NOTICE

Following Governor Newsom’s executive orders prohibiting the convening of public agency meetings in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, all regularly scheduled Marina del Rey Design Control Board meetings will convene as virtual (online) meetings and by teleconference until further notice.

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, at its regularly scheduled public meeting on November 2, 2021, has made the requisite findings under Government Code § 54953(e)(3) that (i) the Board has reconsidered the circumstances of the State of Emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic and that the State of Emergency remains active; and (ii) that local officials continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing.

OBSERVING THE MEETING
To observe the meeting, go to http://beaches.lacounty.gov/watch-dcb-meeting (Zoom Meeting ID: 913 7426 1482) or dial (408) 638-0968 or (669) 900-6833.

PROVIDING VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT
To provide verbal public comment for the record during the meeting, go to http://beaches.lacounty.gov/watch-dcb-meeting (Zoom Meeting ID: 913 7426 1482) and staff will assist you via the Zoom chat feature.

If you are calling in to the meeting, send an email to DBHPlanner@bh.lacounty.gov with the agenda item number, first name, last name, email address, and phone number, and identify yourself as the applicant or not the applicant.

PROVIDING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT
To provide written public comment for the record, send an email to DBHPlanner@bh.lacounty.gov with your comment, the agenda item number, your first name and last name, email address, and phone number, and identify yourself as the applicant or not the applicant. Written comments submitted prior to 5 p.m. on the day before the meeting will be provided to the Design Control Board. Written public comments submitted after 5 p.m. on the day before the meeting will not be provided to the Design Control Board, but will be added to the public record.
1. **Call to Order, Action on Absences, Pledge of Allegiance, and Order of Agenda**

2. **Approval of the January 19, 2022 Minutes**

3. **Consent Agenda**
   *The Chair may entertain a motion by a Board member at the beginning of the meeting to approve certain non-controversial agenda items as consent agenda items unless held by a Board member or member(s) of the public for discussion or separate action.*

4. **Old Business**
   None

5. **New Business**
   A. Parcel 50 – Waterside Shopping Center / Athleta – DCB # 22-001 – Consideration of building modifications and new signage

6. **Staff Reports**
   A. Ongoing Activities Report
      *Board of Supervisors Actions on Items Relating to Marina del Rey*
      *Regional Planning Commission’s Calendar*
      *Coastal Commission’s Calendar*
      *Future Major DCB Agenda Items*
      *Small Craft Harbor Commission Minutes*
      *Redevelopment Project Status Report*
   B. Marina del Rey Special Events

7. **Public Comment**
   *This is the opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items that are not on the posted agenda, provided that the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the Board. Speakers are reminded of the three-minute time limitation.*

8. **Adjournment**

---

**PLEASE NOTE**

1. **ADA ACCOMMODATIONS:** If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Coordinator at (424) 526-7752 (Voice) or (TTY/TDD) users, please call the California Relay Service at 711. The ADA coordinator may be reached by email at rstassi@bh.lacounty.gov.

2. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted Chapter 2.160 of the Los Angeles Code (Ord. 93-0031 ~ 2 (part), 1993), relating to lobbyists. Any person who seeks support or endorsement from the Design Control Board on any official action must certify that he/she is familiar with the requirements of this ordinance. A copy of the ordinance can be provided prior to the meeting and certification is to be made before or at the meeting.


4. All materials provided to the Design Control Board Members are available for public review, beginning the Friday prior to the meeting, at https://beaches.lacounty.gov/design-control-board/. The Department of
Beaches and Harbors website also provides all reports and audio files from current and past meetings. Electronic copies of project submittals for Business Items referred to in this agenda will be available online for a two week period from the date of this agenda.
Location of February 16, 2022 DCB Items

Old Business
None

New Business
5A – Parcel 50 – Waterside Shopping Center / Athleta
Members Present: Meg Rushing Coffee, Member (First District); Steven Cho, Chair (Fourth District); Tony Wong, P.E., Vice Chair (Fifth District)

Members Absent: None

Department Staff Present: Amy Caves, Deputy Director; Maral Tashjian, Planning Specialist; Porsche White, Planner; Tor-Ree Jones-Freeman, Secretary

County Staff Present: Parjack Ghaderi, County Counsel; Clark Taylor, Regional Planning

Guests Testifying: Jennifer Morgan and Mark Wagner, E&S Ring Management Corporation; Patrick Winters, Nadel Architects; Darren Shirai, MIG; Robin Perkins, Selbert Perkins

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance
   Chair Cho called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Approval of the September 15, 2021 Minutes
   Moved by Vice Chair Wong, seconded by Chair Cho. The September 15, 2021 minutes were approved.

   Ayes: 3 – Vice Chair Wong, Chair Cho, Ms. Coffee
   Nays: 0

3. Consent Agenda
   None

4. Old Business
   A. Parcel 113 E&S Ring Management Corporation/Mariners Village Apartments – DCB # 14-003-B – Consideration of final site renovation plan.

   Ms. White presented the staff report.

   Board Comment
   Chair Cho asked if there were any comments for staff.

   Vice Chair Wong inquired about the proposed width of the promenade.

   Ms. White responded that the width of the promenade is between 20’ to 28’ and commented that the Applicant could confirm the width during the Applicant comment period.
Vice Chair Wong commented that based on the renderings the promenade width looked more like 50’ and he wanted to make sure the Applicant has enough room to complete their proposed improvements.

Chair Cho asked Vice Chair Wong for clarification whether his concern was that the area was too wide or too narrow.

Vice Chair Wong responded that it was not too wide.

Chair Cho asked Ms. Tashjian if there were any applicants present.

Ms. Tashjian stated that there were three members of the Applicants’ project team present with an additional seven members available to answer any technical questions. She introduced Jennifer Morgan, Patrick Winters, and Darren Shirai.

Ms. Morgan gave opening remarks and introduced Patrick Winters, the lead architect for the project.

Mr. Winters introduced himself and delivered a presentation regarding the proposed architectural improvements.

Mr. Shirai introduced himself as a Senior Architect at MIG Landscape Architecture in Los Angeles. He delivered a presentation regarding the proposed landscape improvements. He also confirmed that the total width of the waterfront promenade ranges from 20’ to 28’. Furthermore, the Blue Hesper palm trees that were referenced in Staff’s presentation were proposed only at the lookouts as vertical accents so they would not continue along the whole length of the promenade. He explained that their impact on the views was considered limited, and they could be removed from the project, if necessary. He also noted that the plant materials proposed along the promenade would be lush, drought tolerant, and less than 3’ at maturity.

Chair Cho asked if any Board members had questions for the Applicant.

Vice Chair Wong asked if there were any drainage or low impact development (LID) requirements for the project site, as LID related information was not shown in the Applicant’s plans. He expressed a concern that the promenade design may need to be modified in the future if LID requirements were not taken into consideration now.

Mr. Shirai explained that a LID strategy was created by the Applicant’s civil engineers and would not encroach on the promenade itself.
Chair Cho asked whether the promenade width of 20' to 28' was measured from the building face to the edge of the promenade railing, or if the dimensions correspond to the walkable promenade area.

Mr. Shirai responded that the promenade width represents the paved portion of the waterfront. He commented that there are existing trees that line the edges of the promenade and the Applicant intends to preserve the trees.

Vice Chair Wong asked if the Applicant had photographs of the trees proposed for removal and what were the sizes of the trees.

Mr. Shirai responded that there is photographic record of the trees, although it was not included in the presentation. He stated that most of the trees were olive trees and one tree was a Mexican Fan Palm.

Vice Chair Wong expressed that during the last DCB review, there was an issue with the removal of trees at the project site which contributed to the Board denying the project.

Mr. Shirai responded that the olive trees and palm tree were not large canopy trees and none of the trees were above 25’ tall. He noted that the trees exist within a confined on-structure environment and none of them cast much shade. Over the years, their root systems infiltrated the waterproofing on the building, which allowed water to leak in the structures. He also stated that it could be dangerous if the water corrodes the rebar that reinforces the concrete beneath the courtyards. It’s imperative to repair the waterproofing, which could only be effectively accomplished by removing certain trees, which are very old and in poor shape. He stated that there is an arborist report that documents the health of each tree slated for removal. He also expressed that the Applicant’s focus is protecting life and property, and these trees are impacting the structural integrity of the buildings they grow on. He also stated that any trees removed would be replaced with an appropriate species that would grow into mature shade trees. Furthermore, there would be an overall net gain in the number of courtyard trees.

Vice Chair Wong responded that Mr. Shirai’s response was sufficient and asked if a fishpond existed at the property.

Mr. Shirai responded that there are two lagoons at the site that contain koi fish.

Vice Chair Wong asked if they would remain.

Mr. Shirai confirmed that they would remain.

Vice Chair Wong commented that the Board does not have a copy of the Applicant’s material color board which is a short coming of virtual presentations. He stated that the proposed
Ms. Coffee explained her concern regarding the balcony railings and noted that she expressed her concerns to the Applicant during an ex-parte meeting. She agreed with resident concerns regarding the spacing between pickets and the orientation of the railings, which she suggested be installed vertically rather than horizontally. She also noted that the spacing between the pickets would limit visibility of the waterfront, and asked the project team if they would comment on the design intent of the balcony railings and any other options that were considered.

Mr. Winters responded that the design intent was not to block views. He stated that the desire was to provide a balance and ultimately the horizontal design was selected by ownership.

Ms. Coffee asked if there was any thought of a cable system or similar design for the railings.

Mr. Winters responded that various options were considered with the owners, however, the proposed design was decided based on a group consensus.

Ms. Coffee asked about the maximum spacing allowed between rails.

Mr. Winters responded that the maximum spacing allowed is four inches, but he believed the drawings showed two inches.

Ms. Coffee mentioned a concern by residents regarding a reduction in the operable portions of windows. She stated that previously approximately three quarters of the upper portion of the windows would open, with the bottom quarter being non-operable. However, in the proposed design, the renderings show a reduction of operable window space, with only half of the window being operable.

Mr. Winters responded that there was no intention to reduce the openings. He stated that since the building was built under a previous building code, the building code required a 36" bottom sill. Based on new building codes, the requirement was raised to 42".

Ms. Coffee asked if the operable portion has been reduced to meet current code.

Mr. Winters confirmed that the bottom portion of the sills would be raised due to code requirements.

Ms. Coffee asked if the existing posts that border the buildings were structural support for the balconies.

Mr. Winters confirmed that the posts are structural support.
Ms. Coffee asked if the intent was to sand and paint the posts.

Mr. Winters responded that some of the posts would be replaced since the condition of each post varied. He also stated that any posts that remained would be filled, sanded, and coated with the proper color so they had renewed durability.

Ms. Coffee asked what the plans were for similar posts found near landscaped areas surrounding the lagoon edges.

Mr. Shirai responded that the project team was working with a water feature consultant on integrating the existing posts into the new design. He stated that the posts were currently embedded within the bottom of the water features and based on an assessment of the lagoons, the existing posts would remain in place.

Ms. Coffee asked if the posts would receive the same treatment as the architectural posts.

Mr. Shirai responded that the posts in the lagoon were part of private patios and they would not receive the same treatment.

Chair Cho asked if the lagoon posts were pressure treated, would there be an issue with them leaching chemicals into coastal waters.

Mr. Shirai responded that they were not aware of a potential problem with leaching chemicals.

Ms. Coffee stated that in the current design there’s a strong relationship between the architectural columns, the posts at the lagoon, and the raised planting areas, that create a continuous theme throughout Mariners Village. She expressed that by painting some of the columns and refinishing others, an identifiable sense of place may be weakened.

Mr. Shirai explained that several approaches to the landscape design were independent of the architectural design. He noted that the difference in treatment of these posts wouldn’t have a major impact on the cohesiveness of the landscape, but the project team could revisit the finishes, if necessary.

Ms. Coffee responded that her concern was not that the landscape posts match the architectural finishes. Her concern was that the architectural posts would resemble painted telephone poles, which would look unattractive. In addition, she mentioned a public comment regarding the pine trees and the population of herons on the site. She wanted to confirm that none of the trees would be removed.

Mr. Shirai confirmed that no pine trees would be removed. Only olive trees and one Washingtonia Robusta would be removed.
Ms. Coffee asked if the barbecue area would contain lower counter heights for ADA accessibility.

Mr. Shirai confirmed that there would be lowered counter heights, which would be reflected in the working drawing details.

Mr. Winters asked to respond about the telephone pole issue. He expressed that the coating finish used on the posts would be transparent to maintain the original wood post aesthetic.

Ms. Coffee responded that the rendering was deceiving because it appeared to be the same material and color as the building exteriors. She then asked if the proposed signs would be composed of wood or faux wood posts. She also asked the Applicant to confirm whether the free-standing posts would be made of aluminum or plastic.

Ms. Perkins responded to the Board indicating that the signage posts would be composed of faux wood. She also stated that the posts would be created by powder coating a wood design into marine grade aluminum.

Chair Cho requested clarity regarding roofing materials proposed for Buildings 1A and 1B.

Mr. Winters responded that the three-story apartment buildings would have a mansard roofing system with composition shingles in the darker color.

Chair Cho asked if all the existing roofs would be replaced with standing seam roofs.

Mr. Winters responded that the village and portions of the seaside apartments where there are slopes would be standing seam roof systems.

Chair Cho asked if the composition shingle roof was on the materials board.

Mr. Winters confirmed that the shingle roof was not on the materials board.

Chair Cho responded that the Applicant should include the composition roof material on the materials board since the Board received a public comment related to the color of the roof and heat island effect. He asked whether the metal wall panels would be standing seam.

Mr. Winters responded that the intent is to use a dark powder coated panel, not a standing seam around the windows.

Chair Cho asked if the standing seam notes in the package were just general notes related to the use of metal, not the actual profile.
Mr. Winters confirmed that was correct.

Chair Cho expressed a concern related to the AZEK material proposed for the exterior of the buildings. He stated that after calling the company, they informed him that they did not have a vertical installation method as shown on the submitted plans. He also stated that after applying the finish, there could be approximately 5" of added profile to the building on top of the stucco in order to wrap the buildings appropriately.

Mr. Winters responded that AZEK does require that the product be applied in a rain screen configuration and it is easier to put on horizontally. He also noted that the vertical configuration was preferred, and it is more difficult to do. In addition, he confirmed that the wood cladding would be as proposed.

Chair Cho responded that he thought it looked better vertically but noted that it may be difficult to achieve.

Ms. Coffee clarified that her previous comment about vertical versus horizontal layouts was not for the siding, but rather for the balcony guardrails.

Chair Cho asked if the balcony railings would be AZEK or Polyforce since there was an inconsistency in the submittal package.

Mr. Winters confirmed that the intent was to use AZEK.

Chair Cho agreed with the concerns of the residents regarding the horizontal versus vertical railings. He asked that the project team revisit the balcony railing design.

Mr. Winters responded that there were alternate designs that could be revisited, however, he would need to defer to the project owner for approval.

Chair Cho asked if the project team would sand blast the stucco, paint over it, or change the texture.

Mr. Winters responded that the design intent would be to repair the stucco as needed, power wash and paint it.

Chair Cho noted that in the plans several elevations had stairs leading to the rooftop. He asked whether the project team intended to create rooftop decks.

Mr. Winters responded that there was no intent to create any additional roof decks. He responded that the staircases are a maintenance feature and locked gates are on the stairs to prevent access.
Chair Cho asked whether the soffits over the balconies would be a wood feature, and if the soffit of the roof overhangs would be the same throughout the project or different than the roof material.

Mr. Winters responded that for the rafters and fascia board, the intent is to have the darker color that is shown in the plans. The decking would be a lighter stain, like teak, and sealed.

**Public Comment**
Chair Cho asked Ms. Tashjian if any members of the public asked to speak.

Ms. Tashjian responded that two speakers had signed up for public comment. In addition, two members of the public submitted comments via the chat function, which would be read aloud. Ms. Tashjian introduced the first public speaker, Robert van de Hoek.

Mr. van de Hoek experienced audio issues. Ms. Tashjian introduced the second public speaker, Susanne Cummings.

Ms. Cummings introduced herself and noted that she submitted written comments regarding the project. She highlighted her concern regarding the residential balcony railing design and referenced new buildings in Santa Monica for alternatives with vertical rails. She commented that Mariners Village may contain the only buildings in Marina del Rey that still have stucco exteriors. She also expressed that the latte froth paint color highlights the dated stucco exterior, which is unattractive in her opinion. She suggested the use of cladding over the stucco or a muted darker color. She also asked that existing lanterns be left in place, wherever possible, as they create a sense of place and are unique. In addition, she requested that environmental features such as rooftop solar, permeable paving, and greywater, be considered in the renovation project, considering the project location and sea level rise. She noted that heron colonies have existed at the site for years and suggested that awnings, coverings, and other ways to protect residents from the guano be used while still allowing the birds to thrive. For plantings, she suggested that pollinator friendly plants and trees with big canopies that support bird and butterfly species be used. She also requested that a biodiversity baseline survey be done before the renovation begins and noted the lack of security features at the site. In addition, she requested that the Board postpone approval of the project to allow the Applicant time to revisit the balcony railing suggestions and allow the new County supervisor to review the plans.

Ms. Tashjian introduced Robert van de Hoek.

Mr. van de Hoek introduced himself as an environmental scientist and noted several perceived errors in the project from an ornithologist perspective. He suggested that the hired consultant was being selective and cautious regarding the biology on the site and mentioned the State Historic National Preservation Act. He stated that a determination had not been made for this site. He also mentioned that would be a legal issue and could be an issue for lawsuits and the
federal government and the State of California. He requested that the project be postponed to incorporate more conditions that tie in with the history and culture of the site and noted that there are issues regarding three types of trees that would be removed.

Ms. Tashjian introduced Emma Dodson.

Ms. Dodson introduced herself as a coordinator for Trees of the Marina. She proposed that the project be postponed based on requirements put forth by Supervisor Janice Hahn in 2018, which were conditions of E&S Ring’s lease option. She stated that the requirement to create three committees was not met. She also stated that Supervisor Hahn made it clear that the lease option was contingent on the protection of the trees and the heron habitat, and that the lessee should work in partnership with the public and environmental groups. She expressed the need for better communication and cooperation with oversight or a multi-disciplinary committee.

Ms. Tashjian read aloud a comment left by Paul Lance regarding concerns with security, particularly with regard to outside access by non-residents onto the property.

Ms. Tashjian read aloud a comment from Marcia Hanscom regarding concerns with the three committees in Supervisor Janice Hahn’s 2018 motion; one for the nesting trees, one for the channel walk path, and one for affordability for the residents.

Chair Cho concluded the public comment period and brought the matter before the Board.

Ms. Coffee explained that this was the first time she heard about the three committees that were to be formed per Supervisor Hahn’s order. She asked if staff could provide more information.

Ms. Caves responded that the motion did not call for three specific committees to be formed. Instead, the direction from Supervisor Hahn was to work on three sets of issues, which are connected to the Board of Supervisors’ 2018 grant of an option for lease extension to the lessee. She explained that the conditions were still pending and that the lessee had not exercised the option yet, and that this was a separate issue from what the DCB would review in terms of design and landscaping.

Ms. Coffee asked when the option would go into effect or be acted upon by the lessee.

Ms. Caves responded that the option term expires in October 2022, and the lessee has until that time to satisfy various conditions, including working with the three groups.

Ms. Coffee noted that although these issues are separate from the design review itself, it's likely that environmental issues could have a significant impact on the project design, and these efforts should be coordinated in conjunction with each other.
Chair Cho responded that the affordable housing issue could be separated, but agreed with Ms. Coffee’s previous statement. He noted that the design and choice of materials of the landscape and promenade could potentially be impacted based on the findings of each group.

Ms. Caves responded that representatives of the lessee should be able to speak to any discussions that have occurred with the groups, and any changes to the project that have been made thus far. She restated that there was no formal requirement to form committees and there was only a requirement to work with various groups that are interested in specific issues. She stated that the lessees could speak to any related efforts that were undertaken in connection with the application presented in the meeting.

Chair Cho asked Ms. Morgan to speak on the matter.

Ms. Morgan deferred the question to Mark Wagner.

Mr. Wagner asked the question to be repeated.

Chair Cho asked if there was any direct outreach to groups interested in site trees and the public promenade design.

Mr. Wagner responded that the project team had several tenant meetings and met with several environmental groups, some of which testified during the meeting. He stated that the nature of the request from Supervisor Hahn was to establish a meeting with the groups and maintain ongoing dialogue through the renovation process. He noted that the project team intends to maintain dialogue with the groups.

Ms. Coffee asked what environmental groups the project team solicited comments from.

Mr. Wagner responded that Trees of the Marina, Marcia Hanscom, and Robert van de Hoek were contacted.

Ms. Coffee asked if any written recommendations or comments in support of the project were received from the groups. She also asked how comments were recorded.

Mr. Wagner responded that the meetings were recorded and no written comments were received regarding the design that was discussed in the meeting. He noted that the project team met with residents on several occasion and met with the aforementioned environmental groups once.

Chair Cho responded that he was curious about what the public speakers were looking to accomplish. He stated that the renovation is a renovation and would cause disturbance as a general construction project. He also noted that the landscape architect confirmed that the only trees to be removed would be olive trees and one Mexican Fan Palm. He suggested hearing from Mr. van de Hoek regarding the issues at hand.

Ms. Caves responded that it may not be appropriate to start a dialogue with public speakers at this point due to public comment being closed. Ms. Caves also stated that in the motion by Supervisor Hahn in October 2018, she asked that the lessee work in partnership with the tenants and knowledgeable environmental groups to address any related issues to the trees or the heron habitat that arise during the development period. She noted that the Department of
Beaches and Harbors (DBH) understands that the lessee has complied with what was required, and should the project move forward, then the lessee would continue to work with interested groups as directed by Supervisor Hahn.

Ms. Coffee said that there was no mention of the heron colony in the architectural or landscape narratives. She commented that it seems to be a very important aspect of this property and that consideration was not evident or specifically called out by the project team. She stated that it would be helpful to know where the heron colony exists at the site and what mitigation measures would be taken during construction to protect the colony.

Vice Chair Wong stated that there were many issues brought up during the meeting that are beyond the DCB’s concern of project aesthetics. He requested that the project team provide photographs of the trees that would be removed to help inform what kind of replacement trees would be needed and if the trees slated for removal would be bird habitat. He also requested that the project team provide a conceptual low impact development (LID) plan in regards to site landscaping. He expressed that the project should be continued to the next meeting, subject to the submission of the aforementioned details.

Ms. Coffee asked that the project team provide a diagram showing the location of the heron habitat at the site and alternative design options for the balcony railings that have more visibility.

Chair Cho reiterated Ms. Coffee’s request and recommended that the lessee refer to the environmental group that was concerned about the trees for guidance. He also requested that the diagram contain an overlay of the proposed landscape plan to identify if any new landscaping may affect the heron nesting sites, that the project team revisit the railing issue, and include the composition roofing into the materials board as part of the submittal package.

Chair Cho asked staff to provide direction regarding how to continue the project.

Ms. Tashjian responded that the Board could move to continue the project with the requested information.

**Chair Cho moved to continue DCB #14-003-B with five conditions:**

1. The Applicant shall provide photos of each tree proposed for removal and the sizes of corresponding replacement trees.
2. The Applicant shall provide a schematic map of the heron nesting locations found at the site. The map should include an overlay of the Applicant’s proposed landscape plan to ensure proposed landscaping changes would not disrupt the heron population. Coordinating with concerned parties is recommended, if needed.
3. The Applicant shall revisit the residential balcony designs and provide alternative options with horizontal railings.
4. The Applicant shall provide a material sample of the composition roofing and include the roofing material on the project material/color palette.
5. The Applicant shall provide a conceptual low impact development (LID) design for the site as it related to the landscaping design.

Seconded by Vice Chair Wong.
5. **New Business**
   A. Election of New Officers

   Vice Chair Wong moved to continue, seconded by Ms. Coffee.

   Ayes: 3 – Vice Chair Wong, Ms. Coffee, Chair Cho  
   Nays: 0

   B. 2022 Design Control Board Meeting Schedule

   Chair Cho asked if there would be any changes to the standard meeting times and whether meetings would return to in-person meetings.

   Ms. Tashjian responded that the schedule before the Board had no proposed changes and the approval of the schedule occurs annually. She also responded that future meetings would remain virtual until further notice.

   **Moved by Vice Chair Wong, seconded by Chair Cho.**

   Ayes: 3 – Vice Chair Wong, Chair Cho, Ms. Coffee  
   Nays: 0

6. **Staff Reports**

   All reports were received and filed.

   **Moved by Vice Chair Wong, seconded by Chair Cho.**

   Ayes: 3 – Vice Chair Wong, Chair Cho, Ms. Coffee  
   Nays: 0

7. **Public Comment**

   None

8. **Adjournment**

   Chair Cho adjourned the meeting at 3:43 p.m.

   Respectfully Submitted,

   Tor-Ree Jones-Freeman  
   Secretary for the Design Control Board
TO: Design Control Board

FROM: Gary Jones, Director

SUBJECT: ITEM 5A – PARCEL 50 – WATERSIDE SHOPPING CENTER / ATHLETA – DCB # 22-001 – CONSIDERATION OF BUILDING MODIFICATIONS AND NEW SIGNAGE

Item 5A on your agenda is a submittal from Athleta (Applicant), seeking approval for a building modification and new signage at the Waterside Shopping Center. The project is located at 4770 Admiralty Way.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Existing Conditions
The 3,259 square foot tenant space is located within the Waterside Shopping Center and is currently vacant. The storefront features a gray façade and a large dark red fabric awning above the main entrance.

Proposed Project
The Applicant proposes to remodel the façade of the building and install four new business signs.

BUILDING DESIGN

Building Façade
The existing stucco façade would be painted Sherwin Williams Athleta 101 Exterior Gray. The existing fabric awning would be replaced with a new Sunbrella Slate fabric awning. The Applicant also proposes to remove a door at the rear of the tenant space, infill the opening, and repaint the surface to match adjacent finishes.

SIGNAGE

Building Façade
The Applicant proposes one wall-mounted tenant identification sign above the main entrance of the tenant space, facing the interior of the shopping center. The sign would measure 15'- 9 ½" wide by 2' tall and read “Athleta” with a company logo. The sign would
feature white aluminum channel letters with white LED halo illumination and would be installed approximately 15'-11" above grade. The Applicant also proposes to install a secondary wall-mounted tenant identification sign at the rear of the tenant space, facing Admiralty Way. The sign would measure 11'-10" wide by 1'-6" tall and read “Athleta” with a company logo. The halo-lit sign would feature white aluminum channel letters, installed approximately 13'-5" above grade.

The Applicant proposes to install a street number address sign at the storefront façade, underneath the entryway awning. The sign would measure approximately 1’-8" wide by 6" tall and would read “4770” in white halo lit aluminum channel letters.

**Blade Sign**
The Applicant proposes to install a blade sign at the storefront, facing the pedestrian walkway, mounted approximately 9'-7" above grade. The double-sided company logo sign would be composed of an aluminum matte MP923SP black frame, a satin finished MPN951SP silver face, 3M180C-220 silver metallic blades, and a ½" thick black sign bracket. The sign would use internal LED illumination.

**Illumination**
All signage would be illuminated from 15 minutes prior to sundown until one-hour following the closing of the last restaurant at the site, per the DCB approved sign program for the shopping center.

**STAFF REVIEW**
Staff finds that the improvements do not alter the overall architectural style of the shopping center and are generally consistent with the Marina del Rey Design Guidelines and the Waterside Shopping Center Master Sign Program. Following DCB approval, all signs are subject to review by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning for conformity with the Marina del Rey Revised Permanent Sign Controls.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of DCB #22-001, subject to the following conditions:

1) The Applicant shall obtain approval from the Department of Regional Planning.

2) No change shall be made to the approved design, landscaping, hardscape, materials, or signage without written approval from the Department of Beaches and Harbors Planning Division staff.

3) No substantial change shall be made to the approved design, landscaping, hardscape, materials, or signage without the written consent of the Design Control Board.

GJ:AC:pw
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
ATHLETA is proposing to paint the existing EPS and refabric the existing awning to match their brand. New signage will be permitted separately by Vendor.

NEW TENANT SIGNSAGE UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT

NEW AWNING FABRIC

NEW EXTERIOR INSULATION AND FINISH SYSTEM PAINTED 779-14

NEW TУNANT BLADE SIGNAGE UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT
It is the intent and purpose of this color rendering to provide a basic color representation of your sign finish and color. However, digital media and printed colors will vary from actual paint finish and color. Existing painted surfaces will have a perceptible difference in shade and sheen from your sign finish. Providing a sample of the paint you wish to match or a Matthews paint color formula will minimize the differences.

U.S. & P.R. - All signs conform to UL-48/2161 (labeled accordingly) & must comply with UL-41 install procedures. Canada - all signs must be CSA compliant. This sign is designed to be installed in accordance with the National Electrical Code and applicable local codes. The complete sign grounding and bonding of the sign.
It is the intent and purpose of this color rendering to provide a basic color representation of your sign finish and color. However, digital media and printed colors will vary from actual paint finish and color. Existing painted surfaces will have a perceptible difference in shade and sheen from your sign finish. Providing a sample of the paint you wish to match or a Matthews paint color formula will minimize the differences.

© 2021 Image National, Inc. This design is an original work of authorship by Image National, Inc. (image) which owns the copyright and all rights thereto under the United States of America Copyright Act. All rights are reserved by image and, until the use of this design is authorized by image in writing, image warrants the exclusive right to: a) reproduce this design in copies in graphic form or as a sign; b) prepare derivative works based upon the design; c) distribute copies of the design by sale or other transfer of ownership; and d) display the design publicly.

U.S. & P.R. - All signs conform to UL-48/2161 (labeled accordingly) & must comply with UL-41.1 install procedures. Canada - all signs must be CAS compliant. This sign(s) is intended to be installed in accordance with requirements of article 600 of the National Electrical Code and/or applicable local codes. This includes proper grounding and bonding of the sign.

Client: ATHLETA

Design Number: FB-0500-21

File Location: 4TH-1344-MarinaDelReyCA-Exterior-111521-R2

Page No. 2 of 8
It is the intent and purpose of this color rendering to provide a basic color representation of your sign finish and color. However, digital media and printed colors will vary from actual paint finish and color. Existing painted surfaces will have a perceptible difference in shade and sheen from your sign finish. Providing a sample of the paint you wish to match or a Matthews paint color formula will minimize the differences.

**U.S. & P.R. - All signs conform to UL-48/2161 (labeled accordingly) & must comply with UL-41.1 installation procedures. Canada - all signs must be CAS compliant. This sign(s) is intended to be installed in accordance with requirements of article 600 of the National Electrical Code and/or applicable local codes. This includes proper grounding and bonding of the sign.**

**FABRICATION SPECIFICATIONS**

**RECOVER AWNING**

**GENERAL NOTES**

- REMOVE EXISTING AWNING FABRIC AND PAINT FRAME TO MATCH NEW AWNING FABRIC COLOR: SLATE.

**REVISIONS**

- DRAWING TYPE
  - CONCEPTUAL
  - TECHNICAL

**COLOR KEY**

- TO MATCH AWNING MATERIAL COLOR (SLATE)

**NOTE:** MEASUREMENTS ARE BASED OFF OF SCALLED DRAWING. ESTIMATED ONLY. SURVEY REQUIRED PRIOR TO MANUFACTURE.

**SCALE:** 1/2" = 1'-0"
It is the intent and purpose of this color rendering to provide a basic color representation of your sign finish and color. However, digital media and printed colors will vary from actual paint finish and color. Existing painted surfaces will have a perceptible difference in shade and sheen from your sign finish. Providing a sample of the paint you wish to match or a Matthews paint color formula will minimize the differences.

U.S. & P.R. - All signs conform to UL-48/2161 (labeled accordingly) & must comply with UL-41.1 install procedures. Canada - all signs must be CAS compliant. This sign(s) is intended to be installed in accordance with requirements of article 600 of the National Electrical Code and/or applicable local codes. This includes proper grounding and bonding of the sign.

Client: ATHLETA
Site: 1344 4770 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Design Number: FB-0500-21
Date: 19 November 21
Designer: Dave J
Account Manager: Neil Bucher

© 2021 Image National, Inc. This design is an original work of authorship by Image National, Inc. (image) which owns the copyright in the United States (17 U.S.C.). All rights are reserved by image, and the use of this design is authorized only by image. image retains all rights to any derivative works based upon the design. provided that the derivative works remain within the scope of the original design. All rights are reserved by image, and the use of this design is authorized only by image. image retains all rights to any derivative works based upon the design. provided that the derivative works remain within the scope of the original design.
It is the intent and purpose of this color rendering to provide a basic color representation of your sign finish and color. However, digital media and printed colors will vary from actual paint finish and color. Existing painted surfaces will have a perceivable difference in shade and sheen from your sign finish. Providing a sample of the paint you wish to match or a Matthews paint color formula will minimize the differences.

Client: ATHLETA
Site: 1344
4770 Admiralty Way
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Design Number: FB-0500-21
Date: 19 November 21
Designer: Dave J
Account Manager: Neil Bucher

© 2021 Image National, Inc. This design is an original work of authorship by Image National, Inc. Image which owns the copyright protection by the copyright law of the United States (Title 17, U.S. Code). All rights are reserved by Image and, until the use of this design is authorized by Image in writing, Image owns the exclusive rights to: a) reproduce this design in copies, in graphic form or as a sign; b) prepare derivative works based upon the design; c) distribute copies of the design by sale or other transfer of ownership; and d) display the design publicly.
It is the intent and purpose of this color rendering to provide a basic color representation of your sign finish and color. However, digital-media and printed colors will vary from actual paint finish and color. Existing painted surfaces will have a perceptible difference in shade and sheen from your sign finish. Providing a sample of the paint you wish to match or a Matthews paint color formula will minimize the differences.

© 2021 Image National, Inc. This design is an original work of authorship by Image National, Inc. (Image) which owns the copyright therein; c) distribute copies of the design by sale or other transfer of ownership; and d) display the design publicly.

U.S. & P.R. - All signs conform to UL-48/2161 (labeled accordingly) & must comply with UL-41. Install procedures. Canada - all signs must be CAS compliant. This sign(s) is intended to be installed in accordance with requirements of article 600 of the National Electrical Code and/or applicable local codes. This includes proper grounding and bonding of the sign.

Client: ATHLETA  
Site: 4770 Admiralty Way  
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

NOTE: ALL U.L. / MANUFACTURING LABELS MUST BE PLACED OUT OF VIEW.  
ALL SIGNAGE ATTACHMENT, DISCONNECT SWITCHES, ETC. SHOULD BE LOCATED SO THEY ARE NOT VISIBLE TO THE CUSTOMER.

A. 3/8" Rivet Nuts in Back of Letter for Non-Corrosive Securement - Threaded Rod, Lag bolt or Lag & Shield (or appropriate mounting hardware) - 5/8" Aluminum Tube Standoffs provided -  
B. 5/8" Pass thru (Wall Penetration)  
C. 1/2" Flexible Conduit Whip to 120v Power (by others)  
D. 20 amp 120v Circuits Required (supplied by others)  
E. Disconnect Switch Required at Transformer Box (Supplied by Image National-Install by Installer)  
F. Grounded / Bonded Wire Connection from Letter Return To Transformer Can (Required)

NOTE: 'CHI' LOGO IS DUAL LIT UNLESS CODE DOES NOT ALLOW IT

'CHI' LOGO FLUSH W/ FACE

FACE TO INSET 1/4"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED FASTENER SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; - 1/2&quot; LAG SCREW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4&quot; - 3/8&quot; THREADED ROD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; RED HEAD L.D.T. (LARGE DIAMETER TAPCON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; DIA. HILTI HIT ROD WITH HY150 MAX ADHESIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; DIA. HILTI HIT ROD WITH HY20 ADHESIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; DIA. HILTI HIT ROD WITH HY20 ADHESIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; DIA. HILTI HCL SLEEVE ANCHOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot; DIA. LAG WITH 3/8&quot; SHIELD &amp; WASHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 (3&quot;) HEX SCREW W/ FENDER WASHER INTO PLASTIC WALL ANCHOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR ALL OTHER WALL CONDITIONS NOT LISTED ON OUR APPROVED FASTENER SCHEDULE, INSTALLER IS TO DETERMINE A SUITABLE METHOD OF ATTACHMENT FOR SIGNAGE AND OBTAIN APPROVAL FROM IMAGE NATIONAL SIGNS. IF INSTALLER IS UNSURE OF A METHOD, IMAGE NATIONAL SIGNS MUST BE CONSULTED. FOR ALL ATTACHMENT METHODS, INSTALLER MUST ADHERE TO GUIDELINES ON USE AND SITE PREPARATION RECOMMENDED BY FASTENER MANUFACTURER.
NOTE: LANDLORD AND CITY MAY DICTATE CHANGES PER LOCATION

CABINET:
- FRAME: 2" X 2" ALUMINUM SQUARE TUBE PAINTED MP 923SP BLACK (MATTE FINISH)
- FACE: 1/2" WHITE ACRYLIC W/GERBER MASK AND PAINTED MP N951SP SILVER (SATIN FINISH)
- "CHI" LOGO: FIRST SURFACE OPAQUE VINYL - LT SILVER METALLIC 3M 180C-220 FOR THE BLADES

NOTE: ONLY WHITE FIELD IS TO ILLUMINATE

INTERNAL ILLUMINATION:
- GE WHITE LED 7100K FOR A BRILLIANT AND CONSISTENT ILLUMINATION THROUGHOUT ALL ILLUMINATED ELEMENTS OF THE SIGN

NOTE: ALL U.L./MFR LABELS MUST BE PLACED OUT OF VIEW

SIGN TYPE: BLADE FLAG MOUNT
ELECTRICAL: SELF CONTAINED
MOUNTING TYPE: MOUNT FLUSH TO WALL
ATTACHMENT: NON-CORROSIVE SECUREMENT

SELF CONTAINED BLADE SIGN ATTACHMENT DETAIL
SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"

A. Non-Corrosive Securement - Threaded Rod, Lag Bolt or Lag and Shield (or appropriate mounting hardware)- Note: Blocking as Required per Installation Condition. '4' Total Required
B. Pass-Thru Conduit
C. 8'-0" x 1/2" Flexible Conduit Whip Out of Blade
D. 20 amp 120v Circuit Required Within 5' of Sign (supplied by others than Image National)
E. Internal Switch
F. Transformer

NOTE: NOT ACTUAL LED LAYOUT. ENGINEERING TO DETERMINE LAYOUT.
February 16, 2022

TO: Design Control Board

FROM: Gary Jones, Director

SUBJECT: ITEM 6A - ONGOING ACTIVITIES REPORT

BOARD ACTIONS ON ITEMS RELATING TO MARINA DEL REY
On January 11, 2022, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) delegated authority to the Director of Public Works (Director) to accept and execute grant documents from federal, State of California, local, and private agencies to support the County, the Waterworks Districts, and the Marina del Rey Water System. The BOS also authorized the Director to accept grant funds in amounts up to $5 million, provided the BOS is given advance notification before grant acceptance.

The BOS also authorized the Director of Internal Services, as the County’s Purchasing Agent, to proceed with the acquisition of three patrol vessels, in a total amount not to exceed $2,500,000, to replace the aging fleet at Marina del Rey Sheriff's Station.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION’S CALENDAR
No items related to Marina del Rey were on the January 2022 Regional Planning Commission agendas.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION CALENDAR
No meetings were conducted in January 2022 for the California Coastal Commission.

FUTURE MAJOR DESIGN CONTROL BOARD ITEMS
The Department is conducting a periodic review and update of the Marina del Rey Design Guidelines, which can be found at DBH’s website at the following link: http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/dbh/docs/1017705_MdR_DesignGuidelines.pdf. The document was approved by your Board on October 20, 2016. A draft of the updated guidelines will be presented to the Board at a future date.

SMALL CRAFT HARBOR COMMISSION MINUTES
The January 12, 2022 meeting minutes are pending approval.
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT STATUS REPORT
The updated “Marina del Rey Redevelopment Projects Report” is attached.

GJ:AC:tjf
Attachments (1)
February 16, 2022

TO:   Design Control Board
FROM:  Gary Jones, Director
SUBJECT: ITEM 6B – MARINA DEL REY SPECIAL EVENTS

**BURTON CHACE PARK YOGA CLASS**
Burton Chace Park ♦ 13650 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey
Sundays
9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Join the Department of Beaches and Harbors (Department) and instructor Anastasia for a yoga session at the water’s edge and connect with nature and community. Classes are offered to all, regardless of age or ability for $10 per class. Children should be able to follow along or sit quietly with a parent/guardian. Students must bring their own mats and water bottles. Please pre-register for each class by emailing chacepark@bh.lacounty.gov.

For more information: Call (424) 526-7910 or visit beaches.lacounty.gov

**BURTON CHACE PARK ZUMBA CLASS**
Burton Chace Park ♦ 13650 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey
Tuesdays and Thursdays
3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Ditch your boring workout and join the Department’s FREE outdoor Zumba class at Burton Chace Park! Each class is limited to 10 people. Registration is required and is available on a first-come, first served basis. Pre-register for each class by emailing chacepark@bh.lacounty.gov.

For more information: Call (424) 526-7910 or visit beaches.lacounty.gov
DRAWING & PAINTING CLASS
In-Person and online class via Zoom
Wednesdays
5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.

The Department is offering a FREE drawing and watercolor art class for beginners ages 14 years or older. In-person classes are limited to ten people and supplies are provided. Registration is required and is available on a first-come, first served basis. Pre-register for each class by emailing chacepark@bh.lacounty.gov.

For more information: Call (424) 526-7910 or visit beaches.lacounty.gov

MARINA DEL REY FARMERS’ MARKET
Parking Lot #11 ♦ 14101 Panay Way ♦ Marina del Rey
Saturdays
9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

The Department, in collaboration with Southland Farmers’ Markets Association, is offering the Marina del Rey Farmers’ Market on Saturdays. The Marina del Rey Farmers’ Market offers fresh, locally grown organic and conventionally grown fruits and veggies. Also available are prepackaged foods and much more! Paid parking is available for 25 cents for every 10 minutes.

For more information: Call the Marina del Rey Visitors Center at (424) 526-7900 or visit beaches.lacounty.gov

UCLA BLOOD AND BE THE MATCH BONE MARROW DRIVE
Burton Chace Park Community Room ♦ 13650 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey
Friday, February 18, 2022
9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Join UCLA by taking part in this lifesaving blood drive and bone marrow match event, sponsored by the Department. Please remember to eat well and increase your fluid intake a couple of days before and on the day of your donation appointment. A photo ID is required.

To schedule your donation, call (310) 825-0888 ext. 2 or visit the website at www.uclaheath.org/gotblood.

For more information: Email Noelle at nlaimednet.ucla.edu
HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE AND E-WASTE ROUNDUP
Dock 52 Parking Lot ♦ 13483 Fiji Way ♦ Marina del Rey
Saturday, February 19, 2022
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles are sponsoring the annual Household Hazardous Waste and E-Waste Roundup for the proper disposal of environmentally harmful household substances and electronic waste.

For more information: Call Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County at (800) 238-0173 or visit their website at www.lacsd.org

MARINA DEL REY DRAGON BOAT FESTIVAL
Burton Chace Park ♦ 13650 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey
Saturday, March 5, 2022
7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Join the Department for the inaugural Marina del Rey Dragon Boat Festival at Burton Chace Park! This FREE event will include dragon boat teams from local and out-of-state clubs to compete for the fastest boat on the water. Paddlers from 12-80 years old will enjoy the diversity and teamwork that the sport offers. Spectators may participate by cheering for the local Marina del Rey Team or simply enjoy watching the excitement of the races.

For more information: Visit lacountydragonboatfestival.com

W.A.T.E.R YOUTH PROGRAM SPRING SAILING CLASSES
Boathouse - Burton Chace Park ♦ 13640 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey

Los Angeles County Lifeguards will instruct the Department’s sailing courses that teaches students basic sailing knowledge and terms, boat maintenance and rigging, knot tying, tacking, docking and instruction to ocean sailing. Students will learn to sail on 14-foot Capri sailboats (with main sail and jib) and Laser sailboats. In the final days of the session, students may get experience on a Catalina 275 Sport.

Financial aid is available for qualified families. Please call for details.

2022 Spring Session: 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

April 11 – 15
April 18 – 22
Ages: 11 - 17 years old
Class Size: 6 – 10 students with 3 Lifeguard instructors
Level: Beginning and Intermediate
Fee: $355 for 5-day session

*NOTE: Applicants must successfully complete a 100-yard swim test in 2 minutes and 20 seconds to be eligible for Beginning Sailing.

For more information: Call (424) 526-7888 or visit marinadelrey.lacounty.gov

**COVID-19 GUIDELINES**
Maintaining a safe physical distance from others outside your household and wearing a face mask is highly encouraged for the above listed events and activities.

GJ:CML:da
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No. Project Name</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Redevelopment Proposed</th>
<th>Massing and Parking</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9 -- Proposed Hotel on northern portion of Parcel 9U, wetland park on southern portion. | Sam Hardage      | * Proposed dual building hotel, 6-story, 72'-high Marriott Residence Inn, and, 5-story, 61'-high Courtyard Marriott.  
* New promenade improvements, restaurants and amenities.  
* Wetland public park project (1.46 acres). | **Massing** -- One six-story, 72' high hotel and one five-story 61’ high hotel.  
**Parking** -- 231 parking spaces serving the hotel and wetland park. | **Proprietary** -- Option was approved by BOS on 10/6/15. Lease was executed on July 31, 2017  
**Regulatory** -- January 6, 2016, the BOS' approval of the hotel project was appealed to the CCC. On May 13, 2016, the CCC granted a time extension, until December 12, 2016, for the wetland park CDP. On July 11, 2016, work began on the wetland park. On April 26, 2017, the DCB approved the final design of the hotel project. Construction of the hotel began on August 11, 2017, and Certificate of Occupancy was issued on August 2, 2021. The Department of Public Works, Building and Safety Division signed off on the Wetland Park December 2021.  
Wetland Park: Building and Safety signed off on GS Neptune (Parcel 14)’s work at the park in Dec 2021. |
| 10/14 (FF) -- Neptune Marina/Legacy Partners | Andrew Kuo       | * Demolish existing facilities and build 526 apartments.  
* 161-slip marina + 7 end-ties.  
* 28 foot-wide waterfront promenade. | **Massing** -- Four 55’ tall clustered 4-story residential buildings over Parking with view corridor.  
**Parking** -- 1,012 project required parking spaces to be provided (103 public Parking spaces to be replaced off site)  
* Replacement of public parking both on and off site. | **Proprietary** -- December 1, 2015, the BOS agreed to extend the term of the option for up to one year. Lessee submitted Lease Assignments and Assignments of Options to extend existing lease for Parcel 10 and the lease for Parcel 14. The SCHC endorsed the assignments on September 21, 2016 and the BOS approved on October 4, 2016. Parcel 10 and 14 Lease as executed on 12/9/16.  
**Regulatory** -- On January 21, 2015, the final project design was approved by the Design Control Board. On December 12, 2016, work began on the project. Project completion is expected in Summer 2021. On December 14, 2021, the Lessee received Certificate of Occupancy for Parcels 10 and 14, and the Recorded Notice of Completion dated September 7, 2021. Lessee is requesting the Final Completion Certificate from the County.  
Lessee received Certificate of Occupancy for Parcels 10 and 14 on 12/14/2021, and the Recorded Notice of Completion dated 9/7/2021. Lessee is requesting the Final Completion Certificate from the County. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No. Project Name</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Redevelopment Proposed</th>
<th>Massing and Parking</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 - Pier 44/Pacific Marina Venture</td>
<td>Michael Pashaie/ David Taban</td>
<td>* Build 5 new visitor serving commercial and dry storage buildings</td>
<td>Massing -- Four new visitor-serving commercial buildings, maximum 36’ tall and one dry stack storage building, 65’ tall. 771.5 lineal feet view corridor proposed.</td>
<td>Proprietary -- The lessee initialed a revised Term Sheet on July 9, 2015. On January 13, 2016, SCHC endorsed DBH’s recommendation to grant lessee an option to extend the lease term for 39 years. The Grant of Option was approved by the BOS in October 2016. Amended and restated lease was executed on August 24, 2017. Construction began on September 11, 2017. Trader Joe’s opened on 4/18/19. Restaurants including, KazuNori Sushi, Hiho Burger, Uovo Pasta, and American Cheeseburger are now open to the public. Retailers including Bank of America, Seamark, and a few yacht brokers are also open for business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* 82,652 s.f. visitor serving commercial space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory -- February 9, 2016, the BOS approved the project, which was appealed to the CCC. CCC denied the appeal on June 9, 2016. Lessee has received tenant improvement permits to build out several sublessees’ offices. Lessee anticipates the buildout to be complete by early 2022. A 40,000 sq.ft. building is currently vacant. Additionally, DPW will not issue a final Certificate of Occupancy until all buildings have been occupied. The lessee is in negotiation with several prospective tenants for the vacant space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* 141 slips + 5 end ties and 57 dry storage spaces</td>
<td>Parking -- 381 at grade Parking spaces will be provided with shared Parking agreement (402 Parking spaces required).</td>
<td>Regulatory Matter: Shared Parking Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No. Project Name</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Redevelopment Proposed</td>
<td>Massing and Parking</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 113 -- Mariner's Village | Michael Sondermann | * Renovation of 981 apartments  
* Improvements to promenade | Massing – Existing buildings to remain.  
Parking – Existing parking to remain. | Proprietary – Item opened on 9/23/2013. On October 30, 2018, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved an option for an amended at restated lease. The revised project will include 20% affordable units.  
Regulatory – The Regional Planning Commission approved an after-the-fact Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for the previous removal of waterbird nests. The appeal of that CDP was approved by the Coastal Commission in September 8, 2021. Lessee is tentatively scheduled to present at the Marina del Rey Design Control Board meeting scheduled for January 19, 2022. Lessee’s presentation at Jan 19, 2022’s DCB meeting was continued to allow more time to review the proposal. Staff scheduled ex-parte meetings with Meg Coffee and Chair Cho. Staff anticipates Lessee will be able to present at the March 2022 DCB meeting. |