



## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 16-0579      **Version:** 1

**Type:** Old Bus. - Staff Report      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**In control:** City Council Regular Meeting

**On agenda:** 12/20/2016      **Final action:**

**Title:** Manhattan Beach Shopping Center Enhancement Project Site Plan (Community Development Director Lundstedt).  
ENDORSE MANHATTAN VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT SITE PLAN

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. Updated Site Plan: Summary of Modifications dated, 12-06-2016

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
12/20/2016	1	City Council Regular Meeting	approved	Pass

**TO:**

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

**THROUGH:**

Mark Danaj, City Manager

**FROM:**

Community Development Director Marisa Lundstedt

**SUBJECT:**

Manhattan Beach Shopping Center Enhancement Project Site Plan (Community Development Director Lundstedt).

**ENDORSE MANHATTAN VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT SITE PLAN**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Endorse Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project Site Plan

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no fiscal implications associated with this report.

**BACKGROUND:**

On November 7, 2006, RREEF America Reit Corp BBB II ("RREEF") applied for land use entitlements for improvements ("Project") to an 18.4-acre portion (the "site") of the 44-acre Manhattan Village shopping center ("Shopping Center") located at 3200 - 3600 South Sepulveda Boulevard.

On December 2, 2014, the City Council approved Resolution No. 14-0026 approving a Master Land Permit Amendment, Height Variance, and Sign Exception/Program ("MUP") for the Project, and adopted Resolution No. 14-0025 certifying the Project Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR").

Shortly thereafter, a lawsuit was filed challenging the City Council's approval of the Project and certification of the EIR. On November 2, 2016, the Los Angeles Superior Court ruled that the Council had acted correctly and complied with all applicable laws in approving the Project and certifying the EIR.

At the time the City Council approved the Project, there were many comments about the Project, both from the public and councilmembers, regarding the sequencing of construction, parking, and ways to improve the Project. In particular, there were many comments about consolidating Macy's and constructing the Northeast parking structure first, as part of Phase I, and trying to provide a more open feel that would be compatible with the unique Manhattan Beach coastal environment.

## **DISCUSSION**

In response to comments from the public and Councilmembers, RREEF hired a new design team (JLL) and submitted an updated site plan and related materials.

The most notable features of the updated plan are:

- The consolidation of Macy's and the Northeast parking structure have been integrated in Phase I and will be constructed first
- Increased and redistributed parking (2,712 spaces to 2,738).
- Increased parking ratio (4.16 to 4.23).
- Refinement of plaza area and surrounding village shops (including relocating California Pizza Kitchen) to create an improved outdoor space
- Extension of the 30<sup>th</sup> Street access road east from Carlotta Way to Cedar Way to improve vehicular and pedestrian internal circulation
- More efficient Northeast parking structure layout; refined location to facilitate improved Cedar Way/Rosecrans connection and integration into future Phase 3
- Minor modifications to North and South Decks to enable an enhanced plaza area
- An open and integrated design theme that is complementary to the city's unique coastal identity

Condition No. 1 of the MUP provides the Director of Community Development with authority to determine whether any deviation from the Project's approved plan requires an amendment to the MUP or any other discretionary entitlements. Upon her review, the Director has determined that the updated site plan does not require an amendment to the MUP or any other discretionary entitlements, and has approved the updated site plan.

JLL will present an overview of the updated site plan.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

An independent environmental consultant, Eyestone Environmental, reviewed the updated plan and assessed its potential environmental effects to determine whether a subsequent or supplemental EIR

should be prepared. Eyestone concluded that none of the conditions requiring a subsequent or supplemental EIR were present as the Updated Plan does not contain any substantial changes that would require revisions to the EIR. Instead, all impacts from the Updated Plan are the same as, or less than, the impacts of the Project as previously approved. Eyestone therefore prepared an Addendum to the EIR. All of the mitigation measures required by the EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Approved Plan would still be implemented in connection with the updated plan.

**Attachment:**

1. Updated Site Plan: Summary of Modifications dated, 12-06-2016