

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
JANUARY 11, 2012**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 11th day of January, 2012, 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, Conaway, Gross, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Paralusz  
Absent: None  
Staff Present: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development  
Esteban Danna, Assistant Planner  
Jack Rydell, Traffic Engineer  
Recording Secretary, Sarah Boeschen

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 14, 2012**

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Seville-Jones/Conaway) to **APPROVE** the minutes of December 14, 2011.

AYES: Andreani, Conaway, Gross, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Paralusz  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

**3. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

**Ed Caprellian**, a Manhattan Beach resident, said that the actual number of on site and offsite sales indicated in staff's report regarding the alcohol related study that was directed by the City Council is inaccurate and does not correlate with the information of the Police Department regarding the number of onsite and offsite sales of alcohol. He stated that the only issue that has been raised by the Police Department is regarding the number of alcohol related vehicle accidents. He said that corrections have been made, and he provided the results with the revised figures. He commented that the number of alcohol related accidents in the City has dropped, but Manhattan Beach still ranked high in the number of accidents. He indicated that there are concerns regarding the number of alcohol related accidents in the South Bay, including within Manhattan Beach. He commented that the direction from the City Council to the Community Development Director was very general. He requested that the Commission ask the Community Development Director about the results that are expected to be produced in the staff report.

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**01/11/12-2 Planned Development Permit Amendment for Renovation, Small Addition, and a Membership Increase at the Manhattan Country Club Located at 1330 Parkview Avenue**

Assistant Planner Esteban Danna summarized the staff report.

Commissioner Gross asked about the information in the 2008 traffic study being applicable to current conditions for parking at the subject site, as parking meters have since been installed along the street on Parkview Avenue.

Traffic Engineer Rydell commented that the information that he took from the 2008 study was to determine the actual parking demand on the site. He indicated that the peak demand was found to be 116 vehicles per day on a weekday. He said that the study was based on a membership for the club of 1,200. He commented that increasing the membership from 1,200 to 1,400 members would result in an estimated increased demand of 20 parking spaces per day, which would result in a demand of 136 spaces. He commented that there is sufficient parking to handle the peak demand for the club with the proposed expansion, and he can feel comfortable that the available parking will satisfy the parking demand without adversely effecting on adjacent residents.

Director Thompson commented that parking requirements are designed to accommodate the parking demand that is generated by a use on a particular site. He said that there is not a formula for parking requirement that has been established for the subject type of use, and the amount of parking is based on a parking demand study. He commented that it is not possible to accommodate the parking demand during special events, and the expectation is that the parking that is provided will meet the demand during normal operation.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked whether notice of the hearing was provided to the residents of the senior housing development located nearby the club. She said that they are impacted by the use of the subject parking lot for the club.

Assistant Planner Danna indicated that notice was provided to properties within a 500 foot radius of the subject property.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Assistant Planner Danna commented that he believes the subject property and adjacent property are owned by the City. He stated that the City does not have plans to change the use of the building on the adjacent property.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Director Thompson stated that the City Manager and City Attorney are working on the terms of the lease agreement for the subject site. He said that the subject application is separate from the discussions regarding the terms of the lease with the club.

Commissioner Andreani pointed out that the traffic study that was conducted in 2008 is in draft form. She asked as to whether the study was ever finalized and why information was taken from a draft report. She also asked regarding the level of development that requires a traffic impact analysis.

Director Thompson indicated that a new parking study is done when a request is made for change in use of a property. He said that the traffic engineer felt that the information from the 2008 study was adequate and current to today's standards.

In response to a question from Commissioner Conaway, Assistant Planner Danna indicated that the parking lot to the south of the office building is part of the golf course. He commented that notice of the hearing was provided to the residents of the senior housing development near the subject site.

In response to a question from Chairperson Paralusz, Assistant Planner Danna said that staff felt that the distance from any nearby residences is sufficient to mitigate noise from the expansion of the outdoor dining area. He indicated that staff has not received complaints from adjacent residents in the past regarding noise from the dining area. He said that there is no proposal to increase the hours of the dining area. He commented that the increase in demand for parking does not assume an increase in the number of employees. He indicated that staff feels comfortable that there is an adequate surplus of parking to accommodate an increase in the number of employees.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Director Thompson said that it has been the practice of the club to request a permit for special events in order to ensure that the City departments are aware of such events before they occur.

Assistant Planner Danna pointed out that item 14 on page 3 of the draft Resolution requires a parking management plan to be submitted to the City for special events of more than 250 people.

Chairperson Paralusz opened the public hearing.

### **Audience Participation**

**Keith Brackpool**, representing the applicant, stated that they have a ground lease from the City with 65 years remaining. He commented that there currently is no lease negotiation occurring between the club and the City. He stated that the residents of the senior housing development located near the subject site did receive notice of the project. He indicated that they have a full membership. He stated that they need to increase their membership in order to help offset the large investment they are making to renovate the club. He commented that there is not a parking problem at the club. He pointed out that the members would leave the club if parking were an issue. He commented that they donate the facility every year for a special event given by the Manhattan Beach Education Foundation, which they have done for the past 16 years. He said that the Education Foundation requests the special event permit from the City, and they make arrangements with the adjacent businesses to provide for parking.

**Grant Kirkpatrick**, the project architect, stated that they are attempting to update the facility with the remodel rather than to change the nature of the club. He pointed out that they are not proposing any additions outside of the existing footprint of the building. He described the proposed renovations.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, **Mr. Kirkpatrick** indicated that 50 seats would be added to the dining area as a result of the proposal.

**Sara Nielson**, representing the applicant, pointed out that their members did not park on Parkview Avenue prior to the installation of the street parking meters, although some employees did park on the street. She indicated that their members prefer to park in the lot for the club rather than on the street. She indicated that the employees are not permitted to park in the lot for the club. She indicated that the club has leased spaces in the parking lot at Kinecta for employee parking. She pointed out that the membership count, use patterns, and services of the club have not changed since the parking study was done in 2008. She stated that a special event permit is filed for any event over 250 people at the club. She indicated that parking for special events is arranged with Kinecta and the Marriott, which are located across from the club.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Ms. Nielson** indicated that they are adding seats to the dining area as part of the renovations. She commented that most of the additional seating will be outside with the new configuration of the exterior dining. She indicated that people who are not members of the club currently cannot have lunch in the dining area, which would still be the case after the proposed renovations. She pointed out that they are not subject to the same requirements as a fitness center or restaurant because of their restricted patronage base.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, **Ms. Nielson** indicated that approximately 80 percent of their membership base is located in Manhattan Beach. She said that there are a large number of Manhattan Beach residents that would join if they felt the club better met their needs and standards.

In response to a question from Chairperson Paralusz, **Ms. Nielsen** commented that they did study the noise impact to the adjacent residents. She pointed out that shutters and a curtain system would be included to enclose the outdoor area in the evenings. She stated that there has not been an issue with noise in the past because of the distance of the dining area from the adjacent residents.

**Mr. Kirkpatrick** said that the existing outdoor dining area is similar to the subject proposal. He stated that there would be shutters as well as exterior canvas drapes that would enclose the area and help to buffer any noise impacts.

In response to a question from Chairperson Paralusz, **Ms. Nielsen** indicated that they hope to begin construction in March if the project is approved. She commented that the construction would most likely take approximately six months to complete.

**Ed Caprellian** commented that he was not provided with information from staff regarding the number of parking spaces that are allocated to the club in relation to the number allocated to the adjacent office building, which he feels is a critical issue regarding the availability of parking. He said that he is not concerned with the proposed renovations but is concerned that the parking would not be sufficient with the proposed expansion to the club membership. He commented that before the parking meters were installed on Parkview Avenue, the City's previous traffic engineer stated in a report that patrons and employees of local business such as the Marriott and the country club utilized the street parking on Parkview Avenue rather than the private lots in order to avoid the private lot parking fees or at the request of their employers. He said that the previous report also states that special events create additional parking demands. He commented that the previous general manager of the club indicated in a report that the installation of the parking meters on Parkview Avenue would result in many problems. He pointed out that the spaces that are allocated for the country club at the Village Field parking lot are not marked.

**Mr. Caprellian** said that the City Council contracted \$35,000.00 to a consulting firm to research the proposed renovations and the impacts that it might have on the terms of the lease with the City. He commented that the club has requested to lower their lease payments during construction. He indicated that discussion of the previous expansion for the club in 2004 by the Planning Commission took two meetings, and he suggested that the item be continued to the next meeting for further consideration. He said that eight two-hour reserved parking spaces are for tenants of the adjacent office building.

**Mr. Caprellian** indicated that the parking study that was conducted in 2004 was funded by the country club, and the same firm was hired to conduct several studies. He commented that one study conducted by the same firm included the street parking spaces on Parkview Avenue as

belonging to the club. He pointed out that questions were raised by the Planning Commission at the 2004 hearing regarding the management of the parking at the club. He commented that he feels members of the public should be given more than three minutes to speak at Planning Commission meetings. He said that applicants are given unlimited time to speak and three minutes is not necessarily sufficient for members of the public to receive fair and equal consideration.

**Gerry O'Connor**, a Manhattan Beach resident, commented that the situation with the subject proposal is unique, in that the City is the landlord and the governing body over a piece of property and the tenants of that property. He said that the local businesses should be supported. He commented that **Mr. Kirkpatrick** has the best interest of the community at heart and does wonderful projects. He indicated, however, that the primary concern with the proposal is regarding parking. He commented that he voted no on allowing a membership increase for the club in 2004 when the issue was before the Commission and he was the chairperson. He stated that he felt the parking study that was done had some significant questions that were not answered to his satisfaction. He said that he does not object to the expansion of the membership. He indicated, however, that the City has the responsibility as landlord and governing body to ensure that adequate parking is provided.

**Mr. O'Connor** pointed out that the parking study that was commissioned by the club in 2004 was not mentioned in the current staff report. He said that the current staff report references a draft traffic impact study that was conducted in 2008. He indicated that the 2008 parking study was conducted for a project that was never finalized. He said that he does not feel that it is logical to use a draft study as a basis for evaluating the current proposal. He suggested that the Commission review the 2004 parking study before considering the proposed increase. He indicated that there are inconsistencies in the approach of the 2004 parking study and the 2008 parking study. He commented that the 2004 parking study suggested that a membership increase from 1,000 to 1,200 members would require an increase of 14 parking spaces; however, the current staff report suggests that there is an excess of parking and an increase in membership from 1,200 to 1,400 members requires no additional parking spaces. He said that the amount of available parking should be quantified. He stated that the City has a responsibility as the landholder and governing body to provide an assurance that adequate parking will be provided for the site. He commented that he is not suggesting that parking would be insufficient with the proposal; however, he feels that the staff report and traffic study do not provide adequate information in order to reach a conclusion regarding the parking.

**Mr. O'Connor** indicated that the Commission has never had a policy of limiting the time given to members of the public to speak regarding issues. He indicated that members of the public should be allotted ample time to speak provided that they are adding value to the discussion and provided that there are not a large number of other audience members waiting to speak on an item.

**Ms. Nielson** pointed out that 14 parking spaces were added to the club parking lot with the membership increase in 2004; however 44 parking spaces were actually added to the club allocation for parking. She said that commercial office space was converted at the time into club space, which added 44 parking spaces to the supply of parking for the club. She said that the membership in 2004 was actually increased by 20 percent, and the parking was increased by 40 percent. She said that the lease negotiations with the City have been terminated, and they are not pursuing any lease modifications or reduction in lease payments during construction.

**Ms. Nielson** pointed out that the parking study included in the current staff report taken in 2008 was for a project to convert the office building which eventually was not pursued further.

She indicated, however, the information taken by staff in preparing the current staff report was regarding the parking survey data which is accurate. She commented that the study found that the club was using 60 percent of the available parking. She indicated that the street spaces on Parkview Avenue are not utilized since the installation of the meters.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, **Ms. Nielson** indicated that the club does provide valet parking. She indicated that the valet service could utilize the meter spaces on Parkview Avenue; however, the company would be required to pay for the meters.

In response to a question from Commissioner Conaway, **Ms. Nielson** said that their lot has not been full to capacity during normal operation of the club. She said that the valet service arranges parking with the Marriott and Kinecta for special events. She stated their average usage is approximately 40 percent of the available parking, and their peak usage is approximately 60 percent of available parking.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, **Ms. Neilson** stated that they have a contract for use of 20 parking spaces in the Kinecta parking lot. She indicated that the parking analyst did verify the results of the 2008 parking survey; however, the approval of the study was never finalized because the project did not go forward.

**Mr. Kirkpatrick** commented that he is a member of the club for over 10 years and has never had difficulty finding parking. He requested that the Commission consider the information that has been provided in the staff report and take into account that there currently is not an issue with parking at the club. He suggested that the Commission approve the project with the condition that additional information be provided to staff if the Commissioners feel that the data from the 2008 parking survey is not sufficient. He said that it is very important to the applicant that the process move forward.

Chairperson Paralusz closed the public hearing.

Director Thompson commented that there currently have not been any concerns raised regarding parking on the subject site.

Traffic Engineer Rydell said that the only information he used from the 2008 study was the data from the count of the number of occupied parking spaces. He commented that he has confidence in the information that was provided by the firm that did the survey and has no reason to believe that the information that they provided was not accurate. He said that the information he used was raw data and did not include any analysis. He stated that the applicant has a larger parking supply than was considered for the project, as they have a lease for additional parking spaces. He commented that there has always been available street parking on Parkview Avenue when he has visited the site. He indicated that he has also not seen the demand for parking at the club exceeds the amount of available parking. He said that he believes there is adequate parking at the club to accommodate the proposal.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Traffic Engineer Rydell said that he did not review the 2004 parking study. He indicated that his analysis for the subject proposal was based on the data that was included in the 2008 study.

Traffic Engineer Rydell commented that he feels comfortable given the data from the 2008 study that there is adequate parking for the site.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Conaway indicated that he would prefer for a new parking survey be done rather than to revisit a study that was prepared in 2004. He stated that he has no reason to feel that the data gathered in the 2008 study is inaccurate. He said that it has been indicated that there is a surplus of parking for the club, and he does not feel parking is a major issue for the proposed increase in the membership. He pointed out that it is in the best interest of the applicant to provide adequate parking to the members of the club. He indicated that the club is an asset to the community. He said that no complaints have been raised by the tenants of the nearby senior housing development. He commented that any issues with sound have been addressed. He indicated that he would not be opposed to a continuance in order to review the 2004 traffic study. He indicated, however, that he is not convinced that the information from the 2004 report would be applicable in terms of the current parking demand on the site. He indicated that he supports the proposal.

Commissioner Gross commented that he appreciates the input of **Mr. Caprellian** and **Mr. O'Connor**. He said that it costs money to have a perfect process in evaluating projects. He said that the City is attempting to control costs, and it is also important to attempt to reduce the costs for applicants to have a project evaluated. He said that there is not always the time and money to have a perfect process for considering projects. He commented that while the process of evaluating the project has not been perfect, he does not feel it is not sufficiently flawed to change the outcome. He stated that he supports the project as proposed. He said that the project would help to generate more sales tax revenue for the City with the increase in memberships and the increase in seating capacity at the restaurant. He commented that he would hope that the parking for the use of the club would overflow onto Parkview Avenue in order for the City to collect additional revenue from the parking meters. He commented that the proposal would offer 200 more memberships to residents of the City. He pointed out that the applicant has a huge incentive to make sure that the parking meets the demand. He said that the club also serves the City in many ways by sponsoring events. He indicated that he supports the proposal.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that the club provides an important service to the community. She commented that she supports the proposed additions and appreciates that the increase in membership is necessary in order to make the renovations economically feasible. She said that she feels the data that is in front of the Commission supports moving ahead with the proposal. She indicated, however, that she is concerned with not having the information from the 2004 parking study. She said that the 2004 study was certified and signed by a parking engineer, and she would feel more comfortable with having the opportunity to review the factors that were taken into account at that time. She commented that there seems to be adequate parking at the club. She stated, however, that the membership would be increased with the proposal which would result in an increase in the parking demand. She said that she is interested to see the factors that were considered in 2004. She indicated that she also feels that the 2004 report should be reviewed by the traffic engineer. She said that she would support a continuance for the proposal. She commented that she feels the distance between the dining area and the adjacent residents is sufficient to mitigate any noise issues. She also pointed out that concerns regarding noise or traffic issues have not been raised by any neighboring residents to the club. She said that she supports the project but feels the Commission has a duty to review the prior 2004 traffic study.

Commissioner Andreani said that she also supports the project. She stated that she feels the club is an asset to the community and appreciates that they would like to expand. She commented that she is not a member but has attended several events at the club. She said that she appreciates that there would not be a noise impact to adjacent neighbors as a result of the expansion. She stated, however, that she also has concerns with the parking analysis. She said that she is not clear as to why the 2008 draft report for a project involving the office building

adjacent to the club was included with the subject proposal. She pointed out that the club also has leased 20 spaces from Kinecta which she would factor into the available parking. She commented that she is not certain about the parking spaces allotted to the adjacent office building being available for club use after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, as some the office parking may still be occupied after 6:00 p.m. She said that she would support a continuance if concerns regarding the parking cannot be resolved without reviewing the 2004 report.

Director Thompson suggested that staff ask the traffic engineer to review the 2004 traffic study and that the report be addressed in the staff report that is forwarded to the City Council. He said that staff could bring the issue back before the Commission if there are any inconsistencies.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she would be concerned that the Commission is not doing their due diligence in considering the project if they do not review the 2004 study.

Chairperson Paralusz commented that she would approve the project except for her concerns regarding the parking. She indicated that the club provides a great service to the community. She said that she feels the subject proposal would be successful and appreciates that there would not be a noise impact to the surrounding neighbors. She indicated that she also appreciates that the adjacent neighbors have not raised concerns regarding the proposal. She stated, however, that she is concerned that the 2004 parking study was not considered as part of the subject proposal. She commented that projects should be reviewed with the most complete information possible. She indicated that she feels the 2004 study should be considered by the Commission in reaching their decision rather than forwarding the issue to the Council without the Commissioners first having reviewed the report. She said that she does not believe that the additional information will change the ultimate outcome, but she feels it is important to do a thorough review of the information that is available. She indicated that she would support a continuance in order to have an opportunity to review the 2004 study.

Commissioner Gross said that by the Commission requesting to review the 2004 report, an argument could be made that the Commission should review all of the previous traffic reports that have been prepared in the past for the club. He said that the information that is truly relevant is the most recent data regarding the parking. He stated that he is confident that the survey data that was included in the 2008 draft study is accurate. He said that he does not feel that having prior data would necessarily help the Commission in reaching their decision except that it would ensure the thoroughness of the process in approving the project. He said that he feels there is sufficient information that has been provided to approve the subject proposal without reviewing the 2004 study.

Director Thompson pointed out that staff did not ask the traffic engineer to review the 2004 study because the report was done for a separate project and the conditions on the site were different at the time. He said that staff looked at the most current information in making their recommendation. He stated that staff and the traffic engineer feel comfortable with the recommendation in the staff report.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she would want to look at the analysis that was done in 2004 in order to know the factors that were taken into account at the time. She said that the report from 2008 is a draft, and the most recent certified traffic study was conducted in 2004. She said that she does not feel the applicant should be required to incur the expense of conducting a new traffic study, but she would like further information regarding the previous study that was done in 2004.



Commissioner Andreani indicated that her concern is that the study conducted in 2008 is in draft form and was not done for the current project.

Chairperson Paralusz commented that she also feels the Commission should have the opportunity to review the analysis that was done as part of the 2004 study. She commented that a valid question was raised by **Mr. O'Connor** about the parking study, and he was on the Commission when the item was considered in 2004. She commented that she would be in favor of a continuance.

Commissioner Conaway stated that the main issue being considered by the Commission is the proposed membership increase for the club, and the proposal is not for operation of a new hotel or an office building. He indicated that he would be more interested in looking at the current parking numbers rather than reviewing a report from 2004. He said that in this case he feels the data that was provided in the current staff report is sufficient in making a decision. He suggested the possibility of doing a survey in the next two weeks on the site to determine the amount of parking that is currently being utilized.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she does not feel there is a need to collect additional data; however, she wants to have an opportunity to look at the factors that were taken into account in the 2004 study. She said that requiring new traffic counts would burden the applicant with more expense. She said she wants to be certain that the Commission is doing their due diligence in considering the proposal.

Commissioner Gross said that his understanding is that **Mr. O'Connor** is raising an issue that the 2004 and 2008 reports are not consistent. He pointed out that **Mr. O'Connor** did not say that he feels the 2008 data is inaccurate or that there would not be sufficient parking to meet the demand. He indicated that there is sufficient information with the 2008 data to approve the project, as it is not being argued that the information provided from 2008 is inaccurate.

Chairperson Paralusz indicated that she would like to have an opportunity to evaluate whether there are any inconsistencies between the 2004 and 2008 reports and whether any inconsistencies may be relevant in making a decision regarding the subject proposal.

Chairperson Paralusz reopened the public hearing and continued consideration of a Planned Development Permit Amendment for renovation, small addition, and a membership increase at the Manhattan Country Club located at 1330 Parkview Avenue to the meeting of January 25, 2012.

## **5. DIRECTORS ITEMS**

Director Thompson stated that the League of California Cities Planners Institute Conference is scheduled in San Jose on March 20, 2012. He said that he will be attending; however, there is not money allocated in the current budget for the Commissioners to attend conferences this year. He indicated that he is working with the new budget to provide money for the Commissioners to attend workshops and conferences.

## 6. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Chairperson Paralusz said that the project for the Chevron service station at the intersection of Marine Avenue and Aviation Boulevard appears almost completed.

Director Thompson said that work on the project can now progress quickly.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Director Thompson said that new construction has fallen in the City; however, renovation of existing structures is at the same level or higher than in 2006-2007. He indicated that the larger number of renovations is a result of the new incentives for renovating existing structures. He said that the fees for remodeling do not cover the City's expenses, which is an issue.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked if the Commission should give further consideration as to whether they should allow more time for members of the public to speak at meetings and as to whether they are being open and transparent with members of the public.

Director Thompson commented that the City Council is currently considering policies regarding open government, which would also apply to Commissions.

Chairperson Paralusz said that her intent as chairperson has been to provide the public with an opportunity to speak and to provide consistency in the manner in which they can expect to address the Commission. She said that she appreciates the point made by **Mr. O'Connor** that there should be flexibility in certain situations. She commented that her intent as chairperson is to not provide preferential treatment to any members of the public. She said that she would support further discussion regarding having an open government.

Commissioner Andreani feels that there has been flexibility by the Commission in allowing time for members of the public to speak. She said that speakers have typically been allowed additional time unless there has been a large audience where parameters were necessary. She said that she also would support further discussion of the issue and would suggest allowing more time than three minutes for members of the public to speak.

Director Thompson commented that consideration must also be given to the rights of the applicant as well as the efficiency of government. He commented that the discussion can become overrun by a group of people who are raising issues that may not be relevant to the discussion of a particular project. He said that there are many opportunities for members of the public to speak regarding issues and to participate in the process of considering projects. He indicated that the City does a good job of providing notice of projects and in being accessible to receiving input from members of the public. He pointed out that staff members are always available to discuss issues regarding projects with members of the public. He said that Planning Commission meetings are not designed for debating but rather to allow an opportunity for the public to raise any issues regarding a proposal.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Director Thompson stated that he can provide the Commissioners with further information regarding the role of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Conaway said that the public should be educated as well regarding participation at meetings. He commented that the agendas are clear that members of the audience are allowed three minutes to speak. He said that having a limited time encourages members of the public to organize their points and to remain on the topic. He suggested possibly providing

additional community outreach to inform members of the public regarding the public participation process.

Director Thompson indicated that staff does try their best to educate the public.

**7. TENTATIVE AGENDA January 25, 2012**

A Tin Roof- Use Permit Amendment – 3500 North Sepulveda Boulevard

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m. to Wednesday, January 25, 2012, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

SARAH BOESCHEN  
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD THOMPSON  
Community Development Director