

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development

BY: Jason Masters, Assistant Planner
Esteban Danna, Associate Planner

DATE: May 14, 2014

SUBJECT: 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)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **CONDUCT** the continued public hearing, **DISCUSS** the project and **ADOPT** the Draft Resolution **APPROVING** the project with conditions.

APPLICANT

Manhattan Beach Toyota/Scion (Darrel Sperber)
1500 N. Sepulveda Boulevard
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

BACKGROUND

The subject property is currently developed with single story buildings, except the rear of the main building, where the Parts Department is located is two-story. The applicant proposes to demolish 10,351 square feet of the existing 22,096 square foot single story main building and construct a 17,896 square foot two-story addition at the front of the building. A new canopy totaling 2,640 square foot is also proposed which will result in 32,281 total square feet of new building and canopy.

The applicant is proposing to lower the grade of the finish floor of the front of the building by up to five feet and extend 21 feet closer to Sepulveda Boulevard. The proposed building will function as a Toyota/Scion showroom, parts area, customer lounge and sales and operations-related offices.

At its regular meeting of April 9, 2014, the Planning Commission conducted the public hearing, took public testimony, discussed the issues, and continued the public hearing to May 14, 2014. The Commission directed staff to continue working with the applicant to provide design alternatives to address the issues that were identify.

The Commission requested additional information on the Height and Landscaping Variances, and directed that further conditions and restrictions be placed on the project to minimize impacts. Staff was directed to work with the applicant to lower the proposed height of the building, increase landscaping, provide additional trees at the rear of the property, identify and mitigate noise and lighting issues, provide specific signage details, provide information regarding the air conditioners, address glare from glass at the front façade, and verify LEED Silver compliance.

The Planning Commission also requested that the applicant met with neighbors to discuss adjacent residents' concerns regarding noise, lights, height of the proposed building and construction impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Project is Categorically Exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15332.

DISCUSSION

Neighborhood Meetings

The applicant hosted two neighborhood meetings two weeks apart. A copy of the agenda and minutes of the meetings are attached for your reference (Exhibit D). According to the applicant, they discussed the following topics, all which have been addressed through project redesigns and conditions of approval.

Noise

Residents voiced concern about vehicles in the rear of the property, noise from air conditioning units and air tools. The applicant noted that they are diligent about responding to complaints and encouraged residents to voice them. They indicated they were exploring alternatives for relocating the AC units, and installing sound reducing insulation into the parapets. Accordingly, the revised plans show the relocation of the AC units to the existing roof above the parts department which lowers the units about three feet, and the AC units will be smaller and quieter than the previously proposed units. They also agreed that the AC units will be programmed to shutdown no later than 8:00pm each day. A resident also commented that more landscaping in the rear would help to minimize noise concerns.

Lighting

Residents noted that there have been some improvements to the existing lighting that limit off-site illumination. The applicant stated that an Engineer was preparing a lighting study, and that adjustments to lighting have been accomplished. They also noted to neighbors that on-site lighting is necessary for both safety and security purposes. One resident noted that they would continue to take photographs to assist with the lighting improvements. The applicant also provided a letter from their glass contractor confirming that no glare will result from the glass windows at the front of the proposed building.

Height

Some residents were receptive to the newly proposed lowered height, while others were opposed to any increase in height. The applicant agreed to place smaller AC units on the second story roof of the parts department in a colony of 14 units with an automatic shut off at 8 pm. They also explained the contour of the roof and portal height. The height of the parapet wall was reduced by approximately 5 ½ feet and is proposed to slightly exceed the height of the smaller AC units.

Construction Impacts

Residents were concerned with construction impacts; the applicant noted that the project would last approximately six months, and would comply with noise, dust and equipment storage requirements. The work and equipment will be staged at the front of the property and the construction area will be fenced and screened to mitigate dust impacts and ensure safety.

Code Requirements

The Planning Commission requested Staff to work with the applicant regarding appropriate Code requirements as follows:

Variance to exceed maximum allowable height

The Planning Commission requested that the applicant explore design alternatives to lower the height of the proposed building including relocation of the proposed AC units possibly onto the ground level. The applicant is now proposing to relocate the AC units onto the roof of the existing second story parts area, which would lower the proposed building height by 5 ½ feet.

The maximum allowable height on the site due to the flat roof is 22 feet above the average of the four lot corner elevations, which is 159.60'. The existing building height is 162.06' which is about 2 ½ feet above the maximum height. The applicants have redesigned the proposed building, and relocated the proposed air conditioning units. The redesigned roof will be approximately three feet higher than the existing roof at 165.10' which is about 6 ½' above the maximum allowable height. The redesigned parapet extends two feet above the proposed roof at 167.10' to shield AC equipment, and reduce resulting noise impacts. This new parapet design is almost 5 ½ feet lower than the previously proposed parapet height. The proposed Portal (front entry/sign) was lowered slightly from the previous proposal (from 170.75' to 170.41') and exceeds the maximum height allowed by code (159.60') by almost eleven feet. The Variance findings regarding the building height are discussed in the attached Draft Resolution.

Variance to provide less than required landscaping

The Planning Commission requested that the applicant explore options for increasing the amount of landscaping to meet the intent of the code. This included providing additional trees at the rear of the property adjacent to the residential neighborhood. In the Commercial General district, 8% (18,960 square feet) of the property must be landscaped. The applicant has revised the project and proposes to provide 5.4% or 12,829 square feet of landscaping which requires a Variance application. This is 1,116 square feet more than the previous submittal of 5%, or 11,713 square feet, of landscaping area. Currently the property contains approximately 2.5%, or 5,900 square feet of total landscaped area, while the newly proposed project provides a 6,929 square foot increase as shown on the following chart:

LANDSCAPING			
Required	Existing	Initial proposal	Current proposal
8%	2.5%	5%	5.4%
18,960 sq. ft.	5,900 sq. ft.	11,713 sq. ft.	12,829 sq. ft.

The applicant has expanded the landscaping along the perimeter of the property. Pursuant to MBMC Section 10.60.070 (D.1) the parking lot is required to provide perimeter landscaping 10 feet wide adjacent to Sepulveda Boulevard, and five feet wide adjacent to neighboring properties. Furthermore, five percent (5%) of the parking lot area, excluding the perimeter planting strips is required to be devoted to interior landscaping distributed throughout the parking lot. As proposed, the project does not meet the perimeter landscaping requirement or the five percent parking lot area requirement. However staff believes that the project meets the intent of the requirement by providing additional landscaping along the south, west and eastern property lines, and distributed throughout the parking lot area.

Code also requires a minimum of one (1) tree for every six (6) spaces or 21 trees total, which is shown on the landscaping plan and included in the draft Resolution as a condition of approval. Combined with the existing ten (10) trees at the rear of the property the applicant will be providing no less than 31 trees. The applicant will be nearly doubling both the amount of landscaping and trees planted on the property which meets the intent of the Code. The Variance findings are discussed in the attached draft Resolution.

Sign Exception Amendment/Master Sign Program

The applicant wishes to amend the 2004 Sign Exception and create a Sign Program to maintain the existing pole sign which was permitted on May 17, 2011, install new signage on the proposed building and obtain approval for temporary banner signs for planned sales events throughout the year. While the Planning Commission did not object to the new dealership signage, they did request that the Temporary Sign Program be limited to the Code maximum of 90 days per year. The Sign Exception Amendment/Master Sign Program requests:

1. **Installing new Dealership-ID signage** – The existing Sign Exception allows for a maximum of 1,232 square feet of total sign area. The project involves installing 256 square feet of new signage on the proposed building and maintaining all other existing signage on the property which includes the 667 square foot pole sign, and 73 square feet of existing signage on the used car building. This will result in a total sign area of 996 square feet which is less than the maximum allowed for under the approved sign exception.
2. **Temporary Sign Program-** MBMC Section 10.72.050 (A.8) states that sites consisting of a minimum of two acres predominantly occupied by retail uses are eligible for a temporary sign program to establish site specific temporary sign standards specifically for allowable area and duration of display. An application for a temporary sign program can be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director or may be incorporated into a Master Sign Program. The following performance standards shall apply:

- a. Placement of signs shall be oriented toward a commercial street and away from residential homes.
- b. The temporary sign program shall specify sign design guidelines and sign area allocations to be applied to the entire site.
- c. The duration of sign display authorized in a temporary sign program shall not exceed a total of ninety (90) days per calendar year.
- d. Prohibited signs or devices shall be consistent with those provided in subsection E of Section 10.72.070, including but not limited to signs placed on public property and large inflatable tethered objects.

As part of the Master Sign Program, this project involves a Temporary Sign Program allowing up to four 30 square foot maximum banners to be installed at street side locations for a maximum of ninety (90) days per calendar year. Note that the Code limits the number and size of temporary signs and 90 days is the maximum allowed per year.

Public Input

The applicant initiated two neighborhood meetings to discuss the issues and identify possible solutions as previously discussed in this report. Since the last public hearing, Staff has received four written comments. The public comments focus on existing noise and lighting issues, height, landscaping, view impacts from the new facility and construction related concerns.

Existing operational concerns expressed include lighting that is not shielded and is shining directly into homes, noise from the service bays, noise from compressors and air tools. The applicant has been working with the adjacent neighbors to address these issues including updated, shielded and downward facing lighting, keeping the compressor door closed at all times and modernizing air tools. Staff has included as a condition of approval (Condition No. 5) that the security lighting for the site shall conform to Code requirements and shall include glare prevention design; lighting shall be properly shielded to avoid shining beyond any residential properties. Other conditions restrict service hours and air tool operations to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. (Condition No's 13-19)

Nearby residents wanted to ensure that the proposed parapets include sound proofing materials and do not simply visibly block the AC units and that the units themselves are shut off every night at a reasonable hour. The applicant agreed to have the units programmed to shutoff every evening at 8pm. Accordingly, Staff has included as a condition of approval that the proposed roof-mounted air conditioning units shall be permitted to operate hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. (Condition No. 18)

Other comments received were in opposition of the Variance applications, indicating that the additional height is unnecessary and will block views.

CONCLUSION

Staff believes that the project as clarified by the new graphics, and conditioned in the attached draft Resolution, addresses the comments previously made by the Planning Commission, and the public, and as conditioned the Code required findings for approval of the project can be met. The attached draft Resolution includes typical and specific findings and conditions for approving the Use Permit Amendment, Sign Exception and landscape and height Variances.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission conduct the continued public hearing, discuss the revised plans, additional information, and proposed draft Resolution for the subject applications, discuss the findings and conditions, and adopt the attached Draft Resolution approving the project.

EXHIBITS

- A. Draft Resolution No. PC 14-XX
- B. Application Materials
- C. April 9, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes
- D. Toyota Neighborhood Meetings Agendas and Notes
- E. Lighting and glass supporting documentation
- F. Vicinity Map
- G. Plans
- H. Public Comments
- I. Previous approvals:
 - CC Resolution No. 4398
 - CC Resolution No. 4848
 - PC Resolution No. 04-20

RESOLUTION NO. PC 14-XX

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF
MANHATTAN BEACH APPROVING A USE PERMIT AMENDMENT,
VARIANCES AND SIGN EXCEPTION AMENDMENT TO
CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-STORY
COMMERCIAL BUILDING AND OTHER SITE IMPROVEMENTS
LOCATED AT 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD (Manhattan
Beach Toyota/Scion)**

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH DOES HEREBY RESOLVE
AS FOLLOWS:**

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby makes the following findings:

- A. Pursuant to applicable law, the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach conducted duly noticed public hearing on April 9, 2014 and May 14, 2014 received testimony, and considered an application for a Use Permit Amendment, Variances, and Sign Exception Amendment to allow a two-story addition to an existing single-story commercial building located on the properties legally described as Lots 1 through 8 in Block 6 of Tract No. 7514 located at 1500 North Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Manhattan Beach.
- B. The proposed two-story building addition will be closer in grade elevation and distance to the existing sidewalk adjacent to Sepulveda Boulevard. The applicant is proposing to lower the existing grade of the front of the building, adjacent to Sepulveda Boulevard. Redesign of the dealership is consistent with Toyota Corporation's Image II nationwide design guidelines which require that the dealership be updated this calendar year. The proposed first floor area closest to the street will function as a Toyota/Scion showroom, while the remainder at the rear will accommodate the parts area, customer lounge and other sales and operations-related offices. The second floor offices will only be accessible through the interior of the proposed structure, and will contain the remainder of the businesses offices.
- C. A Use Permit Amendment, Variances to exceed maximum allowable height and to provide less than required landscaping area, and a Sign Exception Amendment, including a new Sign Program, are required.
- D. The applicant for the subject project is Darrel Sperber, Dealer Principal of Manhattan Beach Toyota.
- E. Pursuant to Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (MBMC) Section 10.16.030(B), a Use Permit is required for projects with a proposed building area exceeding 5,000 square feet or lot area exceeding 10,000 square feet.

**EXHIBIT A
PC MTG 5-14-14**

- F. Pursuant to Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (MBMC) Section 10.16.030, a Variance is required for projects within the General Commercial (CG) zone that provide less than the required 8% minimum site landscaping.
- G. Pursuant to Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (MBMC) Section 10.16.030(F), a Variance is required for projects exceeding the maximum building height of 22 feet above the average of the four property corner elevations.
- H. Pursuant to Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (MBMC) Section 10.72.050, a Sign Exception Amendment is required to modify signs exceeding two square feet per one lineal foot of property frontage.
- I. The project is Categorically Exempt (Section 15332) from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- J. The project will not individually nor cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.
- K. The General Plan designation for the property is General Commercial. The General Plan encourages commercial uses such as vehicle sales and services that serve City residents and visitors.
- L. The zoning designation for the property is CG (General Commercial).
- M. The zoning districts surrounding the property are CG (General Commercial) to the north, south and west and RS (Residential Single Family) to the east. The existing land use for the property is commercial.
- N. Pursuant to Section 10.84.060(B) of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code the following findings for the Variances are made:
 - 1. *Because of special circumstances or conditions applicable to the subject property—including narrowness and hollowness or shape, exceptional topography, or the extraordinary or exceptional situations or conditions—strict application of the requirements of this title would result in peculiar and exceptional difficulties to, or exceptional and/or undue hardships upon, the owner of the property;*

Variance to Height:

Special circumstances applicable to the subject property include exceptional topography and large lot size. There is a significant elevation change with an almost 22 foot elevation change between the southwest and southeast property corners. The lot size is 237,000 square feet in an area district with a minimum required lot size of 5,000 square feet.

The existing non-conforming building would not create new circumstances or impacts to neighbors' privacy, light, ventilation, or aesthetics. Application of building height requirements for the existing building and the addition would result in exceptional difficulties and/or undue hardships upon the owner of the property, since substantial changes would be needed to portions of the building that currently do not conform and where no changes are

proposed. Bringing the non-conformities up to current standards would also preclude the applicant from complying with the Toyota Corporation's Image II nationwide design guidelines.

Variance to Landscaping:

Special circumstances applicable to the subject property include exceptional topography and significant lot size. The lot size is 237,000 square feet in an area district with a minimum required lot size of 5,000 square feet.

The currently non-conforming lot landscaping would not create new circumstances or impacts to neighbors' or motorists and pedestrians aesthetics. Application of landscaping requirements for the existing or proposed site would result in exceptional difficulties and/or undue hardships upon the owner of the property, since substantial changes would be needed to add over 7,000 square feet of landscaping to a site that currently does not conform and most of which no changes are being proposed. Bringing the non-conformities up to current standards would also create an undue hardship upon the owner of the property as it would require less parking area for customers, employees, vehicle stock, and impede vehicular access.

2. *The relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; without substantial impairment of affected natural resources; and not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity of the development site, or to the public health, safety or general welfare; and*

Variance to Height:

Relief may be granted without detriment to the public good, impairment of natural resources, or to the detriment or injury of properties or improvements in the vicinity, or to the public health, safety or general welfare. While the proposed addition will exceed the maximum allowable height, the existing maximum building height of the parts storage area, which is not changing, is 2.5' above the maximum height. Furthermore, all other code requirements except landscaping will be met. The proposed building size will result in the property having a total square footage 19% of the maximum allowed floor area factor (1.5 FAF allowed by Code). The structure will be kept near the front of the lot, and will not be expanding towards the residential district at the rear of the property which minimizes negative impacts to neighbors since it allows for greater light, air, and privacy with a large parking lot and service bay buildings between the proposed structure and the rear property.

Variance to Landscaping:

Relief may be granted without detriment to the public good, impairment of natural resources, or to the detriment or injury of properties or improvements in the vicinity, or to the public health, safety or general welfare. The amount of landscaping will be increased significantly at both the front and rear of the lot including additional planting areas at the street frontage, and 1,116 square feet of new landscaping and 21 additional trees at the rear property line in addition to the existing 10 trees which will be maintained. As a result, the lot will get much closer to meeting the minimum site landscaping requirement. Furthermore, if only considering the front portion of the lot, the landscaping requirement would come within one percent of the minimum required.

3. *Granting the application is consistent with the purposes of this title and will not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with limitations on other properties in the vicinity and in the same zoning district and area district.*

Variance to Height:

Granting the application is consistent with the purposes of this title and will not constitute granting of a special privilege inconsistent with limitations on other properties in the vicinity and in the same zoning district and area district because the height of the building would not be inconsistent with surrounding properties. The height being proposed would otherwise be allowed by code if it were relocated to the southwest property line, the lowest portion of the lot, and reduced in height by approximately two feet. The non-conforming height is pre-existing, compatible with surrounding buildings, and does not affect the adjoining properties.

Variance to Landscaping:

Granting the application is consistent with the purposes of this title and will not constitute granting of a special privilege inconsistent with limitations on other properties in the vicinity and in the same zoning district and area district because the less than minimum landscaping would not be inconsistent with surrounding properties. The amount of landscaping required by code could only be attained if the property were to reduce or remove building square footage or parking spaces. The non-conforming landscaping is pre-existing, compatible with surrounding buildings, and does not affect the adjoining properties.

- O. Pursuant to Section 10.84.060 of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code the following findings for the Use Permit are made:

1. *The proposed location of the use is in accord with the objectives of this title and the purposes of the district in which the site is located.*

The proposed building is located within the General Commercial district. The proposed uses are consistent with MBMC Section 10.16.010 which states that the district is intended to provide opportunities for the full range of retail and service businesses deemed suitable for location in Manhattan Beach, including businesses not permitted in other commercial districts because they attract heavy vehicular traffic or have certain adverse impacts; and to provide opportunities for offices and certain limited industrial uses that have impacts comparable to those of permitted retail and service uses to occupy space not in demand for retailing or services.

2. *The proposed location of the use and the proposed conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will be consistent with the General Plan; will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare of persons residing or working on the proposed project site or in or adjacent to the neighborhood of such use; and will not be detrimental to properties or improvements in the vicinity or to the general welfare of the city.*

The proposed uses pose no detrimental effects to the public health, safety, or welfare of persons working on the proposed project site or on the adjacent properties. The General Plan of the City of Manhattan Beach poses certain goals and policies which reflect the expectations and wishes of the City with respect to land uses. The subject property is located within the General Commercial land use category. The General Commercial

category provides opportunities for a broad range of retail and service commercial and professional office uses intended to meet the needs of local residents and businesses and to provide goods and services for the regional market. The General Commercial category accommodates uses that typically generate heavy traffic. Therefore, this designation applies primarily along Sepulveda Boulevard which is where the proposed project is located. The maximum floor area factor for the General Commercial Category is 1.5:1. Sepulveda Boulevard is the major commercial corridor in the City, with primarily regional-serving and large-scale businesses, such as Manhattan Beach Toyota, the project applicant. Ensuring quality design is especially important along this corridor to avoid monotonous and overbearing buildings, which the proposed design is consistent with. The project is also consistent with the following Goals and Policies of the General Plan:

- Policy LU-3.2: Promote the use of adopted design guidelines for new construction in Downtown, along Sepulveda Boulevard, and other areas to which guidelines apply.*
- Policy LU-3.5: Ensure that the sign ordinance provides for commercial signage that is attractive, non-intrusive, safe, and consistent with overall City aesthetic goals.*
- Goal LU-6: Maintain the viability of the commercial areas of Manhattan Beach.*
- Policy LU-6.2: Encourage a diverse mix of businesses that support the local tax base, are beneficial to residents, and support the economic needs of the community.*
- Policy LU-6.3: Recognize the need for a variety of commercial development types and designate areas appropriate for each. Encourage development proposals that meet the intent of these designations.*
- Goal LU-8: Maintain Sepulveda Boulevard, Rosecrans Avenue, and the commercial areas of Manhattan Village as regional-serving commercial districts.*
- Policy LU-8.2: Support the remodeling and upgrading needs of businesses as appropriate within these regional serving commercial districts.*

3. *The proposed use will comply with the provisions of this title, including any specific condition required for the proposed use in the district in which it would be located;*

The proposed retail and office uses on the site will be in compliance with applicable provisions of the (CG) General Commercial zone and the required notice, hearing, and findings for the Use Permit, Sign Exception and Variances. The purpose of the CG zone is to provide opportunities for a wide range of regional serving retail and service businesses deemed suitable for location in Manhattan Beach. This includes businesses not permitted in other commercial districts because they attract heavy vehicular traffic or have certain adverse impacts.

4. *The proposed use will not adversely impact nor be adversely impacted by nearby properties. Potential impacts are related but not necessarily limited to: traffic, parking, noise, vibration, odors, resident security and personal safety, and aesthetics, or create demands exceeding the capacity of public services and facilities which cannot be mitigated.*

The proposed project will not adversely impact nearby residents or commercial properties as they are related to traffic, parking, noise, vibration, odors, personal safety, or aesthetics, or create demands exceeding the capacity of public services and facilities. The proposed uses will provide the required off-street parking and will not create an additional demand for public services and facilities which cannot be mitigated. The use is the continuation and upgrade of an existing automobile sales and service use. Conditions of Approval and standard Manhattan Beach Municipal Code requirements will limit any potential adverse impacts.

- P. Pursuant to Section 10.72.080 of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code, the following findings are made regarding the Sign Exception application.

1. *The proposed sign exception would not be detrimental to, nor adversely impact, the neighborhood or district in which the property is located. Potential impacts may include, but are not limited to, design;*
 - a. The site is surrounded directly by commercial uses on the north, south and west and by residential uses to the east. Most adjacent residential and commercial uses are separated from the subject site by distance, parking lots, topography, landscaping and/or physical development and would not be impacted by the proposed sign exception, as conditioned. The proposed sign exception would be consistent with the General Commercial zoning districts, since it will provide uniform site signage that is attractive and outdated signage will be removed. Clear consistent signage will direct visitors to the site which is clearly visible from the surrounding public rights-of-way, but not visible from surrounding commercial or residential properties.
 - b. The scale, size, and function of the proposed construction at this site is such that the 2004 Master Sign Program needs to be updated to install new signage consistent with Toyota's nationwide design guidelines on the proposed building and obtain approval for temporary banner signs for planned sales events throughout the year without negatively impacting the experiences of pedestrians, drivers and passengers, or residential land uses.
 - c. Tenants benefit from signage that attracts visitors but doesn't detract from well-designed exterior building facades. The proposed signage will be consistent with the updated building wall materials and colors, without creating aesthetic or light/glare impacts.
 - d. The proposed signs will enhance the auto dealership by providing a consistent visual identity with Toyota's nationwide design guidelines, and will appear more visually attractive than the existing signs.

- e. The rolling topography of Sepulveda Boulevard alleviates adverse impacts generally seen with increased signage, as visibility is limited.
- 2. *The proposed sign exception is necessary in order that the applicant may not be deprived unreasonably in the use or enjoyment of their property;*
 - a. A comprehensive Master Sign Program for the Toyota site will allow the applicant to install signage compatible with the proposed architecture and site design.
 - b. The enhanced signage increases the potential for visitors to readily identify the location on a state highway with high speeds and traffic volumes.
 - c. The sign exceptions will promote and advertise certain sales events without impacting the experiences of pedestrians, drivers and passengers, or adjacent residential land uses.
 - d. The Project will be enhanced by one Master Sign Program with consistent signage. Furthermore, the sign exception will not result in a change to the perceived number or density of signs across the entire site since the proposed 923 square-feet of proposed signage is less than the 1,232 square feet allowed for under the existing sign exception.
 - e. The exception is warranted since the auto dealership is the largest retail property of its kind in the City, and fronts a state highway which provides adequate access. The signs are necessary to attract and guide visitors from Sepulveda Boulevard.
- 3. *The proposed sign exception is consistent with the legislative intent of this title;*
 - a. The exceptions, as conditioned, will promote preserving the character and quality of the area consistent with the character of Area District II.
 - b. The signage will use high quality and attractive materials, blending with the architectural theme of the dealership expansion, while enhancing and supporting the retail commercial environment of Sepulveda Boulevard.
 - c. The proposed sign program is consistent with the Sepulveda Development Guide.
- Q. The proposed project is consistent with the Sepulveda Boulevard Development Guidelines. This project is consistent with the said guidelines as follows:

The Sepulveda Boulevard Development Guidelines encourage thoughtful development while considering vehicular and pedestrian traffic and circulation, safety, aesthetics, and other development related impacts. Reciprocal Access is generally encouraged between neighboring sites within the same block to improve safety and circulation. However, due to the topography and width of this and neighboring properties, it is not an appropriate design requirement for the subject project. Similarly, Right-turn pockets and Driveway Throats can also improve safety and circulation. However, due to the relatively lower traffic volume to and from this site, and the proposed driveway expansion, they will not be required or recommended by the City Traffic Engineer for this project. Additionally, all Caltrans requirements will be met by the project. The proposed building will be more visually desirable than the existing dealership due to its closer

orientation to Sepulveda Boulevard, more attractive building design, and improved signage, and will not create any residential nuisances as no improvements are proposed near the residential district adjacent to the rear of the property. Pedestrian access to the property will be improved from a new accessible path from the existing sidewalk to the proposed building.

- R. This Resolution, upon its effectiveness, constitutes the Use Permit, Variances, and Sign Exception for the subject property and supersedes all previous resolutions pertaining to the subject use, including Resolution Nos. PC 345, CC 4398, CC 4848, PC 04-20.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby **APPROVES** the subject Use Permit and Variances, and Sign Exception subject to the following conditions:

Site Preparation / Construction

1. The project shall be in substantial compliance with the submitted plans and project description as approved by the Planning Commission on May 14, 2014. Any substantial deviation from the approved plans and project description must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. If an elevator is not required as determined by the Building Official, the plans shall be designed to accommodate a future elevator and submitted to the Community Development Director for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
2. The project shall comply with MBMC Section 9.36.050 which requires that a LEED checklist and supporting documentation be submitted indicating points meeting a minimum LEED 'Silver' level incorporated into documentation for a building permit.
3. All electrical, telephone, cable television system, and similar service wires and cables shall be installed underground to the appropriate utility connections in compliance with all applicable Building and Electrical Codes, safety regulations, and orders, rules of the Public Utilities Commission, the serving utility company, and specifications of the Public Works Department.
4. All defective or damaged curb, gutter, street paving, and sidewalk improvements on Sepulveda Boulevard shall be removed and replaced with improvements as required by and subject to the approval of the Public Works Department and Caltrans. Approval of an Encroachment Permit final by the State Department of Transportation (Cal Trans) shall be submitted prior to Building Department Final Inspection. Right-of-way trees shall be replaced if required by Caltrans.
5. Security lighting for the site shall be provided in conformance with Municipal Code requirements and shall include glare prevention design; lighting shall be properly shielded to avoid shining beyond any residential properties.
6. A Traffic and Parking Management and Construction Plan shall be submitted in conjunction with any construction and other building plans for review by the Community Development, Police and Public Works Departments prior to the issuance of building permits. The plan shall provide for the management of all construction related traffic during all phases of construction, including but not limited to delivery of materials and parking of construction related vehicles. Staging of construction material and equipment on the site shall also be provided on the plans, and shall be located to minimize impacts to the residential neighborhood to the east.

Public Works

7. All easements for sewer lines, sewer manholes and water mains shall be maintained, subject to the approval of the Public Works Department. The business and/or property owner shall provide easement agreements to all City water mains on site where now there are none existing, subject to the provisions above and/or the approval of the Director of Public Works. All new structures shall maintain a minimum clearance from any sewer main, sewer main hole and any water main subject to the Director of Public Works approval.
8. A covered trash enclosure, with adequate capacity for refuse and recycling, shall be provided on the site subject to the specifications and approval of the Public Works Department, Community Development Department, and City's waste contractor. A trash and recycling plan shall be provided as required by the Public Works Department.

Commercial Operational Restrictions

9. The subject site may include up to 68,266 square feet of commercial uses.
10. The Fire Department Connection (FDC), fire suppression valve, and related equipment shall be incorporated into the design of the project and screened from off-site views to the extent reasonably possible.
11. Test driving of vehicles shall be limited to commercial streets such as Sepulveda Boulevard, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Artesia Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard, Highland Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue, Marine Avenue, and Valley/Ardmore. No vehicle testing shall be permitted on residential streets.
12. All vehicle painting will be conducted within the confines of an enclosed building as prescribed by local ordinances. The filters on the paint spray booth must be changed and maintained as prescribed by the manufacturer and a record of the filter changes shall be maintained and submitted at the time of review.

Noise

13. The public address system shall not operate prior to 7:00 a.m. nor after 6:00 p.m., 5 days a week, Monday - Friday. All existing speakers in the service bay area shall not operate on weekends and holidays.
14. Car sales and associated work shall be permitted only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Saturdays.
15. The Service Department and associated work shall be permitted only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays.
16. Auto body/fender repair and associated work shall be permitted only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. All body and fender repair will be conducted not less than 190 feet from the property line of the nearest residence. The use of pneumatic and other similar tools shall be permitted only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays.

17. There will be no new opening on the east side of any service building with the exception of air intake and pedestrian doors with automatic closers.
18. The roof-mounted Air Conditioning Units on the main sales building shall be permitted to operate hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays.
19. The owner/management of the automobile dealership shall provide appropriate supervision to reduce/eliminate activities that generate excessive noise disturbances to the abutting residential properties. Activities that generate excessive noise, not necessary to the normal operation of the business, shall not be permitted in the rear parking area.

Sign Exception

20. A master sign program shall be submitted to the Community Development Department and approved prior to any new signs being installed or existing signs altered or replaced on the property. The program shall provide location, size, height, illumination characteristics, color, and design of all signs, new or existing. Total primary site sign area shall not exceed 1,232 square feet, including pole sign area being counted twice as specified by the sign code.
21. Prohibited signs or devices shall be consistent with those provided in subsection E of MBMC Section 10.72.070, including but not limited to signs placed on public property and large inflatable tethered objects.

Landscaping

22. A detailed site landscaping plan (consistent with the approved Use Permit plan) utilizing Medium, Low, and Very Low water use plants per Water Use Classification of Landscape Species (WUCOLS) plants shall be submitted for review and approval concurrent with the Building Permit application. The landscaping plan shall indicate the maintenance (and subsequent replacement if necessary) of the ten (10) existing trees and twenty-one (21), 24-inch box size trees at locations distributed throughout the parking lot area. All existing landscape areas shall be properly planted and continuously maintained.
23. A minimum 8-foot high block wall shall be maintained along the full length of the rear (east) property line.
24. A low pressure or drip irrigation system shall be installed in the landscaped areas, which shall not cause any surface run-off. Details of the irrigation system shall be noted on the landscaping plans. The type and design shall be subject to the approval of the Public Works and Community Development Departments.

Procedural

25. This Use Permit, Variances, and Sign Exception shall lapse two years after its date of approval, unless implemented or extended pursuant to 10.84.090 of the Municipal Code.
26. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21089(b) and Fish and Game Code section 711.4(c), the project is not operative, vested or final until the required filing fees are paid.
27. Applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold the City, its elected officials, officers, employees, volunteers, agents, and those City agents serving as independent contractors in the role of City officials (collectively "Indemnitees") free and harmless from and against any and all claims (including, without limitation, claims for bodily injury, death, or damage to property), demands, obligations, damages, actions, causes of action, suits, losses, judgments, fines, penalties, liabilities, costs, and expenses (including, without limitation, attorneys' fees, consequential damages, disbursements, and court costs) of every kind and nature whatsoever (individually, a "Claim," collectively, "Claims"), in any manner arising out of or incident to: (i) this approval and related entitlements, (ii) the City's environmental review of this project, (iii) any construction related to this approval, or (iv) the use of the property that is the subject of this approval. Applicant shall pay and satisfy any judgment, award or decree that may be rendered against City or the other Indemnitees in any such suit, action, or other legal proceeding arising out of or incident to this approval, any construction related to this approval, or the use of the property that is the subject of this approval. The City shall have the right to select counsel of its choice. Applicant shall reimburse the City, and the other Indemnitees, for any and all legal expenses and costs incurred by each of them in connection therewith or in enforcing the indemnity herein provided. Applicant's obligation to indemnify shall not be restricted to insurance proceeds, if any, received by Applicant or Indemnitees. This indemnity shall apply to all Claims and liability regardless of whether any insurance policies are applicable. Nothing in this Section shall be construed to require Applicant to indemnify Indemnitees for any Claim arising from the sole negligence or willful misconduct of the Indemnitees. In the event such a legal action is filed challenging the City's determinations herein or the issuance of the coastal permit, the City shall estimate its expenses for the litigation. Applicant shall deposit said amount with the City or enter into an agreement with the City to pay such expenses as they become due.
28. This permit and rights conferred in this approval shall not be effective until the property owner signs and returns an affidavit accepting the conditions of approval. The property owner shall file this affidavit with the Community Development Department within 30 days of this approval and prior to issuance of any development or building permits pursuant to this approval.

SECTION 3. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65009 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul this decision, or concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done or made prior to such decision or to determine the reasonableness, legality or validity of any condition attached to this decision shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days of the date of this resolution and the City Council is served within 120 days of the date of this resolution. The City Clerk shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the applicant, and if any, the appellant at the address of said person set forth in the record of the proceedings and such mailing shall constitute the notice required by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the Resolution as adopted by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of May 14, 2014 and that said Resolution was adopted by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

RICHARD THOMPSON
Secretary to the Planning Commission

Rosie Lackow
Recording Secretary

PLEASE VERIFY THE LIMITS OR WIDTH OF THE BUILDING CANOPY BEHIND THE PORTAL FOR PROPER COORDINATION AND LAYOUT OF THE PROP. LOCATIONS.





EXHIBIT B
PC MTG 5-14-14

APPROVED BY *[Signature]* DATE 1-29-14

NOTE
SEE TECHNICAL DRAWINGS
FOR FABRICATION



1024sc
D/F ILLUMINATED PYLON
NEW CONCRETE BASE REQUIRED
(CONCRETE BASE RAISED 12" ABOVE GRADE)



555 Ellesmere Road
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M1R 4E8
Tel (416) 759-1111
Fax (416) 759-4965
Toll Free 1-800-268-6536
www.pattisonsign.com

A Division of Jim Pattison Industries Ltd.

March 17, 2011 Date

A DiMarco Sales Rep

R. Ferrara Designer

3/16" = 1'-0" Scale

11-0372 Design No.

Revision Note

Job No.

Customer Approval

Date

Note:
See technical drawings for fabrication

All rights reserved. No part of this drawing may be reproduced in any form without written permission from Pattison Sign Group.

It is agreed that the client is entirely responsible to install the concrete base as per Pattison Sign Group technical drawings or the equivalent. Where an existing base is used, the client agrees to check if the structure base can support the sign as supplied by Pattison Sign Group. Pattison Sign Group will not accept any liability.

Voltage: 120volt 277V/3W



TOYOTA


04508
JOHN ELWAY'S MANHATTAN
BEACH TOYOTA
1500 N. Sepulveda Blvd.
Manhattan Beach, CA

January 22, 2014	Date	3/16" = 1'-0"	Scale		Job No.
A.DiMarco	Sales Rep	14 0135	Design No.		Customer Approval
G.D'Acchille	Designer	R1 - March 13, 2014	Revision Note		Date

All rights reserved. No part of this drawing may be reproduced in any form without written permission from Pattison Sign Group.

It is agreed that the client is entirely responsible to install the concrete base as per Pattison Sign Group technical drawings or the equivalent. Where an existing base is used, the client agrees to check if the concrete base can support the sign as supplied by Pattison Sign Group. Pattison Sign Group will not accept any liability.

Voltage: 120volt Specify if different



ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENT

VOLTAGE: 120
AMPS: 1.7

Note:
A step down transformer is required if voltage is higher than 120.

Circuit:
As per local electrical code.

SL72
ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS & MOLDED LOGO

- LOGO EMBOSSED FACE WITH FLAT FACES FOR LETTERS
- ALUMINUM CABINETS & JEWELITE TRIM - RED
- 3/16" #2447 WHITE ACRYLIC FACES
- 3M RED VINYL #3630-73 APPLIED ON FIRST SURFACE
- ILLUMINATED WITH RED LED
- ELECTRICAL HOOK-UP SUPPLIED BY OTHERS

PDNN-18
NON-ILLUMINATED MOLDED LETTERS
(*TO BE USED WHEN PORTAL IS ILLUMINATED)

- MOLDED BLACK ACRYLIC LETTERS - 1 1/2" PROFILE
- STOOLED OFF GLASS PORTAL 1/4"

RE&RE SBL-15
REMOVE AND RELOCATE ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS



SI-15
ILLUMINATED CHANNEL LETTERS


- ALUMINUM CABINETS BLACK
- F-TRIM RETAINERS BLACK
- 3/16" WHITE PIGMENTED ACRYLIC FACES #2447 WITH 3M BLACK PERFORATED VINYL 3635-222 APPLIED FIRST SURFACE
- ILLUMINATED WITH WHITE LED
- ELECTRICAL HOOK-UP SUPPLIED BY OTHERS

ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENT

VOLTAGE: 120
AMPS: 0.85

Note:
A step down transformer is required if voltage is higher than 120.

Circuit:
As per local electrical code.



TOY-3NI
NON-ILLUMINATED TOYOTA ENTRANCE LOGO

- MOLDED ABS PAINTED TO MATCH
- 3M RED VINYL #3630-73

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
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

4. PUBLIC HEARING

- 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.

- 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 the requirements of both Toyota and of the City.

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 because of structural limitations.

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 related 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 achieve 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 Commissioner Andreani’s 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 if glare will occur from morning sun shining on glass on the east side and from afternoon sun on the Sepulveda side of the building. 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 indicated she does care about the viability of 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 would also appreciate a better understanding of 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

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Town Hall Meeting, April 21, 2014

Unofficial Notes

Meeting started about 6:10 pm in the Residents Inn Conference Room

Present from MBT: Darrell Sperber, Roger Ullen, Brad Sperber, Andrisa Sperber, Joy Anderson, Al Wise

Present from community:

Jill Halkias	1605 Magnolia Ave
Paul Mullin	1405 Magnolia Ave
John DeFrance	1501 Magnolia Ave
Gus Cardenas	1505 Magnolia Ave
Randy Kowata	1504 Magnolia Ave
Kim Robinson	1504 Magnolia Ave

Darrell Sperber opened with a welcome and explained that MBT was a family-owned, community-minded, business with antiquated buildings.

Al Wise shared some modernization goals – safety, improving Sepulveda corridor and attracting new business.

Brad Sperber commented about the family orientation of MBT and the need to enhance our customer experience. He also mentioned that Mr. Sperber was spending millions to modernize buildings that he does not own – another commitment to both Toyota and the community.

Roger Ullen began to address the issues based on email notes he had received from Paul Mullin. Namely height, noise, lighting, landscaping and construction dust/sound abatement.

Paul – Noise from the new Target a/c “stirred up a hornet’s nest” when it came to neighborhood input on our project.

Roger - Expressed that the proposed parapets could be insulated with a noise reduction material and that with smaller a/c units the line of sight obstruction would now be less than ½ of a degree.

Paul – If a/c were on ground level, no parapets would be necessary

EXHIBIT D
PC MTG 5-14-14

Kim – The building would still be too high even with the a/c on ground level

John – Suggested trying to trim a couple more feet off the height

Darrell – Stated that the building design was started with the height in mind and stated that it might be possible to do one of three things to reduce height. 1. Utilize smaller a/c units, 2. Put a/c on ground level, 3. Put a/c in a service bay

Paul – Suggested a/c could go on the lower level of the parts department roof

Roger – Engineers are looking at this possibility – structural strength and cost an issue. Also mentioned portal height and the design by Toyota in keeping with building size requirements

Jill – The city codes cannot be determined by Toyota

Kim – Toyota needs to adjust their plans to meet needs of community as every community is different. Did we have an interior section E-W cut diagram?

Roger – No

Darrell – Shared that our plans needed to be approved by Toyota

John – Without the parapets the plan is more palatable. Still concerned about lighting.

Kim – MBT should ask architect to look at redrawing the plans and commented that one absent neighbor is against any increase in height whatsoever.

John – MBT should really consider putting a/c on lower roof of parts

Kim – Suggested putting offices inside the service overhang

John – The a/c doesn't have to be clustered but placement could be broken up

Gus – Asked for clarification of 1st story usage vs. 2nd story usage

Roger – 2nd story is private offices not open to public. MBT has already diminished sound/noise by having only 1 service team working late – until 7 pm. Appreciated all the good ideas.

John – If MBT just stays at the dark blue line or below you should be good

Roger – Is there a consensus on that? Some heads nodded in agreement

Kim – No

Roger – MBT is doing a study on the lighting by an engineer. Adjustments to lighting have already been accomplished.

Kim – Shared new picture. There has been some improvement.

Randy – Agreed – some improvement

Darrell – Up until this time there had been NO complaints about lighting that he was aware of

Paul – There were changes in years past based on neighbor's complaints and over the years some of the improvements have been undone – maybe due to lights being replaced. He is the Neighborhood Watch captain. Neighbors stopped complaining due to "fatigue".

Roger – Expressed MBT needed sufficient lighting for safety concerns

Darrell – MBT will make as many changes as possible after the lighting study comes in. MBT will do what it takes to make it better for neighbors while keeping the lot safe for employees

Kim – Expressed she was excited about the remodel and wants MBT to be successful

Roger – With no further questions about lighting went on to landscape. Currently MBT is at 2.5% - current plans call for an increase to 5%. Looking at putting more trees in easement. Working with landscapers – getting three bids

Jill – Offered access to easement through her yard. Knock first but if not home go ahead and access easement

John – Expressed access to easement through his yard as well but would like to be notified in advance.

Roger – Spoke about mitigating construction project – dust, noise and storing equipment

Jill – Express her reluctance to call and complain but now that she knows us she feels more comfortable in calling with a noise complaint.

Roger - Answered a question about the length of the project – 6 months

Kim – Planning Commission made it clear they were looking out for environmental concerns and made suggestions of a "living wall" or a "green roof" as possibilities for the project

Roger – Working with Mike Garcia about coming up with a green solution. Promised to send email by Tuesday evening and keep the lines of communication open and to have another meeting before the next Planning Commission meeting on May 14th.

Meeting ended about 7:50 pm

Al Wise

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

TOWN HALL MEETING AGENDA

4/28/2014

Variations / Action Plans

1. The increase in building height

- a. The addition of a second floor to the new showroom is necessary for our business expansion and the limited square footage of the property at 5.31 acres. Most medium size Toyota Dealerships are on 7-10 acres sites.
- b. Toyota is requiring all older dealerships to rebuild and conform to the new Toyota Image II designs.
- c. The existing property supports a two story Toyota Parts Department.
- d. The Sales Showroom, our backbone for selling new automobiles will have this new modern design as required by Toyota and will support the all new Toyota Sign Portal at the front or west side of the newly remodeled building.
- e. The following elevations are available on 11x17 illustrated copies.

Top of prior parapet before A/C adjustment-----

Parapet height (eliminated) ----- 7.40 ft.

This is due to the HVAC units being moved to the Parts Department roof which is 4' lower eliminating the 7'4" parapet wall, see attachments.

New Rooftop Parapet height----- 167.10 ft. E. End of building
168.91 ft. W. End of building

Existing Rooftop----- 162.67 ft.

Difference in Rooftops (after A/C relocation)----- 6.24 E. End/4.43 W. End

Portal height (sign) ----- 170.41 ft.

Maximum allowable height 22ft. from the ground.

Ground level height to new Portal is 32.8 ft. This requires a total variance of 10.8 ft. at the Portal at the East end of the building.

- f. The adjusted height for an example using the home at 1504 Magnolia Ave will realize a difference on view angle of the buildings, tree tops and sky line at less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 degree calculated at an average distance of 384 feet and 29' elevation from the back or east side dealership building elevation.

2. Landscaping Improvements / Easement Enhancement's

- a. We currently have reached an agreement with a local professional landscape and design company to start the process of the following scope of work in the easement area at the East side of the property:

- Trim and reshape the existing trees.
 - Remove and replace all dead trees.
 - Plant a minimum of 12, Melaluca Tree's a 24" box size, this variety is recommended by the City for zone 3.
 - Remove and replace the current irrigation system with all new plumbing and sprinkler heads including installation of a high grade electronic timer to improve growth and conserve water.
 - The easement will also include a landscape timber designed step system for easier maintenance and access with a gate leading into the area.
- b. We currently have the capacity to display a total of 112 new and used vehicles on our front display lot depending on the size of the vehicle. The new landscape plans will further reduce our display area by 8-10 vehicles.
 - c. Increased landscape will also create a difficult time for our customers to maneuver through the customer parking areas as we have 1 main entrance and exit for sales, service, rentals, parts, fuel truck, postal services and general delivery to the rear section of the property.
 - d. Further increases to landscape will also jeopardize the onsite parking available for our employee's this would create a real hardship as there is very little parking available close to our dealership. We currently promote ride sharing to our employees; this effort has helped reduce the parking congestion slightly.
 - e. Due to the nature of the business our merchandising display is our sales lot and with the small size of our property, it would be a noticeable hardship to increase the percentage of landscaping to the 8% currently required by the City.
- In summation we are doubling the percentage and square feet calculations of landscaping from 2.45% approximately 5,830 sq. feet to 5% or 11,713 sq. ft. For these reasons we feel it is acceptable to request and receive approval on this variance.

3. Lighting Control:

- a. We are currently in progress to reduce the ambient and direct lighting sources as we were recently made aware of and have made several lighting adjustments to the rear facing lights. We have hired an Electrical Engineering firm to do a photometric study of the rear section of the property to identify hot spots or lack of lighting in areas of safety and security. We will compare lighting standards in accordance with the City of Manhattan Beach making adjustments as necessary; this job task is still working but should be complete with all studies and recommendations in 10 days. We will share the input with our neighbors at that time. I am meeting this week with several lighting specialists to bid the project.
- b. Initially the new Toyota showroom, service, parts and upstairs business offices will have new high efficiency lighting.
- c. The service advisors will be repositioned inside the building further reducing the number of lights required on the drive, recessed lighting will replace the current surface mounted fixtures on the new service drive.

- d. Our plan to use high efficiency lighting where possible in all the new construction will prove in the long term to be a good energy savings and improve the overall lighting control.
- e. We intend on working with our neighbors on any issues they have in regards to our store's operation. This will be an ongoing process during and after the construction phases.

4. Sound Mitigation:

- a. We have recently replaced our rear compressor in the shop with an updated high efficiency and much quieter unit that is enclosed in a building to reduce the noise levels.
- b. We close our main group of technicians down at 6:00 pm and run one team of 4-5 technicians with one service advisor until 8:00pm.
- c. By locating the service advisor team indoors in the new building we should realize a much lower noise level with phone calls, paging customers and general employee conversations.
- d. We have purchased air tools that make less noise than the standard issue.
- e. To address the construction process and noise controls we have planned the area in front and to the west side of our current dealership closest to Sepulveda to station workmen and most of our supplies delivered to that location. We will fence off and screen the construction area and keep the area watered down when dismantling, digging and general excavation to reduce the dust.
- f. One of the larger controls on noise pollution will be replacing the 4 antiquated air conditioning units and air handler with new high efficiency ones, The HVAC Engineer calculated 12 smaller 6 ton units mounted lower on the Parts Department roof along the Target side of the building, see illustrations with parapet sound wall. These new units will be controlled by a central computer programmed to shut all a/c units down at 8:00PM or earlier each day.

5. Construction Site Wind Erosion Controls

Regarding the construction of the new building, the contractors will do as much work as possible in the area adjacent to Sepulveda Blvd. This is where most of the materials will be delivered to which allows improved accessibility for workman at the projects site. We will fence off and screen this area off to mitigate debris and improve safety aspects.

Roger Ullen

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Town Hall Meeting

April 28, 2014

Unofficial Notes

In attendance from the community were: John DeFrance, Gus Cardenas, Paul Mullin, Randy Kowata, Kim Robinson

In attendance from MBT were: Brad Sperber, Roger Ullen, Joy Anderson, Al Wise

Meeting started at 6:20 pm

Everyone was provided with a 3 page agenda and an additional 8 pages of addendums

Al Wise opened the meeting with a welcome

Brad Sperber spoke briefly about the progress MBT has made since last Town Hall Meeting and emphasized MBT's desire to work with the neighborhood with an open door policy

HEIGHT

Roger Ullen began addressing the height issue by stating MBT has agreed to place the smaller a/c units on the lower roof of the parts department in a colony of 12-13 units with an automatic shut off of 8 pm. He also explained the contour of the roof and portal height

Paul did not object to the portal height. Randy agreed

Paul questioned the height of any parapet wall around the a/c colony and Roger stated it would be about 4" over the height of the smaller units

Brad gave an explanation concerning why the a/c units were moved

Randy questioned the accuracy of the less than 1 degree view obstruction

Joy stated that most of the a/c noise was from the cell tower and offered to receive calls if it becomes problematic and she would contact the phone company

John questioned the sound output of the a/c colony

Brad stated that all the a/c units would not be typically working at the same time and reiterated that there would be a timed shutoff

Roger shared the difference between the large Target units and MBT's smaller units

Paul asked about the potential of a solar paneled roof

Roger stated he would look into it

Paul suggested the roof might have some type of ventilation access from the inside

John questioned the need or lack of need for an elevator and asked where the elevator tower might be located on the roof if necessary

Roger shared that an ADA expert had given him a 5 page report stating an elevator would not be necessary due to the upstairs not being a public space but Roger showed him where it might be located if it was determined to be necessary

LANDSCAPING

Al shared about the visit to Ralph's home at 1509 Magnolia and the need to reclaim the easement

Roger spoke about irrigation, timers and tree types – mainly Melaleuca trees

Paul requested that no willows or messy trees be planted

Roger reaffirmed that the owner of MBT had a what-ever-it-takes attitude to make the east landscaping attractive and functional

Brad suggested that the tree type being considered has a deep root system instead of a wide and damaging root system

John showed pics of the Melaleuca Tree on his phone and suggested the trees would help with sound absorption

Roger said that the easement would need regular maintenance

John shared that he would like to see more trees in his corner of the project (South-East)

Al shared about the possibility of building a new access on the north end of the easement through a locked gate

Kim questioned why MBT does not plan an access through our east wall

Paul stated that any gate through our wall would increase noise

Brad expressed that necessary equipment needed to maintain the easement might not fit through a gate access

Roger stated that the access gate needed to be tall enough to keep out any "wrong element"

Kim questioned if any more changes had been made in order to meet the 8% landscaping requirement

Brad shared about the critical need for space

Kim reiterated that there must be something MBT could do to meet the 8%

Brad emphasized that we had doubled what we currently have in landscape

John suggested portable containers with shrub trees

Roger stated that potted plants were being considered

LIGHTING

Roger shared about the lighting study underway

John briefly explained the difference in color (white, yellow, blue)

Kim and John stated that the lighting was better than it was before and Kim said she would take more pictures to assist in the lighting process

SOUND

Roger suggested keeping the roll-up compressor door closed when possible and the installation of sound absorbing material inside the compressor room. He also suggested moving night techs to a less noisy area

Brad shared that moving techs would be difficult because of their tools and said that MBT would make a more conscious effort to keep noise down

Paul said he had heard noise sounding like someone was racing in the back lot.

Joy suggested he call her if it happens again and she would investigate

Roger asked if the new alarm company was keeping noise down

Randy answered that it was

John asked about newer air tools

Roger answered that newer impact guns might be used

John suggested that more landscape in back would help to minimize noise

CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION

Roger shared that MBT would do everything possible to minimize the noise and dust during the construction project and that he would keep everyone informed throughout the process

Roger also reported about the glass study that had been conducted and that glass reflection would not be an issue

John requested an updated elevation schematic

Kim asked if Roger had looked at her email and questioned the details of the glass letter from Compton Glass, Inc.

Brad stated that the glass MBT would be using is specifically designed to eliminate glare

John asked if there were other local buildings currently using this type of glass

Paul requested a pdf of renderings

Brad reiterated MBT's desire to keep the neighbors happy, meet the city requirements and grow a great business

Kim requested a center section diagram

Roger stated it would not be available until the plans are done according to our architect

The meeting ended at 8:15 pm

Al Wise




EXHIBIT E
PC MTG 5-14-14

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Horizon Lighting

Electrical • Repair • Maintenance

April 28, 2014

Toyota Manhattan Beach
 1500 N Sepulveda Blvd,
 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Attn: Roger Ullen
 Re: Toyota Manhattan Beach Exterior Lighting Upgrade Recommendation

Scope of Work:

1. Retrofit (five) existing rear wall metal halide fixtures to operate with a 150W HPS light source.
2. Remove (two) existing metal halide fixtures at the center building. Install (two) 400 watt HPS forward throw tenon mount fixtures to insure accurate bear control.
3. Remove the existing light pole fixtures at the (four) rear light poles. Install (four) 400watt HPS pole mount forward throw fixtures with a tenon top mount.

***Complete all wire connections as needed.**

Materials and Labor

5	#0621-2 150 W HOPS Lamp and Ballast Kit	\$121.00Each	\$ 605.00
6	AC-450- 400W HPS Fixtures Forward Throw Distribution	\$358.10Each	\$2,149.60
1	EPA Lamp Disposal		\$ 25.00
1	Miscellaneous, Wire Fittings and Hardware		\$ 90.00
			<u>Labor \$1,050.00</u>
			Total \$3,919.00



Please contact me to answer any questions as well as how to proceed.

I appreciate the opportunity to be of service.

Benny Olander
 Lighting and Electrical Design Consultant

Approved By: _____ Date: _____

Warranty: All required materials (lamps excluded) and labor are included under warranty for one year from the date of installation. Horizon Lighting is not responsible for the condition or capacity of the existing electrical system, however will note any problems and submit information accordingly. All price quotes are good for 60 days. City permits (if required) are not included in the above quotation unless noted and will be invoiced separately at cost.

Darrell Sperber

From: Darrell At Mbt <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:58 PM
To: Darrell Sperber. W
Subject: Fwd: Exterior lighting Upgrade Recommendations
Attachments: image001.jpg; Untitled attachment 00717.htm; image001.jpg; Untitled attachment 00720.htm; Toyota Manhattan Beach Fixtures.pdf; Untitled attachment 00723.htm; Untitled attachment 00726.pdf; Untitled attachment 00729.htm

DS

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Benny Olander <benny@horizonlightinginc.com>
Date: April 28, 2014 at 3:26:26 PM PDT
To: rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com
Cc: dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com
Subject: RE: Exterior lighting Upgrade Recommendations

Good afternoon Roger,

Hope all is well. I wanted to confirm I have attached my recommendations utilizing a High Pressure Sodium (HPS) light source for the rear lot. The HPS light source will provide sufficient light levels while reducing the light glare considerably as compared to the existing metal halide light source. The fixture style that I have selected is designed for an application such as this where we need light distribution control along with precise aiming in order to focus the light levels within the property guidelines. What item I did discuss with Darrell on Saturday night was the option of an LED light source which makes great sense however the key to the LED light source for this application is color temperature and fixture optics. I do have a few resources that I am looking into. Which I should have answers back in a few days. However, I think it is going to be tough to beat the HPS light source which by the way is a very energy efficient light source rated at 24,000 operating hours, which ensures 4-years of consistent operation. Please review the attached proposal and site map and let me know if I can answer any questions as I am happy to assist in any way.

Thanks

Benny

Benjamin Olander
Lighting and Electrical Design Consultant

Toyota Manhattan Beach



▲ Replace 2 MH Floor Fixtures With A 400 Watt HPS Forward Throw Fixture

■ 5 MH Wall Pack To Retrofit To A 150Watt HPS Fixture

● 1-4 Existing Light Poles To Upgrade To A 400Watt HPS Fixture




April 25, 2014

To Whom It May Concern,


Excessive glare and reflectivity will not be an issue for the Manhattan Beach Toyota/Scion project. There is approximately 2800 square feet of glazing on this project. 180 square feet occurs on the East elevation which has no exposure to the street. Glare will definitely not be an issue at this location. The North elevation has approximately 1500 square feet of glazing. This is more than 50% of the exposed glass on this project. This glass, being on the North will receive minimal to no sunlight depending on the time of the year. The West elevation has approximately 1100 square feet of glazing. This elevation could be an issue if not for the current design of the plans. First, 50% of this area will be covered by the Toyota Panelized curtain wall system. This system is composed of opaque, translucent panes which will prevent 100% of any reflected light from penetrating them and reflecting back toward the street. Second, the area above the West facing storefront will have a canopy and signage which will further reduce the available area for light to reflect. Third, the Solarband 70xl is a high performance, low reflectivity energy glass. The reflective quality of the glass is reduced by coating the inside of the 1st piece of glass in the dual-glazed unit. This coating absorbs light and heat and reduces glare and heat transfer. It is my professional opinion that the glass, storefront layout and orientation to the street will not pose any significant light, health or safety hazard.

Sincerely,



Sean Smith

President and CEO



Looks are still everything.



PPG ARCHITECTURAL GLASS



Starphire® Ultra-Clear Glass

08 81 00/PPG
BuyLine 0239

With its unique blue-edge and superior clarity, **Starphire®** glass represents the ultimate achievement in ultra-clear glass technology.




Extra-Heavy Starphire® Glass

Up to 19 Millimeters

When conventional clear glass is laminated into multiple layers, or specified in increasing thicknesses, its appearance becomes progressively greener. The opposite occurs with **Starphire** glass, whose clarity intensifies as the glass gets thicker. Architects can now take advantage of this unique characteristic by specifying **Starphire** Extra-Heavy glass, in thicknesses of 16 (5/8") and 19 (3/4") millimeters.

The glass also is available monolithically in a variety of thicknesses for vision glass, security glass, spider glass and other specialty and decorative applications.



*Tokyo Kasai Rinkai Park View
Visitors Center*

*Location: Chiba Prefecture, Japan
Products: Starphire® Ultra-Clear Glass
Architect: Yosbio Taniguchi
Glazing Contractor: Arai Glass Co.
Glass Fabricator: Sanshibu Glass Co.*

The ultra-clear character of Starphire glass is exemplified in this Tokyo visitor center project. The difference between the unglazed lower-level breezeway and the Starphire-glazed areas is nearly imperceptible. Contrast that to the green appearance of the glass hand rails which are glazed with conventional clear glass.

Starphire Glass Performance Data

Glass Thickness		Transmittance ²			Reflectance ²		U-Value ⁴ (Imperial)		European U-Value ⁴	Shading Coefficient ⁵	Solar Heat Gain Coefficient ⁶	Light to Solar Gain (LSG) ⁷
Inches	mm	Ultra-violet %	Visible %	Total Solar Energy %	Visible Light %	Total Solar Energy %	Winter Night-time	Summer Day-time				
Monolithic STARPHIRE® Glass												
X 1/4	6	87	91	89	8	8	1.02	0.93	5.75	1.03	0.90	1.01
1/2	12	83	90	86	8	8	0.98	0.89	5.53	1.01	0.88	1.03
5/8	16	81	90	84	8	8	0.97	0.88	5.43	1.00	0.87	1.03
3/4	19	80	90	83	8	7	0.95	0.86	5.34	0.99	0.86	1.04
Clear Glass												
1/4	6	66	89	77	9	7	1.02	0.93	5.75	0.94	0.81	1.09
1/2	12	53	85	64	8	6	0.98	0.88	5.53	0.84	0.72	1.18
5/8	16	49	84	59	8	6	0.97	0.88	5.43	0.80	0.69	1.22
3/4	19	46	83	55	8	6	0.95	0.86	5.34	0.77	0.67	1.24

Notes see page 11.

Cover Photo Credits

Suvarnabhumi Airport-Bangkok Airport, Bangkok, Thailand
Products: **Sungate® 500** Glass
Architect: Murphy Jahn
Glass Fabricator: PMK Central Glass Co., Ltd.

3. American Family Children's Hospital, Madison, WI
Products: **Solarbronze®/Solarban® 60** Glass
Architect: HDR Architecture, Inc.
Glazing Contractor: Klein-Dickert Glass
Glass Fabricator: Oldcastle Glass
Owner: University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics Board

Glazing Contractor: National Glass & Metal Company, Inc.
Glass Fabricator: JE Berkowitz
Owner: Lancaster General Hospital

5. The Institute for Advanced Learning and Research, Danville, VA
Products: **Soloxia™** Glass
Architect: PSA - Dewberry
Glazing Contractor: Piedmont Glass
Glass Fabricator: Vitro America
Owner: Virginia Tech IALR

Cover Inset Photo Credits (left to right)

1. Lear World Headquarters, Southfield, MI
Products: **Solarban® 60/Clear** Glass
Architect: Albert Kahn Associates
Glazing Contractor: American Glass & Metal Corp.
Glass Fabricator: Oldcastle Glass
Owner: Lear Corporation

4. 300 3rd Street, Little Rock, AR
Products: **Solarban® 80** Glass
Architect: AMR Architects
Glazing Contractor: Ace Glass Company
Glass Fabricator: Vitro America
Owner: Moses Tucker Real Estate Inc.

3. Sinclair Broadcasting Group, Hunt Valley, MD
Products: **Optigray® 23** Glass
Architect: Roy Kirby & Sons, Inc.
Glazing Contractor: Vision Contract, Inc.
Glass Fabricator: JE Berkowitz
Owner: Beaver Dam LLC

6. Frontrunner Systems/Bollingbrook Glass & Mirror, Bollingbrook, IL
Products: **Vistacool Azuria™/Sungate® 500** Glass
Architect: Ekash Associates
Glazing Contractor: Frontrunner Glass & Metal, Inc.
Glass Fabricator: Oldcastle Glass
Owner: FUB Partnership

2. St. Regis, San Francisco, CA
Products: **Solarban® 60/Clear** Glass
Architect: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP
Glazing Contractor: Architectural Glass & Aluminum Co.
Glass Fabricator: Northwestern Industries, Inc.
Owner: Starwood Hotels & Resorts

Page 2 Photo Credits (top to bottom, left to right)

1. Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany
Products: **Starphire®** Glass
Architect: Von Gerkin, Mark & Partner
Glazing Contractor: Ian Ritchie Architects

2. Orthopedic Center at Lancaster General Hospital, Lancaster, PA
Products: **Sungate® 500** Glass
Architect: IKM Incorporated

4. Figge Art Museum, Davenport, IA
Products: **Solarban® 60/Clear** Glass
Architect: HLRB/David Chipperfield London
Glazing Contractor: Architectural Wall Systems
Glass Fabricator: Oldcastle Glass
Owner: Figge Art Museum



Ideascapes™
Glass • Coatings • Paint

Solarban® 70XL Solar Control Low-E Glass

Clearly, the New Standard in Solar Control Low-E Glass



NEW!

Solarban® 70XL glass is a technological breakthrough in Solar Control Low-E glass that creates the industry's best combination of visible light transmittance and solar control, together in a clear, color-neutral aesthetic.

With a Solar Heat Gain Coefficient (SHGC) of 0.27 and Visible Light Transmittance (VLT) of 64% in a one-inch insulating glass unit, **Solarban 70XL** produces a Light to Solar Gain (LSG) ratio of 2.37, which exceeds other Solar Control Low-E glasses on the market.

For a tinted glass appearance in an insulating glass unit, **Solarban 70XL** glass can be used in the #3 orientation with any number of outboard tinted glasses from PPG, including tints from the **Oceans of Color®** collection of spectrally selective glasses or PPG Earth-Toned performance glasses. **Solarban 70XL** can also be used in the #2 orientation with a select number of PPG tints. (See performance data on pages 10 & 11.)

Reduced Equipment Costs. Long Term Energy Savings.


An independent energy and environmental research firm used 288 energy simulations for two common building types in climates across North America to compare the energy performance of **Solarban 70XL** glass to other commonly specified architectural glasses.

The testing revealed that, depending on the size, type and climate of a prospective building, **Solarban 70XL** glass has the potential to save architects and building owners hundreds of thousands of dollars in upfront capital cooling equipment costs when it is specified instead of competing products.

Solarban 70XL glass also can produce annual energy savings of up to 13%.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly for environmentally-focused architects, the study also showed that specifying **Solarban 70XL** glass for a typical commercial building can reduce CO₂ emissions by thousands of tons over its lifetime.

All **Solarban** glasses are available through the PPG Certified Fabricator Network. Samples can be ordered at 1-888-PPG-IDEA (1-888-774-4332) or by visiting www.ppgideascape.com.



Leprino Office Building
Location: Aurora, CO
Products: Solarban® 70XL/Clear Glass
Architect: Davis Partnership/Curtis Cox
Glazing Contractor: AI Glass Co.
Glass Fabricator: Northwestern Industries, Inc.
Owner: University of Colorado Hospital



Markstein Hall, The College of Business Administration, California State University
Location: San Marcos, CA
Products: Solarban® 70XL Glass
Architect: AC Martin Partners
Glazing Contractor: Division 8, Inc.
Glass Fabricator: Oldcastle Glass
Owner: California State University



One-Inch Glass Unit Comparisons*

08 81 00/PPG
BuyLine 0239


Insulating Vision Unit Performance Comparisons 1-inch (25mm) units with 1/2-inch (13mm) airspace and two 1/4-inch (6mm) lites; interior lite clear unless otherwise noted

Outdoor Lite: Coating If Any (Surface) Glass	Glass Type +	Indoor Lite: Coating If Any (Surface) Glass	Transmittance ¹			Exterior Reflectance ²		U-Value ³ (Imperial)		European U-Value ⁴	Shading Coefficient ⁵	Solar Heat Gain Coefficient ⁶	Light to Solar Gain (LSG) ⁷
			Ultra- violet %	Visible %	Total Solar Energy %	Visible Light %	Total Solar Energy %	Winter Night- time	Summer Day- time				
Coated													
SOLARBAN[®] 70XL Solar Control Low-E Glass¹¹													
×	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	STARPHIRE + Clear	6	64	25	12	52	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.32	0.27	2.37
	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	SOLEXIA + Clear	3	55	19	10	12	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.29	0.25	2.18
	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	ATLANTICA + Clear	2	48	16	9	8	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.26	0.23	2.07
	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	CARIBIA + Clear	2	48	16	9	7	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.27	0.23	2.07
	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	AZURIA + Clear	4	48	17	9	7	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.27	0.23	2.09
	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	SOLARBRONZE + Clear	2	38	14	7	19	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.23	0.20	1.88
	SOLARBAN 70XL (2)	SOLARGRAY + Clear	2	31	12	7	15	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.22	0.19	1.65
	SOLEXIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	3	56	20	11	13	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.37	0.32	1.74
	ATLANTICA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	2	49	17	10	8	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.32	0.28	1.74
	CARIBIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	2	49	17	9	8	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.32	0.28	1.75
	AZURIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	4	49	17	10	8	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.33	0.29	1.70
	Bronze + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	3	38	15	8	20	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.30	0.26	1.48
	Gray + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	2	32	13	7	15	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.27	0.24	1.34
	OPTIGRAY 23 + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	1	17	7	5	7	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.19	0.16	1.04
	GRAYLITE + SOLARBAN 70XL (3)	STARPHIRE	1	10	5	5	11	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.16	0.14	0.71
VISTACOOL[™] Subtly Reflective Glass													
	VISTACOOL (2)	AZURIA + Clear	29	47	22	21	11	0.47	0.50	2.81	0.39	0.34	1.39
	VISTACOOL (2)	CARIBIA + Clear	16	47	22	21	10	0.47	0.50	2.81	0.39	0.34	1.38
	VISTACOOL (2)	SOLARGRAY + Clear	17	31	28	17	9	0.47	0.50	2.81	0.47	0.40	0.77
SOLARCOOL[®] Glass													
	SOLARCOOL (2)	SOLEXIA + Clear	7	27	19	24	12	0.48	0.50	2.82	0.36	0.31	0.87
	SOLARCOOL (2)	CARIBIA + Clear	6	24	12	19	9	0.48	0.50	2.82	0.30	0.25	0.94
	SOLARCOOL (2)	AZURIA + Clear	10	24	12	20	10	0.48	0.50	2.82	0.29	0.25	0.95
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Bronze + Clear	6	19	21	14	12	0.48	0.50	2.82	0.40	0.34	0.55
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Gray + Clear	6	16	18	11	10	0.48	0.50	2.82	0.36	0.31	0.50
	SOLARCOOL (2)	GRAYLITE + Clear	2	5	12	5	6	0.48	0.50	2.82	0.31	0.26	0.18
VISTACOOL[™] and SOLARCOOL[®] with SUNGATE[®] 500 Low-E (3)													
	VISTACOOL (2)	AZURIA + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	24	44	19	22	11	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.34	0.29	1.53
	VISTACOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	14	44	19	22	11	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.34	0.29	1.51
	VISTACOOL (2)	SOLARGRAY + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	14	29	23	12	10	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.41	0.35	0.83
	SOLARCOOL (2)	SOLEXIA + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	6	25	15	24	13	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.31	0.26	0.98
	SOLARCOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	5	22	10	19	10	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.24	0.20	1.11
	SOLARCOOL (2)	AZURIA + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	8	22	10	20	10	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.23	0.20	1.11
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Bronze + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	5	18	17	14	13	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.34	0.29	0.61
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Gray + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	5	15	14	11	10	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.30	0.26	0.56
	SOLARCOOL (2)	GRAYLITE + SUNGATE 500 (3) Clear	1	5	9	5	7	0.35	0.35	1.96	0.25	0.21	0.21
VISTACOOL[™] and SOLARCOOL[®] with SOLARBAN[®] 60 Solar Control Low-E (3)													
	VISTACOOL (2)	AZURIA + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	11	42	16	20	11	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.30	0.26	1.61
	VISTACOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	7	42	16	20	11	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.29	0.25	1.66
	VISTACOOL (2)	SOLARGRAY + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	7	27	14	11	15	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.28	0.24	1.13
	SOLARCOOL (2)	SOLEXIA + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	3	24	10	24	15	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.22	0.19	1.26
	SOLARCOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	2	21	8	19	10	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.19	0.16	1.30
	SOLARCOOL (2)	AZURIA + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	4	21	8	19	10	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.19	0.16	1.31
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Bronze + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	3	17	9	14	18	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.21	0.18	0.92
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Gray + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	2	14	7	11	14	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.19	0.16	0.86
	SOLARCOOL (2)	GRAYLITE + SOLARBAN 60 (3) Clear	1	4	3	5	10	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.14	0.12	0.36
VISTACOOL[™] Subtly Reflective, Color-Enriched Glass with SOLARBAN[®] z50 Solar Control Low-E													
	VISTACOOL (2)	AZURIA + SOLARBAN z50 (3) OPTIBLUE	9	30	12	20	11	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.29	0.25	1.20
	VISTACOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SOLARBAN z50 (3) OPTIBLUE	5	30	12	20	11	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.29	0.25	1.20
	VISTACOOL (2)	SOLARGRAY + SOLARBAN z50 (3) OPTIBLUE	5	20	11	11	15	0.29	0.27	1.55	0.27	0.24	0.82
VISTACOOL[™] and SOLARCOOL[®] with SOLARBAN[®] 70XL Solar Control Low-E (3)¹¹													
	VISTACOOL (2)	AZURIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	4	38	14	21	12	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.27	0.24	1.59
	VISTACOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	2	38	13	20	11	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.27	0.23	1.65
	VISTACOOL (2)	SOLARGRAY + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	2	25	10	11	17	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.23	0.20	1.24
	SOLARCOOL (2)	SOLEXIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	1	22	8	24	16	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.20	0.17	1.28
	SOLARCOOL (2)	CARIBIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	1	19	6	19	10	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.18	0.15	1.27
	SOLARCOOL (2)	AZURIA + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	1	19	7	19	10	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.18	0.15	1.27
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Bronze + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	1	15	6	14	19	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.17	0.15	1.01
	SOLARCOOL (2)	Gray + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	1	13	5	11	15	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.16	0.14	0.89
	SOLARCOOL (2)	GRAYLITE + SOLARBAN 70XL (3) STARPHIRE	<1	4	2	5	10	0.28	0.26	1.50	0.12	0.10	0.39

Important glass design considerations and comprehensive technical information, including performance, thermal stress and wind load data, for all PPG glasses are available at www.ppgideascape.com/glasstechnical. Monolithic Glass Data can also be found at www.ppgideascape.com/glasstechnical or by calling 1-888-PPG-IDEA (1-888-774-4332).



Vicinity Map



Legend


-  1500 N Sepulveda Blvd
-  Parcels
-  CG
-  RS



EXHIBIT F
PC MTG 5-14-14

0 200 400 Feet

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK



LEGEND

- NEW BUILDING OR REMODELED AREA
- EXISTING BUILDING AREA
- NEW LANDSCAPE AREA
- NEW CONCRETE PATIO
- DISABLED PATH OF TRAVEL
- NEW DISPLAY PAD
- PROPERTY LINE
- NEW TREES (21) MINIMUM

LANDSCAPE AREA

Ⓐ LANDSCAPE ZONE	1,029 SQ.FT.
Ⓑ LANDSCAPE ZONE	868 SQ.FT.
Ⓒ LANDSCAPE ZONE	2,559 SQ.FT.
Ⓓ LANDSCAPE ZONE	692 SQ.FT.
Ⓔ LANDSCAPE ZONE	177 SQ.FT.
Ⓚ LANDSCAPE ZONE	678 SQ.FT.
Ⓛ LANDSCAPE ZONE	825 SQ.FT.
Ⓜ LANDSCAPE ZONE	4,671 SQ.FT.
Ⓝ LANDSCAPE ZONE	1,116 SQ.FT.
TOTAL:	12,829 SQ.FT.

PARKING ANALYSIS

CURRENT PARKING REQUIREMENTS (CODE SECTION 10.64.030)

VEHICLE EQUIPMENT REPAIR: 1 PER 300 SQ.FT.
 VEHICLE EQUIPMENT SALES AND RENTALS: 1 PER 1000 SQ.FT.
 FOR LOTS AND FLOOR AREAS DEVOTED TO SALES AND RENTALS.

LOT DISPLAY AREAS DEVOTED TO VEHICLE SALES: ON DISPLAY (125)
 (125) X 9 X 20 = 22,500 SQ.FT. + 1,000 = CUSTOMER PARKING SPACES (23)
 SHOWROOM RETAIL = 5,596 SQ. FT. + 1,000 = CUSTOMER PARKING SPACES (06)
 SHOP BUILDINGS = 28,820 SQ.FT. + 300 = CUSTOMER PARKING SPACES (97)

TOTAL REQUIRED: (126) SPACES
 (29) SPACES

SITE PARKING SPACES PROVIDED

SEVICE DEPARTMENT (SHOP EXISTING) STALLS DEDICATED TO CUSTOMER SERVICE VEHICLES (98) SPACES
 TOTAL PROVIDED: (127) SPACES

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE PARKING SPACE IN REAR LOT AREA. (78) SPACES

CONSTRUCTION ANALYSIS

EXISTING BUILDING. 1ST AND 2ND FLOOR AND CANOPY	22,096 SQ.FT.
PORTION OF EXISTING BUILDING TO BE DEMOLISHED W/ CANOPY.	10,351 SQ.FT.
EXISTING FOOTPRINT AFTER DEMOLITION 1ST, 2ND FLOOR.	11,745 SQ.FT.
NEW CONSTRUCTION W/ CANOPY	20,536 SQ.FT.
NEW CONSTRUCTION W/ CANOPY AND EXISTING BUILDING TO REMAIN	32,281 SQ.FT.

HEIGHT CALCULATION

(1) n.w.	(2) s.w.	(3) s.e.	(4) n.e.	(5)	(6)
140.08 F.S.	127.70 F.S.	149.25 F.S.	133.38 F.S.	22'	159.60

BUILDING ANALYSIS

ZONING "CG" AREA DISTRICT 2, SEPULVEDA DESIGN GUIDELINES

EXISTING BUILDING. 1ST AND 2ND FLOOR
 1ST FLOOR 16,259 SQ.FT., 2ND FLOOR 3,727 SQ.FT.
 EXISTING CANOPY 2,110 SQ.FT.
 REFER TO SHEET A-2.2 FOR EXISTING FLOOR PLAN

PROPOSED NEW BUILDING ADDITIONS. 1ST AND 2ND FLOOR
 1ST FLOOR 10,950 SQ.FT., 2ND FLOOR 6,946 SQ.FT.
 NEW CANOPY, 2,640 SQ.FT.
 REFER TO SHEET A-2.0 AND A-2.1 FOR PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN

TOTAL NEW AND EXISTING SQ.FT. SHOWROOM, OFFICES AND PARTS.
 1ST FLOOR 18,968 SQ.FT., 2ND FLOOR 10,673 SQ.FT.
 NEW SERVICE CANOPY 2,640 SQ.FT.

TOTAL NEW AND EXISTING SQ.FT. 32,281 SQ.FT.

B OCCUPANCY, (2) STORY
 CBC 2010 TABLE 503 BASIC ALLOWABLE = 9,000 SQ.FT. X 2
 200% INCREASE TWO STORY FLOOR FOR FIRE SPRINKLERS
 CBC 2010 ALLOWS FOR SIDEYARD INCREASES UP TO 100% OF THE BASIC ALLOWABLE FOR 60' MIN. CLEARANCE FROM OTHER STRUCTURES.

TOTAL BASIC ALLOWABLE = 36,000 SQ.FT.
 9,000 B.A. + 9,000 S. X 200% = 36,000 SQ. FT.
 30,952 SQ.FT. = .85977
 36,000 SQ.FT.
 .85977 < 1.0 OK

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT
 CBC 2010 SECTION 507.4 PROVIDES UNLIMITED SQ.FT. ADDITIONS WITH THE USE OF FIRE SPRINKLERS PER CODE SECTION 903.3.1.1 AND SIDEYARD CLEARANCE OF 60' IN ALL FOUR DIRECTIONS.

SITE ANALYSIS

TOTAL PROPERTY.	237,000 SQ.FT.	100.00 %
TOTAL BUILDINGS.		
1. SHOP (4) BUILDINGS	28,820 SQ.FT.	12.16 %
2. PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	32,281 SQ.FT.	13.62 %
3. EXISTING USED CAR BUILDING	4,820 SQ.FT.	02.03 %
TOTAL HARDSCAPE	159,366 SQ.FT.	66.54 %
TOTAL LANDSCAPE	11,713 SQ.FT.	5.00 %

KEY NOTES

- 01 DISABLED PATH OF TRAVEL
- 02 EXISTING BUILDING
- 03 JOINT DRIVEWAY W/ RENTAL CAR
- 04 TOYOTA SIGN EXISTING
- 05 LANDSCAPING (NEW)
- 06 6" CONCRETE CURB
- 07 PROPERTY LINE
- 08 DISPLAY PARKING SPACE
- 09 NEW CAR STORAGE PARKING
- 10 EXISTING SIDE WALK
- 11 EXISTING BLOCK PERIMETER WALL
- 12 ACCESSIBLE PARKING
- 13 48" WIDE ACCESSIBLE PATH OF TRAVEL (NOT TO EXCEED 5% SLOPE/ 2% CROSS SLOPE)
- 14 EXISTING CHAIN LINK FENCE
- 15 EXISTING TRASH ENCLOSURE TO CONFORM TO CURRENT MANHATTAN BEACH DESIGN GUIDELINES AND CURRENT TITLE 24 ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS FOR CALIFORNIA. 6" CMU WALLS
- 16 TRUNCATED DOME, PER SEC. 1127.B.5, ITEM 7, CBC 2010
- 17 NEW OVERHANG AND CANOPY
- 18 STAINLESS STEEL HORIZ. STRETCH WIRE FENCE
- 19 EXISTING MONUMENT SIGN AT SEPULVEDA.
- 20 SPECIAL EVENT TEMPORARY BANNER

NOTES

PARAPETS, SATELLITE ANTENNAE, RAILS, SHYLLIGHTS, ROOF EQUIPMENT MUST BE WITHIN HEIGHT LIMITS.

ALL EXISTING AND PROPOSED UTILITIES, SHALL BE UNDERGROUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 10.60.110 OF THE MSBC.

SEPARATE PERMITS AND PLANS ARE REQUIRED FOR SIGNS, DEMOLITION AND SEWER CAP OF EXISTING BUILDING.

ENCROACHMENT PERMIT APPLICATIONS ARE REQUIRED TO BE SIGNED BY THE PROPERTY OWNER. REFER TO THE ENCROACHMENT STANDARDS AT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOR THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH.

ARCHITECT OF RECORD:

L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.

DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509

38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHHECK	DATE
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
13	0
14	0
15	0
16	0
17	0
18	0
19	0
20	0

No.	REVISION	ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14		0
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			
H			
I			
J			
K			
L			
M			
N			
O			
P			
Q			
R			
S			
T			
U			
V			
W			
X			
Y			
Z			

MANHATTAN BEACH
TOYOTA / SCION
 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER: 0724-2013


Drawn By	File Name
JML	MBTS
Checked By	LT Scale
JML	-
Project Mgr.	Scale:
JML	PER-PLAN

Title:

SITE PLAN

Sheet No.

A-1-0



SEE SHEET A-1.2 FOR ENLARGEMENT


SITE GRADING AND PAVING PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'-0" (TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE NORTH 360 FEET OF THAT PORTION IN THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA OF LOT 7 IN SECTION 19, AS SHOWN ON THE PARTITION MAP SHOWING PROPERTY FORMERLY OF THE REDONDO LAND COMPANY, IN THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SUBDIVIDED BY JAMES F. TOWELL, C.A. EDWARDS AND P.F. WILCOX, COMMISSIONERS, SURVEYED AUGUST 1897, BY L. FRIEL AND FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY ON SEPTEMBER 3, 1897 DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE EAST LINE OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD WITH THE NORTH LINE OF CENTER STREET, NOW MANHATTAN BEACH BOULEVARD AS SAID BOULEVARD AND STREET EXISTED ON OCTOBER 24, 1946; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 660 FEET; THENCE NORTHERLY PARALLEL WITH THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT, A DISTANCE OF 1020 FEET; THENCE WESTERLY PARALLEL WITH SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 660 FEET TO SAID EAST LINE OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD, THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 1020 FEET TO THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.



LEGEND


- F.S. = FINISH SURFACE
- F.F. = FINISH FLOOR
- T.C. = TOP OF CURB
- B.W. = BACK OF WALK
- T.W. = TOP OF WALL
- F.G. = FINISH GRATE
- C.B. = CATCH BASIN
- EX. = EXISTING
- () = EXISTING

NOTES

- ① 31,000 SQ.FT. AREA OF DISTURBANCE, EXISTING ASPHALT TO BE REMOVED WITH RE-GRADE TO DESIGN ELEVATIONS. 2,300 CU. YDS. OF SOIL TO BE REMOVED FROM SITE (EXPORT).
- EXISTING GRADE ELEVATIONS PER CURRENT SITE SURVEY PERPARED BY: DRC ENGINEERING, INC. LAND SURVEYING
- PROPOSED FINISH GRADES PER ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.
- PROPOSED FOOTPRINT OF MAIN BUILDING
- SITE CONDITIONS TO BE REMOVED

KEY NOTES



- 1 EXISTING TRASH ENCLOSURE TO BE DEMOLISHED AND RESULT TO MEET CURRENT MANHATTAN BEACH DESIGN GUIDELINES AND CURRENT ACCESS PER CA. TITLE 24 STANDARDS, 6' H CMU WALLS.
- 2 CHAIN LINK FENCE
- 3 CMU PROPERTY LINE WALL
- 4 SITE RETAINING WALL
- 5 CONCRETE CURB
- 6 PROPERTY LINE
- 7 SIDE WALK
- 8 PLANTER
- 9 PROPERTY LINE CORNER
- 10 ROOF LINE



SEE SHEET A-1.2 FOR ENLARGEMENT

SITE GRADING AND PAVING PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 30'-0" (TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)



ARCHITECT OF RECORD:

L & S
ARCHITECTS, INC.
DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
(909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHECK	DATE
1 1ST-PLANCHECK-CORRECTIONS	0

No.	REVISION ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14	0

MANHATTAN BEACH
TOYOTA / SCION
1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
(310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By JML	File Name MBTS
Checked By JML	LT Scale -
Project Mgr. JML	Scale: PER-PLAN

**SITE-GRADING
AND-PAVING
PLAN**

Sheet No.
A-1-1

LEGEND

- F.S. = FINISH SURFACE
- F.F. = FINISH FLOOR
- T.C. = TOP OF CURB
- B.W. = BACK OF WALK
- T.W. = TOP OF WALL
- F.G. = FINISH GRATE
- C.B. = CATCH BASIN
- EX. = EXISTING
- () = EXISTING

NOTES

- 1 31,000 SQ.FT. AREA OF DISTURBANCE, EXISTING ASPHALT TO BE REMOVED WITH RE-GRADE TO DESIGN ELEVATIONS. 2,300 CU. YDS. OF SOIL TO BE REMOVED FROM SITE (EXPORT).
- EXISTING GRADE ELEVATIONS PER CURRENT SITE SURVEY PERFORMED BY: DRC ENGINEERING, INC. LAND SURVEYING
- PROPOSED FINISH GRADES PER ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.
- PROPOSED FOOTPRINT OF MAIN BUILDING
- SITE CONDITIONS TO BE REMOVED

KEY NOTES

- 1 COVERED TRASH ENCLOSURE TO BE DEMOLISHED AND REBUILT TO MEET MINIMUM MANHATTAN BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE STANDARDS AND CA TITLE 24 ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS, 6' H CMU WALLS.
- 2 CHAIN LINK FENCE
- 3 CMU PROPERTY LINE WALL
- 4 SITE RETAINING WALL
- 5 CONCRETE CURB
- 6 PROPERTY LINE
- 7 SIDE WALK
- 8 PLANTER
- 9 PROPERTY LINE CORNER
- 10 ROOF LINE

ARCHITECT OF RECORD:
L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.
 DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
 38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:	
PLANCHHECK	DATE
1	1ST-PLANCHHECK-CORRECTIONS 0
No. REVISION ISSUES: DATE	
A	05-05-14 0


**MANHATTAN BEACH
 TOYOTA / SCION**
 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By:	JML
File Name:	MBTS
Checked By:	JML
LT Scale:	-
Project Mgr.:	JML
Scale:	PER-PLAN

Title:
PARTIAL-SITE GRADING AND PAVING PLAN

Sheet No.
A-1-2


SEPULVEDA BLVD.




PARTIAL SITE GRADING AND PAVING PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 15'-0"


(TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)






ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"




ARCHITECTURAL SECTION C--3

NO SCALE




ARCHITECTURAL SECTION C--1

NO SCALE





ARCHITECTURAL SECTION C--2

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



ARCHITECTURAL SECTION B--B

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



ARCHITECTURAL SECTION A--A

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

ARCHITECT OF RECORD:
L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.
 DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
 38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

All information shown or described herein is the property of L & S Architects, Inc. (LSA) and shall not be reused, copied or reproduced in any form without the expressed written authorization of LSA.
 © Copyright: L & S Architects, Inc. Inc.
 2012 All rights reserved.

CONSULTANT:
 ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHHECK	DATE		
1	0		
No.	REVISION	ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14		0

MANHATTAN BEACH
TOYOTA / SCION
 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By	File Name
JML	MBTS
Checked By	LT Scale
JML	-
Project Mgr.	Scale:
JML	PER-PLAN





ARCHITECTURAL CROSS-SECTIONS ROOF-PLAN

Sheet No.
A-1.3

KEY NOTES

- 1 W.I. RAILING
- 2 PLANTER
- 3 PROPERTY LINE
- 4 RETAINING WALL
- 5 CONC. PATIO W/ GUARD RAIL
- 6 EX. DRINKING FOUNTAIN
- 7 STOREFRONT ELEVATIONS
- 8 ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN W/ BATTERY BACK-UP
- 7 TEL. BOARD
- 8 ELEC. PANELS
- 9 NEW OVERHANG CANOPY
- 10 REMOVABLE HANDRAILS FOR PORTAL MAINTENANCE

LEGEND


-  PROPOSED NON-BEARING WALLS
-  EXISTING CMU WALLS TO REMAIN
-  EXISTING WALLS TO REMAIN
-  EXISTING BUILDING TO REMAIN

NOTES

1. PLUMBING FIXTURE REQUIREMENTS ARE SHOWN AS PER TABLE-A AND TABLE 4-1, CPC, 2010.
2. FOR CABINET INFORMATION, REFER TO SHEET A-6.0.
3. FOR CEILING INFORMATION, REFER TO SHEETS A-6.0, A-6.1.
4. REFER TO ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION NOTES, SHEET GN-1.
5. FOR DOOR AND ROOM FINISH SCHEDULES, REFER TO SHEET A-7.0., A-7.1.
6. REFER TO SHEET A-7.2 FOR NON-BEARING WALL CONSTRUCTION.
7. REFER TO SHEET A-7.0 FOR CABINET DETAILS.
8. REFER TO ELECTRICAL SHEETS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFICATIONS AND TYPE FIXTURES.
9. REFER TO PLUMBING SHEET P-1.0 FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFICATIONS AND TYPE FIXTURES.
10. REFER TO MECHANICAL SHEETS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFICATIONS AND TYPE FIXTURES.

ROOM LABELS

- 101 TOYOTA SHOWROOM
- 102 SCION SHOWROOM
- 103 OFFICE
- 104 OFFICE
- 105 OFFICE
- 106 CUSTOMER LOUNGE
- 107 CHILD'S PLAY ROOM
- 108 HALL
- 109 HALL
- 110 STAIRS
- 111 TRAINING ROOM
- 112 BDC
- 113 INTERNET DIRECTOR
- 114 SALES 1-6
- 115 HR MANAGER
- 116 MANAGER
- 117 GENERAL MANAGER
- 118 USED CAR MANAGER
- 119 GSM
- 120 LANDING
- 121 RAMP
- 122 RAMP
- 123 F&I OFFICE
- 124 F&I OFFICE
- 125 F&I OFFICE
- 126 F&I OFFICE
- 127 F&I OFFICE
- 128 NEW CAR DELIVERY
- 129 MENS
- 130 WOMENS
- 131 HALL
- 132 BDC
- 133 HALL
- 134 SERVICE WRITE UP
- 135 CUSTOMER LOUNGE
- 136 RENTAL OFFICE
- 137 SERVICE MANGER
- 138 WARRANTY OFFICE
- 139 VENDING MACHINES
- 140 COFFEE AND WATER COUNTER
- 141 PARTS RETAIL BOUTIQUE
- 142 STAIRS
- 143 EX. PARTS STORAGE
- 144 EX. PARTS STORAGE
- 145 EX. OFFICE
- 146 EX. PARTS PICK - UP



ARCHITECT OF RECORD:
L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.
 DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
 38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHHECK	DATE
1 1ST-PLANCHHECK-CORRECTIONS	0

No.	REVISION ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14	0

**MANHATTAN BEACH
 TOYOTA / SCION**

1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By	JML
Checked By	JML
Project Mgr.	JML
File Name	MBTS
LT Scale	-
Scale:	PER-PLAN


Title:
FLOOR PLAN

Sheet No.
A-2-0

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

(TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)



KEY NOTES

- 1 W.I. RAILING
 - 2 PLANTER
 - 3 PROPERTY LINE
 - 4 RETAINING WALL
 - 5 COVERED PATIO
 - 6 EX. DRINKING FOUNTAIN
 - 7 TEL. BOARD
 - 8 ELEC. PANELS
 - 9 NEW OVERHANG CANOPY
- 1 STOREFRONT ELEVATIONS
- ILLUMINATED EXIT SIGN W/ BATTERY BACK-UP

LEGEND

- PROPOSED NON-BEARING WALLS
- EXISTING CMU WALLS TO REMAIN
- EXISTING WALLS TO REMAIN
- EXISTING BUILDING TO REMAIN

NOTES

1. PLUMBING FIXTURE REQUIREMENTS ARE SHOWN AS PER TABLE-A AND TABLE 4-1, CPC, 2010.
2. FOR CABINET INFORMATION, REFER TO SHEET A-5.0.
3. FOR CEILING INFORMATION, REFER TO SHEETS A-6.0, A-6.1.
4. REFER TO ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION NOTES, SHEET GN-1.
5. FOR DOOR AND ROOM FINISH SCHEDULES, REFER TO SHEET A-7.0., A-7.1.
6. REFER TO SHEET A-7.2 FOR NON-BEARING WALL CONSTRUCTION.
7. REFER TO SHEET A-7.0 FOR CABINET DETAILS.
8. REFER TO ELECTRICAL SHEETS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFICATIONS AND TYPE FIXTURES.
9. REFER TO PLUMBING SHEET P-1.0 FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFICATIONS AND TYPE FIXTURES.
10. REFER TO MECHANICAL SHEETS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFICATIONS AND TYPE FIXTURES.

ROOM LABELS

- 201 DEALER OFFICE
- 202 DEALER PATIO
- 203 DEALER TOILET
- 204 CONFERENCE
- 205 OFFICE
- 206 HALL
- 207 OFFICE
- 208 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
- 209 PAYROLL RECORD
- 210 OFFICE SUPPLIES
- 211 HALL
- 212 BUSINESS OFFICE
- 213 HR OFFICE
- 214 CONTROLLER OFFICE
- 215 MENS
- 216 WOMENS
- 217 LUNCH ROOM
- 218 FLEET OFFICE
- 219 HALL
- 220 MEETING ROOM
- 221 SERVICE BDC

ARCHITECT OF RECORD:
L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.
 DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
 38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:		
PLANCHECK	DATE	
1	1ST-PLANCHECK-CORRECTIONS	0
No.	REVISION ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14	0


**MANHATTAN BEACH
 TOYOTA / SCION**

1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By	File Name
JML	MBTS
Checked By	LT Scale
JML	-
Project Mgr.	Scale:
JML	PER-PLAN

Title:
SECOND FLOOR PLAN


Sheet No.
A-2-1



SECOND FLOOR PLAN


SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

(TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)



LEGEND


- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----|--------------|
| 1 | GUARD RAILING | 7 | TEL. BOARD |
| 2 | PLANTER | 8 | ELEC. PANELS |
| 3 | PROPERTY LINE | 9 | . |
| 4 | RETAINING WALL | 10 | . |
| 5 | . | 11 | . |
| 6 | DRINKING FOUNTAIN | 12 | . |



EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

(TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)



ARCHITECT OF RECORD:
L & S
ARCHITECTS, INC.
 DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
 38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHHECK	DATE	
1	0	
1ST-PLANCHHECK-CORRECTIONS		
No.	REVISION ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14	0

MANHATTAN BEACH
TOYOTA / SCION
 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By	File Name
JML	MBTS
Checked By	LT Scale
JML	-
Project Mgr.	Scale:
JML	PER-PLAN

Title:
EXISTING FLOOR PLAN

Sheet No.
A-2-2

LEGEND


- - - - - MAXIMUM HEIGHT PARAPET. 168.91 FT. MSL
- - - - - MAXIMUM HEIGHT PARAPET. 167.10 FT. MSL
- - - - - MAXIMUM HEIGHT PORTAL. 170.41 FT. MSL
- - - - - MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HEIGHT 159.50 FT. MSL
- - - - - MAXIMUM HEIGHT EXISTING BUILDING 162.67 FT. MSL
- - - - - MAXIMUM HEIGHT FOR PROPOSED ROOF TOP 165.10 T.R.

ABBREVIATIONS

- | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| T.W. | TOP OF WALL |
| T.P. | TOP OF PARAPET |
| F.F. | FINISH FLOOR |
| FL. | FLOOR |
| T.R. | TOP OF ROOF |
| M.A.H. | MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HEIGHT |
| M.S.L. | MEAN SEA LEVEL |
| (162.67 T.W.) | TOP OF EXISTING BUILDING |


KEY NOTES

- 01 ACM-2 ALUMINUM COMPOSITE PANEL TOYOTA SILVER
- 02 ACM-2 ALUMINUM COMPOSITE PANEL TOYOTA BLACK
- 03 ACM-2 ALUMINUM COMPOSITE PANEL TOYOTA RED
- 04 STUCCO - DRYVIT MOONLIGHT WHITE 612
- 04A STUCCO - DRYVIT MEDIUM GRAY (SIM.) TO TOYOTA SILVER
- 05 G-1 SOLABAND 70XL GLAZING (TEMPERED), (3) LOW "E", PROVIDE ANTI-GRAFFITI PROTECTIVE FILM TO ALL EXTERIOR GLAZING.
- 06 STOREFRONT GLASS SLIDING DOOR ASSEMBLY
- 07 MAIN BRAND SIGNAGE, SL72 W/ 25" TALL LETTERS
- 08 SS-1 INTEGRATED CURTAIN WALL SYSTEM
- 09 (TOYOTA) MAIN DOOR
- 10 DEALER SIGNAGE, 21" TALL LETTERS
- 11 NOVUM STRUCTURES, LLC. TOYOTA. PORTAL
- 12 EXISTING PAINTED BLOCK WALL
- 13 STRETCH STAINLESS STEEL ROPE WIRE FENCE AND RAIL
- 14 EXTENDED COVERED CANOPY 8' AND 11'
- 15 LANDSCAPE PLANTER
- 16 STEPS
- 16-0" STEPS



NORTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

ARCHITECT OF RECORD:
L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.
 DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509
 38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
 (909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

All Information shown or described herein is the property of L & S Architects, Inc. (LSA) and shall not be reused, copied or reproduced in any form without the expressed written authorization of LSA.
 © Copyright: L & S Architects, Inc. Inc.
 2012 All rights reserved

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHHECK	DATE	
1 1ST-PLANCHHECK-CORRECTIONS	0	
No.	REVISION ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14	0

**MANHATTAN BEACH
 TOYOTA / SCION**
 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER:	0724-2013
Drawn By	JML
File Name	MBTS
Checked By	JML
LT Scale	-
Project Mgr.	JML
Scale:	PER-PLAN

Title:
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS EAST-WEST

Sheet No.
A-3.0

GENERAL NOTES

1. ALL GLAZING ADJACENT TO DOORS OR TO WALKING SURFACES MUST BE OF SAFETY GLAZING MATERIAL PER CBC/IBC 2406.
2. ALL WALL AND BUILDING SURFACES SHALL HAVE GRAFFITI RESISTANT TREATMENT PRODUCT.
3. CONTRACTORS TO STRICTLY FOLLOW TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM FOR ALL EXTERIOR MATERIALS, COLORS, DIMENSIONS AND REVEAL LOCATIONS UNLESS INDICATED OTHERWISE ON THESE DRAWINGS. REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE ARCHITECT FOR RESOLUTION BEFORE BEGINNING ANY WORK.

SIGNAGE ANALYSIS

MAXIMUM SIGNAGE ALLOWED WITHOUT A VARIANCE = 1,232 SQ.FT.


(A) MAIN TOYOTA PORTAL EMBLEM	10'X7'-2"	72 SQ. FT.
(B) MAIN TOYOTA PORTAL BRAND	12'X2'-1"	25 SQ. FT.
(C) MAIN TOYOTA PORTAL DEALER NAME	18'X1'-9"	28 SQ. FT.
(D) FRONT DOOR ENTRANCE TOYOTA BRAND LOGO	3'-6"X4'-6"	16 SQ. FT.
(E) SCION BRAND LOGO NAME	18'-0"X5'-0"	90 SQ. FT.
(F) SERVICE SIGNAGE	16'-8" X1'-6"	25 SQ. FT.
(19) MONUMENT SIGN AT SEPULVEDA BLVD. (REFER TO SHEET A-1.0 FOR LOCATION) (PREVIOUSLY APPROVED 05-17-2011)	24'X10'	667 SQ. FT.
TOTAL		923 SQ. FT.

ABBREVIATIONS

T.W.	TOP OF WALL
T.P.	TOP OF PARAPET
F.F.	FINISH FLOOR
FL.	FLOOR
M.A.H.	MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE HEIGHT

KEY NOTES


- 01 ACM-2 ALUMINUM COMPISITE PANEL TOYOTA SILVER
- 02 ACM-2 ALUMINUM COMPISITE PANEL TOYOTA BLACK
- 03 ACM-2 ALUMINUM COMPISITE PANEL TOYOTA RED
- 04 STUCCO - DRYVIT MOONLIGHT WHITE 612
- 05 G-1 SOLABAND 70XL GLAZING (TEMPERED), PROVIDE ANTI-GRAFFITI PROTECTIVE FILM TO ALL EXTERIOR GLAZING.
- 06 STOREFRONTGLASS SLIDING DOOR ASSEMBLY
- 07 MAIN BRAND SIGNAGE, SL72 W/ 25" TALL LETTERS
- 08 SS-1 INTEGRATED CURTAIN WALL SYSTEM
- 09 (TOYOTA) MAIN DOOR (PER GENSLER IMAGE USA II SHEET A06.12 ELEV. 01.
- 10 DEALER SIGNAGE, 21" TALL LETTERS
- 11 NOVUM STRUCTURES, LLC. TOYOTA, PORTAL
- 12 EXISTING PAINTED BLOCK WALL
- 13 STRETCH STAINLESS STEEL ROPE WIRE FENCE AND RAIL
- 14 EXISTING OVERHEAD DOOR ASSEMBLY
- 15 LANDSCAPE PLANTER
- 16 CONCRETE STEPS
- 17 REMOVEABLE HANDRAILS FOR PORTAL MAINTENANCE



WEST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

(TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)



EAST ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

(TOYOTA IMAGE PROGRAM)

ARCHITECT OF RECORD:

L & S ARCHITECTS, INC.

DONALD A. SAVICKY, ARCHITECT C-7509

38516 AMATEUR WAY, BEAUMONT, CA 92223
(909) 229-0125 E-MAIL: lai911@aol.com

All information shown or described herein is the property of L & S Architects, Inc. (LSA) and shall not be reused, copied or reproduced in any form without the expressed written authorization of LSA.
© Copyright: L & S Architects, Inc. Inc.
2012 All rights reserved

CONSULTANT:

ISSUED FOR:

PLANCHHECK	DATE	
1 1ST-PLANCHHECK-CORRECTIONS	0	
No.	REVISION ISSUES:	DATE
A	05-05-14	0

MANHATTAN BEACH
TOYOTA / SCION
 1500 NORTH SEPULVEDA BLVD.
 MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266
 (310) 546 - 4848

PROJECT NUMBER: 0724-2013

Drawn By JML	File Name MBTS
Checked By JML	LT Scale -
Project Mgr. JML	Scale: PER-PLAN

Title:
EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS EAST-WEST

Sheet No.

A-3.1

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Angela Soo

From: Paul M. Mullin <paulmullin@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 8:03 AM
To: Kimberly Robinson; Anna X (AS) Cardenas; Gus Cardenas; Glen Lucas; Debbie Lucas; John DeFrance; John & Jane Kim DeFrance; Rachelle Sanger; Heidi Walsh; Ted Halkias; Ted & Jill Halkias; Ian & Jennifer Zieger; Jay & Geri Nakamoto; Andrew Hunter; Justine Hunter; Dave Rutan; Michelle & Cyrous Adami; Sam & Betty Steib; Mike & Linda Roth; Isabel Mullin; Lynda Galins; Joe Galins
Cc: Roger Ullen; Darrell Sperber; Jason Masters; List - Planning Commission
Subject: Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Darrell Sperber (owner) & Roger Ullen (operations director) from Manhattan Beach Toyota have set up a meeting for this coming Monday at 6 PM at the Marriott Hotel (I will confirm the location and get back to you -- I think they mean the *Residence Inn*). They have asked me to get the word out to anyone in the neighborhood who is interested in meeting to discuss the project and concerns they have with it going forward. Roger and Darrell have offered to bring in landscape, lighting, architectural, and related specialists as needed contribute to work things out to make sure our concerns are taken into consideration.

At the [public hearing on their remodel project for the dealership last week](#), the MB planning commission strongly suggested that MB Toyota to work with the adjacent residential property owners to come up with ways that they can mitigate known issues before they come back to the planning commission on :

- Building Height -- planning commission suggested they look at ways to come up with the MINIMUM height variance needed.
- Roof-mounted Air Conditioners -- our concerns about noise, ways that can be mitigated, and possible relocation of AC equipment to the ground level.
- Lighting -- how can security lighting in the back lot be mitigated so it does not shine into our homes?
- Landscaping -- What can be done to provide visual screening of the dealership through effective landscaping? Look at options and define maintenance.
- Construction -- siting of equipment and supplies, dust & debris mitigation measures.

If possible, please reply to [Roger Ullen](#) (copied on this message) and let him know if you can attend the meeting, and if you are unable to attend, what your particular concerns are about the proposed remodel at the MB Toyota / Scion dealership.

Thanks for taking the time to engage in the discussion of this project.

Paul Mullin, block captain
1405 Magnolia Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5218
c: 310-613-1868
e: paulmullin@mac.com

=====

On Apr 16, 2014, at 7:47 PM, Roger Ullen wrote:

EXHIBIT H
PC MTG 5-14-14

Hello Kim,

I left a phone message for Paul Mullin tonight and will invite the other neighbors concerned tomorrow, this will be the first of several meetings to gain a better understanding of what we are dealing with and what we can do as a dealership team along with our neighbors to improve the current concerns brought forth in the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th. I plan to have the first meeting with all concerned on Monday 21st at 6:00pm at the Marriot Hotel as this is close for all and should provide a comfortable surrounding.

Thanks,
Roger Ullen

On Tue, Apr 15, 2014 at 8:03 AM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON <robinsonk1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Roger

Thank you for reaching out. We noticed the lights last night after midnight, so I guess the timer isn't working, but anyway I took a photo so that you can see. Pointing the lights down doesn't seem to do the trick, the lights just reflect more off the B building wall. My bathroom was so illuminated that I didn't need to turn on any lights to brush my teeth.



Regarding the meeting, I will be around and I am sure the other neighbors would appreciate an update. Perhaps we can all connect after Paul gets back in town.

Thanks

Kim

--

Manhattan Beach Toyota

Operations Director

Roger W. Ullen

Office 310-546-4848

Cell 209-626-9691

rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com


Make it a great Day!

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Angela Soo

From: KIMBERLY ROBINSON <robinsonk1@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 7:23 PM
To: luke3199@yahoo.com
Cc: Galins, Joseph E (AS); paulmullin@mac.com; gusanna@aol.com; gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com; debbie_lucas@realsimple.com; johndefrance@yahoo.com; jwk54321@yahoo.com; rachelleks@yahoo.com; jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com; tjhalk1@yahoo.com; jillhalkias@gmail.com; jenzieger@mac.com; geri88@verizon.net; arhunter6@gmail.com; justinecpa@gmail.com; daverutan2002@gmail.com; michelleandcy@verizon.net; SandBSteib@aol.com; mikeroth418@verizon.net; isabellmullin@verizon.net; lyndagalins@yahoo.com; rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com; dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com; Jason Masters; List - Planning Commission
Subject: Re: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Last night



On Apr 21, 2014, at 6:00 PM, luke3199@yahoo.com wrote:

Is the meeting happening right now?

Glenn Lucas (310)227-3378

On Apr 21, 2014, at 4:44 PM, "Galins, Joseph E (AS)" <joseph.galins@ngc.com> wrote:

Kim,

good picture! I see the same thing from our west windows.

My concern is any degradation to our western view of the SKY. Thus my opposition to ANY variance for signage or a second story. If Toyota isn't happy with the zoning as-is, they are welcome to vacate the property for something more suitable. Would Residence Inn be interested in expansion?

Joe
1500 magnolia
From my Blackberry

From: Paul M. Mullin [<mailto:paulmullin@mac.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
To: Kimberly Robinson <robinsonk1@mac.com>; Anna X (AS) Cardenas <gusanna@aol.com>; Gus Cardenas <gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com>; Glen Lucas <luke3199@yahoo.com>; Debbie Lucas <debbie_lucas@realsimple.com>; John DeFrance <johndeFrance@yahoo.com>; John & Jane Kim DeFrance <jwk54321@yahoo.com>; Rachele Sanger <racheleks@yahoo.com>; Heidi Walsh <jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com>; Ted Halkias <tjhalk1@yahoo.com>; Ted & Jill Halkias <jillhalkias@gmail.com>; Ian & Jennifer Zieger <jenzieger@mac.com>; Jay & Geri Nakamoto <geri88@verizon.net>; Andrew Hunter <arhunter6@gmail.com>; Justine Hunter <justinecpa@gmail.com>; Dave Rutan <daverutan2002@gmail.com>; Michelle & Cyrus Adami <michelleandcy@verizon.net>; Sam & Betty Steib <SandBSteib@aol.com>; Mike & Linda Roth <mikeroth418@verizon.net>; Isabel Mullin <isabellmullin@verizon.net>; Lynda Galins <lyndagalins@yahoo.com>; Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Cc: Roger Ullen <rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Darrell Sperber <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>; PlanningCommission@citymb.info <PlanningCommission@citymb.info>
Subject: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Darrell Sperber (owner) & Roger Ullen (operations director) from Manhattan Beach Toyota have set up a meeting for this coming Monday at 6 PM at the Marriott Hotel (I will confirm the location and get back to you -- I think they mean the *Residence Inn*). They have asked me to get the word out to anyone in the neighborhood who is interested in meeting to discuss the project and concerns they have with it going forward. Roger and Darrell have offered to bring in landscape, lighting, architectural, and related specialists as needed contribute to work things out to make sure our concerns are taken into consideration.

At the [public hearing on their remodel project for the dealership last week](#), the MB planning commission strongly suggested that MB Toyota to work with the adjacent residential property owners to come up with ways that they can mitigate known issues before they come back to the planning commission on :

- Building Height -- planning commission suggested they look at ways to come up with the MINIMUM height variance needed.
- Roof-mounted Air Conditioners -- our concerns about noise, ways that can be mitigated, and possible relocation of AC equipment to the ground level.
- Lighting -- how can security lighting in the back lot be mitigated so it does not shine into our homes?

- Landscaping -- What can be done to provide visual screening of the dealership through effective landscaping? Look at options and define maintenance.
- Construction -- siting of equipment and supplies, dust & debris mitigation measures.

If possible, please reply to [Roger Ullen](#) (copied on this message) and let him know if you can attend the meeting, and if you are unable to attend, what your particular concerns are about the proposed remodel at the MB Toyota / Scion dealership.

Thanks for taking the time to engage in the discussion of this project.

Paul Mullin, block captain
1405 Magnolia Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5218
c: 310-613-1868
e: paulmullin@mac.com

=====
On Apr 16, 2014, at 7:47 PM, Roger Ullen wrote:

Hello Kim,

I left a phone message for Paul Mullin tonight and will invite the other neighbors concerned tomorrow, this will be the first of several meetings to gain a better understanding of what we are dealing with and what we can do as a dealership team along with our neighbors to improve the current concerns brought forth in the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th. I plan to have the first meeting with all concerned on Monday 21st at 6:00pm at the Marriot Hotel as this is close for all and should provide a comfortable surrounding.

Thanks,
Roger Ullen

On Tue, Apr 15, 2014 at 8:03 AM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON
<robinsonk1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Roger

Thank you for reaching out. We noticed the lights last night after midnight, so I guess the timer isn't working, but anyway I took a photo so that you can see. Pointing the lights down doesn't seem to do the trick, the lights just reflect more off the B building wall. My bathroom was so illuminated that I didn't need to turn on any lights to brush my teeth.

<image.jpeg>

Regarding the meeting, I will be around and I am sure the other neighbors would appreciate an update. Perhaps we can all connect after Paul gets back in town.

Thanks

Kim

--

Manhattan Beach Toyota

Operations Director

Roger W. Ullen

Office 310-546-4848

Cell 209-626-9691

rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com

Make it a great Day!

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Angela Soo

From: luke3199@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 6:01 PM
To: Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Cc: paulmullin@mac.com; robinsonk1@mac.com; gusanna@aol.com; gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com; debbie_lucas@realsimple.com; johndefrance@yahoo.com; jwk54321@yahoo.com; rachelleks@yahoo.com; jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com; tjhalk1@yahoo.com; jillhalkias@gmail.com; jenzieger@mac.com; geri88@verizon.net; arhunter6@gmail.com; justinecpa@gmail.com; daverutan2002@gmail.com; michelleandcy@verizon.net; SandBSteib@aol.com; mikeroth418@verizon.net; isabellmullin@verizon.net; lyndagalins@yahoo.com; rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com; dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com; Jason Masters; List - Planning Commission
Subject: Re: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Is the meeting happening right now?

Glenn Lucas (310)227-3378

On Apr 21, 2014, at 4:44 PM, "Galins, Joseph E (AS)" <joseph.galins@ngc.com> wrote:

Kim,

good picture! I see the same thing from our west windows.

My concern is any degradation to our western view of the SKY. Thus my opposition to ANY variance for signage or a second story. If toyota isn't happy with the zoning as-is, they are welcome to vacate the property for something more suitable. Would Reisence Inn be interested in expansion?

Joe
1500 magnolia
From my Blackberry

From: Paul M. Mullin [<mailto:paulmullin@mac.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
To: Kimberly Robinson <robinsonk1@mac.com>; Anna X (AS) Cardenas <gusanna@aol.com>; Gus Cardenas <gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com>; Glen Lucas <luke3199@yahoo.com>; Debbie Lucas <debbie_lucas@realsimple.com>; John DeFrance <johndefrance@yahoo.com>; John & Jane Kim DeFrance <jwk54321@yahoo.com>; Rachele Sanger <rachelleks@yahoo.com>; Heidi Walsh <jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com>; Ted Halkias <tjhalk1@yahoo.com>; Ted & Jill Halkias <jillhalkias@gmail.com>; Ian & Jennifer Zieger <jenzieger@mac.com>; Jay & Geri Nakamoto <geri88@verizon.net>; Andrew Hunter <arhunter6@gmail.com>; Justine Hunter <justinecpa@gmail.com>; Dave Rutan <daverutan2002@gmail.com>; Michelle & Cyrouis Adami <michelleandcy@verizon.net>; Sam & Betty Steib <SandBSteib@aol.com>; Mike & Linda Roth <mikeroth418@verizon.net>; Isabel Mullin <isabellmullin@verizon.net>; Lynda Galins <lyndagalins@yahoo.com>; Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Cc: Roger Ullen <rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Darrell Sperber <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>; PlanningCommission@citymb.info <PlanningCommission@citymb.info>
Subject: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday

4/21 @ 6PM

Darrell Sperber (owner) & Roger Ullen (operations director) from Manhattan Beach Toyota have set up a meeting for this coming Monday at 6 PM at the Marriott Hotel (I will confirm the location and get back to you -- I think they mean the *Residence Inn*). They have asked me to get the word out to anyone in the neighborhood who is interested in meeting to discuss the project and concerns they have with it going forward. Roger and Darrell have offered to bring in landscape, lighting, architectural, and related specialists as needed contribute to work things out to make sure our concerns are taken into consideration.

At the [public hearing on their remodel project for the dealership last week](#), the MB planning commission strongly suggested that MB Toyota to work with the adjacent residential property owners to come up with ways that they can mitigate known issues before they come back to the planning commission on :

- Building Height -- planning commission suggested they look at ways to come up with the MINIMUM height variance needed.
- Roof-mounted Air Conditioners -- our concerns about noise, ways that can be mitigated, and possible relocation of AC equipment to the ground level.
- Lighting -- how can security lighting in the back lot be mitigated so it does not shine into our homes?
- Landscaping -- What can be done to provide visual screening of the dealership through effective landscaping? Look at options and define maintenance.
- Construction -- siting of equipment and supplies, dust & debris mitigation measures.

If possible, please reply to [Roger Ullen](#) (copied on this message) and let him know if you can attend the meeting, and if you are unable to attend, what your particular concerns are about the proposed remodel at the MB Toyota / Scion dealership.

Thanks for taking the time to engage in the discussion of this project.

Paul Mullin, block captain
1405 Magnolia Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5218
c: 310-613-1868
e: paulmullin@mac.com

=====

On Apr 16, 2014, at 7:47 PM, Roger Ullen wrote:

Hello Kim,

I left a phone message for Paul Mullin tonight and will invite the other neighbors concerned tomorrow, this will be the first of several meetings to gain a better understanding of what we are dealing with and what we can do as a dealership team along with our neighbors to improve the current concerns brought forth in the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th. I plan to have the first meeting with all concerned on Monday 21st at 6:00pm at the Marriot Hotel as this is close for all and should provide a comfortable surrounding.

Thanks,
Roger Ullen

On Tue, Apr 15, 2014 at 8:03 AM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON
<robinsonk1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Roger

Thank you for reaching out. We noticed the lights last night after midnight, so I guess the timer isn't working, but anyway I took a photo so that you can see. Pointing the lights down doesn't seem to do the trick, the lights just reflect more off the B building wall. My bathroom was so illuminated that I didn't need to turn on any lights to brush my teeth.

<image.jpeg>

Regarding the meeting, I will be around and I am sure the other neighbors would appreciate an update. Perhaps we can all connect after Paul gets back in town.

Thanks

Kim

--

Manhattan Beach Toyota
Operations Director
Roger W. Ullen
Office 310-546-4848
Cell 209-626-9691
rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com
Make it a great Day!

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Angela Soo

From: Galins, Joseph E (AS) <joseph.galins@ngc.com>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 5:36 PM
To: 'paulmullin@mac.com'; 'robinsonk1@mac.com'; 'gusanna@aol.com'; 'gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com'; 'luke3199@yahoo.com'; 'debbie_lucas@realsimple.com'; 'johndefrance@yahoo.com'; 'jwk54321@yahoo.com'; 'rachelleks@yahoo.com'; 'jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com'; 'tjhalk1@yahoo.com'; 'jillhalkias@gmail.com'; 'jenzieger@mac.com'; 'geri88@verizon.net'; 'arhunter6@gmail.com'; 'justinecpa@gmail.com'; 'daverutan2002@gmail.com'; 'michelleandcy@verizon.net'; 'SandBSteib@aol.com'; 'mikeroth418@verizon.net'; 'isabellmullin@verizon.net'; 'lyndagalins@yahoo.com'
Cc: 'rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com'; 'dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com'; Jason Masters; List - Planning Commission; 'galins@outlook.com'
Subject: Re: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

All, please consider yourself on cc to my comments; they were meant for Jason and the City Council. My home email is added on cc.

Ps - Thx to Paul for the coordination.
From my Blackberry

From: Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 06:44 PM Central Standard Time
To: 'paulmullin@mac.com' <paulmullin@mac.com>; 'robinsonk1@mac.com' <robinsonk1@mac.com>; 'gusanna@aol.com' <gusanna@aol.com>; 'gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com' <gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com>; 'luke3199@yahoo.com' <luke3199@yahoo.com>; 'debbie_lucas@realsimple.com' <debbie_lucas@realsimple.com>; 'johndefrance@yahoo.com' <johndefrance@yahoo.com>; 'jwk54321@yahoo.com' <jwk54321@yahoo.com>; 'rachelleks@yahoo.com' <rachelleks@yahoo.com>; 'jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com' <jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com>; 'tjhalk1@yahoo.com' <tjhalk1@yahoo.com>; 'jillhalkias@gmail.com' <jillhalkias@gmail.com>; 'jenzieger@mac.com' <jenzieger@mac.com>; 'geri88@verizon.net' <geri88@verizon.net>; 'arhunter6@gmail.com' <arhunter6@gmail.com>; 'justinecpa@gmail.com' <justinecpa@gmail.com>; 'daverutan2002@gmail.com' <daverutan2002@gmail.com>; 'michelleandcy@verizon.net' <michelleandcy@verizon.net>; 'SandBSteib@aol.com' <SandBSteib@aol.com>; 'mikeroth418@verizon.net' <mikeroth418@verizon.net>; 'isabellmullin@verizon.net' <isabellmullin@verizon.net>; 'lyndagalins@yahoo.com' <lyndagalins@yahoo.com>
Cc: 'rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com' <rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; 'dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com' <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; 'jmasters@citymb.info' <jmasters@citymb.info>; 'PlanningCommission@citymb.info' <PlanningCommission@citymb.info>
Subject: Re: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Kim,

good picture! I see the same thing from our west windows.

My concern is any degradation to our western view of the SKY. Thus my opposition to ANY variance for signage or a second story. If Toyota isn't happy with the zoning as-is, they are welcome to vacate the property for something more suitable. Would Reisence Inn be interested in expansion?

Joe
1500 magnolia

From: Paul M. Mullin [mailto:paulmullin@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
To: Kimberly Robinson <robinsonk1@mac.com>; Anna X (AS) Cardenas <gusanna@aol.com>; Gus Cardenas <gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com>; Glen Lucas <luke3199@yahoo.com>; Debbie Lucas <debbie_lucas@realsimple.com>; John DeFrance <johndefrance@yahoo.com>; John & Jane Kim DeFrance <jwk54321@yahoo.com>; Rachelle Sanger <rachelleks@yahoo.com>; Heidi Walsh <jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com>; Ted Halkias <tjhalk1@yahoo.com>; Ted & Jill Halkias <jillhalkias@gmail.com>; Ian & Jennifer Zieger <jenzieger@mac.com>; Jay & Geri Nakamoto <geri88@verizon.net>; Andrew Hunter <arhunter6@gmail.com>; Justine Hunter <justinecpa@gmail.com>; Dave Rutan <daverutan2002@gmail.com>; Michelle & Cyrous Adami <michelleandcy@verizon.net>; Sam & Betty Steib <SandBSteib@aol.com>; Mike & Linda Roth <mikeroth418@verizon.net>; Isabel Mullin <isabelmullin@verizon.net>; Lynda Galins <lyndagalins@yahoo.com>; Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Cc: Roger Ullen <rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Darrell Sperber <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>; PlanningCommission@citymb.info <PlanningCommission@citymb.info>
Subject: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Darrell Sperber (owner) & Roger Ullen (operations director) from Manhattan Beach Toyota have set up a meeting for this coming Monday at 6 PM at the Marriott Hotel (I will confirm the location and get back to you -- I think they mean the *Residence Inn*). They have asked me to get the word out to anyone if the neighborhood who is interested in meeting to discuss the project and concerns they have with it going forward. Roger and Darrell have offered to bring in landscape, lighting, architectural, and related specialists as needed contribute to work things out to make sure our concerns are taken into consideration.

At the [public hearing on their remodel project for the dealership last week](#), the MB planning commission strongly suggested that MB Toyota to work with the adjacent residential property owners to come up with ways that they can mitigate known issues before they come back to the planning commission on :

- Building Height -- planning commission suggested they look at ways to come up with the MINIMUM height variance needed.
- Roof-mounted Air Conditioners -- our concerns about noise, ways that can be mitigated, and possible relocation of AC equipment to the ground level.
- Lighting -- how can security lighting in the back lot be mitigated so it does not shine into our homes?
- Landscaping -- What can be done to provide visual screening of the dealership through effective landscaping? Look at options and define maintenance.
- Construction -- siting of equipment and supplies, dust & debris mitigation measures.

If possible, please reply to [Roger Ullen](#) (copied on this message) and let him know if you can attend the meeting, and if you are unable to attend, what your particular concerns are about the proposed remodel at the MB Toyota / Scion dealership.

Thanks for taking the time to engage in the discussion of this project.

Paul Mullin, block captain
1405 Magnolia Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5218
c: 310-613-1868
e: paulmullin@mac.com

On Apr 16, 2014, at 7:47 PM, Roger Ullen wrote:

Hello Kim,

I left a phone message for Paul Mullin tonight and will invite the other neighbors concerned tomorrow, this will be the first of several meetings to gain a better understanding of what we are dealing with and what we can do as a dealership team along with our neighbors to improve the current concerns brought forth in the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th. I plan to have the first meeting with all concerned on Monday 21st at 6:00pm at the Marriot Hotel as this is close for all and should provide a comfortable surrounding.

Thanks,
Roger Ullen

On Tue, Apr 15, 2014 at 8:03 AM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON <robinsonk1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Roger

Thank you for reaching out. We noticed the lights last night after midnight, so I guess the timer isn't working, but anyway I took a photo so that you can see. Pointing the lights down doesn't seem to do the trick, the lights just reflect more off the B building wall. My bathroom was so illuminated that I didn't need to turn on any lights to brush my teeth.



Regarding the meeting, I will be around and I am sure the other neighbors would appreciate an update. Perhaps we can all connect after Paul gets back in town.

Thanks

Kim

--

Manhattan Beach Toyota

Operations Director

Roger W. Ullen

Office 310-546-4848

Cell 209-626-9691

rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com

Make it a great Day!

Angela Soo

From: Galins, Joseph E (AS) <joseph.galins@ngc.com>
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2014 4:44 PM
To: 'paulmullin@mac.com'; 'robinsonk1@mac.com'; 'gusanna@aol.com'; 'gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com'; 'luke3199@yahoo.com'; 'debbie_lucas@realsimple.com'; 'johndefrance@yahoo.com'; 'jwk54321@yahoo.com'; 'rachelleks@yahoo.com'; 'jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com'; 'tjhalk1@yahoo.com'; 'jillhalkias@gmail.com'; 'jenzieger@mac.com'; 'geri88@verizon.net'; 'arhunter6@gmail.com'; 'justinecpa@gmail.com'; 'daverutan2002@gmail.com'; 'michelleandcy@verizon.net'; 'SandBSteib@aol.com'; 'mikeroth418@verizon.net'; 'isabelmullin@verizon.net'; 'lyndagalins@yahoo.com'
Cc: 'rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com'; 'dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com'; Jason Masters; List - Planning Commission
Subject: Re: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Kim,

good picture! I see the same thing from our west windows.

My concern is any degradation to our western view of the SKY. Thus my opposition to ANY variance for signage or a second story. If toyota isn't happy with the zoning as-is, they are welcome to vacate the property for something more suitable. Would Reissance Inn be interested in expansion?

Joe
1500 magnolia
From my Blackberry

From: Paul M. Mullin [mailto:paulmullin@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
To: Kimberly Robinson <robinsonk1@mac.com>; Anna X (AS) Cardenas <gusanna@aol.com>; Gus Cardenas <gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com>; Glen Lucas <luke3199@yahoo.com>; Debbie Lucas <debbie_lucas@realsimple.com>; John DeFrance <johndefrance@yahoo.com>; John & Jane Kim DeFrance <jwk54321@yahoo.com>; Rachele Sanger <rachelleks@yahoo.com>; Heidi Walsh <jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com>; Ted Halkias <tjhalk1@yahoo.com>; Ted & Jill Halkias <jillhalkias@gmail.com>; Ian & Jennifer Zieger <jenzieger@mac.com>; Jay & Geri Nakamoto <geri88@verizon.net>; Andrew Hunter <arhunter6@gmail.com>; Justine Hunter <justinecpa@gmail.com>; Dave Rutan <daverutan2002@gmail.com>; Michelle & Cyrous Adami <michelleandcy@verizon.net>; Sam & Betty Steib <SandBSteib@aol.com>; Mike & Linda Roth <mikeroth418@verizon.net>; Isabel Mullin <isabelmullin@verizon.net>; Lynda Galins <lyndagalins@yahoo.com>; Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Cc: Roger Ullen <rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Darrell Sperber <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>; PlanningCommission@citymb.info <PlanningCommission@citymb.info>
Subject: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Darrell Sperber (owner) & Roger Ullen (operations director) from Manhattan Beach Toyota have set up a meeting for this coming Monday at 6 PM at the Marriott Hotel (I will confirm the location and get back to you -- I think they mean the *Residence Inn*). They have asked me to get the word out to anyone if the neighborhood who is interested in meeting to discuss the project and concerns they have with it going forward. Roger and Darrell have offered to bring in landscape, lighting, architectural, and related specialists as needed contribute to work things out to make sure our concerns are taken into consideration.

At the [public hearing on their remodel project for the dealership last week](#), the MB planning commission strongly suggested that MB Toyota to work with the adjacent residential property owners to come up with ways that they can mitigate known issues before they come back to the planning commission on :

- Building Height -- planning commission suggested they look at ways to come up with the MINIMUM height variance needed.
- Roof-mounted Air Conditioners -- our concerns about noise, ways that can be mitigated, and possible relocation of AC equipment to the ground level.
- Lighting -- how can security lighting in the back lot be mitigated so it does not shine into our homes?
- Landscaping -- What can be done to provide visual screening of the dealership through effective landscaping? Look at options and define maintenance.
- Construction -- siting of equipment and supplies, dust & debris mitigation measures.

If possible, please reply to [Roger Ullen](#) (copied on this message) and let him know if you can attend the meeting, and if you are unable to attend, what your particular concerns are about the proposed remodel at the MB Toyota / Scion dealership.

Thanks for taking the time to engage in the discussion of this project.

Paul Mullin, block captain
1405 Magnolia Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5218
c: 310-613-1868
e: paulmullin@mac.com

=====
On Apr 16, 2014, at 7:47 PM, Roger Ullen wrote:

Hello Kim,

I left a phone message for Paul Mullin tonight and will invite the other neighbors concerned tomorrow, this will be the first of several meetings to gain a better understanding of what we are dealing with and what we can do as a dealership team along with our neighbors to improve the current concerns brought forth in the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th. I plan to have the first meeting with all concerned on Monday 21st at 6:00pm at the Marriot Hotel as this is close for all and should provide a comfortable surrounding.

Thanks,
Roger Ullen

On Tue, Apr 15, 2014 at 8:03 AM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON <robinsonk1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Roger

Thank you for reaching out. We noticed the lights last night after midnight, so I guess the timer isn't working, but anyway I took a photo so that you can see. Pointing the lights down doesn't

seem to do the trick, the lights just reflect more off the B building wall. My bathroom was so illuminated that I didn't need to turn on any lights to brush my teeth.



Regarding the meeting, I will be around and I am sure the other neighbors would appreciate an update. Perhaps we can all connect after Paul gets back in town.

Thanks

Kim

--

Manhattan Beach Toyota

Operations Director

Roger W. Ullen

Office 310-546-4848

Cell 209-626-9691

[*rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com*](mailto:rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com)

Make it a great Day!

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Angela Soo

From: David Rutan <daverutan2002@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 10:53 PM
To: KIMBERLY ROBINSON
Cc: luke3199@yahoo.com; Galins, Joseph E (AS); paulmullin@mac.com; gusanna@aol.com; gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com; debbie_lucas@realsimple.com; johndefrance@yahoo.com; jwk54321@yahoo.com; rachelleks@yahoo.com; jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com; tjhalk1@yahoo.com; jillhalkias@gmail.com; jenzieger@mac.com; geri88@verizon.net; arhunter6@gmail.com; justinecpa@gmail.com; michelleandcy@verizon.net; SandBSteib@aol.com; mikeroth418@verizon.net; isabelmullin@verizon.net; lyndagalins@yahoo.com; rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com; dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com; Jason Masters; List - Planning Commission
Subject: Re: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Sorry I couldn't attend the meeting. Here are my concerns:

1. Construction time is reasonable and enforce. About 7 or 8 years ago there was some work being done at MB Toyota and there was major noise, like jackhammering, occurring at 6:30 am. On the third day of this I drove over and complained at 6:45 am. Whoever I spoke to just said "When are we supposed to get the work done?" I called the police. The work stopped.
2. Repair time is also reasonable. One night Target decided that 12 midnight was an ok time to pound away on the air ducts leading to the roof which we could hear quite loudly. I called and complained. The noise continued. I called the police, the noise stopped.
3. The units are properly shielded with some sound proofing material, not just shielded to make it look pretty.
4. When the unit is replaced in 10 - 15 years, or more units are put on the roof, the people involved actually follow the municipal code and common decency when placing the units and putting new shielding around new units, unlike Target keeps doing.
5. When there is a noise complaint, do not tell the caller that they do not handle the complaint at the dealership and to call some national number where you end up getting a six digit complaint number for your case and you have to explain yourself three times before they get that no, your car is not making noise, the dealership itself is making noise. Target has implemented such a policy.
6. The larger units that will be needed are turned on and shut off at a reasonable time. I doubt the shielding will be 100% effective.
7. Any obstruction of a view is taken seriously. The ones of us with view can see a strip of houses and trees as we look west. It doesn't take much to obstruct that strip of view.

Thank you for considering my concerns,

Dave Rutan
1217 Magnolia Ave.

On Apr 21, 2014, at 7:23 PM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON wrote:

Last night
<image.jpeg>

On Apr 21, 2014, at 6:00 PM, luke3199@yahoo.com wrote:

Is the meeting happening right now?

Glenn Lucas (310)227-3378

On Apr 21, 2014, at 4:44 PM, "Galins, Joseph E (AS)" <joseph.galins@ngc.com> wrote:

Kim,

good picture! I see the same thing from our west windows.

My concern is any degradation to our western view of the SKY. Thus my opposition to ANY variance for signage or a second story. If toyota isn't happy with the zoning as-is, they are welcome to vacate the property for something more suitable. Would Reisence Inn be interested in expansion?

Joe
1500 magnolia
From my Blackberry

From: Paul M. Mullin [<mailto:paulmullin@mac.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
To: Kimberly Robinson <robinsonk1@mac.com>; Anna X (AS) Cardenas <gusanna@aol.com>; Gus Cardenas <gustavo.d.cardenas@boeing.com>; Glen Lucas <luke3199@yahoo.com>; Debbie Lucas <debbie_lucas@realsimple.com>; John DeFrance <johndefrance@yahoo.com>; John & Jane Kim DeFrance <jwk54321@yahoo.com>; Rachelle Sanger <rachelleks@yahoo.com>; Heidi Walsh <jnhwalshfamily@hotmail.com>; Ted Halkias <tjhalk1@yahoo.com>; Ted & Jill Halkias <jillhalkias@gmail.com>; Ian & Jennifer Zieger <jenzieger@mac.com>; Jay & Geri Nakamoto <geri88@verizon.net>; Andrew Hunter <arhunter6@gmail.com>; Justine Hunter <justinecpa@gmail.com>; Dave Rutan <daverutan2002@gmail.com>; Michelle & Cyrus Adami <michelleandcy@verizon.net>; Sam & Betty Steib <SandBSteib@aol.com>; Mike & Linda Roth <mikeroth418@verizon.net>; Isabel Mullin <isabelmullin@verizon.net>; Lynda Galins <lyndagalins@yahoo.com>; Galins, Joseph E (AS)
Cc: Roger Ullen <rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Darrell Sperber <dsperber@manhattanbeachtoyota.com>; Jason Masters <jmasters@citymb.info>; PlanningCommission@citymb.info <PlanningCommission@citymb.info>
Subject: EXT :Meeting with MB Toyota to discuss issues & concerns with proposed remodel -- Monday 4/21 @ 6PM

Darrell Sperber (owner) & Roger Ullen (operations director) from Manhattan Beach Toyota have set up a meeting for this coming Monday at 6 PM at the Marriott Hotel (I will confirm the location and get back to you -- I think they mean the *Residence Inn*). They have asked me to get the word out to anyone in the neighborhood who is interested in meeting to discuss the project and concerns they have with it going forward. Roger and Darrell have offered to bring in landscape,

lighting, architectural, and related specialists as needed contribute to work things out to make sure our concerns are taken into consideration.

At the [public hearing on their remodel project for the dealership last week](#), the MB planning commission strongly suggested that MB Toyota to work with the adjacent residential property owners to come up with ways that they can mitigate known issues before they come back to the planning commission on :

- Building Height -- planning commission suggested they look at ways to come up with the MINIMUM height variance needed.
- Roof-mounted Air Conditioners -- our concerns about noise, ways that can be mitigated, and possible relocation of AC equipment to the ground level.
- Lighting -- how can security lighting in the back lot be mitigated so it does not shine into our homes?
- Landscaping -- What can be done to provide visual screening of the dealership through effective landscaping? Look at options and define maintenance.
- Construction -- siting of equipment and supplies, dust & debris mitigation measures.

If possible, please reply to [Roger Ullen](#) (copied on this message) and let him know if you can attend the meeting, and if you are unable to attend, what your particular concerns are about the proposed remodel at the MB Toyota / Scion dealership.

Thanks for taking the time to engage in the discussion of this project.

Paul Mullin, block captain
1405 Magnolia Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5218
c: 310-613-1868
e: paulmullin@mac.com

=====

On Apr 16, 2014, at 7:47 PM, Roger Ullen wrote:

Hello Kim,

I left a phone message for Paul Mullin tonight and will invite the other neighbors concerned tomorrow, this will be the first of several meetings to gain a better understanding of what we are dealing with and what we can do as a dealership team along with our neighbors to improve the current concerns brought forth in the Planning Commission meeting on April 9th. I plan to have the first meeting with all concerned on Monday 21st at 6:00pm at the Marriot Hotel as this is close for all and should provide a comfortable surrounding.

Thanks,
Roger Ullen

On Tue, Apr 15, 2014 at 8:03 AM, KIMBERLY ROBINSON
<robinsonk1@mac.com> wrote:

Hi Roger

Thank you for reaching out. We noticed the lights last night after midnight, so I guess the timer isn't working, but anyway I took a photo so that you can see. Pointing the lights down doesn't seem to do the trick, the lights just reflect more off the B building wall. My bathroom was so illuminated that I didn't need to turn on any lights to brush my teeth.

<image.jpeg>

Regarding the meeting, I will be around and I am sure the other neighbors would appreciate an update. Perhaps we can all connect after Paul gets back in town.

Thanks

Kim

--

Manhattan Beach Toyota
Operations Director
Roger W. Ullen
Office 310-546-4848
Cell 209-626-9691
rullen@manhattanbeachtoyota.com
Make it a great Day!

May 5, 1987

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

RESOLUTION NO. 4398

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DETERMINING COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONDITIONS OF AN APPROVED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, AS MODIFIED, TO ALLOW THE BUSINESS EXPANSION AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES FOR THE EXISTING AUTOMOBILE SALES AGENCY LOCATED AT 1500 SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD (ADKINS)

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach conducted public hearings pursuant to applicable law to review an approved Conditional Use Permit, Resolution No. 345, to determine if violations to the conditions of approval exist and necessitate possible modification or revocation of the permits; and

WHEREAS, in addition, the Planning Commission conducted public hearings at the request of the applicant, William Adkins, owner of the business at 1500 Sepulveda Boulevard, Manhattan Ford/Volkswagen, to consider an application for a new Conditional Use Permit to allow expansion of the existing automobile sales agency to include a Volkswagen dealership, for the property legally described as a portion of Lot 7, Section 19, formerly of the Redondo Land Company RF140 in the City of Manhattan Beach; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission adopted its Resolution No. 87-2 on February 11, 1987 (which is now on file in the office of the Secretary of said Commission in the City Hall of said City, open to public inspection and hereby referred to in its entirety, and by this reference incorporated herein and made part hereof), approving the Conditional Use Permit to allow the business expansion and construction of new car sales showroom, subject to certain conditions, and, in addition, determining that the existing dealership, auto body, and fender repair services operates in substantial compliance to the conditions of Planning Commission Resolution No. 345; and

1 WHEREAS, within the time permitted by law and
2 pursuant to provisions of the Municipal Code, the applicant
3 appealed the decision of the Planning Commission relative to
4 certain conditions; and

5 WHEREAS, the City Council held a duly noticed
6 public hearing on April 21, 1987, receiving and filing all
7 written documents and hearing oral argument for and against;
8 thereafter on April 21, 1987, the City Council directed that
9 the decision of said Commission as reflected in Resolution
10 No. 87-2 be sustained, and the Conditional Use Permit granted
11 subject to modification of Conditions 1, 3, 7, 11(e), 16(c),
12 and 26.

13 NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
14 MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DECLARE,
15 FIND, DETERMINE, AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

16 SECTION 1. That the City Council hereby makes the
17 following findings:

18 1. The purpose of the Conditional Use Permit is to
19 allow the construction of an approximate 5200 square foot
20 sales showroom and sales offices at the northwest corner of
21 the property to accommodate the addition of a Volkswagen
22 dealership in conjunction with the current Ford automobile
sales agency. The Conditional Use Permit is required because
the building improvements exceed 5,000 square feet and the
property size exceeds 10,000 square feet, as well as to
maintain the existing auto body and fender repair use.

23 2. Under separate direction by the City Council,
24 the Planning Commission reviewed the Conditional Use Permit
25 (Resolution No. PC 345) and determined that the existing
26 dealership, auto body and fender service operates in
substantial compliance with said Resolution No. 345. The
residents' complaints primarily centered on noise nuisance
and other related issues.

27 3. An Initial Study/Environmental Assessment was
28 prepared and a Negative Declaration was filed in compliance
29 with all respects of CEQA and City of Manhattan Beach
Guidelines, finding no significant environmental impacts
associated with the project.

30 4. The property is located on the east side of
31 Sepulveda Boulevard between 18th Street and Manhattan Beach
32 Boulevard, is zoned C-2, General Commercial, and is located
within Area District II within the Sepulveda Boulevard
Commercial Corridor.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

5. The existing Ford dealership will be retained on site and the Volkswagen sales agency will supplement the existing facility.

6. No expansion or modification, to the existing parts and vehicle repair areas or hours of operation is proposed with the application.

7. Vehicle access to the property will be provided from two existing driveways along Sepulveda Boulevard.

8. The project provides substantial parking, approximately 280 spaces in excess of minimum Code requirements.

9. The project provides landscape planter areas in excess of minimum Code requirements.

10. The design of the project provides for the dedication required under City Council policy. A Covenant and Agreement shall be provided to ensure that the private improvements will be removed in conjunction with the widening of Sepulveda Boulevard.

11. A complete Plot and Parking Plan designating, at minimum, the location and design of all employee parking, customer parking, service vehicle parking, as well as spaces reserved for display areas and vehicle storage should be provided to the City in conjunction with a Building permit application for the subject property.

12. Separate traffic and noise studies have been provided to supplement the Environmental Assessment, which provided an analysis of all related circumstances, nuisances, and/or impacts and provide suggested measures of mitigation.

13. A Sign Appeal was granted for the property by the Board of Zoning Adjustment on November 25, 1980, and subject to the provisions of Resolution No. 80-37. All provisions of this approval will be incorporated into this document.

14. All conditions of previous approvals shall be incorporated into this document and, as such, this Resolution shall supersede all previous discretionary approvals and act as the governing authority for the property.

15. The existing business and the proposed expansion are consistent with both the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and will be compatible with all surrounding land uses.

SECTION 2. Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the City Council does hereby determine that the existing business operates in substantial compliance to the conditions of Planning Commission Resolution No. 345; and approves the Conditional Use Permit to allow the business expansion and construction of new car sales showroom, subject

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

to the following conditions:

1. The public address system shall not operate prior to 7:00 a.m, nor after 6:00 p.m., 5 days a week, Monday - Friday. All existing muffled speakers in the service bay area shall remain muffled and shall not operate on weekends and holidays.

2. Auto body/fender repair and associated work shall be permitted only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

3. A minimum 8-foot high block wall shall be constructed and maintained along the full length of the rear (east) property line.

4. The use of pneumatic and other similar tools shall be permitted only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

5. The owner/management of the automobile dealership shall provide appropriate supervision to reduce/eliminate activities that generate excessive noise disturbances to the abutting residential properties.

6. Excessive loitering, drag racing, or similar activities that generate excessive noise, not necessary to the normal operation of the business, shall not be permitted in the rear parking area.

7. Vehicle testing shall be limited to commercial streets such as Sepulveda Boulevard, Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Artesia Boulevard, Aviation Boulevard, Highland Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue, Marine Avenue, and Valley/Ardmore. No vehicle testing shall be permitted on residential streets.

8. All utilities serving the new facilities, including but not limited to, electric, telephone, and cable television shall be underground to the nearest power service, subject to the approval of the City and all appropriate utility companies.

9. A twelve (12) foot strip of land along the Sepulveda Boulevard frontage of the site shall be dedicated in fee simple title to the City for the purpose of street widening.

10. All damaged curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements on Sepulveda Boulevard shall be reconstructed, subject to the approval of the Public Works Department and Caltrans.

11. A covenant and agreement shall be prepared, approved by the City, and recorded by the applicant prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for any structural modifications to the property. This document shall address the following conditions:

(a) Approval of this covenant and agreement shall be contingent upon approval of an Encroachment Permit by both the State Department of Transportation (Cal Trans) and the City of Manhattan Beach.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

(b) All buildings and other improvements including, but not limited to, parking improvements, signs, walls, or other such similar improvements, shall be removed from public property and restored on private property pursuant to all applicable Uniform Building Code and zoning standards upon demand of the City and/or State of California.

(c) All structures, upon reconstruction, shall maintain an additional five-foot landscape buffer setback from the new property line. The installation of these shall be subject to the approval of the Community Development Department.

(d) The construction of any further building improvements or modifications not deemed necessary for repair and maintenance on this site shall cause this agreement to be null and void and cause all required building and other encroachments to be removed and reconstructed pursuant to the provisions in Conditions 2 and 3 of this document. If said improvements are not removed by the property owner, the City and/or State shall have the right to cause removal with all associated costs borne by the property owner.

(e) The required removal of all buildings and structural encroachments shall be accomplished within a time frame as specified by the City of Manhattan Beach and the State of California when a program for the widening of Sepulveda Boulevard is to be implemented. The time to accomplish the removal of the buildings and structures shall not interfere with development of public property. A reasonable time period for notification of the property owner of removal of improvements shall be provided in the covenant and agreement document.

(f) All expenses to achieve compliance with the above conditions shall be fully borne by the applicant, including attorney fees, should litigation occur.

(g) This covenant shall run with the land and be binding to all future land owners/business owners. The covenant shall be recorded with the County Recorder's Office prior to the issuance of a building permit.

12. Should the appropriate Encroachment Permit application for the retention of improvements within the rights-of-way be denied by Caltrans, the allowances of this covenant shall become null and void. If said project shall be pursued by the applicant in light of the denial, all buildings and structures shall be relocated off the public property, and to maintain a minimum 5-foot setback from the new property line.

1 13. All existing landscape planter areas shall be
2 properly planted and continuously maintained.

3 14. All nuisance and storm water shall be
4 contained on site and conveyed through appropriate pipes to
the existing storm drains adjacent to the subject site.

5 15. The main Sepulveda Boulevard driveway shall be
6 modified to replace the "dust pan" design concept utilizing a
"curb return design", as provided in the traffic analysis,
7 subject to the approval of the Public Works Department and
Caltrans.

8 16. A comprehensive parking/circulation plan shall
9 be submitted with the Building Permit application. The plan
shall provide for, at minimum, the following:

10 (a) Queuing lane design/stripping shall be provided
11 for the service area similar to the design
12 proposed in the traffic analysis, subject to
the approval of the Public Works and Community
Development Departments.

13 (b) A minimum 10 "customer only" parking spaces
14 shall be provided. A minimum one handicapped
space shall be provided.

15 (c) An "Employee Only" parking area shall be
16 provided. The location of the employee
parking area shall not be adjacent to the rear
(east) wall of the property.

17 (d) The location, size, dimension (width/depth),
18 proposed use, and number of all parking spaces
shall be clearly defined on the plan.

19 17. All easements for sewer lines, sewer manholes
20 and water mains shall be maintained, subject to the approval
of the Public Services Department.

21 18. All structures (new/additions) shall maintain
22 a minimum 10-foot horizontal clearance from any sewer main or
sewer main hole.

23 19. All structures (new/additions) shall maintain
24 a minimum 5-foot horizontal clearance from any water main.

25 20. The business and/or property owner shall
26 provide easement agreements to all City water mains on site
where now are not existing, subject to the provisions above
and/or the approval of the Director of Public Services.

27 21. Vehicle access, minimum 15 feet wide, shall be
28 provided to all sewer mains, sewer manholes, water mains, and
valves for purposes of maintenance and repair.

29 22. A comprehensive sign program shall be
30 submitted and approved prior to any new signs being installed
or existing signs altered or replaced on the property. The
31 program shall provide the following, at minimum:

32 (a) Location, size, height, illumination
characteristics, color, and design of all
signs, new or existing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

(b) All signs shall conform to Code with the exception of the existing signs granted pursuant to the approved Sign Appeal.

23. All refuse bins shall be fully screened on all four (4) sides with a minimum six (6) foot high enclosure. Refuse bins shall not be located adjacent to the rear property line.

24. All painting will be conducted within the confines of an enclosed building as prescribed by local ordinances.

25. All body and fender repair will be conducted not less than 190 feet from the property line of the nearest residence.

26. There will be no new opening on the east side of the building with the exception of an air intake and a pedestrian door having an automatic closer.

27. The filters on the paint spray booth must be changed and maintained as prescribed by the manufacturer and a record of the filter changes shall be maintained and submitted at the time of review.

28. The Conditional Use Permit shall be reviewed every six months for the first year commencing from the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy and annually thereafter.

SECTION 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

SECTION 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be entered in the book of original resolutions of said City; shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the City Council of said City in the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and adopted; and shall forward a certified copy of this resolution to the Director of Community Development and the applicant for their information and files.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 5th day of
May, 1987.

Ayes: Archuletta, Holmes, Sieber and Mayor Dennis
Noes: Dougharty
Absent: None
Abstain: None

/s/ Jan Dennis
Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach,
California

ATTEST:

/s/ John Allan Lacey
City Clerk



Certified to be a true copy
of the original of said
document on file in my
office.

John Allan Lacey
City Clerk of the City of
Manhattan Beach, California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

RESOLUTION NO. 4848

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE
DECISION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MADE IN ITS
RESOLUTION NO. 91-19, AS MODIFIED, AND
APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT
TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF AN ADDITION
TO THE SERVICE/PARTS DIVISION
OF AN EXISTING AUTOMOBILE DEALERSHIP
ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1500 SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD
IN SAID CITY (CMC ARCHITECTS, INC./MANHATTAN TOYOTA)

WHEREAS, there was filed with the Planning Commission of
the City of Manhattan Beach, California, an application by CMC
Architects, Inc. for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment, for
property legally described as Lot 7, Section 19, formerly of
the Redondo Beach Land Co. RF140, located at 1500 Sepulveda
Boulevard, pursuant to the provisions of the Manhattan Beach
Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, after duly processing said application and
holding a public hearing thereon, the Planning Commission
adopted its Resolution No. 91-19 (which is on file in the
office of the Secretary of said Commission in the City Hall of
said City, open to public inspection and hereby referred to in
its entirety and by this reference incorporated herein and made
part hereof), on August 14, 1991, approving the Conditional
Use Permit Amendment; and

WHEREAS, within the time period allowed by law, on
September 3, 1991, the decision of the Planning Commission was
appealed by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Council of said City pursuant to the
provisions of the Municipal Code held a public hearing on
October 1, 1991, receiving and filing all written documents
and hearing oral argument for and against; thereafter on said
October 1, 1991, the Council sustained the decision of said
Commission and granted approval for said Conditional Use
Permit Amendment, as modified by additional conditions;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DECLARE,
FIND, DETERMINE, AND ORDER AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. That the City Council does hereby make the
following findings:

1. The applicant is requesting an amendment to existing
Conditional Use Permit approvals, Resolutions Nos. 345, 4398,
PC 88-4, and 4760 which govern the uses on this site.

2. The applicant requests authorization to construct a
5,475 square foot addition to an existing vehicle service
building located on a site containing 49,358 square feet of
existing vehicle sales/service floor area.

3. The property is located in Area District II and is
zoned CG, General Commercial, as are the surrounding proper-
ties, which are zoned RS, Single Family Residential.

4. A Categorical Exemption was filed in compliance with
all respects with CEQA and the City of Manhattan Beach CEQA
Guidelines.

5. The proposed use is permitted in the CG zone and is
in compliance with the City's General Plan designation of
General Commercial.

6. No expansion or modification to the existing parts
and vehicle repair areas or hours of operation is proposed with
the application.

7. The project's proposed parking meets the minimum
requirement of 227 parking spaces.

8. The project proposes additional site landscaping,
however, the site is presently nonconforming with respect to
landscaping and is not required to be brought into full
conformance with the 8% requirement as a result of this
project.

9. The project is not anticipated to have a negative
impact on the surrounding area due to its small size relative
to the existing site facilities and operations, its proposed
low intensity/accessory type of use as parts storage and office
area, its central location on the site, and the existing
conditions of approval that regulate the site's use.

SECTION 2. The City Council does hereby approve the
Conditional Use Permit Amendment for the subject property for
the purposes as set forth in Section 1 of this resolution,
subject to conditions enumerated below:

1 1. All conditions contained within Resolution Nos. 345,
2 4398, PC 88-4 and 4760 shall remain in effect and receive full
3 compliance.

4 2. The building floor area authorized by this approval
5 shall be used as vehicle parts storage and office uses, and
6 shall not be used directly for vehicle repairs or painting.

7 3. All utilities serving the new facilities, including
8 but not limited to, electric, telephone, and cable television
9 shall be underground to the nearest power service, subject to
10 the approval of the City and all appropriate utility companies.

11 4. The applicant shall secure permits for all new signs
12 and alterations to existing signs. All new or altered signs
13 shall be in compliance with the City's Sign Ordinance.

14 5. A detailed parking plan shall be submitted to the
15 Community Development Department indicating consistency with
16 the approved Use Permit plan and compliance with the applicable
17 Municipal Code requirements. All required parking spaces shall
18 have striping, wheel stops, and independent access (non-
19 tandem).

20 6. A detailed site landscaping plan (consistent with the
21 approved Use Permit plan) utilizing drought tolerant native
22 plants shall be submitted for review and approval concurrent
23 with the Building Permit application. All plants shall be
24 identified on the plan by the Latin and common names. The
25 current edition of the Sunset Western Garden Book contains a
26 list and description of drought tolerant plants suitable for
27 this area.

28 The landscaping plan shall indicate the installa-
29 tion, (and subsequent replacement if necessary) of 24-inch box
30 size drought tolerant trees at locations 30 feet on-center
31 along the rear property line where not already existing.

32 A "water efficient" irrigation system shall be
installed in landscaped areas. Details of the irrigation
system shall be noted on the landscaping plans. The type and
design shall be subject to the approval of the Departments of
Public Works and Community Development.

The actual site conditions shall adequately reflect
the approved landscaping plan, and verification shall occur
prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy which may
require on-site assistance of the landscape designer.

7. The site area located between the rear wall perimeter
and the rear property line shall receive weeding and other
landscape maintenance, as necessary, at least once every 90
days.

8. A minimum 8-foot tall fence or wall shall be con-
structed along the site's southerly property line between the
rear property line and rear perimeter wall.

9. A letter from the applicant/owner shall be submitted
for the files of the Community Development and Police Depart-
ments stating the name and business phone number of the person
responsible for addressing neighbor concerns with specific

1 operations disturbances. An additional letter shall be
2 submitted each time said name or phone number changes which
3 shall include a "carbon copy" mailing list of neighbors that
4 have previously contacted said person and received the same
5 letter.

6 10. Compliance with all conditions of approval shall be
7 verified annually.

8 11. This Use Permit shall lapse one year after its date
9 of approval unless implemented or renewed as specified by
10 Section 10.84.090 of the Municipal Code.

11 12. The applicant shall submit a check, made payable to
12 the L.A. County Clerk, to the Community Development Department
13 for filing of the project's Categorical Exemption in compliance
14 with CEQA.

15 SECTION 3. This resolution shall take effect immedi-
16 ately.

17 SECTION 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage
18 and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be
19 entered among the original resolutions of said City; and shall
20 make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the
21 records of the proceedings of the City Council of said City in
22 the minutes of the meeting at which the same is passed and
23 adopted.

24 PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 1st day of October,
25 1991.

26 Ayes: Barnes, Collins, Sieber, and Mayor Holmes
27 Noes: Stern
28 Absent: None
29 Abstain: None

30 ATTEST: /s/ C. R. Holmes
31 Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach,
32 California

33 /s/ Timothy J. Lilligren
34 City Clerk

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000



RESOLUTION NO. PC 04-20

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF
MANHATTAN BEACH APPROVING A SIGN EXCEPTION FOR THE
PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1500 SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD (Image
Point)**

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH DOES
HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:**

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby makes the following findings:

- A. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, on December 8, 2004, received testimony, and considered an application for a sign exception for an existing vehicle sales facility on the property located at 1500 & 1510 Sepulveda Boulevard in the City of Manhattan Beach.
- B. The Assessors Parcel Number for the property is 4166-023-019.
- C. The applicant for the subject project is Image Point, sign contractor for Lincoln Mercury. The owner of the property is William J. Adkins.
- D. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Manhattan Beach CEQA Guidelines, the subject project has been determined to be exempt (Class 1) as minor modifications to an existing facility per Section 15301 of CEQA.
- E. The project will not individually nor cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.
- F. The property is located within Area District II and is zoned CG, Commercial General. The surrounding private land uses consist primarily of commercial uses, with single-family residences beyond.
- G. The General Plan designation for the property is General Commercial.
- H. Approval of the sign exception, subject to the conditions below: will not be detrimental to, nor adversely impact, the neighborhood or district in which the property is located since similar signs have existed on-site previously and exist at similar nearby location; is necessary for reasonable use of the subject property as a vehicle sales facility since such use is more pole sign oriented than typical commercial uses, and is consistent with the intent of City's sign code in that the subject site is larger than it anticipates; as detailed in the project staff report.
- I. The project shall otherwise be in compliance with applicable provisions of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code.
- J. This Resolution, upon its effectiveness, constitutes the Sign Exception approval for the subject project.

Section 2. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby **APPROVES** the subject Sign Exception for a second pole sign and sign area exceeding the permitted amount, subject to the following conditions (*indicates a site specific condition):

Site Preparation / Construction

1. * The project shall be constructed and operated in substantial compliance with the submitted plans as approved by the Planning Commission on December 8, 2004, except that the existing site pole sign (Toyota) shall be relocated to the southerly portion of the site prior to December 8, 2005. The Community Development Director shall have administrative authority to issue a sign permit for a relocated pole sign of 18 feet in height above parking

RESOLUTION NO. PC 04-20

lot grade with an appropriately proportional cabinet size.

2. * Total primary site sign area shall not exceed 1,232 square feet, including pole sign area being counted twice as specified by the sign code.
3. All wires and cables shall be installed within related structures or underground to the appropriate utility connections in compliance with all applicable Building and Electrical Codes, safety regulations, and orders, rules of the Public Utilities Commission, the serving utility company, and specifications of the Public Works Department.
4. The siting of construction related equipment (cranes, materials, etc.) shall be subject to the approval from the Director of Community Development prior to the issuance of any building permits.
5. * Planting shall be installed at the base of each pole sign on the site of minimum areas equal to the sign cabinet area of each sign. A landscaping plan shall be submitted for review and approval concurrent with sign permit application.
6. A low pressure or drip irrigation system shall be installed in the landscaped areas, which shall not cause any surface run-off. Details of the irrigation system shall be noted on the landscaping plans. The type and design shall be subject to the approval of the Public Works and Community Development Departments.
7. Backflow prevention valves shall be installed as required by the Department of Public Works, and the locations of any such valves or similar devices shall be subject to approval by the Community Development Department prior to issuance of building permits.
8. * The project shall maintain compliance with the city's storm water pollution requirements.
9. No waste water shall be permitted to be discharged from the premises. Waste water shall be discharged into the sanitary sewer system.
10. All defective or damaged curb, gutter, street paving, and sidewalk improvements shall be removed and replaced with standard improvements, subject to the approval of the Public Works Department.
11. This Sign Exception shall lapse two years after its date of approval, unless implemented or extended by the Planning Commission.
12. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21089(b) and Fish and Game Code section 711.4(c), the project is not operative, vested or final until the required filing fees are paid.
13. The applicant agrees, as a condition of approval of this project, to pay for all reasonable legal and expert fees and expenses of the City of Manhattan Beach, in defending any legal actions associated with the approval of this project brought against the City. In the event such a legal action is filed against the project, the City shall estimate its expenses for the litigation. Applicant shall deposit said amount with the City or enter into an agreement with the City to pay such expenses as they become due.

SECTION 3. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65009 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul this decision, or concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done or made prior to such decision or to determine the reasonableness, legality or validity of any condition attached to this decision shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days of the date of this resolution and the City Council is served within 120 days of the date of this resolution. The City Clerk shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the

RESOLUTION NO. PC 04-20

applicant, and if any, the appellant at the address of said person set forth in the record of the proceedings and such mailing shall constitute the notice required by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6.


I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the Resolution as adopted by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of December 8, 2004 and that said Resolution was adopted by the following vote:


**AYES: O'Connor, Simon,
Chairman Montgomery**

NOES: Kuch

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Savikas


RICHARD THOMPSON,
Secretary to the Planning Commission


Sarah Boeschlen,
Recording Secretary

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK