

**From:** Schuster-Zingheim and Associates, Inc. [mailto:sz@schuster-zingheim.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 15, 2020 11:42 AM  
**To:** Community-Development <CommunityDevelopment@hermosabeach.gov>  
**Subject:** Two Comments re #8: Report 20-0796; Please send to Planning Commission members for 12/15 meeting  
**Importance:** High

Hi Community Development,

Here are two sets of comments. We submitted one e-comment but the computer was forcing the wrong commenter's name. So here are our two comments.

**Comment from Patricia Zingheim:**

Jay Schuster and I are the owners of 2401 PCH almost across the street from 2200 PCH. We are neutral about the Resolution for 2200 PCH, but strongly request it have four changes for our full support.

1. Require the City Planning Commission to review and approve in an open meeting with the public invited if 2200 PCH increases medical usage over 75% instead of having the Community Development Director approve an exception. This allows neighbors to discuss the impact on their parking of the 75% medical usage.
2. Change the signage requirement to state explicitly that tenants and their employees are not allowed to park at 2200 PCH. Tenants and their employees are the first to arrive at the building and will take 2200's spaces—more likely if they are carrying packages. Both our 2401 PCH visitor parking lot and our neighbor's 2309 PCH lot are very visible to 2200 PCH visitors across the street—compared to the building blocking the parking between 2200 and Hope Chapel. Likely, 2200 visitors will dangerously cross 6 lanes of PCH traffic to park in our lots designated for our visitors. This may become a safety issue for the City. If the Resolution's signage does not change to add "No tenant parking in 2200 PCH's lot," then building management should be required to monitor the parking—which is expensive to do.
3. Do not make future exceptions based on a traffic study but from a thorough review. The 2018 traffic study was conducted on July 25 and 28. There are basically 8 weeks of summer vacation so parking demand was most likely down from its in-season levels because at least 1/8 to 1/4 of the tenants and their respective visitors were on

vacation. We request any future traffic study be conducted during the regular school year, not during vacation time.

4. In document #4, page 3 of Spour & Associates' report, lists Suite 215 as medical usage. The two tenants—Kelly Waggoner and Michele Blume—listed in the tenant roster are not medical but psychologists with a Psy.D., not an MD. So, 753.9 square footage should be subtracted from the grandfathered medical usage's square footage to calculate the correct the increased amount of new square footage requested to become medical. The correction would increase the required number of parking spaces because these non-medical tenants lost any grandfathering of medical usage in Suite 215.

Jay Schuster and I respectfully request these four changes be made to the Resolution before approval.

**Comment from Jay Schuster:**

Pat Zingheim and I are owners of 2401 PCH. Both Pat and I respectfully request the City do a thorough review of its parking requirements to be more in line with other cities' requirements instead of making planned exceptions like the "over 75% medical usage at 2200 PCH." Several of the documents mention the number of parking spaces per square foot for other local cities and nationally.

As another example, Beverly Hills is easing restrictions on medical office space in an effort to help landlords. On 11/17/20, Beverly Hills City Council voted to allow medical use in many of the city's commercial zones to help local property owners fill their spaces. Part of the stated reason for doing this is to help the City's falling business tax revenue that impacts the City's budget.

Beverly Hills' change includes easing parking restrictions: the new medical parking requirement is "one space per 350 square feet" instead of the prior "one space per 200 square feet." Beverly Hills' prior medical parking per square foot was the same as Hermosa Beach's current medical requirement.

Pat Zingheim and I respectfully request:

1. The City consider easing its medical parking restriction in terms of reducing the number of parking spaces per 1000 square feet to be in line with other LA County cities like Beverly Hills and those listed in Spour's report, the average of cities in the overall United States described in the City Staff's Report, and changing business operations including moving permanently to online employees. We request the City start and set a definitive date to complete an overall review of changing its requirements for parking spaces per 1000 square feet. It is important to address this fairly across properties and not make exceptions.
2. The Planning Commission revise its Resolution to require the four changes that Pat mentioned previously:
  - A. Hold a Planning Commission meeting with the public invited to review any request that 2200 PCH makes to have more than 75% medical usage.
  - B. Change the signage to explicitly state tenants and their employees use the Hope Chapel parking lot.
  - C. Do not make exceptions based on a summer traffic study.  
Change the City's requirements for all its properties!
  - D. Increase the required parking spaces by eliminating the existing/grandfathered medical usage for Suite 215.

Thank you very much.