this past year during the selection process for the new City Manager, and this is her last meeting as Acting Director.

8. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Commissioner Paralusz indicated that the holiday fireworks show will take place at 7:00 p.m. on the pier on Sunday, December 12. She said that the event begins at 4:00 p.m.

Commissioner Paralusz said that the toy drive is currently taking place. She said that items can be dropped off at the Fire Department. She commented that there is also a toy drive wrapping party at Joslyn Center on Saturday, December 18 at 11:00 a.m.

Acting Director Jester commented that there are also boxes for donations to the toy drive and food drive at City Hall.

9. TENTATIVE AGENDA December 22, 2010

This meeting is to be cancelled.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m. to Wednesday, December 22 2010, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue.

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

LAURIE JESTER
Acting Community Development Director

Chapter 10.28 - PS PUBLIC AND SEMIPUBLIC DISTRICT

Sections:

[10.28.010 - Specific purposes.](#)

[10.28.020 - Applicability.](#)

[10.28.030 - Land use regulations.](#)

[10.28.040 - Development regulations.](#)

10.28.010 - Specific purposes.

In addition to the general purposes listed in Chapter 10.01, the specific purposes of the PS Public and Semipublic District are to:

- A. Allow consideration of a large public or semipublic use separately from regulations for an underlying base zoning that may or may not be appropriate in combination with the public or semipublic use.
- B. Allow consideration of establishment or expansion of a large public or semipublic use at rezoning hearings rather than at use permit hearings only, and give notice to all of the extent of a site approved for a large public or semipublic use by delineating it on the zoning map.
- C. Allow the Planning Commission and City Council to consider the most appropriate use of a site following discontinuance of a large public or semipublic use without the encumbrance of a base zoning district that may or may not provide appropriate regulations for reuse of the site.

(Ord. No. 1832, Amended, 01/17/91; Ord. No. 1838, Renumbered, 07/05/91)

10.28.020 - Applicability.

The regulations of the PS District shall preclude the regulations of any base district for the use classifications listed in Section 10.28.030, where these uses are permitted in the base district, and have a contiguous site area of 2 acres or more, including alleys, streets, or other rights-of-way. Public and semipublic use classifications on sites of less than 2 acres shall be subject to the regulations of the base and overlay districts in which they are located.

(Ord. No. 1832, Amended, 01/17/91; Ord. No. 1838, Renumbered, 07/05/91; Ord. No. 1864, Amended, 02/18/93)

10.28.030 - Land use regulations.

In the following schedule, the letter "P" designates use classifications permitted in PS districts. The letter "L" designates use classifications subject to certain limitations prescribed by the "Additional Use Regulations" which follow. The letter "U" designates use classifications permitted on approval of a use permit, as provided in Chapter 10.84. The letters "P/U" for an accessory use mean that the use is permitted on the site of a permitted use but requires a use permit on the site of a conditional use. Letters in parentheses in the "Additional Regulations" column reference regulations following the schedule.

Title 10 - PLANNING AND ZONING
 PART II - BASE DISTRICT REGULATIONS
 Chapter 10.28 - PS PUBLIC AND SEMIPUBLIC DISTRICT

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| | | |
| PS DISTRICT: LAND USE REGULATIONS | | |
| | P — Permitted U — Use Permit L — Limited (See Additional Use Regulations) | |
| | PS | Additional Regulations |
| | | |
| Public and Semipublic | | |
| Cultural Institutions | U | |
| Day Care, General | U | |
| Farmers' Market | U | |
| Government Offices | L-16 | |
| Hospitals | U | |
| Maintenance & Service Facilities | L-16 | |
| Park & Recreation Facilities | L-16 | |
| Public Safety Facilities | L-16 | |
| Religious Assembly | L-20 | |
| Residential Care, General | U | |
| Schools, Public or Private | U | |
| Utilities, Major | U | |
| Utilities, Minor | P | |
| Commercial Uses | | |
| Eating and Drinking Establishments | L-17 | |
| Offices, Business and Professional | L-18 | |
| Vehicle/Equipment Sales and Services | L-19 | |
| Commercial Parking Facility | | |
| Accessory Uses | | |
| Accessory Uses and Structures | P/U | |
| Temporary Uses | | |
| Animal Shows | U | (A) |
| Christmas Tree/Pumpkin Sales | P | |
| Circuses and Carnivals | U | |
| Commercial Filming, Limited | U | |
| Trade Fairs | U | |
| Nonconforming Uses | | |
| | | (B) |

.....

PS District: Additional Use Regulations

.....

L-16 City-owned facilities are permitted; all other facilities require a use permit.

L-17 Permitted as an accessory use in a cultural, educational, hospital, or medical institution occupying no more than 5,000 square feet, only if there is no separate entrance or sign.

L-18 Allowed on surplus school sites with a use permit subject to the following limitations:

1. No new structure, including temporary or mobile, shall be built or moved to the site for office purposes.
2. Adequate parking, or required by Chapter 10.64, shall be provided.
3. No clients or customers shall be permitted on the site except on an occasional basis.
4. Hours of business operation shall not exceed 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and weekend and holiday use of the office facilities shall not be permitted except under specific time limitations established as a condition of approval of the use permit.
5. The Community Development Director shall review compliance with conditions of approval annually.
6. The permit may be revoked upon application of the property owner with six months notice to the office tenant.

L-19 Public parking permitted, but commercial parking facilities on City-owned land require a use permit.

L-20 A use permit is required, except for existing church facilities, including private schools contained therein, which do not exceed an overall floor area factor greater than half of the maximum floor area factor permitted by the development standards of the base district. Such excepted facilities shall be subject to the following standards:

1. The depth of the required front yard shall be the same as that required in the zone and area district in which it is located.
2. Buildings and structures on the site shall not be closer than 25 feet to any residential boundary property line, except that a detached single-family dwelling on such site shall conform to the yard requirements, height, and required distance between buildings as prescribed in the zone and area district in which the site is located.
3. No portion of any building or structure shall exceed a height of 30 feet as measured from the average of the finished ground level at the center of all walls, except that steeples or other architectural features containing no floor space may exceed such height limit.
4. All off-street parking requirements shall be conformed to, except that on interior lots the required side yards may be used to provide off-street parking areas and, on corner lots, the interior side yard may be similarly used. Under no circumstances may the required front yard or side yard on the side street side be used for off-street parking.

5. All lights provided to illuminate any parking area or building on such site shall be arranged so as to direct the light away from any premises upon which a dwelling unit is located.
6. All bounding streets and/or alleys shall be improved to the dimensions indicated on any formally-adopted plans therefor, and to the City's specifications pertaining to materials, design and construction. Where no official plan for street alignment or widths has been adopted, the plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for report and recommendation.
7. The following signs only are permitted:
 - (i) One sign area on the outside wall of the main building and parallel thereto, having an area not greater than twenty (20) square feet; and
 - (ii) A detached sign having dimensions totaling not more than twenty (20) square feet and on which both faces may be utilized, such sign being securely mounted on the ground on supports and the top of which sign shall not be more than six (6) feet above the natural level of the ground upon which it rests.
8. Loading and unloading of school buses shall be on the school site and no storage or servicing of school buses or automotive equipment shall be permitted on the site.

(A) See Section 10.84.110: Temporary use permits.

(B) See Chapter 10.68: Nonconforming uses and structures.

(Ord. No. 1832, Amended, 01/17/91; Ord. No. 1838, Renumbered, 07/05/91, ; Ord. No. 1860, Amended, 10/29/92; Ord. No. 1864, Amended, 02/18/93; Ord. No. 1883, Amended, 07/15/93)

10.28.040 - Development regulations.

Development regulations shall be as specified by the use permit, provided that if the use permit fails to regulate an element regulated by an abutting base district, or a use permit is not required, the regulations of the nearest base district shall apply to each portion of a PS district.

(Ord. No. 1832, Amended, 01/17/91; Ord. No. 1838, Renumbered, 07/05/91)