

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH PARKING AND PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
February 26, 2009**

**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 26<sup>th</sup> day of February 2009, at the hour of 6:38 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Present: Adami, Vigon, Stabile, Silverman and Chairman Gross.  
Absent: None.  
Staff Present: Danna, Zandvliet.  
Clerk: Weeks.

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**02/26/09-1    January 22, 2009**

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Adami/Stabile) to approve the minutes of January 22, 2009 as written.

**D. CEREMONIAL**

The Commission and staff welcomed newly-appointed Parking and Public Improvements Commissioner Carlos Vigon.

**E. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

None.

**F. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**02/26/09-2    North Manhattan Beach Valet Parking Program**

Assistant Planner Danna presented the staff report. He related the staff recommendation that the Commission conduct a public hearing and recommend that the City enter into an agreement with the North End Business Improvement District (District) and Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge for use of public parking spaces as identified, and the Public Works yard parking lot, for the North Manhattan Beach Valet Parking Program. He advised that the District would be required to reimburse the City for meter revenues lost when metered spaces are used and the meters are operable; that the proposed route to and from the drop-off/pick-up site and the vehicle storage site would be Highland Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue and

Bell Avenue; that driving through residential areas would be minimal; and that notification of this public hearing was placed in two editions of the Beach Reporter and mailed to residents and property owners within 300 feet of the drop-off/pick-up location, as well as residents and property owners in the vicinity of the proposed route for transporting cars to the storage facility. Mr. Danna reported that, due to concerns expressed by the Parks and Recreation Department over the potential impact on parking at Sand Dune Park received after the completion of the staff report, staff recommends approval of a trial period during the low season until May 31, 2009, during which time, staff would study additional parking demands in the neighborhood, make adjustments to the program and expand the notification area to appropriate neighborhoods.

Prior to receiving input from the public, the Commission discussed the dates of public events in the North End; the program's lack of financial impact on the City; the legality of volunteering the use of public property for private/commercial purposes; the importance of ensuring against the valet company's use of residential streets, U-turns on Highland Avenue and maintaining traffic flow; the lack of definitive routes to the proposed drop-off/pick-up site; the very limited parking in the area; and the idea of employees who work in the North End parking at the National Guard Armory.

Assistant Planner Danna clarified the following: that the Valet Parking Program would be modeled after the successful valet program in the Downtown area; that the City Attorney would be involved in the agreement between the valet company and the District/Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge, which could be terminated at any time; that the fenced Public Works parking lot has approximately 50 to 60 spaces and the unfenced lot has approximately 30 spaces, for which the Armory gives the City access until approximately 4:30 p.m.; and that the Armory's approval would be necessary for valet service employees to park there. Mr. Danna described the route proposed from the Public Works yard to 3600 Highland Avenue, noting that the use of residential streets would be kept to a minimum, and he reiterated staff's recommendation that the Valet Program be implemented for a trial period until May 31, 2009, during which time resident feedback could be addressed.

### **Audience Participation**

Chairman Gross opened the public hearing at 6:49 p.m.

**Francey Seckinger, 1467 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, #2**, resident and member of the North End Business Improvement District, shared information about two trial runs of the Valet Program, including that off-duty Manhattan Beach Police Officers paid by the District to monitor the trials did not find any problems. She discussed that overflow parking could be double stacked and/or parked in the parking facility at Bell Avenue; that the valet company has insurance; and that the District would prefer a beginning time of 6:00 p.m. on Thursday and Friday so employees would have time to vacate the Public Works yard parking lot. She described the proposed routes to and from the proposed pick-up/drop-off site and affirmed that a prohibition against driving on residential streets could be part of the contract between the valet company and the District/Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge.

Assistant Planner Danna verified that the Valet Parking Program would include an indemnity agreement; that staff is unaware of any problems during the past year with the Downtown valet program; and that the Fire Department did not object to the use of the red curb near the fire hydrant for parking, as cars parked there could be moved if need be.

Chairman Gross disclosed that he recently discussed the Program with Ms. Seckinger and other interested individuals at a meeting. He called attention to the City Council's positive discussion of the Downtown valet program.

**Melissa Enriquez Roy, 3504 Highland Avenue, Chairman of the District and Owing Sur La Mer**, explained that valet parking is the District's top priority, as it is in the best interest of businesses and would generate increased patronage, and that some North End business owners have entertained the idea of validating valet parking with purchase.

**Jim Dillorou, 36<sup>th</sup> Street and Alma Avenue**, related his substantial concerns over increased traffic, especially with the many children in the area. He discussed that, during the test periods, the valet cars made many U-turns on Highland Avenue; that valet parking is available nearby at Pancho's; and that he could agree with the proposed Program if traffic would be prohibited on Alma Avenue.

**Sean Stuyweness (No Address Provided)** emphasized that parking in the North End is a big issue and that the proposed valet hours should be increased to help businesses. He felt that \$10.00 for parking is very expensive and would be beneficial to the Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge, but not to other businesses, and indicated that he could support anything that will ease traffic and the use of parking meters.

**A speaker whose name was inaudible, 34<sup>th</sup> Street**, pointed out that, while this idea is interesting, the path of travel is very important, but it was not given.

Assistant Planner Danna and Traffic Engineer Zandvliet offered information about the anticipated timeline for the valet program.

**Jennifer Orona, El Porto Street**, stated her concerns over the potential for increased back-up traffic on northbound Highland Avenue with only two parking spaces for the valet cars; the potential for increased traffic on residential streets; the trial period only during the low season; and the possibility that beachgoers would utilize the valet parking. She said she could support a Valet Program without impacts.

**Mike Quagletti, Owner of Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge**, explained the origination of the proposed Valet Parking Program because North End patrons must drive around, even through residential areas, to find parking. He affirmed that the idea of utilizing after-hours' parking was not well received by North End businesses.

**Wendy Triggs, Lomita**, suggested using shuttle buses instead of valet cars.

Chairman Gross closed the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained that the idea of utilizing shuttle buses on a City-wide basis was examined, but involves a huge capital investment; that, because the Program would be very limited, the capital investment required for shuttle buses would not be cost effective and the valet service would allow for fluctuations in demand; that other parking would be required for shuttle buses; and that the proposed Valet Program would utilize approximately eight parking spaces.

## Commission Discussion

Commissioner Silverman commented on the travel path and the Police Department's presence during the test periods; the issue of U-turns on Highland Avenue; and concerns over potential impact on residential streets, particularly with children playing. It was his opinion that the benefits of the Valet Parking Program would outweigh the problems and he related his support, with the caveat that the City must be vigilant in ensuring that traffic in the residential areas, and on Highland Avenue, is not impacted.

Commissioner Stabile discussed that, while he supports valet parking in principle, the proposed Program does not include enough details, especially the return path, and the valets would either cut through the residential areas or make U-turns on Highland Avenue; that consideration should be given to a trial period during the high season, in that different traffic problems are presented during that time; and that U-turns on Highland Avenue could be prevented with a drop off site on the west side of the street.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet advised that the contract between the valet company and the District/Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge could include a requirement for a specific path of travel; that U-turns on Highland Avenue could be prevented by dropping off patrons on one side of the street and picking them up on the other; that the area in front of Pancho's could be a drop off site; and that consideration must be given to a parking area for the transport vehicle.

It was Commissioner Adami's viewpoint that, while valet parking is a great idea, more details are necessary before making a determination; that drop off options on Rosecrans Avenue should be explored; that the trial period should be during the high season; that a decision should not be rushed; that the safety of children would be of great concern if the program was to begin before 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays; that beginning after 6:00 p.m. would also eliminate the problem of beachgoers using the Program; and that the contract requirements could be examined by the Commission prior to beginning the trial period.

Commissioner Vigon expressed his agreement with valet parking to parlay existing limited space into more parking, but the proposed Program does not include enough details. He contended that there should be three valet parking spaces instead of two and that the trial period should be expanded to six months during the high season. Commissioner Vigon pointed out that traffic flow on Highland Avenue is already impaired by the valet parking across the street at Pancho's; that patrons would have to wait for their cars because the valet parking is far away from the pick up site, which could lead to lack of use; that a large valet parking fee would discourage beachgoers; that the metered lot in the area could be used; and that the travel path could be further studied.

Chairman Gross stated his desire to give firm direction to staff this evening in order to keep the Program moving along. He viewed a two-month trial period during the low season as an opportunity to discover problems and better plan out the details during a time of minimal impact on residential areas and agreed with a car drop off site on the east side of Highland Avenue at 36<sup>th</sup> Street and a car pick up site on the west side of Highland Avenue in front of Pancho's.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet cautioned that various areas on Rosecrans Avenue have an incline and the drop off site should be flat. He reiterated that the contract with the valet company could be terminated for any reason and affirmed that the trial period could be during the high season, but there would be more of an opportunity to refine the Program during the off

season. Mr. Zandvliet verified that the distance between the pick up site and where cars would be parked would be as far as it can be for the Valet Program to be successful and he advised that the Commission could provide staff with direction on the requirements for a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the valet company and the District/Upper Manhattan Restaurant and Lounge, which could be reviewed at the next Parking and Public Improvements Commission meeting.

Lt. Harrod related the Police Department's objection to double stacking vehicles, concern over U-turns and traffic backing up on Highland Avenue and the potential impact on residential streets. He emphasized the importance of a clear traffic plan and holding the valet company accountable to the plan and stated the Department's plans to provide enforcement, support of an extended trial period and desire to work closely with the valet company to better understand related challenges.

The Commission agreed that the valet parking hours on Saturdays should be from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. in that residential areas would be impacted with drivers looking for parking, and discussed the idea of providing disincentives for beachgoers to use valet parking.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained the difficulty of providing disincentives for beachgoers to use valet parking due to the Coastal Zone requirement that parking must be available to everyone on an equal basis.

**Francey Seckinger** asked the Commission to forward the proposed valet parking program to the City Council this evening.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Stabile moved to authorize staff to move forward with a memorandum of understanding for valet parking in the North End Business Improvement District with the following requirements:

1. That the valet program shall not utilize residential streets;
2. That back-up traffic on Highland Avenue shall be avoided;
3. That there shall be no stacked parking;
4. That, if the Public Works yard lot becomes full, the valet parking must either be shut down or other parking lots (such as the National Guard Armory) must be utilized;
5. That the valet shuttle vehicle, its return path and where it is parked shall be defined;
6. That the route to and from the drop off and pick up sites shall be defined;
7. That the drop off site shall be on the east side of the street at 3600 Highland Avenue;
8. That the pick up site shall be on the west side of the street in front of Pancho's;
9. That disincentives for beachgoers to use the valet parking shall be explored; and
10. That the contract between the valet company and the North End Business Improvement District and the Upper Manhattan Lounge and Restaurant shall be for a six-month trial period, with a review after three months and the understanding that the contract can be extended beyond six months with the mutual agreement of the parties.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Adami and passed by unanimous roll call vote as shown below:

Ayes: Adami, Vigon, Stabile, Silverman and Chairman Gross.  
Noes: None.  
Abstain: None.  
Absent: None.

Chairman Gross announced that the MOU will be considered at the Parking and Public Improvements Commission meeting on March 26, 2009 and that the meeting agenda will be available at City Hall, the Library and the City's website on March 20<sup>th</sup>.

### **RECESS AND RECONVENE**

At 8:15 p.m., there was a recess until 8:25 p.m., when the meeting reconvened in regular agenda order with all Commissioners present.

### **02/26/09-3 Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor Parking Restriction Study**

Chairman Gross explained that this item is presented for discussion this evening and that it will be discussed at approximately three Parking and Public Improvements Commission meetings.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet presented background information on the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor Parking Restriction Study. He advised that this is a fact-finding meeting; that approximately 1,200 notices of this meeting were mailed to property owners along Sepulveda Boulevard and one street off of Sepulveda Boulevard; that residents expressed concerns over cut-through traffic and speeding; that a separate priority item is to examine neighborhoods adjacent to and west of Sepulveda Boulevard; that parking on Sepulveda Boulevard is affected by drivers' fear of accidents, but there are no accident patterns in one particular area on Sepulveda; and that, based on the Commission's direction, recommendations would be presented at the next Parking and Public Improvements Commission meeting. Mr. Zandvliet related staff's recommendation that the Commission review the initial findings of the Study, receive public input and provide direction to staff for further analysis and preparation of parking and traffic measures.

At the Commission's request, Traffic Engineer Zandvliet used overhead photographs to review existing parking conditions on Sepulveda Boulevard. He advised that there are approximately 200 parking spaces on the west side of Sepulveda Boulevard and 100 on the east side; that approximately 50% of the east side and approximately 25% on the west side of Sepulveda Boulevard is designated as "no parking;" that the majority of businesses on Sepulveda Boulevard have private parking; that localized areas with parking issues involve large office buildings, daycare centers, auto repair businesses and businesses with small parking lots, or those with lots that are difficult to access; that cars parked in the residential areas are primarily associated with office buildings; and that traffic problems are created by drivers picking up children at a daycare center on Oak Avenue at Manhattan Beach Boulevard;

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet related staff's general opinion that a large overflow parking problem in the neighborhoods adjacent to Sepulveda Boulevard does not exist; that the removal of parking on Sepulveda Boulevard would exacerbate existing problems; and that the majority of cut-through traffic on Oak Avenue is from residents. He recommended that the City's two capital projects to add dual left-turn lanes at two intersections along Sepulveda Boulevard, Cal Trans' desire to restrict parking on the west side of Sepulveda Boulevard at Marine Avenue and require a second left-turn lane for an increased turning radius for large trucks at that intersection be taken into consideration. He explained Cal Trans' contemplation of removing all parking along Sepulveda in Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach and clarified that the City Council forwarded this item to the Commission with the thought that improving traffic movement through the City will divert cut-through traffic in residential streets.

Commissioner Vigon state his viewpoint that there would be no point in removing parking on Sepulveda Boulevard to improve traffic flow without doing the same in adjacent cities; that there are other ways to solve traffic flow problems; and that it seems the City of Manhattan Beach would be better at controlling Sepulveda Boulevard than the State.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained that control of Sepulveda Boulevard could be relinquished back to the City; but, doing so would result in the City incurring maintenance costs; that the Sepulveda bridge over Veteran's Parkway could be widened to the full width in each direction; and that the City does not have the ability to implement permit parking in areas other than Downtown or Mira Costa High School.

### **Audience Participation**

Chairman Gross opened the public hearing at 9:15 p.m.

**Wendy Triggs, Lomita, Bay Animal Hospital Manager**, described where employees of the Animal Hospital currently park on side streets near Sepulveda Boulevard and she voiced her concern that, should parking on Sepulveda be restricted, they will park in the residential areas.

**Steve Finestone, , Manhattan Postal Center, 2711 N. Sepulveda Boulevard**, informed the Commission of the limited parking for his business. He noted that his customers park on Sepulveda Boulevard until approximately 3:00 p.m. and that, should parking be removed, Sepulveda will become a bigger race track.

**Dave Salzman, Owing a Real Estate Business at 1509 N. Sepulveda Boulevard**, agreed that the removal of parking on Sepulveda Boulevard would significantly impact residential streets, especially Pine Avenue.

**Mori Biener, CTJ Congregation, 1829 N. Sepulveda Boulevard**, stated the Congregation's need for parking on Sepulveda Boulevard, particularly on Friday nights and Saturday mornings, and he asked what is wrong with the system as it is at this time.

Chairman Gross explained that traffic backs up near signalized intersections on Sepulveda Boulevard and that, if parking is removed near some of the intersections, traffic flow would be improved.

Chairman Gross closed the public hearing at 9:35 p.m.

## Commission Discussion

Commissioner Silverman related his understanding that there have been several accidents near on Sepulveda Boulevard near 10<sup>th</sup> Street, near Versailles Restaurant. He noted that Councilmember Ward, who has an office on Sepulveda Boulevard, has discussed various parking issues on that street; that he anticipates the ultimate decision will include no changes, but it is important to have further information; and that it is important for businesses on Sepulveda Boulevard to survive.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet explained the visibility restrictions at 10<sup>th</sup> Street and Sepulveda Boulevard, noting that this is not a problem all hours of the day and that parking is restricted there during peak periods. He advised that, should parking on Sepulveda Boulevard be restricted, traffic speeds would increase, and that the demand is not great enough to remove parking to allow for four lanes from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Mr. Zandvliet further advised that the intersection of Rosecrans Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard is saturated with an "F" level of service and, by removing some parking near the intersection, traffic flow would improve without impacting the rest of the street.

Chairman Gross pointed out that business associations such as the Downtown and North End Business Improvement Districts provide great assistance in identifying problems and coming up with solution; encouraged business owners along Sepulveda Boulevard to consider forming an association; and requested input on the Commission's ability to require the formation of a Sepulveda Boulevard Business Improvement District. Commissioner Gross noted that there is a lot of underutilized parking on Sepulveda Boulevard and that there are traffic problems at the major intersections during most of the daylight hours. He recommended that the Commission direct staff to explore and define parking to be eliminated to improve traffic flow at the major intersections (Artesia Boulevard, Marine Avenue, Rosecrans Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard) at all times, including how much parking would be lost and how much is in critical areas.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet suggested that business owners along Sepulveda Boulevard contact the Chamber of Commerce to discuss organizing a Business Improvement District and that a recommendation to form this type of organization could be made, but such a requirement must come from the Council.

Commissioner Vigon commented on the need to discuss what staff should analyze and he questioned the impetus for improving the flow of traffic on Sepulveda Boulevard. He stated his impression that there are alternatives to removing parking on Sepulveda, such as permit parking in residential areas, and suggested that staff explore whether removing parking would really help traffic flow.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet reiterated the importance of protecting neighborhoods. He explained that the question is whether the benefit of removing parking is outweighed by the consequences and that one of the ways to lessen impact on residential streets is to make the main streets flow better would be to restrict turns into neighborhoods, but residents would be restricted as well.

Commissioner Adami suggested that the idea of removing parking from Manhattan Beach Boulevard to Marine Avenue be examined. He highlighted that the first priority is to take care of Manhattan Beach residents and related his feeling that no changes should be made on Sepulveda Boulevard from Manhattan Beach Boulevard to Marine Avenue.

Commissioner Stabile stated his confusion over the lack of a guiding principle or clearly-stated priority with regard to this matter. He expressed his understanding that the Council would like to further restrict parking on Sepulveda Boulevard in response to pressure from Cal Trans and that they would like the Parking and Public Improvements Commission to take the first cut at it.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet clarified that the Council is asking the Commission to provide reasons to either remove or retain parking on Sepulveda Boulevard.

Commissioner Silverman recommended that residents and businesses on Sepulveda Boulevard be surveyed.

**Mr. Salzman** discussed the importance of balancing interests. He explained that, during the greater part of the business day, neither the neighborhoods nor the traffic flow on Sepulveda Boulevard are severely impacted with only two lanes, but they would be if parking on Sepulveda Boulevard is restricted.

It was Chairman Gross' contention that some amount of change to the balance on Sepulveda Boulevard should be brought forward to improve traffic flow during non-peak hours (parking is already restricted during peak hours); but, all parking should not be eliminated. However, he suggested that the idea of eliminating parking on both sides of Sepulveda and the impacts this would have on cut-through traffic and commercial businesses be examined in order to provide definitive information to the Council.

Commissioner Vigon recommended that the actions that would have to be taken in the neighborhoods from a parking and traffic standpoint to eliminate the impact without changing parking restrictions on Sepulveda Boulevard be explored.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet advised that this could be done from an anecdotal standpoint, but it could not be quantified; and that residents would prefer cut-through traffic and turning restrictions over parking permits.

Commissioner Stabile pointed out that no residents were present at the meeting to provide input.

Commissioner Silverman mentioned the importance of knowing which businesses on Sepulveda Boulevard would be most impacted if parking was completely removed and he noted questioned if there is a location along Sepulveda where there could be three lanes all of the time.

Chairman Gross related his understanding that the majority of the Commission would agree not to change the current parking configuration on Sepulveda and he recommended that staff be asked to provide information on why it would be wrong for it to remain status quo.

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet proposed that, since the full range of the impacts is not known, the Commission direct staff to examine extremes, such as not removing parking, to see what would have to be done to protect the neighborhoods and, conversely, completely removing parking to identify the areas that would be significantly impacted, and for what reasons. It was his opinion that individual intersections need not be analyzed.

Commissioner Adami noted that approximately 1200 meeting notices were mailed, but only five business owners attended the meeting, and that, because the most significant problem appears to be between 6<sup>th</sup> Street to Marine Avenue, alternatives for this segment could be examined

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet suggested that the lack of attendance signifies that many people do not think there is a problem on Sepulveda Boulevard. With regard to the idea of surveying residents and business owners, he indicated that it would be beneficial to know areas where parking could be removed and opinions about completely removing parking.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Vigon moved to direct staff to explore preserving existing parking conditions and the measures that would be necessary to protect the neighborhoods from cut-through traffic and completely removing parking on Sepulveda Boulevard and the potential impacts on the neighborhoods and businesses, as well as any potential benefits of both. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stabile and passed by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Silverman questioned what would be asked on a survey, the cost and the benefits. The Commission agreed to discuss the idea of a survey at a future meeting

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet advised that this item will be returned for the Commission's consideration in the near future.

**G. COMMISSION ITEMS**

**01/22/09-4 Parking Meter Revenues and Traffic Violation Revenue Report**

Received and filed.

**Commissioner Silverman Re Parking Meter Rates**

Commissioner Silverman related his understanding of many concerns over the increase in parking meter rates to \$1.25.

**Commissioner Silverman Re Directional Signage**

In response to a question from Commissioner Silverman, Assistant Planner Danna provided input on the temporary directional signage installed near the Metlox development and on the Sign Subcommittee's plans to review permanent sign layouts in the near future.

**Chairman Gross Re Timer**

Chairman Gross asked staff to provide a digital timer in order to help enforce speakers' three-minute time limits.

**Chairman Gross Re Emptying Parking Meters**

Chairman Gross related his understanding that some of the parking meters in the Downtown area are not being emptied, which results in a loss of revenue. He noted that the main goal of changes made to Downtown parking was to encourage drivers to park in other places. He asked staff to monitor whether this is the case.

Lt. Harrod verified that the Police Department is addressing the emptying of the parking meters and will update the Commission.

**H. STAFF ITEMS**

**Assistant Planner Danna Re Form 700**

Assistant Planner Danna reminded the Commissioners to submit their Form 700s to the City Clerk's office by March 27<sup>th</sup>.

**Traffic Engineer Zandvliet Re Residential Parking Permit Override Program**

Traffic Engineer Zandvliet advised that the Residential Parking Permit Override Program for the area east of Ardmore Avenue is scheduled to begin on April 1<sup>st</sup>.

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.