

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
PARKING AND PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
February 23, 2017**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Parking and Public Improvements Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of February 2017, at the hour of 6:35 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairman King, Fournier, Delk, Nicholson, Lipps.  
Absent: None.  
Staff Present: Traffic Engineer Erik Zandvliet, Lt. Andrew Harrod, Battalion Chief Scott Hafdell  
Clerk: Angela Soo.

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**02/23/17-1 October 27, 2016**

**MOTION:** Chair King made a motion to approve the minutes with no corrections. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Delk.

Ayes: Fournier, Delk, Chair King, Nicholson, Lipps.  
Noes: None.  
Abstain: None.  
Absent: None.

**D. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Chair King opened Audience Participation (3-Minute Limit).

There was no audience participation.

Chair King closed Audience Participation.

**E. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**02/23/17-2 Valley Drive Neighborhood Traffic Management Study Report**

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet summarized the staff report, pointing out a correction on page 1, last paragraph, first sentence, should read "In March 2015, the City received a

petition from residents along 4<sup>th</sup> Street between Ingleside Drive and Valley Drive to convert 4<sup>th</sup> Street to a one way ~~eastbound~~ westbound street.” He also noted that 15 additional survey results were submitted after the agenda posted, but the late submissions did not change the overall percentages of the findings.

In response to a question by Commissioner Lipps regarding bulb outs on Ingleside Drive, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained how they would be installed but said that is not one of the recommendations at this time. Downtown has examples of curb bulb outs.

Commissioner Fournier referred to an email from a resident who conducted his own parking count and asked if the City conducted one as well.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said the City did not conduct a parking count and that the seasons greatly affect parking availability. He further added that the Downtown Specific Plan recommends updating the Downtown Traffic Management Plan to address overflow parking demand. He then invited Manhattan Beach Fire Department Battalion Chief Scott Hafdell to the podium.

Commissioners Delk, Nicholson and Fournier asked Battalion Chief Hafdell about access to walkstreet homes in an emergency, walkstreet bollards and speed humps. .

Battalion Chief Hafdell said responders will typically use the alleys, but sometimes it can be restricted due to parked cars or narrow widths, but they would use the same protocols as other walkstreets. He noted there are other obstructions on a walkstreet, such as gas lamps, basketball hoops and other playground items. Battalion Chief Hafdell said the Fire Department prefers not to have any speedbumps because they create a lot of stress on the engines.

In response to a question by Commissioner Fournier, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet confirmed that two extra parking spaces would be created with a walkstreet conversion because there would be more curb space on Valley Drive.

Chair King, Commissioners Lipps and Fournier asked Lt. Andrew Harrod to share his perspective on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. Lt. Harrod said there was no accident history on record, but that not all accidents should or need to be reported. He explained the Police Department prefers installing traffic calming measures to encourage driver compliance prior to enforcement action. Lt. Harrod said a walkstreet closure would hinder police officers’ ability to gain access, and construction sites also present a hindrance in the alleys.

In response to a question by Chair King, Traffic Engineer explained the reason for a red curb at Ingleside Drive and 4<sup>th</sup> Street was to provide adequate turning radius.

Lt. Harrod added that this section of town was developed without a master street plan and evolved to what it is now.

Chair King opened Audience Participation and reminded speakers to limit their comments only to new information that would be helpful for the Commission.

### **Audience Participation**

**Ron Hacohen, 436 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, is against the walkstreet conversion and said the petition has nothing to do with safety, but is a land grab opportunity to increase property values. A trial is not necessary to conclude the negative impact this would have to surrounding neighborhoods.

**Peggy Nisen, 504 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, does not support the walkstreet and said that section of 4<sup>th</sup> Street was never a walkstreet. She is concerned with the loss in parking and submitted an additional page to be included with the last petition she submitted.

**Milan Smith, 509 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**, is against the walkstreet and noted the increased traffic and construction activity in the neighborhood. He pointed out the survey results showed a 2:1 ratio against the conversion and urged the Commission to reject the closure. It is unfair to make their neighborhood better and his worse.

**Michele Colman, 501 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, does not support the walkstreet and advised the parents to exercise more supervision over their children. She believed petitioners want to increase their property values.

**John Porter, 341 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, is not in favor of a walkstreet and said he often witnesses emergency vehicles having difficulty driving down 3<sup>rd</sup> Place because many cars are parked opposite to a garage. A walkstreet conversion would further exacerbate the problem causing a public safety hazard.

**Cindy Kohlmler, 541 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**, does not support closing 4<sup>th</sup> Street and disagrees with the Traffic Engineer's findings that traffic would not change on 2<sup>nd</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup> streets. She is very concerned about losing any parking and remarked that people often use her street for long-term parking because there are no parking restriction signs in place. She also believes petitioners want to increase their property values.

**Jan Schulte, 409 6<sup>th</sup> Place**, said he has sent two petitions to the City, one in 2008 and one last year, regarding traffic and speeding problems at 6<sup>th</sup> Place. He would like a one-way street, partial one-way or speed humps that have been installed elsewhere.

**Seven Glass, 324 7<sup>th</sup> Street**, said people should park all the way in their driveway so they are not obstructing the street. This makes it difficult for people to get out of their garages. He usually sees a car is 10% in the driveway and 90% in the street. He would also like to see more enforcement of bicyclists on The Strand.

**James McCormick, 545 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, does not see a compelling reason for the walkstreet except to provide a safer method for children walking to school. In that case, he

said a sidewalk should suffice and anything more extreme would make current conditions worse.

**John Peets, 433 6<sup>th</sup> Street**, said he does not favor restricting traffic coming into his alley. He said there are too many signs that are not obeyed. He suggested focusing on measures that work. He stated his desire to remove two alley parking spaces on the north side of 6<sup>th</sup> Place because they restrict traffic flow. He also supports 4<sup>th</sup> Street walkstreet conversion because it is the only way to encourage people to park in their garages. He suggested the City conduct a pilot program to clear out garages.

**John Maceachern, 540 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, is in favor of making 500 block of 4<sup>th</sup> Street a walkstreet. He conducted a parking availability study in the neighborhood on different days and times, and submitted his findings to City Hall. He found that an average of 71 parking spaces were available during his study. He stated there are 18 spots on 4<sup>th</sup> Street if a 22-foot spacing is used. Two new spaces would be created on Valley Drive with the walkstreet conversion, bringing the net lost spaces to 16. He felt the neighborhood can accommodate the remaining cars and supports doing a six-month trial.

**Gayla Rabin, 520 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, supports the walkstreet and provided some historical background. She and another resident personally measured the width of all the walkstreets from 4<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> streets. The measurements ranged from 17 feet 11 inches to 21 feet 9 inches. Her block measures 20 feet 4 inches. She speculated her block was never a walkstreet because the church wanted parking for its parishioners. She supports a six-month to one-year walkstreet trial.

**Stacy Myrose, 501 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, supports a walkstreet conversion and said she only used 4<sup>th</sup> Street twice due to the dangerous conditions it presents. She has had to back up on 4<sup>th</sup> Street because of an oncoming car. She felt walking on 4<sup>th</sup> Street also poses a danger due to speeding cars. She pointed out that the street footprint is identical to the 400 block of 4<sup>th</sup> Street, whether or not it was previously a walkstreet. She said a net loss of 16 parking spaces should not affect residents because the area is zoned for two-car garages. She urged a trial in order to accurately assess the impact based on facts.

**Nancy Lemm, 508 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, favors the walkstreet conversion because she is concerned about safety and liability. She noted another collision with a parked car occurred since the October meeting but was not reported. She calculated the actual net parking spaces lost would be at 12 when taking into consideration red curb needed for private walks, and the addition of two parking spots on Valley Drive. She said 4<sup>th</sup> Street is also used for long term parking, which is a problem that should be addressed separately. She believed a one-way street would not adequately address the safety hazards and urged testing the walkstreet during a trial period.

**Linda McLoughlin Figel, 533 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, supports the walkstreet and recommended a trial to allow everyone to properly evaluate the actual impact.

**Terry Boyle, 508 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, does not support the walkstreet conversion and said there are many tools to choose from to address the safety concerns. He believed a trial would be flawed and should only be used as a last resort. He also said parking conditions will change when children will grow up and get their own cars.

**Blair Bartlett, resident**, supports a walkstreet because lower 4<sup>th</sup> Street was designed to be a walkstreet and cannot safely accommodate two-way traffic, let alone one-way traffic. She urged the trial proposal.

**Marc Castellani, 521 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, supports the conversion and believed it would not set a precedent for other streets because that block is unique. 4<sup>th</sup> Street is at the end of an existing walkstreet and adjacent to another walkstreet, 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The street is narrower than other streets to the south. The street is also short at 400 feet long and does not connect to any major thoroughfares. He said the street resembles a walkstreet and has no sidewalks because it was originally designed for that purpose.

**Brendan Harrington, 524 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, supports a six-month trial so that emotions do not impede making a decision based on facts. He suggested tagging all the cars to document where they are parking.

**Michael Kahn, 505 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**, is opposed to the walkstreet, but in favor of sidewalks and one-way street options. His first concern was setting a precedent by approving the walkstreet, allowing other neighborhoods to request similar modifications. His second concern was safety where the eliminated parking spots would increase congestion in other thoroughfares and also affect emergency vehicle access. His third concern was a potential increase in liability against the City due to emergency responders having more difficulty accessing a home due to congested streets.

**Sarah Grasso, 540 5<sup>th</sup> Place**, does not support the walkstreet because it would increase traffic on 5<sup>th</sup> Place, which already experiences high traffic volumes. She said there has been no mention of the impact to 5<sup>th</sup> Place. She indicated the alleyway pavement condition is deplorable in front of her house. She did not think the street was designed to handle that amount of traffic. She supports adding sidewalks and also mentioned two parking spots on 6<sup>th</sup> Place and Ingleside Drive that obstruct traffic flow.

**Sally Alder, 510 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**, does not support the walkstreet because parking is already a major problem in the area, especially on street sweeping days. The 500 blocks of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> streets do not have mandatory street sweeping, which means surrounding neighbors with signs installed on their blocks will use her street to park on enforcement days.

**Barbara Williams, 525 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, supports the walkstreet proposal because it was originally designed as such.

**Shannon Murphy Castellani, 521 4<sup>th</sup> Street**, lead petitioner for the walkstreet, thanked the Commission and Traffic Engineer Zandvliet, and explained her reasoning for

starting the petition. She has a two and four-year-old, and has seen two car accidents since this petition process began. Her intention is not to take parking away and would just like a trial attempt to gauge actual impact to neighborhood.

**Jim Horner, 341 5<sup>th</sup> Street**, is against the walkstreet proposal because parking is sacred in the City, even just one spot. He referenced a previous hearing to remove one parking spot at 217 4<sup>th</sup> Place because encroaching upon a neighbor. The request was turned down because not enough parking in the area. The issue is not an emotional one, but simply a scarcity in parking.

Chair King closed Audience Participation.

### **Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Delk said he clearly does not believe 4<sup>th</sup> Street is wide enough to be a two-way street, but is suitable for one-way traffic flow. He appreciates the safety and parking concerns, as well as the potential impact to other streets.

In response to a question by Commissioner Lipps, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet confirmed the net loss in parking spaces would be approximately 18, depending on car size and red curb markings.

In response to a question by Commissioner Lipps, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet confirmed no other street south of Manhattan Beach Boulevard has the same characteristics of the 500 block of 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

In response to a question by Commissioner Nicholson, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet confirmed that by installing a Left Turn Only restriction at 6<sup>th</sup> Place would divert some traffic to 5<sup>th</sup> Place. He further explained the various traffic diversion onto 1<sup>st</sup> Street or Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Commissioner Nicholson said it would be wonderful for 4<sup>th</sup> Street petitioners to have a walkstreet, but questioned at what cost to the community. He struggles with losing 18 parking spaces given all the efforts made toward parking management.

Commissioner Fournier reiterated his top three concerns – safety, parking and traffic flow. He learned more about the safety aspect after hearing from fire and police. He is concerned about backing out onto Valley Drive. He is not in favor of closing off 4<sup>th</sup> Street because it would mean the loss of 18 parking spaces, though he appreciated the resident's Parking Availability Survey. Should the Commission decide to do a walkstreet trial, he would only support doing a three-month duration in April, May and June.

In response to a question by Chair King, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained the three petition requests.

Chair King said he does not believe petitioners are seeking a land grab opportunity but does foresee traffic impacts regardless of what is implemented. Traffic Engineer Zandvliet confirmed no parking would be lost if the block turned into a one-way street going westbound. Chair King figured the one-way option would improve safety by 50% because traffic would only be going in one direction. It would also potentially serve as a traffic calming measure and eliminate the backup problem with two opposing vehicles.

**MOTION:** Chair King made a motion to recommend Item No. 1 (Post a Left Turn Only restriction for westbound traffic on 6<sup>th</sup> Street at Valley Drive). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nicholson.

In response to Commissioner questions, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet further explained survey findings and discussion followed.

Commissioner Lipps said he does not support installing the stop sign because it just shifts the problem elsewhere without really solving the issue. He was surprised the survey results did not show 100% support for the 15 mph speed limit signs.

Ayes: Delk, Chair King.  
Noes: Fournier, Nicholson, Lipps.  
Abstain: None.  
Absent: None.

Discussion followed on how to proceed with the next motion.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Nicholson made a motion to recommend Item No. 2 (Restrict traffic to one-way westbound on 4<sup>th</sup> Street between Valley Drive and Ingleside Drive, with parking on the north side). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lipps.

Discussion followed on implications of approving this motion before other motions. The Commission then agreed it should first address the complete street closure.

Commissioners Nicholson and Lipps subsequently withdrew their motion and second.

Chair King asked the Commission if there is a motion to recommend the conversion of 4<sup>th</sup> Street to a walkstreet. There was no motion made by the Commission.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Nicholson restated his motion to recommend Item No. 2 (Restrict traffic to one-way westbound on 4<sup>th</sup> Street between Valley Drive and Ingleside Drive, with parking on the north side). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lipps.

Discussion followed.

Ayes: Lipps, Nicholson, Chair King.  
Noes: Delk, Fournier.

Abstain: None.  
Absent: None.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Lipps made a motion to approve Item Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 in staff's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nicholson.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet recited recommendations numbers 3 through 7.

Ayes: Fournier, Delk, Chair King, Nicholson, Lipps.  
Noes: Delk, Fournier.  
Abstain: None.  
Absent: None.

**F. OTHER ITEMS**

**02/23/17-3 Monthly Revenue and Expenditure Reports: Receive and File**

In response to a question by Chair King, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained the items typically purchased under warehouse charges.

Received and Filed.

**02/23/17-4 Staff Follow-Up Items**

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet gave an update on crosswalk improvement project at Highland Avenue and 38<sup>th</sup> Street. The project requires coordination with a gas line project and should be completed before peak summer months.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet provided an update on Gelson's Market, which had its first introduction with Planning Commission with a continued public hearing scheduled for March 22, 2017.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet introduced the new Interim Community Development Director Anne McIntosh and provided other City staffing updates.

**02/23/17-5 Commissioner Items**

Commissioner Lipps said a Citywide campaign should be put forth to get people to park in their garages. He suggested giving incentives by helping people organize their clutter and hold a community garage sale day.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said the effort would be an appropriate project for Leadership Manhattan Beach.

Commissioner Fournier thanked staff for all the hard work put into the neighborhood traffic study. He apologized for getting ahead of the process, but said the process went well.

Commissioner Fournier said parking meters sometimes have difficulty reading credit cards with chips.

Commissioner Delk said at least 10 people come into his restaurant who cannot get their chip credit cards to work.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said he will look into the issue.

Commissioner Fournier requested Traffic Engineer Zandvliet reach out to specific residents in addressing their concerns, such as **Ms. Myrose** with her issue of having to back up on 4<sup>th</sup> Street onto Valley Drive. He feels the effort would go a long way.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said he would follow up with **Ms. Myrose** and anyone else who had side comments, such as requests for red curbs.

Commissioner Fournier asked about the street sweeping sign issue on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, as brought up by **Ms. Alder**.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained the resident petition process to install street sweeping signs.

Commissioner Nicholson referred to an email from a female resident who cannot back out of her garage onto 6<sup>th</sup> Place due to parked cars in two particular spots. He inspected the parking spots and agreed they should not be there.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet said he will reach out to her and noted she can access her garage from one direction, but not the other. He said he will take measurements and consider removing one or both spots if needed. Removing a spot would not require a meeting because considered a safety concern.

Commissioner Nicholson thanked Traffic Engineer Zandvliet for his good work.

Chair King adjourned the meeting.

## **G. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at **8:51 p.m.** to the regular Parking and Public Improvements Commission Meeting on Thursday, March 23, 2017, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.