

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH  
PARKING AND PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
April 25, 2019**

**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 **25th day of April 2019**, at the hour of **6:04p.m.**, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

**B. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG**

**C. ROLL CALL**

Present: Franklin, Longhurst, Delk, Chair Paralusz  
Absent: Lipps  
Staff Present: Erik Zandvliet, City Traffic Engineer  
Anne McIntosh, Community Development Director  
Rafael Garcia, Assistant Planner  
Stephanie Katsouleaus, Public Works Director  
Prem Kumar, City Engineer  
Anne Luke-Jones, Senior Management Analyst  
Anastasia Seims, Senior Civil Engineer  
Clerks: Angela Soo Seilhamer, Recording Secretary

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**04/25/19-1 February 28, 2019**

**MOTION:** Chair Paralusz called for a motion to approve the minutes with no changes. The motion was made by **Commissioner Delk** and seconded by **Commissioner Franklin**.

AYES: Franklin, Longhurst, Delk, Chair Paralusz  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Lipps

**E. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

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

There was no audience participation.

Chair Paralusz closed Audience Participation.

**F. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**04/25/19-2 Consideration of an Encroachment Permit Appeal to Allow a Retractable Fence and Ancillary Improvements in the Public Right-of-Way at 4004 The Strand (4009 Ocean Drive)**

**Commissioner Franklin** disclosed he knows the appellant from a transaction about four years ago, where Commissioner Franklin sold appellant the property. Commissioner Franklin conferred with Community Development Director Anne McIntosh and City Attorney Quinn Barrow to determine if he should recuse himself. City Attorney Barrow said it was not necessary due to the length in time and no current financial interest.

**Assistant Planner Rafael Garcia** summarized the staff report for the encroachment appeal, using additional visual aids from a PowerPoint presentation.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked if the 10-foot area in question is called an easement area.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said it is an encroachment area, which is public property adjacent to private property, and Title 7 allows for certain improvements. Historically, the City has never allowed retractable fences, motors or mechanical equipment in the encroachment area. More typical enhancements include hardscape, landscaping, walls and fences that are approved through an administrative review performed by the Planning Division.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked if there are specific criteria for El Porto, and referenced MBMC Section 7.36.150.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said yes, and quoted MBMC 7.36.150.C.2., at the request of **Chair Paralusz**: "Fences and walls are permitted to be a maximum height of forty-two inches (42") above the adjacent public walkway except that planter walls required in subsection (C)(1) above may have a maximum height of seventy-two inches (72")." He further explained in instances where a significant grade differential exists, the code allows for 30-inch retaining walls. The property in question does not have a substantial slope.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked if anyone knows the history of the 10-foot wide piece of leftover land behind the Strand walk.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said he cannot comment on the history, but noted the City has allowed planter walls from a decorative perspective to provide a transition from private property onto public property.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked if the reason to deny the proposed structure is so that the City has the right to come in at any time for public improvements.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said that is partly the reason as well as the City's general policy to allow only minor improvements.

**Commissioner Longhurst** wanted to clarify one of the late comment letters in support of the fence that stated there are similar barriers on residences closer to the Pier. He pointed out those residences are outside of the defined El Porto neighborhood. He asked if this structure would be allowed in another similarly zoned property.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said the City would not allow the proposed fence on public property anywhere, acknowledged that there may be a similar existing legal non-conforming structure in existence constructed prior to the current code.

**Commissioner Longhurst** asked if the standards are different for private property.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** replied yes, and that he had suggested that the applicant consider relocating the fence onto private property, which would then allow further discussion. However, he said the applicant still favored the public right-of-way.

**Commissioner Delk** asked if the fence would be permissible on private property.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said it would not be allowed in the front 5-foot setback. The maximum height in the front setback is 42 inches. If the fence was pushed back 5 feet, then it could be possible to build a 6-foot high fence.

**Commissioner Delk** asked if the City would cement the encroachment area if the applicant decided to not do any enhancements.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said owners are required to do certain hardscape/landscape improvements, and normally owners voluntarily do so. He said the City would not cement an encroachment area unless it was necessary. For instance, if the City wanted to take back the land in order to widen The Strand for pedestrians or bicycle traffic.

**Chair Paralusz** asked if any prior approvals exist on The Strand encroachment areas that involve a motor, retractable fence or 6-foot high fence.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said not to his knowledge on all those items.

**Chair Paralusz** asked if the fence would it be approved if it was 42 inches and retractable.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said it would not be approved because the retractable portion would require extensive structural grading. No structures are allowed in the public right-of-way nor any motor or engine. Retractable fences have never been allowed, and approval would be inconsistent with existing policy. Conversely, a stationary 42-inch high fence as measured from The Strand grade would be allowed.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked about measurements of the motor casing and whether the measurements on the report could be enlarged in order to better view the dimensions.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** was not sure of the exact dimensions, but according to the applicant the motor unit measures 10"x4"x15", 15 inches being the height.

**Chair Paralusz** opened Public Comment.

**Brianna Cunningham, of C&C Partners—the architects on the project**, addressed the two reasons why the Planning Division denied the encroachment project: 1) The fence is considered a structure and structures are not allowed within the encroachment areas; and 2) Fences are only allowed to be a maximum of 42 inches in height as measured from adjacent public walkway.

**Ms. Cunningham** addressed the first point by explaining the proposed fence is not structural in nature and easily removable due to the small motor size. She also added there are many other neighboring improvements that would be far more difficult to remove, such as decks, high concrete masonry unit walls and stairways. She provided photos for visual comparison.

**Ms. Cunningham** addressed the second point by stating that if the fence is considered a structure, the height of a structure is not defined otherwise within the code, therefore the proposed 6 feet in height is within the code.

**Ms. Cunningham** said the proposed fence does not negatively affect public health, safety or convenience of pedestrians nor is it injurious. It also does not affect The Strand walkway, alleyways, vehicle access or public access to shoreline; it not only meets the code, but exceeds the spirit of the code. It will be aesthetically pleasing. The owner also agreed to bond with the City in any future maintenance or repairs of the fence should the owner no longer be able to care for it, releasing the City from any financial or welfare liability. She also noted no one has come forward in opposition of the fence.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said there was correspondence submitted after the agenda was posted.

**Chair Paralusz** closed Public Comment.

**Chair Paralusz** requested **Assistant Planner Garcia** to approach the podium and asked if he saw the photos presented by **Ms. Cunningham**. He replied no.

**Chair Paralusz** asked **Assistant Planner Garcia** to provide guidance on the fences in the photos, but she acknowledged it is unknown which Strand properties are photographed. She wanted to know how requirements would be applied to those fences in the right-of-way compared to this situation.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said he does not know if those fences are in the right-of-way just by looking at the pictures. Many properties on The Strand do not have an encroachment area and butt up against The Strand. However, in this case there is an encroachment area and that is why the standards are being applied. Many of the fences pictured appear to not

comply with the code, but he cannot comment on those properties due to their individual circumstances. Many legal non-conformities exist in the City, not only just for fences and walls, but for structures as well. Those deemed legal non-conforming have been in existence for some time and are permitted to continue to exist.

**Chair Paralusz** asked what is the public's interest in restricting the building of structures or allowing a retractable fence in the public right-of-way.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said it is public property and there is always a chance the City may need the land to make right-of-way improvements. Also, from a department policy standpoint, the City tries to be consistent with the interpretation of the code and apply it fairly to all projects.

**Chair Paralusz** asked has any other applicant brought this type of application to the City.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said not that he is aware. More typical non-allowable proposals in the encroachment area include barbeques, ponds and water features.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

**Commissioner Delk** said he is not opposed to the mechanical aspect of the fence, as it can be easily removed. However, he may have an issue with the 6-foot height. He does not want the area to resemble Venice Beach.

**Commissioner Franklin** said it is a slight exaggeration to call the fence a structure, as the unit could easily be removed. His understanding of the encroachment area was that if the City needed to reclaim that portion, that the improvements must be completely removed. He recognized that a house could not be built in the encroachment area because a home cannot be removed. Upon doing his own walking survey of the encroachment areas from 40<sup>th</sup> Street onward, of the 30 lots he observed from 40<sup>th</sup> Street to 45<sup>th</sup> Street, 15 of them had fences that were 6 feet or higher. He used his own 6'2" height as reference. He concluded half of the properties are essentially non-conforming by today's standard, noting one fence appeared 15 feet high and two at 11 feet.

**Chair Paralusz** said it is unknown when those improvements were made and if they were in compliance with Manhattan Beach's code at the time, or if they predated the statute. She added that just because someone does something wrong, does not mean the wrongdoing should be allowed to continue. Even if they were violating the law at the time, she questioned whether that gives the Commission license to disregard the current statute. She understands there are higher fences that do not involve motors, but she cannot identify where those locations are in the City, or if they are on public or private property, or legal non-conforming. She is not persuaded that just because there are taller fences in El Porto that the Commission should approve the current proposal.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he just wanted to get an idea of the scope, and reiterated half the properties had taller fences. He stressed the intent is being able to remove things. He said the proposed fence would be easy to remove. That intent is not that objectionable, and he is likely to approve the proposal.

**Chair Paralusz** asked **Commissioner Franklin** how he is able to square it with what the code says.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he does not consider the fence a structure.

**Chair Paralusz** said putting the structural component aside, she asked **Commissioner Franklin** how he reconciles the excess height for the current proposed fence (even if it was not retractable) when there is a height limit of 42 inches.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he would ask the appellant to modify it to 42 inches. **Commissioner Paralusz** asked what if the appellant says no. **Commissioner Franklin** then responded the fence cannot be permitted because the maximum height is 42 inches.

**Commissioner Paralusz** said she would like to make a reasoned decision. The Commission has an obligation as a body to review the application in the context of the law and also consider the surrounding circumstances. She does not have enough information on the other properties or from Commissioner Franklin's visit to El Porto. She just has what the code says today, the proposed request, and how the City has historically treated this statute. She would like to find a middle ground, if possible.

**Commissioner Franklin** said the middle ground would be lowering to 42 inches for the retractable fence.

**Chair Paralusz** reiterated what **Assistant Planner Garcia** said that a motor would not be allowed in the public right-of-way.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked **Assistant Planner Garcia** to clarify planter boxes that can go up to 30 inches and placing a fence on top.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** explained retaining wall measurements for when significant grade differentials exist between the private property and The Strand. For historical context, he said that portion of the City was annexed in the early 1980s. The El Porto area previously belonged to Los Angeles County with different development standards. He understands the standards were fairly flexible back then, but is not sure if the photos presented by the applicant are even in that area.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** also explained that the underground portion is not just the motor but the fence also lowers into a 6-foot deep concrete cavity built into below grade. Typically, fences do not require that type of improvement, which is why this is being considered a structure.

**Commissioner Franklin** wanted further explanation on the photos, and referenced the code pertaining to terraced planters.

**Assistant Planner Garcia** said he could not determine if planters or fences in a photo would be approved under the current code, but he said it appeared to meet the intent of the code.

**Community Development Director McIntosh** said rules are in place to minimize the privatization of public right-of-way, but also allow for people to personalize certain areas and make minor improvements. It is not permissible to completely enclose a yard area. She could not provide any comments on the photos provided by the applicant because there was not enough information or research done. She said the pictured properties are from the past and not something the City wants to see anymore. There are new rules and the project must comply. The property owner did not want to pursue any of the other options suggested by staff, and should not be granted a special exception.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he wanted to seek out an alternative that would be acceptable to the applicant, and referred to the El Porto Strand Standards, Section C.1. in regards to "terraced landscape planters." He also used as an example another property three quarters of a block away.

**Chair Paralusz** said she is still not persuaded, remarking it is not an equal comparison.

**Community Development Director McIntosh** said it is not the Commission's function to offer solutions. Staff can work with the applicant back at City Hall.

**Commissioner Longhurst** commended the applicant and Ms. Cunningham for the innovative proposal and expected to see similar ones in the future. However, he can only base his decision on the code as it is currently written. He suggested doing a code amendment in the future, allowing for new designs that address these technologies. He said the appeal ultimately comes down to a property rights issue. The private property owner is proposing to build a home and related right-of-way improvements; and the City is the steward of the public right-of-way. The City has established certain aesthetics and design criteria that it feels is justified. If a private property owner wants to use a portion of City owned land, the City has the right and obligation not only to establish those design criteria,

but enforce them consistently. He would support an amended design limiting height to 42 inches, but if the applicant is not amendable, then he cannot support the application.

**Chair Paralusz** wanted clarification on the Commission's role, and whether they have latitude to make any recommendations.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said the Commission is just recommending Yes or No on the appeal, but can recommend the applicant go back to the City to reconsider or discuss potential solutions.

**Commissioner Longhurst** concluded that he cannot support the proposal if it does not meet code requirements.

**Chair Paralusz** echoed **Commissioner Longhurst's** comments. She tried to rationalize a way to approve the project, but is not persuaded by any of the pictures due to lack of information and context. She suggested the appellant tighten up the comparisons if going to City Council, showing exact addresses and verifying when the other improvements were approved. She cautioned the history may still remain elusive. She can, however, historically look at how the City interpreted the code. Just based on the 42-inch height limit alone, she cannot support it. Additionally, she is troubled by the 6-foot subterranean portion that involves more structural work and would require a deeper level of excavation in order to remove. Her reasoning on the public interest side is to deny privatization of public property. She applauded the applicant for wanting to improve the property and asked them to work with the City to find a solution within the code. She concluded by saying she regretfully has to deny the appeal.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he does not think the code is sufficiently clear about what is allowed in the public right-of-way given the situation and what is already existing. He noted many properties look walled off from the public with some appearing to have an 8-foot wall blocking public view. Part of the confusion is not knowing the circumstances with the properties in the pictures, such as the grade level. It is unclear what the other property owners are doing. Given there are only about 30 lots that fall under this standard, he said the code can be clarified and made very specific to better guide future developments.

**Chair Paralusz** asked what needs to be clarified; what is unclear about 42 inches. She said even if she conceded to the motor, she cannot disregard the height limit.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said every property is unique in its geography, and the code applies to the property depending on the grades and other factors. It is not advisable to refer to existing conditions of other properties without knowing the full background.

**Chair Paralusz** said what is known is the current requirement of no higher than 42 inches, otherwise the fence would require a waiver or variance of the statute. She wanted to send a clear message to the appellant to keep the height to 42 inches.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he thinks it is wrong to put a 6-foot high fence at the front of the encroachment area, he just wants to get clarification on what is allowed.

**Chair Paralusz** said **Commissioner Franklin** is making good points. She wishes she could say yes to the appeal.

**Chair Paralusz** also wanted to have on public record that seven late comments were received after agenda posting: four (4) opposed of granting the appeal; three (3) in favor of granting the appeal.

**Chair Paralusz** reopened the Public Comment and invited the applicant to speak.

**Shawn Questa, of the design team for the project,** said they are primarily appealing the spirit of the code on why a 6-foot high fence is not allowed for this project and future projects. He considered this a concession because the fence itself is open, allowing the structure to be seen through the fence, and would be retracted most of the time. He added that if a 6-foot high solid fence was built on the property to code, it would be that much higher and

resemble a fortress as opposed to being down lower on the grade by The Strand. The fence was not meant to fortify the house, but for security purposes at night.

**Chair Paralusz** closed the Public Comment and reminded the Commission they are being asked to consider the appeal of the encroachment permit based on the laws as it stands today and not how the appellant might want it to be. City Council is not asking the Commission whether or not the statute should be amended, or what the reasons behind that should be. She understands the reasoning behind the appellant.

**MOTION:** **Chair Paralusz** called for a motion to either support staff's recommendation and deny the appeal or to make a recommendation to support the appeal. **Commissioner Franklin** made a motion to support staff's recommendation and deny the request at 4004 The Strand (4004 Ocean Drive) and uphold the Community Development Director's decision to prohibit the six-foot retractable fence with ancillary improvements within the public right-of-way. **Commissioner Delk** seconded the motion.

AYES: Franklin, Longhurst, Delk, Chair Paralusz  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: Lipps

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** added that this is a recommendation and will go to City Council most likely in June. They will be noticed again for the City Council appeal, as well as the area around the site.

**Chair Paralusz** wanted to thank the design team for their innovation and was sorry that the Commission could not give them their desired result, but the Commission is constrained by what the statute says and she encouraged them to work with the owner and the City to come up with a solution.

**04/25/19-3 Review of Proposed Fiscal Year 2020 – 2024 Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)**

**Public Works Director Stephanie Katsouleas** greeted the Commission and introduced **City Engineer Prem Kumar**, who will be presenting the CIP.

**City Engineer Kumar** introduced the other Public Works staff in the audience who contributed to the CIP. He said the CIP includes various projects, such as street, water and building improvements, wastewater, parks, and also includes studies, evaluations and other right-of-way issues. He then proceeded to summarize the staff report.

**City Engineer Kumar** explained there are eight CIP funding categories, some of which are considered enterprise funds that have a very specific use. He added that all the work is being performed by seven full-time City staff engineers and said City Council approved those positions in order to get the projects done. He proceeded to outline the different funds, noting that Peck Reservoir was a larger scale project.

**Commissioner Longhurst** asked if there are any plans to take the old water tower down.

**City Engineer Kumar** said no, the tower is still a viable component of the City's water system; it modulates the water pressure. He added the tank will be repainted soon.

**Chair Paralusz** asked about the Ocean Drive Pedestrian Crossings, because it is the first time she heard of the project.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** explained a few years ago there was substantial interest in creating enhanced crosswalks at walkstreet locations, connecting over Ocean Drive and onto The Strand.

**City Engineer Kumar** said there are a total of 25 crossings on Ocean Drive, and the City is seeking out grant money to supplement the cost of those improvements. He is optimistic in

finding a grant because the crosswalks help bring people to the beach. He proceeded to talk about funds for stormwater and wastewater.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked if the storm drain and sewer improvements could be annotated as environmental projects in order to further the City's lead in environmental sustainability.

**City Engineer Kumar** said he agrees that would be favorable and would look into it.

**Commissioner Delk** asked about the construction status of Fire Station No. 2.

**City Engineer Kumar** said the project is currently in design and awaiting the new Fire Chief's approval. He expects the design to be completed by year-end and then proceed with the bidding process.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked for clarification on the Senior and Scout House, specifically what the City is contributing to the project.

**City Engineer Kumar** explained the total contribution is \$1 million, which includes fees abatement and hard construction dollars. The Scouts are to complete a design by a certain timeframe and then the City will discuss how to allocate those dollars.

**Commissioner Delk** asked about the City Hall remodel.

**Public Works Director Katsouleas** said it mostly consists of interior reconfigurations to create new space, specifically a training room, in preparation for implementing the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software for Finance and permitting systems. Many other spaces in City Hall had to be reconfigured in order to make the training room.

**City Engineer Kumar** opened up to Commissioner questions and comments, and reminded them their action is to Receive and File.

**Commissioner Delk** said he was going to mention under Commissioner Items the graffiti and trash problems at the El Porto parking lot. He inquired how often the lot gets cleaned.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said that is more of a maintenance issue, not CIP item. He said he would follow up with staff on that matter.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked about the two northbound left turn lanes on Sepulveda Boulevard at Manhattan Beach Boulevard, and inquired why the cost was so high.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** confirmed the amount at \$1.24 million, and explained the cost includes design, construction, right-of-way costs, street and sidewalk widening.

**Chair Paralusz** asked what part of Rowell Avenue was getting a new sidewalk. **Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** responded the segment just south of Pennekamp Elementary School.

**Commissioner Franklin** suggested the slurry seal notice be revised to not say "annual."

**Chair Paralusz** said that the new ADA curb at the intersection of Marine and Rowell Avenue made the street too bumpy on the southwest corner. A driver may be compelled to travel in the opposite lane in order to maneuver safely around the ramp.

**City Engineer Kumar** said he is aware of the issue and agreed the curb needs further correction.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he frequently gets questions from the public about when their street will be repaved, and asked if the information was available online.

**Public Works Director Katsouleas** said everything is available online in two places. The City calendar, which can be accessed from the homepage, contains public meeting dates for all the active projects. In addition, the Engineering page has the entire CIP program with an interactive map.

**Chair Paralusz** received and filed.

## **G. OTHER ITEMS**

### **04/25/19-4 Monthly Revenue and Expenditure Reports: Receive and File**

Received and Filed.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked if there were any updates on the parking meter fee increase, and if the City was getting the anticipated revenue.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said it is too early to tell but he could start preparing month-to-month reports comparing prior years, if the Commission desires.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked why parking restriction hours increased at City Hall, extending it to 5:00 p.m. when it used to be restricted until 3:00 p.m.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** explained it was partly for security reasons and also to provide parking for library and City Hall employees during the day. Parking has become more difficult over the years, where employees returning from the field cannot find a spot and have to park elsewhere in Downtown. He also mentioned the gates being installed will make it clear when the parking is open to the public. He added the entire parking lot is open whenever there is a night meeting and all weekend long.

**Commissioner Franklin** said he worked on the bond measure for the public safety facility, and it was presented as an all-day public parking lot with some spots for staff. He is concerned about the public perception because it is the general public paying for it.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said the general public is also paying for employees to work. If employees cannot find parking, that means they are not working and also taking up spaces in some other area of the City. He assured the spaces are being used and no loss of parking is occurring; the parking is just being reallocated for library and City employees.

### **04/25/19-5 Staff Updates**

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** asked what the Commission would like an update on.  
**Chair Paralusz** requested an update on the Manhattan Village Mall.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said the mall is in Phase 2, and completed the northeast deck and Macy's. The south deck parking structure is now under construction along with the south shops that will be part of the central plaza area. The parking structure will provide 200 additional spaces, and eight more shops will be created along with an anchor restaurant next to CPK. Phase 3 is currently in plan review, which includes the north deck and shops in that area.

Discussion followed on mall parking, Wells Fargo turning into a steakhouse, Urban Plates, Olive Garden parking area and reopening Cedar Way driveway.

**Chair Paralusz** said the temporary speedhumps placed near Urban Plates and Chili's area may cause a hazard. Drivers sometimes go into the opposite lane in order to avoid driving over the bump. This could be dangerous due to there being a blind turn.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said he can let the mall contractors know and suggested to align the speed hump across the entire street.

**Commissioner Franklin** commented on the relocated street near the medical office, and how the traffic backs up for drivers when someone is waiting to make a left turn onto Village Drive. He asked if a right-turn lane could be put there for drivers who want to access Parkview Avenue.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said the mall could consider that if there is enough demand, but they would have to widen the street. He said the decision is ultimately up to the mall because that street is private property.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked who he should speak with to bring up this issue. **Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** suggested he speak with mall management.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** continued his updates by noting upcoming items that will be going to the Commission in the next few months:

- Citywide crosswalk evaluation that would examine existing and potential locations
- Scooters and bike share; current ban expires in January, looking at regulating
- Telecom ordinance in June
- Revision to all private parking standards for commercial areas only, factoring in electric vehicles, carpool or fuel-efficient cars; and examining what is appropriate now.

**Chair Paralusz** said she liked the improvements around Meadows Avenue, especially the lighted crosswalk, but questioned why two stop signs are on at least two corners.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** explained the old stop signs have not been removed yet.

Discussion continued on the crosswalks around Meadows School.

**Commissioner Delk** asked about North End parking meter signs that say “Curb your Wheels”, and why those signs are not placed on every space where it is required. He one day observed a parking enforcement officer using a leveler.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** agreed the signs should be on every space that requires wheel curbing because the general public does not know that the grade is. These signs should be addressed when the new parking meter signs are installed.

Discussion continued on curbing wheels.

**Commissioner Delk** asked if City Hall is open every Friday now. **Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said yes, and explained the new Friday hours being 7:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m., and the expected staffing levels.

**Commissioner Franklin** asked about the private school bus situation on 17<sup>th</sup> Street just west of Poinsettia Avenue adjacent to Pacific School, and asked if it was referred to the police.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** said he and police are working on the issue. Signs are posted prohibiting parking of large vehicles. All four private schools were contacted and put on notice that they cannot use 17<sup>th</sup> Street for drop-off/pick-up zones. A safer alternative has been suggested to the school to use private parking lots, but some parents may object because it would be a different location.

Discussion continued on other school bus loading locations.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet** also explained to Commissioner Franklin that small car spaces would be addressed in the Downtown Parking Management Update under curb management, which examines how to make the best use of curb space.

#### **04/25/19-6 Commissioner Items**

Commissioner Items were included under Staff Updates.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at **7:52 p.m.** to the adjourned Parking and Public Improvements Commission Meeting on **Thursday, May 30, 2019**, in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City. (The regular meeting of May 23, 2019 has been rescheduled due to the City Council Budget Study Session occurring on the same evening).

/s/Kathleen Paralusz

**Kathleen Paralusz**

Chairperson

/s/Angela Soo Seilhamer

**Angela Soo Seilhamer**

Recording Secretary

/s/Erik Zandvliet

**Erik Zandvliet**

Secretary to the Parking and Public Improvements Commission