MINUTES

HUNTINGTON BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2009
HUNTINGTON BEACH CIVIC CENTER
2000 MAIN STREET, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92648

5:15 P.M. – COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO ORDER

	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
ROLL CALL:	*Speaker,*	*Mantini,*	*Farley,*	*Shier Burnett,*	*Scandura,*	*Livengood,*	*Delgleize*

AGENDA APPROVAL

A MOTION WAS MADE BY SCANDURA, SECONDED BY LIVENGOOD, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION AGENDA OF JULY 28, 2009, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: **Speaker, Mantini, Farley, Shier Burnett, Scandura, Livengood, Delgleize**
NOES: **None**
ABSENT: **None**
ABSTAIN: **None**

MOTION APPROVED

Chair Shier Burnett and Commissioner Speaker recused themselves from the discussion on Item No. A-1 and left the room.

A. PROJECT REVIEW (FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS)

A-1. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 08-001/GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 08-007/LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT NO. 08-002/ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 08-004 (DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE/PARKING) – Jennifer Villasenor, Associate Planner

Jennifer Villasenor, Associate Planner, reviewed the items distributed to the Planning Commission. Bill Dvorak, consultant with Kimley-Horn & Associates, gave a brief overview of the proposed project.

Commissioner Scandura asked staff if Table No. 2 on Page 5 was above and beyond the current square footage or if it was included in the current numbers. Ms. Villasenor indicated that Table No. 2 was referring to net new development beyond the existing development. Commissioner Scandura noted that the current parking standards for restaurant uses is 10 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. and that the recommendation would lower that to 8 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. He asked staff to

explain the basis for the recommended reduction. Mr. Dvorak stated that some restaurants in the downtown area had significant pedestrian traffic which led to a reduced recommended standard and noted that he was still in discussion with staff regarding this recommendation.

Commissioner Scandura noted the parking strategies listed in the parking study included using private underutilized lots. He asked if that strategy was included in the Downtown Specific Plan Update. Mr. Dvorak indicated that his staff did research the possibilities of renting private lots

Stanley Smalewitz, Director of Economic Development, indicated that staff had been in discussions with private land owners regarding interim parking lots and have had Development Assistance Team meetings regarding the possibility. He indicated that the improvements required to use those lots would have initial capital costs that would outweigh the benefits of the use.

Commissioner Scandura stated that he was amenable to the idea of remote lots but wondered if the availability of spaces was being overestimated. He said that he was concerned that modifying the parking rates might encourage the public to visit beach cities with lower rates. He requested that color copies of pages 22 through 24 of the Downtown Parking Study be provided to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Mantini asked for the rationale behind the reduced ratio of residential guest spaces and hotel spaces. Mr. Dvorak indicated that part of the recommendation for reducing the residential guest ratio is increasing the available modes of transportation. Commissioner Mantini asked if this recommendation was then dependent on transportation strategies and therefore might not be appropriate. Mr. Dvorak noted that there is a trend in California for reduced vehicle ownership and felt the ratio reduction was appropriate.

Serine Ciandella, consultant with Kimley-Horn, stated that a survey of cities supported a small reduction in hotel guest spaces, provided that alternative transportation was provided. Commissioner Mantini asked if the difference between the larger hotels such as the Hyatt and the Hilton were taken into account with this recommendation. Ms. Ciandella indicated that the recommendation was intended for smaller hotels and Commissioner Mantini stated that this distinction was not made in the information provided.

Commissioner Mantini asked if the view from the beach itself was taken into account in regards to beach parking. Ms. Smalewitz noted that staff has been looking at projects with similar parking structures and that the varying types of sheathing available create an art element to the structure. He stated that a formal design would be required to go through Design Review Board for approval. Commissioner Mantini asked that examples be provided to her.

Commissioner Livengood asked if the proposed cultural center had possible underground parking. Mr. Dvorak confirmed this. Commissioner Livengood asked if this proposed parking would be utilized for overflow parking. Mr. Dvorak indicated that it could be.

Commissioner Livengood expressed concern over possible cost for downtown retail and restaurant employee parking and asked if there was any strategy to

address this issue. Mr. Dvorak indicated that free employee parking was not recommended and is inconsistent with the overall plan. He stated that remote parking for the employees would be recommended.

Commissioner Livengood asked if part of the parking strategy included eliminating the parking along Main and 5th Street. Eric Justesen, lead consultant with RRM Design, indicated that the streetscape improvements recommended for that area would encourage greater pedestrian traffic and reduce that available street parking in that area. Commissioner Livengood stated that reduced parking in that area would have an adverse effect on businesses and asked staff to do an outreach to those businesses. Mr. Smalewitz stated that staff has done an outreach regarding this matter with local businesses, including several workshops with the Business Improvement District Board. He noted the recommended streetscape improvements would include wider sidewalks to reduce pedestrian congestion and increase circulation.

Commissioner Livengood indicated that two separate business owners had contacted him recently and been unaware of these recommendations. He is concerned that the differences between the December 2008 draft and the July 2009 draft have not been related to the public.

Commissioner Livengood asked if there was a recommendation to increase parking along the bluffs. Mr. Dvorak indicated that there was not.

Commissioner Livengood stated that the July 2008 market study recommends less onsite parking and more offsite parking and stated that those recommendations were in conflict with the parking analysis recommendations. He stated that he would like staff to look into how the market study would impact the onsite parking ratios.

Commissioner Livengood asked that the Strand parking fees be included in the report and noted that 2nd Street and 5th Street were left out of the report. He asked for that to be corrected.

Commissioner Delgleize asked who would own the proposed trolley/shuttle service and if it would be a joint venture with the city. She also asked if there would be security for late night users. Mr. Smalewitz indicated that staff had been researching the possibility of remote parking lots with bus service but that the cost would be prohibitive. He indicated that staff is now looking into hiring an established company and that security has not been looked into as of yet. Commissioner Delgleize asked when that information would be available and Mr. Smalewitz indicated that the information would not be available until the implementation phase.

Commissioner Livengood briefly discussed the overall square footage included in the proposal.

Mr. Fauland reported on the square footage and indicated that the boundaries for the districts in the proposed specific plan do differ from the previous specific plans. He cautioned the Commission against comparing the square footages from previous plans for this reason. He indicated that staff research reveals that the proposed square footage is similar to the original 1983 Downtown Specific Plan until the plan was revised in 1995.

Commissioner Livengood indicated that the square footage reduction between the 1983 and 1995 Downtown Specific Plans were due to the decision to create a "village concept" for the area.

Commissioner Scandura stated that he was concerned about the cost to downtown employees for parking and asked staff to be mindful of the cost.

Vice-Chair Farley asked what the threshold was for acceptable parking ratios. Mr. Dvorak indicated that at 70% occupied, new parking should be researched, at 80% occupied, new parking should be in the design/construction process, and at 90% occupied, occupancy is considered full. He noted that the methodology involves examining turnover rates which impacts the threshold numbers.

Mr. Dvorak stated that 1700 spaces would be needed to accommodate current and net new development. He indicated that better management of the current spaces would improve the parking situation downtown.

Vice-Chair Farley asked if the addition of bike spaces would reduce the number of needed parking spaces. Mr. Dvorak confirmed this but noted that it was not a one to one replacement. He noted that during the course of the analysis he heard multiple requests for increased bike parking.

Commissioner Delgleize asked if the parking plan addressed how to better utilize the upper levels of the Main Street parking structure and if there were bike rack placement recommendations. Mr. Dvorak stated that there were recommendations for the placement of bike racks and the number of racks. Mr. Dvorak recommended additional signage for the upper levels of the parking structure that would indicate the number of available spaces. Commissioner Delgleize asked if incentives for businesses had been considered. Mr. Dvorak agreed that offering incentives were recommended. Mr. Smalewitz stated that management of the parking spaces was vital and encouraged a unified parking strategy. He noted that staff has been working with private parking structure owners towards this goal. Commissioner Delgleize agreed that better management of the current available spaces was needed.

Mr. Fauland noted that the Book Two strategies and recommendations are suggestions, and not a part of the proposed codified Downtown Specific Plan.

Mr. Justesen distributed a handout to the Planning Commission regarding RRM Design's experience in similar projects as requested.

A motion was made by Scandura, seconded by Delgleize, to move public comments after study session Item No. A-1.

AYES: Mantini, Farley, Scandura, Livengood, Delgleize
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Shier Burnett, Speaker
ABSENT: None

MOTION APPROVED

THE MINUTES WILL REFLECT ITEMS IN THEIR ORIGINAL ORDER.

B. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

B-1. PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS – Chair Shier Burnett

Chair Shier Burnett gave an overview of the issues with the project review process. Mr. Fauland gave examples of the difficult time constraints staff is currently working under to meet the required thresholds in the project review process.

Commissioner Livengood stated that his concern of altering the process based on project size or complexity might be unfair to the general public. He suggested that staff compile a list of particular types of projects, such as Subdivision Maps and General Plan Conformance, to be streamlined and that the rule be amended to list those exceptions.

Commissioner Scandura asked if General Plan Conformance and Subdivision Maps require public hearings. Mr. Fauland indicated that General Plan Conformance does not require a public hearing but Subdivision Maps do.

Commissioner Scandura asked if there were examples of non-public hearing items that are controversial. Chair Shier Burnett asked if controversy should be the litmus.

Commissioner Livengood noted that study sessions have the advantage of allowing the public to see the item prior to the hearing. He stated that having a study session was more efficient in that it generally prevents having to call for the continuance of an item.

Vice-Chair Farley asked what the normal processing time for items is for most projects. Mr. Fauland stated that most items are under a 60 day processing timeline, absent an environmental review which could add up to one year to the review time. He noted that General Plan Amendments are not subject to a mandatory processing time.

Vice-Chair Farley asked if one week was sufficient time to notice an additional meeting. Mr. Fauland stated that continuance to a date certain does not require renoticing as long as the agenda is posted in accordance to the timeline guidelines.

Vice-Chair Farley suggested that if the processing time is less than sixty days that the study session and public hearings be held on the same day.

Commissioner Scandura noted that controversial and complex projects require preparation time, including meeting with applicants and the public. He stated that study sessions two weeks prior to the public hearing assist in that preparation. He suggested limiting the same night study session and public hearing to General Plan Conformance only.

Mr. Fauland stated that staff would be willing to provide a list of projects for the Planning Commission's consideration on this matter. He noted that a list might provide better guidance as to what would be in conflict with the project review process timeline. Chair Shier Burnett indicated that she would welcome that as it would allow the Commission a clearer view of the obstacles facing staff. Mr. Fauland noted that staff does provide the Commission with a tentative schedule and staff has now placed a list of pending entitlements on the city website for public information purposes. He noted that this has given staff a better indication as to which items will be controversial.

Chair Shier Burnett suggested that language could be added to note that particular items were not subject to a study session unless requested in order to allow some discretionary power.

Commissioner Speaker noted that items can be continued if need be.

Commissioner Livengood stated that making judgment calls on what items might be controversial and/or complex and need more time creates a problem in that people are being treated differently. He stated that the two week gap between study sessions and public hearings was working well.

Commissioner Scandura noted that continuations create additional expenses for both the city and the applicants. He stated that he feels the two week gap between study sessions and public hearings cuts down on the number of continuations.

Mr. Hess asked the Commission to allow staff to return to the Commission with a list of projects that can be simplified for study session. He noted that study session staff reports in the past were one page overviews and have now evolved into complete analyses and that this has advanced the internal timelines. He stated that if Commission allowed staff to provide that list of items it would allow for possibly streamlining the process. He noted that staff is attempting to provide more information electronically and minimize the use of paper.

Chair Shier Burnett stated that she would like staff to provide that list at the next study session. Mr. Fauland asked for additional time and indicated that staff would aim for the August 11, 2009 meeting. There was a brief discussion of the upcoming meetings and Chair Shier Burnett indicated that a September deadline would be acceptable and that it was up to staff's discretion.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Andrissa Dominguez, resident, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with the preservation of the Main Street Library and surrounding public space, and the proposed redevelopment of the area known as Triangle Park. She cited concerns with parking and the preservation of the "village" atmosphere downtown. She also suggested that staff explore alternate sites for the proposed Cultural Arts Center.

Kim Kramer, on behalf of the Huntington Beach Downtown Residents Association, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with the preservation of the Main Street Library and surrounding public space, and the proposed redevelopment of the area known as Triangle Park.

George Berg, resident at 607 Main Street, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with parking. He asked the Planning Commission to consider allowing permit parking in his neighborhood.

Richardson Gray, resident, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with the preservation of the Main Street Library and surrounding public space, and the proposed redevelopment of the area known as Triangle Park. He asked that the City Attorney provide official clarification as to whether a Measure "C" vote is required to build on the area known as Triangle Park.

Nancy Tucker, resident, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with downtown densification and preserving the existing quality of life for the residents.

Bob Bolen, resident, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with parking and downtown densification.

Richard Plummer, resident by Lake Park, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with downtown densification and parking. He asked staff to provide projected cumulative parking requirement numbers for the Downtown Specific Plan area.

Mary Boddy, resident at 7th Street, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update). She said that there are too many theaters in Huntington Beach and questions the proposed addition of a theater as part of the proposed Cultural Arts Center. She also cited concerns with parking and alcohol sales downtown.

Ron McLin, resident, spoke regarding Item No. A-1 (Downtown Specific Plan Update), citing concerns with alcohol sales, parking and downtown densification.

D. AGENDA REVIEW (UPDATE ON ALL AGENDA ITEMS) – NONE

E. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEE REPORTS - NONE

F. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS - NONE

7:00 PM – RECESS FOR DINNER

7:30 P.M. – COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Led by Commissioner Livengood

	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
ROLL CALL:	*Speaker,*	*Mantini,*	*Farley,*	*Shier Burnett,*	*Scandura,*	*Livengood,*	*Delgleize*

A MOTION WAS MADE BY SCANDURA, SECONDED BY LIVENGOOD, TO MOVE STUDY SESSION ITEM NO. B-1 AFTER NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEM NO. D-1 AND APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA OF JULY 28, 2009, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: **Speaker, Mantini, Farley, Shier Burnett, Scandura, Livengood, Delgleize**
NOES: **None**
ABSTAIN: **None**
ABSENT: **None**

MOTION APPROVED

THE MINUTES WILL REFLECT ITEMS IN THEIR ORIGINAL ORDER.

A. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - NONE

B. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

B-1. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2008-010 (ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS ELEMENT) **Applicant:** City of Huntington Beach **Request:** To amend the Environmental Hazards Element of the General Plan by incorporating language to identify the city's adopted Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) and establish an as necessary basis for review, maintenance and updates. **Location:** Citywide **Project Planner:** Hayden Beckman

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Motion to: "Approve General Plan Amendment No. 08-010 by approving the draft City Council Resolution (Attachment No. 1) and forward to the City Council for adoption."

The Commission made the following disclosures:

- Commissioner Speaker has attended the study session.
- Commissioner Mantini has attended the study session.
- Vice Chair Farley has attended the study session.
- Chair Shier Burnett has attended the study session.
- Commissioner Livengood has attended the study session.
- Commissioner Delgleize has attended the study session.

Hayden Beckman, Planning Aide, gave the staff presentation and an overview of the proposed project.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.

WITH NO ONE PRESENT TO SPEAK, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY LIVENGOOD, SECONDED BY SPEAKER, TO APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 08-010 BY APPROVING THE DRAFT CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION (ATTACHMENT NO. 1) AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: **Speaker, Mantini, Farley, Shier Burnett, Scandura, Livengood, Delgleize**
NOES: **None**
ABSENT: **None**
ABSTAIN: **None**

MOTION APPROVED

C. CONSENT CALENDAR

C-1. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES DATED JUNE 9, 2009

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Motion to: "Approve the June 9, 2009, Planning Commission Minutes as submitted."

A MOTION WAS MADE BY FARLEY, SECONDED BY SCANDURA, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 9, 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES AS SUBMITTED, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: **Speaker, Mantini, Farley, Shier Burnett, Scandura, Livengood**
NOES: **None**
ABSENT: **None**
ABSTAIN: **Delgleize**

MOTION APPROVED

D. NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

D-1. D-1. PLANNING COMMISSION RULES (AMENDED RULE NO. 9) – Chair Shier Burnett

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Motion to: "Approve the Planning Commission Rules with Amended Rule No. 9 and forward to the City Council for approval."

Chair Shier Burnett asked that if Rule No. 9 could be stricken if it is simply restating a state rule. She noted that her original request was to have Rule No. 9 rewritten to mirror that state law but feels it might be redundant.

Vice-Chair Farley stated that he was inclined to leave the rule in as the rules are the guidelines the Planning Commission operates by.

Commissioner Scandura agreed with Vice Chair Farley.

Leonie Mulvihill, Senior Deputy City Attorney, stated that section 11 talks about the requirement for recusal but does not discuss leaving the room and suggested that the Planning Commission rule was created to address that.

Chair Shier Burnett asked if the Planning Commission Bylaws would be a better location for this item and Ms. Mulvihill indicated that it did not matter.

Commissioner Speaker asked if leaving the room was a necessity and indicated that he would like to be able to stay to hear public comments. Ms. Mulvihill indicated that the Commissioners are generally required to leave the room but that there were exemptions listed in the code section and now expressly listed in the proposed amended Rule No. 9.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY SHIER BURNETT, SECONDED BY FARLEY, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RULES WITH AMENDED RULE NO. 9 AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES:	**Mantini, Farley, Shier Burnett, Scandura, Delgleize**
NOES:	**None**
ABSENT:	**Livengood**
ABSTAIN:	**Speaker**

MOTION APPROVED

E. PLANNING ITEMS

E-1. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING -NONE

E-2. CITY COUNCIL ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING -NONE

E-3. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING- NONE

F. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

F-1. PLANNING COMMISSION REQUEST ITEMS – NONE

F-2. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Scandura noted that he would be unable to attend the August 25, 2009 Planning Commission meeting and also wished his mother-in-law a happy birthday.

Chair Shier Burnett noted that she had recently visited Golden West College and was disappointed by the changes made to the campus due to the construction of the CVS Pharmacy.

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned at 8:05 PM to the next regularly scheduled meeting of Tuesday, August 11, 2009.

APPROVED BY:

Scott Hess, Secretary

Elizabeth Shier Burnett, Chairperson

09pcm0728