

ATTACHMENT 7
City of Manhattan Beach
Community Development Department

California Coastal Commission
Appeal No. A-5-MNB-15-0049

Proposed Project Revisions 2016

Public Access:

Appeal Issue: The Expansion of the City-approved Downtown Valet Parking Program, including an increase in drop-off/pick-up locations and operational hours, will cumulatively displace a significant number of public parking spaces that are necessary to support public access to the beach.

The following revisions are proposed:

Existing Project:

- Two valet stations occupy 10 on-street parking spaces during valet hours
- Valet hours:
 - o MB Post – Thurs-Fri 6 PM-12 MN, Sat-Sun 11 AM-12 MN (5 spaces)
 - o Fonz's – Tues-Fri 6 PM-12 MN, Sat-Sun 11 AM-12 MN (5 spaces)
- 120 parking spaces in Skecher's Office Building
- 12:1 private space per on-street space parking ratio

2015 Proposed Project:

- Four valet stations occupy 18 on-street parking spaces during valet hours
- Valet hours:
 - o MB Post – Mon-Fri 6PM-12MN, Sat 12NN-12 MN, Sun 11AM-10PM (5 spaces)
 - o Fonz's – Mon-Fri 6PM-12MN, Sat 12NN-12 MN (5 spaces)
 - o Arthur J's – Mon-Fri 6PM-12MN, Sat 12NN-12 MN, Sun 11AM-10PM (4 spaces)
 - o The Strand House – Mon-Fri 6PM-12 MN, Sat 6PM-12 MN, Sun 6PM-10PM (4 spaces)
- 120 parking spaces in Skecher's Office Building
- 6:1 private space per on-street space parking ratio

Revised Project:

- Three valet stations to occupy 15 on-street parking spaces during valet hours
- Proposed valet hours:
 - o MB Post – Tues-Fri 6 PM-12 MN, Sat-Sun 11AM-12 MN (5 spaces)
 - o Fonz's – Tues-Fri 6 PM-12 MN, Sat-Sun 11AM-12 MN (5 spaces)
 - o Pages – Tues-Fri 6 PM-12 MN, Sat-Sun 11AM-12 MN (5 spaces)
- 150 parking spaces in Skecher's Office Building and Zisli's building (321 12th St.)
- 10:1 private space per on-street space parking ratio
- Add "Public Valet Parking" signs at all Valet Stations

Supporting Statements:

- The valet operation will provide parking for 10 vehicles for every displaced space.
- 15 valet spaces = 4% of all on-street spaces and only 1% of all public spaces in Downtown
- Makes available 150 private spaces not otherwise open to public
- Valet proximity to beach is more convenient for public to drop off/pick-up without walking long distances.
- Agreement allows City to require acquisition of additional private parking spaces if needed.
- Valet service reduces congestion by reducing need to search for open parking spaces.
- Valet offers longer parking duration close to beach (Up to 12 hours rather than 5 hour limit)
- Makes more parking available close to beach at night after Pier lots close at 9:30pm.
- Every valeted car opens up an additional public parking space, effectively adding up to 150 more low-cost parking spaces available for public access.
- Expanded hours offer more parking available to public by relocating parking demand to private parking spaces. (Tuesday-Friday 6pm-Midnight, Saturday-Sunday 11am-Midnight)
- Expanded hours offer longer parking duration than street spaces.
- The public has always had and will continue to have full access to the valet program without restrictions.

Valet Pricing:

Appeal Issue: With the increase in Valet parking fees, the City-approved Downtown Valet Parking Program is cost prohibitive for beach goers.

Existing Project Valet Fee:	\$9.00 flat fee
2015 Proposed Project Valet Fee:	\$11.00 flat fee
2016 Revised Project Valet Fee:	\$10.00 flat fee

Supporting Statements:

- Proposed \$10 is less than the market rate, similar to other South Bay beach parking fees.
- Other beach parking fees: Huntington Beach (\$15/day), Bolsa Chica (\$15), Dockweiler (up to \$12.50), Santa Monica Beach/Pier (\$12-\$15), and Venice Beach (\$15)
- Pricing includes a premium for secured lot and some covered parking, proximity to prime locations, up to 12 hour parking.
- Every vehicle parked by the valet opens up a potential public street space for short term users.

Traffic Safety:

Appeal Issue: The operation of the City-approved Downtown Valet Parking Program is unsafe due to double- and triple- parking and blocking of alleys by the valets.

Existing Project Terms: None

2015 Proposed Project Terms:

- The final Valet Parking Agreement prohibits double/triple parking

2016 Revised Project Terms:

- Explicit language in agreement prohibiting double parking and blocking alleys.
- Require single lane flow-through valet operation.
- Relocate Manhattan Avenue valet zone to east side of street (non-appealable zone).

Supporting Statements:

- All valet movements will be flow-through, and must yield to street traffic.
- No backing into traffic lanes will be required.
- All valet stations will be located on the far side of a minor intersection to minimize possible congestion.

One-Year Term:

Appeal Issue: The City Council's resolution fails to explain that the approval of the permit and the contract with the vendor is limited to one year.

2016 Revised Project:

- The City Council resolution will be revised to explicitly state a 1-year contract term for the valet operator.
- The valet agreement and operation will be reviewed at one year to evaluate the success of the program and to make changes as appropriate. Any substantive changes will be forward to the Coastal Commission Staff for review.
- The format of the Coastal Development Permit will be revised to include the findings and conditions in the Resolution.

Applicant(s):

Appeal Issue: The City of Manhattan Beach is the applicant and should have been set forth as the applicant on the City's Resolution No. 15-0045.

2015 Proposed Project:

- The City informed the Coastal Commission staff that the City and DBPA are co-applicants of this project.

2016 Revised Project:

- The revised application will state that the City of Manhattan Beach is the sole applicant.

Resident and Property Owner Noticing:

Appeal Issue: Residents and Residential property owners did not receive notice of the City Council's meeting as required under the LCP notice provisions.

2015 Proposed Project Terms:

- The staff report accurately explains that the public hearing for Coastal Development Permit CA 15-20 at the City Council meeting on July 7, 2015, was adequately noticed.

2016 Revised Project:

- Any revised CDP will be re-noticed (100' radius and newspaper ad) as required.

SUBSTANTIAL ISSUES FACTORS

1. *The degree of factual and legal support for the local government's decision that the development is consistent or inconsistent with the certified LCP and with the public access policies of the Coastal Act;*

- The City did not provide a rational to the finding that the project is consistent with the LCP.
- Coastal Act public access policies were not referenced.

Remedy: Provide supplemental documentation in Coastal Development Permit to verify consistency with the LCP and Coastal Act Policies.

2. *The extent and scope of the development as approved or denied by the local government;*

- One year term was not included in the City Council resolution (aka CDP).

Remedy: Provide separate Coastal Development Permit (CDP) document with extent and scope of project to be approved by City Council.

3. *The significance of the coastal resources affected by the decision;*

- Unclear whether proposed valet program would negatively impact coastal access
- Unclear if proposed valet program is consistent with certified LCP and public access policies.

Remedy: Provide supplemental documentation in Coastal Development Permit to verify consistency with LCP.

4. *The precedential value of the local government's decision for future interpretations of its LCP; and,*

- Proposed valet operation may set negative precedent for future valet operation.

Remedy: Provide follow-up analysis after one year trial period to Coastal Commission staff.

5. *Whether the appeal raises local issues, or those of regional or statewide significance.*

- Protection of coastal access of Downtown Manhattan Beach is statewide issue.

Remedy: Work with Coastal Commission staff to provide periodic status reports.

Coastal Development Permit No. A-5-MNB-99-453:

- Pursuant to De Novo Coastal Development Permit No. A-5-MNB-99-453 (CA 99-41), the City recognizes that an amendment to this Permit may be required due to the changes in the times of operation for the location on the west side of Manhattan Avenue between 10th Street and 11th Street, and asks that this Resolution and Agreement supersede the prior CDP.