

Legislation Text

File #: 20-0359, Version: 1

TO:

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

THROUGH:

Bruce Moe, City Manager

FROM:

Carrie Tai, AICP, Community Development Director

SUBJECT:

Recent Planning Commission Quasi-Judicial Decisions:

Proposed Master Use Permit for a New 162-Room, 81,775 Square-Foot Hotel with Full Alcohol Service for Hotel Patrons and a New 16,348 Square-Foot Retail and Office Building; and Reduced Parking with 152 Parking Spaces at 600 S. Sepulveda Boulevard; and Make an Environmental Determination in Accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (MB Hotel Partners, LLC) (Continued from October 14, 2020) (Community Development Director Tai). **INFORMATION ITEM ONLY**

On November 19, 2020, the Planning Commission considered the item described below.

 Proposed Master Use Permit for a New 162-Room, 81,775 Square-Foot Hotel with Full Alcohol Service for Hotel Patrons and a New 16,348 Square-Foot Retail and Office Building; and Reduced Parking with 152 Parking Spaces at 600 S. Sepulveda Boulevard; and Make an Environmental Determination in Accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (MB Hotel Partners, LLC) (continued from October 14, 2020).

The Planning Commission continued the public hearing from the October 14, 2020, Planning Commission meeting to consider an application requesting a Master Use Permit for a new 162-room, 81,775 square-foot, four-story hotel and a separate new 16,348 square-foot two-story retail and office building at 600 S. Sepulveda Boulevard. The applicant's Master Use Permit also includes a request for a parking reduction, as well as the ability to serve full alcohol (beer, wine, and distilled spirits) to hotel guests in conjunction with food service. The subject site is located in the "CG-D8" (General Commercial, Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor Overlay) design overlay district in Area District I.

Staff presented the applicant's modified plan based on requests made by the Planning Commission at the October 14, 2020, hearing. The plans were revised to: (1) replace some of the proposed compact parking spaces with standard-sized parking spaces, which resulted in a net loss of six parking spaces for a new proposed total of 152 parking spaces; (2) incorporate a widened ramp to the subterranean garage and improve visibility to and from the ramp; (3) provide architectural screening on the hotel building's fourth floor eastern façade along Chabela Drive; and (4) redesign

File #: 20-0359, Version: 1

landscaping and planters along the site's eastern perimeter to provide better screening. The plans were also updated to address the Planning Commission's request for a line-of-sight illustration depicting views east from the hotel's eastern façade, an exhibit showing shadows from the proposed building(s) on the adjacent properties, and more details on the site's northern perimeter landscaping. The applicant spoke in favor of the project and addressed some of the public comment.

During the public hearing, 28 public speakers provided public comment. Three speakers spoke in favor of the project, while the other 25 speakers spoke in opposition to the project. Staff also received 13 written public comments, with 10 emails in support of the project and three emails opposed to the project. Late public comment was received from 32 individuals, with six individuals expressing support for the project and 26 individuals expressing opposition to the project. Several individuals expressing opposition to the project made multiple late public comments. A petition with 118 signatures expressing opposition to the project was also received as a late public comment.

Commissioner Thompson expressed disappointment with the proposed screening on the hotel building's eastern facade, the proposed plant material and planter size along the site's eastern perimeter, and the massing and lack of articulation along the eastern façade of the hotel building. Commissioner Thompson suggested that the fourth floor hotel rooms either be removed or set back further west, further preserving the privacy of the residences to the east. Commissioner Ungoco and Chair Morton expressed general support for the project but sought improvements to the screening on the hotel building's fourth floor eastern façade and larger box sizes for plant materials along the eastern perimeter, in order to further obscure hotel patrons' views to the east. Accordingly, the motion included the addition of the following conditions:

- Screening on the fourth floor of the hotel building's eastern façade shall be bolstered to ensure privacy for the first floor of the first row of homes along Chabela Drive to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.
- Applicant shall revise landscaping plan to increase the size of the proposed plant material (upon installation) along the property's eastern perimeter such that the plant material achieves a height up to the third floor plate height upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.

The Commission voted 2-1 to approve the draft resolution with the modifications listed above, approving the applicant's Master Use Permit request and adopting the associated environmental determination, with Commissioner Ungoco and Chair Morton voting in favor and Commissioner Thompson voting against the motion.

Link to the Planning Commission Staff Report: https://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2020/20201 https://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2020/20201 https://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2020/20201 https://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2020/20201 https://cms6ftp.visioninternet.com/manhattanbeach/commissions/planning_commission/2020/20201

STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION: CONDUCT THE PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPT THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION APPROVING THE MASTER USE PERMIT SUBJECT TO CERTAIN CONDITIONS AND ADOPTING THE ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Planning Commission quasi-judicial decisions can be called up for review by two City Councilmembers or appealed by any member of the public within 15 days of the decision (M.B.M.C. 10.100.020).