



Legislation Text

File #: 19-0187, **Version:** 1

TO:

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

THROUGH:

Bruce Moe, City Manager

FROM:

Anne McIntosh, Community Development Director

SUBJECT:

Recent Planning Commission Quasi-Judicial Decisions:

1. Use Permit- Unita
2. Coastal Development Permit CA 18-09 Appeal
(Community Development Director McIntosh).

INFORMATION ITEMS ONLY

On April 10, 2019 (after the posting of the April 16, 2019 City Council agenda), the Planning Commission considered the items described below. **In the event the Commission takes action on either item, staff will inform the Council of the decision no later than April 15, 2019.**

STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE RESOLUTION WITH CONDITIONS

1. Consideration of a Resolution Approving a Use Permit to Allow a Co-Working and Shared Office Space with Occasional Member Workshops and a Type 57 Alcohol License to Allow for the Sale and Onsite Consumption of Beer and Wine at 516 North Sepulveda Boulevard (Gencoglu)

On June 25, 2018, the City received an application requesting a Use Permit to allow for a change of use for the conversion of an existing sports bar and billiards hall (2nd Half Sports Bar) to a new co-working and shared office space (Unita Office Building). The project is located in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district in Area District I. The applicant is not proposing an increase in square footage of the existing two-story building originally constructed in 1969 with an addition approved in 1993. The Use Permit for the sports bar/billiards hall was originally approved by the City Council in 1983 with several amendments thereafter including for the building expansion in 1993. The request is for a Use Permit for a new co-working and shared office space with occasional member workshops and networking events and a Type 57 alcohol license to allow for the sale and onsite consumption of beer to members, and beer and wine at workshops and events.

Link to the April 10, 2019, Planning Commission staff report:

http://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2019/201904

[10/20190410-2.pdf>](#)

STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION: UPHOLD THE DIRECTOR'S DECISION

2. Appeal of the Director's Approval of Coastal Development Permit No. CA 18-09 for the Demolition of a Single Family Residence and Construction of a New Three-Story Single Family Residence with a Two-Car Garage and a Basement at 205 Rosecrans Place (Appellant Eggers)

On March 23, 2018, a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) application was submitted to demolish an existing single family residence with garage and construct a new three-story single family residence with an enclosed two-car garage and basement. A CDP is required for the project since the lot is located in the Coastal non-appealable area of the City, where CDP's are not appealable to the California Coastal Commission. The CDP was approved by the Director on February 25, 2019. On March 11, 2019, an appeal of the decision was filed by the property owner at 204 Rosecrans Place located across Rosecrans Place to the south of the subject property. The appellant indicated in a comment email during the Directors review period that the new development would adversely impact the existing parking condition of his property across the alley.

Link to the April 10, 2019, Planning Commission staff report:

[<http://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2019/20190410/20190410-3.pdf>](http://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2019/20190410/20190410-3.pdf)

In the event the Planning Commission takes action on these Projects, staff will inform City Council of the decision no later than April 15, 2019.

Planning Commission quasi-judicial decisions can be called up for review by a Councilmember or appealed by any member of the public within 15 days of the decision. For all requests for review, it shall be presumed that the reason for the request is that the decision may have significant and material effects on the quality of life within the City, or that the subject matter of the decision may have Citywide importance warranting review and determination by City's elected officials. Bias shall not be presumed or inferred due to a request for review.