

**MANHATTAN BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 11, 2025**

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California was held in a hybrid format (Zoom and in person, City Council Chambers, 1400 Highland Avenue) on the 11th day of June, 2025. **Chair Sistos** called the meeting to order at the hour of 3:00 p.m.

B. PLEDGE TO FLAG

C. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Tokashiki, Ungoco, Hackett, Chair Sistos
Absent: Vice-Chair Dillavou
Others Present: Michael Codron, Interim Community Development Director
Adam Finestone, AICP, Planning Manager
Maricela Guillean, Associate Planner
Tatiana Maury, Agenda Host

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Planning Manager Finestone requested Item E., the Reorganization of the Commission, to be removed from the agenda due to the excused absence of the current Vice-Chair. This item will be postponed to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

A motion was made and seconded (Ungoco/Tokashiki) to approve the amended agenda.

Roll Call:

Ayes: Commissioners Tokashiki, Ungoco, Hackett, Chair Sistos
Noes: None
Absent: Vice-Chair Dillavou
Abstain: None

Agenda Host Maury announced the motion passed 4-0.

E. REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION – Removed from the agenda

F. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – None

G. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

06/11/25-1. Regular Meeting – May 28, 2025

Chair Sistos called for any changes; seeing none, it was moved and seconded (Hackett/Ungoco) to approve the minutes as submitted.

Roll Call:

Ayes: Commissioners Tokashiki, Ungoco, Chair Sistos
Noes: None
Absent: Vice-Chair Dillavou
Abstain: None

Agenda Host Maury announced the motion passed 4-0.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

06/11/25-1. Study Session to Discuss Provisions Related to Rear Yard Setbacks for Accessory Structures in Single-Family Residential Zones

Chair Sistos announced the item and asked for the staff report.

Planning Manager Finestone introduced **Associate Planner Maricela Guillean** who presented the staff report and made herself available to questions from Commissioners.

Commissioners asked and **Associate Planner Guillean** answered questions regarding fence/wall clearances for accessory structure setbacks (0-3 feet), existing development patterns in Area Districts I-IV, and differences in the four pathway options provided by staff.

Chair Sistos asked if there are certain zones within the City that staff may consider implementing differing development standards based on the number of structures that already exist. **Associate Planner Guillean** responded that generally Area Districts III & IV are comprised of smaller lots compared to Area District I & II, and because Area Districts I and II contain the vast majority of single-family zoned properties in the City, they are the focus of this effort. She added that any single-family zoned properties in Area District III & IV are within the coastal zone, where different regulations may apply.

Commissioner Ungoco asked if the Fire Department has any feedback on whether habitable structures should have a setback in the back of the property to which **Planning Manager Finestone** confirmed that, per the Building Official, there's no need to provide access to the other side, given the structures are fire rated appropriately.

Commissioner Ungoco asked if there is a requirement for a certain percentage of a property to have permeable surfaces. **Associate Planner Guillean** confirmed there is and will be maintained assuming no changes are made.

Commissioner Ungoco expressed his concern for potential drainage issues that may occur from allowing accessory structures to be built right up to the property line. **Planning Manager Finestone** stated that there are requirements when a structure is designed to ensure drainage is directed to the subject property and not discharged onto other properties.

A lengthy discussion was held regarding drainage between staff and the Commission.

Commissioner Tokashiki asked and **Associate Planner Guillean** confirmed there is no requirement for properties to have fences so essentially a property owner could have an accessory structure along a rear side property line as long as it is completely within their property's boundaries.

A discussion was held between the Commission and staff regarding the maintenance of a wall/fence that has a visual impact on the adjacent property owner. It was confirmed that the responsibility will be that of the property owner that owns the accessory structure; however, property owners may come to an agreement amongst themselves.

Chair Sistos asked for clarification on a "habitable" structure, to which **Associate Planner Guillean** identified examples of such structures.

Commissioner Hackett and staff discussed different triggers that can be used to achieve compliance with setback requirements for existing accessory structures should said requirements change.

Chair Sistos requested, and **Planning Manager Finestone** provided background on the reason that this study session was being held.

Chair Sistos asked for a refresher on setback requirements for ADUs and **Associate Planner Guillean**, **Interim Community Development Director Michael Codron**, and **Planning Manager Finestone** provided the requested information.

Commissioners shared their thoughts/concerns amongst themselves, focusing their discussion on zero versus three-foot setbacks, air-gaps between structures, and the height of detached garages.

Chair Sistos opened the floor for public comments.

Residents **Genie Pardon** and **Thomas Hillis** shared their experience related to accessory structures adjacent to their property lines and made recommendations regarding the height of ADUs and garages, and setbacks.

Chair Sistos closed the public hearing and called for Commissioner deliberation.

After a lengthy deliberation, staff provided input on alternative setback options and processes including:

- exploring increasing rear and side setbacks;
- limiting an accessory structure to 50% of the linear length of a rear yard; and,
- options to allow alterations or additions through a ministerial or discretionary process.

The Planning Commission asked staff to come back with a second study session to explore alternative setback options and processes.

H. DIRECTOR'S ITEMS

1. The second-floor outdoor dining area at Esperanza is close to getting their final inspections and will reopen June 26, 2025
2. Building permits should be issued in the next couple of weeks for the commercial structure on Oak Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard (next to Wells Fargo)

I. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS - None

J. TENTATIVE AGENDA – June 25, 2025

K. ADJOURNMENT

At 4:39 p.m. it was moved and seconded (Ungoco/Hackett) to adjourn the meeting to 3:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 25, 2025. The motion passed 4-0 by roll call vote.