

**CITY OF MAN HATTAN BEACH  
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
MARCH 14, 2018**

(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 March, 2018, at the hour of 6:04 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

**1. ROLL CALL**

Present: Burkhalter, Fournier, Morton, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Apostol  
Absent: None  
Others Present: Anne McIntosh, Director of Community Development (20 min late)  
Laurie Jester, Planning Manager  
Eric Haaland, Associate Planner  
Nhung Madrid, Senior Management Analyst  
Jason Masters, Assistant Planner  
Michael Estrada, Assistant City Attorney  
Erik Zandvliet, City Traffic Engineer  
Rosemary Lackow, Recording Secretary

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

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

03/14/18-1. Regular meeting – February 14, 2018

03/14/18-2. Regular meeting – February 28, 2018

It was moved and seconded (Morton/Burkhalter) to approve both sets of minutes subject to a change to page 3 of the February 28<sup>th</sup> minutes adding discussion between Commissioner Fournier and Sgt. Knickerbocker regarding service calls.

Commissioner Seville-Jones noted that at the February 14, she and Chair Apostol recused themselves from participating in the hearing for the Skechers application.

Roll Call:

AYES: Burkhalter, Fournier, Morton, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Apostol  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

**4. GENERAL BUSINESS**

03/14/18-3 Consideration of a Resolution Approving a Use Permit Amendment for the 900 Club and Downstairs Bar for Operational Changes and Changes to the Entertainment Permit Requirements, for an Existing Restaurant/Bar at 900 Manhattan Avenue (900 Club and Downstairs Bar)

Chair Apostol announced the item and invited Staff to make a presentation. Director McIntosh gave a brief overview, noting that the Commission closed the public hearing and directed that staff draft a Resolution approving the application, with specific changes to the conditions of approval of the existing use permit. Tonight the appropriate action for the Commission is to discuss the draft Resolution and determine whether it accurately reflects their direction to Staff, based on public input from the public hearing and the Commission's

discussion and consensus following the hearing. Director McIntosh advised the Commission to accept public comment but focus on the main issue as to whether the Resolution as drafted reflects its direction. The alternatives available to the Commission include: adopt the Resolution as presented, amend it, or it can also deny the application, and direct Staff to prepare another Resolution with appropriate findings.

**Director McIntosh** also clarified that the Commission should direct any questions it may have tonight to Staff and if the Commission adopts a Resolution with more restrictive conditions tonight, the applicant does not have the option to withdraw the application and continue operating under the current use permit conditions. The Commission's action has been placed on the City Council's agenda at its next meeting.

Chair Apostol invited public comment, limited to three minutes.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

**Don McPherson**, 1001 Bayview Drive, distributed copies of written testimony. He requested that the Commission set a new public hearing and direct staff to provide engineering plans, a fire-code compliance study, an acoustic analysis and a draft entertainment permit in that he believes that the applicant can withdraw his application thus avoiding new more strict conditions.

**Martha Andreani**, downtown resident, believes that business owner has resolved most of the noise issues but residents believe further noise mitigations are needed. She raised concerns regarding a few proposed conditions: Condition 11: believes should specifically state that dancing is not allowed for downstairs; Condition 12: questioned that the Commission voted to allow an increase to 24/year for Special Event entertainment events; Condition 13: questioned that special event would not involve entertainment; Condition 21: questioned what date 45 days (implementation benchmark) is counted from; Condition 22: noted the owner is going a good job removing litter from the sidewalk. Lastly she suggested if needed, having another meeting with the business owner present.

**William Victor**, owner on 9<sup>th</sup> Street, supports the prior speakers suggestions and comments and suggested that "business operator" (condition 22) be spelled out or clarified; questioned whether there really is room for dancing on the ground floor, and emphasized that compliance with fire codes should be taken very seriously.

**Director McIntosh** advised that Fire Chief Espinosa is present to address any questions about fire code/safety.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

**Fire Chief Espinosa** explained that occupancy limits (92 for upstairs/31 downstairs) are based on a specific floor plan submitted to the City. Director McIntosh explained further that various floor plans have been submitted over the years and these numbers are based on the most recently filed plan. To confirm the current requirement, the applicant has been requested to submit a plan for both up and downstairs showing all current walls, exits, stairs and furnishings. The Fire Marshall and Community Development Director will jointly inspect the site to confirm the permitted occupancy regardless of the outcome of this hearing.

Brief discussion followed in which **Commissioners Fournier and Seville-Jones** expressed concern that this has not been resolved and **Commissioner Morton** asked how critical this information is for tonight. **Chief Espinosa** explained that the Fire Marshal has authority and will evaluate the maximum occupancy based on the amount of area that is being occupied and exiting.

**Director McIntosh** outlined two options for the Commission regarding the pending fire inspection: 1) approve with a condition or, 2) continue this item until the inspection results can be provided. She reiterated that the applicant does not have an option to withdraw the application and revert back to the current use permit.

Discussion ensued, focused on the side door to the downstairs bar, fire safety, exiting and the proposed condition requiring that the 9<sup>th</sup> Street door be in a closed position after 10:00 p.m. to mitigate noise. **Chief Espinosa** affirmed that 900 Club, similar to other such businesses, has annual safety inspections and although the 9<sup>th</sup> Street door is the legal entry, the bar can have a secondary exit (i.e. on Manhattan Avenue). **Commissioner Burkhalter** stated he is uncomfortable with imposing specific physical changes as such

conditions may have unintended consequences; **Commissioner Seville-Jones** would not be able to support the application, granting more privileges while noise issues are still not resolved by some physical mitigation. **Chair Apostol** pointed out that the conditions require patrons of 900 Club to be directed to use the Manhattan Avenue entrance and that while the 9<sup>th</sup> Street door must be closed after 10:00 pm (with self-closing device) it would not be locked. **Commissioner Fournier** expressed concerns that information in the City's upcoming fire inspection may be important and is inclined towards continuing the item to get more information.

**Director McIntosh** suggested adding wording to condition 1 to specifically require the applicant to submit updated floor plans to be used to reassess the occupancy loads and also affirmed the Chair's understanding that the Fire Marshal has the authority to require a fire code inspection at any time if needed.

**Chair Apostol** emphasized that the Commission's duty is to either approve, amend or deny the proposed resolution as representing the Commission's direction and turned the focus to comments received tonight as follows.

Dancing/Security Guard/Effective Date: **Director McIntosh** advised that proposed condition 11 specifies dancing is allowed on the second floor but is silent as to the first floor. Assistant City Attorney Estrada pointed out that the word "limited" in the condition logically restricts the use of a dance floor as being permitted only on the second floor. Director McIntosh noted that Staff intended to only regulate dancing via placement of a dedicated dance floor area and not to regulate movement of patrons "in place". Further Chief Espinosa noted the Fire Department's main concern regarding a dance floor is that it not be located in a way that blocks exiting. **Director McIntosh** also clarified that requirements for a security guard are set forth in condition 6 which indicates the days (in addition to special events) and time that the guard is required to be present. Ms. McIntosh lastly clarified that the date that the Resolution is signed is the day from which 45 days is to be counted.

9<sup>th</sup> Street Door: **Chair Apostol** summarized the direction from the Commission: that the door be shut (not propped open) after 10:00 p.m. and that a self-closing device be installed to mitigate noise by causing the door to close automatically after being opened. He believes that the resolution reflects this direction.

**Commissioner Morton** noted he is troubled about the side door. He recalled that at the last meeting, the Commission decided to not give the owner an extra hour, and with no community objection, took away the requirement for "last call". He noted that the Fire Marshal did not have any urgent issues with the door and has concern that, along with other new restrictions, requiring the door to be completely closed instead of propped open, without knowing how much this would actually reduce noise, may be too onerous and not a good tradeoff and he noted also the owner is not present tonight to comment.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** commented that the issue of the door closure has been much discussed and the business owner was aware of this discussion tonight. While the owner has been a good operator for the Club upstairs, there have still been noise complaints related to the bar, and she believes that having the door closed will help resolve the complaints. She would also like to see the resolution more specifically prohibit a dance floor on the first floor.

Discussion followed about dancing and what activity is to be allowed for the use permit. The Commission arrived at a consensus that the permit should regulate an organized form of dancing with a dedicated dance floor area only and not apply to individuals swaying "in place" to music. **Chair Apostol** emphasized that he was uncomfortable with the proposed wording of condition 11 as he thought it could be misinterpreted.

The Commission further discussed and there was consensus that the side door should be clearly conditioned to be closed after 10:00 p.m. except for ingress and egress with a self-closing device installed.

A question was raised as to whether the number of special events that would be permitted, whether the amount of 24/year (condition 13) was the direction of the Commission. **Director McIntosh** indicated that staff prepared the resolution consistent with the minutes record which indicated 24 was to be approved.

**Chair Apostol** summarized based on the Commission's discussion, four areas of the resolution to be revised: 1) require the owner to submit accurate and dimensioned floor plans to the Fire Marshal (condition 1); 2) revise

wording to clarify prohibited dancing except on a dedicated dance floor (condition 11); 3) add wording that the occupancy limits for the building are subject to annual Fire Marshal review (condition 17); and, 4) clarify that the 9<sup>th</sup> Street doo shall be accessible for ingress and egress and not locked daily after 10:00 pm (condition 21-f).

**Director McIntosh** suggested re-wording of conditions 1 and 11 to read: Condition 1: “The applicant shall provide updated dimensioned floor plans to the satisfaction of the Building Official and Fire Marshal in order to reassess the occupancy loads for the entire building based on the egress system.”; and Condition 11: “The dedicated dance floor shall be limited to a 12 x 12 foot maximum area on the second floor.”

It was moved and seconded (Seville-Jones/Fournier) to adopt the proposed Resolution, approving the subject Use Permit Amendment, subject to the above four changes to conditions 1, 11, 17 and 21(f).

Roll Call:

AYES: Fournier, Morton, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Apostol  
NOES: Burkhalter  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

Director McIntosh advised that the application is approved and that it will be placed on the consent calendar of the City Council on April 3. Staff will provide the Council with an updated report with this action.

## 5. PUBLIC HEARING

03/14/18-4. Consideration of Resolutions Approving Use Permit Applications to Construct a New Office Building and an Office Building Addition and Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report Pursuant to the California Quality Act for Projects at 305 and 330 South Sepulveda Boulevard (Skechers USA)

Chair Apostol announced that this is a continued public hearing. Commissioners Seville-Jones and Chair Apostol recused themselves due to potential conflict of interest and they left the chambers.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** assumed the Chair and invited Staff to make a presentation.

**Associate Planner Eric Haaland** gave the staff report covering topics including: project description; Commission action and direction on 2/14/18; four action items for consideration; and a revised commercial loading plan (replacing a location off Boundary place to a location within the parking garage). Mr. Haaland pointed out that Boundary Place will no longer be accessed for commercial loading and that side is to be physically obstructed. The resolution also requires that should ownership change and alley loading were found to be needed, then the project would be subject to a Use Permit Amendment and new public hearing and notification. Mr. Haaland concluded with the staff recommendation: to conduct the public hearing, and after considering all input and evidence, adopt resolutions certifying the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and approving the Use Permit and Use Permit Amendment subject to conditions.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** invited questions of staff.

**Mr. Haaland** clarified that at the last meeting the Commission approved the EIR and 330 project use permit amendment, but did not formally adopt Resolutions for those approvals yet.

Commissioner Burkhalter invited City Traffic Engineer **Erik Zandvliet** to respond to questions.

**Commissioner Fournier** asked about the reason for the EIR mitigation measure to lengthen the southbound left turn pocket on Sepulveda Boulevard onto Tennyson Street and would like to feel more comfortable that the turns will be as safe as possible given the speed of traffic going north.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** responded that the reason for lengthening the left turn pocket is to allow for more U-Turn volume for southbound Sepulveda Boulevard at Tennyson Street. He stated the following: there is sufficient sight distance for the U-turn drivers to have enough time to make the turn; pointed out that

drivers have additional options to make additional turns at Artesia Boulevard and Keats Street; confirmed that all mitigation measures were evaluated as safe and reasonable; and that east bound cars on Duncan Avenue will be prohibited from turning left onto northbound Sepulveda Boulevard. However, this last measure will need to be approved by both Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach, and if so, must be in place prior to occupancy of the new building.

In response to a further concern by **Commissioner Fournier** that traffic increase on westbound Duncan Avenue into the neighborhood, **Mr. Zandvliet** stated that there will be turn restrictions on the driveway exit serving the Skechers building. If a problem arises, then the Neighborhood Plan, a key component of the project, can be used to address such issues.

**Director McIntosh** emphasized that all applicable conditions contained in the Resolutions have been evaluated for safety.

Commissioner Burkhalter invited the applicant to make a presentation.

**David Hibbard**, architect for Skechers, stated that staff has well covered the project issues and the proposed solution for addressing neighbor concerns, he also presented slides detailing how the access to the original loading area off Boundary Place will be closed off. He affirmed for **Commissioner Burkhalter**, the applicant understands that if the building became occupied by a different tenant and needs a larger loading area, then a use permit amendment would need to be filed. **Director McIntosh** clarified that yellow curbing on Sepulveda would be subject to an encroachment permit from Caltrans, and she assumes that whether the curb is yellow or normal grey, that the Sepulveda curb may also be an area where delivery vehicles would park.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

**Bill Beck**, owner of nearby OK Corral Preschool, stated he supported the revised plan, noting it is a relatively inexpensive way to resolve issues on Boundary Place.

**William Victor**, hopes people living near will also be happy with the solution. He would like to discuss another issue regarding public noticing.

**Commissioner Fournier** noted that he is planning to bring this subject up at a subsequent meeting and Mr. Victor should “stay tuned”.

**Harris Bass**, neighbor on Boundary Place commended Staff, the Commission and Skechers as he thinks this is a great solution for the loading issue.

**Stuart Wesolik**, 700 block of Longfellow, lives near the preschool and is happy with the solution and wants to understand that Boundary will no longer be a loading zone.

**Director McIntosh** indicated that the area will be prohibited from use as a loading zone, and if needed “no parking” signs will be installed.

There being no further speakers, **Commissioner Burkhalter** closed the hearing.

#### COMMISSION ACTION

**Commissioner Morton** stated he strongly supports, feels the revised plan is a beautiful solution, a “win-win” solution that seems even more useful for Skechers too.

**Commissioner Fournier** feels this is a great solution, especially given the sensitivity of the loading issue to the residents. He commended the architect in coming up with this creative solution.

It was moved and seconded (Morton/Fournier) to adopt Resolutions: **APPROVING** a Final Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program and **APPROVING** a Use Permit for a New Building located at 305 So. Sepulveda and a Use Permit Amendment for an existing building at 330 South

Sepulveda Boulevard subject to conditions.

Roll Call:

AYES: Burkhalter, Fournier, Morton,  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: Seville-Jones, Chairperson Apostol (recused)

Commissioner Burkhalter called for a 5 minute recess at 7:45 p.m. and the Commission reconvened at 7:50 p.m. Chair Apostol and Vice Chair Seville Jones rejoined the Commission in the chambers.

03/14/18-5. Consideration of the Final Draft General Plan Mobility Plan Update and Negative Declaration of Environmental Impacts Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Chair Apostol announced the item and invited Staff to make a presentation. Director McIntosh gave introductory remarks, introducing Nhung Madrid, Senior Management Analyst, who has been the project manager of the Mobility Plan. Ms. Madrid gave an overview of the project with aid of slides covering: Background and relationship to the General Plan and AB 1358; Community Engagement, Vision for Transportation; Updating the Mobility Plan; Goals and Policies; the Mobility Plan Contents; Mobility for All (pedestrians, bicycles, public transit; Environmental Determination (Initial Study/Negative Declaration); and Next Steps (public hearing and adoption scheduled for May 15, 2018 City Council meeting). Sr. Management Analyst Madrid explained that the main goal of the Plan is to look for ways to reduce VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) which can quantify reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

**Sean Daly**, Iteris, Inc., explained the development of the Mobility Plan emphasizing that in amending the General Plan it gave the community the opportunity to express their goals for the City. In updating the Circulation Element (now to be renamed The Mobility Plan), it is a chance to move towards a more multi-modal rather than mainly car oriented policy document. He noted that it's very critical to have a clear vision and the goal was to offer a flexible, convenient, energy efficient transportation options, while enhancing safety and strengthening the community while considering all users consistent with the Complete Streets Act. He went over the various parts of the plan, noting most of the goals and policies of the 2003 Circulation Element have been retained including ensuring a balanced transportation system, moving commuter traffic while preventing neighborhood intrusion, meeting parking needs while accommodating pedestrians and bicyclists. He called attention to a comparison between the goals and policies of the preceding Circulation Element and the Current Mobility Plan noting that no significant changes occurred. He also noted towards the end of the Plan there is a section titled "Mobility For All" which is a forward thinking actionable section again addressing modes of pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and cars.

**Laura Stetson**, MIG, went over the Negative Declaration for the Mobility Plan explaining that this Negative Declaration concludes that there will be no significant adverse impact, and anticipates that in the future at implementation additional programs will undergo individual environmental review as needed.

**Ms. Madrid** stated the Staff recommendation: that the Commission, after hearing the staff presentation, Conduct the public hearing and Adopt a resolution that Recommends that the City Council amend the General Plan and adopt the Manhattan Beach Mobility Plan, and Adopt a Negative Declaration.

#### PUBLIC INPUT

Chair Apostol invited public input.

**William Victor** longtime resident, inquired regarding the Negative Declaration, stating he would like to review it. Regarding mobility, he asked if staff could look into 1) adjusting a stop light for eastbound Manhattan Beach Boulevard at Sepulveda which he believes is too lengthy and, 2) lengthen the signal time for cars going east on Manhattan Beach Boulevard turning to Valley/Ardmore, because this is too quick.

**Director McIntosh** provided Mr. Victor a copy of the project Staff Report and Attachments.

**Chair Apostol** closed the public hearing, there being no more speakers and invited Commission discussion.

#### COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

**Commissioner Fournier** inquired as to how the Plan regards the Valley/Ardmore Greenbelt area, noting that it would be great if its utility could be enhanced, for example could it be used as a bikeway? **Erik Zandvliet**, City Traffic Engineer, noted that the Plan shows the Veterans Parkway as a pedestrian way, but noted that its crossings are key to getting around. The City has a draft pedestrian crossing treatment tool box. Although the City's Master Plan for Bikes does have a planned bike path, the specific design and location has yet to be determined. **Mr. Zandvliet** also noted that the bikeway's cost could be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars depending on the design. The City would look for grant funding such as an "Active Transportation" or "Safe Route to School" grant programs.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** stated she had a number of policy/goal questions. She wondered why the Master Plan of streets does not identify Highland Avenue, which is an extension of Vista del Mar, as a major entry or an artery? **Mr. Zandvliet** responded that the Mobility Plan identifies Highland Avenue as an entry point, but is not an arterial street because it lacks roadway capacity. He noted that Highland Avenue is a "collector", not arterial street. **Commissioner Seville-Jones** also expressed concern that a performance measure on page 19 calling for a decrease in speed on local streets might apply to Highland Avenue; however **Mr. Zandvliet** clarified that Highland Avenue is not considered a "local street" so he doesn't think this applies to Highland Avenue.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** noted her general concern that transportation policies may go a little too far in accommodating bicycles on Highland Avenue and that it will impact commuters by slowing down traffic in favor of bike lanes. **Mr. Zandvliet** responded that not all of Highland Avenue is appropriate for bike lanes, and there are alternative streets (Manhattan Avenue, or Valley/Ardmore e.g.) that may be more appropriate for a bike path that may not require removal of street parking. **Commissioner Seville-Jones** asked whether the bulleted goals on Page 6 could include more of a vision to move commuters more efficiently to regional destinations.

**Director McIntosh** noted that that the Planning Commission could suggest this be added as another goal.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** inquired as to whether the fact that the City provided parking for its employees in the City Hall parking structure or provided programs such as carpooling could be identified as an achievement since the 2003 Circulation Element Plan (see Page 12). Traffic Engineer Zandvliet noted that the Plan is more geared towards circulation as opposed to parking, and as a higher level policy, the document does not address individual employers; however Director McIntosh noted that the City does have a carpool program which is more related to mobility.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** inquired/commented regarding the following Plan policies (page 65):

Policy 1-1.6: *Require property owners, at the time of new construction or substantial remodeling to dedicate land for roadway or other public improvements such as sidewalks and/or bicycle lanes....* What areas of town would this apply to? **Mr. Zandvliet** explained that this is an older policy that may require owners to dedicate additional land for sidewalks, if shown on a master plan for sidewalks or bicycle paths. **Ms. McIntosh** clarified that the City would need to have a dedication policy approved by City Council in place before staff would start imposing such a condition on a development, but staff applies this to streets with existing sidewalks on a case-by-case basis.

Policy 1.-1.1: *Allow for flexible use of public rights-of-way to accommodate all users of streets while maintaining safety standards.* Should this policy add "and efficient traffic flow" as well as maintaining safety standards? **Mr. Zandvliet** responded that, while there has to be a balance, the emphasis on the new Plan is safety over traffic flow consistent with the Complete Streets Act policies, but this is a policy issue that could be discussed. **Commissioner Seville-Jones** acknowledged that such is her overall concern – that traffic flow should have more emphasis.

Policy 1-3.7: *Work to preserve on-street parking within beach areas.* Is the intent to limit building of condos (since in doing so, to provide on-site parking new curb cuts are often needed)? **Director McIntosh** explained that the intent is not to slow limit or stop development but to look case-by-case if by design curb parking can be preserved by consolidating curb cuts.

Policy 1-4.2: *Protect and enhance the walkstreets as important access corridors to the beach and implement enhanced/improved crossings where the walkstreets connect to the street systems.* **Commissioner Seville-Jones** asked as to the intent – does it relate to visual access as well as traffic flow? **Mr. Zandvliet** explained that the purpose is to promote crosswalks or other safety features at walk street intersections, and secondarily, there is a potential view corridor is improved because crosswalks require clear sight lines.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** noted verbiage in the Plan that the School District should encourage alternative modes of transportation other than vehicles, and asked whether the City is working with the schools to reduce individual car trips. **Mr. Zandvliet** noted that the City has a good relationship with the School District, and whenever possible, encourages the schools to promote alternative transportation for walking and biking in collaboration with grant funding opportunities. The City also has a long history of partnering to find solutions for school neighborhood issues and he works closely with the school maintenance department.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** further inquired as to how a shuttle program might be encouraged that could include the schools. **Senior Management Analyst Madrid** cited past shuttle efforts and noted that the Plan has a short discussion about the desire of the community to have some type of shuttle that would connect the east and west parts of the City, however, presently there is a high cost for such service which would need to be subsidized by the City. **Mr. Zandvliet** added he believes the City would be open to proposals from an outside private vendor shuttle service, and noted the Downtown Specific Plan encourages drop-off areas for shuttles.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** reiterated her discomfort with a lack of emphasis in the Mobility Plan for the issue of traffic flow improvement. She expressed the reality is that many residents need to commute to regional employment centers and questioned whether some value should be recognized for commuting time.

**Mr. Zandvliet** acknowledged that the Plan does not have any explicit policies to further enhance traffic flow, but the Plan does talk about preserving infrastructure and the roadway network so traffic flow is not restricted.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** acknowledged that she understands that this is a balancing situation, but would like to see something in the Plan that actually states a goal to improve commuter travel times.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** noted that the background traffic studies for the updated Mobility Plan have shown the City has not generally had increased traffic volumes since 2003. This is consistent with a nationwide pattern starting in 2008 due to the recession, but the volumes have been slowly going up since.

**Commissioner Seville-Jones** commented in closing that part of the vitality of Manhattan Beach is providing easy access to commercial centers, not just the commute time within and she would have liked to have seen in the Plan a goal of improving regional commute time.

**Director McIntosh** pointed out a movement throughout the practice of transportation planning and engineering and in CEQA (change in measuring traffic impacts by VMT, not Level of Service) that reflect a different way of looking at transportation values. This movement discourages travelling long distances and is a different way of looking at transportation values nationwide. This Mobility Plan is consistent with that change in values. She noted that Staff can pass along comments of the Commission to the City Council with its report of this decision.

**Commissioner Burkhalter** noted he has learned that, perhaps counter intuitively, on arterials which have become more multi-modal accommodating, because the roadway becomes more defined in protecting alternative modes (i.e. bikeways and pedestrian paths) even if a lane had to be removed, it turns out that the traffic actually flows better as there is less interruption.



Chair Apostol stated that he had nothing to add and called for a motion.

It was moved and seconded (Morton/Burkhalter) to adopt the proposed Resolution, **APPROVING** a recommendation that the City Council adopt an amendment to the General Plan for the Mobility Plan Update, and **ADOPT** a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** of Environmental Impacts.

Roll Call:

AYES: Burkhalter, Fournier, Morton, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Apostol  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: None  
ABSTAIN: None

Director McIntosh noted that it is expected that this matter will be scheduled for public hearing by the City Council at its meeting of May 15<sup>th</sup>.

**6. DIRECTOR’S ITEMS**

Director McIntosh reported:

- There are no items for the March 28<sup>th</sup> evening and staff expects to cancel that meeting.
- The Metlox item is going to the City Council on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Council will review the Planning Commission decision and the ground lease at that time.

**7. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

Commissioner Fournier suggested having a Commission discussion about Code Enforcement as he feels there is a gap between residents’ expectations and the process as heard at a recent hearing. Director McIntosh advised that this would be outside of the purview of the Commission and she encouraged the Commission to refer any citizen with code enforcement issues to directly contact her, as this is her responsibility and the issue of staff resources is a budget related issue which is the responsibility of the City Council.

**8. TENTATIVE AGENDA – March 28 – no items (to be cancelled)**

**9. ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 P.M. to Wednesday, April 11, 2018, (March 28 cancelled) at 6:00 P.M. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROSEMARY LACKOW  
Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE APOSTOL  
Chairperson

ATTEST:

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