

Nhung Madrid

From: Marisa Lundstedt
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2016 8:37 AM
To: Nhung Madrid; Laurie B. Jester; Ted Faturros
Subject: FW: Planned intensification of Manhattan Beach - Important research/points to consider for MB Downtown Specific Plan decisions

FYI

From: mb4mbcitycouncil@gmail.com [mailto:mb4mbcitycouncil@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Mark Burton
Sent: Sunday, November 27, 2016 1:42 PM
To: Marisa Lundstedt
Subject: Fwd: Planned intensification of Manhattan Beach - Important research/points to consider for MB Downtown Specific Plan decisions

Let's discuss.

Marisa Lundstedt
Director of Community Development
P: (310) 802-5503
E: mlundstedt@citymb.info



Office Hours: M - Th 7:30AM - 5:30 PM | Alternate Open Fridays 8:00AM - 5:00 PM | Closed Alternate Fridays | Not Applicable to Public Safety

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **jim quilliam** <jimquilliam@outlook.com>
Date: Saturday, November 26, 2016
Subject: Planned intensification of Manhattan Beach - Important research/points to consider for MB Downtown Specific Plan decisions
To: "mburton@citymb.info" <mburton@citymb.info>

Councilmember Burton (Mark),

As a member of the Manhattan Beach community I am asking for your sound leadership to not allow the commercial goals and influence of intensification of our downtown community (increased building heights, increased tenant frontage, private dining in public right of way and 2nd floor outdoor dining) adversely impact our quality of life and put at risk our community's integrity and soul. The planned intensification of the downtown with these proposed specific plan changes (increased building heights, increased tenant frontage, private dining in public right of way and 2nd floor outdoor dining) are in direct conflict with preserving and

enhancing the small town character of Manhattan Beach and is incongruent with the specific plans stated vision and our espoused vision for Manhattan Beach.

“According to the California Healthy Kids Survey, 42 percent of 11th-graders in Manhattan Beach Unified and 38 percent in Redondo Unified reported current alcohol and drug use — compared to 30 percent of juniors in the Los Angeles Unified School District and a 35.2 percent state average.”

Manhattan Beach is above the State of California average and ahead of Los Angeles in 11th-Graders current alcohol and drug use (see link for article below). Is this what we want for Manhattan Beach and our future? Is this the infrastructure (promoting more bars/more alcohol serving restaurants) that we want for our children and future generations in Manhattan Beach?

<http://www.dailybreeze.com/social-affairs/20160919/parents-are-focus-of-workshops-to-combat-teen-drinking-and-drug-use-in-beach-cities>

As you are all aware that more alcohol usually correlates to more problems.

Please reference the study below “More Bars May Mean More Problems for Manhattan Beach, Study Finds”, cities and communities with a high density of alcohol outlets were 3.7 times more likely to have high rates of violent crime. “The findings in this report underscore the need for policymakers, communities, schools, businesses, health care providers and others to take targeted preventive actions to reduce alcohol outlet density and adverse alcohol-related consequences among adults and youth,” lead researcher Tina Kim said (see link for article below).

<http://patch.com/california/manhattanbeach/more-bars-may-mean-more-problems-manhattan-beach-study-finds>

As a Manhattan Beach community member and core downtown resident, it is inconceivable to me and a misrepresentation to say “we support and value a relaxed (Noise free), charming, walkable, pedestrian oriented clean and safe environment” while simultaneously and concurrently planning for a downtown with increased intensification with (increased building heights, increased tenant frontage, private dining in public right of way and 2nd floor outdoor dining).

Please do not allow the misrepresented intentions for intensification and economic vitality destroy the remaining attributes of preserving the small town character of our Manhattan Beach community.

Respectfully, James Quilliam

310-200-8242

2



MANHATTAN BEACH COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

1590 ROSECRANS, STE D #335, MANHATTAN BEACH, CA. 90266

11-28-16 P12:52 IN
tm

November 26, 16

To: Ms. Nhung Madrid
Community Development Department, City of Manhattan Beach

Subject: The Downtown Specific Plan

Dear Nhung,

I hope that you are well. I attach for your reference the opinion of the MBCPOA. This is what we presented to both the residents and business owners groups. All of us want what is best for our city. We live here and should prepare for a good future to those who come after us.

We sincerely thank you for your service to the community.

Best wishes,

Tony Choueke
Secretary



MANHATTAN BEACH COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

1590 ROSECRANS, STE D #335, MANHATTAN BEACH, CA. 90266

November 21st. 2016




Meeting with Downtown Residents and Business Owners

AGENDA

- 1. Height limits for commercial buildings.**
- 2. Store Frontage lengths.**
- 3. Store size limitations.**
- 4. Use Permit processing time.**
- 5. Second story development.**

EXAMPLES OF PITCHED ROOFED BUILDINGS





MBCPOA: Height Limits and Density.

The purpose of the proposed changes is to make downtown buildings more interesting and esthetically pleasing. Two sets of regulations for commercial buildings are proposed. One is for flat roofs where the current 26 ft. height limit remains in effect. The second is for identical sized buildings where we may want to have pitched roofs.

Residential Current Code Current Code Area B	Commercial With Flat Roof Modification to Current Code Area B	Commercial with pitched roof
Height 30 ft. Density: 1.7 x FAR Floors: 3 floors allowed	26 ft. 1.5 x FAR 2 floors allowed	30 ft. 1.5 x FAR 2 floors allow
Ceiling Heights First Floor: 8 ½ Ft. Between Floors: 1 ½ Ft. Second Floor: 8 1/2 Ft. Between Floors: 1 ½ Ft. Third Floor: 8 Ft. Roof: 2 Ft. Total: 30 Ft.	12 Ft. 2 Ft. 10 Ft. 2 Ft. 26 Ft.	12 Ft. 2 Ft. 10 Ft. 6 Ft. 30 Ft.


SEE IMAGES ATTACHED

MBCPOA: Store Frontage Length

If a typical single lot size is 30 ft. x 90 ft., (2,700 sq. ft.) then limiting the store front size to 35 ft. is impractical.

Assuming that 90ft. of storefront is on the main road and 30 ft. is on the alley, then using the 35 ft. recommended limit for store frontage size, you will have 3 very small stores on this lot, one of them without alley or trash access. Please see the attached plans and calculations.


Recommend that we leave the current regulations of 50 ft. storefront in place.



RETAIL AREA FOR EACH STORE: 540 SQ. FT.

STOCK ROOM AREA: 360 SQ. FT.

MIDDLE STORE HAS NO DEDICATED TRASH AREA OR SERVICE ENTRANCE



STORE A: 50 FT. FRONTAGE
RETAIL SPACE: 1,140 SQ. FT.
STOCKROOM

STORE B: 40 FT. FRONTAGE
RETAIL SPACE: 840 SQ. FT.
STOCKROOM

AND OFFICE SPACE: 300 SQ. FT.

AND OFFICE SPACE: 300 SQ. FT.

MBCPOA: Store Square Footage Area


**The requirement for a Use Permit if a retail store is bigger than 1,600 sq. ft.:
This requirement should be adjusted upwards to 2,200 sq. ft.**

- 1. Most commercial lots are 30 ft. x 90 ft. or 2,700 sq. ft.**
- 2. The proposed regulation will only encourage very small stores. If a 30ft. frontage needs to be divided into two stores, each store will be, like a railway car, very long and narrow and not conducive for retail sales. We need to maintain our flexibility to respond quickly to consumer demands.**


Retail space when the 30 x 90 ft. lot is cut in half: 1,100 sq. ft.

Retail space when the 30 x 90 ft. lot is whole: 2,200 sq. ft.

We are recommending that the retail store size be 2,200 sq. ft. without requiring a use permit. This is not excessive and still constitutes a smaller type store.



30x90 FT. STORE DIVIDED INTO
TWO SEPARATE STORES



30x90 FT. STORE USED AS ONE

MANHATTAN BEACH COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

USE PERMITS PROCESSING TIME

Whereas the requirement to obtain use permits for occupancy and for construction is well understood and supported by the MBCPOA, there are no time limits in which use permits need to be either approved or denied.

When new business owners apply for use permits, they should not have to wait months before a decision is rendered. 30 days is acceptable. After that, many good prospective entrants into the downtown, commercial marketplace may well be discouraged by a cumbersome and open-ended process.

If a use permit is applied for and there is no answer from the city that the permit is denied, then it should be assumed that the new business is permitted.

MBCPOA ENCOURAGES OPENING UP THE DOWNTOWN TO MORE RESIDENTS

There are many single story commercial lots in downtown. It could be a good idea to put residential units above the commercial, ground-floor commercial area.

Keeping the FAR at 1.5 x the lot size.

Limiting the build-out to a maximum of 2 floors.

Requiring just 3 spaces for the entire lot, commercial and residential combined.


This will give more people an opportunity to live in and support the downtown area.

Ground Floor


Trash, Parking and Entry to Second Floor:	600 sq. ft.
Ground floor commercial area:	<u>2,100 sq. ft.</u>
Total for Ground Floor:	2,700 sq. ft.

Second Floor

2nd. Floor residential: (one or two units)	1,950 sq. ft.
Stepped back 2nd. Floor terrace:	450 sq. ft.
Space that is not built out:	<u>300 sq. ft.</u>
Total for second floor:	2,700 sq. ft.



GROUND FLOOR RETAIL



SECOND FLOOR RESIDENTIAL