



Agenda Item # \_\_\_\_\_

# Staff Report

## City of Manhattan Beach

**TO:** Honorable Mayor Fahey and Members of the City Council

**THROUGH:** Geoff Dolan, City Manager

**FROM:** Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development  
Rosemary Lackow, Senior Planner

**DATE:** September 20, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Consideration of a Planning Commission Recommendation to Approve Zoning and Local Coastal Program Code Amendments (MBMC Section 10.64.170/Coastal A.64.170) to Revise Parking Lot Lighting Regulations

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the City Council conduct the public hearing, waive further reading and introduce Ordinance No. 2078.

**FISCAL IMPLICATION:**

There are no fiscal implications associated with the recommended action.

**BACKGROUND:**

The City of Manhattan Beach Zoning Ordinance and Local Coastal Program contain regulations for parking lot lighting within its commercial parking standards that have been in effect since 1991 (adopted with comprehensive zoning revision program, or "ZORP"). The objective of the regulations is to provide for adequate safety and security while safeguarding nearby residential properties from glare.

The City's current regulations are inadequate and in some ways overly restrictive and inflexible, when applied to larger non-coastal sites, especially when upgrades are needed. This has resulted in the filing of variances in a few instances and the City Council has indicated it would be better to amend the code. On August 24, 2005 the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing and adopted Resolution PC 05-10 (5-0 vote) that recommends major changes to the lighting regulations in the Municipal Code and relatively minor changes to the Local Coastal Program (LCP) zoning code.

Staff has therefore prepared Ordinance No. 2078 which contains the Commission's recommendations for consideration by the City Council (Exhibit A). In the Municipal Code, Section 10.64.170 would be repealed and replaced, and in the LCP, Section A.64.170 would be amended. Upon adoption of the ordinance by the City Council, Staff will process a separate application to the Coastal Commission for approval of the LCP amendment.

**DISCUSSION:**

In developing its recommendations to the Planning Commission, Staff visited and compared several parking lots and lights throughout the City, contacted other cities, and conferred with professional engineers who specialize in lighting, especially regarding technical issues.

*City survey*

Staff found that there was a lot of variation in City parking lot lighting codes. While some cities had height limits for light poles, many had very simple and general requirements that required lighting to be installed but screened to prevent glare and reviewed lighting plans on a case by case basis or through use permits or specific plans. Some cities regulated lighting more to meet special security standards contained within building safety codes.

*Current Manhattan Beach regulations*

The City's current code has five standards or criteria for parking lot lights that apply to all commercial properties in the City, coastal and non-coastal. These include: 1) a limit of 12-feet for the height of light poles or lights on buildings, 2) a limit of a 60-degree "cone of direct illumination" from any light source, 3) a maximum illumination level of 3 footcandles on the site and 4) a maximum illumination of .5 footcandle in an R (residential) district) and 5) a requirement that lighting not shine directly onto an adjacent street.

Staff determined that the 12-foot pole height limit, the "cone of illumination" limit, and the 3 footcandle limit should be changed for the non-coastal commercial areas. The "cone of illumination" is difficult to understand and therefore to enforce when reviewing a lighting plan or observing on-site. It is onerous for larger sites which have large parking areas and high public activity to meet the 12 foot standard. To have uniform and adequate lighting with short poles, the quantity of poles increases, and the shorter the pole, the more poles are needed. This is not only more costly but results in more impediments (light poles) within the parking area. There are new technologies that can be applied to taller poles such as lamps with "cut-off" recessed lenses and methods of screening or skirting lamps that prevent light from spilling into areas where it is not wanted.

The 3 footcandle standard likewise has been difficult in the non-coastal area. Generally lighting levels get higher as you get closer to the light source and "hot spots" (excessively bright conditions) can result under or near a light if the pole is too short. This is undesirable because it creates glare. Staff found that the existing limit of .5 footcandle for a residential property (assumed to be adjoining or across the street from a commercial site with parking lot lighting poles) is appropriate and this standard is to be continued in both the coastal and non-coastal zones.

*Proposed lighting regulations*

Manhattan Beach has many situations where homes are close to commercial uses, therefore Staff also focused on standards that would mitigate glare. Staff found that the main technical issues related to lighting were: 1) having enough light for a safe environment; 2) having uniform lighting throughout the parking lot; 3) having an appropriate type of lamp; 4) having an appropriate quantity and spacing of lights; and as stated, preventing glare and spillover in an effective manner.

As stated, Staff believes the current regulations serve the coastal commercial areas well and few changes are proposed, except to provide a clear purpose statement, and to eliminate a requirement regarding “cone of illumination”. The following requirements or standards have been included in Ordinance No. 2078 to address all issues and will be applicable to the non-coastal commercial areas:

1. **To achieve a safe amount of light, uniform pattern, and appropriate number/spacing of light:** a minimum of 1 footcandle is to be required throughout the parking area, and the maximum intensity of illumination shall be 10 footcandles at any point in the parking areas, and not exceeding a 4:1 ratio (average to minimum). This means that if the minimum level is one footcandle, the average cannot exceed four footcandles. The spacing and amount of light poles is dependent and therefore adjusts to meet the standards for lighting levels. (This replaces the current absolute maximum of 3 footcandles.)
2. **To ensure an appropriate lamp:** low pressure sodium lamps are specifically to be prohibited because they are known to distribute light poorly and distort color. (This is a new regulation.)
3. **To prevent glare and spillover:** a maximum of .5 footcandle is to be permitted in a residential district, consistent with current regulations. The following new criteria will also address this issue: light fixtures shall possess sharp “cut-off” qualities at all property lines, with shielding as necessary; and light pole height is to be limited to: 20 feet unless within 25 feet of a residential property, in which case it is to be limited to 12 feet.
4. **To ensure maintenance:** light poles and fixtures are to be properly maintained and shall not be covered by a paint that has a highly reflective material or color.
5. **Exceptions:** Pole heights are to be permitted up to 30-feet with Director approval, with specific findings, including compliance with lighting levels measured in footcandles, and adequate buffering by means of topography or landscaping.

On larger sites with at least 25,000 square feet and with high intensity retail use, pole heights taller than 30 feet but no higher than 35 feet are to require approval of a Use Permit. The Use Permit cannot be approved unless the lighting levels do not exceed an average of 5 and maximum of 18 footcandles at any point. Additionally it must be determined that the lighting facilities are comparable in scale to the buildings on the site and do not interfere with existing trees or landscaping.

6. **Lighting plans:** A photometric lighting plan is to be required to be prepared by a state registered electrical engineer that depicts a point-by-point footcandle layout. The plan is to be comprehensive and include all security lighting on the premises and shall cover all of the parking lot, including service and loading areas.

*Planning Commission findings*

The Planning Commission adopted all of the Staff recommendations upon determining that the proposed regulations:

- Are well balanced in that they consider the property rights of the commercial owners as well as the residents who live near large commercial sites as on Sepulveda or other major corridors. The proposed standards contain limits for illumination which are reasonable and requests for enhancements beyond these limits must be considered with a use permit which involves public hearings and notice.
- Contain a purpose statement that is clear and useful in enforcing the code.
- Address scale and relationship to buildings and landscaping on the site when tall lighting facilities are proposed. The regulations require that light poles and fixtures be comparable in scale to buildings on the site and do not interfere with or be affected by trees and landscaping, with the intent that landscaping be maintained as much as possible.
- Are needed to address the variations in commercial parking lots along Sepulveda and other non-coastal commercial areas.

The record of the Commission hearing is attached, including minutes, Staff Report dated 8-24-05, Resolution PC 05-10 and a “strike-out” version of PC 05-10 that shows the existing code to be deleted and new code words being added.

*Public notice*

As this was a proposed code amendment, Staff advertised the Planning Commission hearing by publishing a large display ad in the Beach Reporter on August 11 for the Planning Commission hearing, and on September 8 for the City Council hearing. No members of the public provided input to the Planning Commission and Staff has not received any calls or correspondence regarding the proposed amendments.

**CONCLUSION:**

The Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) and Local Coastal Program currently contain regulations for parking lot lighting on private property commercial sites. The current regulations, which permit light poles up to only 12 feet is overly restrictive and ineffective for the non-coastal areas, such as Sepulveda Boulevard and especially large parking lots. Variances have been filed when such sites have a lot of difficulty in complying with this restrictive height standard.

The proposed ordinance provides updated and reasonable standards that differentiate as is appropriate, between the coastal and non-coastal commercial sites. For the coastal areas such as downtown and the Highland Avenue north-end, which are relatively small, and pedestrian oriented areas that are closer to residential uses, the current light pole height and level of illumination does not need to be changed. The larger retail sites located in the non-coastal commercial areas that have high public use and need taller poles to widely distribute light need more flexibility. Flexibility is built into the code, but the standards also call for public review if lighting levels are requested to be significantly enhanced or for very tall light poles.

It is appropriate that the City Council conduct the public hearing and, subject to further input, staff recommends that the Council adopt proposed Ordinance No. 2078.

Agenda Item #: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments:

- A. Ordinance No. 2078
- B. PC minutes 8/24/05
- C. Resolution PC 05-10
- D. Resolution PC 05-10 (strike-out)
- E. Staff Report to Planning Commission 8/24/05 (some attachments not available)

ORDINANCE NO. 2078

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY ZONING CODE (SECTION 10.64.170) AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM ZONING CODE (SECTION A.64.170) REGARDING PARKING LOT LIGHTING REGULATIONS

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Council hereby makes the following findings:

- A. Pursuant to applicable law, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on August 24, 2005 regarding the proposed Code Amendments related to revisions of parking lot lighting regulations, and public testimony was invited and received.
- B. The public hearing held by the Planning Commission was advertised by a one-quarter page display ad published on August 11, 2005 in The Beach Reporter, a newspaper of general circulation in Manhattan Beach.
- C. Pursuant to applicable law, the City Council conducted a duly noticed public hearing on September 20, 2005 regarding the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding the proposed Code Amendments (Resolution PC 05-10) related to revisions of parking lot lighting regulations, and public testimony was invited and received.
- D. The public hearing held by the City Council was advertised by a one-quarter page display ad published on September 1, 2005 in The Beach Reporter, a newspaper of general circulation in Manhattan Beach and notice was mailed to interested parties of record.
- E. The applicant for the subject project is the City of Manhattan Beach.
- F. The purpose of the proposed Amendments is to simplify the current commercial parking lot lighting regulations and to address differences between inland and beach area commercial sites and to ensure lighting conditions are effectively designed resulting in a safe environment while minimizing light nuisances to neighboring residential uses or properties.
- G. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Manhattan Beach CEQA Guidelines, the subject Amendments are exempt in that they are covered by the general rule that CEQA [Section 15061 (3)] only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment, and since it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA; and,
- H. The proposed amendments have been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4, Section No. 65853, et seq., of the State of California Government Code.
- I. The project will not individually nor cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.
- J. The proposed amendment to the Title 10 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) and Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the Manhattan Beach General Plan as follows:

Goal LU-5: Protect residential neighborhoods from the intrusion of inappropriate and incompatible uses.

Policy LU-5.1: Require the separation or buffering of residential areas from businesses which produce noise, odors high traffic volumes, light or glare, and parking through the use of landscaping, setbacks, or other techniques.

Goal LU-6: Maintain the viability of the commercial areas of Manhattan Beach.

Policy LU-6.1: Support and encourage small businesses throughout the City.

Policy LU-6.2: Encourage a diverse mix of businesses that support the local tax base, are beneficial to residents and support the economic needs of the community.

K. The proposed amendments to the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the City's certified Local Coastal Program:

Policy II.1: Control development within the Manhattan Beach coastal zone.

Policy II.A.2: Preserve the predominant existing commercial building (development) scale.

Policy II.A.3: Encourage the maintenance of commercial area orientation to the pedestrian.

Policy II.A.6: Encourage development of adequate parking facilities.

The above three policies will be facilitated in that the existing height limit of 12-feet (from finished ground level) for light sources and a maximum of 3 foot candle level of illumination will be maintained. These criteria are consistent with lighting engineering standards for low scale commercial development parking lots with orientation to the pedestrian.

SECTION 2. The City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby APPROVES the proposed amendment to Section A.64.170 lighting of the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program, Chapter 2, Title A (Coastal Zoning Code) as follows:

Section A.64.170.Lighting.

The purposes of lighting regulations are: to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety, to protect nearby residential uses from undue glare and, to ensure that the existing low-scale pedestrian friendly character of commercial areas is maintained. Outdoor parking area lighting shall not employ a light source higher than twelve feet (12'), and shall not directly shine onto an adjacent street or residentially zoned or developed property. Maximum illumination at ground level shall be three (3) foot candles and shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.

SECTION 3. The City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby APPROVES the proposed amendment to the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (Section 10.64.170 Lighting) as follows:

**“Section 10.64.170.Lighting.**

- A. Lighting regulations are intended to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety while protecting nearby residential uses from undue glare.
- B. Each plan for the construction, renovation or replacement of an outside parking lot with lighting shall include an exterior photometric lighting plan prepared by an electrical engineer registered in the State of California, consisting of a point-by-point foot candle layout (based on a ten (10') foot grid center extending a minimum of 20 feet outside the property lines. The lighting plan shall be comprehensive and include all exit and security lighting on the property, and shall cover the entire parking lot plus all loading and service areas.
- C. Standards. The plan shall be designed in compliance with the following:
  - 1. The maximum height of a light source located within 25 feet of a residentially zoned or developed parcel shall be no more than 12 feet and shall be no more than 20 feet in all other areas (measurement from adjoining ground level).
  - 2. The light fixtures shall possess sharp cut-off qualities at all property lines and shielding shall be provided as necessary.
  - 3. The light fixtures and poles shall be properly maintained. Paint covering shall not be of a color or type that is highly reflective.
  - 4. There shall be no low pressure sodium light fixtures.
  - 5. The minimum illumination level shall be 1 foot candle.
  - 6. The maximum intensity of illumination shall be computed based on a four to one (4:1) ratio (average-to-minimum) throughout the parking lot, including loading and service areas.

7. The maximum illumination level within the parking lot including loading and service areas at any location shall be 10 foot candles. The maximum illumination level shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.
8. The Director of Community Development may approve lighting that employs a light source up to 30 feet in height, for sites with moderate to high public use, providing such installation meets all other standards in this section and conditions exist which ensure residential light nuisances will be avoided. Such conditions shall include but not be limited to: buffering achieved by difference in ground elevation, the presence of dense mature vegetation or the orientation, location or height/massing of buildings relative to the nearest residential property.
9. A use permit may be approved for lighting on commercial sites containing at least 25,000 square feet that have high intensity public use(s) with light sources that exceed 30 feet in height and produce light that exceeds the average-to-minimum of 10-foot candles if the findings in paragraph 8. of this section and the following additional findings are made:
  - a. The maximum height is 35 feet.
  - b. Illumination levels do not exceed an average of 5 foot candles and a maximum of 18 foot candles at any location on the entire parcel.
  - c. The proposed light poles and fixtures are comparable in scale to the building(s) on the same site.
  - d. The lighting facilities including poles and fixtures do not interfere with nor is their function affected by mature trees or landscaping.”

SECTION 4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66499.37, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul this decision, or concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done or made prior to such decision or to determine the reasonableness, legality or validity of any condition attached to this decision shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days of the date of this Ordinance and the City Council is served within 120 days of the date of this Ordinance.

SECTION 5. If any sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have passed this Ordinance and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

SECTION 6. Any provisions of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code, or appendices thereto, or any other Ordinance of the City, to the extent that they are inconsistent with this Ordinance, and no further, are hereby repealed.

SECTION 7. This Ordinance shall go into effect and be in full force and operation from and after thirty days after its final passage and adoption.

SECTION 8. The City Clerk shall cause this Ordinance or a summary thereof to be published and, if appropriate posted, as provided by law. Any summary shall be published and a certified copy of the full text of this Ordinance posted in the Office of the City Clerk at least five (5) days prior to the City Council meeting at which this Ordinance is to be adopted. Within fifteen (15) days after the adoption of this Ordinance, the City Clerk shall cause a summary to be published with the names of those City Council members voting for and against this Ordinance and shall post in the Office of the City Clerk a certified copy of the full text of this Ordinance along with the names of those City Council members voting for and against the Ordinance.



AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor, City of Manhattan Beach, California

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
AUGUST 24, 2005**

1  
2 A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach was held on  
3 Wednesday, August 24, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400  
4 Highland Avenue.

5  
6 **ROLL CALL**

7  
8 Chairperson Savikas called the meeting to order.

9  
10 Members Present: Bohner, Lesser, Schlager, Simon, Chairperson Savikas  
11 Members Absent: None  
12 Staff: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development  
13 Laurie Jester, Senior Planner  
14 Sarah Boesch, Recording Secretary  
15

16 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** August 10, 2005

17  
18 Commissioner Lesser requested that page 4 line 11 of the August 10 minutes be revised to read:  
19 "Commissioner Lesser commented that the amount of permitted BFA was limited by ZORP, but  
20 it was not limited further by the Bulk Volume Ordinance."  
21

22 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Simon/Lesser) to **APPROVE** the minutes of August  
23 10, 2005, as amended.  
24

25 AYES: Bohner, Lesser, Schlager, Simon, Chairperson Savikas  
26 NOES: None  
27 ABSENT: None  
28 ABSTAIN: None  
29

30 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** None

31  
32 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

33  
34 **05/0824.1 Zoning and Local Coastal Program CODE AMENDMENTS (MBMC Section**  
35 **10.64.170/Coastal A.64.170) to Revise Parking Lot Lighting Regulations**  
36

37 Director Thompson indicated that the issue was initiated because commercial parking lot lights  
38 poles are currently limited in the Code to a height of 12 feet, and there have been Variance  
39 requests to increase the height of poles. He said that staff feels it is appropriate to amend the  
40 Code given the new technologies currently available for shielding impacts from lighting to the  
41 adjacent residents. He commented that staff is recommending that the Commission approve the  
42 draft Resolution recommending the City Council approve the proposed Code standards.

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 24, 2005

Page 2

1  
2 Senior Planner Jester summarized the staff report. She indicated that the proposal is to update  
3 the Code provisions in the inland commercial areas of the City. She commented that there have  
4 been requests to replace existing lighting because a height of 12 feet is not sufficient for large  
5 sites. She indicated that the smaller lighting does seem to work in the coastal areas, and only  
6 minor changes are being recommended for the downtown and Highland Avenue commercial  
7 sections. She indicated that the current Code language allows a maximum cone of illumination  
8 of 60 degrees, which can be confusing to implement. She commented that the Code also allows  
9 a maximum permitted lighting level of 3 foot candles, which is inadequate for larger sites. She  
10 stated that the commercial sites in the coastal area are much smaller than the inland sites and  
11 should have different standards. She indicated that many cities have general criteria for limiting  
12 glare, and some cities require Use Permits for commercial lighting. She commented that  
13 Manhattan Beach does have the most restrictive height limit of the cities that staff surveyed. She  
14 stated that the goal is to provide uniform lighting throughout the parking lot; to provide adequate  
15 illumination for safety and security; and to prevent glare and spillover to residential properties.  
16 She indicated that different types of lamps have different characteristics, and the goal is to ensure  
17 that the lamps that are used and the quantity and spacing of lights are appropriate.

18  
19 Senior Planner Jester indicated that staff is proposing a 4:1 foot-candle average to minimum  
20 uniformity ratio throughout parking lots; a minimum of 1 foot-candle and maximum 10 foot  
21 candle for lights within a parking lot; and a maximum .5 foot-candle for lights adjacent to  
22 residential lots. She said that the lighting engineers that staff consulted indicated that a  
23 requirement for such a ratio would provide a more uniform or even lighting.

24  
25 In response to a question from Chairperson Savikas, Senior Planner Jester commented that a  
26 foot-candle is a measure of intensity of light. She said that the first number in the ratio  
27 represents the average of the spread of light from all lamps on the entire site, and the second  
28 represents the minimum level of light.

29  
30 Senior Planner Jester stated that language has been added to the purpose statement to clarify that  
31 preventing offsite glare is an important purpose of the Code requirements. She indicated that  
32 requirements are included for "cutoff" lamps and shielding and skirting. She stated that lamps  
33 would be restricted to a maximum height of 12 feet within 25 feet of a residential property; and  
34 an overall maximum of 20 feet with allowances for up to 30 feet with certain criteria and  
35 approval from the Community Development Director. She indicated that low pressure sodium  
36 lamps would be prohibited because of their poor light distribution and color distortion. She  
37 indicated that a photometric plan would be required when proposing to upgrade existing lighting  
38 or install new lighting. She stated that such plans would need to be prepared by a certified  
39 lighting engineer; would need to be comprehensive and include all lighting for the site; and  
40 would need to show a point by point grid layout of the illumination from the lamps. She  
41 commented that there are circumstances where staff feels enhanced lighting may be appropriate

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 24, 2005

Page 3

1 for high activity uses on larger sites, such as for the Target site and some businesses along  
2 Rosecrans Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard. She indicated that lighting for such uses would  
3 require a Use Permit and would be permitted an absolute height limit of 35 feet; a maximum  
4 illumination of 18 foot-candles; and a maximum average illumination of 5 foot-candles. She  
5 indicated that special findings would be required and evaluated on a case by case basis. She  
6 commented that large street lamps along the road are typically 29 high, and lamps along  
7 sidewalks are typically 11 or 12 feet high in the downtown area.

8  
9 Director Thompson pointed out that the proposed Code amendments would not regulate  
10 streetlights but only lights on commercial sites.

11  
12 In response to a question from Commissioner Simon, Senior Planner Jester indicated that the  
13 proposal does not regulate lights on recreation fields.

14  
15 Chairperson Savikas opened the public hearing.

16  
17 There being no one wishing to speak, Chairperson Savikas closed the public hearing.

18  
19 In response to a question from Commissioner Schlager, Senior Planner Jester said that there has  
20 been no response from the community regarding the proposed changes; however, staff has been  
21 working with representatives of a couple of commercial sites that are considering revising their  
22 lighting standards.

23  
24 In response to a question from Commissioner Schlager, Director Thompson said that the  
25 complaints typically received by staff are regarding lights from commercial sites spilling over  
26 into adjacent residential areas such as along Oak Street. He indicated that staff feels the  
27 provisions that are proposed address issues of light spilling over into residential areas.

28  
29 Commissioner Schlager said that it appears that the regulations do allow flexibility in applying to  
30 individual sites.

31  
32 Director Thompson pointed out that the Code will remain restrictive to properties adjacent to  
33 residences.

34  
35  
36 Commissioner Lesser said that his largest concern is whether the regulations has an effect on the  
37 rights of residents with properties adjacent to commercial properties east of Sepulveda  
38 Boulevard that would be most impacted by the changes. He commented that he is comfortable  
39 that the proposed changes are well balanced and with the City being more restrictive than many  
40 other communities.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

August 24, 2005

Page 4

1 Commissioner Simon stated that purpose statements are very important in providing direction for  
2 the application of ordinances, and the purpose statement for the proposed lighting regulations is  
3 well written. He said that it is important for the public to be able to provide input, which is  
4 provided in the proposed Code language. He indicated that he supports including items (c) and  
5 (d) under Section 3 of the draft Resolution that the proposed light poles and fixtures are  
6 comparable in scale to the buildings on the same site and that the lighting facilities including  
7 poles and fixtures do not interfere with nor is their function affected by mature trees or  
8 landscaping. He indicated that the staff report provides a great deal of thought and effort.

9  
10 Commissioner Bohner said that the necessity for the Resolution has been shown. He indicated  
11 that it takes into account variations that might be required under certain circumstances. He  
12 commented that he supports the proposed Code amendments.

13  
14 In response to a question from Chairperson Savikas, senior Planner Jester stated that the only  
15 type of lighting that would be restricted under the new regulations are low pressure sodium light  
16 fixtures. She said that other types of light fixtures currently available such as metal halide, high  
17 pressure sodium, fluorescent, or mercury vapor would be permitted.

18  
19 Chairperson Savikas commented that the draft Resolution is very well written, and she supports  
20 the proposal.

21  
22 A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Schlager/Bohner) to **ADOPT** the draft Resolution  
23 recommending that the City Council **APPROVE** Zoning and Local Coastal Program CODE  
24 AMENDMENTS (MBMC Section 10.64.170/Coastal A.64.170) to revise parking lot lighting  
25 regulations

26  
27 AYES: Bohner, Lesser, Schlager, Simon, Chairperson Savikas  
28 NOES: None  
29 ABSENT: None  
30 ABSTAIN: None

31  
32 Director Thompson explained that the Commission’s recommendation will be forwarded to the  
33 City Council for its consideration at a public hearing to be scheduled for a future date.

34

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS  
TO THE CITY ZONING CODE (SECTION 10.64.170)  
AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM ZONING CODE  
(SECTION A.64.170) REGARDING PARKING LOT  
LIGHTING REGULATIONS**

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH DOES  
HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings:

- A. Pursuant to applicable law, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on August 24, 2005 regarding the proposed Code Amendments related to revisions of parking lot lighting regulations, and public testimony was invited and received.
- B. Public notice included a one-quarter page display ad published on August 11, 2005 in The Beach Reporter, a newspaper of general circulation in Manhattan Beach.
- C. The applicant for the subject project is the City of Manhattan Beach.
- D. The purpose of the proposed Amendments is to simplify the current commercial parking lot lighting regulations and to address differences between inland and beach area commercial sites and to ensure lighting conditions are effectively designed resulting in a safe environment while minimizing light nuisances to neighboring residential uses or properties.
- E. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Manhattan Beach CEQA Guidelines, the subject Amendments are exempt in that they are covered by the general rule that CEQA [Section 15061 (3)] only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment, and since it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA; and,
- F. The proposed amendments have been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4, Section No. 65853, et seq., of the State of California Government Code.
- G. The Planning Commission finds that the project will not individually nor cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

- H. The proposed amendment to the Title 10 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) and Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the Manhattan Beach General Plan as follows:

**Goal LU-5: Protect residential neighborhoods from the intrusion of inappropriate and incompatible uses.**

Policy LU-5.1: Require the separation or buffering of residential areas from businesses which produce noise, odors high traffic volumes, light or glare, and parking through the use of landscaping, setbacks, or other techniques.

**Goal LU-6: Maintain the viability of the commercial areas of Manhattan Beach.**

Policy LU-6.1: Support and encourage small businesses throughout the City.

Policy LU-6.2: Encourage a diverse mix of businesses that support the local tax base, are beneficial to residents and support the economic needs of the community.

- I. The proposed amendments to the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the City's certified Local Coastal Program:

Policy II.1: Control development within the Manhattan Beach coastal zone.

Policy II.A.2: Preserve the predominant existing commercial building (development) scale.

Policy II.A.3: Encourage the maintenance of commercial area orientation to the pedestrian.

Policy II.A.6.: Encourage development of adequate parking facilities.

The above three policies will be facilitated in that the existing height limit of 12-feet (from finished ground level) for light sources and a maximum of 3 foot candle level of illumination will be maintained. These criteria are consistent with lighting engineering standards for low scale commercial development parking lots with orientation to the pedestrian.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendment to Section A.64.170 Lighting of the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program, Chapter 2, Title A (Coastal Zoning Code) as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

Section A.64.170.Lighting.

The purposes of lighting regulations are: to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety, to protect nearby residential uses from undue glare and, to ensure that the existing low-scale pedestrian friendly character of commercial areas are maintained. Outdoor parking area lighting shall not employ a light source higher than twelve feet (12'), ~~shall create no cone of direct illumination greater than sixty degrees (60°) from a light source higher than six feet (6')~~, and shall not directly shine onto an adjacent street or residentially zoned or developed property. Maximum illumination at ground level shall be three (3) foot candles and shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendment to the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (Section 10.64.170 Lighting) as follows:

Section 10.64.170.Lighting.

- A. Lighting regulations are intended to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety while protecting nearby residential uses from undue glare.
- B. Each plan for the construction, renovation or replacement of an outside parking lot with lighting shall include an exterior photometric lighting plan prepared by an electrical engineer registered in the State of California, consisting of a point-by-point foot candle layout (based on a ten (10') foot grid center extending a minimum of 20 feet outside the property lines. The lighting plan shall be comprehensive and include all exit and security lighting on the property, and shall cover the entire parking lot plus all loading and service areas.
- C. Standards. The plan shall be designed in compliance with the following:
  - 1. The maximum height of a light source located within 25 feet of a residentially zoned or developed parcel shall be no more than 12 feet and shall be no more than 20 feet in all other areas (measurement from adjoining ground level).
  - 2. The light fixtures shall possess sharp cut-off qualities at all property lines and shielding shall be provided as necessary. The
  - 3. The light fixtures and poles shall be properly maintained. Paint covering shall not be of a color or type that is highly reflective.
  - 4. There shall be no low pressure sodium light fixtures.
  - 5. The minimum illumination level shall be 1 foot candle.
  - 6. The maximum intensity of illumination shall be computed based on a four to one (4:1) ratio (average-to-minimum) throughout the parking lot, including loading and service areas.
  - 7. The maximum illumination level at any location within the parking lot including loading and service areas shall be 10 foot candles.
  - 8. The Director of Community Development may approve lighting that employs a light source up to 30 feet in height, for sites with



**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

moderate to high public use, providing such installation meets all other standards in this section and conditions exist which ensure residential light nuisances will be avoided.

Such conditions shall include but not be limited to: buffering achieved by difference in ground elevation, the presence of dense mature vegetation or the orientation, location or height/massing of buildings relative to the nearest residential property.

9. A use permit may be approved for lighting on commercial sites containing at least 25,000 square feet that have high intensity public use(s) with light sources that exceed 30 feet in height and produce light that exceeds the average-to-minimum of 10-foot candles if the findings in paragraph 8. of this section and the following additional findings are made:
  - a. The maximum height is 35 feet.
  - b. Illumination levels do not exceed an average of 5 foot candles and a maximum of 18 foot candles at any location on the entire parcel.
  - c. The proposed light poles and fixtures are comparable in scale to the building(s) on the same site.
  - d. The lighting facilities including poles and fixtures do not interfere with nor is their function affected by mature trees or landscaping.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66499.37, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul this decision, or concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done or made prior to such decision or to determine the reasonableness, legality or validity of any condition attached to this decision shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days of the date of this resolution and the City Council is served within 120 days of the date of this resolution.

SECTION 5. If any sentence, clause, or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this resolution. The Planning Commission hereby declares that it would have passed this resolution and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

SECTION 6. Any provisions of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code, or appendices thereto, or any other resolution of the City, to the extent that they are inconsistent with this resolution, and no further, are hereby repealed.

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the Resolution as adopted by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of August 24, 2005 and that said Resolution was adopted by the following votes:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

---

**RICHARD THOMPSON**  
Secretary to the Planning Commission

---

**SARAH BOESCHEN**  
Recording Secretary

RI H:CodeAmendments/lighting/PCResodraft

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-10**  
**(strike-out/underline – showing code changes)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS  
TO THE CITY ZONING CODE (SECTION 10.64.170)  
AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM ZONING CODE  
(SECTION A.64.170) REGARDING PARKING LOT  
LIGHTING REGULATIONS**

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH DOES  
HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings:

- A. Pursuant to applicable law, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on August 24, 2005 regarding the proposed Code Amendments related to revisions of parking lot lighting regulations, and public testimony was invited and received.
- B. Public notice included a one-quarter page display ad published on August 11, 2005 in The Beach Reporter, a newspaper of general circulation in Manhattan Beach.
- C. The applicant for the subject project is the City of Manhattan Beach.
- D. The purpose of the proposed Amendments is to simplify the current commercial parking lot lighting regulations and to address differences between inland and beach area commercial sites and to ensure lighting conditions are effectively designed resulting in a safe environment while minimizing light nuisances to neighboring residential uses or properties.
- E. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Manhattan Beach CEQA Guidelines, the subject Amendments are exempt in that they are covered by the general rule that CEQA [Section 15061 (3)] only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment, and since it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA; and,
- F. The proposed amendments have been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4, Section No. 65853, et seq., of the State of California Government Code.
- G. The Planning Commission finds that the project will not individually nor cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-10**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

- H. The proposed amendment to the Title 10 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) and Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the Manhattan Beach General Plan as follows:

**Goal LU-5: Protect residential neighborhoods from the intrusion of inappropriate and incompatible uses.**

Policy LU-5.1: Require the separation or buffering of residential areas from businesses which produce noise, odors high traffic volumes, light or glare, and parking through the use of landscaping, setbacks, or other techniques.

**Goal LU-6: Maintain the viability of the commercial areas of Manhattan Beach.**

Policy LU-6.1: Support and encourage small businesses throughout the City.

Policy LU-6.2: Encourage a diverse mix of businesses that support the local tax base, are beneficial to residents and support the economic needs of the community.

- I. The proposed amendments to the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the City's certified Local Coastal Program:

Policy II.1: Control development within the Manhattan Beach coastal zone.

Policy II.A.2: Preserve the predominant existing commercial building (development) scale.

Policy II.A.3: Encourage the maintenance of commercial area orientation to the pedestrian.

Policy II.A.6.: Encourage development of adequate parking facilities.

The above three policies will be facilitated in that the existing height limit of 12-feet (from finished ground level) for light sources and a maximum of 3 foot candle level of illumination will be maintained. These criteria are consistent with lighting engineering standards for low scale commercial development parking lots with orientation to the pedestrian.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendment to Section A.64.170 Lighting of the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program, Chapter 2, Title A (Coastal Zoning Code) as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-10**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

Section A.64.170.Lighting.

The purposes of lighting regulations are: to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety, to protect nearby residential uses from undue glare and, to ensure that the existing low-scale pedestrian friendly character of commercial areas are maintained. Outdoor parking area lighting shall not employ a light source higher than twelve feet (12'), ~~shall create no cone of direct illumination greater than sixty degrees (60°) from a light source higher than six feet (6')~~, and shall not directly shine onto an adjacent street or residentially zoned or developed property. Maximum illumination at ground level shall be three (3) foot candles and shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendment to the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (Section 10.64.170 Lighting) as follows:

Section 10.64.170.Lighting.

- A. Lighting regulations are intended to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety while protecting nearby residential uses from undue glare.
- B. Each plan for the construction, renovation or replacement of an outside parking lot with lighting shall include an exterior photometric lighting plan prepared by an electrical engineer registered in the State of California, consisting of a point-by-point foot candle layout (based on a ten (10') foot grid center extending a minimum of 20 feet outside the property lines. The lighting plan shall be comprehensive and include all exit and security lighting on the property, and shall cover the entire parking lot plus all loading and service areas.
- C. Standards. The plan shall be designed in compliance with the following:
  - 1. The maximum height of a light source located within 25 feet of a residentially zoned or developed parcel shall be no more than 12 feet and shall be no more than 20 feet in all other areas (measurement from adjoining ground level).
  - 2. The light fixtures shall possess sharp cut-off qualities at all property lines and shielding shall be provided as necessary.
  - 3. The light fixtures and poles shall be properly maintained. Paint covering shall not be of a color or type that is highly reflective.
  - 4. There shall be no low pressure sodium light fixtures.
  - 5. The minimum illumination level shall be 1 foot candle.
  - 6. The maximum intensity of illumination shall be computed based on a four to one (4:1) ratio (average-to-minimum) throughout the parking lot, including loading and service areas.
  - 7. The maximum illumination level within the parking lot including loading and service areas at any location shall be 10 foot candles. The maximum illumination level shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-10**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

8. The Director of Community Development may approve lighting that employs a light source up to 30 feet in height, for sites with moderate to high public use, providing such installation meets all other standards in this section and conditions exist which ensure residential light nuisances will be avoided.

Such conditions shall include but not be limited to: buffering achieved by difference in ground elevation, the presence of dense mature vegetation or the orientation, location or height/massing of buildings relative to the nearest residential property.

9. A use permit may be approved for lighting on commercial sites containing at least 25,000 square feet that have high intensity public use(s) with light sources that exceed 30 feet in height and produce light that exceeds the average-to-minimum of 10-foot candles if the findings in paragraph 8. of this section and the following additional findings are made:
- a. The maximum height is 35 feet.
  - b. Illumination levels do not exceed an average of 5 foot candles and a maximum of 18 foot candles at any location on the entire parcel.
  - c. The proposed light poles and fixtures are comparable in scale to the building(s) on the same site.
  - d. The lighting facilities including poles and fixtures do not interfere with nor is their function affected by mature trees or landscaping.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66499.37, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul this decision, or concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done or made prior to such decision or to determine the reasonableness, legality or validity of any condition attached to this decision shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days of the date of this resolution and the City Council is served within 120 days of the date of this resolution.

SECTION 5. If any sentence, clause, or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this resolution. The Planning Commission hereby declares that it would have passed this resolution and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

SECTION 6. Any provisions of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code, or appendices

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-10**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

thereto, or any other resolution of the City, to the extent that they are inconsistent with this resolution, and no further, are hereby repealed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the Resolution as adopted by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of August 24, 2005 and that said Resolution was adopted by the following votes:

AYES: [Chair Savikas, Vice-Chairman Simon, Commissioners Schlager, Bohner, and Lesser](#)  
NOES: [None](#)  
ABSENT: [None](#)  
ABSTAIN: [None](#)

---

**RICHARD THOMPSON**  
Secretary to the Planning Commission

---

**SARAH BOESCHEN**  
Recording Secretary

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

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development  
Rosemary Lackow, Senior Planner

**DATE:** August 24, 2005

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Code Amendments (MBMC Section 10.64.170/Coastal A.64.170)  
to Revise Parking Lot Lighting Regulations

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Commission **CONDUCT** the **PUBLIC HEARING** and **ADOPT** the attached Resolution amending parking lot lighting regulations.

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Manhattan Beach Zoning Ordinance and Local Coastal Program contain regulations for parking lot lighting within its commercial parking standards that have been in effect since 1991 (adopted with comprehensive zoning revision program, or “ZORP”). The objective of the regulations is to provide for adequate safety, while safeguarding nearby residential properties from glare.

The City’s code currently has a single absolute height limit (12-feet) for parking lot lights throughout the City. Staff believes this is appropriate and effective for smaller parking lots, but difficulty arises when larger sites seek to replace or upgrade lighting facilities and existing taller lights significantly exceed the code limits. On at least two occasions variances have been before the Planning Commission and the City Council has indicated that it would be better to amend the code to accommodate such situations.

**DISCUSSION**

Staff visited and compared several parking lots and lights throughout the City, contacted other cities, and consulted technical guidelines and professional engineers including the City Traffic Engineer and a private consultant that specializes in designing commercial lighting facilities. The attached draft Resolution reflects Staff’s conclusion that the codes should be revised to: address significant differences between the beach and inland commercial areas, be as simple as possible, be more effective for ensuring safety and security while considering the needs of adjoining residential properties.



### *Current City Code*

The City's Zoning Ordinance and Local Coastal Program codes (Sections 10.64.170/A.64.170) read as follows:

#### Lighting.

Outdoor parking area lighting shall not employ a light source higher than twelve feet (12'), shall create no cone of direct illumination greater than sixty degrees (60°) from a light source higher than six feet (6'), and shall not directly shine onto an adjacent street. Maximum illumination at ground level shall be three (3) foot candles and shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.

Staff believes that this code generally works well in the beach area and on small sites in the inland commercial areas. The 12-foot height limit and absolute maximum amount of illumination of (3) foot candles is reasonable for the small lots and fits the low scale "village atmosphere" in Downtown and the commercial north-end of Highland Avenue area. However, Staff does not believe this height and illumination standard is appropriate for the many sites in the inland area, especially on Sepulveda and Rosecrans Avenue, the City's main commercial corridors. This is because those commercial properties are typically much larger and zoned for more intensive uses. In addition, the inland larger sites are required to have conventional on-site parking for all uses, as opposed to many downtown lots which can rely to a large degree on off-site parking in consolidated City lots.

Staff believes that the maximum 0.5 foot candle amount of light which applies to an adjoining R (residential) district is appropriate throughout the City, in that it will prevent light spillover for small lots and will not be an issue for larger commercial sites that are not near homes. Lastly, Staff believes that the requirement for a maximum 60 degree "cone of direct illumination" is confusing and not necessary. Light nuisances can be prevented by having other criteria including requiring shielding and utilizing lamps that have "cut-off" recessed lenses.

### *City survey*

Staff contacted or researched codes for several other cities. The following summarizes this relevant information.

1. Most cities have only general guidelines with requirements for shielding and diffused (indirect) illumination which may mean simply that the lamp or bulb itself should not be visible from a residential property (Hermosa Beach, Torrance, Culver City). Many cities evaluate larger sites on a case-by-case basis through a Use Permit or Specific Plan (Palos Verdes Estates, Simi Valley). Another approach is to have a generalized code requirement and separate specific guidelines that are used for evaluating sites (Agoura Hills). Some cities have both zoning and building codes that address lighting along with other security and safety regulations (El Segundo, Irvine).

2. Most cities did not have very restrictive height limits in their codes for lighting poles. Staff believes this is due to the varying needs for lighting in cities.<sup>1</sup>
3. Many cities require that a comprehensive photometric plan be submitted for Staff review to check lighting facilities. The plan becomes the basis for working with the applicant to achieve appropriate lighting

### *Technical Lighting Considerations/Recommendations*

From a technical perspective the following are considerations in designing a lighting plan: 1) having uniform lighting; 2) having enough light; 3) preventing glare and spillover of nuisance light onto adjoining residential and other sensitive uses ; 4) having an appropriate type of lamp; and 6) having an appropriate quantity/spacing of lights. Staff consulted the Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) of North America Lighting Handbook, a 1987 document that is widely used for designing lighting systems, including parking lots (see excerpts attached to Exhibit C, Resources). Although this document has been updated as recently as 1998, Staff believes that the standards proposed in the draft Resolution are still appropriate and consistent with the approach and practices recommended by IES.

Discussion on each issue and the related Staff recommendations are as follows.

1. Uniformity of lighting. Especially dark or bright (“hot”) spots should be avoided, although it is natural that the area directly under a lamp will be the brightest and the areas farthest away will be the darkest. Instead of having just a minimum and maximum level of illumination, the lighting level is recommended to be calculated with a “uniformity ratio”. An “average-to-minimum” method is recommended, supplemented with a maximum illumination level at any point. Using this method involves comparing the average level of light to the minimum level and applying this ratio to the parking lot.

**Staff recommendation:** The code should include an average-to-minimum limit of 4:1 foot candles, meaning that both the minimum and the average amount of light is established and the ratio between the two should be no more than 4:1 throughout the entire parking lot, including loading and service areas.

2. Amount of illumination. A specified absolute minimum of about 1 foot candle of light should be included. For larger lots, this typically is an issue at the periphery of the lot where light is cast from more centralized fixtures, but for small lots, it may be more efficient to place the poles at the boundary of the lot, facing inward. Some large commercial operators may also want enhanced lighting not just for security but to advertise and attract drivers to a site. Because of this, Staff recommends that an absolute maximum level of illumination be included.

---

<sup>1</sup> The most restrictive Staff found was Agoura Hills, (max height of 16 feet) which has limited retail and discourages tall lighting to preserve a semi-rural town character.

**Staff recommendation:** There should be a maximum level of 10 foot candles at any location on the commercial site.

3. Preventing glare/nuisance. There are many terms for nuisance light. The concern in Manhattan Beach as in many cities is light that spills over from the site onto residential property. The goal is to have light contained at acceptable levels within the parking lot site, or where lighting is intended.

**Staff recommendation:** A purpose statement should be included to address the intent of the lighting standards. In addition, a number of criteria should be included to ensure lighting is controlled. These include: height limits for lamps, restrictions on unsuitable types of lamps, requirements for suitable “cut-off” types of lamps and/or shielding, and appropriate illumination standards. Staff recommends: a maximum height of 20-feet for lamps, measured from the finished ground level. Staff also recommends a minimum pole/lamp setback of 25 feet from a property zoned or developed with a residential use and maximum lamp height of 12 feet (the existing maximum height limit) if a light is placed within that setback. To address the fact that the City has such a variety of commercial sites, Staff also recommends including a provision that gives Staff the authority to approve mounting heights between 20 and 30 feet if certain findings can be made, provided all other applicable requirements and criteria are met.

4. Lamp types. While low pressure sodium lamps are considered the most effective in producing light, they distribute light poorly and color is highly distorted. These are the bright yellow lights that were installed throughout the City of Long Beach and are systematically being replaced. Metal halide and high pressure sodium lamps, by comparison, perform well and are commonly recommended for parking lots.

**Staff recommendation:** A provision should be included that prohibits use of low pressure sodium lamps. As stated, lamps with “cut-off” qualities due to recessed lenses, and shields or skirts should also be required.

5. Quantity/spacing of light poles. The objective is to have the minimum amount of light poles to achieve the intended purpose for aesthetic and liability reasons. Having too many light poles also takes up space that might otherwise be used for parking. None of the cities surveyed have standards for a maximum number of lights or spacing of poles. Instead, this is determined based on a Lighting Plan and photometric survey prepared by a certified electrical engineer.

**Staff recommendation:** No specific spacing is being included in the draft Resolution. Staff believes that the combination of all of the above measures will address concerns.

6. Lighting Plan. All applicants requesting new lighting systems or upgrading of existing should be required to submit a comprehensive and professional lighting (photometric) plan.

**Staff recommendation:** The required plan should consist of a comprehensive point-by-point foot candle layout (based on a ten (10) foot grid center) extending at least twenty (20') outside the property lines, prepared by a State registered electrical engineer. The plan should include all on-site lighting.

7. Special circumstances. There may be special cases such as the Target store on Sepulveda where a combination of the use, high level of public activity and security needs, building location, orientation or relationship to adjoining properties or other factors may warrant lighting that exceeds one or more of these criteria such as lamp height and average/maximum level of illumination.

**Staff recommendation:** Such requests for enhanced lighting should require a use permit and thus be subject to review (with a public hearing) and approval by the Planning Commission with limit of lamp height of 35 feet/ maximum illumination, 18 foot candles maximum at any point and maximum average illumination of 5 foot candles. These maximum values (equivalent to the Target lot values) should only be approved if stringent findings can be made. The draft Resolution contains suggested findings.

#### *General Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) Consistency*

In the inland Area Districts I and II, the proposed code revisions will apply to the General and Local Commercial (CG and CL) zones, as well as Planned Development and Industrial Park (PD and IP) zones. The proposed amendments will provide more flexibility for evaluating lighting conditions in these areas, which include (but may not be limited to): Rosecrans Avenue, and Aviation, Artesia, Sepulveda and Manhattan Beach Boulevards. The code will also set standards for controlling glare for adjoining residential neighborhood.

Within the coastal zone, the proposed code revisions will apply to the CD (Commercial Downtown) and CNE (Commercial North End) zones. Staff recommends mainly a simplification of the existing code criteria. No provision for exception (other than a variance) is recommended for the coastal zone. The goal is to preserve the existing low-scale village character, which also will protect nearby neighborhoods from glare.

The proposed amendments will facilitate the following General Plan goals and policies:

**Goal LU-5: Protect residential neighborhoods from the intrusion of inappropriate and incompatible uses.**

Policy LU-5.1: Require the separation or buffering of residential areas from businesses which produce noise, odors high traffic volumes, light

or glare, and parking through the use of landscaping, setbacks, or other techniques.

**Goal LU-6: Maintain the viability of the commercial areas of Manhattan Beach.**

Policy LU-6.1: Support and encourage small businesses throughout the City.

Policy LU-6.2: Encourage a diverse mix of businesses that support the local tax base, are beneficial to residents and support the economic needs of the community.

For the coastal zone the proposed amendments will facilitate two LCP policies: Policy II.A.2 which seeks to “Encourage maintenance of the predominant existing building scale” by requiring lighting that corresponds to building scale, and Policy II.A.3 which seeks to “Encourage the maintenance of commercial area orientation to the pedestrian” by ensuring low scale parking lot lighting.

**ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION**

The proposed amendments are a statutory exemption from CEQA pursuant to Guidelines, Section 15061 (b) (3) in that the changes consist of a clarification and minor modification of lighting regulations and with implementation, it can be seen with certainty that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result.

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

A large display notice of this hearing was published in the August 11, 2005 edition of the Beach Reporter. Staff has received no written or other communications.

Attachments:

- A. Draft Resolution PC 05 -
- B. Public Notice
- C. List of Resources (some attachments not available electronically)
- D. Photos of Existing Parking Lot Light poles

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS  
TO THE CITY ZONING CODE (SECTION 10.64.170)  
AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM ZONING CODE  
(SECTION A.64.170) REGARDING PARKING LOT  
LIGHTING REGULATIONS**

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH DOES  
HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission hereby makes the following findings:

- A. Pursuant to applicable law, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on August 24, 2005 regarding the proposed Code Amendments related to revisions of parking lot lighting regulations, and public testimony was invited and received.
- B. Public notice included a one-quarter page display ad published on August 11, 2005 in The Beach Reporter, a newspaper of general circulation in Manhattan Beach.
- C. The applicant for the subject project is the City of Manhattan Beach.
- D. The purpose of the proposed Amendments is to simplify the current commercial parking lot lighting regulations and to address differences between inland and beach area commercial sites and to ensure lighting conditions are effectively designed resulting in a safe environment while minimizing light nuisances to neighboring residential uses or properties.
- E. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Manhattan Beach CEQA Guidelines, the subject Amendments are exempt in that they are covered by the general rule that CEQA [Section 15061 (3)] only applies to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment, and since it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA; and,
- F. The proposed amendments have been prepared in accordance with the provisions of Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 4, Section No. 65853, et seq., of the State of California Government Code.
- G. The Planning Commission finds that the project will not individually nor cumulatively have an adverse effect on wildlife resources, as defined in Section 711.2 of the Fish and Game Code.

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

- H. The proposed amendment to the Title 10 of the Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) and Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the Manhattan Beach General Plan as follows:

**Goal LU-5: Protect residential neighborhoods from the intrusion of inappropriate and incompatible uses.**

Policy LU-5.1: Require the separation or buffering of residential areas from businesses which produce noise, odors high traffic volumes, light or glare, and parking through the use of landscaping, setbacks, or other techniques.

**Goal LU-6: Maintain the viability of the commercial areas of Manhattan Beach.**

Policy LU-6.1: Support and encourage small businesses throughout the City.

Policy LU-6.2: Encourage a diverse mix of businesses that support the local tax base, are beneficial to residents and support the economic needs of the community.

- I. The proposed amendments to the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program (Title A, Chapter 2) are consistent with the following goals and policies of the City's certified Local Coastal Program:

Policy II.1: Control development within the Manhattan Beach coastal zone.

Policy II.A.2: Preserve the predominant existing commercial building (development) scale.

Policy II.A.3: Encourage the maintenance of commercial area orientation to the pedestrian.

Policy II.A.6.: Encourage development of adequate parking facilities.

The above three policies will be facilitated in that the existing height limit of 12-feet (from finished ground level) for light sources and a maximum of 3 foot candle level of illumination will be maintained. These criteria are consistent with lighting engineering standards for low scale commercial development parking lots with orientation to the pedestrian.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendment to Section A.64.170 Lighting of the Manhattan Beach Local Coastal Program, Chapter 2, Title A (Coastal Zoning Code) as follows:

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

Section A.64.170.Lighting.

The purposes of lighting regulations are: to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety, to protect nearby residential uses from undue glare and, to ensure that the existing low-scale pedestrian friendly character of commercial areas are maintained. Outdoor parking area lighting shall not employ a light source higher than twelve feet (12'), ~~shall create no cone of direct illumination greater than sixty degrees (60°) from a light source higher than six feet (6')~~, and shall not directly shine onto an adjacent street or residentially zoned or developed property. Maximum illumination at ground level shall be three (3) foot candles and shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles in an R district.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach hereby recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed amendment to the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code (Section 10.64.170 Lighting) as follows:

Section 10.64.170.Lighting.

- A. Lighting regulations are intended to ensure that adequate lighting is provided for personal and traffic safety while protecting nearby residential uses from undue glare.
- B. Each plan for the construction, renovation or replacement of an outside parking lot with lighting shall include an exterior photometric lighting plan prepared by an electrical engineer registered in the State of California, consisting of a point-by-point foot candle layout (based on a ten (10') foot grid center extending a minimum of 20 feet outside the property lines. The lighting plan shall be comprehensive and include all exit and security lighting on the property, and shall cover the entire parking lot plus all loading and service areas.
- C. Standards. The plan shall be designed in compliance with the following:
  - 1. The maximum height of a light source located within 25 feet of a residentially zoned or developed parcel shall be no more than 12 feet and shall be no more than 20 feet in all other areas (measurement from adjoining ground level).
  - 2. The light fixtures shall possess sharp cut-off qualities at all property lines and shielding shall be provided as necessary. The
  - 3. The light fixtures and poles shall be properly maintained. Paint covering shall not be of a color or type that is highly reflective.
  - 4. There shall be no low pressure sodium light fixtures.
  - 5. The minimum illumination level shall be 1 foot candle.
  - 6. The maximum intensity of illumination shall be computed based on a four to one (4:1) ratio (average-to-minimum) throughout the parking lot, including loading and service areas.
  - 7. The maximum illumination level at any location within the parking lot including loading and service areas shall be 10 foot candles.
  - 8. The Director of Community Development may approve lighting that employs a light source up to 30 feet in height, for sites with



**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

moderate to high public use, providing such installation meets all other standards in this section and conditions exist which ensure residential light nuisances will be avoided.

Such conditions shall include but not be limited to: buffering achieved by difference in ground elevation, the presence of dense mature vegetation or the orientation, location or height/massing of buildings relative to the nearest residential property.

9. A use permit may be approved for lighting on commercial sites containing at least 25,000 square feet that have high intensity public use(s) with light sources that exceed 30 feet in height and produce light that exceeds the average-to-minimum of 10-foot candles if the findings in paragraph 8. of this section and the following additional findings are made:
  - a. The maximum height is 35 feet.
  - b. Illumination levels do not exceed an average of 5 foot candles and a maximum of 18 foot candles at any location on the entire parcel.
  - c. The proposed light poles and fixtures are comparable in scale to the building(s) on the same site.
  - d. The lighting facilities including poles and fixtures do not interfere with nor is their function affected by mature trees or landscaping.

SECTION 4. Pursuant to Government Code Section 66499.37, any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void or annul this decision, or concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done or made prior to such decision or to determine the reasonableness, legality or validity of any condition attached to this decision shall not be maintained by any person unless the action or proceeding is commenced within 90 days of the date of this resolution and the City Council is served within 120 days of the date of this resolution.

SECTION 5. If any sentence, clause, or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this resolution. The Planning Commission hereby declares that it would have passed this resolution and each sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or otherwise invalid.

SECTION 6. Any provisions of the Manhattan Beach Municipal Code, or appendices thereto, or any other resolution of the City, to the extent that they are inconsistent with this resolution, and no further, are hereby repealed.

**RESOLUTION NO. PC 05-XX**  
**(strike-out/underline)**

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the Resolution as adopted by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting of August 24, 2005 and that said Resolution was adopted by the following votes:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

---

**RICHARD THOMPSON**  
Secretary to the Planning Commission

---

**SARAH BOESCHEN**  
Recording Secretary

RI H:CodeAmendments/lighting/PCResodraft

Commercial Parking Lot Lighting Standards  
Manhattan Beach Planning Commission  
August 24, 2005

Resources

Cities

1. Agoura Hills
2. Culver City
3. El Segundo
4. Garden Grove
5. Hermosa Beach
6. Irvine
7. Palos Verdes Estates
8. Redondo Beach
9. Torrance
10. Simi Valley

Professional Engineers

1. Masoud Nariman, P.E., TEK Engineering Group, Canoga Park.
2. James Otterson, P.E., P.L.S., P.T.O.E., Otterson and Associates, Huntington Beach
3. Erik Zandvliet, Traffic Engineer, Manhattan Beach

Technical Reports & Articles (excerpts attached)

1. Lighting for Parking Facilities (RP-2098 excerpt): Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, 1987.
2. The Parking Handbook for Small Communities (excerpt): John D. Edwards, ITE, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1994.
3. "Surface Lot Lighting", Parking Today January, 2005.
4. "Parking Facility Lighting" by Paul Box, Parking Today, April, 2005.