

ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

MANHATTAN BEACH CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
REMOTE BROADCAST CAPTIONING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2021

Services provided by:
QuickCaption, Inc.
4927 Arlington Avenue
Riverside, CA 92504
Telephone - 951-779-0787
Fax Number - 951-779-0980
quickcaption@gmail.com
www.quickcaption.com

* * * * *

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in
order to facilitate communication accessibility and **may not be
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.**

* * * * *

>> WE ARE LIVE, MADAM MAYOR.

>> THANK YOU.

WELCOME BACK, EVERYBODY TO THE 6:00 P.M. REGULAR MANHATTAN BEACH TODAY IS JANUARY 19TH.

WE ARE PICKING UP OUR AGENDA AT LETTER J, PUBLIC HEARING ABOUT THE HOTEL ON 600 SOUTH POMONA BOULEVARD.

ITEM NUMBER 10.

I WOULD LIKE TO REORDER LETTERS A, B AND C IS TINY BIT.

I CHECKED WITH THE CITY ATTORNEY.

JUST AS A COURTESY, I WOULD LIKE TO ELEVATE LETTER B AND TACKLE THAT FIRST MAKING AN APPEAL FOR THE APPELLANTS.

I THINK IT WAS COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO WHO WANTED TO CONSIDER WAIVING THE APPEAL FEE.

STEVE, THIS IS YOUR AGENDA ITEM.

WE WILL DO B FIRST AND THEN GO TO A, AND START THE PUBLIC HEARING.

>> THANKS.

I WOULD MOVE TO WAIVE THE FEES AND I WOULD DO THAT NOT BECAUSE I WANT TO PICK AND CHOOSE WHICH FEES TO WAIVE OBP ON WHAT MATTERS NOT BECAUSE I WAS GOING TO AVOID BUT I WAS GOING TO APPEAL THIS.

IF I WAS GOING TO APPEAL IT RATHER THAN HAVE THEM STEP INTO MY SHOES AND PAY A FEE, IT WOULDN'T COST ANYTHING TO APPEAL.

THAT'S WHY THE WAIVER OF THE FEES.

>> Mayor Hadley: THIS IS THE FIRST TIME I AM A MAYOR THAT WE WOULD BE WAIVING THE FEES.

DO WE VOTE ON THAT?

>> YES, IF THERE IS A MOTION ON THE FLOOR AND SECOND, YOU CAN GO AHEAD AND VOTE.

COUNTY CLERK TAMURA, CAN YOU DO A ROLL CALL PLEASE ON WAIVING FEES FOR APPELLANTS.

>> YES.

COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN.

COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> GOOD EVENING, MAYOR HADLEY AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL. I AM HERE TO PRESENT A MASTER USE PERMIT REQUEST FOR A NEW HOTEL FOR A SEPARATE OFFICE RETAIL BUILDING AT 600 SOUTH SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

I WOULD LIKE TO START OUT WITH BACKGROUND ON THE SITE.

THE SITE IS LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE 600 BLOCK OF SOUTH SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

IT'S A STATE HIGHWAY UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF CALTRANS.

THE SITE IS -- WAS FORMALLY USED ASS EL TORITO RESTAURANT.

EL TORITO WAS OPERATING UNDER A USE PERMIT THAT WAS APPROVED IN 1984 THAT ALLOWED FOR FULL ALCOHOL SERVICE OF BEER, WINE AND SPIRITS AND HAD OPERATING HOURS IN THE USE FROM 11:00 A.M. TO MIDNIGHT SEVEN DAYS A WEEK.

THE SITE IS BEING USED ON A TEMPORARY BASIS BY SKETCHERS.

MOSTLY AS A PLACE TO ALLOW FOR PARKING OF THEIR CONSTRUCTION WORK ON ALL OF THEIR BUILDINGS BEING BUILT ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONSIDERED THE REQUEST AT THE OCTOBER 14TH, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AND REQUESTED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT AND CONTINUED THE PUBLIC HEARING TO THE NOVEMBER 18TH, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. AT THAT POINT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE PROJECT 2-1 WITH COME MODIFICATIONS.

TWO INDEPENDENT GROUPS APPEALED THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S DECISION.

ONE BEING -- [INDISCERNIBLE] THE OTHER GROUP BEING UNITE HERE LOCAL 11.

THE COUNCIL CALLED UP FOR A REVIEW OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S DECISION.

THE CALL FOR REVIEW WAS MADE AT THE DECEMBER 1ST 2020 CITY COUNCIL MEETING.

THAT MAKES THIS HEARING A DE NOVO HEARING.

SO THE SITE IS LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD AND TENNYSON STREET.

THERE ARE COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES TO THE NORTH, SOUTH AND WEST.

THERE ARE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES TO THE EAST.

THERE ARE TWO SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IMMEDIATELY ACROSS THE STREET FROM CHABELA FROM THE SITE AND MORE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES TO THE EAST.

TO THE WEST OF THE SITE IS THE CITY OF MISSION BEACH.

THIS IS ZONING OF THE SITES AND HOW THEY ARE ZONED.

THERE ARE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES ZONED TO THE NORTHWEST OF THE SITE INCLUDING THE TWO HOMES DIRECTLY ACROSS THE SITE FROM CHABELA THAT IS SINGLE FAMILY.

THERE IS HIGH RESIDENTIAL EAST OF THE SITE.

THE ZONE IS CGBA.

NOW, THAT D8, THE SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD WAS SOMETHING THE PROJECT -- THE CITY PROJECT LOOKED AT ANY CHANGES TO THE MUNICIPAL CODE, WHICH RESULTED IN THE CREATION OF THE D8 OVERLAY ZONE.

IT WAS A LENGTHY PROCESS AND MANY PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NOTICES IN THE NEWSPAPER AND COVERED IN THE LOCAL PRESS AS A WELL DOCUMENTED INITIATIVE THAT THE CITY UNDERTOOK.

THE ADOPTION OF THE D8 OVERLAY ZONE OCCURRED IN MARCH 2018.

IT ALLOWS FOR UNIQUE DEVELOPMENT FOR HOTELS.

THAT INCLUDES A 45-FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT JUST FOR THE HOTEL USE AND SOME OTHER DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS THAT ARE MORE FLEXIBLE OTHER THAN NON-HOTEL USES IN THE ZONE.

I WANT TO DIVE A LITTLE BIT INTO THE UNDERLYING ZONING.

THE CURRENT PLAN HAS THE PROPERTY LISTED AS A GENERAL COMMERCIAL USE CATEGORY.

WHAT THAT MEANS ACCORDING TO THE GENERAL PLAN AND I QUOTE -- THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL CATEGORY PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR A BROAD RANGE OF RETAIL AND SERVICE, COMMERCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL OFFICE USES, INTENDED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF LOCAL RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES AND TO PROVIDES GOODS AND SERVICES FOR THE REGIONAL MARK.

LIMITED INDUSTRIAL USES ARE ALSO PERMITTED.

THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL CATEGORY ACCOMMODATES USES THAT TYPICALLY ACCOMMODATE HEAVY TRAFFIC.

THIS DESIGNATION APPLIES PRIMARILY ALONG SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD. GOING TO THE ZONING OF THE LOT, THE ZONING IMPLEMENTS THE GENERAL PLAN.

THE ZONING IS AS I SAID CG GENERAL COMMERCIAL.

WHAT THE CODE DESCRIBES THE CG GENERAL COMMERCIAL AS FOLLOWS -- TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FULL RANGE OF RETAIL AND SERVICE BUSINESSES DEEMED SUITABLE FOR LOCATION IN MANHATTAN BEACH, INCLUDING BUSINESSES NOT PERMITTED IN OTHER COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS BECAUSE THEY ATTRACT HEAVY VEHICULAR TRAFFIC AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO PROVIDE OFFICES AND CERTAIN LIMITED INDUSTRIAL USES THAT HAVE IMPACTS COMPARABLE OF THOSE PERMITTED TO RETAIL AND SERVICE USES IN OCCUPIED SPACE NOT IN DEMAND FOR RETAIL SERVICES.

OTHER PROPERTIES IN THE CG ZONE FOR INSTANCE, ARE TARGET, TOYOTA, THESE KIND OF BIGGER BUSINESSES THAT WOULD BE REALLY OUT OF PLACE LET'S SAY IN THE DOWNTOWN.

SO THIS PROJECT THAT WE WILL REVIEW TONIGHT GOES ALONG THOSE LINES.

FINALLY, THE D8 SEPULVEDA OVERLAY DISTRICT ALLOWS FOR MORE FLEXIBILITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IF NEEDED IN ORDER TO PROMOTE DESIRABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC USES AND GENERAL VITALITY IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL CG ZONE.

THAT'S THE BACKGROUND OF THE UNDERLYING ZONING AND WHAT THE DEVELOPMENT INTENDS FOR THE SITE.

WHAT YOU SEE HERE ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD, THIS IS TENNYSON STREET.

YOU HAVE AN L-SHAPED BUILDING ON THE NORTH AND EASTERN END OF THE PROPERTY, DETACHED TWO-STORY RETAIL AND OFFICE.

RETAIL ON THE BOTTOM AND OFFICE ON THE TOP.

THERE ARE TWO WAYS TO ACCESS THE SITE.

THERE IS PARKING ON THE SURFACE LEVEL HERE AND UNDERGROUND WHICH YOU ACCESS THROUGH THIS RAMP.

LET ME GET INTO MORE DETAIL HERE.

SO THE SURFACE LEVEL PARKING WHICH YOU CAN SEE HERE, HAS 29 PARKING SPACES.

SUBTERRANEAN PARKING HAS 123 PARKING SPACES AND YOU CAN ACCESS IT FROM THIS RAMP RIGHT HERE.

THIS SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD ENTRANCE IS A NEW ENTRANCE.

THE ONLY WAY TO ACCESS THE SITE IS FROM TENNYSON STREET.
THE APPLICANT WILL BE CREATING A NEW ENTRANCE ON TO THE SITE
FROM SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.
THE APPLICANT WILL HAVE A DEDICATION ALONG SEPULVEDA HERE, WHICH
WILL WIDEN THE RIGHT LANE HERE, WHICH WILL ALLOW YOU TO TUCK
INTO THIS WIDENED LANE AND TURN INTO THE SITE, WHICH WILL HELP
TRAFFIC MOVE BETTER ALONG SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.
THERE IS A DEDICATION ALONG THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY TO BE
USED BY THE CITY TO CREATE A SIDEWALK.
ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY, THERE IS ONLY TREES, THERE IS
NO SIDEWALK.
TALKING MORE ABOUT THE SITE HERE, THIS IS THE SUBTERRANEAN
PARKING GARAGE RIGHT HERE.
THE GARAGE HAS A REALLY UNIQUE DESIGN BECAUSE IT HAS THIS
PERIMETER HERE THAT IS LANDSCAPED, BUT IT'S ALSO OPEN.
SO YOU CAN SEE FROM THIS CROSS-SECTION HERE, YOU HAVE
SUBTERRANEAN GARAGE, THE BUILDING HERE, BUT YOU HAVE THIS ACCESS
ALONG HERE THAT ALLOWS LIGHT AND AIR TO ENTER THE GARAGE.
THIS IS GREAT FOR SUSTAINABILITY BECAUSE THE APPLICANT DOESN'T
HAVE TO SPEND MONEY ON LIGHTING OR AIR CIRCULATION.
A LOT OF THAT IS PROVIDED FROM NATURAL LIGHT AND AIR.
AND IT ALSO CREATES A NICE AMOUNT OF LANDSCAPING THROUGHOUT THE
SITE.
GOING INTO MORE DETAILS OF THE BUILDINGS, SO THERE IS THE NEW
HOTEL BUILDING FOUR STORIES, 40 FEET TALL.
IT WILL HAVE 162 ROOMS.
THE L SHAPE ALONG THE NORTH AND EASTERN PART OF THE PROPERTY.
THERE IS A FOURTH FLOOR OUTDOOR TERRACE FACING SEPULVEDA
BOULEVARD.
THE BUILDING MEETS ALL THE HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS, SETBACK
REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN THE CITY ZONING
CODE.
AS FAR AS HOTEL OPERATIONS GO, THE APPLICANT DESCRIBES THE HOTEL
AS QUOTE A SELECT SERVICE HOTEL.
A VERY SMALL FITNESS CENTER, VERY SMALL BUSINESS ROOM, A FEW
MEETING ROOMS THAT ARE FOR THE GUESTS AND OCCUPANTS OF THE HOTEL
TO HEAD INTO THERE AND SEND A COUPLE OF EMAILS AND THINGS LIKE
THAT.
THERE ARE NO BANQUET ROOMS OR BALLROOMS OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT.
THERE IS SOME LIMITED DINING AND FULL ALCOHOL SERVICE ON THE
SITE, BUT THIS IS FOR HOTEL PATRONS ONLY.
THE APPLICANT IS PROPOSING AND THE COMMISSION APPROVED LIMITED
SERVICE DINING AND FULL ALCOHOL BETWEEN 7:00 A.M. AND 1:00 A.M.
THE EL TORITO THAT WAS ON THE SITE HAD FULL ALCOHOL LICENSE AND
HAD PERMIT 11:00 A.M. TO MIDNIGHT SEVEN DAYS A WEEK.
FINALLY, THE HOTEL IS -- GUESTS OF THE HOTEL ARE REQUIRED TO --
CANNOT STAY LONGER THAN 30 CONSECUTIVE DAYS AT THE HOTEL.

MOVING ON TO THIS DETACHED RETAIL OFFICE BUILDING ON THAT SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE SITE, THIS BUILDING IS TWO STORIES, 30 FEET TALL.

THE GROUND FLOOR RETAIL IS 6894 SQUARE FEET.

THE APPLICANT HAS NOT IDENTIFIED ANY TENANTS FOR THE BUILDING. BUT THERE IS -- MOVING ON, THERE IS SOME PARKING FOR THE OFFICE AND THE RETAIL BUILDING TO BE USED BOTH BY THE SURFACE LOT AND ALSO THE UNDERGROUND LOT.

THE BUILDING ALSO COMPLIES WITH THE SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD DESIGN GUIDELINES.

SO THE BUILDING IS CLOSE TO THE STREET AND THE SIDEWALK, WHICH CREATES A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEDESTRIANS AND THE BUILDING. IT'S NOT LIKE A GIANT PARKING LOT AND A BUILDING SHOVED WAY AT THE END.

THAT CREATES A GREAT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND THE SIDEWALK AND PEDESTRIANS.

PART OF THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST IS ALSO A REQUEST TO REDUCE PARKING.

SO THE CODE REQUIRES 243 PARKING SPACES.

THE APPLICANT IS PROPOSING 152 PARKING SPACES.

NOW, MDMC, THE MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 10.64 ALLOWS FOR A REDUCTION IN PARKING WITH THE USE PERMIT REQUEST IF THE APPLICANT PROVIDES SOME TYPE OF PARKING STUDY TO BACK UP THE REQUEST.

SO THE APPLICANT HAS OBTAINED A PARKING STUDY FROM KIMLEY-HORN SHOWING THE MINIMUM ON-SITE PARKING FOR THE SITE IS 152 SPARKING SPACES.

WHEN SHARED PARKING SYNERGIES ARE TAKING INTO ACCOUNT, THE SITE ONLY NEEDS 117 PARKING SPACES.

I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THOUGH, THAT THE CITY'S APPROVAL OR ANY POTENTIAL APPROVAL OF THE REDUCTION IN PARKING BASED ON 10.640500B DOES NOT TAKE INTO SHARED PARKING SYNERGIES.

THIS STUDY BY SIMILE HORN, ALSO NOTES IT'S CONSERVATIVE BECAUSE IT DID NOT FACTOR INTO ACCOUNT IMPACTS OF RIDESHARE.

UBER AND LYFT, CONSIDERING HOW CLOSE THIS HOTEL WILL BE TO THE AIRPORT, WILL PROBABLY PLAY A ROLE IN GETTING PEOPLE TO AND FROM THE HOTEL.

THIS NUMBER OF 152 SPACES DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT UBER AND LYFT.

SO IN THE RESOLUTION THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED, THERE WERE MANY THINGS -- MANY CONDITIONS THAT WERE PLACED TO HELP SAFEGUARD THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

ONE IS A CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT AND PARKING PLAN.

SO THE CONTRACTOR BUILDING THE PROJECT KNOWS EXACTLY WHERE ALL THE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS WILL PARK AND WHERE THE ROUTES WILL BE FOR THE DELIVERIES AND THINGS LIKE THAT.

THERE WILL ALSO BE SECURITY CAMERAS REQUIRED THROUGHOUT THE

SITE, AS WELL AS THE POSSIBILITY OF HAVING PRIVATE SECURITY FORCE ON-SITE.

LIGHTING IS REQUIRED TO POINT AWAY FROM PROPERTIES.

THERE ARE RESTRICTIONS AS MENTIONED EARLIER, ON ALCOHOL SERVICE AND LIVE ENTERTAINMENT.

THERE IS ALSO -- THE APPLICANT WOULD ALSO BE REQUIRED TO PLACE SIGNS THROUGHOUT THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD SAYING THAT NO HOTEL PARKING IS ALLOWED IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

THIS SIGN RIGHT HERE IS RIGHT BEHIND THE BELMAR ON OAK STREET. IT SERVES AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE TYPE OF SIGN THE APPLICANT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO PLACE IN THE RESIDENTIAL STREETS.

FINALLY, THERE IS UPGRADED -- THE APPLICANT WILL BE REQUIRED TO UPGRADE THE STREET BARRICADES AT TENNYSON STREET AND CHABELA DRIVE.

[INDISCERNIBLE].

HERE IS A VIEW OF WHAT THE HOTEL LOOKS LIKE FROM CHABELA DRIVE. AGAIN, THIS IS THE REAR OF THE HOTEL.

RIGHT HERE IS CHABELA DRIVE.

RIGHT HERE IS TENNYSON STREET.

OVER HERE ARE THE SINGLE FAMILY HOMES.

YOU CAN SEE THERE IS SOME OF THAT SUBTERRANEAN LANDSCAPING HERE AS WELL AS THE NEW SIDEWALK THAT DOES NOT EXIST.

YOU WILL SEE ON THE THIRD AND FOURTH FLOORS IS ARCHITECTURAL SCREENING.

THAT STRATEGIC HELPS LIMIT THE VIEWS OF THE HOTEL PATRONS WHO ARE LOOKING EAST ACROSS CHABELA DRIVE.

THE PROJECT IS CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT FROM CEQA.

THE PROJECT MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE ZONING CODE.

THE PROJECT SITE MUST BE LESS THAN FIVE ACRES AND SURROUNDED BY URBAN AREAS.

THE SITE HAS NO VALUE TO RARE HABITAT AND ENDANGERED SPECIES. THE PROJECT WILL NOT RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS RELATED TO NOISE, AIR QUALITY OR WATER QUALITY.

SO THE PROJECT MEETS ALL OF THESE REQUIREMENTS.

SPECIFICALLY IN TERMS OF DETERMINING IF THE PROJECT HAS SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS WITH NOISE, AIR QUALITY AND WATER QUALITY, THAT IS CONCLUDED BY THE REPORTS.

THERE ARE REPORTS THAT CONFIRM THE CLASS 32 -- THAT THERE ARE NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND THEREFORE THE PROJECT CAN FALL UNDER THE CLASS 32 EXEMPTION FROM CEQA.

AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THERE WERE TWO APPEALS TO THE PROJECT. ONE BY A GROUP CALLED BY -- [INDISCERNIBLE] AND UNITED LOCAL 11.

THESE ARE SOME OF THE POINTS THEY MAKE.

I WILL GO INTO THESE IN MORE DETAIL HERE.

A LOT OF THEIR APPEALS ARE -- CAN BE VERY TECHNICAL AND THE

STAFF REPORT GOES INTO A LOT OF TECHNICAL DETAIL AND REBUTTALS TO THEIR POINTS.

THEY BELIEVE THE PARKING REDUCTION IS NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE.

THERE ARE INCONSISTENCIES FROM THE PARKING STUDY.

THE NOISE WAS NOT PROPERLY STUDIED.

THERE IS INACCURATE RESTRICTION ON ALCOHOL SERVICE.

THERE IS A RATIO.

THAT THE TRAFFIC STUDY DID NOT ACCOUNT FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND IMPACTS ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS.

THERE IS ALSO INACCURACIES IN THE CEQA STUDIES IN TERMS OF CERTAIN THRESHOLDS BEING MET, THE EVALUATION OF THE AESTHETIC IMPACTS AND OTHER THINGS AND ALSO THE NOTICE OF EXEMPTION WAS FILED.

OTHER POINTS OPPONENTS MAKE THEY DID NOT CONSULT CALTRANS AND USE PERMIT FINDINGS CANNOT BE MADE TO THE PUBLIC.

LET ME START WITH THE APPLICANT -- THE APPLICANT SAYS THE PARKING REDUCTION IS NOT JUSTIFIABLE.

THEY BASE THIS ON THE PLAY DIFFERENT PART OF THE CODE THAN WHAT THE CITY IS USING.

THEY ARE SAYING THE PART OF THE CODE THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO USE, YOU CAN ONLY HAVE A 15% REDUCTION IN PARKING WHEN YOU TAKE SHARED PARKING SYNERGIES INTO ACCOUNT.

THE PARTS OF THE CODE THIS PROJECT IS USING, CANNOT TAKE SHARED PARKING SYNERGIES INTO ACCOUNT.

THERE IS NO STATED MAXIMUM REDUCTION IN PARKING CAN BE HAD UNDER MBMC 10.64.050B.

THE STUDY SAYS THERE IS A MINIMUM OF 152 PARKING SPACES REQUIRED ON THE SITE WITHOUT THE SHARED PARKING SYNERGIES.

THAT'S WHY THEY ARE BASING THE REQUEST FOR REDUCED PARKING UNDER 10.64.050B.

THE APPLICANT IS ALSO SAYING THERE IS SOME INACCURACY IN THE PARKING STUDY USE ESTIMATES.

ONE THING THEY ARE SAYING IS THAT THERE IS EATING AND DRINKING ON-SITE, WHICH IS A RESTAURANT AND THEREFORE -- BUT THE PARKING DEMAND STUDY DOES NOT MENTION RESTAURANT.

I WANT TO BE VERY CLEAR THERE IS NO RESTAURANT ON-SITE.

A RESTAURANT IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, MEANING ANYONE CAN WALK IN AND ORDER SOMETHING.

ALL THE EATING AND DRINKING OPPORTUNITIES ON THE SITE ARE FOR HOTEL PATRONS ONLY.

WHICH MEANS THAT BECAUSE THE ONLY PEOPLE GOING TO THESE ESTABLISHMENTS ARE ALREADY AT THE HOTEL, THERE IS NO NEED TO PROVIDE MORE PARKING AND THEREFORE IT'S NOT PART OF THE PARKING.

IF DOWN THE ROAD, IF THE APPLICANT WANTED TO, YOU KNOW, HAVE A RESTAURANT OR BAR OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, ONE THEY WOULD HAVE TO AMEND THE MASTER USE PERMIT AND PART OF THAT WOULD REQUIRE A NEW

PARKING EVALUATION AND SHOWS HOW THE ON-SITE PARKING MEETS WITH THE PARKING DEMAND WITH THE RESTAURANT INCLUDED.

MOVING ON ON THE APPLICANT MAKES A VERY TECHNICAL ARGUMENT ABOUT -- [INDISCERNIBLE] AND HOW THE CITY USED THE INCORRECT MODALITY FOR CALCULATING THIS.

I WANT TO READ TWO SENTENCES TRAUMATIC STAFF REPORT.

WHILE THE USE OF THE 85TH PERCENTILE DATA IS AN INDUSTRY PRACTICE FOR TRIP GENERATION, IT IS NOT INDUSTRY PRACTICE FOR PARKING GENERATION.

TRIP GENERATION DIFFERS FROM PARKING GENERATION IN THAT THE FORMER IS CONCERNED WITH HOW MANY VEHICLE TRIPS ARE GENERATED BY THE USE AND THE LATTER IS CONCERNED WITH PARKING DEMAND, DURATION AND TURN OVER.

AND THEN IT GOES ON TO SAY THAT THE ITE, WHICH IS THE ORGANIZATION OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERS, AND THE PARKING GENERATION MANUAL FIFTH EDITION USES THE PEAK PARKING DEMAND FOR EACH STUDY SITE, NOT THE AVERAGE PARKING DEMAND WHICH CALCULATING AVERAGE PARKING RATES.

SO THAT AGAIN, IT'S A TECHNICAL ARGUMENT, BUT BASICALLY, THE APPLICANT IS GIVING THE INCORRECT METHOD IN CALCULATING PARKING. MOVING ALONG, THE APPLICANT MAKES SEVERAL CLAIMS ABOUT TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND THAT DIFFERENT TRAFFIC IMPACTS WEREN'T STUDIED ENOUGH.

WERE IN THING THEY DO IS POINT TO THE SKETCHERS PROJECT, WHICH INCLUDES THE CONSTRUCTION OF SEVERAL 100,000 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE SPACE ACROSS MANHATTAN BEACH AND HERMOSA BEACH. THERE IS A LOT OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THIS PROJECT AND THAT PROJECT.

FOR ONE THING THE SKETCHERS PROJECT PEAK TRIP GENERATION WAS MORE THAN THREE TIMES THIS PROJECT.

SO THE STUDY IS A LOT LARGER.

BUT ALSO THIS PROJECT HAS SOME REALLY UNIQUE THINGS THAT HELP IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW.

ONE OF THOSE THINGS IS THIS CURB CUT HERE -- I AM SORRY THE NEW DRIVEWAY ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

I HAVE SHOWN THE SITE ON THE LEFT WHERE THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN ENTER THE SITE IS MAKING A RIGHT ON TENNYSON AND THEN INTO THE SITE.

THE APPLICANT WILL BE CREATING A NEW DRIVEWAY ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

YOU DO NOT NEED TO MAKE A RIGHT ON TO TENNYSON STREET TO ENTER THE SITE.

YOU CAN GO ON THIS WIDENED SHOULDER HERE AND TURN INTO THE PROJECT.

SO THIS HELPS IMPROVE TRAFFIC FLOW, AND YOU KNOW, DECREASES THE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE THAT COULD POTENTIALLY GO ON TENNYSON STREET. ANOTHER THING THAT THE APPELLANT SAID BECAUSE EL TORITO CLOSED

IN 2018 IT'S TOO OLD TO USE.
IT'S THE INCORRECT BASELINE.
IT'S COMMON PRACTICE TO USE, YOU KNOW, TRAFFIC INFORMATION UP TO TWO YEARS OLD, AND THEREFORE THE CITY BELIEVES THE CORRECT BASELINE WAS USED.
THE APPELLANT BRINGS UP SEVERAL THINGS ABOUT NOISE.
THEY CLAIM THE NOISE TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE EFFECT OF THE AIR CONDITIONING ON THE ROOFS.
SO THEIR CLAIMS ARE FLAWED FOR SEVERAL REASONS.
ONE, ALL THE AIR CONDITIONING UNITS ARE NOT NEXT TO EACH OTHER. THEY ARE SPREAD THROUGHOUT THE ROOMS.
FURTHERMORE, THE AIR CONDITIONING UNITS ARE SCREENED BY THIS ROOF PARAPET HERE AND THAT HELPS REDUCE THE NOISE.
MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL DID HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY SINCE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AND SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE STAFF REPORT LAST WEEK, TO RUN CALCULATIONS ABOUT WHAT THE NOISE IMPACT WOULD BE FOR ALL 25 HVAC UNITS.
WHAT THEY HAVE CONCLUDED WHEN ALL OF THOSE UNITS ARE RUNNING AT THE SAME TIME, THERE WILL NOT BE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF NOISE THAT WOULD EXCEED THE THRESHOLD OF THE NOISE ORDINANCE.
THE MEMO THAT MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL PREPARED HAS BEEN SUBMITTED AS PART OF THE RECORD IN THE LATE AFTERNOON.
MOVING ON TO SOME MORE CLAIMS BY MB POETS.
THE NOISE IMPACTS WERE NOT ANALYZED IN HERMOSA BEACH.
MBI DID ANALYZE THE NOISE IMPACTS TO THE WEST AND INCLUDED THE NOISE IMPACTS WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.
THE ADDENDUM TO THE ORIGINAL NOISE TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM WAS INCLUDED AS AN ATTACHMENT TO THE REPORT.
THE SAME REPORT AMPLIFIED MUSIC AND LIVE PERFORMANCES, THE APPELLANT CLAIMS THAT MBI DID NOT INVESTIGATE THIS.
BUT MBI DID HAVE A CHANCE TO INVESTIGATE THIS.
THEY DID LOOK AT THIS AND DID DETERMINE THE NOISE LEVEL WOULD NOT EXCEED THE CITY THRESHOLDS AND ALSO THERE ARE SOME FACTORS THAT CAN HELP WITH NOISE FROM AMPLIFIED MUSIC AND LIVE PERFORMANCES.
THE FACT YOU CAN TURN DOWN A SPEAKER VOLUME.
ALSO THE WAY THE PLANNING COMMISSION WAS APPROVED, IT LIMITS LIVE MUSIC FROM 9:00 P.M. TO 5:00 A.M.
NOW, THE SECOND APPELLANT, THEY INCLUDED SEVERAL CLAIMS THAT WERE IN MB POETS' APPEAL.
IT GOES INTO GREAT DETAIL ON THE FINDINGS P.
THE APPELLANT HAS PROVIDED EVIDENCE EXPLAINING WHY THOSE FINDINGS CAN'T BE MADE OR SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO THAT EFFECT.
THE APPELLANT ALSO CLAIMS THE NOTICE OF EXEMPTION WAS FILED PREMATURELY.
THE NOISE EXEMPTION WAS FILED IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED IT.

THEY APPROVED IT THE DAY AFTER.

THE NOISE EXEMPTION WAS FILED BEFORE THE APPEALS AND COUNCIL REQUESTED REVIEW.

THE UNITE HERE LOCAL 11 MAKES CLAIMS ABOUT TRAFFIC SAFETY, THAT THE CITY HASN'T ANALYZED TRAFFIC SAFETY AND THAT THERE HAVE BEEN A LOT OF ACCIDENTS IN THE SURROUNDING AREA.

STAFF BELIEVES THE SITE WILL ACTUALLY INCREASE SAFETY.

RIGHT NOW AGAIN, THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN EXIT THE SITE NORTH ON SEPULVEDA IS EXIT ON TO TENNYSON, MAKE A RIGHT FROM TENNYSON ON TO SEPULVEDA.

WITH THE NEW CURVE CUT ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD THOUGH, OR THE NEW DRIVEWAY, YOU WILL BE ABLE TO MAKE THAT RIGHT OVER HERE, WHICH GIVES YOU ARE MUCH BETTER LINE-OF-SIGHT SOUTH ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD THAN THE EXISTING CONDITION.

THAT WILL INCREASE SAFETY, NOT DECREASE IT.

ALSO THE FACT THERE WILL BE A NEW SIDEWALK ON CHABELA DRIVE HERE MEANS THAT PEDESTRIANS DON'T HAVE TO WALK IN THE MIDDLE OF CHABELA OR THE OTHER OF CHABELA TO WALK NORTH.

THEY CAN WALK ON THE SIDEWALK OUT OF THE WAY OF CARS.

SO BETWEEN THE IMPROVED SITE CONDITIONS AND THE NEW SIDEWALK, YOU KNOW, THAT WILL INCREASE SAFETY.

BUT THE OTHER POINT THAT NEEDS TO BE MADE IS THAT THE APPELLANT HAS NOT MADE ANY LINKS BETWEEN THE OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT AND TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS ARE CAUSED FOR A MYRIAD OF DIFFERENT REASONS. THERE HAS NOT BEEN A LINK SAYING WHY A HOTEL WOULD INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC OVER LET'S SAY, ANOTHER TYPE OF USE.

I AM SORRY TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS OVER ANOTHER TYPE OF USE.

THAT CONCLUDES THE APPELLANT'S CONCERNS AND THE STAFF'S REBUTTAL TO THEM.

THERE IS MORE IN THE STAFF REPORT THAT GOES INTO MORE DETAIL.

SINCE THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED THE PROJECT, THERE HAVE BEEN A FEW TWEAKS TO THE PROJECT THAT I WANT TO DISCUSS.

ONE IS THAT THE OFFICE BUILDING WAS REDUCED FROM 16,348 SQUARE FEET TO 16,248 SQUARE FEET.

ALSO THE ARCHITECTURAL SCREENING HAS BEEN ENHANCED SINCE THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

ONE CONDITION THAT THE PLANNING CONDITION ADDED TO THE RESOLUTION IN ORDER TO APPROVE IT IS THAT THEY WANTED THE APPLICANT TO COME BACK WITH A BETTER SCREENING DESIGN.

SO THIS DESIGN THAT'S IN THE PLANS ATTACHED TO THE STAFF REPORT AND THIS GRAPHIC FROM THOSE PLANS IS DIFFERENT AND OBSCURES IT MORE OF THE VIEW THAN WHAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION SAW.

FURTHERMORE, THE APPLICANT IS NOW PROPOSING TO HAVE THAT SCREENING ON NOT JUST THE FOURTH FLOOR ON THE EASTERN SIDE OF CHABELA, BUT ALSO THE THIRD FLOOR.

ONE REASON THAT IS IS BECAUSE THE PLANNING COMMISSION PLACED A

CONDITION IN THE RESOLUTION REQUIRING THAT THE BAMBOO INSTALLED WHEN THE CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY OF ISSUE NEEDS TO BE A CERTAIN HEIGHT.

AND THE APPLICANT WENT INTO A BUNCH OF LANDSCAPING AND NURSERIES AND COULDN'T FIND BAMBOO TALL ENOUGH.

RATHER THAN HAVE BAMBOO BE THAT TALL, THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ALLOW HIM TO HAVE SCREENING NOT JUST THE THIRD FLOOR, BUT ALSO THE FOURTH FLOOR IN ORDER TO OBSCURE THE VIEWS OF THE HOTEL PATRONS TO THE EAST.

WITH EVERY USE PERMIT, THERE ARE REQUIRED FINDINGS THAT MUST BE MADE.

AND THOSE FINDINGS ARE AS FOLLOWS -- SO ANY PROJECT THE PROPOSED LOCATION OF THE USE MUST BE IN ACCORD WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE TITLE AND THE PURPOSES OF THE DISTRICT WOULD DECIDE TO LOCATE IT.

THIS FINDING CAN BE MADE AS MENTIONED EARLIER IN THE PRESENTATION, I DISCUSSED THE UNDERLYING ZONING AND WHAT IS MEANT TO GO IN THAT ZONE AND THE PROJECT FULLY FITS WITHIN THAT. THE SECOND PLANNING PROPOSED LOCATION OF THE USE AND CONDITIONS WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY OR WELFARE.

I WENT OVER THE GENERAL PLAN AND HOW IT'S COMPATIBLE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND UNDERLYING THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL USE CATEGORY THAT THE GENERAL PLAN DISCUSSES.

THIRD, THE PROPOSED USE WILL COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING TITLE.

THIS PROJECT MEETS ALL THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR HEIGHT, SETBACKS AND LANDSCAPING AND THEREFORE, IT'S IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ZONING CODE.

FINALLY, THE LAST REQUIRED FINDING FOR A MASTER USE PERMIT IS THAT THE PROPOSED USE WILL NOT ADVERSELY IMPACT OR BE ADVERSELY IMPACT BY NEARBY PROPERTIES.

AGAIN, A LOT OF THE PROPERTIES SURROUNDING THE PROPERTY ARE ALREADY COMMERCIAL ZONED.

AND THE PROJECT IS ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD, WHICH IS MEANT FOR COMMERCIAL USES.

SO THE PROJECT IS NOT UNIQUE IN ITS IMPACTS.

AND THERE ARE ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT AND THE SITE THAT HELP DECREASE -- [INDISCERNIBLE].

THERE ARE OTHER COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS AND LARGE STREETS, ETC. THAT HELP CREATE DISTANCE IN THE PROJECT AND NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES.

NOW, THE REDUCTION IN PARKING UNDER 10.64.050B HAS ITS OWN FINDINGS THAT MUST BE MADE.

THE DEMAND MUST BE LESS THAN THE PARKING REQUIREMENT AND THE CODE.

THE WAY THAT'S BACKED UP IS WITH A PARKING STUDY.

AGAIN, THE APPLICANT HAS PROVIDED THE PARKING STUDY WHICH HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY THE CITY'S TRAFFIC ENGINEER. THE CITY'S TRAFFIC ENGINEER AGREES WITH THE PARKING ANALYSIS. BASICALLY, THE PARKING ANALYSIS PROVES OR SUPPORTS THE AMOUNT OF PARKING PROVIDED WILL MATCH THE PARKING DEMAND OF THE USES AT THE SITE.

AND THE SECOND AND FINAL REQUIREMENT FOR REDUCED PARKING SAYS THAT THE PROBABLE LONG-TERM OCCUPANCY OF THE BUILDING OR STRUCTURE BASED ON ITS DESIGN WILL NOT GENERAL ADDITIONAL PARKING DEMANDS.

AGAIN, STAFF BELIEVES THIS FINDING CAN BE MADE, IT'S PRETTY DIFFICULT TO CONVERT A HOTEL TO A DIFFERENT USE BECAUSE A HOTEL IS JUST A BUNCH OF CUBBIES WITH ALL THE DIFFERENT ROOMS LIKE A HONEYCOMB AND TRYING TO CONVERT THAT BUILDING TO A DIFFERENT USE WOULD BE DIFFICULT AND HAVE AN EFFECT ON THE PARKING AS WELL. AS FAR AS NOTICING ON PUBLIC COMMENT GOES ON THIS PROJECT, A NOTICE WAS MAILED ON JANUARY 4TH, 2021.

STAFF HAS MAINTAINED A LIST OF INTERESTED PARTIES WHO HAVE COMMENTED ON THE PROJECT IN THE PAST.

AN EMAIL WAS SENT OUT TO TEASE PARTIES ON JANUARY 4TH NOTIFYING THEM OF TONIGHT'S HEARING AND CITY COUNCIL WOULD BE CONSIDERING THE PROJECT.

AN AD WAS PLACED IN THE BEACH REPORTER.

AN EMAIL WAS SENT OUT ON JANUARY 13TH WITH A LINK TO THE INTERESTED PARTIES AND A LINK TO THE STAFF REPORT AND HOW TO PARTICIPATE IN TONIGHT'S MEETING VIA ZOOM.

AS YOU CAN EXPECT AND ARE ALL AWARE, WE DID RECEIVE A LOT OF PUBLIC COMMENT, ALMOST ALL OF IT AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE STAFF REPORT, BOTH IN SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION OF THE PROJECT. SO WITH THAT, STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE CITY COUNCIL CONDUCT THE PUBLIC HEARING, MAKE AN ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION AND DIRECT STAFF TO DRAW UP A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE MASTER USE PERMIT WITH CONDITIONS.

BEFORE I HAND IT OVER TO THE APPLICANT, WHO WILL HAVE TEN MINUTES TO SPEAK, I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT WE HAVE QUITE A CAST OF SUPPORTING CHARACTERS HERE WHO CAN ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAVE, BESIDE MYSELF AND [INDISCERNIBLE] AND DIRECTOR TAI. WE HAVE THE CITY'S TRAFFIC ENGINEER.

WE HAVE JOHN BELLES FROM MBI, THE CITY'S ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT ON THE PROJECT.

THE APPLICANT HAS SEVERAL OF HIS CONSULTANTS AS WELL.

SO I AM AVAILABLE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS IF THERE ARE ANY.

IF NOT, WE CAN HAND IT OVER TO THE APPLICANT.

>> Mayor Hadley: TERRIFIC.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGER THAI, IS THIS A GOOD TIME TO ASK MY COLLEAGUES QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STAFF REPORT?

>> ABSOLUTELY.

PRIOR TO TURNING IT OVER TO THE APPLICANT TO THE, IF CITY COUNCIL HAS QUESTIONS FOR STAFF, THIS IS A GOOD TIME TO CLARIFY IT.

>> Mayor Hadley: COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO YOU ARE UP.

>> S.Napolitano: I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.

IN SOME AREAS OF THE STAFF REPORT, IT REFERS TO FOOD SERVICE AND ALCOHOL TO HOTEL PATRONS ONLY AND THEN IN OTHER PLACES I READ HOTEL PATRONS AND GUESTS.

SO DO WE HAVE A LEGALLY DEFINED DEFINITION OF WHAT HOTEL PATRON MEANS?

IF I WALK IN AND I WANT TO ORDER A DRINK, DOES THAT MAKE ME A HOTEL PATRON BECAUSE WE DON'T SAY HOTEL GUEST.

I AM READING THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PAGE 4 OF 9, ITEM NUMBER 14 IT SAYS THE HOTEL'S EATING AND DRINKING OPTIONS ARE FOR THE USE OF THE HOTEL PATRONS ONLY.

UNLESS WE DEFINE WHAT A HOTEL PATRON IS AND WHETHER OR NOT THEY INCLUDE GUESTS, YOU KNOW, IT COULD INCLUDE ANYONE.

>> SO I THINK WE CAN DEFINITELY WORD SMITH THAT AND HAVE A SENTENCE IN THERE THAT SAYS HOTEL PATRON MEANS ANYONE WHO HAS PAID FOR AN OVERNIGHT ACCOMMODATION IN THE HOTEL.

>> S.Napolitano: SO WHAT ABOUT THEIR GUESTS?

>> THEY WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO ORDER A DRINK.

>> S.Napolitano: SO IF I AM STAYING AT THE HOTEL AND I HAVE A FRIEND AT MANHATTAN BEACH, COME MEET ME AT THE NEW HOTEL, MEET ME UP TOP AT THE TERRACE, I ORDER A DRINK AS A HOTEL GUEST, BUT HEY, YOU CAN'T HAVE ONE, GUY SITTING NEXT TO ME OR IS IT BECAUSE THE HOTEL GUEST IS PAYING FOR THEIR FRIEND OR FRIENDS IF HE HAS TEN OF HIS CLOSEST FRIENDS OR 100 OF HIS CLOSEST FRIENDS THERE WITH HIM, CAN HE OR SHE BUY THAT PERSON A DRINK.

>> COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO THE WORD GUEST MEANS SOMETHING DIFFERENT IN A HOTEL FOR EXAMPLE THAN IT WOULD HAVE, YOU KNOW, IN OTHER LAND USE.

AND SO YOU KNOW, WHAT I MIGHT RECOMMEND IS WHEN WE HAVE THE APPLICANT COME UP AND SPEAK, WE CAN TALK ABOUT IN TERMS OF OPERATIONALLY CLARIFYING THE USE OF THE LOUNGE AND THE AREA UPSTAIRS IS FOR HOTEL ROOM GUESTS.

IF THE APPLICANT WISHES TO DISCUSS WHETHER THAT --

>> S.Napolitano: DIRECTER, I APPRECIATE THAT, BUT IT DOES ME ZERO GOOD BECAUSE SOMEONE TELLING ME SOMETHING AND WHAT'S ENFORCEABLE ARE TWO DIFFERENT THINGS.

>> UNDERSTOOD.

I THINK ONE IMPORTANT THING IS TO LAY THE FOUNDATION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

IF THE NEED IT'S NOT ENFORCEABLE, THEN WE CAN TALK ABOUT, YOU KNOW, WHAT IT IS.

IS IT AN OCCUPANCY LIMIT?

IS IT THE SIZE?

SO WHAT IS IT?

I THINK INVOLVING THE APPLICANT IN THAT DISCUSSION IS PROBABLY A BETTER STRATEGY THAN TRYING TO SPECULATE AS TO WHAT THE WORD GUEST MEANS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE HOTEL BECAUSE YOU MAKE A VALID POINT THE WORD GUEST APPLIED TO A HOTEL CAN BE SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT AND CAN BE CONSTRUED TO BE, YOU KNOW, EITHER THE HOTEL GUEST ROOM INVITE OR THE HOTEL GUEST HIMSELF.

>> S.Napolitano: I HAVE SAT LONG ENOUGH IN THIS SEAT WHAT I AM TOLD I AM HEARING AND WHAT THE HAPPENS IN PRACTICE ARE DIFFERENT.

BUT I WILL HEAR IT.

SECOND QUESTION, HOW DOES THE SETUP OF THE TERRACE AREA COMPARE TO THE SECOND STORY OUTDOOR DINING RESTRICTIONS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT FOR THE DOWNTOWN WHERE YOU HAD TO BE ENCLOSED BY THREE SIDES, I THINK IT WAS, AND COULDN'T DO THIS, COULDN'T DO THAT?

>> THAT'S AN INTERESTING QUESTION.

SO FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE COUNCIL, THE CITY COUNCIL PASSED SOME GUIDELINES, WHICH MAYBE ABOUT TWO YEARS AGO, THAT HAVE GUIDELINES FOR OUTDOOR DINING IN THE DOWNTOWN ZONE.

AND THEY WERE REFERRING TO CERTAIN PROPERTIES AS WELL AS PLACE SOME RESTRICTIONS ON HOURS, AND I BELIEVE REQUIRED SOME STUDIES IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY.

I HAVEN'T LOOKED AT THEM IN A WHILE.

I THINK ALONG SEPULVEDA OR ACTUALLY, ANYWHERE OUTSIDE OF THE DOWNTOWN, THERE IS NO SPECIAL OR UNIQUE RESTRICTIONS ON OUTDOOR DINING WHETHER IT'S ON THE GROUND FLOOR, SECOND FLOOR, THIRD FLOOR OR WHATEVER.

>> S.Napolitano: I AM NOT SURE WE EVER HAD SECOND STORY DINING ON SEPULVEDA.

>> I CAN'T THINK OF ANYONE, NO.

>> S.Napolitano: WE DIDN'T HAVE A DOWNTOWN.

THE ISSUE THERE WAS TO PLAN FOR IT ESPECIALLY THE DISTANCE FOR RESIDENTS.

THE DISTANCE FOR RESIDENTS WERE FURTHER ALONG FROM RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES.

>> RIGHT.

SO THE WAY WE REGULATE DINING IS THROUGH A USE PERMIT PROCESS BECAUSE IN OUR CITY, ANY RESTAURANT REQUIRES A USE PERMIT, WHICH MEANS THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND/OR THE CITY COUNCIL HAS AN OPPORTUNITY TO PLACE CONDITIONS.

WITH THE DOWNTOWN OUTDOOR DINING GUIDELINES, THE CITY KIND OF PREEMPTIVELY SAID HEY, ANY RESTAURATEUR WHO WANTS TO DO THIS, IN ADDITION TO OUR USE PERMIT, PLEASE KNOW THAT THESE ARE CONSIDERATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS WE WANT YOU TO BE AWARE OF BEFORE YOU EVEN APPLY.

SO THAT'S ONE OF THE DIFFERENCES.

>> S.Napolitano: BUT WHY AGAIN, WHY WAS THAT NOT A

CONSIDERATION HERE FOR CITY CONSISTENCY?

I WILL GO FURTHER WITH FOR INSTANCE, THE SERVICE OF ALCOHOL SEVEN DAYS A WEEK AND ENTERTAINMENT AS WELL, BUT LET'S JUST FOCUS ON THE ALCOHOL.

YOU KNOW, WE HAD FOR MANY YEARS NOW, LIMITED THE SERVICE OF ALCOHOL IN NEW RESTAURANTS DOWNTOWN, ESPECIALLY THOSE WITH CPS THAT CAME BEFORE US TO 10, 11:00 P.M. DURING THE WEEK AND MAYBE MIDNIGHT OR 1:00 A.M. ON FRIDAY AND SATURDAY.

BUT WE JUST SAID DO YOU KNOW WHAT, BECAUSE THIS ISN'T THE DOWNTOWN, WE ARE GOING TO DO THAT.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE RESTRICTIONS ARE ON MALL RESTAURANTS OR OTHER RESTAURANTS ON SEPULVEDA.

THIS SEEMS INCONSISTENT WITH EVERYTHING ELSE WE HAVE DONE THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS.

>> THERE ARE A COUPLE DIFFERENT THINGS --

>> COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO, YEAH, YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE THINGS I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT IS, YOU KNOW, IN TERMS OF APPLYING REGULATION, IF THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT A CERTAIN SET OF GUIDELINES FOR THE DOWNTOWN, THE STAFF IS NOT EXACTLY IN A POSITION TO ARBITRARILY IMPLEMENT THOSE IN EVERY OTHER PART OF THE CITY.

CERTAINLY WITH THE DOWNTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES IN 2018, THAT PREDATED THE SEPULVEDA INITIATIVE, DURING WHICH A WIDE RANGE OF LAND USES AND ALSO OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS WAS DISCUSSED.

>> S.Napolitano: DOES THAT MEAN WE TAKE WHATEVER THE APPLICANT ASKS FOR?

>> WE LOOK AT THE REGULATIONS THAT APPLY TO THE AREA AND WE DO APPLY THOSE.

HOWEVER, YOU KNOW, WHEN A CERTAIN STANDARD IS ADOPTED FOR A SPECIFIC PART OF THE CITY, TO SIMPLY APPLY IT TO EVERY OTHER PART OF THE CITY, YOU KNOW, IS SOMETHING WE NEED CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION ON.

THE CITY COUNCIL WOULD BE TO ADOPT THOSE SAME GUIDELINES OVER A LARGER AREA, LARGER GEOGRAPHICAL AREA.

AND SO FOR THE STAFF TO DO THAT IS PART OF THE REGULAR COURSE OF APPLYING REGULATIONS TO A PROJECT WOULD BE ARBITRARY.

HOWEVER, THROUGH THE USE PERMIT PROCESS, SINCE EVERY USE PERMIT APPLICATION IS REVIEWED UNDER ITS OWN MERIT AND UNDER ITS OWN CONTEXT, IF IT'S DETERMINED THERE IS A CERTAIN REQUIREMENT THAT HELPS THE PROJECT MEET THOSE FINDINGS IN ITS PARTICULAR LOCATION, YOU KNOW, THE APPROVAL BODY, AND THE STAFF COULD APPLY THAT.

BUT TAKING THE DOWNTOWN GUIDELINES AND APPLYING THEM TO SEPULVEDA IS NOT SOMETHING --

>> S.Napolitano: I APPRECIATE WE DON'T HAVE ANY GUIDELINES REGARDING ALCOHOL SERVICE DOWNTOWN. IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE THIS OR THAT.

>> OUTDOOR, DINING, CORRECT.

>> S.Napolitano: I AM JUST TALKING ABOUT ALCOHOL SERVICE.
I WOULD THINK TO SET A TEMPLATE WE SHOULD AT LEAST GIVE SOME
THOUGHT.
THAT'S MORE OF A COMMENT RATHER THAN A QUESTION.
THAT'S IT FOR ME.

>> Mayor Hadley: COLLEAGUES, COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY AND MAYOR
PRO TEM STERN.

>> R.Montgomery: THANK YOU YOUR HONOR.
I MAINTAIN MY COURSE AND WILL BASE MY DECISION ON EVIDENCE
PRESENTED TONIGHT.
I CAN SAY THAT HE TOLD ME CERTAIN THINGS ABOUT THE PROPERTY
DEVELOPMENT AND I MERELY ASK QUESTIONS WITHOUT ANY COMMENTS.
WITH THAT BEING SAID, I WOULD ASK TED A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.
FIRST OFF, TED, THE SETBACK IS 20 FEET OFF OF CHABELA, IS THAT
CORRECT?

>> SO BACKING UP FOR A SECOND, COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES DO NOT
HAVE SETBACKS.
IT'S A ZERO REQUIRED SETBACK.
THE APPLICANT HAS CHOSEN TO PUSH THE PROPERTY BACK FROM THE
EXISTING PROPERTY LINE FROM ABOUT 15.5 FEET TO 14.5 FEET WHERE
IT IS ALONG CHABELA.
THERE WILL BE A SIX FOOT DEDICATION THAT WILL BE TURNED INTO A
SIDEWALK.

>> R.Montgomery: I AM LOOKING AT PLANS WHERE 20 FEET CAME FROM.
FENCE LINE, BOUNDARY LINE TO THE FIRST WALL, 14, 6.
OKAY.
WERE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS MADE BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION
ABOUT PUSHING THE BOUNDARY LINE FARTHER WEST?
DID THAT EVER COME UP?

>> AT THE CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING IN NOVEMBER, COMMISSIONER
THOMPSON REQUESTED -- ASKED THE APPLICANT TO EXPLORE REDUCING
THE BULK OF THE FOURTH FLOOR ALONG CHABELA DRIVE AND MAYBE
REDISTRIBUTING ROOMS SOMEWHERE ELSE AND TURNING A PORTION TO A
FOUR STORY STRUCTURE TO THREE STORY STRUCTURE WHICH COULD REDUCE
ROOMS THAT COULD BE PART OF THE HOTEL.
THAT WAS COMMISSIONER THOMPSON WHO VOTED AGAINST THE PROJECT.

>> R.Montgomery: UNDERSTOOD.
HERE'S MY NEXT ONE, THE CONCERN THE INTERFACE OF A HOTEL AND A
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TO THE EAST ALONG CHABELA DRIVE, DID
ANYBODY DISCUSS BESIDES COUNCILMEMBER THOMPSON THE MASSING OF
THIRD OR FOURTH FLOORS AND PUSH THEM TO THE WEST?
YOU WOULDN'T BE SITTING ALL FOUR LEVELS ON THE EDGE OF THE FENCE
LINE.
YOU WOULD BACK UP TWO FLOORS TO THE WEST.
I UNDERSTAND THERE IS A ROOM CONCESSION.
I AM ASKING WAS THERE A DISCUSSION OR TALK ABOUT THAT.

>> SO THERE WAS A DISCUSSION LED BY COMMISSIONER THOMPSON VOICING HIS CONCERN ABOUT THAT.
IF I REMEMBER CORRECTLY CHAIR MORTON THOUGHT IT WOULD BE UNREASONABLE TO ASK THE APPLICANT TO DO THAT.
I BELIEVE PART OF THE REASON WAS WAS BECAUSE THE PROJECT WAS MEETING ALL SETBACK REQUIREMENTS, ALL HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS. IT'S NOT LIKE THE APPLICANT IS ASKING FOR A VARIANCE TO GO ABOVE THE HEIGHT LIMIT OR GO CLOSER TO THE PROPERTY LINE THAN IS ALLOWED.

CHAIR MORTON FELT THAT CONSIDERING THE APPLICANT IS MEETING ALL THE DESIGN GUIDELINES IN THE CODE -- I DON'T WANT TO PUT WORDS IN HIS MOUTH -- BUT IT WOULD NOT BE THE BEST APPROACH TO TAKE AT THIS POINT IN THE PROJECT.

>> R.Montgomery: UNDERSTOOD.
A FEW MORE.

THE HEIGHT, I HAVE SEEN A COMMENT, THIS IS HIGHEST BUILDING ON SEPULVEDA.

CAN YOU ADDRESS THAT?

>> SURE.

SO AS I SAID EARLIER IN MY PRESENTATION, THE CITY COUNCIL IN MARCH 2019, ADOPTED THE D8 SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD -- SEPULVEDA CORRIDOR OVERLAY ZONE.

THAT BASICALLY CHANGED THE HEIGHT LIMIT IN THESE PROPERTIES ALONG SEPULVEDA FOR HOTEL USES ONLY FROM 30 FEET TO 40 FEET. SO THIS PROJECT IS THE FIRST PROJECT THAT IS TRYING TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THAT NEW CODE AND THEREFORE IF IT'S BUILT, IT WOULD BE THE HIGHEST PROJECT ALONG SEPULVEDA IN THE CITY.

THAT BEING SAID, THERE ARE OTHER PROPERTIES ZONED D8, ARE IN THAT OVERLAY ZONE AND THEY TOOK DOWN THE ROAD COULD APPLY FOR A MASTER USE PERMIT TO BUILD A HOTEL THAT'S 40 FEET TALL AND IT WOULD BE UP TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION SOME MORE CITY COUNCIL TO APPROVE OR DENY THAT REQUEST.

AGAIN, BECAUSE THIS IS THE FIRST PROJECT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THAT, THAT'S WHY IT WOULD BE THE TALLEST BUILDING ALONG SEPULVEDA IN THE CITY.

>> R.Montgomery: UNDERSTOOD.
ONE MORE.

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING QUESTION, MY CONCERN COMING OFF SEPULVEDA, YOU MAKE A LEFT TURN TO GET IN.

I LIKE THE NEW DRIVEWAY THERE.

PROBABLY YOUR COMMENTS MADE HIM DO THAT.

TELL ME HOW THAT WORKS SOMEONE COMING DOWN ON SEPULVEDA HAS TO MAKE A U-TURN TO GET BACK INTO THE PROPERTY TO COME IN.

IS THAT WHY THEY MADE THE CUTOUT ONE OF THE APRONS SO THEY COULD GET IN BUT MAKING THE LEFT-HAND TURN.

>> LET ME PULL THE GRAPHIC UP REAL QUICK BECAUSE I THINK IT WOULD PEE HELPFUL FOR THE -- BE HELPFUL FOR THE DISCUSSION.

>> R.Montgomery: YES, THANK YOU.

>> SO THE WIDENED SHOULDER HAS A COUPLE OF PURPOSES ALONG SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.

IT WILL BE A FEW ACCESS TO THE HOTEL.

IT'S NOT THE ONLY ACCESS TO THE HOTEL.

IF YOU ARE COMING SOUTHBOUND ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD, YOU CAN MAKE A LEFT TURN AS YOU WOULD HAVE BEFORE FOR THE EL TORITO AND THEN COME IN THE DRIVEWAY FOR THE HOTEL OFF TENNYSON.

YOU CAN ALSO MAKE A U-TURN SOUTHBOUND TO NORTHBOUND ON SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD AND ENTER THE HOTEL SITE FROM SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD AS WELL.

SO YOU HAVE TWO OPTIONS THERE.

THE WIDENED SHOULDER IS AN ADVANTAGE THAT YOU CAN SLOW DOWN AND GET OUT OF TRAFFIC.

IT ALSO PROVIDES A MUCH GREATER SIGHT DISTANCE FOR THE DRIVERS THAT ARE COMING OUT OF THE HOTEL SITE.

AS YOU KNOW THERE IS A CURVE TO THE SOUTH AS YOU GO TOWARDS ARTESIA BOULEVARD WHERE TRAFFIC IS COMING NORTHBOUND AND BATES BIT DIFFICULT TO SEE.

BY PLACING THE DRIVEWAY FARTHER NORTH YOU HAVE THE ABILITY TO ENTER SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD WITH GREATER SIGHT DISTANCE.

THERE ARE ADVANTAGES THERE.

OVERALL YOU WILL SEE AN IMPROVEMENT TO TRAFFIC SAFETY IN THAT AREA BECAUSE OF THAT.

>> R.Montgomery: THANK YOU.

I WILL STOP QUESTIONS FOR NOW AND COME BACK LATER ON.

>> PRE TEM MAYOR I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED SO FAR.

WITH RESPECT TO THE PARKING STUDY, WHAT WE UNDERSTAND IS THAT THE CODE WOULD HAVE REQUIRED 243 SPACES BASED ON THIS DEVELOPMENT, BUT THERE WAS A REDUCTION TO 152 SPACES AND THAT WAS PER THE CODE.

WHAT ARE THE FACTORS THAT WENT INTO 91 LESS PARKING SPACES BEING NEEDED?

>> SO, THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION.

SO OUR CODE HAS A WHOLE BUNCH OF LAND USES AND THEN THE CORRESPONDING PARKING.

WHAT IT SAYS IS THAT A HOTEL NEEDS 1.1 PARKING SPOTS PER ROOM. HOWEVER, WE KNOW THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT KINDS OF HOTELS, RIGHT?

A HOTEL WITH BANQUET ROOMS AND POOLS WILL HAVE A DIFFERENT TRAFFIC GENERATION THAN THIS TYPE OF HOTEL.

IT HAS BROAD CATEGORIES, HOTEL 1.1 PARKING SPOTS PER ROOM. BECAUSE OF THAT THE CODE RECOGNIZES THAT NOT ALL HOTELS AND OTHER TYPES OF BUSINESSES ARE THE SAME AND IT ALLOWS FOR IF YOU PROVIDE A PARKING STUDY TO PROVE THAT THE PARKING DEMAND IS LESS, THEN THEY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO REQUEST THAT REDUCTION IN

PARKING.

SO THIS SPECIFIC HOTEL AND THE PARKING DEMAND IT'S BASED OFF IS CALLED A BUSINESS HOTEL.

THAT'S IDENTIFIED BY THE ITE.

THOSE ARE THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERS THAT HAVE THE PARKING GENERATION MANUAL, AGAIN, THIS IS PAGE 6 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

IT TALKS ABOUT THIS TYPE OF BUSINESS HOTEL THAT DOESN'T HAVE BANQUET FACILITIES OR CONFERENCE ROOMS OR A SWIMMING POOL, IT GENERATES WAY LESS PARKING THAN YOUR -- LET'S SAY YOUR BIGGER HOTEL THAT HAS ALL OF THOSE THINGS.

SO WHEN YOU ENTER THAT INTO THE EQUATION, THAT'S HOW YOU GET THE SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN PARKING FROM 243 TO 152.

IN THE BROADER CONTEXT, YOU KNOW, I CAN REMIND THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE CITY'S COMMERCIAL PARKING STANDARDS IN SOME RESPECTS ARE A LITTLE OUTDATED.

THE CITY COUNCIL HAS ASKED THE CITY'S TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND THE PLANNERS TO REVISE OUR COMMERCIAL PARKING STANDARDS TO BRING THEM MORE IN LINE WITH CURRENT TRENDS, AND CURRENT TRENDS, WHICH I BELIEVE IS SOMETHING WE ARE WORKING ON.

SO THAT'S PART OF SOME GREATER CONTEXT ABOUT, YOU KNOW, OUR PARKING -- ABOUT HOW THE CODE LOOKS IN PARKING AND HOW THE APPLICANT THROUGH THE PARKING EVALUATION, WAS ABLE TO SHOW THAT LESS PARKING WAS REQUIRED FOR THIS TYPE OF HOTEL AT THIS SITE.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: AND IS SOME OF THAT DUE TO USE OF RIDESHARE AND TRIPS FROM THE AIRPORT.

WAS THAT PART OF THE CURRENT TRENDS?

>> AS KIMLEY-HORN SPATED IN THEIR -- STATED IN THEIR EVALUATION RIDESHARE IS NOT FACTORED INTO THE REDUCTION, WHICH IS WHY IT'S CONSERVATIVE OR ONE OF THE REASONS WHY IT'S CONSERVATIVE.

AS FAR AS HOW WE ARE ADJUSTING THE REST OF THE PARKING CODE DOWN THE LINE, I'M NOT SURE HOW OR IF RIDESHARE WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: OKAY.

THANK YOU.

WHILE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT PARKING, IS THERE STREET PARKING ALONG TENNYSON THAT ABUTS THE OFFICE BUILDING?

>> RIGHT NOW?

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: YES, CURRENTLY OR ONCE THIS PROJECT IS APPROVED?

>> I DO SEE SOME CARS HERE.

I DO BELIEVE THERE IS PARKING ALONG TENNYSON.

WHEN I DID A SITE VISIT, I DID PARK ALONG TENNYSON.

YES, I DO BELIEVE THERE IS PARKING ALONG TENNYSON, STREET PARKING.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: WILL THAT CONTINUE.

>> THERE IS NO CONDITION THE APPLICANTS REMOVE STREET PARKING. THERE MIGHT BE STREET GAIN.

THERE ARE TWO CURB CUTS HERE.
WHEN YOU FILL UP THAT CURB CUT, THERE IS MORE PARKING.
THERE MIGHT BE A GAIN OF ONE OR TWO SPOTS WHERE THAT CURB USED
TO BE.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: I WANTED TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE NOISE
STUDY.

THE QUESTION I HAVE ABOUT THAT IS THERE WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT
THE CLOSEST SENSITIVE RECEPTORS WHEN THEY WERE ANALYZING HOW THE
NOISE BASICALLY WOULD TRAVEL, RIGHT, TO THE CLOSEST SENSITIVE
RECEPTORS.

WHAT WAS NOTED IN THIS NOISE STUDY WAS THAT THE CLOSEST
SENSITIVE RECEPTOR, MEANING THE RESIDENTS TO THE EAST, SO CABELA
RESIDENTS, WERE 300 FEET AWAY FROM THE NOISE IMPACT FROM THE
TERRACE.

BUT THERE IS ALSO THIS INDICATION IN THE STAFF REPORT THAT
CABELA IS 40 FEET AWAY FROM THE BUILDING.

SO I AM WONDERING WHY DOES THE NOISE STUDY INDICATE THAT CABELA
RESIDENTS, THESE CLOSEST SENSITIVE RECEPTORS ARE 300 FEET AWAY
AND NOT 40 FEET AWAY?

>> SURE.

SO THE BUILDING AS I SAID IS L SHAPED.

THE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS, THE RESIDENCES TO THE EAST OF CHABELA,
CABELA.

BY THE TIME YOU MEASURE THE DISTANCE OVER HERE TO THE PROPERTY
AND THE RIGHT OF WAY TO THE PROPERTY AND THEIR PROPERTY LINE TO
THE STRUCTURE, YOU GET ABOUT 300 FEET.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: OKAY.

>> I SHOULD ALSO MENTION, THAT TERRACE IS NOT ON A LINEAR FLAT
ACROSS THE GROUND.

IT'S ALSO UP THESE STORIES.

THAT ALSO CONTRIBUTES TO THE DISTANCE.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: OKAY.

THANK YOU.

CAN YOU ALSO DESCRIBE THE FOOD SERVICE.

IS THERE IN FACT A RESTAURANT AND BAR IN THE HOTEL OR IS IT JUST
A KITCHEN THAT WILL SUPPLY APPETIZERS AND FOOD TO ROOMS AND TO
THE LOUNGE AREA?

>> RIGHT.

SO IN THE APPLICANT -- WELL, BACKING UP FOR A SECOND.

SO THE CODE USES THE TERM EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENT TO
DESCRIBE RESTAURANTS, RIGHT?

AND THAT REQUIRES A USE PERMIT.

AND THE APPLICANT IS NOT REQUESTING AN EATING DRINKING
ESTABLISHMENT AS PART OF THIS USE PERMIT.

THEREFORE, THERE IS NO RESTAURANT ON-SITE, WHICH GOES BACK TO
THE DISCUSSION OF HOW THE FOOD AND THE ALCOHOL FOR HOTEL PATRONS
ONLY, MEANING PEOPLE STAYING OVERNIGHT AT THE HOTEL, NOT A

RANDOM PERSON WALKING OFF THE STREET AND ORDERING A DRINK BECAUSE THAT'S A BAR OR A RESTAURANT.

COULD YOU REPEAT YOUR QUESTION?

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THAT WAS MY QUESTION.

WAS THERE A RESTAURANT OR IS IT JUST A KITCHEN?

>> I REMEMBER WHAT I WANTED TO SAY, THE WAY THE APPLICANT HAS DESCRIBED THE FOOD SERVICE THERE, IT'S LIMITED SERVICE. SO IN THE MORNING THERE WILL BE A BREAKFAST BUFFET FOR THE HOTEL GUESTS, YOU KNOW A SMALL LITTLE BUFFET. THROUGHOUT THE DAY THERE WILL BE APPETIZERS AND DRINKS AVAILABLE.

THERE IS NO ROOM SERVICE AT THE HOTEL.

THERE IS NO KITCHEN.

YOU CAN'T ORDER A FILLET MIGNON FOR YOUR ROOM.

IF YOU WANT TO GET A DRINK AND GET SOME SLIDERS OR SOMETHING, YOU WOULD HAVE TO GO DOWNSTAIRS OR UPSTAIRS TO GET THAT.

SO THE FOOD OFFERS ARE NOT -- [INDISCERNIBLE]

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THANK YOU.

KIND OF FOLLOWING UP ON COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO'S QUESTIONS, DO WE HAVE -- WHAT ARE THE RESTAURANT AND ALCOHOL AND OUTDOOR TERRACE USES OF THE OTHER HOTELS IN THE AREA OF THIS HOTEL? SO THE BELMAR OR THE WEST DRIFT OR ANY OF THE OTHER HOTELS ON SEPULVEDA?

RATHER THAN COMPARING THOSE USES TO DOWNTOWN, DO WE HAVE ANY INDICATION THAT THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH THE RESTAURANT OR THE ALCOHOL OR OUTDOOR TERRACE USES WITH THE HOTELS THAT ARE MORE CLOSE TO SEPULVEDA?

>> FIRST, BOTH OF THOSE HOTELS ARE VERY, VERY DIFFERENT FROM ONE ANOTHER.

RIGHT, IN TERMS OF OPERATION, SIZE AND AMENITIES AND A WHOLE BUNCH OF OTHER FACTORS.

I DON'T KNOW OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD WHAT THE WEST STRIP HAS, WHAT ENTITLEMENTS IT HAS.

I AM SURE IT HAS THE ABILITY TO SERVE ALCOHOL.

THE BELMAR I KNOW DOES HAVE SOME TYPE OF RESTAURANT ON-SITE.

I DON'T KNOW OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD WHAT THOSE HOURS ARE IN THEIR USE PERMIT, BUT I DON'T BELIEVE EITHER ONE OF THOSE HOTELS HAS AN OUTDOOR PATIO ON A THIRD FLOOR WHERE DRINKS ARE SERVED. SO THIS IS A UNIQUE PROPERTY IN THAT THIS WILL BE THE ONLY HOTEL BUILT IN THE CITY SO FAR THAT HAS SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

I THINK IT'S HARD TO COMPARE WHAT'S ALLOWED AT OTHER PROPERTIES UNDER OTHER USE PERMITS, WHETHER IT'S OUTDOOR ON THE GROUND FLOOR, INDOOR VERSUS WHAT'S BEING PROPOSED HERE.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: OR HOURS OF OPERATION FOR ALCOHOL OR RESTAURANT.

>> CORRECT.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: AND THEN MY LAST QUESTION AND I WILL

TURN THIS BACK OVER IS DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION ON HOW THE NO HOTEL PARKING SIGNS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD AROUND THE BELMAR, HOW HAS THAT BEEN FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD? WAS THERE ENFORCEMENT OR COMPLAINTS CONTINUING ONCE THE SIGNS WENT UP?

>> I HAVE NOT GOTTEN THAT INFORMATION FROM PARKING ENFORCEMENT, SO I DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER. AGAIN, THE CONDITIONS THERE ARE QUITE DIFFERENT FROM THIS HOTEL. THAT HOTEL IS A LOT OLDER.

I BELIEVE IT HAS LESS PARKING.

I THINK THEY ALSO HAVE VALET PARKING.

THEY, TOO HAVE SOME TYPE OF PARKING STUDY.

I DON'T KNOW THE DETAILS OF IT.

I DON'T KNOW IF TRAFFIC ENGINEER REMEMBERS DETAILS OF THE PARKING SITUATION THERE.

>> YEAH, MAYOR PRO TEM STERN, IT DOES HAVE A VALET SERVICE OPERATION.

IT DOESN'T HAVE ENOUGH ON-SITE PARKING, BUT THEIR RESTAURANT IS ALSO I RECALL, OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AS WELL.

TO MY KNOWLEDGE, WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY COMPLAINTS.

I KNOW EARLIER IN 2020, WE DID LOOK INTO THE BELMAR, I SAW A WHOLE HOST OF DIFFERENT REASONS.

WE DIDN'T SEE ANY HISTORY OF ANY COMPLAINTS.

IF THAT HELPS, THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: OKAY.

THANK YOU.

I AM DONE.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU, MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.

>> J. Franklin: DOES THE CITY RESTRICT THE TYPE OF RETAIL? THE BOTTOM FLOOR OF THAT BUILDING IN THE FRONT WILL BE RETAIL, I THINK.

CAN WE RESTRICT THE TYPE OF RETAIL.

IT'S LUDICROUS TO THINK OF IT BEING A 7-ELEVEN OR SOMETHING, BUT SOMETHING THAT WILL CAUSE A LOT OF TRAFFIC?

>> SO THE CODE HAS A DEFINITION OF WHAT RETAIL IS AND HAS A CORRESPONDING PARKING REQUIREMENT, WHICH IS ONE PARKING SPOT FOR EVERY 200 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL.

WHAT TYPE OF RETAIL, CAN COULD BE A FLORIST TO RETAIL WORSE CASE SCENARIO IS 7-ELEVEN.

7-ELEVEN SELLS ALCOHOL, WHICH MEANS WE REALIZED HAVE TO COME BACK WITH A USE PERMIT AMENDMENT TO ALLOW 7-ELEVEN TO SELL ALCOHOL.

I DON'T SEE THAT.

THE APPLICANT CHOSE RETAIL DUE TO PARKING.

HE COULD HAVE RENT IT AS OFFICE SPACE OR PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT USE OR TUTORING OR A YOGA STUDIO OR DIFFERENT USES THAT HAVE MORE PARKING DEMAND THAN RETAIL.

HE CHOSE RETAIL BECAUSE IT'S ONE OF THE HIGHEST PARKING DEMANDS AND HELPS CREATE ENOUGH PARKING ON-SITE.

SO THERE IS A LOT OF FLEXIBILITY OF WHAT CAN BE PUT ON THE BOTTOM FLOOR OF THAT RETAIL.

AND ALSO SOME GENERAL RESTRICTIONS IN TERMS OF IF SOMEONE WANTS TO DO SOMETHING THAT REQUIRES A USE PERMIT, LIKE SELL ALCOHOL, WE WOULD HAVE TO COME BACK TO THE PLANNING COMMISSIONER, TO CITY COUNCIL TO GET THAT APPROVED.

>> J. Franklin: SO WE CAN IN SOME RESPECTS CONTROL THAT?

>> YES.

>> J. Franklin: THE BAMBOO ALONG CHABELA -- CABELA, CHABELA, SO WHAT'S THE NEW -- SO I UNDERSTAND YOU HAVE THE EXTERIOR LEVERS ON FLOORS THREE AND FOUR.

THEY CONTROL WHAT THE GUESTS LOOKING OUT THE WINDOW CAN SEE. THEY WILL BE TILTED SO THE GUESTS CANNOT LOOK DOWN ON THE PROPERTIES EAST OF CHABELA.

WHAT'S THE NEW HEIGHT REQUIREMENT THAT THE BAMBOOS TO GROW IN ORDER COVER THE FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR?

>> BACKING UP FOR A SECOND, SO THE -- OR THE PLANNING COMMISSION PUT THE APPLICANT TO HAVE A CONDITION, AND -- MAYBE I SHOULD TRY TO FIND IT, BASICALLY WHAT THE CONDITION SAID IS WHEN YOUR BUILDING IS READY TO GET A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, WHICH MEANS IT'S BUILT AND PEOPLE CAN START RENTING ROOMS IN THERE, THEN THE BAMBOO MUST REACH A CERTAIN HEIGHT.

THE APPLICANT AT THE MEETING SAID THAT'S FINE, NO PROBLEM. AFTER THE MEETING, THE APPLICANT CONTACTED A BUNCH OF NURSERIES AND SAID DO YOU SELL BAMBOO THAT'S THIS HIGH SO THAT WHEN I BUY IT FROM YOU, I CAN PUT IT IN THERE AND IT MEETS THE REQUIREMENT? THEY SAID NO.

THE APPLICANT SAID I CAN'T FIND BAMBOO BIG ENOUGH TO INSTALL THERE, I WANT TO INSTALL LOUVERS ON THE THIRD FLOOR FOR SCREENING, AND HE STILL WANTS TO INSTALL BAMBOO.

THEY CAN CHANGE THE CONDITION, THEY CAN ELIMINATE THE CONDITION. THERE ARE A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS THEY CAN DO.

THE BAMBOO, THIS IS IN THE LANDSCAPE PLAN, I BELIEVE WITHIN NINE WEEKS WITHIN THAT BUILDING, WHICH IS CONSIDERED FAST GROWING.

>> J. Franklin: OKAY.

>> THAT'S THE HISTORY OF THE BAMBOO.

I WILL SAY THE FIRST VERSION OF THIS PLAN THE PLANNING COMMISSION SAW IN OCTOBER DID NOT HAVE BAMBOO.

IT HAD TREES.

THE COMMISSION REQUESTED CHANGES WITH THE SCREENING AND THE APPLICANT CAME UP WITH BAMBOO, NOT JUST FOR AESTHETIC REASONS, BUT ALSO FOR SCREENING BECAUSE IT GROWS SO QUICKLY RELATIVELY SPEAKING AND IT CAN PROVIDE EFFECTIVE SCREENING.

>> J. Franklin: THANK YOU.

YEAH, BECAUSE I HAVE SOME ON THE WEST SIDE OF MY PROPERTY AND IT

DOES GROW VERY, VERY FAST.
IT'S PROBABLY AT LEAST TWO STORIES HIGH.
I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IT COULD, YOU KNOW, MEET THE
QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY.
SO REGARDING SHEET NUMBER 27 ON THE SHADE STUDY, AT LEAST IN THE
BIG DOCUMENTATION PACK, IT WAS SHEET NUMBER 27 -- I AM SORRY THE
SHADOW STUDY.
I'M NOT SURE IF YOU HAVE THAT IN YOUR POWERPOINT.
>> I CAN PULL IT UP.
YOU SAID SHEET 27.
>> J. Franklin: SHEET 27, YES.
>> HERE WE GO.
>> J. Franklin: YEAH, THERE YOU GO.
IT WAS HARD TO DETERMINE FROM THIS, BUT IS THERE ANY POINT -- I
AM ASSUMING YOU TOOK THESE MEASUREMENTS ON THE ACTUAL DAYS, IS
THAT CORRECT.
>> THE WAY IT WAS DESCRIBED TO ME WAS THIS IS ACTUALLY DONE BY
A COMPUTER MODEL.
THE ARCHITECTS MEASURE ALL THE BUILDINGS, PUT THEM INTO THE
MODEL AND THEN THE SOFTWARE CALCULATES BASED ON WHERE THE SUN IS
WHAT THE SHADOWS WOULD BE.
>> IT'S ACTUALLY A VERY SOPHISTICATED SOFTWARE THAT PRODUCES
THIS.
>> J. Franklin: SO I WAS TRYING TO DETERMINE, YOU KNOW, IF THE
SHADOW AT ANYTIME DURING THE YEAR, YOU KNOW, COVERS, YOU KNOW --
HOW MUCH IF IT EVEN DOES, IF IT EVEN MAKES IT ACROSS, YOU KNOW,
THE NEW SIDEWALK, THE 14 OR 15-FOOT SETBACK, THE NEW SIDEWALK,
THE 24 OR 25-FOOT STREET AND THEN THE SETBACK ON THE OTHER SIDE,
DO WE HAVE AN IDEA?
>> LET ME ZOOM IN A LOT HERE.
SO YES, THERE IS SOME SHADOW.
THIS IS MONDAY 20TH AT 5:00 P.M.
SO THERE IS SOME SHADOW THAT TOUCHES THE BUILDINGS OVER HERE AND
THE SIDEWALK.
IF WE GO DOWN TO JUNE 21ST, 5:00 P.M., AGAIN, TOUCHING SOME OF
THE SIDEWALK IN THE BUILDINGS HERE.
GOING DOWN TO SEPTEMBER, AGAIN, THESE ARE LONGER SHADOWS,
5:00 P.M. THAT DO TOUCH THOSE BUILDINGS.
AND THEN FINALLY, ON DECEMBER 21ST, AGAIN, MORE SHADOWS, A
LITTLE ON THE SIDEWALK AND A LITTLE ON THOSE BUILDINGS.
JUST TO BE CLEAR, THE DEAD DOESN'T HAVE ANY RULE THAT SAYS NO
BUILDING IS ALLOWED TO CAST A SHADOW ON ANOTHER BUILDING OR
RESIDENTIAL BUILDING OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT.
THIS INFORMATION WAS REQUESTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AT THE
OCTOBER HEARING JUST TO KNOW WHAT SHADOWS WOULD BE CREATED AND
ALSO TO GIVE SOME INFORMATION TO THE RESIDENTS ABOUT WHAT THE
SHADOWS WOULD BE.

>> J. Franklin: PRETTY MUCH IT'S THE TWO HOMES THAT ARE ORIENTED NORTH-SOUTH, BUT IT WOULD BE HITTING THEIR WEST WALLS. TWO HOMES?

>> YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
THAT IS AT 5:00 P.M. ON ALMOST ALL OF THOSE DAYS EXCEPT 4:00 P.M. ON DECEMBER 21ST.
OBVIOUSLY, AS THE SUN SETS FARTHER, YOU KNOW, THE SHADOWS WILL GROW LONGER.
BUT AT THOSE KIND OF EVENING TIMES, THOSE ARE THE TWO PROPERTIES THAT WILL HAVE SOME SHADE ON THEM.

>> J. Franklin: GREAT.
THANK YOU.
AND IT'S A SHADOW STUDY.
SO THIS WOULD BE FOR ERIC, OUR TRAFFIC ENGINEER.
SO WE TALKED ABOUT COMING SOUTHBOUND ON SEPULVEDA, AND NEEDING TO MAKE A LEFT TURN IN THE TENNYSON LEFT TURN BAY WHEN YOU ARE GOING SOUTHBOUND.
I AM JUST WONDERING THAT COMES UP RATHER QUICKLY, ESPECIALLY FOR SOMEONE THAT'S NEW TO THE CITY.
THEY ARE DRIVING IN FROM LAX OR WHATEVER AND LET'S SAY THEY MISSED IT, SO THEIR NEXT OPTION WOULD BE TO MAKE A LEFT UP AT THE LIGHT AT ARTESIA, ASSUMING THEY WOULD GET INTO THE FAR LEFT-HAND LANE.
PRESENTLY, I KNOW THIS IS ALL CALTRANS CONTROL, BUT PRESENTLY YOU CANNOT MAKE A U-TURN AT SOUTHBOUND SEPULVEDA WHEN YOU ARE IN THE LEFT TURN BAY TO GO EASTBOUND ON ARTESIA.
IS THERE ANY WAY, OR WHAT WOULD BE REQUIRED, THE SHORT ANSWER, WHAT -- BECAUSE I KNOW CALTRANS IS VERY COMPLICATED, BUT WHAT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO CHANGE THAT SO YOU COULD MAKE A U-TURN.
IT'S IMPACTED BY THE WESTBOUND ARTESIA MAKING A RIGHT TURN BECAUSE THEY GET A LIGHT, A GREEN ARROW.
IS IT IN THE REALM OF POSSIBILITY, ERIC?

>> OPERATIONALLY, NO, IT'S NOT.
THERE ARE DUAL LEFT TURNS AS YOU KNOW SOUTHBOUND SEPULVEDA TO EASTBOUND ARTESIA BOULEVARD.
AT THE SAME TIME THE LEFT TURNS ARE GOING THERE IS A RIGHT TURN ARROW.
THAT'S NEEDED FOR THE CAPACITY AND THE SHEER VOLUME OF THAT INTERSECTION.
IF YOU REMOVE THAT, YOU WILL HAVE BACKUPS ON THE STREET.
IF THE DRIVER MISSES THE TURN, CONTINUES DOWN SEPULVEDA AND U-TURN AT THE NEXT SIGNAL.
ULTIMATELY GO TO A LEFT TURN AT ARTESIA BOULEVARD AND HEAD EASTBOUND ON ARTESIA BOULEVARD AND HEAD BACK TO WHERE THEY CAME FROM.
GENERALLY SPEAKING, IF SOMEONE IS NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE AREA, THEY DON'T KNOW INTO A RESIDENTIAL AREA.

THEY DON'T LIKE THAT BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW IF THEY WILL GET STUCK.
THAT'S GENERALLY WHAT YOUR GPS ROUTES WILL DO.
THEY SEND YOU BACK THE WAY YOU CAME.
>> J. Franklin: GREAT.
THANK YOU.
STILL WITH YOU, ERIC, THERE IS A BARRICADE AT TENNYSON EASTBOUND AT CHABELA.
AND THEN SHELLY HAS HALF A BARRICADE, TECHNICALLY IT'S ONE-WAY WEST, THERE IS A ONE-WAY DIRECTIONAL SIGN WEST, AND THEN ON THAT BARRICADE IT SAYS WRONG WAY, DO NOT ENTER.
HAS THERE BEEN CONSIDERATION OF MAKING THAT A FULL BARRICADE AND WHAT WOULD BE THE IMPLICATION?
WOULD IT HELP CALM THE TRAFFIC BACK THERE IF ANY WAYWARD HOTEL GUESTS OR EMPLOYEES WERE TO GO BACK THERE?
>> THE ACTUAL HALF BARRICADE WORKED VERY WELL FOR MANY, MANY YEARS.
IT'S GENERALLY HIDDEN.
IF YOU ARE NOT FROM THE AREA, YOU DON'T KNOW IT'S THERE.
WE DON'T HAVE AN ENFORCEMENT ISSUE AT THIS TIME.
NOW, THE APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO UPDATE THAT -- THOSE HALF CLOSURE AT SHELLY.
ANY CHANGES TO THE TRAFFIC CIRCULATION TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD WOULD NEED TO GO THROUGH A NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC STUDY.
FORTUNATELY, WE ALREADY HAVE ONE IN PROCESS BECAUSE OF THE SKETCHERS DEVELOPMENT.
THE SKETCHERS DEVELOPMENT IS PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE CITY TO CONDUCT A NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC STUDY ON BOTH SIDES OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.
IT'S BASICALLY INCLUDED IN THAT FUTURE STUDY.
WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE RESIDENTS ARE INVOLVED IN ANY OF THAT.
>> J. Franklin: DOES IT DROP SOUTH, FAR ENOUGH SOUTH TO GET SHELLY?
YOU KNOW, KEATS, SHELLY AND TENNYSON?
>> YES, IT DOES.
>> J. Franklin: GREAT.
GOOD.
EXCELLENT, THANK YOU.
NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
THANK YOU.
>> Mayor Hadley:
THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN AND THEN COUNCILMEMBER NAP CIRCLE BACK TO YOU.
>> S.Napolitano: THANK YOU MY QUESTION WAS ANSWERED.
>> Mayor Hadley: GREAT.
I HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS FOR TED AND THEN GO ON TO THE APPLICANT.

FOR THOSE IDENTIFY FOLLOWING ALONG, I HAVE AN ORDER CHEAT SHEET
HERE FROM STAFF.

SO AFTER MY QUESTIONS, WE WILL GO TO THE APPLICANT, THEN WE WILL
HAVE COUNCIL QUESTIONS TO THE APPLICANT, THEN WE WILL HAVE THE
MB POETS TIME TO SPEAK, AND THEN COUNCIL QUESTIONS OF THE MB
POETS AND THEN THE UNION APPEAL AND THEN COUNCIL QUESTIONS OF
THE UNION APPEAL.

THEN WE WILL HAVE THE PUBLIC SPEAKING FOR TWO MINUTES.

THAT WILL COME AFTER THE UNION AND COUNCIL QUESTIONS, THEN WE
CAN HAVE COUNCIL QUESTIONS AGAIN, APPLICANT REBUTTAL AND THEN
COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND CLOSE FOR
DELIBERATION.

WE WILL SEE IF WE CAN GET THROUGH ALL OF THAT TONIGHT.

MAYBE WE WILL NOT.

TED, THANK YOU.

GREAT PRESENTATION.

GOSH, THE PLANS AND THE VISUALS, YEAH, THINGS LIKE THE SHADOW
STUDY, IT'S AMAZING THE TECHNOLOGY AND THE PRINTING
CAPABILITIES.

IT REALLY HELPS.

THE BIRDS EYE VIEWS ARE AMAZING.

THANK YOU.

SO WAS THE PARKING STUDY -- I HAVE THREE QUESTIONS.

WAS THE PARKING STUDY REDUCED FOR THE MANDATORY SPACES BECAUSE
OF AIRLINE CODES THINKING A VAN FROM THE AIRPORT WOULD BE
BRINGING A BUNCH OF PEOPLE OR WAS THAT NOT A FACTOR?

>> NO, THAT DID NOT PLAY A FACTOR AT ALL.

IT'S REALLY ABOUT IF YOU DIG INTO THE DETAILS OF THE PARKING
STUDY, THE PARKING STUDY SAYS THIS TYPE OF BUSINESS HOTEL HAS
WAY LESS PARKING DEMAND THAN THIS DOES.

IT SAID .71 OR .72 PARKING SPACES ARE NEEDED PER HOTEL ROOM
INSTEAD OF THE 1.1 PER HOTEL WHAT OUR CODE SAYS.

BASED ON THAT AND THEN DOING A SIMILAR THING FOR THE OFFICE AND
THE RETAIL, BASED OFF -- THAT NUMBER .72, IS FROM THE ITE.

THAT'S THE TRAFFIC ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION, RIGHT?

BASED OFF OF THOSE NUMBERS AND WHEN YOU CALCULATE ALL THE PEAK
TIMES, YOU GET A 152.

IT'S BASED OFF OF TECHNICAL ANALYSIS, NOT SPECULATION THE DELTA
CREW IS COMING IN ON A BUS.

>> Mayor Hadley: THAT'S GOOD TO KNOW.

THANK YOU.

>> MAYOR HADLEY, I WANT TO ADD ON TO TED'S ANSWER.

I WANT TO PROVIDE HOW TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER HAS THAT DATA.

THEY DO STUDIES ON LAND USES IN DIFFERENT SETTINGS.

THAT'S HOW YOU STUDY PARKING DEMAND FOR SOMETHING THAT ISN'T ON
THE GROUND YET IS THAT YOU HAVE AN ABUNDANCE OF DATA.

FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF HOTELS, THEY DO LOOK AT THE TYPICAL

CLIENTELE THAT USES THESE KIND OF HOTELS ESPECIALLY PROXIMITY TO AIRPORTS, SO IT'S VERY LIKELY SOMETHING LIKE A FLIGHT CREW OR BUSINESS TRAVELERS OR OCCASIONAL LEISURE TRAVELERS WERE ALL FACTORED INTO THE DATA.

IN A VERY INDIRECT WAY THAT WAS PROBABLY TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, BUT TO TED'S ANSWER THAT'S NOT TAKEN INTO DIRECT LOCATION TO THE SPECIFIC SITE.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU THAT'S GREAT.

WHAT DID YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAID OUR PARKING CODES IN MANHATTAN BEACH ARE A BIT OUTDATED?

>> WELL --

>> WANT ME TO TAKE THAT?

>> YOU COULD PROBABLY BE MORE ARTICULATE THAN I COULD.

>> OUR PARKING CODES FOR A HOTEL IMAGINED A FULL SIZE, FULL SERVICE TYPE OF HOTEL, SUCH AS THE WIND DRIFT HOTEL.

IT WAS BACK IN THE '80S WHEN IT WAS FORMULATED.

THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS UBER OR LYFT OR RIDESHARING OF ANY KIND.

SO EVERYONE DROVE THEMSELVES TO THE HOTEL OR RENTED A CAR AND THAT'S NOT WHAT HAPPENS ANYMORE.

THE NEWER PARKING CODES ACROSS THE BOARD FROM ULI OR ITE OR ANY OTHER ACRONYMS HAVE FEWER PARKING GENERATION THAN THERE ARE ROOMS.

THAT'S WHY WE ARE SPECIFICALLY POINTING TOWARDS THE ITE RATES BECAUSE THOSE ARE THE MOST ACCURATE AND THOSE ARE THE INDUSTRY STANDARD NOW.

SO IT'S APPLIED TO THIS SITE USING OUR CITY'S MUNICIPAL CODE THAT ALSO ALLOWS FOR A REDUCTION BASED ON PARKING CODE.

>> Mayor Hadley: AND THE DATE OF THE ITE STUDY, HOW RECENT IS THAT DATA FROM ITE?

>> JANUARY 2019.

>> JUST TO BE CLEAR ABOUT THE OUTDATEDNESS OF THE PARKING CODE OR WHAT'S OUR EXISTING PARKING CODE, AS WAS MENTIONED EARLIER, WE ARE REVIEWING ALL THE COMMERCIAL PARKING STANDARDS.

WE WILL MAKE ADJUSTMENTS AND BRING THAT TO COUNCIL AT A LATER DATE.

IT'S NOT JUST HOTEL.

IT'S A LOT OF DIFFERENT LAND USE CATEGORIES THAT HAVE, YOU KNOW, AN OUTDATED, EITHER TOO HIGH OR TOO LOW, PARKING REQUIREMENT.

THAT WILL BE COMING, COMPLETELY INDEPENDENT OF THIS PROJECT, AT ANOTHER TIME.

>> Mayor Hadley: GREAT.

SORT OF A PART B TO THAT, ERIC, SO ITE STUDY WAS JANUARY 2019.

WOULD YOU SAY RIDESHARE USE HAS GONE UP SINCE THEN AND RENTAL CAR TRAFFIC HAS GONE DOWN SINCE THEN OR IS IT ABOUT THE SAME NOW AS IT WAS IN JANUARY 2019?

>> COLLECTIVELY AS DIRECTOR TAI WAS MENTIONING, IT'S A

ACCUMULATION OF MANY DATA POINTS OR MANY HOTELS OVER MANY YEARS. SO SOME OF THE NEWER HOTELS THAT HAVE DATA WILL INCLUDE SOME OF THAT RIDESHARE.

SOME OF THE OLDER ONES DON'T.

AND SO WE ARE CONTINUING TO SEE A DECREASE IN PARKING GENERATION FOR HOTELS BECAUSE OF THAT.

>> Mayor Hadley: SO WE CAN ASSUME THE DECREASE IN PARKING REQUIREMENT JANUARY 2019 TO TWO YEARS LATER, JANUARY 2021.

>> RIGHT.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU AND THEN LASTLY, ABOUT VIEWS FROM THE SECOND FLOOR, TED, WHAT ABOUT THE BAMBOO.

HOW TALL WILL THE BAMBOO BE WHEN IT'S PUT IN THE GROUND?

>> SURE, LET ME PULL THESE PLANS UP AGAIN.

THERE IS A REALLY NICE VISUAL THAT SHOWS THE BAMBOO.

BEAR WITH ME FOR JUST A SECOND AS I BRING THAT UP HERE.

SO IN THE LANDSCAPING PLAN, RIGHT THERE.

LET ME ZOOM IN ON THIS GRAPHIC AND I HOPE EVERYONE CAN SEE THIS AT HOME.

WHAT I ACTUALLY ASKED THE APPLICANT TO DO WITH THEIR LANDSCAPING TEAM IS TO SHOW THE HEIGHTS OF THE BAMBOO AT DIFFERENT YEARS.

SO AT INSTALLATION HERE, IT SAYS IT WILL BE 12 FEET TALL.

THREE YEARS FROM INSTALLATION, IT WILL BE 21 FEET TALL.

SIX YEARS FROM INSTALLATION IT WILL BE 30 FEET TALL.

AT YEAR NINE FROM INSTALLATION, IT WILL BE 39 FEET TALL, WHICH REACHES THE HEIGHT OF THE HOTEL.

I WANT TO ALSO POINT OUT IF I GO BACK A BIT TO THE ELEVATION OF THE STRUCTURE, IF YOU LOOK AT A SIDE ELEVATION HERE, LET ME ZOOM HYDROCARBON, CHABELA, AS IT GOES NORTH, THERE IS A HUGE CHANGE IN GRADE.

SO THIS BOTTOM FLOOR HERE OF THE HOTEL ROOMS, BY THE TIME YOU GET OVER HERE ON THE NORTH, IT'S COMPLETELY UNDER THE GRADE, WHICH MEANS THIS IS THE SECOND FLOOR, THIS IS THE THIRD FLOOR, THIS IS THE FOURTH FLOOR HERE.

SO ALREADY, EVEN IF YOU DIDN'T HAVE BAMBOO, THIS SCREENING WALL HERE, RIGHT, THIS SIX FOOT WALL THAT THE APPLICANT WANTS TO INSTALL, WILL ALREADY OBSCURE ANY VIEWS FROM THE FIRST FLOOR.

THE SECOND FLOOR WILL BE ABLE TO LOOK ACROSS THE STREET AND

THIRD AND FOUR AS PROPOSED WILL HAVE THE LOUVERED SCREENING.

THE GRADES SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WHEN THINKING ABOUT THE EFFECTS OF THE SCREENING ON TO THE NEIGHBORS.

>> Mayor Hadley: YEAH, THAT'S A GREAT GRAPHIC.

THANK YOU.

THE SECOND FLOOR CANNOT LOOK INTO NEIGHBOR'S BACKYARDS, CORRECT?

>> I'M NOT -- I HAVE THIS GRAPHIC HERE EARLIER, AND -- OF WHAT THE VIEW WOULD BE FROM THE TOP FLOOR, RIGHT HERE, RIGHT?

SO WE HAVE.

WHAT CAN SOMEONE SEE FROM THE TOP FLOOR IF YOU DID NOT TAKE INTO

ACCOUNT THE LOUVERS?
WE DID NOT ASK FOR THAT FROM THE SECOND FLOOR.
I THINK LOOKING AT WAY THIS GRAPHIC WAS DONE, THIS CROSS-SECTION
WAS TAKEN IN THE MIDDLE OF THE TWO PROPERTIES OVER HERE ACROSS
ON CHABELA, KIND OF ALONG THE REAR PROPERTY LINE.
I DON'T THINK THEY COULD SEE MUCH.
I CAN'T SAY THAT WITH CERTAINTY.
BUT I DON'T THINK SO.
I DO WANT TO POINT OUT THE PROPERTIES ACROSS THE STREET ARE ONE
STORY.
MOST OF THE PROPERTIES IN THE POET SECTION ARE ONE STORY.
AS ANYONE WHO LIVES IN A ONE STORY EXOS, THE HOUSE NEXT DOOR
NEXT TO YOU IS A TWO STORY, THEY CAN SEE YOUR BACKYARD, THEY CAN
SEE YOUR ROOM.
THAT'S JUST HOW IT IS.
THERE IS NOTHING IN OUR CODE THAT PREVENTS SOMEONE IN A TWO
STORY HOUSE FROM LOOKING INTO THE YARD OF A ONE STORY YARD.
THAT'S JUST THE WAY THE BUILDING WORKS.
THE SAME THING APPLIES FOR COMMERCIAL PROPERTY AS WELL.
>> Mayor Hadley: GOT YOU.
THANK YOU SO MUCH.
STAFF, I THINK WE WILL LET YOU GO.
COUNCIL, DO WE WANT TO MAKE THE MOTION TO EXTEND PAST
10:30 RIGHT NOW?
I AM NOT SAYING MIDNIGHT.
THAT WAY WE WON'T FORGET.
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: I WILL MOVER.
>> Mayor Hadley: A SECOND?
COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY, THANK YOU.
>> R.Montgomery: NOT MIDNIGHT.
>> Mayor Hadley: NO.
WE WILL GET IT OUT OF THE WAY.
I DON'T WANT TO INTERRUPT THE APPLICANTS AND THE QUESTIONS.
SEEMED LIKE A GOOD TRANSITION POINT.
CLERK TAMURA LIZA TAMURA, ROLL CALL PLEASE.
>>Clerk: COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO.
>> S.Napolitano: OKAY.
>>Clerk: COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.
>> R.Montgomery: YES.
>> COUNCILMEMBER FRONT RANGE.
>> YES.
>> YES.
>> MAYOR HADLEY.
>> YES.
COLLEAGUES, NO ONE LIKES TO GET TO BED EARLIER THAN I DO.
I WILL NEVER PUSH A MEETING LONGER THAN WE HAVE TO.
COMMITTEE DIRECTOR TAI, IS THIS A GOOD TIME TO COME FORWARD?

>> YEAH, AT THIS POINT THE HOTEL PARTNERS.
>> CAN EVERYBODY HEAR ME.
>> Mayor Hadley: YES, WE CAN SEE AND HEAR YOU, JAN.
>> TECHNOLOGY WORKS.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
I WOULD LIKE TO SAY GOOD EVENING TO MAYOR HADLEY AND THE MEMBERS
OF THE MANHATTAN BEACH CITY COUNCIL.
MY NAME IS JAN HOLTZE.
I AM HERE TO PRESENT THE PROPOSED SEPULVEDA PROJECT ON 600 BLOCK
OF SEPULVEDA BOULEVARD.
I AM A LONG-TERM RESIDENT.
I MOVED HERE IN 1987.
OVER 33 YEARS AND THAT DOES QUALIFY ME AS OLD.
OUR PROJECT REPRESENTS THE CULMINATION OF YEARS OF EFFORT BY THE
CITY, INCLUDING ITS PLANNING STAFF, PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY
COUNCIL.
I VERY MUCH APPRECIATE THE TIME YOU WILL BE TAKING TONIGHT TO
LISTEN TO OUR PRESENTATION, DISCUSS THE MERITS OF THE PROJECT
AND ANSWER QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE.
FIRST AND FOREMOST IS LARRY COSMOT AND HIS TEAM.
JEAN FONG AND HIS TEAM IS ONE OF THE LEADING ARCHITECTS IN THE
HOTEL INDUSTRY NATIONALLY, INCLUDING THREE RECENTLY COMPLETED
PROJECTS IN EL SEGUNDO.
JASON MELCORE HIS TEAM WITH KIMLEY-HORN AND BARBARA HALL.
UNFORTUNATELY, WE HAVE BEEN FORCED TO RETAIN THE SERVICES OF
KEITH McCULLOUGH WHO IS PROVIDING SOME LEGAL ADVISORY SERVICES
NOT ONLY WITH REGARD TO OUR CEQA COMPLIANCE, BUT ALSO WITH THE
CURRENT LITIGATION FILED BY THE APPELLANTS.
QUICKLY, I WOULD LIKE TO DESCRIBE WHAT OUR HOTEL IS NOT.
I WOULD LIKE TO DISPEL THE MYTHS AND GROWTH MISREPRESENTATIONS
PUT FORWARD OVER THE LAST TWO MONTHS.
FIRST OUR BUILDING IS NOT A 200-FOOT TALL BUILDING.
WE ARE NOT EXEMPT FROM CEQA REVIEW.
TO THE CONTRARY, WE CONDUCTED A FULL ANALYSIS FOR TRAFFIC, AIR
QUALITY, NOISE AND HYDROLOGY THAT DEMONSTRATED NO SIGNIFICANT
IMPACTS, NOT EVEN CLOSE, THUS FURTHER ANALYSES ARE NOT EVEN
WARRANTED.
OUR BUILDING IS NOT MISLEADINGLY THE BUILDING DEPICTED ON A
FLYER.
THERE IS NO BAR ON THE ROOF OF THE HOTEL.
I REPEAT THERE IS NO ROOFTOP BAR.
WE ARE NOT A CONVENTION HOTEL, NOR DO WE HAVE BANQUET
FACILITIES.
IF YOU WANT THAT, GO TO THE WEST RIFT.
THE HOTEL DOES NOT HAVE A FULL SERVICE RESTAURANT NOR ROOM
SERVICE NOR ANY OTHER AMENITIES AS SPA OR POOL FACILITIES.
WE WILL ALLOW FOR TAKE-OUT FROM OUR SPECTACULAR LOCAL

RESTAURANTS.

THERE IS NOT LIVE ENTERTAINMENT GOING UNTIL 1:00 A.M.

OUR WINDOWS ARE ONLY OPENABLE TO FOUR INCHES WIDE.

WE ARE NOT INCREASING NOISE FROM THE PARKING AREAS.

TO THE CONTRARY, WE ARE DROPPING THE PARKING BELOW TO THE ADJACENT GRADES ON CHABELA BY UP TO 20 FEET AND PARKING WILL BE LOCATED UNDERNEATH THE CONCRETE PODIUM STRUCTURE FOR THE BUILDINGS ABOVE.

OUR PARKING IS BASED ON CODE AS EARLIER DESCRIBED BY THE PLANNER.

WE ARE NOT CREATING ANY TRAFFIC TRAVELING EAST ON TO OUR PROPERTY.

HERE'S WHAT WE ARE.

WE ARE A VERY WELL DESIGNED MIXED USE PROJECT THAT ACTUALLY REDUCES THE TRAFFIC IMPACTS BY AT LEAST 20% IF IT WAS COMPARED TO A PROJECT WHERE WE DEVELOPED SOLELY AS A HOTEL AND MORE THAN 35% IF COMPARED TO ALTERNATIVE OPPORTUNITIES LIKE AN OFFICE BUILDING.

WE INCREASED OUR SETBACKS ON CHABELA FROM THE ALLOWABLE ZERO FOOTING SETBACK TO STREET FEET AND PROVIDED PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY AND NEW LANDSCAPING AND BAMBOO AND STREET LIGHTS ON CHABELA. WE INCREASED THE WIND SCREENINGS TO THE ROOMS ORIENT THE THIRD FLOOR AND FOURTH FLOOR CHASING CHABELA TO REDUCING VIEW INTO OUR ROOMS.

WE WILL BE A LIMITED SERVICE, SELECT SERVICE, PREMIUM CLASS 3.5 STAR BUSINESS HOTEL AFFILIATED WITH ONE OF THE MAJOR FRANCHISES. NO LIVE MUSIC EVER UNLESS ALLOWED BY EVENT SPECIFIC PERMIT ONLY APPROVED AND ISSUED BY THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH.

WE DIRECT ALL OF OUR TRAFFIC ON TO AND OFF OF SEPULVEDA.

WE ARE OVER PARKED, NOT UNDER PARKED, BY OVER 35 PARKING SPACES. IN FACT, THE PLANNING COMMISSION EVEN ALLOWED US TO REDUCE FURTHER FROM OUR PLAN EARLIER BY EIGHT SPACES IN ORDER TO MINIMIZE THE USE OF COMPACT SPACES.

LASTLY, WE ARE AN ECONOMIC BENEFIT FOR OUR CITY, PROJECTED TO CONTRIBUTE OVER \$1 MILLION ANNUALLY AND I COULD GO ON.

I NEED TO MAKE THIS SHORT AND QUICK.

IN SUMMARY WE SUBMITTED OUR PRELIMINARY APPLICATION ON AUGUST 9TH, 2019.

PLANNING STAFF AND CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER AND PUBLIC WORKS AND POLICE AND FIRE HAVE WORKED STEADILY AND DILIGENTLY FOR 17 MONTHS SCRUTINIZING THIS PROJECT AND WE MUCH APPRECIATE THEIR INPUT.

THE PROJECT IS SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER.

THE PLANNING SUBMISSION SPENT ALMOST FOUR HOURS OVER TWO PUBLIC HEARINGS LISTENING TO THE PUBLIC COMMENT, DISCUSSION AMONG THE COMMISSIONERS AND A VOTE TO APPROVE THE PROJECT.

WE NOW FIND OURSELVES HERE UNDER THE SHADOW OF PENDING

LITIGATION FROM THE APPELLANTS BEFORE THE MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL HAVE EVEN HAD A CHANCE TO DISCUSS OUR APPLICATION. I TRUST THE MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL WILL WEIGH ALL FACTORS THEY HEAR HERE AND SEPARATE THE WHEAT FROM THE CHAFF. I THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I AM MAKING THIS QUICK BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE LARRY CHIME IN FOR A COUPLE OF MINUTES HERE BEFORE WE ARE FINISHED.

>> HI, THIS IS LARRY.
CAN YOU HEAR ME?
JUST CHECKING.
>> Mayor Hadley: YES, WE CAN HEAR YOU NOW.
>> GOOD EVENING.

MY NAME IS LARRY COSMOT FROM COSMOT AND COMPANIES. WE ARE LOCATED IN MANHATTAN BEACH. WE REPRESENT THE DEVELOPER. MY FAMILY AND I ALSO RESIDE IN MANHATTAN BEACH FOR NEARLY 15 YEARS.

AS YOU MAY BE AWARE, OUR COMPANY HAS WORKED ON MANY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FOR 35 YEARS ADVISING CITIES AND COUNTIES AND PRIVATE CLIENTS THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA. FOR THIS PROJECT, WE EVALUATED THE FISCAL BENEFITS. BEFORE THAT, THIS PARCEL, THIS SITE HAS BEEN THE DISCUSSION AND DEBATE -- HAS BEEN DISCUSSED AND DEBATED FOR YEARS WITH THE SEPULVEDA PLAN. I HAD A CHANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THOSE DISCUSSIONS. OUT OF IT CAME AN ABSOLUTE CONCLUSION THAT THIS WAS AN OPPORTUNITY. THIS WILL BE A HIGH QUALITY SELECT SERVICE HOTEL. AND THE TIMING FOR THIS APPLICATION IS VERY UNIQUE. WE SIT HERE AT THE CROSSROADS OF REAL ECONOMIC DISLOCATION. YOU HEARD TONIGHT LITERALLY A MULTITUDE OF FOLKS AND YOU WILL HEAR MORE ABOUT OUR LOCAL VENDORS AND RESTAURANTS THAT ARE ALL SUFFERING. THIS HOTEL WILL BRING THOUSANDS OF PATRONS TO THE COMMUNITY. IF YOU LOOK AT YOUR OWN BUDGET STATEMENT, CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH BUDGET SNAPSHOT FOR 2021, THAT STATEMENT STATES THE CITY WILL LOSE ABOUT \$1 .3 MILLION IN REVENUES JUST THE IMPACT OF COVID. THAT'S 11% RESPECTIVELY. WHAT WILL THE HOTEL BRING, IT WILL BRING THAT IN ITS INSTALLATION BY 2023. IT WILL BRING IN \$1.3 MILLION IN REVENUE IN SALES TAX, PROPERTY TAX AND HOTEL TAX. YOU HAVE YOUR COFFER, WHICH IS YOUR PUBLIC STATEMENT OF YOUR ECONOMIC CONDITION. THERE IS A REQUIREMENT FOR A CITY TO CONSIDER ECONOMIC IMPACTS. THIS IS A LAND USE DECISION, BUT IT'S ALSO A PROJECT THAT

FULFILLS ALL THE LAND USE REQUIREMENTS THAT WERE ESTABLISHED AFTER YEARS OF DEBATE.

THIS IS A PROJECT THAT WILL HELP ALL THE LOCAL VENDORS AND MERCHANTS DOWNTOWN AND ELSEWHERE TO GET RESTORED AND RESUSCITATED BY THE ADVENT OF LOTS OF NEW PATRONS AND CUSTOMERS. THIS IS AN ATTRACTIVELY DESIGNED PROJECT THAT WILL CAPITALIZE THE INCREASE OF TAX TO 12% THAT THE CITY RECENTLY APPROVED. IT DELIVERS ON THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SITE AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, IT COMES AT A TIME THAT WILL BENEFIT MANY OF THE MERCHANTS AND VENDORS DOWNTOWN THAT ARE CURRENTLY SUFFERING. THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Hadley: THAT WAS PINPOINT TIMING.

THANK YOU.

COLLEAGUES, ANY QUESTIONS FOR MR. HOLTZE OR MR. COSMOT? ARE THERE ANY?

YES, COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN, AND THEN COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> J. Franklin: UNLESS I MISSED, I DON'T THINK ANYBODY ASKED HOW LONG FROM WHEN YOU BREAK GROUND, HOW LONG WILL THE PROJECT ESTIMATED TAKE?

>> ABOUT AN 18-MONTH PERIOD FROM BREAKING GROUND TO OCCUPANCY.

>> J. Franklin: THANK YOU.

YOUR HONOR.

>> Mayor Hadley: YES, COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> R.Montgomery: YES, THE QUESTION I ASKED TED WAS -- I DIDN'T READ EVERY SINGLE MINUTE OF THE DISCUSSION, DID THEY EVER TALK TO YOU ABOUT -- [INDISCERNIBLE] CONCERNS OF THE THIRD FLOOR?

>> WELL, THERE WERE SOME QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER THOMPSON, I THINK, THAT HE WAS TRYING TO VOICE HIS OWN OPINION ABOUT NOT NECESSARILY THE MASSING OF THE BUILDING, BUT MORE I THINK HAVING TO DO WITH ARTICULATION, AS I KIND OF UNDERSTAND IT OF THE BUILDING.

IT WASN'T NECESSARILY A HEIGHT ISSUE OR A SETBACK ISSUE AS MUCH AS IT WAS I THINK, KIND OF HISTORICALLY, I THINK HE HAS AN AVERSION TO TALL VERTICAL WALLS.

>> R.Montgomery: IT WAS ABOUT THE THIRD FLOOR --

>> EXPRESSING.

>> R.Montgomery: THIRD FLOOR ARTICULATION WAS DISCUSSED. AND THE REASON WHY YOU DIDN'T DISCUSS IT PAST THAT POINT BECAUSE WAS WHY?

>> WELL, I THINK IT CAME UP AFTER PRETTY MUCH ALL OF THE DEBATE AT THE END OF THE SECOND HEARING.

AND I THINK IT WAS A SUBJECT THAT HAD, YOU KNOW, BEEN BROUGHT UP VERY QUICKLY, AND, YOU KNOW, WITH VERY LITTLE DISCUSSION AND WAS NOT SOMETHING NECESSARILY THAT, YOU KNOW, WE FELT THAT IT WAS POSSIBLE TO BE ELIMINATING A WHOLE STACK -- OR WHOLE LINE OF ROOMS AS HE WAS SUGGESTING.

I THINK, YOU KNOW, HAVING THOUGHT ABOUT IT LATER, HE MIGHT HAVE

BEEN TRYING TO ASK FOR SOMETHING ELSE, BUT I AM NOT SURE.

>> R.Montgomery: UNDERSTOOD.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU, RICHARD.

MAYOR PRO TEM STERN, COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO, QUESTIONS?

I HAVE QUESTIONS MR. HOLTZE AND MR. COSMOT, TALK TO ME ABOUT THE MANAGEMENT OF THE HOTEL.

I AM SURE YOU ARE BOTH AWARE BECAUSE YOU LIVE IN MANHATTAN BEACH, THIS COUNCIL HAS BEEN GOBSMACKED I CAN SAY BY A RECENT SHOOTING AT A LOCAL HOTEL AND JUST SOME MANAGEMENT ISSUES THAT SOMEHOW GOT AWAY FROM THEM AND THAT'S CREATED SOME REAL PROBLEMS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY AND SOME GRAVE CONCERNS AMONG COUNCIL AND OUR STAFF AND OUR POLICE HAVE SPENT JUST AN INORDINATE AMOUNT OF TIME TRYING TO RECTIFY THOSE.

TELL US ABOUT, WHY SHOULD WE TRUST YOU COMING INTO THE COMMUNITY TO RUN THIS HOTEL AND HOW DO WE KNOW IT WILL BE RUN WELL?

HOW DO WE KNOW THERE WILL NOT BE PROBLEMS?

THE LAST QUESTION IS HOW CAN YOU KICK PEOPLE OUT AFTER 30 DAYS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

HOW DO YOU PREVENT SQUATTERS, WHAT ARE YOUR TECHNIQUES?

LARRY, I THINK YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO MUTE YOURSELF OR TURN OFF ONE OF YOUR DEVICES, LARRY.

>> SORRY ABOUT THAT.

WELL, THAT'S ALL OF QUESTIONS, AND I THINK, YOU KNOW, FIRST OF ALL, UNDERSTAND THAT WITH MY BACKGROUND, WITH MY FAMILY'S BACKGROUND, THAT WE ARE MANAGING LARGE SORT OF URBAN HOTELS, DENVER, DALLAS, HOUSTON, AND THE ISSUES THAT ARE GOING ON HERE ARE NO DIFFERENT THAN ANYWHERE ELSE.

YOU KNOW, THE HOTELS AT TIMES ARE RUNNING AT MAYBE 20% OCCUPANCY.

IF THERE IS A QUESTION OF TRYING TO GO OUT AND FIND PEOPLE TO FIND ROOMS, THERE IS A LIMIT TO THAT.

YOU KNOW, I CAN'T SPEAK TO THE PROBLEMS THAT OCCURRED AT THE RESIDENCE INN.

THOSE FOR SOME REASON ARE VERY UNUSUAL.

WE HAVE NEVER HAD THOSE ISSUES.

SOME OF THEM DO INVOLVE OPERATIONS WHERE, YOU KNOW, YOU REQUIRE A CREDIT CARD DEPOSITS OF PEOPLE.

YOU DON'T ACCEPT CASH FOR PAYMENTS.

AND ALSO SOME OTHER ISSUES, WHICH I THINK ARE PROBABLY MORE KIND OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY AS FAR AS THE ENTITLEMENT OF THIS PROJECT WHICH HAS FAR MORE RESTRICTIONS ON IT THAN THAT PROPERTY DID BACK IN 1985.

AS FAR AS I UNDERSTAND IT THE RESTRICTIONS ON THAT PROPERTY AND THE C UP IS BEING UPDATED TO INCORPORATE MORE THAN KIND OF STANDARDS FOR THE CITY.

SO THAT'S A VERY GENERAL QUESTION TO ANSWER, TO BE GIVING YOU.

I CAN'T GIVE A GUARANTEE, BUT I CAN TELL YOU -- AND I WOULD GET THE PEOPLE FOR THE RESIDENCE INN, WOULD SAY THE SAME, THEY HAVE NO INTENTION OR ANY SORT OF EXPERIENCE WITH ANY OF THIS BEFORE, AND I THINK THAT -- I CAN'T MAKE COMMENTARY ON THEIR OPERATIONS. ALL I CAN SAY FROM OUR OPERATIONS, WE HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED THESE SORTS OF ISSUES.

YOU KNOW, THESE ARE BUSINESSES WHERE YOU ARE DOING BUSINESS WITH ANYONE AND EVERYONE.

YOU ALMOST CAN'T TURN DOWN BUSINESS, BUT YOU NEED TO BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT HOW YOU LOOK FOR THESE PEOPLE AND HOW YOU TAKE CARE OF THE PROBLEMS.

AS FAR AS NOT BEING ABLE TO STAY PAST 30 DAYS, WE JUST DON'T TAKE RESERVATIONS FOR THAT.

WHAT HAPPENS IS THAT TRIGGERS A LOSS OF THE TOT AS WELL.

SO WE JUST HAVE A POLICY OF NOT DOING THAT.

I BELIEVE ONE OF OUR OTHER PROPERTIES, I FORGET, IT MIGHT BE HOUSTON, I'M NOT SURE, HAS THE SAME SORT OF REQUIREMENT.

SO IT'S AN OPERATIONAL IN OUR SYSTEMS WHERE PEOPLE CANNOT MAKE A RESERVATION FOR LONGER THAN A CERTAIN NUMBER OF DAYS.

>> Mayor Hadley: GOTCHA, THANK YOU.

THOSE ARE MY QUESTIONS.

LET ME GO BACK -- COLLEAGUES, ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

I AM LOOKING FOR HANDS HERE.

ONE MORE.

COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> R.Montgomery: THANK YOU.

REMIND ME AGAIN ON WHY YOU NEED AN EXCEPTION ON THE 15 PARKING SPACES?

>> WHAT 15 PARKING SPACES?

THE REDUCTION IN PARKING.

MERCHANDISE THE REDUCTION IN PARKING.

>> IT'S A MATTER OF OPERATIONS AND ECONOMICS.

WE DON'T NEED IT.

SUBTERRAIN IAN UNDERGROUND PARKING IS EXTRAORDINARILY EXTENSIVE AND IT'S A TAX ON THE COST AND THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF THE PROPERTY.

SO WE IN FACT, BELIEVE EVERY BIT OF THE KIMLEY-HORN STUDY REAFFIRMS EVERYTHING WE KNOW ABOUT THE HOTELS THAT WE HAVE BEEN OPERATING.

WE KNOW THAT THE WEST DRIFT HOTEL AS WHAT THEY CALL A DRIVE-IN RATIO OF ABOUT 40%, WHICH MEANS OF ALL OF THEIR ROOMS THAT ARE FILLED, ABOUT 40% HAVE A VEHICLE TO PARK.

WE ARE ASSUMING 72%.

WE HAVE THE ABILITY BECAUSE WE ARE SO UNDER PARKED OR OUR SUPPLY, THAT WE COULD ACTUALLY GO TO 92 OR 93%.

SO GIVEN THE FACT THAT MANHATTAN BEACH SITS IN EXACTLY THE RIGHT SPOT, WHICH IS IT'S A VERY DESIRABLE PLACE TO BE FOR CLIENTELE,

THIS PROPERTY WILL BE A VERY DESIRABLE PLACE, AND I THINK ATTRACT A VERY DESIRABLE, YOU KNOW, PAYING BUSINESS CLIENT WHO IS -- YOU KNOW, WE ARE FOUR MILES, TEN MINUTES FROM LAX. AND LAX WAS PRE-COVID WAS SOMETHING LIKE 90 MILLION TRAVELERS. THOSE TRAVELERS, YOU KNOW, THEY WILL BE PEELING OFF AND STAYING IN HOTELS, WHETHER IT'S DOWNTOWN OR SANTA MONICA. SOME WANT TO STAY AT THE BEACH AND THIS IS GOING TO BE ONE OF THE TRUE GEMS WHERE, YOU KNOW, OUR HILTON TRAVELERS OR MARRIOTT TRAVELERS WHO WHENEVER WE DECIDE TO LAND THE FLAG, WILL BE SELECTING THAT.

SO WE HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO FEAR WHATSOEVER ABOUT THERE EVER BEING ANY SORT OF A PARKING ISSUE.

>> R.Montgomery: THE FOLLOW UP QUESTION DOES THAT NUMBER INCLUDE THE EMPLOYEES AT THE HOTEL?

AND ALSO THE RETAIL STORES TO PARK AS WELL?

>> YES, ABSOLUTELY.

AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE TABLES THAT WERE PROVIDED BY KIMLEY-HORN IN THE TRAFFIC STUDY, YOU CAN LOOK AT THE -- I THINK THEY REALLY ONLY COVER 18 HOURS OF THE DAY, BUT YOU CAN LOOK AT THE EBB AND FLOW OF THE DEMAND FOR PARKING THROUGHOUT THE DAY.

BY FAR THE HIGHEST DEMAND IS AT NIGHT AT MIDNIGHT.

THAT'S WHERE WE HIT THE HIGH POINT.

DURING THE DAY, IT'S SIGNIFICANTLY LESS THAN DEMAND.

THAT IS ALSO THE TIME OF DAY WHEN WE HAVE THE LARGEST AMOUNT OF PEOPLE WORKING IN THE HOTEL AS FAR AS HOUSEKEEPING AND OTHER PEOPLE.

TYPICALLY, SAY FOR OUR DENVER HOTEL, YOU KNOW, THE PEOPLE WHO ARE WORKING THERE, I DON'T THINK THAT EVEN HALF OF THEM DRIVE THEIR OWN CAR.

>> R.Montgomery: ONE CLARIFICATION, YOU ANSWERED IT.

I AM GOOD.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> Mayor Hadley: COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN, AND THEN MB POETS, YOU ARE UP NEXT AFTER THE COUNCIL QUESTIONS.

>> J. Franklin: I WANT TO SEE THE IMPACT ON WEEKENDS.

TYPICALLY A BUSINESS HOTEL, THE BUSINESS TRAVELERS GO AND THEN YOU HAVE THE WEEKEND.

WILL YOU HAVE REDUCED BUSINESS RATES?

WHAT'S IN YOUR BUSINESS PLAN ABOUT WEEKENDS?

>> WE WANT TO HAVE IT FULL.

THAT'S ABOUT ALL I CAN SAY.

WE SAY IT'S A BUSINESS HOTEL.

YES, BUSINESS TRAVELERS ARE GOING TO BE A LARGE COMPONENT OF THAT.

THE PITCH THAT BRUCE MADE ABOUT WHY THE 40-FOOTED HEIGHT LIMIT IS SO APPLICABLE TO A HOTEL, THE BUSINESS TRAVELERS, THE BONVOY AND HILTON POINTS, ALL OF THOSE PEOPLE ARE EXPECTING WHEN THEY

STAY AT A TEMPO OR AC HOTEL, SOMETHING LIKE THAT, THEY HAVE A CERTAIN LEVEL OF WHAT THEY EXPECT FOR THE HOTEL. SO THOSE TRAVELERS WILL HAVE THAT DURING THE WEEK, BUT MANHATTAN BEACH, AS, YOU KNOW, I COULD SEE ON SUNDAY NIGHT, THIS PAST SUNDAY NIGHT AT 6:00 AT NIGHT AFTER THE SUN HAD SET, THE DOWNTOWN MANHATTAN BEACH WAS MOBBED WITH VISITORS. AND THERE ARE NO RESTAURANTS OPEN, NO NOTHING AND THEY ARE STILL COMING.

SO WE FULLY PLAN THAT THIS HOTEL IS GETTING RUN AT SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 80 AND 90% OCCUPANCY OVER THE COURSE OF A 12-MONTH PERIOD.

RESIDENCE INN IS RUNNING AT 97%.

THE WEST DRIFT HAS A BIT MORE TURNOVER.

THEY RUN AT ABOUT 75%, BUT ALL THE OTHER HOTELS AROUND THE EL SEGUNDO AREA ARE RUNNING 80, 90, 95% OCCUPANCY.

SO WE WILL BE FILLED ON THE WEEKENDS.

>> Mayor Hadley: RICHARD, YOU GOOD?

>> R.Montgomery: I AM GOOD, YOUR HONOR, THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Hadley: JOE, HILDY, STEVE.

COMMUNITY DIRECTOR TAI, THE MB POETS ARE UP NEXT, CORRECT?

>> YES, MB POETS IS THE FIRST APPELLANT.

I BELIEVE THEIR FIRST CONTACT IS A DARYL FRANKLIN.

IF HE CAN BE UNMUTED, PLEASE.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU TO OUR TWO APPLICANTS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION.

>> HI.

APOLOGIZES.

I HAVE JUST LOST IT.

MY NAME IS DARRYL FRANKLIN.

I LIVE ON TENNYSON STREET WITH MY WIFE AND FIVE CHILDREN.

I HAVE FILED THE APPEAL ON BEHALF OF MB POETS.

IT'S A GROUP OF 30 OR MORE HOUSEHOLDS OF THE QUIET RESIDENTIAL STREETS THAT WILL SUFFER THE IMMEDIATE IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

WE ARE IN FAVOR OF RESPONSIBLE DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNIZE THE TOURIST TAX TO THE CITY.

WE WANT TO THANK YOU THE CITY COUNCIL AND STAFF ON THE BEHALF OF THE WORK THEY DO ON BEHALF OF THE RESIDENTS AND ASK THAT YOU TAKE AN OBJECTIVE LOOK ON THE ISSUES AS PRESENTED.

THANK YOU FOR THE WAIVER OF THE APPEAL FEES.

THIS DEVELOPMENT IS THE -- WHAT IS PROPOSED IS HUGE FOR THE SIZE OF THE SITE.

AT THE VERY LIMITS OF PERMITTED DENTIST DESTINY HEMMED BY SEPULVEDA ON ONE SIDE AND RESIDENTS ON THE OTHER SIDE.

IT'S ON THE CORNER WHERE TWO LOST THEIR LIVES IN TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS THE LAST TWO YEARS.

THE CITY COUNCIL OWES TO THEIR FAMILIES AND ALL THE FAMILIES IN

OUR CITY TO MAKE SURE THE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THIS DEVELOPMENT ARE PROPERLY MINIMIZED.
A FULL MAR WOULD DO THAT.
MB POETS PROVIDES 150 PAGES FACT BASED ANALYZED REASONS AS TO WHY THIS DEVELOPMENT DOESN'T QUALIFY FOR AND CAN'T BE GRANTED A CEQA EXEMPTION.
OUR REPORT DOESN'T STAND ALONE.
THE OTHER APPELLANTS TODAY HAVE THEIR OWN REPORTS AND THEIR OWN EXPERTS COMING TO A SIMILAR CONCLUSION.
THE PARKING PLAN HAS NO PROVISION WHATSOEVER TO MEET PARKING DEMAND FROM THE BAR AND RESTAURANT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.
THE APPEAL STAFF REPORT THAT NO PARKING DEMAND WILL OCCUR FOR THIS SERVICE BECAUSE THE RESOLUTION BANS PUBLIC USE.
OUR AAVC EXPERT EXPLAINS ONE CANNOT OPERATE AN ESTABLISHMENT WITH A TITLE 47 LICENSE ON THAT BASIS.
THE LACK OF PARKING FOR THE BAR AND RESTAURANT IS ALSO BREACH OF THE CITY'S OWN MUNICIPAL CODE THAT REQUIRES ALL NEW LAND USES HAVE ADEQUATE OFF STREET PARKING FOR THE USE AND ASSOCIATED LOADING REQUIREMENTS.
I WOULD ASK TED TO EXPLAIN TO EVERYBODY HOW THE TRUCKS WILL LOAD IN AND OUT OF THIS HOTEL EVERY SINGLE MORNING.
IT'S A SIMPLE FACT IF THIS HOTEL HAS INADEQUATE PARKING, THE CARS HAVE TO TRY TO GO SOMEWHERE OFFSITE.
PARKING IS EXTREMELY LIMITED.
OUR PARKING EXPERTS PROVIDED A VERY DETAILED POINT BY POINT TECHNICAL REBUTTAL OF DEVELOPER'S EXPERT ANALYSIS SUMMARIZES VERY GENERALLY, THE DEVELOPER'S TEAM VIOLATES THE CITY CODE ON THE MAXIMUM 15% REDUCTION FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT.
I WANT TO POINT OUT THIS ISN'T INVALIDATED BY 1064.050.
THEY ARE NOT AN EITHER/OR.
THEY BOTH EXIST TOGETHER.
THEY USE A 50% AVERAGE, WHICH DOESN'T APPLY ON THESE FACTS.
YOU HEARD THE DEVELOPER FLIP-FLOP TONIGHT.
THE DEVELOPER'S PARKING EXPERT INCORRECTLY CLARIFIES THIS HOTEL TO SUPPRESS THE PARKING DEMAND.
THE EVIDENCE IS CLEAR THAT THE PARKING WILL OVERFLOW THIS SITE MANY TIMES THROUGH PERIODS OF PEAK DEMAND.
IN PLAIN ENGLISH, THAT MEANS THERE WILL BE A LOT OF CARS LOOKING FOR PARKING ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS ON A VERY REGULAR BASIS.
WHEN IT COMES TO TRAFFIC, THE EXPERTS EXCLUDED ANALYSIS OF NEARBY RESIDENTIAL STREETS.
THEY LEFT 30TH STREET OFF THEIR MAP ENTIRELY.
THE DEVELOPER FELT CONDUCTING ACCUMULATIVE IMPACTS -- [INDISCERNIBLE] TURNING TO NOISE.
THE REPORT DOESN'T EVALUATE NOISE LEVELS AROUND THE SITE AT NIGHT AS IS REQUIRED BY CODE.
IT USES UNREALISTIC AND UNUSUALLY LOW ASSUMPTIONS CALCULATIONS.

IT DOESN'T ANALYZE ANY MUSIC.
IT ANALYZE THE IMPACT OF BAR NOISE ON RESIDENTS.
IT TALKS ABOUT BUILDINGS SHIELDING NOISE WHEN THERE ARE NO BUILDINGS.
NOISE RESIDENTS ARE IN DIRECT LINE-OF-SIGHT.
THE REPORT FAILS TO ANALYZE THE IMPACT OF COMPULSIVE NOISE.
PROJECT NOISE WILL BE CLEARLY AUDIBLE BEYOND THE PREMISES.
IN CLOSING, AS ELECTED OFFICIALS, I WOULD URGE YOU TO TAKE SERIOUSLY, THE THREE PETITIONS CALLING FOR A FULL EIR.
THE SIGNATURES ARE COME FROM RESIDENTS AND VOTERS ALL CALLING FOR A FULL ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.
WHAT YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO DO IS PLAIN AND SIMPLE, REVERSE THE FINDING OF A CEQA EXEMPTION AND ORDER REMOVAL OF THOSE RESTRICTIONS AND REQUIRE A FULL EIR.
THE EIR SHOULD TAKE PLACE ONCE COVID IS DONE ONCE THE LOCAL CHURCH AND HIGH SCHOOL ARE IN FULL OPERATION AND THE TRAFFIC ON SEPULVEDA IS IN NORMAL LEVELS.
>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU MR. FRANKLIN.
>> MY NAME IS DOUGLAS KARSTENS P.
WE ARE HERE ON BEHALF OF THE MB POET.
I WANTED TO THANK EVERYBODY THIS EVENING AND ESPECIALLY DARRYL FRANKLIN'S PRESENTATION.
WE WISH THAT WE DIDN'T NEED AN ATTORNEY.
WE WISH THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE TO FILE THAT LAWSUIT.
WE WOULD NOT HAVE DONE IT IF THE NOTICE OF EXEMPTION HAD NOT BEEN FILED, BUT WE ARE.
RELYING ON AN EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL EQUALITY ACT IS NOT THE RIGHT THING TO DO HERE.
IT'S A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DEMOCRACY.
IT WAS DESIGNED TO PROMOTE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, NOT ONLY TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, BUT ALSO TO ENSURE ALL THE CONSTITUENTS IN THE CITY, YOUR VOTERS, THAT THE ENVIRONMENT IS BEING PROTECTED AND THAT THEY ARE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE AND UNDERSTAND THE IMPACTS THE COMMUNITY WILL SUFFER AND HOW THOSE WILL BE ADDRESSED.
THERE ARE A NUMBER OF UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES HERE THAT TAKE THIS PROJECT OUT OF THE EXEMPTION FROM CEQA, [INDISCERNIBLE].
IF AN EXEMPTION WAS NOT BEING USED, THE FULL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COULD BE DONE WHERE PEOPLE COULD ACTUALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT'S HAPPENING HERE.
THE UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT ARE PRESENT THAT TAKE THIS OUT OF AN EXEMPTION OR COULD YOU TELL ME IMPACTS OF TRAFFIC AND PROXIMITY TO RESIDENTIAL USE NOT JUST TO THE EAST, BUT ALSO TO THE WEST.
THERE ARE VIOLATIONS OF THE CODE.
THERE ARE THE IMPACTS THEMSELVES THAT ARE UNUSUAL AND WILL BE SIGNIFICANT IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS VERY SPECIAL NEIGHBORHOOD,

THIS VERY SPECIAL PLACE, THE POET SECTION OF THE CITY.
THOSE IMPACTS INCLUDE TRAFFIC AND NOISE AND AIR QUALITY.
WE SUBMITTED A LOT OF COMMENTS, SO DID THE UNITE HERE GROUP.
ALL OF THOSE COMMENTS TAKE A LOT OF UNDERSTANDING AND LOOKING AT
AND ASK THAT YOU DO THAT BECAUSE ONE BENEFIT OF AN ENVIRONMENT
IMPACT REPORT WOULD BE TO RESOLVE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE
DIFFERENT EXPERTS SAYING WE ARE RELYING ON THIS OR THEY ARE
RELYING ON THAT.

IT TAKES A VERY CAREFUL PARSING THAT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO DO ON
AN EXEMPTION WHICH CUTS A REVIEW PERIOD SHORT.

THIS PROJECT HAS A LOT OF SIMILARITIES TO THE RESIDENTS IN, A
LOT OF THE MITIGATION MEASURES THAT ARE REQUIRED THERE SHOULD BE
REQUIRED HERE.

THIS WILL BE THE HIGHEST BUILDING ON SEPULVEDA IN THE CITY.
IT'S VERY UNUSUAL IN ALL OF THOSE UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT.

ALSO LOOKING AT THE EXTENSIVE -- [INDISCERNIBLE] THERE ARE
THREE ARTICLES.

THERE ARE 116 PARTICIPANTS AT THIS LATE HOUR AT 10:30 P.M. IN
THE EVENING.

ASA -- THIS IS A PROJECT THAT WILL BE WITH THE CITY FOR MANY
YEARS.

TO PRODUCT THE QUALITY OF LIFE AND PROTECT QUALITY OF YOUR
REDSKINS, MANY WHO ARE SPENDING MORE TIME IN THEIR HOMES, HAVE
TO BE PROTECTED THROUGH AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS.
WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME THIS EVENING DURING THESE
EXTRAORDINARY TIMES.

WE HOPE YOU WILL HEAR THE CONCERNS OF EVERY MEMBER OF THE
COMMUNITY THAT WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK.

WE ASK THAT YOU REQUIRE AN ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT REPORT AND DENY
THE PROJECT.

DENY IT NOW AND PASS IT LATER WITH AN ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORT.
I APPRECIATE YOUR TIME.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU.

COLLEAGUES, QUESTIONS FOR THE MB POETS?

MR. FRANKLIN AND MR. KARSTENS?

I SEE NO QUESTIONS.

THANK YOU MR. FRANKLIN AND MR. KARSTENS.

WE ARE GOING TO MOVE ON.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR PRESENTATION.

WE ARE GOING TO GO ON TO THE UNION, THE OTHER APPELLANT FOR THIS
PROJECT.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR TAI.

>> YES, OUR SECOND APPELLANT IS UNIT HERE LOCAL 11.

THE CONTACT NAME I HAVE HERE IS DANIEL WILSON.

I AM NOT SURE IF THAT'S THE PROPER REPRESENTATIVE.

TED KNOWS WHO IT IS.

>> YES, THIS IS TED SPEAKING.
IT COULD ALSO BE JORDAN -- I AM PROBABLY MISPRONOUNCING HIS LAST
NAME, WHO IS THE LAWYER REPRESENTING UNITED HERE 11.
>> HI, THERE TED.
IT WILL BE -- [INDISCERNIBLE] AND MYSELF.
>> THAT SOUNDS GOOD.
THEY WILL BE GIVEN TEN MINUTES.
>> Mayor Hadley: CARRIE, WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT THE
TRANSLATION?
THAT'S PUBLIC COMMENT THAT WILL BE LATER, CORRECT?
>> FOR TRANSLATION, I AM GOING TO DEFER FOR COUNTY CLERK TAMURA
FOR THOSE LOGISTICS.
>> Mayor Hadley: WE WILL TACKLE THAT A LITTLE BIT LATER.
>> THANK YOU.
>> GIDEON NEEDS TO BE UNMUTED.
>> WHO IS SPEAKING FIRST FOR THIS PUBLIC HEARING?
>> I AM SPEAKING FIRST.
>> I WILL START THE TIMER AND WHEN YOU ARE READY TO PASS IT ON
TO THE NEXT PERSON, I WILL UN-MUTE THEM AT THAT TIME.
>> VERY GOOD.
AM I WAITING FOR THE TIMER TO START?
GOOD EVENING, MAYOR HADLEY, HONORABLE COUNCILMEMBERS AND STAFF.
MY NAME IS DANIELLE WILSON AND I AM A RESEARCHER FOR UNITE HERE
LOCAL 11.
WHEN WE SEE A PROJECT LIKE THIS THAT OUR EXPERTS HAVE DETERMINED
WILL HAVE SIGNIFICANT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND NEGATIVE
IMPACTS ON AIR QUALITY, YOU HAVE TO ASK PUBLIC SERVANTS LIKE
YOURSELVES TO PUSH FOR THE HIGHEST ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS.
HERE WE ARE LOOKING AT A PROJECT THAT HAS BEEN DETERMINED
INCORRECTLY EXEMPT FROM CEQA.
WE NEED TO ASK FOR MORE.
THE CITY DESERVES BETTER.
THE RESIDENTS DESERVE BETTER AND WORKING FAMILIES DESERVE
BETTER.
NO ONE UNDERSTANDS MORE THAN WE DO HOW BADLY CITIES ARE HURTING
RIGHT NOW.
OUR MEMBERS ARE NOT ONLY THE MIDWEST VULNERABLE, BUT THEIR JOBS
IN THE INDUSTRY ARE INTRINSICALLY LINKED TO THE CITY'S WELL
BEING AND EVERYONE KNOWS THAT, BUT WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO
CONSIDER THE COMPREHENSIVE IMPACTS OF OUR DECISIONS AND NEGATIVE
IMPACTS OF OUR ENVIRONMENT ARE NOT WORTH THE CRUMBS THE
DEVELOPER IS WILLING TO OFFER US.
PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING.
DO RIGHT BY YOUR RESIDENTS AND DO RIGHT BY THE WORKERS WHO BACK
UP THIS VERY CITY.
THANK YOU.
I WILL PASS IT OVER TO GIDEON.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU, DANIELLE.
>> I AM HOPING YOU CAN SEE ME HERE.
>> Mayor Hadley: I CAN SEE YOUR, GIDEON.
>> THANK YOU, MAYOR, COUNCILMEMBERS.
THANK YOU FOR THIS INFORMATIVE AND EXEMPLARY MEETING TONIGHT.
I HAVE LEARNED A LOT FRANKLY, IN THE FOUR HOURS WE HAVE BEEN
TOGETHER, YOU AND YOUR CONSTITUENTS AND STAFF.
I AM GIDEON FOR THE APPELLANT TONIGHT.
WE REQUIRE A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION -- [INDISCERNIBLE]
PROPER PUBLIC COMMENT FOR THE PROJECT.
MEMBERS OF LOCAL 11 INCLUDING MANY WHO LIVE AND WORK IN THE CITY
JOIN TOGETHER TO FIGHT FOR IMPROVED LIVING STANDARDS AND WORKING
CONDITIONS.
AS YOU KNOW COVID HAS HIT THE UNION VERY HARD.
WE HOPE YOU AND YOUR LOVED ONES ARE OKAY.
IN ANY EVENT MAKING COMMENTS LIKE THESE TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS LIKE
YOU IN CONNECTION TO MATTERS OF PUBLIC CONCERN SUCH AS
COMPLIANCE FOR ZONING RULES FOR THIS PROJECT IS IN CORE
FUNCTIONS OF THE UNION.
FUNDAMENTALLY, THE UNION WANTS TO MAKE SURE THAT HOTELS FOLLOW
THE RULES AND IN YOUR VIEW, THIS PROJECT DOES NOT.
WE SUBMITTED EXTENSIVE DOCUMENTS, INCLUDING FROM EXPERTS TODAY
TO PLANNING STAFF, WHO HAS BEEN ACCESSIBLE AND PRESENTED A VERY
THOROUGH STAFF REPORT.
YOU MAY HAVE THOSE DOCUMENTS, BUT HE WAS VERY THOROUGH AND HE
DID NOT REFERENCE TONIGHT THE NEW DETAILED SUBMITTALS SO WE ARE
A BIT CONCERNED.
WE ARE SORRY WE DID NOT GIVE YOU MUCH TIME TO REVIEW BUT THAT'S
BECAUSE WE ONLY GOT YOUR OWN STAFF REPORT WITH THE DEVELOPER'S
TECHNICAL RESPONSES JUST SIX DAYS AGO.
FRANKLY, WE WERE NOT GIVEN MUCH TIME.
THIS IS A CEQA EXEMPTION CASE.
THERE WAS NO PUBLIC REVIEW FOR A DOCUMENT LIKE THAT AND THAT'S A
BIG ISSUE, PLUS THE HOLIDAYS AND COVID, SO I AM VERY SORRY.
BUT IF YOU PUT YOURSELVES IN OUR SHOES, PROBABLY WOULDN'T HAVE
BEEN MUCH DIFFERENT, BUT I DO WISH WE HAD MORE TIME.
WE DID DROP ABOUT 200 PAGES OF EXPERT LETTERS AND ATTACHMENTS
TODAY.
WHAT DOES IT SAY?
IT'S A LOT OF ANALYSIS ON VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED IS WHAT WE ARE
GETTING IN THE STAFF REPORT.
OUR EXPERT LETTERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES, BUT THE EXPERTS
CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT FAILS TO PROVIDE AN ACCURATE TRAFFIC
ANALYSIS, WHICH AS A RESULT MASKS TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND THAT THE
PROJECT HAS SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES
IMPACTS.
THE STUDY FROM THE DEVELOPER, WHICH WE SAW ABOUT A WEEK AGO,

MODELS THIS AS AN ALL SUITES HOTEL, WHICH HAS LESS TRAFFIC IMPACTS, BUT THIS IS NOT A HOTEL WITH SUITES. ALSO THE STUDY TOOK CREDIT FOR THE EL TORITO TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF NEW TRIPS THE PROJECT ALLEGEDLY CAUSES, BUT THE EL TORITO HAS BEEN CLOSED FOR YEARS, NO? SO ALL THE TRIPS FROM THIS PROJECT ARE NEW. WE DON'T START FROM AN EL TORITO THAT IS OPEN AS OUR BASELINE. THIS PROJECT IS 1800 MORE TRIPS WHICH WILL LEAD TO SIGNIFICANT TRAFFIC IMPACTS. THE TRAFFIC STUDY IS NO GOOD. THE EXEMPTION IS NO GOOD. AS FOR THE AIR POLLUTION STUDY, OUR EXPERTS SAY THE INTENSITY FACTORS ARE GREENHOUSE GASES AND EMISSIONS WERE PLAYED WITH. IN AN EFFORT TO MORE ACCURATELY DETERMINED THE EMISSIONS OUR EXPERT PROVIDED AN MORE UPDATED MODEL THAT CONCLUDES THE PROJECT WILL HAVE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS TO THE NEIGHBORS DURING CONSTRUCTION AND GREENHOUSE GAS IMPACTS DURING OPERATION. THE EXPERT CONCLUDES THE PROJECT WOULD EXCEED 2016 BASELINE AND 2045 TARGET VEHICLES MILES TRAVELED FOR THE REGION. THESE ARE EXPERT CONCLUSIONS SUPPORTED BY FACTS AND ANALYSIS, WHICH IS SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE. IN LAYMAN'S TERMS, BECAUSE OF THESE EXPERT COMMENTS, THE PROJECT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR A CEQA EXEMPTION. THAT'S ONLY ALLOWED UNDER PROJECT 32 AND THIS PROJECT DOES NOT QUALIFY. FOR THESE REASONS, BASED ON ALL THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD EVERYTHING MB POETS HAS DONE, LOCAL 11 RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THE COUNCIL DENY THE APPROVAL UNTIL AN EIR IS PREPARED. [INDISCERNIBLE]. LOCAL 11 THEREFORE RESPECTFULLY ASKS THAT YOU GRANT THE APPEALS AND ORDER THE PROJECT TO UNDERGO MORE COMPREHENSIVE CEQA ANALYSIS AND AT A MINIMUM IF YOU HAVEN'T SEEN OUR EXPERT -- WE ASK THAT YOU REVIEW THIS INFORMATION TONIGHT. WE DIDN'T HAVE MUCH TIMING HERE. THANK YOU AND YOUR STAFF FOR THE DILIGENT WORK-UP AND AGAIN FOR THE EXEMPLARY MEETING THAT YOU CONDUCTED ALL NIGHT LONG. THANK YOU.

>> R.Montgomery: THANK YOU, GIDEON.
THANK YOU, DANIELLE.
COLLEAGUES, ANY QUESTIONS FOR UNIT 11.
COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN.

>> J. Franklin: HI, THANKS FOR YOUR PRESENTATION.
HAVE YOU BEEN GETTING STAFF REPORTS ALL ALONG?
IS THAT REALLY THE UPDATED STAFF REPORT THAT YOU GOT SIX DAYS AGO OR WAS IT FROM GROUND ZERO?
YOU ARE MUTED.

>> FOR EXAMPLE, THE TRAFFIC ANALYSIS WAS NOT GIVEN TO US AND

THAT WAS ONE OF THE COMMENTS WE MADE IN THE ORIGINAL APPEAL.
WE SAW THAT ABOUT SIX, SEVEN DAYS AGO.
THE UPDATED NOISE ANALYSIS, THE RESPONSE TO SOME OF THE
GREENHOUSE GAS ISSUES.
WE FILED THE APPEAL IN EARLY DECEMBER.
THIS HEARING IS ONE MONTH LATER, THAT WAS PRETTY QUICK.
SO THERE IS A LOT OF NEW STUFF IN THIS REPORT.
AGAIN, WE HAD AN MMD OR EIR, ALL OF THIS STUFF WOULD HAVE BEEN
IN ONE PLACE AND ALL THE TECHNICAL STUDIES WOULD HAVE BEEN THERE
AND ALLOWED TO HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT AND PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD, 30,
45 DAYS.
WHEN YOU DO AN EXEMPTION, THIS IS WHAT HAPPENS.
>> J. Franklin: GOT YOU.
THANK YOU.
>> Mayor Hadley: COLLEAGUES, ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS?
THANK YOU FOR JOINING US TONIGHT.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATIONS.
CITY ATTORNEY BARROW, GIVEN THE LATE HOUR AND THE REMAINING
PARTS OF THE AGENDA, WHAT IS YOUR OPINION CONTINUING THIS ITEM
SO THAT WE CAN GIVE FULL TIME TO PUBLIC COMMENT AT A DATE, WHICH
WOULD BE FEBRUARY 2ND?
I HEARD FROM CITY MANAGER BRUCE MOE, WE CAN CONTINUE THIS ITEM
TO FEBRUARY 2ND AGENDA?
>> YEAH, I THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA.
IT'S NOT LEGALLY REQUIRED, BUT IT IS GETTING PRETTY LATE
TONIGHT.
AND SO THE PEOPLE THAT ARE STILL WAITING TO TALK ABOUT THIS
COULD BE REFRESHED AND COME BACK ON THE 2ND.
ALL YOU NEED IS A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING, AND A
SECOND AND THEN A VOTE.
>> Mayor Hadley: FOR THOSE OF YOU AT HOME -- JUST SO YOU KNOW,
THE LIST AHEAD OF US ISN'T A LITTLE BIT FOR THIS, SO BY
CONTINUING IT, IT DOES SEEM LIKE A GOOD IDEA WHERE WE WON'T BE
GOING INTO THE WEE HOURS OF THE NIGHT.
WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT NEXT AND TWO MINUTES EACH.
WE WANT TO GIVE EVERYONE THEIR FULL TIME.
WE HAVE COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND THEN THE APPLICANT REBUTTAL AND
THEN COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND THEN WE CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND
THEN COUNCIL DELIBERATION, SO THERE IS QUITE A BIT MORE TO THIS
NEW PROCESS WHICH IS NEW TO ME AND PERHAPS NEW TO MANY OF YOU ON
BOTH SIDES OF THIS PROJECT.
SO IF OUR CITY ATTORNEY SAID NOT LEGALLY REQUIRED TO CONTINUE,
BUT THAT WE MAY, I THINK MY COLLEAGUES MY SUPPORT ME IF SOMEONE
MIGHT MAKE A MOTION TO CONTINUE PUBLIC COMMENTS FORWARD UNTIL
FEBRUARY 2ND.
DO I HAVE A MOTION?
>> R.Montgomery: I WILL MOVE THAT WE CONTINUE THE PUBLIC

COMMENTS FOR THIS ITEM TO THE NEXT CITY COUNCIL.
>> Mayor Hadley: WELL, WE WILL CONTINUE THE WHOLE HEARING.
>> RIGHT.
THAT WOULD BE FEBRUARY 2ND.
>> Mayor Hadley: FEBRUARY 2ND AT 6:00 P.M.
CITY ATTORNEY BARROW, WHERE WOULD THIS SHOW UP IN THE AGENDA FOR
THE FOLKS WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT FOR CONTINUED
ITEM?
>> YES, IT'S AT YOUR DISCRETION.
WE COULD START RIGHT OFF WITH THE PUBLIC HEARING AND START RIGHT
AT 6:00 AND EVERYTHING ELSE WILL COME AFTER THAT IF YOU WANT.
IT'S YOUR DISCRETION.
>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.
SO WE CAN MOVE IT CLOSER TO THE BEGINNING THAN PERHAPS.
>> YES, YES.
>> Mayor Hadley: YES.
>> WAS THERE A SECOND?
>> Mayor Hadley: YEAH, DO WE HAVE A SECOND FOR COUNCILMEMBER
FRANKLIN'S MOTION?
>> I WILL SECOND YOUR HONOR.
>> Mayor Hadley: COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO HAS SECOND.
COUNTY CLERK TAMURA, ROLL CALL PLEASE.
>>Clerk: THANK YOU MAYOR HADLEY.
>> YES.
>> COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO.
>> YES.
>> COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN.
>> J. Franklin: YES CONFERENCE COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.
>> R.Montgomery: YES.
>>Clerk: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: YES.
>> MAYOR, THAT MOTION PASSED, THERE WILL BE NO FURTHER NOTICE
OF THE CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING.
NO EVERYONE WHO IS IN ATTENDANCE SHOULD PUT IT ON THEIR
CALENDARS AND WE WILL BE BACK ON FEBRUARY 2ND.
>> R.Montgomery: TERRIFIC.
CITY ATTORNEY BARROW, I DO NOT CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.
>> THAT'S CORRECT.
>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.
BUT I MAY MOVE ON TO AGENDA ITEM 11?
>> YES.
>> Mayor Hadley: SO COLLEAGUES AND STAFF, WE WILL MOVE ON TO
LETTER K, GENERAL BUSINESS AND NOW WE WILL GO TO AGENDA ITEM 11,
CONSIDERATION OF GRANTING HARDSHIP EXEMPTION TO 7-ELEVEN STORE
NUMBER 24549 REQUESTING ADDITIONAL TIME TO COMPLY WITH ORDINANCE
WHICH PROHIBITS THE RETAIL SALE OF TOBACCO PROJECTS.
>> GOOD EVENING.

TONIGHT IS CONSIDERATION OF GRANTING HARDSHIP EXEMPTION TO 7-ELEVEN REQUESTING ADDITIONAL TIME TO COMPLY WITH ORDINANCE NUMBER 20-0007.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT CITY COUNCIL ADOPT RESOLUTION TO EXTEND THE COMPLIANCE PERIOD TO JUNE 30TH, 2021 FOR 7-ELEVEN. ON FEBRUARY 18, 2020, THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTED ORDINANCE 20-0007 PROHIBITING THE SALE OF TOBACCO IN MANHATTAN BEACH. CITY ADOPTED OCTOBER 31ST 2020 AS THE DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING APPLICATIONS FOR A HARDSHIP.

SO ON DECEMBER 1ST, CITY COUNCIL DID APPROVE EXTENSIONS FOR THE THREE OTHER BUSINESSES THAT REQUEST A HARDSHIP BY OCTOBER 31ST FOR SALES UP TO JUNE 30TH, 2021.

PRIOR TO DEADLINE OF OCTOBER 31ST, 2020, THE CITY DID RECEIVE AN APPLICATION FROM THE OWNER OF THE 7-ELEVEN LOCATED AT 1221 ARTESIA BOULEVARD.

THE APPLICANT DID REQUEST FOR AN ADDITIONAL 24 MONTHS TO SELL TOBACCO PRODUCTS.

THE APPLICANT DID DEMONSTRATE THE SALE OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS HAS BEEN DECLINING THE LAST THREE YEARS, BUT ALSO REQUESTED THE ADDITIONAL 24 MONTHS.

THE APPLICANT HAS NOT PROVIDED SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT THE DENIAL OF THE REQUEST FOR THE REQUEST BEING DENIED ANY EQUITABLE USE OF THE PROPERTY CONTAINING THE SALE OF TOBACCO FOR 7-ELEVEN. WITH THAT BEING SAID, STAFF RECOMMENDS THE CITY COUNCIL EXTEND THE COMPLIANCE DATE FOR THE APPLICANT UNTIL JANUARY 30, 2021. THIS IS SIMILAR TO THE OTHER BUSINESSES THAT GOT THE EXTENSION IN DECEMBER BY ADOPTING RESOLUTION 21- 0012.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU FINANCE DIRECTOR CHARELIAN? ANY QUESTIONS?

CITY ATTORNEY BARROW WILL OPEN THIS UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

>> YES.

>> Mayor Hadley: DEPUTY CITY CLERK, ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR THIS ITEM.

>> WE DON'T HAVE ANY REQUESTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THIS ITEM.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU.

I WILL OPEN IT UP FOR A DISCUSSION OR A MOTION.

COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> R.Montgomery: I WILL MAKE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THIS BASED ON FACT THIS IS A APPLICANT TURNED IN THIS WORK ON TIME AND EARLY.

I WILL MAKE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE HARDSHIP REQUEST.

>> Mayor Hadley: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN, IS THAT A SECOND?

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: SECOND THAT.

I AM JUST CONFIRMING THIS IS THROUGH JUNE 30TH, 2021.

>> Mayor Hadley: CORRECT.

YEAH, THE APPLICANT ASKED FOR 24 MONTHS.

WE ARE GRANTING SIX MONTHS.
WE HAVE A MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY AND SECOND BY MAYOR
PRO TEM STERN.
COUNTY CLERK TAMURA ROLL CALL VOTE, PLEASE.
>>Clerk: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: YES.
>>Clerk: MAYOR HADLEY.
>> Mayor Hadley: YES.
>>Clerk: MOTION PASSES 5-0.
>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU WE WILL MOVE ON TO AGENDA ITEM 12,
WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CONSIDERATION
OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A HARDSHIP EXEMPTION AUTHORIZING MB
SMOKE TO TEMPORARILY SELL TOBACCO PRODUCTS.
FOR THIS WE WILL BRING UP CITY ATTORNEY QUINN BARROW.
>> ACTUAL, I BELIEVE MANAGEMENT ANALYST WILL BE TAKING THE LEAD
ON THIS.
>> Mayor Hadley: TERRIFIC.
HI, ALI.
>> HI.
GOOD EVENING MAYOR HADLEY AND CITY COUNCIL.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
I AM AN ANALYST FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES.
THE ITEM BEFORE YOU IS A CONSIDERATION OF HARDSHIP EXEMPTION
AUTHORIZING MB SMOKE TO TEMPORARILY SELL TOBACCO PRODUCTS IN
MANHATTAN BEACH UNTIL APRIL 30TH OF 2021.
I JUST WANTED TO PROVIDE A BIT OF A HISTORY OF HOW WE GOT HERE
JUST TO REFRESH ALL OF OUR MEMORIES.
THE CITY BEGAN ITS DISCUSSION AT THE COMPLETE PROHIBITION ON THE
SALE OF TOBACCO IN MANHATTAN BEACH AT ITS CITY COUNCIL ON JUNE
4TH IN 2019.
AFTER SEVERAL MEETINGS GATHERING PUBLIC INPUT AND DISCUSSION THE
CITY COUNCIL INTRODUCED ORDINANCE NUMBER 20-0007 ON FEBRUARY 4TH
IN 2020.
ALLOWING IT TO SELL TOBACCO PRODUCTS UNTIL DECEMBER 21ST, 2021.
AT THIS TIME COUNCILMEMBERS EXPRESSED THEY WAND TO ACCOMMODATE
THE APPLICANT HOWEVER, ONE OR MORE COUNCILMEMBERS AT THAT
MEETING EXPRESSED CONCERNS ABOUT WHETHER THE APPLICANT WOULD
TAKE MEASURES TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDINANCE BUT WERE WILLING TO
PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL SALE OF TOBACCO SALES.
AT THE CITY COUNCIL HELD ON JANUARY 5TH, 2021, THE CITY COUNCIL
CONSIDERED A DRAFT RESOLUTION ABOUT PROVIDING ADDITIONAL TIME TO
ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO SELL TOBACCO PRODUCTS IN LIGHT OF WHETHER
OR NOT THE APPLICANT IT ACTED IN GOOD FAITH.
THE COUNCIL CONTINUED THE MATTER AND DIRECTED STAFF TO VISIT THE
SITE TO DETERMINE IF THEY WERE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE VAPING
PRODUCTS BAN THAT HAD ALREADY BEEN ADOPTED AND TO DRAFT A
RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE A 90-DAY EXTENSION.

I WANTED TO INFORM YOU STAFF DID OBSERVE ILLEGAL PRODUCTS ON DISPLAY, HOWEVER THERE WAS A SIGN PRESENT IN THE SHOP THAT HAD STATED THAT MB SMOKE CANNOT SELL SUCH PRODUCTS. SO THE STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT RESOLUTION NUMBER 21-0010.

I AM HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

>> YOU ARE MUTED, YOUR HONOR.

YOUR HONOR, YOU ARE MUTED.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU.

THANK YOU ANALYST.

LET'S SEE IF MY COLLEAGUES HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR YOU.

>> OKAY.

>> Mayor Hadley: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THANK YOU.

I AM WONDERING SINCE THE TIME OF THE LAST MEETING, HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONTACT WITH THIS BUSINESS OWNER?

HAVE THEY ATTEMPTED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE FREE CONSULTANT?

HAVE THEY SUBMITTED ANY MORE DOCUMENTS TOWARDS THEIR EXEMPTION?

>> I CAN ANSWER PART OF THAT QUESTION.

THE APPLICANT HAS NOT EXPRESSED ANY INTEREST IN OUR CONSULTANT SERVICES AT THIS TIME.

AS FAR AS THE COMMUNICATION, I WILL LET CITY ATTORNEY QUINN BARROW ANSWER THAT.

>> THANK YOU.

YEAH, YESTERDAY, I SENT A COURTESY RESOLUTION TO THE ATTORNEY, AND TO MB SMOKE, THE PROPRIETOR AND RECEIVED AN EMAIL BACK FROM THE ATTORNEY WHO DID NOT INDICATE THAT HE WOULD TALK TONIGHT, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO MENTION THAT, YOU KNOW, THAT THE MAYOR SHOULD OPEN UP PUBLIC COMMENT AND SEE IF ANYONE WANTS TO SPEAK ON THIS TYPICALLY.

I TOLD THEM THAT THE COUNCIL WOULD CONTINUE THE MATTER TO PROVIDE THEM ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPORT THEIR APPLICATION.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

IS THAT SUFFICIENT?

>> R.Montgomery: YEAH -- [INDISCERNIBLE]

>> Mayor Hadley: YOUR QUESTIONS?

>> R.Montgomery: NO QUESTION.

>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.

ANY OF MY OTHER COLLEAGUES?

OKAY.

I WILL OPEN IT UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENT THEN AT THIS TIME AND DEPUTY CITY CLERK MARTHA ALVAREZ, DO WE HAVE ANYBODY CUED UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENT?

>> I AM NOT SHOWING ANY REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THIS ITEM.

>> Mayor Hadley: I WILL CLOSE PUBLIC COMMENT AND RETURN TO MY COLLEAGUES FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR A MOTION.

>> R.Montgomery: YOUR HONOR.

>> YES.

>> R.Montgomery: WE HEARD THE DOCTOR TALK ABOUT WHAT SHE SAYS AS A MEDICAL DOCTOR AND VAPING AS COUNCIL MADE THE BAN HAPPEN, NOT SO MUCH AS TOBACCO, THAT CAME LATER.

WHAT BOTHERS ME MORE IF YOU READ PAGE 332 OF THE STAFF REPORT TONIGHT, YOU WILL READ ON JANUARY 6TH, 2021, STAFF VISITED MB SMOKE.

STAFF OBSERVED ILLEGAL VAPING PRODUCTS WERE ON DISPLAY AS WELL AS A SIGN THAT STATED MB SMOKE COULD NOT SELL SUCH PRODUCTS. WE DIDN'T HAVE THE INFORMATION LAST MEETING WHEN I ASKED FOR A 90-DAY EXTENSION AS OPPOSED TO SIX MONTHS BECAUSE EVERYBODY ELSE FOLLOWED THE RULES.

IT SHOULD BE MORE CONCERNING TO THIS COUNCIL THAT NOT ONLY THE FIRST QUESTION, NOW, YOU HAVE SEEN THE SECOND EVENT.

DOES ANYONE BELIEVE AFTER ONE EXTENSION THERE WILL BE NO MORE REQUESTS?

I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT.

I WILL NOT BE VOTING IN FAVOR OF THIS EXTENSION.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

ANYBODY ELSE?

>> I AM SORRY.

YOU CUT OUT IN THE LAST PART COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> R.Montgomery: MY LAST COMMENT I DIDN'T BELIEVE THIS WAS THE LAST TIME WE HAVE SEEN TWO INCIDENTS OF BAD FAITH.

I AM CONCERNED WE WILL SEE A THIRD OR FOURTH EVENT OF BAD FAITH BECAUSE OF THAT I AM STICKING TO 90 DAYS AND THAT'S IT.

I AM VOTING PAST THE 90 DAYS I AGREED TO LAST TIME.

>> Mayor Hadley: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: I DIDN'T --

>> Mayor Hadley: NO.

YOU LOOKED LIKE YOU WERE REACHING FOR YOUR MUTE BUTTON.

SORRY.

QUESTIONS, COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN, I WILL WRAP UP AFTER YOU ARE DONE.

DO YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR DELIBERATIONS?

>> J. Franklin: NO.

>> Mayor Hadley: YEAH, I WILL BE HONEST, I THINK IT'S JUST CLEANER AND BETTER FOR THE CITY TO TREAT ALL OF THESE RETAILERS THE SAME, JUST PUTTING ON HIGH RISK MANAGEMENT HAT IF -- YOU KNOW, I JUST THINK IT PROTECTS THE CITY THE MOST NOT TO SINGLE ANYBODY OUT, SO THAT IS ONE OF MY CONCERNS.

I HEAR YOU COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY, BUT I THINK, YOU KNOW, ORIGINALLY WE TALKED ABOUT EXTENDING THE TIME FOR THIS ONE AND NOW, YOU KNOW, I WAS IN FAVOR OF THAT IN THE PAST, NOW, I JUST THINK TREATING THEM ALL THE SAME, INCLUDING THE ONE THAT WE JUST APPROVED EARLIER, THE 7-ELEVEN, I JUST THINK THAT'S NEAT AND

CLEAN FOR THE CITY, AND SEEMS FAIR TO ME.
SO THAT WOULD BE MY PREFERENCE IS TO ALLOW MB SMOKE TO
TEMPORARILY SELL TOBACCO PRODUCTS TO JUNE 30TH, 2021 AND THEN
ALL THE HARDSHIP EXEMPTIONS WOULD HAVE A SIMILAR END DATE.
THAT'S MY PREFERENCE.

COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN.

>> J. Franklin: I AM SORRY.

I WAS LOOKING BEFORE.

SO WE WENT THERE AND WE MONITORED.

IS THERE ANYTHING WE CAN PUT IN THIS OR DO WE AUTOMATICALLY
MONITOR THEM GOING FORWARD, ANY NEW DATE?

>> Mayor Hadley: I AM NOT SURE.

DO YOU HAVE COMMENT THERE ON ENFORCEMENT GOING FORWARD.

>> TYPICALLY ON TOBACCO ORDINANCES, IT'S DONE WHEN PEOPLE
COMPLAIN ABOUT -- WE RECEIVE A COMPLAINT FROM, YOU KNOW, A
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC OR MIGHT BE CALLING OUR OFFICE LETTING US
KNOW THERE IS A CODE VIOLATION, SO I WOULD ASSUME THIS WOULD BE
TREATED IN A SIMILAR MANNER, BUT THE REASON WHY WE WENT OUT ON
JANUARY 6TH WAS THE CITY COUNCIL'S REQUEST SUBSEQUENT TO THEIR
LAST CITY COUNCIL MEETING.

>> ALI IS CORRECT, IT'S TYPICALLY COMPLAINT DRIVEN, GIVEN THE
FACT THAT WE DID GO IN TWO WEEKS AGO AND SAW WHAT WAS GOING ON
THERE, WE WOULD LIKELY INTO PERIODIC CHECKS FOR THE REMAINDER OF
THE TIME THE BUSINESS IS SELLING TOBACCO PRODUCTS.

>> J. Franklin: IT HAD WE ALSO REQUEST THAT THEY REMOVE THE
DISPLAY OF THE VAPING PRODUCTS?

THAT JUST SEEMS UNUSUAL.

>> R.Montgomery: CAN I ADD THAT TO FOLLOW UP.

JUST TO MAKE SURE WE ARE ALL ON THE SAME PAGE HERE.

THIS BAN ISN'T ON VAPING PRODUCTS.

THAT HAPPENED FIRST ON NOVEMBER 5TH, 2019.

WE ARE NOT TALKING LAST YEAR.

THE BAN ON VAPING PRODUCTS WAS CLEAR.

THERE IS NO CONFUSION HERE.

EITHER THEY FOLLOW THE RULES OR THEY AT THIS POINT IN TIME --
DIDN'T, THAT'S IT, MAYOR, THANK YOU --

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU, RICHARD.

>> J. Franklin: I AGREE TO EXTENDING IT TO THE REST OF THEM ON
JUNE 30TH OF THIS YEAR JUST SO THAT DATE IS CERTAIN AND THAT
WILL BE THE END OF IT.

>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY, COUNCIL, DO WE HAVE ANY MOTIONS?

WE ARE ALL ASLEEP.

GOSH, I THOUGHT WE MIGHT FINISH BEFORE 11.

BUT NOT NOW IF WE BOG DOWN ON THE SECOND TO LAST ITEM.

>> J. Franklin: I WILL MAKE A MOTION -- MAYOR PRO TEM STERN,
DID YOU WANT.

I WILL BE HAPPY TO MAKE THE MOTION.

>> Mayor Hadley: GO AHEAD, JOE.
YOU SPOKE FIRST.

>> J. Franklin: SOUNDED LIKE YOU SAID YOU SMOKE FIRST.
SO I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE ALLOW MB SMOKES AN EXTENSION UNTIL
JUNE 30TH, 2021 TO COMPLETE THEIR SUPPLY OF ALCOHOL -- NO OF
TOBACCO PRODUCTS, AND REMOVE ANY DISPLAY OF VAPING PRODUCTS.
THAT JUST SEEMS SO UNUSUAL.

>> IF THERE IS A SECOND TO THAT MOTION, WE CAN REVISE THE
RESOLUTION SO THAT YOU WOULD BE ADOPTING THE RESOLUTION AS
REVISED TONIGHT.

>> I WILL SECOND, YOUR HONOR.

>> Mayor Hadley: WE HAVE A MOTION BY COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN.
WE HAVE A SECOND BY COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO.
I WILL CALL COUNTY CLERK TAMURA CAN YOU DO A ROLL CALL?

>>Clerk: COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY.

>> R.Montgomery: NO.

>>Clerk: COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN.

>> J. Franklin: YES.

>> MAYOR HADLEY.

>> Mayor Hadley: YES.

>>Clerk: COUNCILMEMBER NAPOLITANO.

>> S.Napolitano: YES.

>>Clerk: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: YES.

>>Clerk: MOTION PASSES 4-UP WITH.
COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY VOTING NO.

>> THAT'S ADOPTION RESOLUTION NUMBER 21-0010 AS REVISED TO
CHANGE THE DATE OF COMPLIANCE TO 6/30/21, AND REQUIRE THAT NO
MORE VAPING EQUIPMENT, WHICH IS ALREADY A CONDITION, YOU KNOW,
NO MORE SALES OF VAPING EQUIPMENT, WHICH IS ALREADY CONDITION
NUMBER 2.

SO THE ONLY CHANGE IS CHANGING THE DATE.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: YOUR HONOR --

>> Mayor Hadley: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: CAN WE JUST UNDERSCORE THE NEED TO GO
BACK TO THIS PLACE OF BUSINESS AND DOCUMENT OBSERVATIONS ON A
PERIODIC BASIS THROUGH THE TIME OF THIS EXTENSION SO THAT WE
MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE A RECORD OF THE PATTERN OF THEIR
INVENTORY AND WHETHER THEY ARE AT LEAST ATTEMPTING NOW TO COMPLY
WITH THIS ORDER?

>> Mayor Hadley: YEAH, IT SOUNDS GOOD TO ME.
CERTAIN ATTORNEY BARROW, IS THAT LEGAL?

>> YES.

>> CODE ENFORCEMENT WILL DO THAT.

>> Mayor Hadley: PERFECT.

>> GO AHEAD, MAYOR.

>> R.Montgomery: SOUNDS LIKE COUNCILMEMBER FRANKLIN AGREED WITH

THAT.

>> J. Franklin: YES.

>> Mayor Hadley: ANY OBJECTIONS?
I THINK RICHARD IS IN FAVOR OF THAT.
THANK YOU, ALI.
GREAT REPORT.

>> R.Montgomery: JUST --

>> JUST TO CLARIFY THAT DOES NOT REQUIRE CHANGING THE
RESOLUTION.
THAT GIVES DIRECTION TO CODE ENFORCEMENT TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE.

>> Mayor Hadley: THE RESOLUTION WILL BE CHANGED JUST WITH THE
DATE.

>> EXACTLY.

>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.

>> I HAVE A CLARIFICATION QUESTION.
CITY ATTORNEY BARROW, I REMEMBER -- [INDISCERNIBLE] REMOVING
VAPING PRODUCTS FROM THE DISPLAY.

>> Mayor Hadley: WOULD YOU LIKE THAT PART OF THE RESOLUTION.

>> R.Montgomery: ABSOLUTELY.

>> POINT NUMBER TWO WILL NOT JUST BE WILL TERMINATE ALL SALES,
BUT REMOVE ALL PRODUCTS FROM DISPLAY.

>> Mayor Hadley: DO WE WANT TO PUT A DATE ON THAT OR IS THAT
DIFFICULT TO ACHIEVE?

>> WE CAN MAKE IT ONE WEEK.

>> Mayor Hadley: ONE WEEK.
YEAH.
IF WE ARE GOING TO PUT IT IN, I THINK A DATE SHOWS THAT WE ARE
SERIOUS AND THEN THAT IS EASIER TO ENFORCE FOR STAFF IF THEY
HAVE A DATE.

>> OKAY.
WE WILL DO THAT.

>> Mayor Hadley: RICHARD, ARE YOU GOOD WITH THAT.

>> YEAH.

>> Mayor Hadley: GREAT COLLABORATION.
GREAT JOB, COUNCIL.
WE WILL MOVE ON TO AGENDA ITEM 11, CITY COUNCIL REQUESTS AND
REPORTS INCLUDING AB1234 REPORTS.
SO FIRST WE WILL DO AGENDA ITEM 13, WHICH IS CONSIDER REQUEST BY
MAYOR HADLEY AND COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY TO AGENDIZE BELATED
REQUESTS FOR HARDSHIP EXEMPTIONS FROM ARCO AND PLAYER'S LIQUOR,
DUE TO EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.
WE WILL CALL BACK FINANCE DIRECTOR CHARELIAN.

>> THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
THIS WAS AGAIN, A REQUEST THAT WE RECEIVED FROM THE ARCO PAST
THE OCTOBER 31ST DEADLINE.
I BELIEVE STEP TWO OF THE PROCESS.

>> Mayor Hadley: THIS IS STEP TWO.

WE ARE PREPARING FOR STEP THREE.
ASSUMING COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY IS STILL OKAY WITH THAT AND I
AM STILL OKAY WITH IT, WE WOULD NEED A THIRD COUNCILMEMBER TO
MOVE THIS TO A FUTURE AGENDA.
>> I WILL BE THE SECOND JUST TO MAKE SURE EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS
WHAT HAPPENED HERE.
PLAYERS LIQUOR WAS A TOTALLY DIFFERENT SITUATION.
THE OWNERS OF ARCO ARE NEW, THEY RELIED ON THE PRIOR OWNER TO
CONTACT -- [INDISCERNIBLE] AND APPLY FOR AN EXTENSION.
THAT DID NOT HAPPEN.
THESE TWO ARE UNIQUE AND THERE IS NO PRECEDENT HERE.
HERE ARE TWO PEOPLE THAT ARE NOT FOLLOWING THE RULES.
>> Mayor Hadley: CITY ATTORNEY BARROW, I THINK I ERRED, IF WE
GET A THIRD, THEY WILL NEED TO RETURN?
>> THEY WILL NEED TO RETURN.
THEY HAVE TO FILE AN APPLICATION AND STAFF WILL HAVE TO FINALIZE
THEIR APPLICATION AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION.
WE HAVE A THIRD VOTE TONIGHT TO DO THAT?
>> Mayor Hadley: DO WE MOVE AND SECOND OR JUST A SHOW OF HANDS.
>> YEAH, LET'S MAKE A MOTION AND A SECOND.
>> Mayor Hadley: I WILL MOVE.
WE HAVE A SECOND BY COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY AND THEN WE WILL
TAKE A ROLL CALL VOTE -- MAYOR PRO TEM STERN, DID YOU HAVE
DISCUSSION?
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: DON'T WE JUST NEED A THIRD?
>> YES, EITHER WAY.
IF WE HAVE THE MOTION AND SECOND.
>> Mayor Hadley: MAYOR PRO TEM STERN IS THE THIRD.
GREAT.
>> IT WILL COME BACK ON A FUTURE AGENDA.
STAFF WILL TALK TO BOTH BUSINESS OWNERS TO HAVE THEM FILL OUT AN
APPLICATION.
>> Mayor Hadley: PERFECT.
THANK YOU.
THANK YOU COUNCILMEMBER MONTGOMERY FOR THE BACK STORY.
I THINK YOU ARE RIGHT.
WE ARE NOT CREATING PRECEDENT.
THESE WERE UNIQUE AND IN ONE CASE VERY POIGNANT EXTENUATING
CIRCUMSTANCES SO I THINK WE DID THE RIGHT THING THERE.
AB1234 -- CITY COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA.
COLLEAGUES?
LOVE IT.
MOVING ON.
LETTER M, FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, LETTER N --
>> YES, THANK YOU.
TWO REALLY QUICK THINGS.
FIRST OFF, ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR TONIGHT WAS THE ANNUAL

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019.
WHILE IT WAS ON CONSENT, I WANT TO PUBLICLY CONGRATULATE OUR
FINANCE DEPARTMENT FOR ONCE AGAIN OBTAINING A CLEAN AUDIT
OPINION FOR ALL THE HARD WORK THAT GOES INTO THAT.
FRANKLY, IT'S NOT JUST FINANCE.
IT'S ALL THE DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE DILIGENT THEIR SPENDING OF THE
MONEY AND ACCOUNTING FOR IT THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.
I DIDN'T WANT THAT TO GO UNNOTICED EVEN THOUGH IT WAS ON THE
CONSENT CALENDAR.
THE SECOND THING I WANTED TO MENTION IS THAT ALI LATRONA WILL
GIVE US A BRIEF UPDATE ON THE [INDISCERNIBLE].
HAS CONTINUED TO MEET.
THAT'S TRACKING TOWARDS A MARCH 2ND DATE FOR A REPORT TO COME TO
FULL COUNCIL.
ALI, CAN YOU GIVE A BRIEF UPDATE.
>> ABSOLUTELY.
THANK YOU.
SO ON OCTOBER 20TH, CITY COUNCIL APPOINTED THEIR TEAM MEMBERS
AND TWO ALTERNATES TO THE BEACH TASK FORCE WHICH WORDS TASKED
WITH ADDRESSING THE OF BRUCE BEACH.
LEADING -- MEETING EVERY OTHER WEEK SINCE OCTOBER 7TH THEY HAVE
BEEN WORKING TOGETHER AND FINALIZED SOME REPORTS WHICH ARE
AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE.
YOU CAN TAKE A LOOK AT THOSE.
THEY ARE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.
THESE SUBCOMMITTEES WERE TASKED WITH EXAMINING THE HISTORY OF
BEACH AND EXPLORING THE SUBJECT OF A RESOLUTION OF APOLOGIZE.
FOURTH SUB-COMMITTEE WAS RECENTLY CREATED TO BRING ALL OF THE
RECOMMENDATIONS TOGETHER AND THEY ARE WORKING ON CREATING A
FINAL REPORT.
THEY HAVE BEEN WORKING TOGETHER ON THIS REPORT AND ACTUALLY,
VOTED AT THEIR LAST MEETING ON SOME OF THE NEW PROPOSALS, WHICH
THEY WILL BE PRESENTING TO CITY COUNCIL ON MARCH 2ND.
THE FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDED PROPOSALS AND THE REST OF THE
SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS AS BRUCE MENTIONED, WILL BE PRESENTED
ON -- [INDISCERNIBLE].
IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER THEM.
>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU, ALI.
I HAVE A QUICK QUESTION.
IS THERE A COUNCILMEMBER ON EACH SUB-COMMITTEE OR ARE THERE SOME
SUBCOMMITTEES WITHOUT MAYOR PRO TEM STERN OR COUNCILMEMBER
NAPOLITANO ON THEM.
>> ACTUALLY, ALL OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES HAVE BEEN MEETING
INDEPENDENTLY.
WE THOUGHT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO THAT THAT SITUATION FOR THE TASK
FORCE TO DO THEIR WORK AND THEN THE SUBCOMMITTEES TO BRING IT
BACK TO THE TASK FORCE AND CHAIRS FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU.
STEVE, DO YOU WANT TO JUMP IN?
>> YEAH, AND HILDY CAN SPEAK TO THIS AS WELL.
>> S.Napolitano: WE ARE BASICALLY FACILITATING THE TASK FORCE
AT THIS POINT AND WORKING WITH THE GROUPS TO BRING FORWARD WHAT
THEIR RECOMMENDATION WILL BE.
>> Mayor Hadley: SO SOME SUBCOMMITTEES DO NOT HAVE A COUNCIL
REP ON THEM.
AND THEN THE FOURTH SUB-COMMITTEE.
>> S.Napolitano: RIGHT, EACH SUB-COMMITTEE HAS BEEN REPORTING
ON THEIR PROGRESS AND PROVIDES THEIR WORK PRODUCT TO THE TASK
FORCE IN GENERAL.
>> Mayor Hadley: RIGHT.
>> S.Napolitano: THE TASK FORCE IN GENERAL, WE HAVE BEEN
FACILITATING VOTES ON THAT.
BUT BECAUSE COUNCILMEMBER STERN AND I WILL BE TAKING VOTES AND
MAKING COMMENTS ON THESE THINGS AT THE CITY COUNCIL, WE HAVE
REFRAINED FROM VOTING ON, YOU KNOW, WHAT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS
ARE GOING TO BE.
THESE ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE.
>> Mayor Hadley: OH.
OKAY.
>> S.Napolitano: WE HAVE BEEN PROVIDING OUR INPUT AS ASKED AND
EVERYTHING, BUT AS FAR AS WORK PRODUCT COMES FROM THE TASK
FORCE, THIS ISN'T GOING TO BE COUNCILMEMBER STERN AND MINE
RECOMMENDATION TO YOU.
IT'S THE TASK FORCE BECAUSE OUR VOTE AND DISCUSSION AND
EVERYTHING WILL BE COMING AT COUNCIL WITH YOU.
>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.
>> S.Napolitano: COUNCILMEMBER STERN, AM I SPEAKING OUT OF
ORDER THERE.
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: NO, THAT'S ABSOLUTELY RIGHT.
WE ARE MORE JUST FACILITATING THEIR CONVERSATIONS AND MAKING
SURE IT COMPLIES WITH THE REGULAR RULES AND WHEN THEY WARRANT TO
ASK US A QUESTION ABOUT WHETHER IT'S CONSISTENT WITH ANYTHING
THAT THEY NEED TO KNOW, THEY ASK US THOSE QUESTIONS, BUT THEY
ARE THE ONES THAT ARE SUBMITTING THE REPORTS AND THEIR CONCERNS
AND THEIR COMMENTS AND THEY ARE THE ONES THAT ARE VOTING ON
THESE THINGS TO BRING THEM FORWARD.
>> Mayor Hadley: SO EVEN IF YOU HAVE A PRIVATE OPINION --
>> S.Napolitano: EXACTLY.
>> Mayor Hadley: [INDISCERNIBLE] YOU RECALLED SAY BRING IT TO
COUNCIL, THIS IS THE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE.
>> S.Napolitano: WE HAVE PROVIDED SOME INPUT ALONG THE WAY,
AGAIN, THE IDEA WAS TO LET THIS GROUP MAKE THEIR
RECOMMENDATIONS.
LET IT COME TO COUNCIL BECAUSE FRANKLY, WE ARE HOPING TO AVOID,

YOU KNOW, MINORITY REPORTS, MAJORITY REPORTS AND HAVING A FRACTURED TASK FORCE.

COUNCILMEMBER STERN AND I HAVE OUR OWN OPINIONS, SOME AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH SOME OF THE THINGS THAT ARE DONE, BUT WE FEEL RATHER THAN TRY TO OPEN UP THE CITY BEING ACCUSED OF TRYING TO MANIPULATE.

WE WANT THEM TO HAVE FREE REIGN AND SPEAK IN THE WAY THEY WANT TO SPEAK.

>> Mayor Hadley: THAT'S VERY HELPFUL.

YOU ARE ON TRACK AND ON SCHEDULE FOR THE TASK FORCE TO PRESENT ON MARCH 2ND.

>> S.Napolitano: WE HOPE SO.

>> R.Montgomery: WHAT'S THE LEGAL PROCESS, QUINN AND BRUCE, IF THEY ARE NOT READY?

WE GAVE THEM FOUR MONTHS.

I DON'T MIND IF THEY ARE NOT READY, BUT ARE THEY BOUND TO THAT? WHAT'S THE WAY OUT?

>> LET ME RESPOND TO THAT.

YEAH, IF THEY NEED MORE TIME, YEAH, DEFINITELY WE WOULD GIVE THEM MORE TIME.

>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.

JOE, DID YOU HAVE A QUESTION.

>> S.Napolitano: I THINK WE APPRECIATED THE DEADLINE.

WE WILL GO BACK TO THE GROUP IF THERE IS A WILLINGNESS TO EXTEND TO SEE IF IT'S NEEDED OR WHAT IT WOULD BE FOR, BUT, YOU KNOW, WE ARE TRACKING PRETTY WELL RIGHT NOW.

>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.

>> S.Napolitano: THEY ARE ANXIOUS TO GET BEFORE COUNCIL AS WELL.

>> Mayor Hadley: GREAT.

THEY ARE NOT FEELING STRESS INFERENCE THIS IS AN IMPATIENT GROUP.

THEY DO NOT WANT TO WAIT.

>> Mayor Hadley: THAT'S GREAT.

JOE, YOU HAVE A QUESTION.

>> YOU ASKED ME ABOUT TASK FORCE IN GENERAL, ARE THEY GIVEN SPECIFIC GUIDELINES AND THEN ONCE IT DOES COME BEFORE COUNCIL DO YOU VOTE ON IT IN TOTAL.

>> S.Napolitano: YOUR HONOR, WE MADE VERY CLEAR WHAT THE DIRECTION OF COUNCIL WAS, AND WHAT THE EXPECTATIONS ARE AND THE PRIORITIES WHILE ALSO EMPHASIZING THAT WE CAN BRING ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THE TASK FORCE HAS FOR ANY ADDITIONAL ITEMS BEYOND SPECIFICALLY COUNCIL DIRECTED TO REDO THE HISTORY AND TO CONSIDER IT AN ART PIECE.

BUT THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS INTO HAVE A LOT OF ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION THAT THEY WANT COUNCIL TO CONSIDER AND TO EITHER EXTEND THE TASK FORCE AFTER THE FOUR-MONTH PERIOD TO DISCUSS OR

SEE WHAT THE NEXT STEPS FOR THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS WOULD BE OR ADDITIONAL DIRECTION FROM COUNCILS TO WHETHER TO EXPLORE THIS ONE OR THAT ONE MORE, BUT, YOU KNOW, AS FAR AS BEYOND THAT, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, WE HAVE TRIED TO MAKE THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THEY WANT WITHOUT SAYING YOU CAN'T DO THAT, COUNCIL SAID NOT TO.

>> R.Montgomery: GOT YOU.

>> S.Napolitano: THEY VOLUNTEERED TO HAVE THEIR VOICES HEARD. WE WANT THEIR VOICES HEARD.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: TO STEM BACK A LITTLE BIT TO ANSWER YOUR QUESTION TO HOW TO TASK FORCES WORK IN GENERAL? THIS ONE IS A LITTLE UNPRECEDENTED.

WE HAVE TASK FORCES IN THE CITY THAT DO DIFFERENT THINGS AND ORGANIZED IN DIFFERENT WAYS.

WE HAVE SEEN THEM EVEN TONIGHT.

THIS ONE IS UNPRECEDENTED TO HAVE TWO COUNCILMEMBERS AND ALL OF THESE COMMUNITY MEMBERS.

AND SO IT RUNS A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT.

YOU KNOW, WE HAVE KIND OF LEARNED THEIR GOALS AND WE HAVE LEARNED HOW TO REALLY MAKE THIS MORE PRODUCTIVE, AND TO KIND OF OUR GOAL, STEVE AND MY ROLE IN HOW THESE MEETINGS GO FORWARD. SO THIS ONE, THIS WILL BE DIFFERENT THAN OTHER TASK FORCES YOU WILL SEE THAT WILL REPORT BACK.

>> S.Napolitano: WE ARE NOT GOING TO PRETEND THAT WE WERE NOT BUILDING THE PLANE AS WE WERE FLYING IT HERE. THERE WAS NO TEMPLATE TO GO OFF OF.

YOU KNOW, CERTAINLY WE HAVE RESPONDED TO A LOT OF THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE BY THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS AS WELL ABOUT WANTING -- THEY WERE VERY INTERESTED AND HAVE BEEN ALL ALONG AS TO WHAT COUNCIL WANTS TO SEE AND WHAT THEY CAN AND CAN'T DO, THINGS LIKE THAT.

AGAIN, YOUR HONOR WE, YOU KNOW, WE HAVE BEEN TRYING TO FACILITATE AND KEEP THEM ON TASK.

THAT'S MORE OUR FOCUS THAN TELLING THEM WHAT'S ACCEPTABLE AND WHAT'S NOT, FRANKLY THERE IS NOT A VOTE FROM MAJORITY COUNCIL YET.

>> Mayor Hadley: YEP, VERY HELPFUL. HOW HAS THE ATTENDANCE BEEN.

>> S.Napolitano: EXCELLENT.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THERE ARE TEN MEMBERS AND THEY SHOW UP EVERY TIME.

>> Mayor Hadley: THAT'S FANTASTIC.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THEY ARE ALL THESE COMMITTEES, THEY ARE ON THE SUBCOMMITTEES.

MANY ARE ON MULTIPLE SUBCOMMITTEES.

THEY VOLUNTEER FOR EVERY ONE OF THEM.

>> S.Napolitano: QUITE A GOOD WORKING GROUP.

>> Mayor Hadley: THAT'S GREAT.

>> J. Franklin: CAN WE HAVE THEM TEMP FOR US, THAT KIND OF PARTICIPATION.

>> Mayor Hadley: YES, THEY SOUND MOTIVATED. TERRIFIC.

THANK YOU, ALI.

THANK YOU BRUCE, FOR BRINGING THAT UP.

IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE, ALI YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD?

>> NO, I JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING THE OPPORTUNITY AND THEY ENJOY WORKING ON IT.

IT WILL BE REALLY FUND.

>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENDANCE. SUNDAYS LIKE A LIVELY GROUP THAT NEEDS YOU THERE.

>> S.Napolitano: LIVELY IS AN UNDER STATEMENT.

>> Mayor Hadley: I CAN'T WAIT.

>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: ALI ORGANIZATION AND INPUT AND ALL THE DIFFERENT WAYS THEY CONTACT HER AND HAVING TO PULL ALL THESE REPORTS AND PUTTING THE WEBSITE TOGETHER, IT IS REMARKABLE.

>> S.Napolitano: WE ARE NOMINATING ALI FOR SAINTHOOD AFTER THE TASK FORCE COMPLETES.

>> Mayor Hadley: THE MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, CORRECT? I ZOOMED INTO THE FIRST ONE.

ARE THEY ON THE HOME PAGE OF THE CITY WEBSITE?

>> YES, THEY ARE.

THEY ARE UNDER THE CALENDAR ITEMS.

SO WE ADVERTISE THAT ON SOCIAL MEDIA AS WELL AS SEND OUT NOTIFICATIONS.

BUT WE HAD A PRETTY DECENT NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THOSE AS WELL, SO IT'S BEEN REALLY INTERESTING TO SEE THAT.

>> Mayor Hadley: YEAH, I MIGHT TUNE IN IN FEBRUARY. WE HAVE SIX WEEKS BEFORE THE FINAL PRODUCT.

TERRIFIC.

THANK YOU.

GREAT IDEA FOR AN UPDATE ON THE TASK FORCE.

I HAVE GOTTEN SOME QUESTIONS.

I THOUGHT I AM NOT ON THE SUB-COMMITTEE, SO I WASN'T GOING TO MICROMANAGE.

THANK YOU.

PRETTY MANAGER REPORT, ANYTHING ELSE?

>> THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Hadley: ATTORNEY REPORT?

>> NO REPORT TONIGHT.

>> R.Montgomery: THANK YOU LETTER P. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

ANYONE HAVE ANY?

Q, CLOSE SESSION.

>> NOTHING TONIGHT.

>> Mayor Hadley: OKAY.
SO LETTER R, WE WILL ADJOURN THIS MEETING TO TOMORROW EVENING,
OH, YEA, AT 6:00 P.M.
WE HAVE A JOINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING WITH PLANNING COMMISSION
AND PPIC.
I DON'T BELIEVE WE WILL NEED TO GO PAST 11:00 P.M. FOR THAT.
SO I WON'T JUMP THE GUN THERE.
>> DO WE HAVE THE DOCUMENTATION FOR THAT?
WAS IT IN THE TWO BIG BINDERS FOR THE MEETING TOMORROW.
>> Mayor Hadley: YES.
>> WORK PLANS.
>> Mayor Hadley: YEAH, IT LOOKS LIKE THIS.
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THERE IS A SECOND AGENDA.
>> IT WAS ON THE INSIDE SLEEVE OF YOUR NOTEBOOK.
>> I SEE THE AGENDA.
I WAS WONDERING IF THERE WERE THE ACTUAL WORK PLANS PRINTED UP
ALREADY?
>> Mayor Hadley: PROBABLY THE CALENDAR ON THE CITY EMAIL YOU
CAN FIND MORE.
>> Mayor Pro Tem Stern: THERE IS A STAFF REPORT ATTACHED TO THE
AGENDA.
>> GOT IT.
>> Mayor Hadley: THANK YOU, ALL.
HAVE A GREAT EVENING.
>> GOOD NIGHT.
>> GOOD NIGHT.
>> GOOD NIGHT.
>> GOOD NIGHT.