

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
MAY 22, 2013**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of May, 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  
Rosemary Lackow, Recording Secretary

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 8, 2013**

The following amendments were made by the Commission:

Commissioner Andreani: In the Roll call: change Chairperson’s name from Andreani to Conaway. On page 3, mid-page, revise the first two and a half lines to “In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani regarding how the City will check and control long-term occupancy and parking, and potential for alcohol sales and consumption in one of the retail businesses, since the site is near a successful and expanding child care facility, Mr. Haaland pointed out that...” (keep remainder of sentence). On page 5, first line, change “Commission” to “Commissioner”. In the next paragraph, third line, strike “; being that” and replace with “, since”. In the fourth line, after “believe” strike “this” and replace with “the project” and strike “medical uses” and replace with “Mr. Tyner’s medical uses”.

Commissioner Paralusz: On page 2, paragraph near end of page starting “Commissioner Paralusz” in the second line, insert “buildable area” after “allowable”. On page 4, in the last paragraph, in line two, strike “for” after “relating to” and change “clinic” at the end of the paragraph to “clinics”. On page 7, second paragraph from the bottom (3. Usable open space) in first line, strike “and effect”. Same page, last paragraph, change “or” to “of” after “she is not in favor”.

Chairperson Conaway: On page 8, at the beginning of the fifth paragraph starting “1. Regarding the suggestion to amend the purpose statement...”: strike “1”. On the same page, the next paragraph that is currently labeled “2 . Alley access (Page 3, Q. and F.)”, change “2” to “4” and bold the words “4.Alley access .”. Then, move this renumbered paragraph (changed from 2. to 4) in its entirety and the following paragraph (both relating to alley access) up on the page so that it follows the second paragraph that ends with “Usable Open Space”.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani/Gross) to **APPROVE** the minutes of May 8, 2013, as amended.

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

**3. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION - None**

#### 4. PUBLIC HEARING

05/22/13-2. 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).

Community Development Director Thompson made introductory remarks and explained the hearing protocol, noting the public testimony would be heard at the beginning, and that a presentation will be given by the City's Traffic consultant, afterwards the public will have an opportunity to provide additional input.

Chairperson Conaway thanked everyone for coming, opened the public hearing and invited the public to speak.

**Helen Block**, 1610 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, described the importance of the mall, stating it is convenient, attractive, clean and safe. She feels that the mall needs additional retail space to retain loyal shoppers and a competitive edge otherwise shoppers may go elsewhere. She strongly supports the project in that it has ample parking, and walking areas and she feels the project is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

**Ed Duffy**, 3001 Oak Avenue, is concerned that Manhattan Village will become a destination mall and will make traffic worse, resulting in more people using the Tree Section neighborhood as a cut through, to avoid congestion on Sepulveda and that construction traffic will also make traffic worse. Regarding the proposed parking decks, he supports a single parking structure, and is concerned that light and noise impacts will be worse with two decks. He remarked that the scissor lifts don't go up high enough to illustrate the actual proposed heights of the lights and advised the applicant to use equipment called "condors" that can go higher. He urged the Commission to address traffic and impact issues, emphasizing that the intersection at Oak and 30<sup>th</sup> is already congested and has a lot of additional traffic from the medical building recently built nearby on Sepulveda.

**Mark Rispler**, owner of the Manhattan Village Fertility Center located in the Hacienda Building on the project site, stated that his business, which involves growing embryos, is very sensitive to air toxins even with his very sophisticated filtration system and therefore he is concerned about degradation of air quality. He objects to the proximity and height of the proposed north parking deck.

**Darryl Sperber**, resident at Pacific and 35<sup>th</sup> St. and owner of Manhattan Toyota, realizes there are many issues that need to be worked through, but supports the project on the basis that it will greatly enhance the City. His business services over 100 cars a day and he provides a shuttle service to the owners who can shop at the mall while waiting. The enhancement will make the mall an even better place to shop.

**Khryste Langlais**, owner of Babycakes in Torrance favors the expansion project and would love to expand her bakery to Manhattan Village which is a highly desirable business location.

**Mark Neumann**, 3208 Laurel Avenue and representative for the owners of the Hacienda Building. He is concerned that the center's tenants have no idea what is planned. He is concerned about parking during construction. He reiterated that they have an agreement with RREEF for a 2-story parking structure at the north end of the Village Shops, across Cedar Way from his building, but G+2 is actually three stories. He believes that incorporation of the Northwest corner parcel as soon as possible is really important to residents.

**Houston Spriggo**, of SusieCakes, a tenant in the Hacienda Building, supports development and business competition in general, but his concern is that there is not enough parking.

**Mark Krigsman**, Oak Avenue, has been long concerned with this project, and his concerns are: that the size of the expansion is not consistent with the General Plan goal to enhance quality of life and small town character; that a variance is requested; believes that the EIR is flawed in its analysis for parking and traffic and has not fully analyzed health risks and Greenhouse Gas emissions; that there will be significant

impacts in the areas of traffic and circulation, crime, air pollution; that attracting large national chain stores will negatively impact local businesses; and that public notification should be expanded, and a detailed model of the project should be displayed. In conclusion he stated his opinion that the City should take a close look at the relationship of RREEF to Deutsche Bank.

**Scott Shaw**, 105 N Valley Dr., recently moved to the City, supports the project in that the center needs upgrading. He thinks there will be short time pain during construction, but a long term gain. He doesn't think the increase in retail space will negatively affect rush hour traffic on Sepulveda.

**Jim O'Callaghan**, President of the Manhattan Beach Chamber of Commerce, is glad to have provided reports to the Council regarding the City's strong purchasing power, and how much retail "leakage" is leaving the City that could be captured internally. He is concerned that if the enhancements do not happen, shoppers will go elsewhere and in the long term the effect is that the center may have vacancies and undesirable tenants may be attracted. As the City's population ages it also needs more services and the revenue from the expanded retail will go a long way to address this.

**Chris Prodromidies**, 3100 Oak Avenue, thanked the Commission for allowing the public to speak first. He believes that expansion and upgrade of some sort is necessary, but has concerns: he supports a single parking structure as opposed to four as proposed and believes that the flags installed don't show the full impact of the parking structure height as they don't take the light poles into account. Other concerns are the staging of the construction, and uncertainties including the plan for the Northwest corner parcel and not having an agreement with Macy's as a main anchor.

**Steve Packwood**, Oak Avenue, thanked the applicant for hosting a recent neighborhood meeting and for putting up flags where the parking structures will be going, noting that the light poles will add another 11 feet. He has concerns that the beach character will not be retained and is opposed to the proposed parking structures, and believes a single parking structure should go in the corner towards Rosecrans, which will also be easier to secure. He agrees that the City needs a commitment from Macy's and encouraged the Planning Commission as it continues through this process to define the project scope in advance.

**James Gill**, 3017 N. Valley Dr. is concerned with the parking, and thinks that multiple parking structures would be ok as long as they are well designed, have entrances and exits that work well and do not cause congestion. Parking needs to be given a high priority, as a benefit for the community.

There being no further speakers, Chair Conaway closed the public hearing.

Presentation by the City's EIR Traffic Consultant

**Pat Gibson**, Gibson Transportation Consulting Inc., the EIR Traffic and Parking consultant hired by the City, gave a Power Point presentation, summarizing first the square footage and uses, both being demolished and newly built per each phase. He focused on addressing four main questions:

1. How much growth is going to occur? Answer: the net new traffic trips are relatively small when compared to the existing traffic levels. Specifically, over an entire day, in the worst case (after Phase 2), the project will add less than one half of 1% new traffic trips, and at the peak hour, less than 2%.
2. Why does traffic not increase in the pm peak hour? Answer: the developer is replacing high activity land uses with less intensive land uses. As an example, in the pm peak, 9,000 square feet of high intensity use (7-11, donut shop, liquor store) would yield 436 trips, and a parking demand of 12 spaces. Conversely, the same square feet of lower intensity use such as a sit down restaurants would yield 89 trips but would have a parking space demand of 90 spaces. The effect of this change is less pm traffic, but an increase in the parking demand. Applying this to the actual project, Fry's and the Cinema would be higher intensity uses that would be replaced by less intensive uses.
3. Regarding Phasing, does the project traffic work prior to the closure of Fry's? Answer: yes. Service levels for intersections were evaluated on Sepulveda at both Rosecrans and Marine which respectively have existing service levels F and E. The conclusion is that there will be no significant impact to either intersection, as the change in the ratios will be less than significant.

4. Why must the parking be increased? Answer: Short term parking demand is being replaced by long-term parking demand. The center has had an approved parking ratio of 4.1 spaces/1,000 square feet for more than a decade. People park an average of 120 minutes at the theater, 30 minutes at Fry's and 90 minutes for retail. With the new mix of uses due to an increase in length of stay more parking is needed to provide adequate supply for the project.

**Mr. Gibson** noted that the EIR did analyze potential construction parking needs and impacts. Many factors were considered including possible construction delays and seasonal peaking and the conclusion was that there would be no significant impacts. A construction management plan that includes construction parking, and truck routes will be required also.

Commissioner Paralusz asked whether during construction, traffic would have to be rerouted on Sepulveda, and **Mr. Gibson** responded that there would be nothing resulting from the mall construction that would cause a re-routing on Sepulveda, but on Rosecrans there may be some mid-day lane closures due to widening to create a new entry into the mall from east bound Rosecrans.

Commissioner Ortmann commented that the traffic presentation re-affirmed that traffic should not be a problem. Commissioner Ortmann asked **Mr. Gibson** what drove the assumptions for Phase III, now that it has been withdrawn. **Mr. Gibson** responded and clarified that the assumptions for a combination of retail, restaurant, etc. (various potential uses) were stated and analyzed in the EIR for all phases including Phase III, and these resulted in an understanding of the worst case situation, and then the project size and uses were limited accordingly to avoid significant impacts. Further **Mr. Gibson** explained that the EIR contains "traffic equivalences" for determining maximum square footage of uses and impacts.

Community Development Director Thompson explained that when the project planning started in 2006 there was discussion about the maximum size of building that could occur and this was determined by analyzing traffic counts and impacts. The applicant committed to not exceed that maximum. Mr. Thompson further stated that the maximum square footages are known for Phase III, and this is an example of how managing the development by Phases is better because, by knowing the scope and limits for each phase, they have better control and more actual data will become known as each phase is completed.

Commissioner Andreani asked the question, what would the impact be if Fry's stays? **Mr. Gibson** responded that the worst case is if Fry's stays and that scenario was tested as well in the EIR. However there would be a condition that would require the developer to conduct further study to show that an alternative plan would not create any significant impacts. In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Andreani, **Mr. Gibson** stated that the full build out of Plaza El Segundo was taken into consideration by the EIR traffic analysis.

In response to a request for clarification by Commissioner Gross, **Mr. Gibson** affirmed his understanding that the Sepulveda intersections (Marine and Sepulveda) resulting from the development, in the worst case, will be relatively small and will not be noticed by most people. In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, **Mr. Gibson** stated he thinks the prior adopted parking standard of 4.1 per 1,000 square feet is still good because they have looked at past parking counts and conducted new counts and is a good standard to apply going forward, subject to a cap on the square footage of allowed restaurant space.

Commissioner Ortmann expressed his concern regarding cumulative impacts from the project which along with other nearby developments might be considered significant. **Mr. Gibson** responded that per CEQA you can only hold a new project accountable for its own incremental impact, but because this project is adding traffic where volumes are already at a very high level, the City has adopted criteria establishing a threshold of significance for traffic added by the project. The cumulative analysis, using the year 2022, limits the project to being able to add only 1% to the capacity of the intersections and that is why only 176 trips maximum can be generated from the project during the pm peak hour and only about 40 are being added to most of the critical intersections during the pm peak hour.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, **Mr. Gibson** responded that the City can set its own threshold and 1% is what Manhattan Beach uses and this is common among cities.

Commissioner Conaway expressed his concern that there will be a greater than 1% increase (1.8%) in the PM peak hours at intersections already at levels E and F, but still this is not considered a significant impact and how can this be? **Mr. Gibson** explained that intersection capacity is determined by peak direction, so even though adding more than 1% is added they will be going mostly in the non-critical (northbound) direction and do not affect the intersection capacity calculation. A shopping center is not like an office building, where most people come and go during the peak hours, but shopping impacts are instead spread throughout the day.

In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Conaway as to whether improvements such as mass transit or pedestrian or bicycle circulation improvements could be factored in as ways to offset some of the traffic impacts. **Mr. Gibson** responded that while those things can be measured and studied, it is difficult to analyze, and the EIR did not consider them because it was seeking to be a very conservative, worst case analysis.

In response to a question from Commissioner Conaway, **Mr. Gibson** explained that the 204 parking spaces needed, as shown in the presentation, is just to replace Fry's, and the higher number (400 – 600 spaces required) is a result of applying the actual standard of 4.1 spaces per thousand square feet. In response to another question from Commissioner Conaway regarding impacts to the Tree Section, **Mr. Gibson** stated that the Final EIR includes a discussion on neighborhood traffic on Oak, and the conclusion was that so few new trips are being added to Sepulveda compared to the existing, that very few new cut-through trips are anticipated.

There being no further questions of **Mr. Gibson** and no further staff presentation, Chairperson Conaway invited the applicant to make a presentation.

**Mark English**, representing RREEF, made a Power Point presentation stating that he would try to be brief and address only issues that have been raised tonight and also he has some additional material to submit. His major points were:

1. The South parking Deck elevation has been updated to illustrate the lighting and as shown on a cross section diagram, as one approaches from Sepulveda this south structure will appear almost as a surface parking lot.
2. On the south deck the top of the light poles are 30 feet 6 inches above ground, and this compares to lights on Sepulveda (31 feet) and the parapet of Macy's which are 41 feet (main Macy's) and 38 feet (Men's store).
3. Referring to lighting photos at night, there will be no glare from above or the side when a full cut-off is applied to the lamp fixture, which directs light only directly down to the ground.
4. They are developing design guidelines for storefronts and the parking decks that will be applied and the decks will blend in with the development, so they won't look like parking structures, as shown in the examples and renderings.
5. Rosecrans Parking Deck Option (Northeast corner): if the parking is confined entirely in this area, the result would be a 10-level deck structure which would be taller than the nearby office building. If they put a 2-story structure in the Fry's location at the northwest corner, this can take 2 levels off the north-east corner, and the result would be an 8-level deck structure in the northeast location. Also, these locations would be relatively far from the main entrances of the center off Sepulveda at 33<sup>rd</sup> Street and from Marine at Cedar where 70% of the traffic is generated from and he feels there will be a lot of traffic conflicts if the decks are moved to only the north-east and north-west quadrants. The Americana and Grove shopping centers have single parking structures, but those structures were planned from the ground up to be close in to the center of the retail uses.

6. The larger the parking deck is, the harder it is to make it not look like a parking deck structure. Two or three story decks can more easily blend in with commercial architecture.
7. The distance that shoppers would have to walk from the northeast and northwest corners of the site would be too far and this is important to the success of the center.
8. He presented two letters from Macy's just received today, one from a Vice President in Planning and Traffic supporting the parking dispersion for the project and one from the Macy's Real Estate office in Ohio supporting the direction of the project.
9. The EIR contains a requirement that the project have a Traffic Management Plan which they are working on and this will include a construction parking plan with mitigation measures and they are committed to this.

Commissioner Ortmann asked and **Mr. English** confirmed that the light poles in the slides from Nova Scotia were in-kind replacements, 35 feet in height and at the mall they would be 37 feet from the ground. That compares to existing poles 30 feet, top of Hacienda 42 feet and 48 feet for poles on Sepulveda. To the east, the Macy's sign is 38 feet and parapet is 42 feet.

Commissioner Gross asked if they could install a light at the center as an example of what is planned to be installed.

**Liz Griggs**, Mall Manager, responded that they had looked into putting flagging up another 15 feet to illustrate lighting height but had some OSHA compliance issues, and then considered putting up some 50 foot poles, but that was very costly.

Commissioner Gross responded that he was only thinking of one or two lights being installed as examples.

**Chip Israel**, lighting consultant for the applicant, spoke regarding the types of lights that would be installed and showed a lamp head with LED lights as an example. The lamps will have very little light trespass, they are directed straight downward, and are like a series of many very intense individual flashlight beams.

Commissioner Paralusz stated that she noticed the lights in the Target parking lot that seemed to shine the light straight down and asked Mr. Israel if he could identify an existing light that could be viewed as an example of the kind of lighting proposed and **Mr. Israel** stated that he could do that.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Conaway about the lights **Mr. Israel** stated that metal shields can be readily added to the lamps to block the view of the lights before or after they are installed.

The Commissioner was advised that it was appropriate to ask questions of staff at this time.

Commissioner Paralusz asked whether the medical building on the west side of Sepulveda across from the mall was a project that was brought to the Planning Commission, to which Director Thompson responded "no". At the request of Commissioner Paralusz, Planning Manager Jester described the public noticing that has been done for the hearings, indicating that beyond the minimum 500 foot radius of property owners, staff asked that the applicant provide notice to residents in the 500 foot radius and well as the two nearby senior housing projects and staff also met with those seniors apartment managers. In addition, staff requested that the applicant meet with groups of citizens and Staff sent notices to an extensive list of interested persons including many residents and has provided much information on the City's website.

At this time Chairperson Conaway re-opened the public hearing.

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

**Mark Krigsmann**, Oak Avenue resident, stated he doesn't see anything in the project that will guarantee that high intensity land uses will be replaced with lower intensity land uses; he believes that there should be some middle ground on the design and location of parking structures in that the options shouldn't be limited to either eight or ten story structures near Rosecrans versus what is proposed.

**Jennifer Heyday**, has a business in the Hacienda Building, has concerns about safety and security and is not comfortable after working late going to a parking structure, and especially believes that the ravine between Fry's and the mall is not suitable for a parking structure for security reasons.

**Trey Duval**, an Oak Avenue resident stated the Grove and Americana centers in other cities are not good models for what they want in Manhattan Beach and stated his opinion that the biggest impacts to traffic will be when people shop, on the weekend as opposed to midweek evening peak commuter hours.

**Steve Packwood**, Oak Avenue, stated that he believes that the applicant's presentation on parking structure options distorts the issue. He thanked Mr. Gibson for his presentation, emphasizing that the reports are about incremental change and he appreciates that the traffic engineer has acknowledged that existing traffic volumes near the project are already very high.

**Mark Neumann** 3208 Laurel Avenue, questioned whether there is justification in terms of a need for retail sales tax, for the proposed addition. If there is justification, ok, but if not, the City should look carefully before approving new parking decks and so much more square footage.

**Diane Wallace**, president of Manhattan Village HOA noted their group has had a committee that has studied this project and they have found the applicant to be responsive. She feels the City has done a great job with its outreach and recently RREEF had a meeting open to all residents. She is excited about the proposed lights and hopes the City can address some issues that have come up. She feels good about the plan going forward. She urged the Commission to progress with the approval.

**Paula Packwood**, Oak Avenue resident, requested that the light heights be demonstrated so she can determine if she will be able to view them from her home. She wants to see an option for a parking structure at the corner near Rosecrans but doesn't think it needs to be 10 stories tall.

There being no other speakers, Chairperson Conaway closed the public hearing, thanking all for participating.

It was noted that the applicant is normally allowed another chance to address the Commission and therefore the applicant was invited to again speak briefly to address additional comments.

**Mark English**, representing RREEF spoke, briefly explaining the evolution of the parking deck design, and emphasizing that most recently they have made changes to make the parking decks look more like a surface parking lot, and commercial buildings. They feel they have gone far in addressing the parking structure issues to minimize their visual impact and have made changes in response to the Manhattan Village HOA input. An option was explored to put the parking down below the mall on the City owned lot, but that did not turn out to be a good option in his opinion. He emphasized that the current plan has resulted from a lot of thought, discussion, and revisions, and he urged careful consideration, as opposed to asking them to start the design process over.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, Director Thompson stated that the role of the Commission tonight is to give direction to staff who will then meet with the developer to work out refinements to the plan, and then revisions will be brought back to the Commission to review at a continued hearing next month. Staff will prepare detailed conditions, and prepare a resolution in which they could vote on it at the next meeting.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross about the potential for staff to work with the applicant to install a sample light, Director Thompson stated that he is impressed with the lighting that is proposed and believes that the glare is not going to be an issue. Commissioner Gross noted that there are

new LED lights in the beach area, on streets between 16<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Streets, between Highland and Ocean which can be viewed.

In response to a request for clarification from Commissioner Ortmann regarding Phase III, Director Thompson explained that thresholds for maximum development were established for the Master Plan including Phase III and each phase is very detailed. Further, Phases I and II can stand on their own with or without Fry's.

Chairperson Conaway pointed out that even if the City approved a Master Plan for all three phases, there is no guarantee that they will all be implemented and built.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ortmann as to whether the applicant withdrew Phase III at the behest of the City, Director Thompson explained that this came about after the applicant was in discussions with the City and having so many issues relating to the corner made it very difficult to plan for it, therefore the applicant made the decision that it would be better to take Phase III out of the current Plan and add it back to the Plan at a later time.

## **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Paralusz thanked the public for attending these meetings, as well as staff and the applicant. She acknowledged mitigating all concerns is hard, but is comfortable with the project as it stands now. They have reviewed the project for over a year, and she has seen a plan that has changed and improved. They have collaboratively worked together with residents and the Commission to refine and address concerns. Commissioner Paralusz stated that her job as a planning commissioner is to balance the developers interests with the public interest, and she wants to be assured the project will fit into the community. After hearing the traffic and planning presentation, she is convinced that the applicant is doing everything it can to minimize the traffic impact. Believes Staff is capable of working with the Traffic Engineer to work issues out. Lighting is an issue and believes that if there's anything that can be done, it should be part of the project as approved. Regarding the parking structures, she believes they are now a much more manageable size and will also blend with the retail stores and center, and the decks facing Sepulveda will have retail buildings in front of them to minimize their impacts. Also she does not want to see the City lose tax dollars to other cities and noted that Plaza El Segundo is going forward with their next phase and residents may go across Rosecrans to shop there. In conclusion, Commissioner Paralusz believes the project is greatly improved and it is time move on with a decision.

Commission Ortmann stated that he is still not comfortable with the project and that there are still issues to be worked out especially with the parking garage design in that he believes that there may be some changes that the public will more completely support. He believes that the public feels there has not been enough outreach. He does not think enough has been explored for bike and pedestrian enhancements. He believes that cut-through traffic in the Tree Section is a concern and will get worse, and perhaps the developer should work with the City to mitigate the impacts. He is not as concerned with the density and scale and wishes they could achieve the density with a lot less parking and would like more info on this.

Commissioner Andreani stated that she thinks the project is close and has come a long way, especially with the parking structures, but feels the project is not quite ready. She believes that 500 feet notification is not enough and wondered if there could be a full page ad in Beach Reporter and generally more outreach. She recognizes that improvement is needed at the mall but there are outstanding issues: they need to improve access to the mall and address traffic intrusion in the Tree Section; believes that the flags don't really illustrate the bulk and volume of the proposed parking structures, she is concerned about the removal of trees and landscaping, does not see that the number of parking spaces is going to be reduced even though that was encouraged, and is not clear as to where employees are going to park. She would like to see a scale model but at least a vellum plan of the proposal plan overlaying the existing site plan would be helpful. She would also like to understand why a height variance is necessary and more info about signage. Regarding mobility, she is still concerned about traffic backup on Marine going into the Tree Section. She asked if there could be some cooperation with Plaza El Segundo, such as a tram connecting the two centers and lastly thanked the public for their participation.



Commissioner Gross stated that he is in general agreement with Commissioner Paralusz and disclosed that did have a brief discussion with Mark English about the importance of public participation. He has walked and biked along both Oak and Sepulveda and is convinced that given the flags installed, there is not a problem with height of the parking structures from the Sepulveda and Tree Section perspectives. He sympathizes with the Oak Street residents but wants to clarify, in the context of the General Plan, the roles of the PC and City Council in reviewing this project. He believes their role is to make sure that the City's General Plan adopted in 2003 will be upheld. He cited General Plan goals to have vibrant commercial districts and support of the mall as a regional serving retail center. He also thinks the white papers provided by the applicant have helped him answer many questions. He has a small list of issues: he doesn't like reducing parking, and while admiring the goal to improve bike path feeds to the mall, the infrastructure for this is several years away. He encourages staff to try and get more mature trees on the site to block views of buildings from Sepulveda and thinks the lighting should be allowed at a 15 foot height with the conditions relating mainly to safety. Lastly, in the draft conditions, Commissioner Gross asked whether all the street dedications being required by the City are needed.

Chairperson Conaway stated that he has not supported the site plan from the beginning, not liking the four parking structures (they reduce opportunities for better internal circulation and feels they cut off the center from the community) and wanting much more for bike and pedestrian connections. He needs to be convinced that having parking decks all on the north side won't work, noting that there is a lot of land in that portion of the site and he believes that this can be convenient to shoppers, as well as tie in well with pedestrian connections. He believes that the applicant has done everything they can to enhance the four separate decks, but wants to see alternatives that are not ten stories tall. He would like to see the studies about locating the parking decks, but if they do not change the four parking deck plan he has these concerns: if Phase III does not go through, the south deck will work well but the 3500 Hacienda Building may be cut off with no retail activity nearby; he needs much more info on how security would work and interface with the City Police Department. He doesn't think it's necessary to ask the applicant to put up sample lights but it would be helpful if the applicant can draw up cross sections to show how the lights will appear from Sepulveda Boulevard. He would like to see the applicant explore other designs in that he thinks what has been presented so far captures a level of quality but not necessarily a Manhattan Beach style or theme. Regarding public notice, he would like to see an ad in the Beach Reporter full page or whatever can be done to enhance outreach and feels more residents should be aware of the project.

Commissioner Gross added one more comment to Staff that the dedicated bike path along Cedar Way should continue all the way to Marine.

Development Director Thompson stated his recommendation is to continue the public hearing to June 26 at which time staff will bring a list of conditions with discussion about the applicant's reaction to the conditions, and a draft Resolution. Staff will also do more outreach including a half page ad in the newspaper.

## **ACTION**

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani/Paralusz) to reopen the public hearing and continue the public hearing to June 26, 2013.

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

**4. DIRECTOR'S ITEMS - None**

**5. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS - None**

**6. TENTATIVE AGENDA June 12, 2013**

a. Parking Reduction – 1751 Artesia Boulevard (continued from May 8, 2013 meeting)

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m. to Wednesday, June 12, 2013, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

ROSEMARY LACKOW  
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

---

RICHARD THOMPSON  
Community Development Director