

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
APRIL 24, 2013**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2013, 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, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Chairperson Conaway  
Absent: None  
Staff Present: Richard Thompson, Community Development Director  
Laurie Jester, Planning Manager  
Recording Secretary, Rosemary Lackow

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – April 10, 2013**

The following amendments were made by the Commission:

Commissioner Andreani: Page 1, Roll Call: correct title as Chairperson Conaway and Commissioner Andreani; Page 8, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph from top add a colon after “Second Units”; Page 9, Planning Commission items, first paragraph, shall be corrected to read “Commissioner Andreani noted that on April 11<sup>th</sup> in the Fire and Police Conference Room, the concept plan for the Veteran’s Parkway Maintenance Improvement Project will be presented. She also stated that the Final EIR for the Mall.....informative.” Same page, also under Commission Items, paragraph 3, insert “no” before “smoking”.

Commissioner Paralusz: Page 5, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph from the top: strike : “understand that” and replace with “that she requires” and strike “can be received”.

Chairperson Conaway: Page 3, third paragraph from top, first line: insert “code allowed” after “the minimum”. Same page, in the paragraph starting “There being no further questions..” add a “d” to the end of “invite”.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED to **APPROVE** the minutes of April 10, 2013, as amended.

AYES: Andreani, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Chairperson Conaway  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

**3. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

**Steve Vogle** stated he wanted to comment on the Manhattan Village project, and Chairperson Conaway advised that he should speak later in the public hearing for this project which is an agenda item.

**Viet Ngo**, long time City activist spoke and stated that the minutes regarding the Library are very critical and are incomplete in that they do not provide his input regarding the architects. He is putting the Commission on notice regarding the Brown Act and requested that the minutes for March 27 be so corrected.

There being no further public comments, Chairperson Conaway asked staff for correct procedure for correcting the minutes. Director Thompson stated that it would be appropriate for Mr. Ngo to put his concerns in writing and submit them with his request to the Planning Commission for consideration.

**4. GENERAL BUSINESS**

[04/24/13-2.](#) Adoption of a Resolution Approving a Variance from Building Height Standards by Two Inches for a Third Story Addition to an Existing Two-Story Single Family Residence Located at 508 Third Street. (Boyle)

Development Director Thompson made a brief summary recounting the proposal, the Commission’s

direction to approve the variance and stated that the action tonight is to review and approve the Resolution language, and not reopen the discussion as the public hearing is closed.

Commissioner Gross commended staff in their skill in drafting the Resolution as directed, especially in reflecting the truly exceptional situation. Commissioner Paralusz added that she wanted to emphasize that she felt the Variance was a good decision and the amount of the height variance being granted at only 2 inches is the absolute minimum needed by the applicant to make the project work.

Brief discussion followed regarding the building square footage that is reported on page 4 of the Resolution. Development Director Thompson explained that the square footage in the Resolution reflects City building records. Commissioner Andreani commented that she thought the Resolution was a good reflection of the Commission's direction and the approval is an example of the applicant working well with the staff and Commission to achieve a compromise.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED to **ADOPT** Resolution No. PC 13-04, approving a variance for 508 Third Street, with no changes.

AYES: Andreani, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Chairperson Conaway  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

Director Thompson announced a 15-day appeal period, and that this decision will be forwarded to the City Council at a future regular meeting with a recommendation to "Receive and File".

## 5. PUBLIC HEARING

04/24/13-3. Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project, Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Master Use Permit Amendment, Variance (Building Height), Sign Exception and Sign Program, located on the east side of Sepulveda Boulevard between Rosecrans Avenue and Marine Avenue (3200-3600 North Sepulveda Boulevard).

Chair Conaway noted announced the protocol that speakers will have 3 minutes to make comments due to the many people wishing to speak.

Director Thompson introduced this item, giving the background and stating that tonight's focus will be on the Final EIR, project revisions and parking. Planning Manager Jester gave a brief overview and laid out the process for the presentation which in order will include the applicant, then the EIR consultant which will include the traffic and parking consultant, then she will present a conclusion. Ms. Jester explained that some draft conditions of approval have been provided to encourage discussion. She gave a PowerPoint presentation covering many items in the Staff Report. After reviewing the history of the project and public review so far, she noted that the project has evolved to address public concerns, starting with the EIR scoping meeting in 2009 which drew comments that identified issues to be analyzed in the EIR. Revised applications were submitted in June and October, 2012 and most recently in March 2013. She clarified that the EIR covers the 18-acre portion of the site where new development is proposed but the entitlements including the Master Use Permit, are for the entire 44 acre site. She also explained that the Final EIR covers the Northwest Corner or Phase III which has been withdrawn from the Master Use Permit. The Phase III corner development will be the subject of a future Master Use Permit amendment and public hearings but is covered under the project description in the Draft and Final EIR.

At the conclusion of Ms. Jester's presentation a brief discussion was held by the Commission with Staff.

In response to a question as to whether it would be appropriate for the Commission to discuss the preliminary conditions, Director Thompson indicated that the Commission could discuss this at their discretion, but first the public hearing should be conducted.

In response to a question by Commissioner Andreani regarding page 79 of 193 of the Staff Report in a reference to a letter submitted by the Hacienda parcel owner, Ms. Jester indicated that staff did not verify the square footage numbers in the letter that asserted the size of Manhattan Village compared to other malls.

In response to a request by Chairperson Conaway Ms. Jester explained that regarding the period for public comments for the Final EIR, state law requires only a minimum 10-day review period, but in this case there will be several months of the public comment period before the Planning Commission and City

Council, right up to the point when eventually the City Council closes the public hearing and makes a decision on the applications. Continuing, Ms. Jester explained the difference between the Draft and Final EIR – that the Final EIR includes the Draft EIR and all public comments on the Draft EIR and responses to all those comments, as well as anything that has been brought up that requires additions and revisions to the Draft EIR or changes made by the applicant.

**Mark English, of RREEF** representing the applicant gave a PowerPoint presentation with the following main points: the Site Plan, Phase I and Phase II; the estimated Development Phasing time frames for the Village Shops- Phase I , with first the South Shops and south parking deck (starting in August 2014 to tenant leasing in November 2015); the North Shops and north parking deck (starting June 2015 to leasing in September 2016); Building G2 and the southern portion of the south parking deck (starting April 2016 to leasing November 2016); and finally, Phase II, North East corner Macy’s consolidation (starting August 2016 to Summer 2018). Mr. English explained that they cannot accomplish all at the same time, parking must be available for active uses as the project progresses. The last piece of The Village Shops will involve the tenants Coffee Bean and Tea Leaf/Sees/Vitamin shop and it is intended that these shops will be retained but moved to other locations onsite.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Paralusz, Mr. English confirmed that the main visual difference in the plan now is that the south deck recedes from Sepulveda Boulevard and is elongated and narrowed and expands to the south, and there are buildings between the parking decks and Sepulveda so you won’t be able to see much of the deck structure from Sepulveda.

In response to Commissioner Ortmann, using the slide of the Phase I Village Design Aesthetics as a reference, Mr. English explained that, from Sepulveda and the ground level the updated plan won’t look much different from before, and he will show more how the parking decks will not look like parking structures and further, that these slides are intended to act as starting points to show what is being proposed. Regarding the parking deck lighting, he pointed to the lights on the top of the deck noting that these will be 15 feet tall. The way to minimize glare is to direct it down to the ground as opposed to directing it horizontally, and they prefer light poles to accomplish this instead of bollards.

In response to Chairperson Conaway’s inquiry as to the loading docks, and deliveries, Mr. English, showed two areas where loading and deliveries will occur and noted that some flags have been placed on-site to show prospective locations. Mr. English then showed a slide of an existing parking structure in Walnut Creek explaining it is an example of a “G+2” deck but has a Starbucks on the ground level. In response to Commissioner Gross, Mr. English stated that the clock tower is masking an elevator. Mr. English next showed a graphic rendering of a proposed bridge connection, stating that this has two purposes, besides providing a pedestrian connection: it will visually serve as a gateway statement for The Shops and then also serve to calm approaching traffic.

Mr. English displaying a slide of the Veteran’s Parkway and how pedestrians and bike riders will be able to travel through the Parkway to and from the Mall, and that there is the possibility for a small dog park at the bridge entrance. Mr. English responded to Commissioner Ortmann that he cannot say exactly what will be happening underneath the Sepulveda bridge area, because first, they do not own that land, and the bridge project will be under construction for a while and there is more work to be done in planning this and figuring out how connections to the project will be made. Director Thompson affirmed that more work needs to be done in this area.

Mr. English proceeded to discuss slides showing: 1) walking distances to the Mall in 5, 10 and 20 minutes increments, 2) stakeholder comments including a letter from the Hacienda building owner and a meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> between Macy’s and the City, 3) parking supply in the north and south “cores” , employees parking areas, overall parking ratios, including comparisons with national shopping center and Los Angeles norms and other specific southern California shopping centers and, lastly the proposed preliminary Conditions of Approval.

Regarding the Hacienda Building at 3500 Sepulveda Boulevard, Mr. English stated that both parties are in compliance with all obligations of that agreement. Mr. English clarified that tenant leases cover where employees can park, and they are currently using a shuttle between the center and the lower City-owned lot as well as the parking in the culvert area which currently is required for medical offices employees.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Gross about the parking ratios Mr. English stated that the Traffic and Parking consultant would address that question. In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani, Mr. English showed where the valet drop off areas are proposed in front of the CPK building. He showed the parking ratio information in the “core” area, with an existing ratio of 3.7.

There is a ratio of greater than 4.1 in the Veteran's Parkway and restaurants on the south side, and 3.7 for Phase 1 core, and then 3.5 for the Phase 2 core plus the North East corner. Mr. English concluded his remarks about parking by suggesting four important "takeaways" as follows:

- 1) the existing core (total north and south) area parking ratio of 3.74 per 1,000 square feet is below the industry standard of 4.5 and the Los Angeles competition average of 5.0 per 1,000 square feet;
- 2) the proposal is to maintain about the same ratio in the core areas (3.74 existing versus 3.70 for Phase I Village Shopping Center);
- 3) surplus parking, if any will not be in the core areas; and
- 4) Phase III is an opportunity to reduce the parking ratio.

Commissioner Gross questioned whether because the far north and south areas there are greater parking ratios, is this an opportunity to create better circulation to the excess parking at these far ends. Mr. English noted that major tenants such as Ralph's and CVS would be against removing parking in their area if needed to create such access, and further RREEF is engaged in working out traffic improvements on Marine Avenue.

Mr. English showed photos of two parking structures at the Grove that provide a single structure (as opposed to two as proposed by RREEF) and commented that it is very difficult to mitigate the bulk of such a large parking structure).

Mr. English noted the following points regarding the draft conditions on behalf of the applicant:

- 1) the conditions address the right issues;
- 2) work still needing to be done includes: identifying requirements and standards, timing for compliance, and to provide sign-off procedures;
- 3) They have concerns that conditions relating to street dedication and improvements need clarity as to requirements and timing and the City of El Segundo should not have approval rights over the applicant and the City of Manhattan Beach.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross Mr. English stated that there are issues with the conditions that relate to streets and their attorneys have not looked at yet, but he is confident staff wants to work with them.

Mr. English wrapped up by thanking the Planning Commission and they hope that this latest plan demonstrates that they have responded after listening to the community and various stakeholders. They take pride in their projects and believe the community will too, when the project proceeds.

Chairperson Conaway encouraged the Commissioners now to ask specific questions of the applicant.

In response to Commissioner Gross, Mr. English verified that White paper #1, dated November 2, 2012 is still valid and the basic premises remain the same. Commissioner Gross urged that the public look at the 9 "white papers" prepared by the developer.

Commissioner Paralusz stated she had no questions at this time.

Commissioner Andreani requested, information on the valet, and was informed by Mr. English that the cars dropped off in the valet area will be stored at the top level of the G+2 south deck.

Commissioner Ortmann stated he had no questions at this time.

Chairperson Conaway asked what is the impact to the traffic study conclusions when you remove the Fry's component (Phase III)? Mr. English responded that the traffic consultant will specifically respond but he emphasized that although they have for now withdrawn Phase III this is still an essential part of the overall center and its removal was the best way to move the project forward.

Mr. English responded to a question from Commissioner Gross - that RREEF would come in for planning approvals for Phase III as soon as Phase I is completed.

To respond to Chairperson Conaway's questions about phasing and related traffic and parking impacts, **Sarah Drobis**, Gibson Transportation Consulting, stated that in doing the traffic analysis of EIR, they looked at many various situations and all kinds of development scenarios and in each case the potential impacts would not be significant. They determined the greatest potential impact is prior to Fry's use being removed and after Phase I is operating and still they found there to be no significant impact. The

main point is that greatest impact was accounted for in the traffic study which is part of the EIR and the conclusion is that there will be no significant impacts.

**Mark English**, for RREEF stated that the manager of Macy's is present and would like to make a statement at this time and Chairperson Conaway invited the manager to address the Commission.

**Tracie Manick**, Vice President of Macy's at the Mall spoke of several things that are not commonly known by the public but she feels are important. She noted the following points: 1) out of 85 stores, this store in Manhattan Village is one of the most productive in terms of revenue dollars per square foot and this productivity continues to grow; 2) this store rates second in the nation in consumer satisfaction surveys, and convenient parking is very important. 3) There is a prediction of high consumer growth at Manhattan Village, and the expansion is greatly needed; 4) she urged the Commission to look at how best to service the center; 5) 86% of Mall shoppers live within 2 miles of the center and about 12% are now coming to Manhattan Village from other areas. In addition the Galleria's Nordstrom's will be leaving in two years, and this is a customer base the Mall can service. 6) She requests that parking standard be kept as proposed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ortmann, Ms. Manick stated that the 12% coming from other South Bay areas does not make Manhattan Village a "regional" market draw.

### **EIR PRESENTATION**

Stephanie Eyestone-Jones, President, Matrix Environmental, the City's consultant made a Power Point presentation, covering:

- 1) The three main purposes of an EIR in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA): to inform decision-makers, suggest ways to reduce impacts, and encourage public participation.
- 2) Overview of the EIR process from Initial Study to filing of Notice of Determination (NOD). The NOD filing starts the time frame for statute of limitations whereby a party can litigate.
- 3) Issues Evaluated in Draft EIR
- 4) Overview of Final EIR (corrections, minor modifications, responses to comments, mitigation monitoring program)
- 5) Overview of topics commonly raised in Draft EIR/Final EIRs: traffic, structure massing and size, crime, lighting, noise, aesthetics, hazards.

Commissioner Gross asked and Ms. Eyestone-Jones explained that, as stated in the Final EIR on pages 20-21 of the Executive Summary, the draft EIR is distributed to several state agencies for their input and while the City is the primary decision maker, he is correct that the State has been consulted and the various State Department's concerns are addressed in the EIR. In response to another question from Commissioner Gross Director Thompson responded that the role of the City Council is to certify the EIR and the role of the Planning Commission is to make a recommendation on certification.

**Sarah Drobis**, Gibson Transportation Consulting, again summarized the traffic analysis, and that they analyzed different combinations of the project, and in all, came to the same conclusion that there would be no significant impacts. She noted project traffic improvements including dedication of right-of-way for Sepulveda bridge widening; Rosecrans deceleration lanes, and Cedar Way ring road improvements for traffic and bike circulation. The Final EIR includes an updated circulation plan with improvements and enhancements.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Gross, it was explained that Urban Land Institute (ULI) which sets 4.5 per 1,000 square feet as a parking standard, is an established authority for determining national parking standards.

Chairperson Conaway clarified through the consultant that the parking at 2,393 existing is proposed to increase to between 2,856 – 3,142 spaces, exclusive of the City owned lot and these are incorporated in the Final EIR as a potential range depending on the final approval and how it would be built out.

**Ms. Drobis** continued to explain that after Phase II, on a peak weekend day in December there is anticipated to be some additional parking spaces. She feels that they can reduce the ratio to 4.1 which would be a slight reduction on parking spaces, however removal of more than 50 spaces could be a tipping point and should be watched, because this could lead to a loss of customers or spill-over into other areas (in front of Ralphs, etc.). So, they can support a slight parking reduction after Phase I, with a robust employee Parking Management Plan, which is reviewed by the City and would be reviewed again before Phase III to verify parking conditions.

**Ms. Drobis** concluded by recapping: the project is not forecasted to cause significant impacts. Ms. Drobis further explained, in response to a question from Commissioner Andreani, that one can conclude that there will be no significant impact, even with 21 to 22% increase in square footage because some large generators such as Fry's and the theater will be removed. The issue is how to "right size" the parking.

In response to questions from Chairperson Conaway **Ms. Drobis** advised that the trip generation analysis is the study to look at. The net increase is 150 trips during peak hour and they analyzed the distribution of those trips and related impacts. The removal of Fry's and theater, which are the biggest generators, influences this a lot. Chairperson Conaway noted he is having difficulty justifying the conclusions from a layman's point of view and how it works.

Ms. Drobis responded to Commissioner Ortmann that the Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual was used to determine the net number of trips for each Phase and also explained the am/pm peak traffic thresholds of significance (2% increase per the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan) is used by the City to determine "significant impact".

Commissioner Gross referred to a letter they received that says everything in the EIR is wrong, and that the author states his intent to sue the City and Commissioner Gross requested that Staff comment on this. Development Director Thompson responded that the letter has been forwarded to the City Attorney who will provide guidance, and further that the City's legal team has been closely involved with the project for the City. Director Thompson also explained that the EIR is not subject to approval by the State, but several State agencies are informational resources to the City.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairperson Conaway invited the public to comment.

**Brandon M. Taylor**, a long-time resident stated his objection to the EIR alleging that it is not valid and has not met its legal burden. He has stated his points in detail in a letter to the Commission, but his main reason is his belief that the applicant has not provided specific enough plans to allow the Planning Commission to understand the project clearly enough.

**Mark Kringsman**, Oak Avenue, has been involved in the process, representing a group of Tree Section residents and doesn't believe that the EIR adequately addresses issues they have raised, which would include the issue of traffic using the Center and Oak Avenue as a bypass. Also he believes that the Commission may not have looked closely at the ownership to see who RREEF is and is concerned about RREEF's investment in the community, being an investor not a developer, and the problems RREEF had in Sunnyvale.

**Chris Prodromides**, Oak Avenue resident, lives down the street from the prior speaker, and he believes that Mark is right – that there are too many assumptions.

**Steve Packwood**, Oak Avenue, attended the first session in June and talked about what the community wants. The bottom line, if the center predicts a 12% growth that relies on shoppers coming from outside the City, will the Center possibly lose its local identity? Also, he didn't hear much to eliminate concerns about parking and he emphasized that the City is the Lead Agency, and urged as such for the Commission to do its due diligence now while there are still many unanswered questions as they make a recommendation to the City Council.

**Paula Packwood**, 3113 Oak, suggested that the developer give a quick recap as they go, about where they are in the process and requested that they not be allowed to piecemeal the project. She also raised the question as to whether they can negotiate an agreement with Plaza El Segundo to provide a site for overflow parking, and can flags be put where the parking decks and lights will be located and their height and further can the developer have lights installed in the poles so they can see if the light will be visible from her living room.

**Diane Wallace**, Manhattan Village resident, appreciates RREEF's responsiveness but has a question relating to Phase III - is there a disconnect in that the City had objections to the North West corner, resulting in that portion of the project being withdrawn? She requested an explanation to the objections by the City regarding the North West corner piece at some point.

**Jim O’Callaghan**, President, Manhattan Beach Chamber of Commerce, stated that the City had contracted with their Chamber to determine the “leakage” of retail dollars from the community and the purchasing power of the City and advised that the City is losing several millions annually.

**Marilyn Hocum**, resident on 33<sup>rd</sup> Street has two concerns: parking and traffic, and questioned why would we want less parking and then stated that it seems logical that there may be more traffic and parking impacts if they are building more parking spaces to accommodate customers.

**Scott King**, 25 year resident, stated he feels the City needs some form of irrevocable commitment from RREEF that it will do Phase III, also thinks the rationale as to why no new impacts will result, but new parking spaces are needed because shoppers will be staying longer.

There being no other speakers, Chairperson Conaway closed the public hearing.

## **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Gross asked the audience: “How many people do not shop at the mall?” One person raised a hand.

Chairperson Conaway invited the applicant’s representative to address the Commission in response to public input.

Mark English stated he won’t attempt to respond to many issues as he feels his team has already addressed such. The withdrawal of the North West corner piece is only done for practical reasons – to allow them to get the rest of the site development started. The corner piece is addressed in the EIR and suggested that, if this is desired by the City, they could add the corner in the Master Use Permit, as a building envelope with a more general description. Mr. English concluded by speaking to the issue of RREEF’s relationship with Deutsche Bank and the Sunnyvale shopping center project. An important fact is that RREEF has no partner and no debt on this project. The Manhattan Beach Shopping Center is an unencumbered asset and is not comparable to the Sunnyvale situation.

Director Thompson responded to a question from the Commission as to why Phase III (North West Corner/Fry’s) is not being included in the current approval. The corner is very important to the City, but the idea was to concentrate on the first two phases and have more time to work out Phase III design issues. In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Director Thompson indicated that the applicant withdrew the land use applications for that Phase.

Commissioner Paralusz noted that the applicant has the option to wait until the corner design was resolved but has chosen to drop the corner and work out the issues which appears to be a mutually agreeable situation. Director Thompson added that he thinks the option to wait offers a better benefit to the public because it will result in much better connectivity of the corner into the center.

Chairperson Conaway commented that there are some things that directly relate to Phase III that may need to be written into this approval, such as the Veteran’s Parkway parking and connection.

Director Thompson affirmed to Commissioner Gross there are three phases. The applicant is willing to bring in Phase III for entitlement approval soon after I and II. Mr. Thompson added that building in phases is very common for centers.

Chairperson Conaway noted that Staff has asked the Commission to go through the list of draft conditions. Commissioner Ortmann suggested that at the next meeting the public speak first, without having to sit through more lengthy presentations, to which there was agreement.

Chairperson Conaway asked Staff if it needs input from the Commissioners on the draft conditions, and Commissioner Andreani suggested that a “jumping off point” should start this discussion. Development Director Thompson suggested that the Planning Commission start its discussion with parking.

Commissioner Gross stated that he likes the idea of having an Employee Parking Management Program, but doesn’t like the City telling the applicant to reduce the number by 100 parking spaces. The applicant is going to spend their money on those spaces only if they think they need it and the City should not second guess them on parking. He raised the fact that the developer’s business plan provides a lot of data and the City should allow the developer to figure out how they will get shoppers to stay a

little longer because they know their shoppers best. The City should require a parking Management Program.

Commissioner Andreani commented that the public doesn't like the proposed parking structure height and bulk and that there are multiple structures; however she asked how can they achieve more parking without structures? She is expecting that the structures, similar to the Walnut Creek example, will be designed to look like buildings and not parking structures and Macy's wants a plan that accommodates their shoppers. She expressed concern regarding the fiscal impact from online retail shoppers and believes that the design of the parking structures has improved quite a bit.

Commissioner Paralusz noted that Commissioners Gross and Andreani echoed some of her thoughts – such as the benefit of requiring a Parking Management Plan. Commissioner Paralusz stated she disagreed, however that the City should be involved with mandating where parking should be located and perhaps not dictate how many spaces to add. Finally, she is not in favor of reducing the parking numbers, and on the Phase I south deck on the Sepulveda side, favors putting buildings in front of the parking decks and extending the parking structure to the south.

Commissioner Ortmann stated that he supports staff's desire to come up with a more reasoned approach to the parking and not based on the need for parking solely on "peak" times. He believes there's a site plan issue, though, in that too much square footage is being proposed in areas of the project where there's the least amount of parking. In closing, Commissioner Ortmann would support anything that staff can do to minimize the amount of parking being added. However, he is also interested in finding out how progressive malls determine the maximum parking they need, and what is the benefit or payoff for providing a maximum amount?

Chairperson Conaway stated he thought the challenge is how to provide additional parking to an existing center. The General Plan policy is to encourage a small town atmosphere should be taken very seriously. He expressed general support for the amount of parking being proposed. With the master planning in the Veterans Parkway greenbelt area, he believes that the Planning Commission should focus more on pedestrian and bike connections which he thinks could be strengthened. He fully supports staff working with the applicant to reduce the parking need for the development.

#### **COMMISSION ACTION**

Chairperson Conaway reopened the public hearing and subsequently a motion was MADE and SECONDED (Paralusz/Ortmann) to **CONTINUE** the public hearing to May 22, 2013.

AYES: Andreani, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Chairperson Conaway  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

#### **6. DIRECTOR'S ITEMS - None**

#### **7. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

Commissioner Andreani announced that on May 2<sup>nd</sup> there will be an important public meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the Police and Fire Facility to consider a final concept plan for the Veterans Parkway.

Commissioner Gross announced that on April 29, the Public Works Department will conduct the second public meeting at 6:30 p.m. at the Police and Fire Facility to discuss planned improvements to the existing stairs leading from the Strand to the Bike Path.

#### **8. TENTATIVE AGENDA - May 8**

Development Director Thompson noted that the items for the next regular meeting include Mansionization code amendments, a parking reduction and a Coastal Development Permit for a project on The Strand. He reminded the Commission that they will be adjourning tonight's

meeting, however to the special joint Planning Commission / City Council meeting on April 30<sup>th</sup>. He reminded the Commissioners to bring their comments with them to the joint meeting.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m. to April 30, 2013, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, and 1400 Highland Avenue

ROSEMARY LACKOW  
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

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