
Hb Temporary Event Permits - Please attach to the agenda tonight

From Laura <lpskin415@gmail.com>

Date Tue 5/27/2025 2:51 PM

To City Clerk <cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov>; City Council <citycouncil@hermosabeach.gov>

Myra,

I tried to attach my ecomment on the agenda but the message stated it was too long. Please include as a supplemental for City Council on the Public Hearing item for Temporary Events.

Thank you,

Laura Pena

Dear Mayor, Council Members and Staff -

I appreciate the city's efforts to update its Temporary Event Permit processes. I also recognize how challenging it is to strike a balance between promoting community vibrancy and addressing potential neighborhood impacts. I'd like to share my concerns regarding the direction of the Temporary Minor Special Events (TMSEPs), especially how they relate to our M-1 Light Industrial (Cypress) District.

At the February 18th Planning Commission Meeting, commissioners were asked to focus solely on permit mechanics, not land use issues. However, since many of the concerns now raised by Council appear to revolve around land use, it's frustrating to see the discussion shift retroactively. If we are going to re-open the land use question which I believe is a valid point, we should honor what's already been adopted through PLAN Hermosa and discuss the land use during our Comprehensive Zoning Updates.

As stated in PLAN Hermosa (p. 94), the Cypress District is envisioned as Hermosa's "creative, production, and light industrial center," featuring "flexible use spaces, "co-working offices," and "maker industries." The plan calls for "common gathering areas and meeting spaces" to foster the exchange of ideas. If that doesn't suggest assembly and activation, I don't know what does. I support the recommendations of our Planning Commission as proposed in the Staff Report.

In regards to the Temporary Minor Special Event Permits (TMSEP) as they relate to our commercial districts, I support the following recommendations:

- 1. Location:** The updated TMSEP definition includes indoor and outdoor spaces, but most examples (like car shows, festivals, flea markets, fairs) clearly apply ONLY to outdoor spaces. Indoor uses which used to be governed by the *Limited Live Entertainment Permit* for product launches or private events with alcohol and entertainment did not include such restrictive language such as "maintain the requirement that any deviation from the specified standards require a Conditional Use Permit."

Recommendation: Let businesses get approval for indoor promotional events directly from the Community Development Director. If denied, let the business appeal to the Planning Commission. A full Conditional Use Permit (CUP) should not be the first stop.

2. **Restricted Days:** Planning Commissioners asked for police data to justify prohibiting events on holidays like St. Patrick's Day, Cinco de Mayor, and Labor Day Weekend. That data was never provided.

Recommendation: Let the Police Department weigh in with actual call data. If there's a safety reason to restrict a certain day, fine - but it should be based on facts, not assumptions. Our businesses need the opportunities to attract customers with low impact events and promotions that our Police Department has stated are not the problem with resource allocation. If necessary, review the process in a year if the data shows otherwise.

3. **Permit Duration:** As currently proposed, an administrative permit for a TMSEP shall not exceed twelve (12) months from the first approved event with a cost of **\$621** per year. This proposed update deviates significantly from the current "*Limited Live Entertainment*" permit which allows for alcohol and entertainment that applies to our downtown businesses "indoor use" with a permit duration of two (2) years and a cost of **\$297**.

Recommendation: Allow our downtown businesses to apply for an event permit with a two **(2) year** duration for "*indoor use*" similar to M-1 businesses with a rate of **\$297**.

4. **Entertainment Hours:** The Temporary Minor Special Event Permit (TMSEP) currently limits amplified entertainment to 10 AM - 9 PM for up to four (4) hours. In the M-1 Zone, it's 8 AM - 10 PM for up to five (5) hours.

Recommendation: Align the TMSEP entertainment hours to be consistent with the M-1 Zone.

These permits aren't just about paperwork, they're tools to help our city grow in the right direction. The Planning Commission provided further direction to the City Council to allow for refunding options for denied permits. Also, the ten (10) page permit application needs to be reviewed for streamlining and efficiency purposes. We need to stay competitive with other cities who offer much simpler application processes. Let's use these permits to encourage creativity, fairness, and more business activity across all our commercial areas.

As always, I appreciate your thoughtful consideration.

Laura Pena

5/27/2025

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the Hermosa Beach City Council

Re: ZTA 23-03 – CEQA Objection Regarding Intensification of Uses in M-1 Zone

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I am writing to formally object to the City's reliance on the "common sense exemption" under CEQA Guidelines §15061(b)(3) for Zoning Text Amendment 23-03 related to Temporary Uses and Events. The proposed ordinance includes substantial land use intensifications in the M-1 Light Industrial Zone, including:

- Authorization for up to 72 event days per business under the limited events permit per year, a significant increase in frequency and land use activity. Additionally, another 72 event days per business under the temporary minor special event permit process.
- The addition and allowance of providing or selling of alcohol, providing live and amplified music, and extended hours for such events.
- A reduced administrative approval process that may diminishes discretionary oversight, environmental screening and parking requirements currently in place.

These are material changes that increase the likelihood of cumulative noise, traffic, parking, public safety, and quality-of-life impacts, particularly as the M-1 zone lies near residential or sensitive areas including a public park. The City's assertion that it is "certain" no environmental effects will occur is inconsistent with CEQA law and common sense. At minimum, the City must conduct an Initial Study to assess whether a Negative Declaration or EIR is warranted. By asserting an exemption, the City avoids even the most basic environmental due diligence the residents and business owners deserve.

Under Public Resources Code §21177, this letter constitutes formal notice of objection and is intended to preserve all rights under CEQA, including but not limited to legal challenge should the ordinance be adopted without adequate environmental review.

I respectfully request the Council continue or reconsider this item and direct staff to initiate appropriate CEQA review considering the foreseeable impacts associated with this ordinance.

Respectfully,

Jed Sanford