

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
JUNE 14, 2017**

(DRAFT)

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 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: Burkhalter, Morton, Seville-Jones, Vice Chair Ortmann  
Absent: Chairperson Apostol  
Staff Present: Anne McIntosh, Director of Community Development  
Michael Estrada, Assistant City Attorney  
Laurie Jester, Planning Manager  
Ted Faturos, Assistant Planner  
Rosemary Lackow, Recording Secretary

Vice Chair Ortmann welcomed new commissioners Burkhalter, Morton and Seville-Jones who gave brief self-introductions: Commissioner Burkhalter is a 25+ year resident and business owner and architect; Commissioner Seville-Jones, a 20+ year resident, 3<sup>rd</sup> time on the Commission, law firm manager; and Commissioner Morton, born and raised in Manhattan Beach is an entrepreneur, passionate about the City.

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

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

06/14/17-1 Special Meeting – April 19, 2017  
06/14/17-2 Regular Meeting – May 24, 2017

Due to lack of voting eligibility, both sets of draft minutes were continued to the next available meeting.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING**

06/14/17-3. Consideration of a Use Permit to Allow the Sale of Beer and Wine for Off-Site Consumption at a Permitted Food and Beverage Sales Establishment at 1141 Highland Avenue (Andrew's Cheese Shop)

Assistant Planner Ted Faturos gave the staff report, noting the details of the site and proposed food and beverage sales use, applicable zoning and the proposed alcohol license operational details. He emphasized that the sole reason for the hearing is the sale of beer/wine for off-site consumption, as the food and beverage sales use is a permitted use in the CD zone. Mr. Faturos noted that the staff, including the Police Department recommends approval with conditions such as limited hours of operation (closing not beyond 7 pm except 6 pm on Sundays), prohibitions for after hour special events, on-site seating and alcohol consumption.

In response to concerns noted by Commissioner Seville–Jones, Mr. Faturros stated that staff has not considered, nor now recommends, imposing conditions such as a cap on shelf space for alcohol bottles, or prohibiting sale of small single serving “airplane” bottles of alcohol because staff does not believe such conditions would be effective. Director McIntosh clarified for Commissioner Seville-Jones that staff does not know with certainty that the applicant has violated its permits in Santa Monica.

**Thea Trindle**, FE Design, applicant’s representative, summarized the operations of the proposed use, including hours and peak traffic, number of employees, and store layout, and stated that the applicant accepts all conditions and fully intends to comply with all as well as those of the state ABC license. She suggested that in condition 2, “property owner” be replaced by “operator” as it is the business operator, not property owner who obtains the operating permits, although the use permit, once approved would run with the land.

**Andrew Steiner**, applicant, acknowledged that half or smaller bottles of alcohol could conceivably be taken elsewhere for consumption but had not considered this as an issue that needs to be addressed. As to on-premise consumption events occurring at his Santa Monica store, he has worked this out with both that city and the State ABC and private events are held with locked doors. He intends to not hold such events at the Manhattan Beach store, however, in case the need arises, he would hold such events either at another local restaurant that has a full liquor license or at his Santa Monica store, not at 1141 Highland Ave.

In response to an inquiry from **Commissioner Seville-Jones, Mr. Steiner** stated that he would be amenable to adding language clarifying conditions in which private events could be conducted (e.g. with locked doors) but reiterated it is not his intent to hold such events in Manhattan Beach.

In response to the Vice Chair’s inquiry, **Director McIntosh** confirmed that typically the operator, not property owner applies for the alcohol license.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

Vice Chair Ortmann opened the public hearing and invited the public to speak.

**Tony Choueke**, owner, 1141 Highland, supports the application, believing that this food retail business is a great addition and will build community.

**Mark Lipps**, MB Chamber of Commerce, stated his support in that the proposal is for more of a culinary related retail use than a bar and as so will fit well into the tone and spirit of the community which is being recognized globally.

Seeing no other speakers, **Vice Chair Ortmann** closed the hearing and invited discussion.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** stated that this is a use that is both unique and fitting for the Downtown in that it will sustain its vibrant small retail atmosphere. However, noting that the right of CUPs run with the land, she asked if the Commission would support revision of Section 2 of the Resolution (Alcohol Licenses) to include additional conditions: 1) a limit in the amount of shelf space allowed for alcohol vs. food such as no more than 10% more than the amount shown on the submitted floor plan; 2) prohibition of sale of single serving 4 oz bottles; and 3) in existing condition 3 regarding beverage sales: change “and” to “and/or” for consistency to read: “Alcoholic beverage sales shall be limited to retail beer and/or wine for off-site consumption only. On-

site alcoholic beverage and/or food service and/or consumption and/or seating are prohibited.”

At the request of the Vice Chair, **Director McIntosh** advised that staff did not feel it was necessary to impose the suggested additional conditions in order for the required findings to be made by the Commission and further to address **Commissioner Seville-Jones** inquiry, there is no substantive distinction between “and” and “and/or” in the wording of condition 3. Mr. Fatusos added that subject to MBMC Section 10.08.050, definition of Food and Beverage Sales, it is implicit in the floor plan that no on-site seating would be allowed.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** explained she is proposing additional conditions under the belief that, with the current conditions as proposed in the draft resolution, the proposed use might change under a different tenant to operate more as a liquor store that primarily sells beer and wine products. **Director McIntosh** opined that, she did not think that such could happen, as the Use Permit approval is for a food and alcohol retail use.

**Commissioner Morton** stated his support for the resolution as submitted by staff because he believes the proposed use is desirable and supportive for the downtown and surrounding community. He doesn’t believe the requested alcohol sales will create problems as the sale is limited to off-premise consumption and there is a clear intent to maintain both food and alcohol products in the store. Regarding single service or half-bottle wine alcohol product sale, he does not believe that the addition of one additional such retail use would have the effect of transforming the Downtown since there are several other locations already where such products can be purchased.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** stated he supports the resolution conditions as drafted because he believes it is beneficial to provide flexibility to the operator who may need to adapt to the changing economy conditions and tastes. He does not necessarily find a problem if the shop changes, where wine, vs. cheese becomes the primary sales product.

**Vice Chair Ortmann** stated his agreement with Commissioners **Morton and Burkhalter** in supporting the application pursuant to the draft resolution without the suggested conditions.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** stated she will vote “no” on approval of the draft resolution because she is focused on the fact that the Use Permit will run with the land and she believes that this is an opportunity to closely regulate a proposed new alcohol use for future businesses.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved and seconded (Morton/Burkhalter) to **ADOPT** the draft Resolution **APPROVING** the application. Said motion was subsequently amended, to include the replacement of “owner” with “operator” in condition 2 of Section 2 of the Resolution.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Burkhalter** as to the potential change of the cheese/wine shop to a liquor store, Director McIntosh stated that the enforcement would be guided by the conditions of approval of the Use Permit among which is a standard condition (number 1, Section 2 draft Resolution) requiring that the project be operated in substantial compliance with the project description and plans as submitted for the use permit. A proposal to substantially change the floor plan at any time in the future where sales of beer and wine for off-premise consumption would become a primary, not ancillary use, would be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Roll Call:  
AYES: Burkhalter, Morton, Vice Chair Ortmann  
NOES: Seville-Jones  
ABSENT: Chair Apostol  
ABSTAIN: None

06/14/17-4 Request to Amend Certain Conditions of Approval for the Master Use Permit for the Remodel and Expansion of the Manhattan Village Shopping Center Located at 2600 Through 3600 N. Sepulveda Boulevard and 1180 through 1200 Rosecrans Avenue (Manhattan Village Shopping Center)

Planning Manager Laurie Jester noted late attachments received and corrected wording in condition 1, on page 3 of the draft Resolution to read “presented to the Planning Commission”, replacing “approved by the Planning Commission”. Ms. Jester proceeded with a detailed report with the aid of slides, outlining the application, background including 2014 MUP approval and 2016 site plan modification, explaining the site layout, and explaining briefly each of the conditions that require refinement which fall into two broad categories. Under the category of phasing and sequencing, the conditions to be modified include: 36 (Employee Parking Management Program), 37 (Valet Parking Management Plan), 39 (Fry’s Driveway-Sepulveda Boulevard), 40 (Offer to Dedicate-Rosecrans Avenue) and 48 (Marine Avenue-Cedar Way) and under the category of physical site plan, the conditions to be modified include: 13-f (Northeast Deck Rosecrans Access), 50-q (Stairway and Elevator-North Parking Deck), 50-r (Setback-North Parking Deck); and 50-s (Parking Layout).

Ms. Jester additionally reviewed the findings in the draft Resolution and environmental review performed which includes an Addendum to the 2014 EIR completed in 2016 for the “Refined Site Plan” and a second Addendum to the 2014 EIR which analyzed potential environmental effects for this specific MUP amendment. It was concluded that none of the proposed condition modifications would have an impact as defined under CEQA that was not previously analyzed in the 2014 certified EIR and therefore would not require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR (to the EIR certified in 2014) and all of the mitigation measures required by the 2014 EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program will continue to apply and will be implemented.

Ms. Jester concluded that the Staff recommends that the Commission, after accepting input, adopt the draft Resolution conditionally approving the proposed revised conditions.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

**Vice Chair Ortmann** opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to make a presentation.

**Phil Friedl**, JLL, spoke on behalf of RREEF, property owner. He stated that the revisions will result in improved site circulation and parking, the sequencing changes will be more in line with what the community and City Council want and will enhance social interactions. He went over the main changes proposed that they feel will improve the center, highlighting: at the 30<sup>th</sup> Street entrance an aisle has replaced a parking field, in the northwest corner of the site; number of parking spaces in the structure and lower culvert will be increased to 599 (from 507) achieved by moving the northeast parking structure farther west, and overall the center parking ratio is increase from 4.14 to 4.23 (per 1,000 sf GLA). The plaza area will now align with the main mall entry and serve as a gathering place, as well as traffic calming feature, and Cedar Way will feel more like a “Main Street” with retail facing it and parking hidden as much as possible. Other aspects he summarized include

structural changes to existing large retail, the relocation of California Pizza Kitchen, the existing interior mall refresh and improvements to the center mall court.

**Gary Graumann**, representing Fry's, opposes the proposed wording of condition 39 (Sepulveda Boulevard) which relates to the existing "right in - right out" driveway on Sepulveda. The concern is that the store would be seriously impacted if its use of the driveway is required to be modified to right turn in only or eliminated as triggered by the bridge improvement project work being planned by Caltrans. Mr. **Graumann** emphasized that this driveway is the store's only means of large truck access to the loading docks and suggested that the trigger for required change in the driveway to be tied to Fry's future vacation of the site. He specifically suggested a one-word change for (a) and (b) for condition 39 (Sepulveda Boulevard), where the word "first" would be replaced with "last".

**Phillip Cook**, resident and commercial property owner is familiar with the process of getting permits for commercial construction and while he is neither for or against the application, urges that the Commission not get bogged down in minutiae but realize that if a project gets delayed there are economic impacts to such.

**Marie Colmey**, local resident, supports the application, believes that the changes are consistent with the interests of the community and the Council and it is important that the project move forward as expeditiously as possible.

**Mark Lipps**, Manhattan Beach Chamber of Commerce, believes the project has some great points and should be expedited. The suggestion made by Fry's is worth considering, but urged that this not delay the project.

**Lara Leitner**, attorney representing the owners of 3500 Sepulveda, which is known as the "Hacienda Building" noted the bases for opposition to the MUP amendment consistent with written comments are based on the following assertions: 1) the Site Plan approved by the Community Development Director in December 2016 was not properly processed and approved; 2) believes that the application for the MUPA is not properly signed and the application itself is invalid; 3) believes that the project with revisions is being segmented and as such is in violation of CEQA and recirculation is required and; 4) believes that the revisions being requested in this application directly negatively impact the Hacienda Building including a revised location of an elevator in the north parking deck, architectural and aesthetic design changes; vehicular circulation changes and changes to parking spaces including the number provided in certain locations.

**Mark Neumann**, 3208 Laurel Avenue, representing 3500 Sepulveda Boulevard, stated his opposition on multiple grounds because he feels that the action requested tonight will change the entitlements on his property without his signature on the application. He believes that there is a lot wrong with this project, and big issues. They have owned this property since 2008 and subsequently a Settlement Agreement was reached with REEF and he believes that the proposed changes are not consistent with that Agreement and they are not treating 3500 Sepulveda fairly. He believes that a construction management plan should be developed and he does not believe this has been addressed. Although the parking per thousand has gone up, he does not believe that the amount will be adequate. He also believes that there have been design changes to the building elevations that require special approval and the EIR has not been followed. Finally he believes that REEF has not personally discussed the changes with him and has not been a good neighbor and he respectfully requests denial of the application.

Vice Chair Ortmann invited a rebuttal from the applicant.

**Peter Gutierrez**, representing RREEF, stated that he believes that CEQA has been properly addressed noting

the addenda to the EIR have thoroughly reviewed and addressed all issues. He believes that the Director had the authority to approve the revisions in 2016 and urged the Commission to not delay the project.

**Phil Friedl** responded to questions from the Commission, stating that the revised site Plan has been shown to Mr. Neumann and that he personally met with Mr. Neumann. He has no problem with condition 39 either as currently written or as proposed to be revised by the Fry's representative. **Mr. Friedl** also explained that the elevator location as previously shown was not feasible and currently the location is at the most western location that is possible. He believes that there still will be some line of sight to 3500 Sepulveda from the elevator and believes that the addition of wayfinding signs near the elevator will assist visitors in accessing and being aware of the Hacienda building.

Regarding parking and the distance of parking from the Hacienda building, **Mr. Friedl** stated that there is a greater mass of parking that is closer to the Hacienda Building because the northeast parking structure which contains 514 spaces will be moved farther west (from the 2014 Site Plan). He also stated that the northeast deck will also have ground level access that is easily accessible to the Hacienda building. Mr. Friedl confirmed the number of culvert parking spaces near Hacienda will be decreased, but the number of surface parking spaces at the north deck near Hacienda have increased from 53 to 64.

Vice Chair Ortmann invited the Commission to discuss and ask questions.

**Director McIntosh**, in response to a question from Commissioner Burkhalter regarding condition 39, clarified that Caltrans has the jurisdictional authority regarding the Fry's driveway and the requirements comes from Caltrans. The intent of Staff is to have a condition that will be acceptable to Caltrans.

**Gary Graumann**, Fry's, demonstrated how trucks access the store loading docks in a right in, right out pattern. He pointed out that the large trucks can safely use the parking area off Sepulveda however they cannot get through a pinch point on the site to exit to Rosecrans. Being able to maintain a driveway on Sepulveda is critical.

**Director McIntosh** reported that the condition addressing the future condition/configuration of the Fry's Sepulveda driveway arose through a response to a comment letter from Caltrans in the Final EIR. She stated Staff's opinion that the condition in the draft resolution gives more time to allow the existing driveway access to continue since the current 2014 resolution stipulates a sunset of 2016. The goal is to be able to accommodate the business tenant as much as possible and allow Fry's to operate until roadway construction on the bridge project actually commences by Caltrans or if Fry's vacates. She suggested adding an additional clause to condition 39 such as "or if in the event that Caltrans does not require the elimination of the right turn out driveway on Sepulveda".

There was agreement that additional wording as suggested by the Director be incorporated into condition 39. Vice Chair Ortmann invited further discussion on any other issues.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** suggested addressing comments received about impacts from changes to the north parking deck, noting that he understands that by pushing back the deck there is a benefit in that this mitigates the massing effect from the structure.

**Mark Neumann** responded that he feels that, although in the other two parking structures (south and northeast) the parking ratio of spaces per 1,000 GLA new retail being added has increased (by 5.4 and 6.4) the increase for the north deck near his property is much less (.36) and parking availability could be further

diminished, for example, if a parking valet program is implemented at the north garage. He suggested that a second elevator be added to the north parking structure on the west side to give better access to his building.

In response to Commissioner Morton, **Mr. Neumann** stated that what he wants is to secure the protections, such as parking availability, for his site and parking provided during construction, that he had in the Settlement Agreement with RREEF. He explained that regarding CEQA he recognizes that an environmental analysis has been done, however it is not based on a plan that was properly approved.

**Lara Leitner**, representing the Hacienda building, made some clarifications on her client's position: that they want to go back to the original approved Site Plan in 2014 before the revisions made in December 2016, however not entirely. Their goal is to restore certain protections for the Hacienda building from 2014; to not stop the entire renovation project but to protect the Hacienda Building, a small business owner.

**Director McIntosh** reminded the Planning Commission that the action before them tonight is to look at a series of specific wording changes to the conditions that implement the Refined Site Plan as endorsed by the City Council in 2016, relative to how the project is now proceeding, and determine whether the wording changes are appropriate and acceptable. Amendments to the Site Plan are not before the Commission for action.

**Vice Chair Ortmann** commented that the staff presentation suggests that the proposed wording changes are routine administrative adjustments however testimony tonight from other parties (Fry's and the Hacienda Building owner) suggests that there are very substantial issues. He asked for Staff's input.

**Director McIntosh** responded that the parties involved include Fry's which has a tenant relationship with the applicant, and the Hacienda Building, which is an adjacent property owner within the project. Some of what needs to be discussed, such as regarding the Fry's driveway situation, may be a private property matter between landlord and tenant. In that regard Staff feels that the wording on the Fry's driveway addresses as much as it can in terms of city authority. In terms of the Hacienda building, the testimony has included discussion about a private Settlement Agreement between the two property owners, therefore again, those issues are beyond the scope of the action before the Commission tonight. Staff believes that the City has followed all appropriate procedures relative to proposed revisions in the phasing of the project, including complying with CEQA. It is appropriate that the Commission look at the condition of approval wording changes to see if these are appropriate and consistent with regard to the Refined Site Plan from December 2016.

**Commissioner Morton** commented that it seems that the opposition by the Hacienda is mainly based on a fundamental disagreement as to the way the 2016 application was processed in an effort to disqualify the project and revert back to the 2014 approval. He believes he must base his decision on what is in front of him tonight with a presumption that the 2016 approval is valid.

**Assistant City Attorney Estrada** advised the Commission to focus its discussion on the specific matter before them, and it may now be appropriate to close the public hearing.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

**Vice Chair Ortmann** closed the public hearing and invited the Commission to discuss the application.

In response to questions from **Commissioner Seville-Jones**, **Director McIntosh** advised that the application

before them is valid. **City Attorney Estrada** opined that the signature of the Hacienda Building owner is not required on the application because the conditions requested to be changed do not involve the zoning or the uses on property other than that owned by RREEF.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** additionally inquired, in evaluating parking adequacy, whether there is a standard that is applied to the entire site, or whether there is another standard that addresses possible impacts to an adjacent property, as alleged by the Hacienda building owner. **Director McIntosh** responded that, the Refined Site Plan approval in 2016 and its implementation is the basis for the matter being considered now and explained that when the refined site plan was being implemented, it became apparent that some of the 2014 conditions did no longer make sense based on the new phasing, or no longer reflected the project as being designed. Ms. McIntosh noted that the changes being considered tonight came to staff from the applicant for the purpose of making the project better and more in line with the goals of the community and City Council and she further advised that, in making a decision, the Commission focus on the current draft Resolution, its findings and conditions of approval and mitigation measures which make up “the record” of this application.

**Assistant City Attorney Estrada** clarified that the purpose of this MUP amendment is to merely refine the conditions of the 2014 approval to be consistent with the December 2016 Refined Site Plan that was approved administratively by the Community Development Director and subsequently endorsed by the City Council.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** inquired as to whether, in making a finding of no adverse impacts, including parking, to nearby properties (Resolution 14-0026 page 13 of 39) there was a baseline that should be considered, to which **Director McIntosh** responded that there is no applicable baseline from 2014 that should be applied, but that the Commission should make its decision by focusing on this specific revisions to the conditions, the statements by the applicant and testimony received from all parties as to whether the refinements create an impact. Director McIntosh noted that it has been Staff’s determination after reviewing letters received from the Hacienda building owner that the proposed refinements will not have an impact to that property or change the findings.

In response to comments by **Vice Chair Ortmann**, **Director McIntosh** emphasized that the refinements being requested are a result primarily due to the phasing changes approved in December 2016. Staff determined what revisions are needed to make the project consistent with the new phasing and sequencing, and also concluded that these changes not only make sense, but will also not result in any significant impacts, as shown by the environmental review, and will improve the project to be developed more as it was intended to be.

**Vice Chair Ortmann**, in response to an inquiry from **Commissioner Burkhalter**, invited Mr. Neumann to address the net change in terms of parking serving the Hacienda Building, comparing the 2014 and 2016 Site Plans. **Mark Neumann** stated that spaces were to be added, however 9 spaces were lost from the North Parking Structure area and 67 spaces from the culvert area for a total of 76 spaces lost.

**Lara Leitner**, attorney for 3500 Sepulveda, provided more detail, stating that the 2014 Resolution is conditioned to require 30 additional spaces in the lower culvert lot, which when added to 122, would provide a total of 152 culvert spaces as originally approved. The revised site plan cites 85 culvert spaces on the revised plan and the 2014 Resolution condition is proposed to be modified to require that 580 total spaces to be provided in the culvert and northeast deck combined, and therefore the 30 additional required spaces would be allowed to be located in the northeast deck, as opposed to the culvert lot.

In response to **Commissioner Seville-Jones**, **Director McIntosh** indicated that there is no code metric that guarantees that required parking is provided within a certain proximity to any business. Although the parking



layout was considered when the site plan was evaluated in December, it was determined that the proposed change would not create an adverse impact because the number of available spaces being provided by the culvert lot and northeast parking deck would be increased overall.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

It was moved and seconded (Morton/Seville-Jones) to approve draft Resolution PC 17- with modification of condition 39 (Sepulveda Boulevard) in provisions (a), (b) and (c) only, as suggested by Staff, adding wording to the effect that “the elimination of the right turn out will not be required unless mandated by Caltrans”.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** commented that she struggled with the site plan related revisions and the parking as related to proximity, in particular. She is hopeful that the elevator location issue can be mitigated by signage, and the North Parking Structure setback does not seem to be a material issue. Pointing out that proximity is a relative concept she believes the overall parking ratio is good and useful for the project including Hacienda building patrons and has come to the conclusion that the findings can be made and the project should be approved. Commissioner Seville-Jones also noted her disappointment that private litigation matters which she believes are not within the scope of the application, were brought before the Commission.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** stated that the main issue is parking and its proximity, however he will be supporting the motion because he believes that the Commission must review the project based on current conditions which he believes supports the draft findings to approve the application.

**Commissioner Morton** stated his support but recognizes the issues and concerns raised by Fry’s and the Hacienda Building. He feels, however, that given the scope and focus of the application, being the realignment of the 2014 conditions of approval to be consistent with the 2016 approval, he is compelled to approve.

**Vice Chair Ortmann** stated that he appreciates the guidance from Staff to keep the Commission focused on the appropriate scope of its review and he also shares Commissioner Seville-Jones disappointment regarding communications between the property owners which are beyond the Commission’s purview. Although he did not support approval of the project in 2014, and compelling arguments have been expressed by the Hacienda Building, he now supports this application based on the scope of what is before the Commission.

**Assistant City Attorney Estrada** advised the Commission that the wording of the pending motion should be amended so that the proposed new wording being added to condition 39 apply only to sections (a) and (b), and not (c) as initially moved. Commissioners Morton and Seville-Jones accepted this change to the motion.

Roll Call:

AYES: Burkhalter, Morton, Seville-Jones, Vice Chair Ortmann  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Chair Apostol  
ABSTAIN: None

Director McIntosh announced that the Commission’s decision of approval will be an informational item on the next City Council agenda.

**5. GENERAL BUSINESS**

06/14/17-5. Discussion of Work Plan Items for Joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting

Director McIntosh explained that this is an opportunity to allow the new Commissioners to provide topics for discussion at its upcoming joint meeting with the City Council regarding its Work Plan. Discussion topics could be any issues or policies or ideas that the Commission may have, for example, as relating to the decision-making process and the built environment. At the last Commission meeting it was suggested that the Council study the Sepulveda Boulevard corridor including the residential interface, streetscape and parking requirements. It was agreed that the Commissioners will provide input to the Director via email.

**6. DIRECTOR’S ITEMS**

Director McIntosh advised the Commission of a development proposal submitted by Skechers, with the City of Hermosa Beach taking the lead on the project, that proposes new buildings on Sepulveda/Pacific Coast Highway, some in Hermosa Beach and some in Manhattan Beach. The location is the southern end of Sepulveda, around Duncan Avenue. The draft EIR has been prepared by Hermosa Beach as Lead Agency with participation and review by Manhattan Beach. The public notice will be published tomorrow and this starts a 60-day environmental review period extending to August 15th. After the 60-day Draft EIR review period, there will be responses to all comments received and a Final EIR will be published and hearings are anticipated within six months from now.

The Planning Commissioners will each receive a hard copy of the EIR however other copies will be made available to the public including an electronic version posted on the Manhattan Beach website (Community Development page, under Current Projects/Programs).

**7. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS – None.**

**8. TENTATIVE AGENDA – June 21, 2017 – No items.**

a. Joint City Council/Planning Commission/Public Improvements Commission Meeting

Director McIntosh stated she would check to see if an absence at the special joint meeting would count against the total absences that are allowed. She noted the joint meeting starts at 6:00 p.m. and the Commission will be joined by the PPIC.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 P.M. to Wednesday, June 21, 2017 at 6:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue.

ROSEMARY LACKOW  
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ANNE MCINTOSH  
Community Development Director