

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 9, 2014**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 9th day of April, 2014, 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
Eric Haaland, Associate Planner
Ed Kao, Senior Civil Engineer
Tony Olmos, Director of Public Works
Jason Masters, Assistant Planner
Rosemary Lackow, Recording Secretary

2. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 12, 2014

The following changes were requested by the Commission:

Commissioner Gross requested on Pg. 5, second to last paragraph, the 4th sentence be revised to read “Regarding the wall on the west side that diminishes ~~westerly~~ southerly and is visible....”

Commissioner Andreani requested on Pg. 5, that the first paragraph be revised to read: “Commissioner Andreani, based on Attorney John Strain’s letter attached to the Staff report, wanted to clarify her remarks relative to alcohol licensing as she believes there has been misunderstanding and misinterpretation by both staff and the applicant. She did not mean that ~~they~~ the Shade Hotel could or should operate only with a Type 66 (in-room minibar or controlled access cabinet) ABC license. She contacted the ABC in 2005, 2010 and most recently on March 6, 2014 ~~she did so~~ because she wanted to understand ~~about the~~ what other liquor license options are available with a Type 66 license. The ABC confirmed there are options other than the Type 47 license that can be used along with the Type 66 license. She doesn’t want anyone to think that she wants or expected the hotel to operate only with Type 66 license, but there were (in 2005) and are options to choosing the Type 47 license. There are other options.”

Commissioner Paralusz requested that the last paragraph on Pg. 4 be revised to read: “Commissioner Paralusz ~~stated informed~~ that she believes it is very unlikely she will be present at the April 23rd meeting due to an out of state work commitment. She was very hopeful she could be present to help bring this issue to closure but thanked Staff for all their hard work and also lots of thanks thanked the neighbors for being tireless advocates for their neighborhood. And Commissioner Paralusz also give gave credit to Mr. Zislis for working things out continuing to try to work things out with the neighborhood. She stated that Shade Hotel is very important to the community but that so is the neighborhood and that both need to thrive and co-exist peacefully. She wished everyone good luck.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani / Paralusz) to **APPROVE** the minutes of March 12, 2014, as amended.

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

04/09/14-2. Application for a New Coastal Development Permit to Repair and/or Replace

Pedestrian Access Stairs and Retaining Walls, as Well as Build New ADA Compliant Ramps as Part of The Strand Pedestrian Access Improvement Project.

Commissioner Gross recused himself, on advice from the City Attorney because his residence is on the Strand. Commissioner Gross left the chambers.

Director Thompson introduced the hearing item and stated that the presentation would be by the Department of Public Works, represented by Director Tony Olmos and Senior Civil Engineer Ed Kao who proceeded with a detailed report and slide presentation.

In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani, Director Olmos explained that the “pathway to the sea” project has already been approved through the CIP process (Capital Improvement Program), that a contract is expected to be awarded in May, and construction completed by Memorial Day.

Director Thompson confirmed Commissioner Paralusz’s understanding that a Coastal Development Permit is only required for the project because it is located in the coastal zone.

In response to a suggestion by Chair Conaway that consideration be given for adding handrails on the stairs at a height for young children, Mr. Kao stated that the focus has been to meet all ADA requirements, and that staff would discuss this with the City’s ADA consultant, and see if this is required and whether the project budget can accommodate this additional feature.

Chairperson Conaway opened the public hearing. There being no one present wishing to speak, Chairperson Conaway closed the public hearing

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Paralusz summarized that she is very happy to see that this project is finally and expeditiously going to be constructed. She wholeheartedly supports and has no changes to the draft resolution. Commissioner Andreani echoed Commissioner Paralusz’s remarks and stated she thought the resolution is well written. Chairperson Conaway stated his agreement and emphasized that he is very happy to see that beach access will be improved.

ACTION

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Ortmann / Paralusz) to **APPROVE** the Coastal Development Permit for the subject project, per the submitted draft Resolution.

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

Director Thompson announced that this item is approved. Commissioner Gross rejoined the Commission.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

04/09/14-2. Consideration of a Resolution Approving a Use Permit Amendment and Variance for Proposed Market with Off-Site Alcohol Sales and On-Site Tastings, Parking Deck, and other Site Alterations to an Existing Retail Center, Manhattan Place, at 1133 Artesia Boulevard (McKinley Malak Architects, Inc.)

Director Thompson introduced the item, noting that the public has been re-noticed in advance of this hearing. Associate Planner Eric Haaland gave a power point presentation with slides.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ortmann regarding project signage, Mr. Haaland explained that Staff recommends approval at this time.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ortmann, Mr. Haaland addressed the project driveways and Commissioner Ortmann's suggestion that there is opportunity for consolidation of driveways which might improve offsite traffic turning movements. Associate Planner Haaland explained that the subject retail center site does not have direct access to the driveway on Sepulveda Boulevard.

In response to concern expressed by Commissioner Gross, who stated that he has visited the site, that a possible requirement to notch the westerly wall may result in loss of one or two parking spaces. Associate Planner Haaland stated that the project architect has been analyzing the westerly wall and will have some new info to present tonight.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Andreani as to the proposed finding of public necessity or convenience, on page 2 of the draft resolution, Mr. Haaland explained that this language comes from the state Department of Alcohol Beverage Control, and that the finding is required from the City by ABC due to the number of other alcohol licenses already existing in the City. Mr. Haaland also confirmed that although the applicant is now proposing a new pole sign, this would require a separate filing for a Sign Exception.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Conaway opened the public hearing.

Hany Malak, project architect, explained that updated plans that he is now providing were not available until tonight. He described a new proposal to open up the west wall and "dress" it with a "green screen". He also noted that there is some landscaping proposed at the corner of the site and described the existing reciprocal access agreements and driveways serving the center. The applicant agrees to all conditions, except number 17 where the applicant would like to conduct tastings from 11:00 am to 8 pm instead of 11:00 am to 7 pm.

In response to Commissioner Gross, Mr. Malak explained that plants being proposed on and near the west wall will be on the bank property and the applicant knows that the plants will have to be replaced when the parking structure is built. This requires agreement and cooperation by the bank property owner. **Mr. Malak** indicated this work will be done.

In response to Commissioner Gross, as to whether the landscaping being discussed on bank property is required, Director Thompson indicated that this can be addressed in the adopted resolution as a condition.

In response to a question from Chairperson Conaway, Mr. Haaland confirmed that the project does comply with applicable landscaping requirements.

In response to Commissioner Paralusz, Associate Planner Haaland noted that other retail uses that have approved alcohol tasting, and there is some variety in the closing times ranging between 7pm and 9pm. In response to Chair Conaway, Mr. Haaland explained that the closing hour recommended is for the tasting activity, not the overall store use.

In response to Commissioner Gross, Director Thompson noted that staff can add language in condition 6 that requires the applicant/owner to install and maintain landscaping along the west wall.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ida, neighbor, stated that she would like more details on how the tastings will take place. Chairperson Conaway stated that he would ask the architect to address and respond to this question.

Charles Castello, nearby property owner stated his concern about adding another alcoholic beverage outlet in the area. He asked about the identity of the property owner and proposed tenant.

Chair Conaway invited the applicant to address the stated questions and concerns.

Hany Malak, representing the applicant stated he is not at liberty to say who the tenant is since negotiations are still pending. Regarding the proposed retail alcoholic sales, he noted there would be sales only, and no consumption besides tasting on the premises. There is to be no seating, just an isolated area where one stands and tastes and then makes a purchase and leaves. **Mr. Malak** noted that Manhattan Place LLC is the owner, and is not present tonight.

To Commissioner Paralusz, **Mr. Malak** clarified that the applicant is in discussion with a “high end food retailer” and the lease deal is in place, but just not yet signed.

There being no other persons wishing to speak, Chair Conaway closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Gross indicated that he is comfortable with the draft resolution subject to the discussed changes made to conditions 1 and 6. He has no strong feelings either way about the tasting closing hour.

Commissioner Paralusz stated she is in favor of the project as an aesthetic enhancement of this corner, and is persuaded by the neighbors’ comments and believes the closing time for tastings should stay as 7 pm.

Changes to the draft resolution conditions were discussed. It was agreed that in condition 1, the notching should be not required and language revised and/or inserted as determined appropriate by staff. In condition 6 it was agreed to add a requirement for the owner to be responsible for coordinating the landscaping installation and maintenance with the adjoining bank property owner.

Commissioner Andreani noted she is also in favor of the project generally and it will be an excellent improvement and favors not extending the hour of tasting to 8 pm, and agrees with discussed changes to conditions 1 and 6. Commissioner Andreani also suggested that, for clarity, Staff add reference to the 7pm closing time for tasting to condition 16 regarding overall operating hours.

Commissioner Paralusz concurred with Commissioner Andreani’s proposed changes.

Commissioner Ortmann, believes the project will be a nice addition to this corner of the City, and doesn’t have any strong feeling regarding the request to extend the tasting hours.

Chair Conaway clarified for the neighbors that the Commission takes its responsibility in reviewing and approving new projects very seriously and they are very aware of alcohol saturation levels in the city. He has read the resolution wording and noted that this approval limits this space to grocery store with incidental beer and wine tasting not service, and the physical space where tasting will occur is also limited. To clarify, he noted that the conditional uses approved stay with the land but even under a different owner, a radically different use, such as a nightclub, cannot occur without a public hearing and Commission approval. He agrees with changes discussed to conditions 1 and 6, and the language to be added to condition 16 about tasting, and does not support extending the tasting hour to 8 pm.

Commissioner Gross clarified the prior use at the space was retail grocery store and this proposal actually returns the building use back to retail food and beverage that it was prior to a health club.

ACTION

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Gross/Andreani) to **APPROVE** the Subject Use Permit Amendment and Variance for the subject project, per the draft Resolution as amended in conditions 1, 6, and 16.

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

Director Thompson announced the project is approved and that this decision will be placed on the City Council consent calendar on May 6, with a recommendation to Receive and File.

04/09/14-4. Consideration of a Use Permit Amendment, Variances and Sign Exception Amendment to Construct an Addition to an Existing Two-Story Commercial Building and Other Site Improvements Located at 1500 North Sepulveda Boulevard. (Manhattan Beach Toyota/Scion)

Commissioner Paralusz announced she is recusing herself due to a financial conflict of interest and then she left the chambers.

Director Thompson introduced Jason Masters Assistant Planner who gave the staff report assisted by a slide presentation. Topics focused on the site location and vicinity map, background, and past approvals, plans including building elevations, required permits including variances for building height and landscaping, signage including temporary sign program and proposed Sign Exception and the proposed use permit amendment. Mr. Masters concluded that the main neighborhood concerns are noise and glare and visual impact due to the proposed increased building height.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gross, Assistant Planner Masters stated that the project is an addition of 20,536 square feet and there will be a total of 10,000 (approximately) net new square feet. Regarding sign total square footage, whether more or less than existing, Mr. Masters stated that this information has not been provided on the plans, but staff believes it will be less than existing. Regarding building height, Mr. Masters confirmed that the portion of the parts building that will remain is just above the 22-foot limit and the top of the roof for the new second floor area will be another 2.9 feet above that. The roof of the new building will be almost 6 feet above 22 feet and the parapet adds another 7.25 feet in height. If an elevator is to be required, it is estimated to be under the height of the parapet. Finally, Mr. Masters confirmed that while thousands of square feet of new landscaping will be added, the site will still be around 5%, less than 8% as required.

In response to Commissioner Andreani, Mr. Masters stated that Toyota corporate standards do not override the City zoning codes. Assistant Planner Masters also explained that the elevator issue is an ADA compliance matter that is still being investigated.

In response to Chairperson Conaway, Director Thompson explained the purview of ADA by the Building Official but the Commission can, if it makes findings, support a requirement for an elevator.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Andreani who pointed out her concern for glare from new tall windows that face Sepulveda, Director Thompson indicated that Staff would look into this concern.

Commissioner Ortmann commented that he did not see the relevance of the Toyota national standards that were mentioned in the written staff report. In response to Commissioner Ortmann's inquiry as to special circumstances that would support a landscaping variance, Assistant Planner Masters noted that there are not many places where more landscaping can be provided due to the amount of car display area, driveway and access and employee parking. Mr. Masters also cited the fact that the building addition is to be located towards the front of the lot in an area that already has a considerable amount of landscaping. Mr. Masters also explained that the 21 new trees being added would be distributed throughout the property.

Mr. Masters explained to Chairperson Conaway that a Sign Exception is needed in part because of the way the code calculates allowed area for pylon (pole) signs and Temporary Signs.

At the invitation of Chairperson Conaway, the applicant made a presentation.

Darryl Sperber, owner of Manhattan Beach Toyota gave a brief history of the dealership and explained the Toyota corporate "Image 2" program that affects his dealership and that has the intent of modernizing the facility and provide consistent branding of the product and improve the customer experience. The

implementation of this program was a condition of the sale when he purchased the dealership. He is eager to make things better for the neighbors.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, **Mr. Sperber** noted that he must upgrade his dealership and believes that he can satisfy both Toyota and the requirements.

In response to Commissioner Ortmann, **Mr. Sperber** stated they exceed the parking requirement by 79 spaces.

Associate Planner Danna explained, through the Chair, the rationale for the landscaping exception.

Commissioner Ortmann asked why lighting and glare has not already been resolved for the neighbors, to which **Mr. Sperber** explained that it was his intent to deal with the lighting concerns concurrent with other improvements.

In response to Commissioner Andreani, architect **Jack Lamphere** stated regarding glare that he would be amenable to addressing this in an appropriately worded condition. Secondly, regarding landscaping they would consider installing permeable pavement instead. **Mr. Lamphere** first suggested an approach whereby more landscaping would be provided in the public areas as opposed to the display or storage areas. For example, they want to locate the new trees in areas where the public would most likely benefit from seeing them. Regarding installing permeable pavement, **Mr. Lamphere** acknowledged they will be tearing up 35,000 square feet of pavement and this would be the opportunity to comply with state water quality, addressing run-off pollution requirements as well. Mr. Lamphere indicated that he will meet all the state requirements. Commissioner Andreani clarified that by “permeable” she intends that water could soak through the pavement.

In response to Chairperson Conaway, **Mr. Lamphere** indicated that the L-shaped area in the side yard would not work as a place to locate mechanical HVAC equipment.

In response to Chairperson Conaway, **Mr. Sperber** stated that the dealership has 75 to 80 employees who park onsite and several others either carpool or take public transportation.

Commissioner Gross disclosed that he visited the site and was able to see that the parts department has a 2-story height and was also able to see the view lines from neighbors to the east.

There being no further questions, Chairperson Conaway opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John De France, owner on Magnolia, didn't get notification on the hearing, and questioned that there is a basis for granting the variances and economic hardship is not adequate. His concerns are the increase in service capacity and related impacts, and the height of new building including possibility that the new higher wall might amplify noise. He believes it's premature to make a decision tonight. While he doesn't want to seem anti-business, he believes the business improvements can be done in a way that also mitigate issues, like noise. He would like to see more effort from the applicant to mitigate neighborhood impacts.

Paul Mullin, 1405 Magnolia, believes that in the past lighting impacts have been addressed but over time issues have regressed somewhat. He credits Mr. Sperber with trying to be a good neighbor and he would like the conditions to include a requirement that the west side of the site be used for staging during construction. He cited efforts to address noise on this site such as including a condition that the use of pneumatic tools end at a specified time.

Randy Kowata, neighbor, stated his concerns relate to the height variance for the AC units and believes they can be relocated in an area other than the roof and he is also concerned with noise. There's a lot of sound that bounces around at the rear of the site and he suggests that landscaping be considered as a buffer. He requested that the applicant identify and address the neighbors' impacts and believes the applicant can achieving the minimum code requirements. He appreciates that the site will be remodeled.

Kim Robinson, 1504 Magnolia believes it may be possible that the office space that is being added can be done elsewhere on the site and is concerned that already excessive noise will only increase. Regarding lighting and illumination she suggests that the applicant provide a detailed lighting plan and she is also concerned that construction debris and dust may come onto her property during construction because there is a wind tunnel effect that exists and the wind comes towards her home. She would like to see large inflated signs not allowed on the dealership roofs and would like the temporary sign program to address these and similar advertisements. Ms. Robinson noted that in 2009 the City Council adopted an ordinance requiring a minimum “green building” rating of silver be required for any new project over a certain size and wondered if green building standards may be applied. Regarding landscaping she believes some trees wells could be placed in the rear and that the trees along the rear of the property are not on the dealership site but in a utility easement.

Gus Cardenas, neighbor on Magnolia, noted that wind patterns exist and this also results in carrying noise, and he wants this project to avoid the impacts that occurred with the Target project. He would like the exterior lighting to be not intrusive and can the buildings have windows that do not face Magnolia? He is concerned also with the height variance and does not understand why a commercial site cannot meet height codes as required for residential sites.

Chairperson Conaway invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Darryl Sperber appreciates concerns of neighbors, asked his architect or project manager to address concerns by neighbors.

Jack Sphere, architect, acknowledged comments about the Target and perhaps no property screening was provided. He believes that the existing AC units are visible and believes that the parapet walls will hide the units if permitted with the variance. Now the way the dealership is, the AC units are visible and he believes that the parapet walls if allowed with a variance would hide the units and also might mitigate noise. He would consider locating the AC units on the ground but wants to avoid a split system design. He has looked into noise and cited the dB level of the AC units would be 95 and decrease with distance and depending whether the person hearing is outside or inside their home. The noise level might be 65-70 dBs if a neighbor is inside their home and then at night the level decreases further to about 55 dB when neighbors are mostly inside a home. He believes that the building when first constructed in 1965 was already over the 22 foot height limit and it is difficult to meet the City’s strict height limit and still build to the Toyota appearance standard.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ortmann as to the number of times Toyota has met with neighbors, **Mr. Sphere** indicate that the owner and project manager would be happy to address neighbor issues and would like to see the conditions include the measures that will address their concern and not slow the project.

Darryl Sperber, owner, added that he has been at this location for a number of years, and just recently heard about the lighting issue at the rear, and believes that once he knows about problem or complaint he has properly acted to address a problem.

Chairperson Conaway closed the hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Associate Planner Danna stated that variances in the Sepulveda commercial corridor include: Wells Fargo bank, the “Skechers Building”, the Versailles restaurant site, and the “Rite-Aid site” and Manhattan Village mall. He also stated he can get detailed information to the Commission regarding heights on other properties if they would like this.

Commissioner Ortmann cautioned that leniency on code standards can result in a “slippery slope” and the City can lose the impact of what they can accomplish. He also suggested that landscaping at the rear might have visual and noise benefits. Mr. Danna responded that he agrees a thicker landscaping screen may be a benefit. Commissioner Ortmann stated that he believes this way of framing the landscaping issue is different than as expressed in the staff report which is that the site can’t meet the code, because of special

circumstances. Assistant Planner Masters pointed out that the draft resolution does address landscaping maintenance along the rear of the site and noted that the trees along the rear are in an easement behind a wall but are on the dealership property and have to be maintained.

Chair Conaway stated that he wanted to address inflatables and it was confirmed by Mr. Masters that this is addressed in the resolution.

The Commission started its deliberation with the issue of the corporate requirements and then addressed the various issues that arose in the hearing. It was her feeling that the corporate requirements complicate the project review and believes that the goal is to see if the project can be upgraded to meet code first, while recognizing that each property also should be examined for its individual characteristics.

Chair Conaway stated that he believes that the city codes come first and that the corporate issues should be regarded as guidelines.

Commissioner Ortmann believes the issue of what trumps what is irrelevant because the city codes prevail. He also believes that by not meeting in advance with the neighbors the applicant has lost some opportunity and perhaps processing time. Meeting with neighbors would have provided a lot of insight.

Commissioner Gross cited Policy LU 8.2 in the General Plan to support the remodeling and upgrading of commercial sites and he noted this business is a franchise similar to the Apple store. The City needs to deal with franchises and respect their licenses if we want to keep or attract them. He also acknowledged that it's a balancing act and they need to also respect the residents who live nearby. There are special conditions where there are homes immediately adjacent to commercial, these are typical cases that come before the Commission. There is not always a perfect solution that makes everyone happy, but the Commission's job is to balance the needs of residents and businesses. Sometimes the applicant does not meet with the neighbors and the neighbors only hear of the project just before the hearing. The applicants need to consider the neighbors' concerns before the hearing. Commissioner Gross stated that he did not have many significant issues with the draft Resolution.

Chairperson Conaway directed that the Commission now move into specifics with the main issues, noting that it didn't sound like the Commissioners overall were ready to make a decision.

Commissioner Gross stated he generally is in support of a height variance. While usually he looks to compare the project with the height of other nearby properties and other parts of Sepulveda, in this case he also found the discussion of the parapets and their use in possibly mitigating problems with the AC units on the roof, to be compelling. He does not have a problem with the 5 foot (approximately) roof height variance.

Commissioner Andreani stated that she needs more information before deciding about the height variance, and acknowledged that the building is known to already be 2 feet over the height limit. It was clarified that the proposed construction will be an increase of 10.5 more feet. She would consider a height variance but needs more info, and is concerned about the impact to neighbors and needs to know more about the parapet and what it is and why it would be used and whether the degree of height variance can be reduced.

Commissioner Ortmann stated his issue with the height variance is that he doesn't believe the owner has looked closely enough into whether the AC units can be located somewhere on the ground floor somewhere. He hasn't seen any investigation by the owner and architect and basically doesn't believe he has enough information.

Chairperson Conaway stated he agrees with Ortmann and pointed out that when variances have been approved in the past it is based on the minimum necessary and often the amount over the limit is a small footprint. He also doesn't believe alternatives have been properly looked into. He is not ready to approve the height and also believes putting the units on the roof is old technology. He encouraged the owner to seek other new technology methods of cooling such as net zero buildings, and passive cooling.

Commissioner Gross indicated that he believes the building style being proposed relates to the degree of height variance being requested. He can support a variance if it represents the minimum needed to meet

their objective.

Commissioner Ortmann stated that until he understands the function of what the variance serves, he doesn't want to assign a number or a specific amount of height over the limit that he might support.

Chair Conaway directed the discussion to landscaping and whether there is support for less than 8%.

Commissioner Andreani stated she thought more can be done. For example, she believes more trees are desirable, including some to shield the neighbors in the back. She would consider approving less than 8% as long as more is done and they address issues at the rear.

Commissioner Ortmann indicated he would be looking at whether the spirit of the law is met and would look into how the landscaping accomplishes its purposes. He thinks the owner should meet with neighbors to see what they feel is important.

Commissioner Gross indicated that he thinks that the density of landscaping, like of trees is more important than just area covered by landscaping. He believes that the 21 trees will be enough, but the trees should be the type that will mature and grow high. He agrees that this business has outdoor retail areas where the "store" space is the outdoor display area. He is comfortable with the amount of trees as long as they create an adequate barrier for the neighbors.

Chair Conaway emphasized that findings for granting variances are very important. So far he doesn't see the hardship or special circumstances that warrant granting relief from the standard. He also is disappointed that Toyota is not being more proactive with technology and show a desire to meet code minimums.

Discussion began regarding resolution conditions.

Commissioner Gross would like to see limits for use of pneumatic tools limits and he would like to see noise and light conditions that cover the entire site and that mitigate the neighbor's concerns as much as possible.

Commissioner Andreani believes that equipment noise can be remedied by setting times for operation. She wanted to know if there would be windows at the rear that would refract glare back to the neighbors and is still concerned about glare on Sepulveda.

Commissioner Ortmann advised the owner to reach out to neighbors and engage in a dialogue with them to resolve issues.

Chair Conaway suggested the discussion be about wrapping up all other issues: signs and glare but suggested the issues regarding the elevator which relate to ADA regulations be not discussed.

Commissioner Gross would like confirmation as to how much signage is existing and how much is being proposed.

Commissioner Ortmann stated he believes that glare can be addressed and he doesn't feel the signage is a significant problem.

Commissioner Andreani would like to know how glare on the Sepulveda side of the building will occur. She is opposed to banner signs and believes temporary signs should not be up for 120 days and believes that too many banners along Sepulveda will make the corridor look messy. She really cares about the dealership and the corridor.

Chair Conaway stated he is persuaded to consider the issue of signage including temporary banners and perhaps banners should be prohibited, and concurs with Commissioner Andreani that more information is needed about possible window glare on the west side and would like information from the applicant on the type of glass to be used and whether it will be reflective.

Associate Planner Danna indicated that Staff has taken good notes.

Commissioner Andreani thanked staff and the owners for being engaged in this process and acknowledged that while it was hoped a resolution could be passed tonight, she hopes they understand that more information is needed.

Commissioner Gross suggested to the applicant that there is a strong message from the Commission is to get the project as good as possible. He also would appreciate understanding from the owner's perspective.

Chair Conaway thanked neighbors regarding their effort tonight and explained the public noticing, and that he generally supports this project, wants it to proceed quickly and believes there is opportunity for this project to be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. He encourages the applicant and the city to work together to address all issues.

Associate Planner Danna noted it is now appropriate for the Commission to reopen and continue the hearing to May 14th and it was so ordered by Chairperson Conaway.

Commissioner Paralusz joined the Commission in the chambers.

5. DIRECTOR'S ITEMS – No items to report

6. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

- Commissioner Ortmann noted the Commission has received letters from a citizen regarding Level 10 Fitness. Commissioner Andreani noted that she has been advised by Director Thompson that this is a matter that is being discussed with the City Attorney and is not within the purview of the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Gross reported on a Planning Commission conference he and Chairperson Conaway attended and that he found it very worthwhile, and has provided a written summary that is available from staff. One issue he found interesting was learning how other city planning commissions conduct hearings and one important "take away" is that commissioners should not reflect any bias during the public hearing process, including how they ask questions. Commissioner Andreani suggested that 3-d models would be good to be required of big projects in terms of providing information about a project. Chair Conaway found it very interesting to hear about how to use online technology to increase public input for project hearings and he also came away from the conference realizing that staff has done a good job in providing the support to the Commission and the public in administering public hearings before the Commission.
- Commissioner Paralusz inquired about activity at a former preschool project behind Jiffy Lube on Manhattan Beach Boulevard and Mr. Danna explained that there has been a remodel project including landscaping to improve the site for a permitted business use. Commissioner Paralusz indicated that she most likely will not be present for the upcoming rotation of the Chair, and she expressed her thanks and appreciation to Chairperson Conaway for being an excellent Chair and she also congratulated Commissioner Gross for taking on the position of the next Chair. Chairperson Conaway expressed his appreciation to all.

7. TENTATIVE AGENDA – April 23, 2014

1. Rotate Chair
2. Use Permit Amendment: Shade Hotel
3. CIP

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10: 50 pm. to Wednesday, April 23, 2014, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue.

ROSEMARY LACKOW
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

RICHARD THOMPSON
Community Development Director