



MANHATTAN BEACH COMMERCIAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

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

Sept. 20th. 2016

To:

**Mr. Erick Haaland,
Associate Planner
Community Development Dept.
1400 Highland Ave.,
Manhattan Beach, Ca. 90266
Email: ehaaland@citymy.info**

Subject: Encroachment Permit Appeal -117 Manhattan Beach Blvd.

Dear Eric,

I hope that you are very well. I would like to say that on the behalf of the commercial property owner's association, we strongly support the placement of retractable awnings above existing balconies at The Strand House which we all support and appreciate.

Thank you for considering our opinion in your making the decision to allow this to move forward.

Best wishes,

**Tony Choueke
Secretary**

Erik Zandvliet

From: Gary McAulay <gary.mcaulay@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 4:08 PM
To: List - PPIC
Subject: Parking and Public Improvements Commission

Dear PPIC –

I am writing in opposition to the proposed retractable awnings in the Public Right of Way at 117 Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

In 2011, City Council very unwisely approved a major five foot encroachment into the Public Right of Way in allowing two balconies with dining. This giveaway directly contradicted the stated policies of the general plan for low-profile development, maintenance of the small town atmosphere, and reduced shading. The tenuous justification for allowing this encroachment for what was already the largest restaurant in town was an existing not-to-code balcony next door, built without City approval. Oh, and a desire for a “vibrant” downtown. The contortions that went into this very questionable decision continue to mystify me.

This set a bad precedent (and the City has been all about precedent, as shown by the non-conforming balcony used to justify the overhead balconies at Shade restaurant). Approval of the encroachment only opened the door to additional encroachment and exceptions, of course; so,

here we are.

As noted in the staff report for this item, “The unique aspect of the balcony encroachment approval led to the condition that restricted any additional encroachment items.” Council at least recognized the major encroachment they were allowing, and restricted additional encroachment.

“Reasoning for the proposal is to provide safer cover for balcony diners than the current umbrellas provide.” Not that there have been any actual umbrella injuries, of course. This is just the next step to enclosing the balconies; full coverage attached awnings, surely to be followed by drop-down sidings, then heaters, lighting, etc. Increased bulk, more shading, reduced views, increased commercial development in the Public Right of Way; all one step at a time through appeals and minor concessions by the City.

Erik Zandvliet

From: James Gill <jamesrgill@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 6:44 PM
To: List - PPIC
Subject: Parking and Public Improvements Commission

Dear PPIC –

I am writing in opposition to the proposed retractable awnings in the Public Right of Way at 117 Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

In 2011, City Council very unwisely approved a major five foot encroachment into the Public Right of Way in allowing two balconies with dining. This giveaway directly contradicted the stated policies of the general plan for low-profile development, maintenance of the small town atmosphere, and reduced shading. The tenuous justification for allowing this encroachment for what was already the largest restaurant in town was an existing not-to-code balcony next door, built without City approval. Oh, and a desire for a “vibrant” downtown. The contortions that went into this very questionable decision continue to mystify me.

This set a bad precedent (and the City has been all about precedent, as shown by the non-conforming balcony used to justify the overhead balconies at Shade restaurant). Approval of the encroachment only opened the door to additional encroachment and exceptions, of course; so,

here we are.

As noted in the staff report for this item, “The unique aspect of the balcony encroachment approval led to the condition that restricted any additional encroachment items.” Council at least recognized the major encroachment they were allowing, and restricted additional encroachment.

“Reasoning for the proposal is to provide safer cover for balcony diners than the current umbrellas provide.” Not that there have been any actual umbrella injuries, of course. This is just the next step to enclosing the balconies; full coverage attached awnings, surely to be followed by drop-down sidings, then heaters, lighting, etc. Increased bulk, more shading, reduced views, increased commercial development in the Public Right of Way; all one step at a time through appeals and minor concessions by the City.