

**CITY OF MAN HATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 25, 2018**

(DRAFT)

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 25th day of April, 2018, at the hour of 6:02 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
Michael Estrada, Assistant City Attorney
Eric Haaland, Acting Planning Manager
Angelica Ochoa, Associate Planner
Nhung Madrid, Senior Management Analyst
Rafael Garcia, Assistant Planner
Erik Zandvliet, City Traffic Engineer
Rosemary Lackow, Recording Secretary

2. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (3-minute limit) – Tom Hastings, Dianthus resident, expressed two concerns about the City’s existing parking standards. His first concern is that the current standards generally based on building square footage by type of use may not address parking needs of both customers and employees. His second concern is that when a commercial business turns over, the new business may have a higher demand for parking. He feels both situations can result in not having enough on-site parking and cause impacts to the adjoining neighborhood.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

04/25/18-1. Regular Meeting – March 14, 2018

It was moved and seconded (Seville-Jones/Burkhalter) to approve the minutes as submitted.

Roll Call:

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

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

04/25/18-2. Appeal of an Administrative Decision to Approve a Minor Exception for 1208 The Strand

Commissioner Burkhalter recused himself, in that he had a long standing relationship with the project architect, and left the chambers.

Chair Apostol invited Staff to make a presentation.

Associate Planner Angelica Ochoa gave a presentation of the application, with aid of slides, stating the staff recommendation is to uphold the Director of Community Development’s decision of approval of the Minor Exception Amendment, and therefore deny the subject appeal. She proceeded, with the aid of slides, covering the project background and neighborhood setting, applicable zoning, chronology of the planning approvals, the background and findings of the Director of Community Development in approving the project

as well as the basis of the appeal submitted by appellant Maya Soderstrom, 1212 The Strand.

Chair Apostol invited the Commission to ask questions of staff.

Ms. Ochoa responded to **Commissioner Fournier** that the reconfiguration of a top floor balcony that reduces its projection is a concession to the neighbor to the south. The balcony was not required by code to be pulled in because, as a legal nonconforming portion of the structure it has a right to remain in its existing location. This change was incorporated as a “special condition”.

There being no further questions of staff, Chair Apostol invited input on the application in the following order: Applicant (John Altamura) 15 minutes, Appellant (Maya Soderstrom) 15 minutes, followed by 5-minute rebuttals from both.

PUBLIC INPUT

Applicant presentation

Lisa Kranitz, Wallin, Kress, Resisman & Kranitz, LLP, represents project Applicant John Altamura. She clarified and confirmed the Commission’s receipt of submittals including a Supplemental Response Letter dated April 25, citing the City’s Coastal regulation that exempts the project from a Coastal Permit noted that her client also met with the owners of 1212 after the receipt of an April 12th letter received from Cox Castle & Nicholson.

Michael Lee, architect for the project presented a number of slides highlighting the positive aspects of the project: 1) the amount of open space has been increased and the amount of building square footage has decreased (both by 200 square feet); 2) the building top deck has been pulled back 2’8” from the Strand and overall has been upgraded structurally; 3) the building is now fire sprinklered; 4) the entry stairway in the side yard is safer and user friendly for the unit inhabitants, its length shortened from 16 to 12 foot run and now there is only a one (vs. two) story climb to the unit; 5) by redesigning the stairs the structure has been confined entirely on the 1212 Strand property and two supporting pipe columns have been eliminated; 6) there is no viable alternative in relocating the entry stairs to the units; and 7) the reconfiguration of the stairway results in a more visually open side yard.

Mr. Lee also noted that at an on-site meeting held with the neighbor issues were discussed, the main problem being the stairway. The neighbor requested that the stairs be relocated to the opposite side of the building, but the 1208 owner’s response was that this was not viable and no resolution was reached.

Kathy Kernochan, owner of the upper unit at 1208 The Strand urged that the Commission deny the appeal which has created a great hardship, emotional and financial, due to the long delay in the project.

Chair Apostol invited the Appellant to address the Commission.

Appellant Presentation

Diana Courteau, Courteau & Associates, represents Appellant Maya Soderstrom. She noted there are four owners of 1208 The Strand and the owners had no meetings with her client at the outset of the project. She urged the Commission to grant the Appeal based on the following arguments: 1) the project is not merely an alteration or remodel but with structural changes to each of the units and does not fall within the Minor Exception statute (MBMC 10.84.120); 2) the project owners have misrepresented the degree of construction for example, stating initially it was 47% thereafter 67% and thereafter between 67% and 90% and the plans contain multiple inaccuracies as to square footage; 3) the statement that the 1212 The Strand project will not be detrimental to neighbors is false. The significant changes including lowering of the stairway down to the second story right next to the entry to 1212 The Strand which is a significant impact and in addition with the changes 1208 will have access all the way to the beach along the boundary of 1212 Strand, another new impact; 4) she believes that the 1208 owners have misrepresented the construction to the City intentionally so as to circumvent the current code; 5) the City employees in approving the project are complicit and if this is upheld there will be a significant loss of value and use and damage to neighbors due to misrepresentation and violation of statutes of safety violations as well as federal and Coastal Commission violations; 6) Compliance to the code is not unwarranted or unfeasible; 7) the granting of the exception by staff appears to be political and discriminating and believes that the builders exhibit a pattern of disregarding the code.

Ms. Courteau concluded by stating that her client reserves all rights and remedies against the project owners, City planners and City Council and will if left no choice pursue federal litigation. Ms. Courteau emphasized that while the project architect had discussion with the south neighbor which resulted in a compromise being reached to reduce the top deck, her client on the north side was not informed of that discussion nor did the owners initiate discussion with her client until she noticed beams coming out towards her property.

Maya Soderstrom, owner at 1212 The Strand, has been an owner next door for almost 12 years. She believes the project should be classified as new construction and out of fairness, should be brought into conformity. Her main objection is that the new entry for 1208, by being lowered, is going to be right at the same level and across from her existing main entry resulting and this will be a significant loss of privacy.

Chair Apostol invited any others wishing to speak on behalf of the Appellant.

Kenneth Bley, Cox, Castle and Nicholson, represents the owner of 1200 Strand and referred to his letter just submitted today to the Recording Secretary. He urged that the Commission either deny the appeal based on lack of evidence or delay a decision until evidence can be submitted that demonstrates the basis for the Director's determination that 10% of the existing structure value has been retained.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked for confirmation of the receipt of the April 25th letter received from the speaker, Mr. Bley and subsequently copies were distributed to the Commission. The Commissioners took a few moments to read the April 25th letter submitted by Mr. Bley.

Chair Apostol invited the Applicant and owner of 1208 The Strand to present a five minute rebuttal.

Applicant Rebuttal

Lisa Kranitz requested additional time to address the letter just received from Kenneth Bley. **Ms. Kranitz** stated that the existing stairs were removed and the structural I-beams (to support a new cantilevered stairway) were installed in June 2017 and the first time an issue was raised by the appellant was in January, 2018. The only new work being considered for the Amendment relates to the unauthorized work including new sheer walks and stud replacement in the lower two units due to dry rot and termite damage. All other work was authorized by the original 2014 Minor Exception.

Michael Lee emphasized that the project will be in compliance with residential building and safety and fire codes but it is the Municipal Zoning Code that requires the Minor Exception due to zoning nonconformities. He believes that the valuation of what is existing after the removals will be considerably more than 15% because the foundation, first and second floors and roof are still there. The original Minor Exception allowed a "complete down-to-the-studs" remodel which was permitted for most of the building as well as replacement of all the exterior finishes for the entire building. He explained that the stairs on the north side serve the upper two units while the entry and beach access for the ground floor unit are on the south side of the building. The egress to and from the beach and the alley is pre-existing – there is no new ingress or egress on the north side that serves the upper two units adjoining 1212 The Strand.

At the request of **Commissioner Morton**, discussion focused on the issue of project valuation and what constitutes the 50% threshold of existing valuation. **Mr. Lee** explained that there are various ways to calculate the valuation. One way that is provided for in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) is to use a worksheet that sets a per square foot value (e.g. \$160 for existing or new habitable area and \$80 for remodeling of existing living area). Another valuation methodology, that the Building Official used for this Minor Exception project was to look at the structure and determine what percentage of the existing structure will remain compared to the value of the new work; for a Minor Exception, at least 10% of the existing structure must be maintained. Under the methodology provided in the UBC the project will certainly exceed 50% and accordingly all UBC issues will be addressed. However the Zoning Code allows the builder to exceed the 50% valuation mark with the Minor Exception, provided at least 10% of the existing building is maintained. The Amendment was approved based on a determination that 15% of the building is remaining.

Director McIntosh advised that one reason for the delay in the fall of 2017 was that staff was carefully reviewing the valuation issue in great detail for compliance to the Minor Exception provisions.

Mr. Lee explained that the original Minor Exception was for a complete exterior remodel including all finishes, doors and windows the stair and structural upgrades to the front and back of the building and remodeling of the top unit. After work commenced there were two areas where additional work was done including, first the front decks for all three units, which were found to be damaged were authorized to be replaced entirely. As commenced additional unauthorized interior work was done on the interior of the lower two units which consisted of installing sheer walls and replacing stud walls that were found to be rotted. Mr. Lee noted he could not estimate the value of the non-authorized work and acknowledged it was their mistake to assume that it would be acceptable to replace the rotted stud walls in the interior of the lower two units without City authorization. He noted the City, as a result of the discovery of the new interior work in the lower units, re-reviewed the project and ultimately stood by its determination that the project was in compliance, and that at least 15% of the building remained.

Commissioner Morton inquired as to the Applicant's responsiveness to the north homeowner (Appellant). **Mr. Lee** responded that the project owners were not required to notice neighbors for the Minor Exception, therefore no notices were sent. When they learned of the concerns of the north homeowner, an office meeting was held in January between the project Applicant and the Appellant and her attorney at which concerns were expressed. A second on-site meeting was requested and held but the Appellant was not in attendance and the project Applicant was unable to come to a resolution with the Appellant on issues. The project Applicant received a communication from the neighbor to the south who expressed concern that the front deck allowed a view into his bedroom and it was agreed that the Applicant would pull back the deck to address this concern which was a fairly straightforward solution and would not compromise the entire building design. He noted that he would like to come up with a different solution for the stairs, as requested by the Appellant but has not been able to do that as there is no viable solution, however the Applicant is still willing to accommodate what he can, such as addressing exterior materials to be used.

Chair Apostol invited the Appellant to present a rebuttal (8-minute limit).

Appellant Rebuttal

Diane Courteau questioned the accuracy of the representation from Ms. Kranitz that the stair existed since 2017. In December 2017 in a site visit saw there was no stairway but she witnessed cracking and undermining on her client's property and beams projecting out. It wasn't until recently that they saw the stairs in a lowered location. Regarding meetings, one was held but that occurred only after filing objections. At the second meeting at the site, the Applicant stated that they would work with her client as to the type of materials and finishes facing her property. Such is not considered a "concession" to her client because the main issue of impact relates to the stairway location, the exterior wall materials. She joins with Mr. Bley in the request to either deny the appeal or continue the matter to allow her client to hire an expert who can review the calculations made by the City that at least 10% of the building remains.

Commissioner Fournier asked Ms. Courteau as to whether she had any proof tonight that the project has exceeded 90% value. Ms. Courteau responded that the basis for her opinion is more as a layman viewing the project in its current state. She stated she is in the process of finding an architect to act as an outside expert to review the City calculations and intends to accomplish this prior to this matter being put on a City Council agenda, which she understands could be within sixty days.

Chair Apostol asked if there were any others wishing to speak during rebuttal by the Appellant.

Ken Bley, Cox, Castle, Nicholson, stated that under the law he believes "substantial evidence" must be in the record to support the statement of the \$840,514.98 total project valuation and that there is 15% or \$126,000 remaining structure. He does not believe that this required evidence has been provided by Staff.

There being no other speakers, **Chair Apostol** closed the public comment portion of the hearing and invited the Commissioners to ask any further questions and discuss.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Assistant City Attorney Estrada advised the Commission this Appeal matter is not an "evidentiary hearing". He explained that appeal cases only require an "evidentiary hearing" if the initial decision that is being appealed required public notification and public hearing. The subject Minor Exception Amendment was granted administratively and a public notice was not required. Therefore the role of the Commission is

to review the decision of the Director and determine whether to uphold that decision or grant the appeal.

Commissioner Seville-Jones asked **Director McIntosh** to address how the value of the unpermitted work was taken into account in establishing the total project valuation (\$840k). Director McIntosh stated she personally cannot provide details as this work was done by the Building Official, but she stated that the required calculations were done and there is a full accounting of the calculations on record as to how the \$126,000 figure was determined. **Associate Planner Ochoa** added that the 15% is based on the framing found only on the roof and second and third floors. Ms. Ochoa further explained that the “project valuation” is not representative of the amount spent by the builder on construction, but is comprised of the value of existing square footage plus the value of the remodel work being done, using a worksheet with assigned unit valuation numbers. The value of the additional work does not alter the “project valuation” amount of \$840k because it already is accounted for in applying the worksheet and formulas.

In response to **Commissioner Fournier**, Director McIntosh affirmed his understanding that, in accordance with the City calculations, the total building value is \$840,000.

In response to inquiries from **Commissioner Seville-Jones**, **Director McIntosh** explained that the word “minor” in Minor Exception is not related to the degree of construction allowed (e.g. cosmetic vs. structural changes) but rather pertains to zoning issues. Minor Exceptions are intended to encourage rehabilitation of existing buildings without adding new any area, even if the builder elects to spend significant amounts on the remodel materials.

Associate Planner Ochoa clarified for **Commissioner Morton** that the 50% calculation is relevant to the “project valuation” and the 10% remaining is relevant to the Minor Exception “building valuation” and reiterated that the project was cleared on both calculations, after determining the remaining building value based on the roof and floor joists which are staying in place.

Chair Apostol requested and received clarification from architect Michael Lee that photos that were in the presentation were taken prior to the start of construction. Mr. Lee displayed pre-construction photos again to show that the project at 1208 for 40 or 50 years had stairs that provide passage along the entire northerly side between the alley and beach with a portion of the stair run adjoining the entry of the Appellant’s unit.

Commissioner Seville-Jones stated that she would deny the appeal for the following reasons: 1) does not think there has been any valid statement made that causes her to think the decision should be overturned rather believes Staff has followed the code meticulously; 2) does not believe that there has been deliberate circumvention of the Code, misrepresentations or inaccuracies; 3) believes that the project is consistent with the Minor Exception which is intended to preserve older properties even when major construction occurs; the Minor Exception offers a tool to assist owners as they weigh options to rebuild entirely or remodel existing; 4) The project has several positive enhancements as described; and 5) believes the project as all major construction is inconvenient and creates change but does not believe the project will be detrimental. Commissioner Seville-Jones also noted that the decision by an owner in proceeding with a project often involves a balancing of whether to scrape the lot to build an entirely new building or retain the existing building, and the Minor Exception is a zoning tool that can help property owners decide how to proceed. She believes that the Staff has clearly stated how the valuations were made and believes that delay on the construction was caused not only by the appeal, but also by the additional work that was done without City approval. She commended staff for expeditiously processing the Appeal.

Commissioner Morton stated he will vote to deny the appeal and acknowledged that while the project appears to be a brand new building to the naked eye, the code requires a more meticulous review which he feels Staff followed. He understands that part of the delay is due to the diligence that staff took to technically verify the valuations in accordance with the Minor Exception regulations, and the Planning Commission’s job is to follow the Zoning regulations. He believes that Staff has done their job in applying the code and this has helped to alleviate his concerns although the delay that has occurred is unfortunate.

Commissioner Fournier stated his agreement with his fellow Commissioners. He acknowledged that there is nothing “minor” about a project that results in 90% of the building’s removal and this is a difficult case. He feels that Staff did an excellent job although acknowledged he did not clearly understand how the 90% valuation was done. He will be denying the Appeal.

Chair Apostol noted he appreciates the great amount of work that has gone into this project review. He

understands the Appellant's discomfort with the new stair coming so close to her home but he believes that issue is beyond the scope of review before the Commission tonight. He believes that the Director and Staff did a good job in following the existing code.

ACTION

It was moved and seconded (Morton/Seville Jones) to **UPHOLD** the decision of the Community Development Director and thereby **DENY** the Appeal of a Minor Exception (as amended) for the property located at 1208 The Strand.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Fournier, Morton, Seville-Jones, Chairperson Apostol

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Burkhalter (recused)

04/25/18-3. Consideration of the Sepulveda Initiatives Ad Hoc Working Group Recommendations

Commissioner Burkhalter rejoined the Commission.

Chair Apostol announced the item and invited Staff to make a presentation. Director McIntosh gave brief introductory remarks, noting she is excited to be bringing this project before the Planning Commission. She explained the evolution of the work item, from a Specific Plan as conceived initially in the Council Work Plan, to the present Sepulveda Initiatives project which was approved by the City Council last September.

Staff presentations followed, first an overview by Nhung Madrid, Senior Management Analyst and project manager, followed by Rafael Garcia, Assistant Planner, regarding the work done of the Ad Hoc Working Group in five meetings, and finally Erik Zandvliet, City Traffic Engineer, of the discussions regarding parking standards.

Senior Analyst Madrid described the City Council direction in September, 2017 including its timeline which meets the goal of addressing concerns regarding proliferation of health care facilities on the corridor. She summarized the overall process in forming the Ad Hoc Working Group and referred to the Sepulveda Initiatives Working Group Summary Report, April 2017 which is part of the written staff report.

Rafael Garcia, Assistant Planner, guided the Commission through the Working Group discussions and final recommendations with the aid of a Power Point slide presentation. Generally, after looking at the existing Sepulveda Guidelines, the Working Group considered whether more flexible standards should be adopted through code amendments in exchange for desirable features or uses on the corridor, in an attempt to attract uses and development deemed desirable by the Ad Hoc Group. In general the Group supported considering flexible development standards for height, setbacks, and parking. Assistant Planner Garcia went over the recommendations in detail, covering main topics including: **Development Standards** (covering issues of height and setbacks); **Desirable Uses and Features** (possibly allowing mixed use on a conditional basis, and possibly limiting or further regulating new office/medical uses); and a number of possible amendments to the **Sepulveda Boulevard Development Guide**. With respect to parking Mr. Garcia explained that the Group generally supported updating and simplifying the parking codes where appropriate, but did not support granting parking reductions for the purpose of attracting certain types of businesses. Staff recommends that parking be reviewed first by the Parking and Public Improvements Commission (PPIC) and then brought back to the Planning Commission in fall, 2018 after the other Sepulveda Initiatives are implemented.

Commissioner Fournier asked for clarification on the discussions about possibly increasing building height, noting that this is a very important community issue. **Mr. Garcia** clarified that discussion included the fact that certain commercial businesses require minimum ceiling heights which can be constrained by the height limit. **Director McIntosh** pointed out that the concept of allowing greater than 30 feet height was not being recommended by the Group as a wholesale change for all commercial development along the corridor, but rather only for certain uses that were considered by the entire Group to be desirable, such as a hotel. Further, the Group was not able to arrive at what the specific maximum increase in the height limit should be, but rather it should be reasonable and not open-ended. **Director McIntosh** explained that hotel developers have stated

that in most cases Staff is told a minimum of 10 additional feet is needed for a hotel (40-ft) however for some sites this may not be sufficient.

In presenting on setbacks, Mr. Garcia illustrated that there is a relationship between allowing additional building height, and the existing “daylight plane” standard - if greater height were to be allowed for certain desired uses, the daylight plane setback requirement would increase. Mr. Garcia noted that the Group consensus was that flexibility in applying the daylight plane and setbacks should be only applicable to certain desirable uses as an incentive.

Mr. Garcia displayed a photo of the El Torito site which is one of the “opportunity sites” for which inquiries have been received to be re-developed, with considerable interest for a hotel. He noted the differences between existing residential and commercial setbacks if a mixed use project were to be proposed on this site, given the current standards, the rear yard residential setback would be quite onerous. The Group recommendation was that existing setbacks should be modified to accommodate mixed use projects with flexibility afforded to the residential portion of such a project. Mr. Garcia also noted that the Commission could establish a ratio cap of residential to commercial in order to maintain the commercial character of the corridor.

Assistant Planner Garcia explained the recommendations for modification of the Sepulveda Guidelines including a recommendation that large sites provide side or rear access to residential neighborhoods located behind a commercial site, so that residents can avoid entering Sepulveda in order to access the project. Examples of existing development that provides such facilitated access are the Manhattan Center in the 1900-block and “Goat Hill”.

Erik Zandvliet, City Traffic Engineer gave a brief presentation on parking, noting that the Group arrived at a critical conclusion that changing the quantity standards was not critical in providing incentives for attracting desirable uses. There was also concern that easing parking standards could result in overflow commercial parking on neighborhood streets. He summarized other recommendations that were made such as allowing use of surplus parking on one site with another site; having flexible shared parking standards; improving parking lot design standards and allowing on-street parking spaces to be eliminated if replaced on-site.

Director McIntosh concluded the Staff presentation by stating the recommendation that the Commission discuss the information presented and direct Staff to prepare a draft resolution recommending ordinance language to the City Council, that would implement site development incentives for specified desired uses, but defer a review of parking standards to a later date. She explained that the code amendment would likely be to allow for a new type of entitlement application, possibly an “Incentive Bonus Overlay” that would be an enhancement of the underlying existing zoning. A tentative public hearing date for the proposed implementing Ordinances is May 23rd. Staff is anticipating a relatively simple code change applicable only to the CG zoning district and use types.

Staff clarified the following for the Commission: 1) Sepulveda Boulevard is not affected by lot merger restrictions; 2) the Group discussed professional offices as being desirable and complimentary to residential uses (either in a mixed use project or with nearby neighborhoods) but were not among the uses that need special incentives, rather the focus was on types of uses that are desired but missing on the corridor; 3) the Group was open to the concept of introducing residential uses on Sepulveda with complimentary commercial uses incorporated either in the same structure or on the same lot; and 4) senior housing is a form of residential use.

PLANNING COMMISSION DIRECTION

Chair Apostol invited public input, seeing none, the Commission proceeded with discussing each issue area and provided direction as follows:

Issue #1: Building Height: The Commission discussed and arrived at a consensus generally in favor of allowing an increase in building height along the order of 10 more feet, provided that any impacts to adjoining or nearby residences can be mitigated. Impacts to be avoided should include (but not be limited to) loss of privacy, sunlight and shading and views and noise. The performance standards should take into account possible height exemptions for mechanical equipment. The Commission also agreed that the daylight plane can be a good tool to buffer adjoining residences (privacy, shadowing, etc.) as well as improve aesthetics by articulating the building façade, but they asked that Staff look into other options that might be available to provide flexibility, such as larger overall setbacks and use of design features (landscaping or window

placements, e.g.) that could also be applied.

Issue #2: Setbacks (Conventional). The Commission discussed and focused on mixed use setbacks. The consensus was to support mixed use (commercial plus housing on same property) on the corridor but directed that Staff develop a set of specialized performance standards that would ensure that adequate buffering be provided but which might also offer rewards for voluntary concessions. Zero setbacks should be avoided. The Commission generally supported looking at encouraging the development of small units that would provide housing opportunities for employees who worked nearby and suggested that Staff to look at standards for mixed use used by other communities.

Issue #3: Desirable uses and features: The Commission generally endorsed the list of uses as suggested by the Working Group that would be incentivized with flexible standards which includes among others, hotels and mixed use. Staff suggested, due to interest expressed regarding professional offices, it could look at incentivizing such use within the context of mixed use where there is an appropriate balance of “day/night” uses proposed.

The Chair invited **Jan Holtze**, a member of the Working Group to address the Commission regarding uses. **Mr. Holtze** stated that the Group focused on the types of uses that practically might be incentivized on the “opportunity sites” identified in the staff report, that are currently suitable for development of those uses that are desired, but lacking on the corridor.

Issue 4: Development Guide. The Commission endorsed all enhancements recommended by the Group and as described in the Staff Report.

Issue #5: Parking. The Commission endorsed the recommendation of the Working Group, as described in the Staff Report – that recommended adjustments in the parking codes, anticipated to be relatively few in number, be separated out from the planning amendments and then trail the implementation of the Sepulveda Initiatives.

Management Analyst Madrid advised the Planning Commission that, with the direction provided tonight, Staff will prepare draft Code Amendments to implement the Sepulveda Initiatives and present to the Planning Commission in a public hearing to be held May 23.

5. DIRECTOR’S ITEMS

Director McIntosh asked the Commission for ideas as to how best to make the community aware of the May 23rd public hearing on the Sepulveda Initiatives amendments. Suggestions offered included providing written notice to all property owners within 1,000 feet of Sepulveda; an announcement at a City Council meeting, and press releases or articles in the Beach Reporter.

Director McIntosh also advised that there will be a joint meeting with the City Council and she will confirm the date.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS – None

7. TENTATIVE AGENDA – May 9, 2018:

There are no items for this date therefore it will be cancelled. The next Commission meeting will be held May 23rd. Commissioners Morton and Seville-Jones advised that they would be out of town on May 23rd.

8. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 P.M. to Wednesday, May 23, 2018 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