

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

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Marisa Lundstedt, Director of Community Development

BY: Nhung Madrid, Senior Management Analyst
Laurie B. Jester, Planning Manager

DATE: May 11, 2016

SUBJECT: Continuation of Draft Downtown Specific Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **ACCEPT THE PRESENTION AND DISCUSS.**

BACKGROUND:

Since June 2014, the community has been engaged in an ongoing discussion of the future of Downtown. In early 2015, the City collaborated with the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to conduct a week-long visioning charrette to engage community stakeholders and evaluate the Downtown area. The recommendations from ULI's evaluation were presented to the community in a public presentation with the premise that a consultant would develop the implementation tool designed to carry out the vision and recommendations for the Downtown. In May 2015, the City began pursuing the preparation of the Downtown Specific Plan with Michael Baker International (MBI), which has brought together the community with input from various stakeholders including residents, businesses, land owners, community groups and several other interests in the City.

In addition to ULI's week-long visioning charrette and 123 stakeholder interviews, the City has held eleven workshops and public meetings representing over 50 hours of community outreach. In addition, staff has invested nearly 40 hours conducting one-on-one intercept surveys throughout the City to hear direct feedback from the community. The Plan outreach efforts also included the use of Open City Hall, where staff received over 170 survey responses, all which have been reviewed and considered in the Draft Plan.

Since the public release of the Draft Specific Plan in mid-March, the City has held two informational meetings and two community workshops and provided a high level overview of the key elements of the Draft Plan and collected the community's input on the document. The comments received through these four outreach meetings, general public comment provided via email, and the discussion that took place at Specific Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #4 were synthesized and organized into the Specific Plan's five primary topic areas: vision, private development, public improvements, parking, and economic development. Within the individual topic areas, input was further grouped by concept. Each concept was tabulated based upon the

number of comments received. The key concepts that received the most mentions were then organized into two categories: “Community Consensus Items” and “Items Requiring City Council Direction”.

On April 12th, the City held a Joint City Council/Planning Commission Study Session to review the Plan’s “Community Consensus Items” and “Items Requiring City Council Direction”. The goal of the Joint City Council/Planning Commission Study Session was for staff to receive initial feedback from the Planning Commission and initial direction from the City Council on these key concepts; and staff was given sufficient feedback and direction to move forward. A follow-up City Council meeting was held on April 18th to further refine City Council’s recommendations and direction on the Draft Specific Plan.

DISCUSSION:

At the Planning Commission meeting on April 27th, an update on the outcome of the April 18th City Council Meeting was presented to the Commission, which included a summary of Consensus Items and Items Requiring Further Direction. Overall, the City Council supported and approved staff’s recommendation to revise and/or retain Consensus Items related to vision, land use and private development, and public improvements in the next iteration of the Plan. For detailed information about these Consensus Items, please refer to Attachment A.

For the Items Requiring Further Direction, the Commission discussed six key concepts related to land use and private realm development standards. The key concepts included:

- Building Height/Stories
- Maximum Tenant Frontage
- Retail Square Footage
- Ground Floor Retail Uses
- Façade Transparency
- Setbacks & Stepbacks

The discussion allowed the Commission to ask clarifying questions, request additional information and/or to explore potential options for the various key concepts. Attachment B provides a summary table of the discussion surrounding those six key concepts mentioned above.

In addition, there was consensus from the Commission for staff to return at a later date to allow for further discussion of the remaining contents of the Draft Plan. At this time, staff is seeking guidance and input from the Commission on potential questions and/or follow-up items that Planning Commission would like staff to explore in preparation for when this item returns to the Commission for the Public Hearing in June.

CONCLUSION:

The consultant team is in the process of preparing the Draft Public Hearing Downtown Specific Plan and Environmental Review document for the 30-day public review period. The Planning Commission Public Hearing is tentatively scheduled for June 22nd or June 29th with final adoption by City Council in July. The Public Draft Downtown Specific Plan - March 2016 was previously distributed to the Planning Commission and public copies are available for viewing at

the Manhattan Beach Library, Manhattan Beach Police Department, and the City Hall Community Development Public Counter.

Attachment A: April 27, 2016- Planning Commission Staff Report and attachments

Attachment B: April 27, 2016- Summary Table of Planning Commission Discussion on “Items Requiring Further Direction”

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

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

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Marisa Lundstedt, Director of Community Development

BY: Nhung Madrid, Senior Management Analyst
Laurie B. Jester, Planning Manager

DATE: April 27, 2016

SUBJECT: Draft Downtown Specific Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission **ACCEPT THE PRESENTION AND DISCUSS.**

BACKGROUND:

Since June 2014, the community has been engaged in an ongoing discussion of the future of Downtown. In early 2015, the City collaborated with the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to conduct a week-long visioning charrette to engage community stakeholders and evaluate the Downtown area. The recommendations from ULI's evaluation were presented to the community in a public presentation with the premise that a consultant would develop the implementation tool designed to carry out the vision and recommendations for the Downtown. In May 2015, the City began pursuing the preparation of the Downtown Specific Plan with Michael Baker International (MBI), which has brought together the community with input from various stakeholders including residents, businesses, land owners, community groups and several other interests in the City.

In addition to ULI's week-long visioning charrette and 123 stakeholder interviews, the City has held ten workshops and public meetings representing over 40 hours of community outreach. In addition, staff has invested nearly 40 hours conducting one-on-one intercept surveys throughout the City to hear direct feedback from the community. The Plan outreach efforts also included the use of Open City Hall, where staff received over 170 survey responses, all which have been reviewed and considered in the Draft Plan.

DISCUSSION:

Since the public release of the Draft Specific Plan in mid-March, the City has held two informational meetings and two community workshops and provided a high level overview of the key elements of the Draft Plan and collected the community's input on the document. The comments received through these four outreach meetings, general public comment provided via email, and the discussion that took place at Specific Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #4 were synthesized and organized into the Specific Plan's five primary topic areas: vision, private development, public improvements, parking, and economic development. Within the individual

**ATTACHMENT A
PC MTG 5-11-16**

topic areas, input was further grouped by concept. Each concept was tabulated based upon the number of comments received. The key concepts that received the most mentions were then organized into two categories: “Community Consensus Items” and “Items Requiring City Council Direction”.

On April 12th, the City held a Joint City Council/Planning Commission Study Session to review the Plan’s “Community Consensus Items” and “Items Requiring City Council Direction”. The goal of the Joint City Council/Planning Commission Study Session was for staff to receive initial feedback from the Planning Commission and initial direction from the City Council on these key concepts; and staff was given sufficient feedback and direction to move forward. A follow-up Special City Council meeting was held on April 18th to further refine City Council’s recommendations and direction on the Draft Specific Plan. This report is intended to provide an update on the outcome of the April 18th City Council Meeting.

The Community Consensus Items were determined based on the community’s input received following the release of the Draft Plan. Overall, there was community consensus that the Plan should have more emphasis on residents, but to balance that emphasis of the residents’ needs and the role of visitors to sustain economic vitality. There was also consensus to revise specific language in Vision Goal 4 to “Encourage the retention of existing small businesses”. For Land Use and Private Development Standards sections of the Plan, there was consensus to retain the Downtown’s small scale and massing as well as encouraging outdoor dining within the private realm. And lastly, consensus of Public Improvements include enhancing bicycle parking, public art, landscaping, beautification, no new traffic signals, and the installation of discreet wayfinding signage which would all compliment Downtown’s small town character.

Overall, the City Council supports and approves staff’s recommendation to revise and/or retain those items mentioned above related to vision, land use and private development, and public improvements in the next iteration of the Plan. Staff will work with the Consultant Team to revise and/or retain the items discussed above, and will modify the Final Draft Plan accordingly.

Key Concepts- Consensus items and Items Requiring Further Discussion

For details about each of the key concepts discussed below, please refer to Attachment A. The staff report in its entirety for the April 18th meeting, which is the same as the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting, can be found on the City’s website listed under the April 12, 2016 Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting.

Consensus Items

The City Council’s recommendation for items within this category were specific, and are as follows:

Vision

- All in favor of the 1996 Vision statement from the Downtown Strategic Action Plan with minor modifications and acknowledge visitors.

“Maintain Downtown Manhattan Beach as a safe, attractive, pedestrian-friendly village with a small town atmosphere and sound economy which sustains uses, activities, and

family and cultural events primarily oriented towards the local Manhattan Beach Community.”

Use Permit Process

- Support for Option #2: “Develop more additional findings to support the vision and goals of the Specific Plan.”
- Delete all of section 4.4B because it relates to Formula Uses.
- Add finding to 4.4A: Maintain and enhance residential quality of life for Manhattan Beach community.

Towers and Turrets at Corners

- Support for Option #1, “Do not allow towers/turrets to exceed the height limit.”

Land Use Changes

- Agree with Plan Proposal “Add live/work use; make animal boarding, animal hospital, service stations and vehicle equipment repair unpermitted uses downtown” except allow for Veterinary/Animal Hospital with overnight animal boarding associated with veterinary services.

Private Dining in Public Right of Way**

- Support study of Draft Plan Proposal: Provide outdoor dining in public right-of-way in furniture zone.
- Evaluate current sidewalk dining regulations and enforcement.

Maintain or Increase Parking

- Combine Options 2: “Maintain existing parking supply, and replace any lost spaces” and Option 3: “Manage existing parking demand through various parking strategies” with direction to explore parking options outside of the DTSP in the near future.

Beachhead Site**

- Support of study of Beachhead for circulation and agreed on no terraced seating.

Pedestrian Plazas **

- Support for review of pedestrian plazas and exclude mid-block crossings.

Drop Off Zones

- Support for Option 2: Construct multi-use drop-off zones at locations where no net loss of parking and where there would not be parking and traffic impacts.

Eliminate Chapter 9, Economic Development

- Eliminate Chapter 9.
- Chapter 9 will be used by the City Manager’s Office in the EDAC formation.

Items Requiring Further Discussion

Several of the following key concepts mirror the intent of the moratorium, and staff is seeking further discussion on these items:

Ground Floor Retail Uses

- General support for Plan Proposal: “Banks, offices, catering services adjacent to a sidewalk or pedestrian area requires a Use Permit; allowed on upper levels without a Use Permit. Communication facilities only allowed on upper levels with a Use Permit,” with better definition of use permits findings and enforcement.
- Need more information regarding communication facilities.

Retail Square Footage Cap or Formula use Regulations

- Conceptually in favor of 1600 sq. ft. cap for retail without a Use Permit. Request for examples.
- Plan will not include any formula use regulations.
- Delete Section 4.4B since these are formula use findings
- No other uses are subject to this square footage cap regulation.

Building Height/Stories**

- General support for Option 2: Limit height in commercial areas to two-stories, 26 feet (Area B); however, expand exceptions to the height limit to exclude mechanicals, solar and pitched roofs. The exceptions referenced above shall not exceed 28 feet.

Maximum Tenant Frontage

- General support for 35’ maximum tenant frontage for retail, and request for examples of 50’ building frontages for restaurants, and review options for primary streets.
- 35’ maximum tenant frontage for Manhattan Beach Blvd, and options for Manhattan Ave and Highland Ave. Planning Commission to evaluate options.

Facade Transparency

- General support for 70% façade transparency as presented in Draft Proposal, and request for examples showing less than 70% façade transparency.
- Provide options for non-primary street frontages (architectural details through Design Guidelines, materials, and active frontages).

Setbacks and Stepbacks

- General support for setbacks and stepbacks. Request to provide examples and guidelines.
- Stepbacks (second story) are optional.

**These items (as described above) are included for environmental review purposes. The decision on whether or not these items are included in the final specific plan will be determined by City Council.

While the City Council provided direction on all of the key concepts, the Council also requested proper vetting of the key concepts through the Planning Commission and requested input from the Commission on potential options for each concept. At this time, staff is seeking guidance and input from the Commission on potential questions and/or follow-up items that Planning

Commission would like staff to explore in preparation for when this item returns to the Planning Commission for the Public Hearing in June.

CONCLUSION:

Next steps include preparation of the Draft Public Hearing Downtown Specific Plan and Environmental Review document for the 30-day public review period. Staff anticipates returning to the Planning Commission on June 22nd or June 29th for a Public Hearing and adoption by City Council in July. The Public Draft Downtown Specific Plan- March 2016 was previously distributed to the Planning Commission and public copies are available for viewing at the Manhattan Beach Library, Manhattan Beach Police Department, and the City Hall Community Development Public Counter.

Attachment A: Attachments 1 & 2 Summary Sheets from April 12, 2016 Joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting

THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Vision: Role of Visitors - Relative to Businesses and Residents

Topic:

Role of Visitors: Relative to Businesses and Residents

Chapter:

Ch. 3 Vision

Draft Plan Proposal:

Revise Goals and definition to preserve small town character while ensuring continued economic vitality

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 9

Small town character, economic vitality, business retention



Benefits

- ◇ Provides consistency with the overall Vision and the Land Use Chapter of the Specific Plan
- ◇ Supports needs of residents while encouraging economic vitality
- ◇ Provides a balanced approach

Challenges

- ◇ The Plan should acknowledge that visitors and tourists support the Downtown economically
- ◇ The Downtown is located totally within the Coastal Zone and the State Coastal Commission supports visitors serving uses within the area

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Same as Advisory Committee
- ◇ Plan needs to be balanced, recognizing that residents and visitors support the Downtown economically, in that the ULI study states that visitors support 50% of the retail space and restaurants rely on visitors for nearly 75% of their patrons

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Economic vitality should be emphasized not economic development, so residents are not impacted
- ◇ Definition needs to emphasize the needs of the residents over the needs of tourists and visitors

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	-Goal 4 currently states: "Encourage economic development" -Definition of small town character, bullet 5 states: "Recognize the need of visitors and tourists to sustain local businesses."
Option 1	-Revise Goal 4 to state: "Encourage economic vitality" -Delete bullet 5 in the definition of small town character.
Option 2	Further revise Goals and definition of small town character
Option 3	No changes



Private Development: Use Permit Process

Topic:

Additional Use Permit Findings

Chapter:

Ch. 4 Land Use

Draft Plan Proposal:

Require additional Use Permit findings

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Small town character, economic vitality, mix of uses, sustainable design, compatible uses



Benefits

- ◇ All of the current four Use Permit findings would still be required to be met
 - Consistency with the Goals of the General Plan is an existing required finding
- ◇ Ensures that Use Permits are reviewed comprehensively
- ◇ Addresses the unique character and situation of the Specific Plan area
- ◇ Recognizes the need for additional review and

Challenges

- ◇ More detailed review and analysis by Planning staff and Planning Commission is required

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Same as Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Use Permits are not scrutinized thoroughly, are approved too frequently and are not an effective means of regulating businesses
- ◇ Use Permits are a good process to allow public input and for elected officials to make decisions

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	<p>Additional findings: “The proposed use will maintain a balanced mix of uses which serves the needs of both local and nonlocal populations.” “The granting of the use permit will not produce an incremental effect of similar uses that would be detrimental to the City.”</p>
Option 1	Revise proposed additional findings to emphasize serving residents
Option 2	Develop more additional findings to support the vision and goals of the Specific Plan
Option 3	Do not add additional Use Permit findings



Private Development: Corner Height

Topic:

Corner Height

Chapter:

Ch. 6 Private Realm Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

Allow Towers/Turrets on Corner Buildings to Exceed Height Limit by 6 Feet

Related Goals: Ch. 6

Distinctive architecture, eclectic building design, strong design identity



Benefits

- ◇ Draws attention to corner businesses
- ◇ Creates opportunity for distinctive architecture
- ◇ Encourage eclectic building styles and design

Challenges

- ◇ Block views and sunlight
- ◇ Larger scale buildings
- ◇ City code may require a city-wide election to allow a portion of a building to exceed the height limit (MBMC 10.60.050 D)

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Most respondents are opposed to allowing any building feature to exceed the height limit

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Most of the Advisory Committee opposed allowing any building feature to exceed the height limit
- ◇ The MB Commercial Property Owners Association likes the idea of allowing towers to exceed the height limit on corner buildings

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Allow towers/turrets to exceed the height limit by 6 feet on corner buildings
Option 1	Do not allow towers/turrets to exceed the height limit
Option 2	Only allow mechanical equipment to exceed height limit (will need screening)
Option 3	Allow and regulate what architectural features can exceed the height limit on corner buildings (dimensions of feature, non habitable, etc) and only allow on corner buildings on major intersections



Private Development: Land Use Changes

Topic:

Land Use Changes

Chapter:

Ch. 6 Private Realm Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

Add Live/Work Use; Make Animal Boarding, Animal Hospital, Service Stations, and Vehicle Equipment Repair Unpermitted Uses Downtown

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Encourage Pedestrian Oriented Uses, Mix and Compatibility of Uses, Encourage Uses Open on Weekends and Beyond 9am - 5pm for a More Active Street Life



Benefits

- ◇ Encourage pedestrian oriented uses
- ◇ Added uses would encourage a more active street life
- ◇ Some uses (automotive repair, service stations) have negative impacts on neighbors
- ◇ Live/work units encourage sustainable work
- ◇ No uses that are being eliminated currently exist downtown, thus preventing the creation of legal nonconforming uses

Challenges

- ◇ The prevention of some uses will force downtown residents to travel elsewhere for some services
- ◇ Some live/work uses, like light manufacturing, could have negative impacts on neighbors if not regulated properly

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Some pet-owning residents voiced concern that animal-related uses would be prohibited

Advisory Committee

- ◇ No comment

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Add live/work use; make animal boarding, animal hospital, service stations, and vehicle equipment repair unpermitted uses downtown
Option 1	Select which mix of uses would continue to be permitted and which will be unpermitted
Option 2	Leave uses permitted, do not create live/work use



Public Improvements: Private Dining

Topic:

Private Dining in Public Right-of-Way

Chapter:

Ch. 7 Public Realm

Draft Plan Proposal:

Provide outdoor private dining in public right-of-way in “Furniture Zone”

Related Goals: Ch. 7

Supports outdoor lifestyle, encourages social interaction, defines downtown “look”



Benefits

- ◇ Creates outdoor gathering space
- ◇ Helps define sense of “place”
- ◇ Highlights outdoor lifestyle
- ◇ Supports local business vitality
- ◇ Encourages longer stays in Downtown

Challenges

- ◇ Requires additional regulation and enforcement
- ◇ All business would not have same opportunity
- ◇ Increases overall maintenance
- ◇ Increases parking demand without adding new parking space requirement
- ◇ May block sidewalks if not regulated correctly

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Outdoor dining is supported if sidewalks are not blocked
- ◇ Outdoor nighttime activity may increase noise and trash
- ◇ Outdoor dining is part of small-town character
- ◇ Outdoor dining can be accommodated by private dining in setbacks or open-air private dining

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Some believe outdoor dining is not compatible with nearby residential uses

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Provide outdoor private dining in public right-of-way in “furniture zone”
Option 1	Provide outdoor private dining in public right-of-way at pedestrian plazas only
Option 2	Make no change to the existing Private Encroachment Policy on outdoor dining
Option 3	Prohibit new outdoor dining permits



Public Improvements: Maintain or Increase Parking

Topic:

Maintain or Increase Parking Supply

Chapter:

Ch. 5 Circulation Plan, Ch. 7 Public Realm

Draft Plan Proposal:

Increase parking supply with new underground parking

Related Goals: Ch. 5 & 7

Reduce parking shortage, parking options



Benefits

- ◇ Reduces overflow parking in neighborhoods
- ◇ Parking can be used for variety of users
- ◇ Potential revenue source for public/private partnership
- ◇ Parking at Downtown edges reduces street congestion and encourages window shopping
- ◇ Provides peak parking for special events

Challenges

- ◇ More parking may increase downtown activity
- ◇ New parking will not satisfy
- ◇ Coastal Commission public access requirements may restrict preferential parking uses.
- ◇ High construction costs
- ◇ Limited opportunity sites

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ No new parking or structures needed
- ◇ Specific Plan should focus on parking strategies rather than new parking
- ◇ New parking will never satisfy total demand
- ◇ Parking is a seasonal problem
- ◇ Need to reduce merchant parking in neighborhoods
- ◇ Insufficient resident parking within Downtown
- ◇ Parking as a first priority should be increased (survey result)

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Resident parking is needed
- ◇ Merchant parking is needed
- ◇ Explore all parking options including remote parking

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Increase parking supply with new underground parking
Option 1	Construct new underground parking for merchants and/or residents
Option 2	Maintain existing parking supply, and replace any lost spaces
Option 3	Manage existing parking demand through various parking strategies



Public Improvements: Beachhead Site

Topic:

Beachhead Design

Chapter:

Ch. 5 Circulation Plan, Ch. 7 Public Realm

Draft Plan Proposal:

Redesign with turnaround, drop-off, terraced seating

Related Goals: Ch. 5 & 7

Enhances walking, history, arts, alternate travel modes, creates social spaces



Benefits

- ◇ Provides better circulation at end of Manhattan Beach Boulevard
- ◇ Creates safer pedestrian paths
- ◇ Provides drop-off area to reduce congestion
- ◇ Helps define sense of “place”
- ◇ Creates area for seating, landscaping, bike parking, gateway treatments
- ◇ Opportunity site for public art
- ◇ Highlights active lifestyle (volleyball, biking, etc.)
- ◇ Encourages walking and biking

Challenges

- ◇ Drop-off zone may encourage more congestion at pier
- ◇ Artistic design may not appeal to all
- ◇ Could look cluttered if designed poorly
- ◇ Increases ongoing maintenance
- ◇ Loss of 4 parking spaces
- ◇ If a drop off is not provided, more loading will occur on Ocean Drive

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ General support for improved streetscapes and furnishings
- ◇ Support for treatments that encourage walking and biking
- ◇ Need more bike parking at beachhead
- ◇ Many opposed to any loss in street parking
- ◇ Many opposed to major change in appearance

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Drop offs should be located away from beachhead
- ◇ Some believe additional street activity is not compatible with nearby residential uses

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Redesign with turnaround, drop-off, and terraced seating
Option 1	Reconstruct end of street with turnaround only and no drop-off zone
Option 2	Upgrade Existing Streetscape only



Public Improvements: Pedestrian Plazas

Topic:
Pedestrian Plazas

Chapter:
Ch. 5 Circulation Plan, Ch. 7 Public Realm

Draft Plan Proposal:
Construct 2 midblock pedestrian plazas with crosswalks on Manhattan Beach Bl.

Related Goals: Ch. 5 & 7
Creates social spaces, encourages walking, safer crossings, reduces speed



Benefits

- ◇ Provides area for seating, landscaping, bike racks, art
- ◇ Removes obstructions from sidewalks
- ◇ Creates public gathering space
- ◇ Multi-functional loading area
- ◇ Supports multi-modal transportation
- ◇ Safer pedestrian crossing
- ◇ Reduces traffic speeds (Traffic Calming)
- ◇ Encourages walking and biking

Challenges

- ◇ Loss of 3-5 street spaces per curb extension
- ◇ Creates additional points of pedestrian conflict
- ◇ Traffic may back up through crosswalks due to nearby signals.
- ◇ Drivers may back out from diagonal parking into crosswalk

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ General support for improved streetscapes and furnishings without loss in parking
- ◇ Opposition on pop-outs that reduce street parking
- ◇ Additional public space not needed
- ◇ Blocks are already short enough-pedestrians can go to intersections
- ◇ Creates additional congestion at loading area
- ◇ May encourage more out-of-town visitors

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Committee supports enhanced corner plazas instead of mid-block plazas
- ◇ Crossings can be handled at intersections with exclusive pedestrian phasing
- ◇ Public seating should not be expanded
- ◇ Drop-offs will cause congestion
- ◇ Drop-offs are needed for variety of transportation services

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Construct 2 midblock pedestrian plazas with crosswalks on Manhattan Beach Bl.
Option 1	Construct midblock pedestrian plazas with alternate replacement parking
Option 2	Construct midblock pedestrian plazas without crosswalks
Option 3	Construct intersection pedestrian plazas by enhancing existing corner extensions
Option 4	Do not construct any pedestrian plazas



Public Improvements: Drop-Off Zones

Topic:

Drop-off Zones

Chapter:

Ch. 5 Circulation Plan, Ch. 7 Public Realm

Draft Plan Proposal:

Construct multi-use drop-off zones at key locations.

Related Goals: Ch. 5 & 7

Encourages walking, alternate travel modes, improves accessibility, reduces parking demand



Benefits

- ◇ Supports multi-modal transportation
- ◇ Reduces overall parking demand
- ◇ Encourages walking and biking
- ◇ Can be built into pedestrian plazas
- ◇ Can be built into enhanced crossings
- ◇ Improves accessibility for disabled persons
- ◇ Provides designated loading area for Uber, taxis, shuttles, valet, limo, etc.
- ◇ Reduces amount of double parking
- ◇ Reduces need to drive around for parking space

Challenges

- ◇ Loss of 1-2 street spaces per drop-off-zone
- ◇ Vehicles may queue into travel lanes waiting to use drop-off, increasing short-term congestion
- ◇ May require additional regulation/enforcement
- ◇ Adds new lane merging movement on street

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Provide treatments that encourage walking and biking
- ◇ Drop offs will help reduce parking demand
- ◇ Creates additional congestion at loading area

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Drop-offs will cause congestion
- ◇ Drop-offs are needed for variety of transportation services
- ◇ Regulation of drop off zones would be needed

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Construct multi-use drop-off zones at key locations
Option 1	Construct multi-use drop-off zones at locations except on Manhattan Beach Bl.
Option 2	Construct multi-use drop-off zones at locations where parking is not lost.
Option 3	Do not construct any drop-off zones.



Economic Development: Condense Chapter 8

Topic:

Condense Chapter and emphasize residents and business retention/vitality

Chapter:

Ch. 9 Economic Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

Revise Goals to focus on vision and condense Chapter

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4 & 9

Small town character, economic vitality, business retention



Benefits

- ◇ Provides consistency with the Vision of the Specific Plan
- ◇ Supports needs of residents while encouraging Economic Vitality
- ◇ The City's Economic Vitality Manager can assist in leading development of future strategies
- ◇ Provides a balanced approach

Challenges

- ◇ Economic Vitality strategies will need to be further developed in the future

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Same as Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Concerns that the Goals are focused too much on business expansion, development and growth
- ◇ Goals do not address the residents desires or needs for resident serving neighborhood uses
- ◇ Chapter needs to focus on business retention, particularly small local businesses
- ◇ Economic vitality should be emphasized while maintaining the small town atmosphere
- ◇ There should not be a focus on tourists
- ◇ Plan needs to be balanced, recognizing that residents and visitors support the Downtown economically

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Economic Development and Strategies Chapter title
Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rename Chapter: "Economic Vitality" - Revise Goals to only include two: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- "Promote resident serving uses" and 2- "Enhance and encourage business retention and economic vitality consistent with small town character" - Condense Chapter to include strategies within the Appendices
Option 2	Eliminate Chapter and incorporate new Goals within the Vision Chapter
Option 3	No changes



Ground Floor Retail Uses

Topic:

Ground Floor Retail Uses

Chapter:

Ch. 4 Land Use

Draft Plan Proposal:

Require a Use Permit for banks, offices, catering and communication facilities on the ground level streetfront

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, 6, & 9

Small town character, pedestrian access and orientation, activities along streetscape, strong sense of community, economic vitality



Benefits

- ◇ Noticed Planning Commission public hearing
- ◇ City Council is final decision maker
- ◇ The pedestrian-oriented environment is maintained and enhanced with active streetfront
- ◇ More active evening and weekend streetfronts
- ◇ Many office and bank services are provided on-line so service opportunities are still provided
- ◇ Non-active uses are allowed on the second floor, off alleys and with entrances only off of sidewalks

Challenges

- ◇ Use Permit process typically takes three to four months, more with appeals
- ◇ Use Permit cost is over \$8,000
- ◇ No guarantee applicant will get approval
- ◇ Some smaller local businesses may need to go through the Use Permit process

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Some non-active uses prefer ground floor locations, particularly real estate offices and banks
- ◇ Real estate offices are active uses
- ◇ There are too many non-active uses on the sidewalk level. They do not enhance the pedestrian environment and charm
- ◇ The proposed Use Permit requirement is a balanced and fair approach to reviewing individual business proposals.
- ◇ Use Permits are a good process to allow public input and for elected officials to make decisions
- ◇ A Use Permit is already required for any office over 2,500 square feet
- ◇ The Use Permit approval process is arbitrary and criteria is not defined

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Included in General comments

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Banks, Offices, Catering Services adjacent to a sidewalk or pedestrian area requires a Use Permit; allowed on upper levels without a Use Permit. Communication facilities only allowed on upper levels with a Use Permit
Option 1	Prohibit office/banks on streetfronts with an exception for small walk-up locations with a Use Permit
Option 2	Require a Use Permit for all banks, offices and catering services over 2,500 square feet, and all communication facilities
Option 3	No change to current regulations, only require a Use Permit for banks over 2,500 square feet



Private Development: Square Footage Cap

Topic:

Square Footage Cap for Different Land Uses and Use Permit Requirements

Chapter: Ch. 4 Land Use

Draft Plan Proposal:

Provide different square footage caps for Use Permits for different land uses

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Small town character, economic vitality, mix of uses, sustainable design, compatible uses



Benefits

- ◇ Requires public review process for all businesses (restaurants/alcohol) with potential impacts, all larger sized offices, and all other uses that are large or on large sites
- ◇ Limits “big box” retail
- ◇ Retail square footage caps (without a use permit) are a proposed alternative to Formula Use regulations
- ◇ Different square footage requirements could be tailored to different land uses for consistency with any approved maximum lot frontage regulation. With typical lot sizes of 100 feet deep by 30 feet wide, a 3,500 SF cap could be proposed instead of the current 5,000 SF cap

Challenges

- ◇ Non-conforming uses would be created as uses and properties currently without a Use Permit would now require a Use Permit
- ◇ New tenants, same use as a prior tenant, in an existing building would be required to go through a Use Permit process, costing several months and over \$8,000 with no guarantee. Currently only a building permit and business license required

Options

Options	
Draft Plan Proposal	Maintain current Use Permit and square footage caps
Option 1	Revise standards to require a Use Permit for all businesses (single or Multi-tenant) over 3,500 SF and properties with land area over 7,000 SF. Maintain requirements for Use Permits for all restaurants/alcohol and for offices over 2,500 square feet
Option 2	Develop other square footage cap standards
Option 3	Do not require additional Use Permit square footage cap standards

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Not discussed

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Not discussed



Private Development: Formula Uses

Topic:

Formula Use Regulations (size of retail shops)

Chapter:

Ch. 4 Land Use

Draft Plan Proposal:

Require a Use Permit for Formula Uses

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, 6, & 9

Small town character, scale and charm, economic vitality, mix and compatibility of uses, strong sense of community, business strengthening



Benefits

- ◇ Noticed Planning Commission public hearing
- ◇ City Council is final decision maker
- ◇ Additional specific findings required:
 - Merchandise or services offered meets a current unmet need
 - Business will enhance the destination quality of the Specific Plan Area
 - Interior / exterior compatible with existing scale architecture, pedestrian orientation, small town character and is an enhancement to the area
- ◇ A healthy blend, balance and diversity of businesses is encouraged
- ◇ Provides for a unique commercial identity, in order to proactively address an unwelcome character of sameness and monotony

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Other current Use Permit requirements already adequately address formula uses
- ◇ Same as Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Use Permits are not scrutinized thoroughly, are approved too frequently and are not an effective means of regulating businesses
- ◇ Use Permits are a good process to allow public input and for elected officials to make decisions

Challenges

- ◇ Use Permit process typically takes three to four months; more with appeals
- ◇ Use Permit cost is over \$8,000
- ◇ No guarantee of approval
- ◇ Some smaller local businesses may be defined as formula uses or grow into formula uses; costs and time could discourage these local businesses

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Use Permit required for all businesses (not limited to retail) with 11 or more locations nationwide that meet 2 or more standard features
Option 1	Add revised findings for consistency with the Plan vision and additional findings to require a balance and diversity of uses and economic vitality. Add additional Goal to support existing neighborhood serving uses
Option 2	Limit retail uses to 1,200 to 1,600 SF
Option 3	Allow existing formula uses to be replaced with other formula uses
Option 4	Allow a maximum of 30-40% of Specific Plan area as formula uses (ULI)
Option 5	No change; existing Use Permit regulations discourage formula uses



Building Height/Stories

Topic:

Building Height/Stories

Chapter:

Ch. 6 Private Realm Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

No Change in Max Height

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Small town character, tight urban form, pedestrian scale and massing



Benefits

- ◇ Small town character
- ◇ Lower profile buildings on a human scale
- ◇ Less intense building mass
- ◇ Pedestrian friendly buildings
- ◇ Enjoyment of more sunlight, ocean views, fresh air

Challenges

- ◇ City code may require a city-wide election to allow a change in the height limit and the method for determining max height (MBMC 10.60.050 D)
- ◇ An increase in the height limit, but not the two story limit, would create buildings that look like three story buildings even though the actual buildings might only be two stories at 30 feet high

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Almost all respondents are opposed to any increase in the height limit
- ◇ Some want to limit existing one story buildings to only one story

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Most of the Advisory Committee was against any increase in the height limit
- ◇ The MB Commercial Property Owners Association suggests increasing the height limit to 30 feet along MBB and Highland but keep the two story requirement, in addition to many other changes to height-related development standards such as roof pitch and roof decks

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	No change to the maximum height limit
Option 1	Explore the legality of changing the height requirements (in commercial areas) to increase the maximum allowable height in different parts of the downtown.
Option 2	Limit height in commercial areas to 26 feet; however, expand exceptions to the height limit to exclude mechanicals, solar and pitched roofs. The exceptions referenced above shall not exceed 30 feet in height.
Option 3	Decrease in maximum height and limit commercial areas to one story.



Maximum Frontage of 50 Feet

Topic:

Maximum Frontage of 50 feet

Chapter:

Ch. 6 Private Realm Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

Require a maximum of 50 linear feet of individual building frontage along a street

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Small town character, scale and charm, pedestrian orientation, activities along streetscape, sustainable design, compatible uses



Benefits

- ◇ Maintains the scale and rhythm of the lot patterns in the Specific Plan area, which typically range from 25 to 33 feet in width for a single lot
- ◇ Enhances the pedestrian-oriented environment
- ◇ Provides consistency with the proposed standard of requiring a Use Permit for any use over 3,500 SF, instead of 5,000 as currently required, This is also consistent with the typical maximum lot depth of 100 feet
- ◇ There may not be a need to regulate store frontage if the City creates regulations for maximum retail square footage (see Formula Use Regulations)

Challenges

- ◇ Currently there is no limit to the building frontage allowed along a street
- ◇ Non-conforming buildings would be created as currently there are a number of buildings with individual frontages along a street over 35 or 50 feet in width, typically 1 to 3 double and triple lots and buildings per block on each side of the block

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ The 50 foot maximum building frontage is too wide and not consistent with the small town character; 35 feet is more consistent with the vision.
- ◇ There are already several lots and building frontages over 35 and 50 feet in width, particularly along Manhattan Avenue and Highland Avenue

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Included in General Comments

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Require a maximum of 50 linear feet of individual building frontage along a street
Option 1	Require a maximum of 35 linear feet of individual building frontage along a street
Option 2	Do not require a maximum linear footage requirement



Private Development: Façade Transparency

Topic:

Façade Transparency

Chapter:

Ch. 6 Private Realm Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

Minimum Façade Transparency of 70%
Between 2.5 ft and 8 ft Above Ground Floor

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Small town character, pedestrian oriented buildings, active street life, economic vitality, business strengthening



Benefits

- ◇ Buildings become pedestrian oriented, activating the street
- ◇ Consistent with uses the plan is trying to encourage on the ground floor: retail, restaurant, personal service, etc.
- ◇ Gives businesses an opportunity to draw customers in with attractive window displays
- ◇ Many buildings already comply with this requirement, making the new standard less of a burden for landlords and tenants

Challenges

- ◇ Some existing facades may become nonconforming

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Discussion topic did not generate much public comment for or against

Advisory Committee

- ◇ No comment

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Minimum façade transparency of 70% between 2.5ft and 8ft above ground floor
Option 1	Remove any requirement for minimum façade transparency
Option 2	Reduce the requirement for minimum façade transparency below 70%



Setbacks & Stepbacks

Topic:

Setbacks and Stepbacks

Chapter:

Ch. 6 Private Realm Development

Draft Plan Proposal:

Create Maximum Front, Rear, Sideyard, and Street Sideyard Setbacks; Optional Second Story Stepbacks

Related Goals: Ch. 3, 4, & 6

Small town character, tight urban form, pedestrian scale and massing



Benefits

- ◇ Maximum Setbacks, when applied to large sites (Skechers, Vons, etc), encourage pedestrian oriented, village-like architecture that is closer to the street
- ◇ Maximum setbacks prevent buildings from being too far away from the street and thus avoid the creation of empty areas
- ◇ Optional second story stepbacks help reduce visual bulk of buildings
- ◇ Optional second story stepbacks are not required, and thus give flexibility to architects and property

Challenges

- ◇ Maximum setbacks potentially create nonconforming buildings that will make major remodels more difficult
- ◇ Optional second story stepbacks create second story decks that when occupied by outdoor dining could create noise and other negative impacts to residences that would need to be addressed during the restaurant's use permit public hearing process

Public Input

General Comments

- ◇ Limited feedback on maximum setbacks
- ◇ Some are concerned that optional second story stepbacks would create opportunities for second story outdoor dining that would create negative impacts on residences
- ◇ Some feel second story decks are not aligned with small town character

Advisory Committee

- ◇ Some advisory committee members expressed concern about second story decks and their impacts on neighbors and pedestrians

Options

Draft Plan Proposal	Create Maximum Front, Rear, Sideyard, and Street Sideyard Setbacks; Optional Second Story Stepbacks
Option 1	Require minimum 6 ft second story stepback (instead of being optional). In addition to the findings required by State law and the Municipal Code (e.g., compatibility with surrounding uses), findings must also be made that any restaurant use proposed on a second floor is consistent with the Specific Plan and it's vision and such restaurant use will enhance the Downtown area
Option 2	Change maximum setbacks and optional second story setbacks
Option 3	Remove maximum setbacks and optional second story setbacks from plan



THIS PAGE
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Attachment B:
Summary Table of Planning Commission Discussion on "Items Requiring Further Direction"

	Hersman	Bordokas	Apostol	Conaway	Ortmann	Consensus	Follow-Up Items
Building Height/ Stories	Why is Metlox 30'?		Initially agreed pitched roofs should be exempt but then agreed with Conaway. If it is just height for Downtown, supports keeping the height limit at 26'. If all offices are on the second floor, which requires elevators, we need to consider how that potentially impacts height limits.	No exceptions for mechanical or pitched roofs. Potential exception for elevator due to mechanical equipment to help architects deal with ADA. Mechanical equipment can be very big and with screening on top, the roofline has effectively been raised. Good architects love a challenge, height limit works. If we allow for exceptions, should specify size/dimensions of allowed mechanicals, how far back they need to be placed.		No exceptions for mechanical or pitched roofs. Potential exception for elevator due to mechanical equipment to help architects deal with ADA. If we allow for exceptions, staff should specify size/dimensions of allowed mechanicals, and how far back they need to be placed.	
Maximum Tenant Frontage					If it is not a current regulation, is there a problem?		Request for analysis of lots and square footage cap and how it relates to maximum frontage.
Retail Square Footage	Does square footage number include storage, restrooms, etc. or just retail space? On Manhattan Ave and Highland Ave frontages...it affects the square footage store size.		Request for "ratio analysis" (A store that is 30 feet wide shouldn't be more than 90 feet long) Supports square footage and frontage limits but not if they are just arbitrary numbers (formula or ratio analysis, general retail rule of thumb, square footage cap and frontage done together)	The 1,600 number seems arbitrary. Wants an "evidenced based number". Max square footage should take into consideration lot size. We don't want to lock in small units and we want a mix of store sizes. Wants to apply square footage cap to actual lots and see how they work.	Needs a number grounded in data. How sustainable are businesses if they are that small? Need to provide opportunities for businesses to be successful.		There is a relationship between width, depth, square footage and ratio formula.
Ground Floor Retail Uses		What happens when an office leaves a ground floor? Is it grandfathered in? Does it automatically become retail? If an office leaves, does office leave forever? Landlords with ground floor offices are "winning the lottery" as they have special privileges and could raise the rents. Is our goal to have zero office on ground floor? Do we want all retail on ground floor?	What happens when a new tenant moves into a nonconforming use? Can a ground floor office tenant be immediately replaced by another ground floor office tenant without a use permit? Is there clarification between different office uses? Should have goal of a certain percentage of office for Downtown.	How do different scenarios play out when a nonconforming use on the ground floor becomes vacant? Clarify how to handle change of tenant but same use. There are several double and triple lots. How do we address owners with multiple lots?	Comment: Specify how staff/MBI came up with recommendations. Explain if staff has already considered certain options (percentage discussion).		Educate-Respond to various questions. Follow-up on percentage cap for El Segundo.
Façade Transparency	Alley vs. Street: Should be treated differently. Can we discourage big white walls (MB Creamery) through design guidelines.	Grandfathering nonconforming transparency? How would that work?	Need some flexibility for requiring transparency for buildings, especially older buildings, that would be very burdensome because of structural reasons. Don't want to force a landlord to tear down half a building in order to install a window. There should be structural alternatives (Hersman agreed)	Need more specificity on regulations for corner lots.	Why 70%? Provide nuance of some uses/locations do not need	All agreed that frontages need to be defined (alley vs. street, primary vs. secondary street) and that there should be more specificity for regulations on corners.	Why was 70% façade transparency proposed?
Setbacks & Stepbacks	Why is there such a fear of 2nd floor dining? Request for detailed CUP findings and specificity in findings.	Stepbacks limit architecture. If someone wants their second story to be setback 1 foot they couldn't do it because there is a 6 foot minimum. Going to create too much uniformity. Understands concern with noise associated with dining on 2nd floor.	Remove stepback as optional and leave up to designer. In favor of outdoor dining but as long as it doesn't impede pedestrians or ADA.	The "option" makes him think there should be a trade-off (carrot) if the developer follows the stepback requirement. There doesn't seem to be a trade-off. Provide measurements for more first floor setbacks.		Remove stepback language. If it is optional, then it is not needed. All commissioners loved outdoor dining.	Request for detailed CUP findings and specificity in findings for outdoor dining.