

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 26, 2017**

(DRAFT)

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 26th day of April, 2017, at the hour of 6:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Conaway, Ortmann, Chairperson Apostol
Absent: Bordokas
Staff Present: Anne McIntosh, Interim Director of Community Development
Stephanie Katsouleas, Public Works Director
Prem Kumar, City Engineer
Erik Zandvliet, City Traffic Engineer
Mark Leyman, Parks and Recreation Director
Rosemary Lackow, Recording Secretary

2. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (3-minute limit) – None

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

04/26/17-1. Regular meeting – March 29, 2017

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Conaway/Ortmann) to **APPROVE** the minutes of March 29, 2017 subject to the following change.

Pg. 5, second paragraph, second line: after “decide” add a comma and strike “whether” , and then after the w “regardless” strike “as to” and replace with “of” to read:
.....where the Commission needs to decide, regardless of who the applicant is,...

Roll Call:

AYES: Conaway, Vice-Chair Ortmann,
NOES: None
ABSENT: Bordokas
ABSTAIN: Chairperson Apostol

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

03/29/17-2. Determination of Consistency of the New Proposed Projects in the FY 2017-18 Through FY 2021-22 Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan with Manhattan Beach General Plan

Chair Apostol invited Public Works Director Stephanie Katsouleas to make a presentation regarding the 2017-18 Five-Year CIP. Upon introducing herself, Public Works Director Katsouleas explained that historically the Commission has been asked to review the CIP for only projects being funded in the next budget but this year, the planning review applies to all of the projects that are within a five-year CIP period from FY 17/18 to FY 21/22.

City Engineer Prem Kumar proceeded with a slide presentation covering: the creation of the CIP, its funding sources, the timeline for adoption (to be in effect July 1), the role of the Planning Commission, and the General Plan consistency proposed findings. He emphasized that this Plan is a financial planning

tool and is based on goals, priorities and needs that have been identified in some way. Broad categories of projects include: core (recurring); one-time only; initiatives and studies and emergency projects. The types of projects fall into the categories of streets, water, wastewater, storm water, studies and evaluations, parks, buildings, and other miscellaneous right-of-way projects. Although this is a five-year plan, funding is to be appropriated only for the next budget year and the CIP is revised annually.

City Engineer Kumar addressed Attachment B to the staff report, which he emphasized is a list of only new capital projects that the Commission has not seen before and are being proposed in the five-year plan. He noted that the entire listing of all projects in the CIP including existing CIP is available on the City's website. Mr. Kumar explained the eight funding sources from FY 2017/18 to FY 21/22 (including unfunded projects) and then walked the Commission through the entire list of projects on Attachment B, starting with Measure R Local Return street improvements. He and/or Public Works Director Katsouleas responded to questions of the Planning Commissioners throughout the presentation.

Public Works Director Katsouleas, in response to an inquiry from Commissioner Conaway, explained that the raised or decorative pedestrian crossing improvements were proposed for Ocean Drive because it is a major pedestrian thoroughfare, and there is a need to make its many intersection crossings more visible especially because the homes often have very small (typically one foot) setbacks from the roadway. The associated cost of \$20,000 per crosswalk has not yet been fully vetted. At some point there will be a discussion about exactly what will be installed and the projected cost could change.

Public Works Director Katsouleas explained that the City Council has indicated pedestrian safety is of high priority and reminded that the role of the Commission is to review for General Plan consistency, not the value of the projects, as this is the purview of the City Council.

Public Works Director Katsouleas responded to comments from **Commissioner Ortmann** who expressed concern that the pedestrian improvements do not include Highland Avenue which he has long felt has a very significant need for pedestrian improvement. She noted that the pedestrian improvements on Attachment B are only the new sidewalk projects, however currently there are 46 CIP projects that are underway and of these, eight deal specifically with pedestrian safety at various locations, including Highland Avenue and the intersection of Highland/38th Street and around several schools.

Commissioners Conaway and Ortmann suggested for future reference, that the entire list of projects, not just new ones as provided in the attachment, would be very helpful in providing a context for the Commission to understand where the new projects fit in.

Public Works Director Katsouleas stated that the entire CIP list is available on the website and will be presented to the City Council next week. **City Engineer Kumar** noted that there is a backlog of already approved capital projects that date back to 2009. Projects have not yet been constructed due to the lack of staff resources. **Public Works Director Katsouleas** further informed that the Council has recently tentatively approved new engineer positions that would enable the City to catch up within two years.

Commissioner Ortmann stated that from his perspective having crosswalks marked is not enough. A major issue for Highland Avenue, for example, a main street linking to downtown is that much of the sidewalk width between downtown and Marine is very narrow. He has long observed that this street seems to be designed to serve mainly as a conduit for cars to get out of the City much to the expense of the local community. Perhaps it might be time to explore the role of Highland for the community.

Public Works Director Katsouleas explained that the crosswalks on Highland will be lit by either flashing beacons or in-ground lighting.

Commissioner Conaway asked about the structural rehab study proposed for Parking Structures 3 and 4 in downtown, which has an estimated cost of \$500,000. **City Engineer Kumar** explained that this is just an estimate at this time and the study is needed to understand the full extent of structural problems for both structures. **Commissioner Conaway** feels that the estimate is very inflated and the study can be done for much less, and in this case, funds could be freed up for another project from the unfunded list, such as the "Intelligent Parking Occupancy System" whereby sensors would be installed in parking facilities. **Commissioner Ortmann** encouraged that a structural engineer should be involved in the vetting process

for the parking structures.

City Engineer Kumar responded that these amounts are only rough estimates at this time, and ultimately Public Works will issue a contract based only on a fully vetted scope of work. **Public Works Director Katsouleas** added that this is a good example of why it is so beneficial to have a five-year CIP plan, because, after the General Plan consistency findings are made, projects can be moved quickly from the unfunded to the implementation list if funding becomes available during the cost vetting process.

City Engineer Kumar proceeded to walk the Commission through all projects on the unfunded list.

Commissioner Conaway questioned whether the City had a policy about using a synthetic material such as crumb rubber for athletic fields, noting environmental and health concerns. **Parks and Recreation Director Mark Leyman** explained that while the City does not have a formal policy, the City is very much aware of this issue and monitors the science. The problem facing the City is overuse of its natural grass fields and the City is looking into alternative materials such as bamboo and cork infill.

Public Works Director Katsouleas, responding to Commissioner Conway, explained that the Fire Station No. 2 study, while it has been discussed, is not on the unfunded list at this time due to specific direction from the City Council to not proceed at the moment, however the City Council will be discussing this topic soon.

City Engineer Kumar concluded his presentation by reminding that the action before the Planning Commission is the adoption of Attachment A, which adopts a finding of consistency between the CIP projects for Fiscal Years 2017/18 through 2021/22 and the General Plan.

A brief discussion followed regarding the unfunded project list. **City Engineer Kumar** explained that the unfunded projects list, which includes rough estimates, provides a mechanism for tracking projects that have a community need, and are able to be implemented if funds become available or if priorities change. **Commissioner Conaway** endorsed the inclusion of these projects in the CIP and would like to see the Fire Station No. 2 project also included as he believes it is an important need in the community.

COMMISSION ACTION

There being no further discussion by the Commission, a motion was made and seconded (Conaway/Ortmann) to **ADOPT** draft Resolution 17-03 as submitted, determining that the proposed Fiscal Year 2017/2018 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is consistent with the Manhattan Beach General Plan.

A member of the audience requested to be allowed to address the Commission. Chair Apostol apologized, and invited the audience member to comment, noting that he had mistaken him for a staff member.

Gary Osterhout, 31st Street resident, presented several critical points regarding the CIP and the process for General Plan consistency review. He noted several areas that he found the CIP process and proposal to be lacking, including program accountability and transparency. He also feels there are incorrect references to the General Plan and inaccurate identification of funding resources. He feels that the staff report lacks needed detail of how the projects were prioritized and lacks any mention, which he feels is very important, in the relationship of the listed projects with not only the goals, but with specific policies that underlie the goals. He believes that it is important to delve deeper into the details so that the General Plan is kept in sight while making important decisions. **Mr. Osterhout's** project specific comments included (but were not necessarily limited to) that he believes: maintenance of Veteran's Parkway should be addressed in the Plan; projects being funded under measures R and M approved by voters should more directly relate to the main purposes of those measures; the improvements of City Hall restrooms cannot be supported by General Plan Land Use goal LU-3 as indicated in the matrix; questions the relevance of the Hermosa Greenbelt project to storm drains; does not support the street banner pole replacement project because he does not believe that the banners represent the community's desired aesthetic; the steps in Sand Dune park should not be constructed of concrete for aesthetic purposes and the Strand bikeway undercrossing project should be accelerated. As to including a list of the unfunded projects, **Mr. Osterhout** stated that over the years he has come to feel that such projects should **not** be included in the CIP review, because

as in the case of the Begg Pool which has been on the unfunded list since 2001, this can result in giving the public an unreasonable expectation as to what projects will get done. **Mr. Osterhout** stated that regarding transportation, he favors an approach whereby all the funding is first put “on the table” and then prioritizing should be done on use of those funds so that the City can get the most “bang for the buck.”

Commissioner Ortmann stated that several points made by the commenter echo feelings of the Commission, especially related to transparency and relationship of projects to goals.

Interim Director McIntosh noted that from a planning point of view, when asked to make findings of consistency with the General Plan, as in this case, the primary objective is to ensure that there is no aspect of any of the projects that will be in conflict with the General Plan, as opposed to finding that each and every project is in some way specifically reflected in the General Plan.

In the ensuing discussion, **Commission Conaway** stated he would like to encourage staff to provide more detail, and **Commissioner Ortmann** commented that he agreed with the comment that the City Hall restroom remodel is not addressing a land use issue and this appears to be in incorrect General Plan reference.

City Engineer Kumar explained that the City Hall restroom remodel is needed to comply with ADA requirements and the sidewalk improvement projects have received a high priority because the City receives a very high number of community requests relating to public sidewalks.

Chair Apostol noted his appreciation that the public commenter has put a lot of time and thought into the CIP and yet he feels strongly that if every single citizen were to be polled on the prioritization of projects, one might find that personal preference plays a big role, and while each project is important the reality is that the City cannot implement all projects.

The Commission came to a consensus that they should take action tonight by adopting the draft Resolution, with the understanding that the Public Works staff would subsequently review Attachment B to correct the applicable goal for the City Hall restroom remodel project and ensure all General Plan references are accurate.

Public Works Director Katsouleas noted that she is confident that all of the projects are consistent with the General Plan.

Chair Apostol asked Commissioner Conaway if his pending motion needs to be restated with any revisions. At the request of Interim Director McIntosh, Commissioner Conaway clarified that he did not think his original motion needed to be amended and that no changes to the draft Resolution are needed. However, he understands that before the CIP goes to the City Council, that staff will revise the list of projects (Attachment B) to correct the General Plan goal for the City Hall restroom project. His motion is based on the submitted draft Resolution, with no changes and Commissioner Ortmann stated his agreement.

Chair Apostol stated he was struggling with the minor inconsistency with respect to the City Hall restroom project consistency, but is leaning towards approving the CIP consistency tonight to facilitate the overall approval process.

Chair Apostol called for the question on the pending motion to Adopt Resolution PC 17-03, as submitted. He clarified that the intent is to approve the CIP as being consistent with the General Plan, subject to the change to Attachment B as discussed and future inclusion of the entire CIP list of projects in future considerations.

Roll Call:

AYES: Conaway, Ortmann, Chairperson Apostol
NOES: None
ABSENT: Bordokas
ABSTAIN: None

5. DIRECTOR'S ITEMS

Interim Director McIntosh noted that the May 10th meeting will most likely be canceled.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS – None.

7. TENTATIVE AGENDA – May 10, 2017 – No items.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 P.M. to Wednesday, May 10, 2017 in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue.

ROSEMARY LACKOW
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

ANNE MCINTOSH
Interim Community Development Director