

Matrix of Recommendations

	Increased Height	4:12 Roof Pitch and Parking Requirement	Daylight Plane	Desirable Use:					D-8 Overlay District	Change of Use-Use Permit Waiver	Senior Housing	Medical Office	Desirable Features
				High-End Restaurant	Community Theater	Children's Museum	Hotel	Mixed-Use					
Ad Hoc Working Group	Support for allowing the height to be increased to over 30 feet. There was no consensus on the height increase, however, a few of the members indicated 40-45 feet.	Support for removing the requirement so that no roof pitch or lower level parking within the building footprint is required.	Support for allowing for additional flexibility as part of the daylight plane requirement.	Support	Support	Support	Support	Support Mixed-Use along Sepulveda Blvd. and developing new development standards for Mixed-Use development projects if Mixed-Use is allowed along Sepulveda Blvd.	Topic was not presented.	Topic was not presented.	Topic was not presented.	No further regulations for new office and medical uses.	Tax Tourism Assessment Beautification/ Improvement Fund Safety Features Wider Sidewalks/ Buffer Zones Standard ROW Improvements
Planning Commission Straw Votes 6/13/18		(5-0)	(5-0)	(5-0)	(5-0)	(4-1)		(2-3)	(4-1)	(5-0)	(2-3)		
Burkhalter	Opposed to allowing 40 ft. within the entire overlay.	Support for removing the requirement so that no roof pitch or lower level parking within the building footprint is required.	Support for allowing additional flexibility as part of the daylight plane requirement. However, the Commission felt it was important that an impact study be required to provide evidence that there are no impacts to adjacent properties.	Support	Support	Support	Support	Opposed; concerned that such projects may replace desired existing neighborhood commercial uses; Sepulveda Blvd. may not be a desirable location for residential; adding more residential uses could put an undue strain on infrastructure.	Support; with the addition of the Manhattan Village Mall site (and City owned parking lot).	Support	Opposed	The Commission did not have any significant comments or objections to allowing medial use on Sepulveda Blvd.	The Commission did not have any significant comments or objections pertaining to desirable features. Amend Sepulveda Boulevard Development Guide.
Fournier	Support for up to 45 ft. height limit.			Support	Support	Support		Supportive of Mixed-Use. Mixed-Use could result in entry-level housing or in developments that add a walkable or more vibrant atmosphere.	Support; with the addition of the Manhattan Village Mall site (and City owned parking lot).		Support for "congregate care" type of assisted senior housing, versus a collection of individual apartments.		
Morton	Support for up to 45 ft. height limit.			Support	Support	Support		Supportive of Mixed-Use and of having residential above commercial; believes that it can be achieved on both sides of Sepulveda Blvd.	Support; with the addition of the Manhattan Village Mall site (and City owned parking lot).		Opposed to replacing a retail center of diverse uses with stand-alone residential, including senior living.		
Seville Jones	Opposed to allowing 40 ft. within the entire overlay.			Support	Support	Support		Opposed; concerned that such projects may replace desired existing neighborhood commercial uses; Sepulveda Blvd. may not be a desirable location for residential; adding more residential uses could put an undue strain on infrastructure.	Support; with the addition of the Manhattan Village Mall site (and City owned parking lot).		Support for "congregate care" type of assisted senior housing, versus a collection of individual apartments. There is an urgent need for more opportunities for MB seniors, and for residents to have their elderly family members close to them.		
Thompson	Opposed to allowing 40 ft. within the entire overlay, but supported 40 ft. maximum only for hotels and only on the east side of Sepulveda.			Support	Support	Opposed; not an appropriate use on the Corridor.		Opposed; concerned that such projects may replace desired existing neighborhood commercial uses; Sepulveda Blvd. may not be a desirable location for residential; adding more residential uses could put an undue strain on infrastructure.	Opposed; the west side of Sepulveda should not be included due to the pattern of shallow lots.		Opposed to any type of residential on Sepulveda including residential as part of Mixed-Use; believes that residential (having the highest market value) will threaten to replace smaller desired retail and service businesses.		
City Council 7/17/18 Discussion													
Hersman				Support	Support; finds it interesting and does not find reason not to allow these uses.	Support; finds it interesting and does not find reason not to allow these uses.	Support; believes Manhattan Beach needs more hotels.				Support	Open to having a formula to limit the amount of medial office.	Additional feature: historical referencing-plaque, photograph, art element.
Howorth		Support for removing roof pitch requirement.					Supportive of incentivizing hotels.	Does not want to push for Mixed-Use if not practical; would like additional information.			Support for residential and assisted living; there is a need and it is a desirable use; the location is appropriate.		Additional feature: historical referencing-plaque, photograph, art element.
Lesser	Willing to offer height for hotels.		Remain at 45 degrees and wants to examine the residential impact (bulk).		Skeptical of this use; would like to keep Sepulveda retail oriented.	Skeptical of this use; would like to keep Sepulveda retail oriented.	Support; most important principle use.	Opposed; too few opportunity sites and wants to keep Sepulveda economically thriving.			Opposed; concerned about senior housing and not having sales tax generation; other areas may be better suited.	Agrees with Hersman on exploring a formula; concerned that it does not generate property tax.	
Montgomery	Has concerns about increased height.		Remain at 45 degrees until any changes on height are made.	Support	Support	Support	Concerned about every block becoming hotel; depends on locations (Rosecrans-Sepulveda would be OK).	Support; any kind of housing, especially with housing crisis.			Support; would consider the use.	Does not want to regulate; let the market decide.	
Napolitano	Unsure about increased height; previous hotels have made height work.	Support for removing roof pitch requirement.	Depends on height increase. Remain at 45 degrees since it affects the residents.			Does not foresee anyone proposing this use.	Supports; however, unsure about increased height for this use.	Opposed; questions success, especially considering other cities' Mixed-Use.			Opposed to residential and therefore senior housing on Sepulveda.		