Malibu Civic Center Design Standards
Task Force
Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, January 13, 2015
6:30 p.m.
City Hall – Multipurpose Room
23825 Stuart Ranch Road

Call to Order

Roll Call – Recording Secretary

Approval of Agenda


1. Ceremonials / Presentations
   A. Administration of Oath of Office to Task Force Members
   B. Introductions of Staff, Consultant Team, and Task Force Members

2. Written and Oral Communication from the Public
   A. Communications from the Public concerning matters which are not on the agenda but for which the Task Force has subject jurisdiction. The Task Force may not act on these matters except to refer the matters to staff or schedule the matters for a future agenda.
   B. Task Force and staff comments and inquiries

3. Consent Calendar
   None.

4. Old Business
   None.

5. New Business
   A. Malibu Civic Center Design Standards
      Staff recommendation: 1) Discuss the Civic Center Design Standards Task Force’s purpose and responsibilities; 2) Discuss the Civic Center’s planning and design context, including review of the Malibu Civic Center Design Setting the Stage Workbook; 3) Review results of the October 2014 Open House Summary Report; 4) Review and affirm
five to eight “Big Ideas” from the workshop and the issues the design standards need to address; and 5) Discuss next steps.

Staff contact: Planning Manager Blue, 456-2489 ext. 258

Adjournment

Guide to Civic Center Design Standards Task Force Proceedings

The Oral Communication portion of the agenda is for members of the public to present items which are not listed on the agenda, but are under the subject matter jurisdiction of the Task Force. No action may be taken under, except to direct staff, unless the Task Force, by a two-thirds vote, determines that there is a need to take immediate action and that need came to the attention of the City after the posting of the agenda. Although no action may be taken, the Task Force and staff will follow up at an appropriate time on those items needing response. Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. Time may be surrendered by deferring one (1) minute to another speaker, not to exceed a total of eight (8) minutes. The speaker wishing to defer time must be present when the item is heard. In order to be recognized and present an item, each speaker must complete and submit to the Recording Secretary a Request to Speak form prior to the beginning of the item being announced by the Chair (forms are available outside the Council Chambers). Speakers are taken in the order slips are submitted.

Items in Consent Calendar have not been discussed previously by the Task Force. If discussion is desired, an item may be removed from the Consent Calendar for individual consideration. Task Force members may indicate a negative or abstaining vote on any individual item by so declaring prior to the vote on the motion to adopt the entire Consent Calendar. Items excluded from the Consent Calendar will be taken up by the Task Force following the action on the Consent Calendar. The Task Force first will take up the items for which public speaker requests have been submitted. Public speakers shall follow the rules as set forth under Oral Communication.

Old Business items have appeared on previous agendas but have either been continued or tabled to this meeting with no final action having been taken. Public comment shall follow the rules as set forth under Oral Communication.

Items in New Business are items which are appearing for the first time for formal action. Public comment shall follow the rules as set forth under Oral Communication.

Copies of the staff reports or other written documentation relating to each item of business described above are on file in the Planning Department, Malibu City Hall, 23825 Stuart Ranch Road, Malibu, California, and are available for public inspection during regular office hours which are 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday and 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Friday. Written materials distributed to the Task Force within 72 hours of the Task Force meeting are available for public inspection immediately upon distribution in the Planning Department at 23825 Stuart Ranch Road, Malibu, California (Government Code Section 54957.5(b)(2). Copies of staff reports and written materials may be purchased for $0.25 per page. Pursuant to state law, this agenda was posted at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

The City Hall telephone number is (310) 456-2489. To contact City Hall using a telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD), please call (800) 735-2929 and a California Relay Service operator will assist you. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Environmental Sustainability Director Victor Peterson at (310) 456-2489, ext. 251. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADD Title II). Requests for use of audio or video equipment during a Task Force meeting should be directed to Alex Montano at (310) 456-2489 ext. 227 or amontano@malibucity.org before 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing agenda was posted in accordance with the applicable legal requirements; dated this 9th day of January 2015.

Patricia Salazar, Senior Administrative Analyst
Task Force Agenda Report

To: Members of the Task Force

Prepared by: Bonnie Blue, AICP, Planning Manager

Date prepared: January 9, 2015

Meeting date: January 13, 2015

Subject: Malibu Civic Center Design Standards

RECOMMENDED ACTION: 1) Discuss the Civic Center Design Standards Task Force’s purpose and responsibilities; 2) Discuss the Civic Center’s planning and design context, including review of the Malibu Civic Center Design Setting the Stage Workbook; 3) Review results of the October 2014 Open House Summary Report; 4) Review and affirm five to eight “Big Ideas” from the workshop and the issues the design standards need to address; and 5) Discuss next steps.

DISCUSSION: On July 14, 2014, the City Council approved an agreement, including a scope of work (Attachment 1), between the City of Malibu and MIG / Hogle Ireland for preparation of Civic Center Design Standards ("Project"). As part of the Project, a Task Force, comprised of citizens with a stake or interest in the Civic Center Area, was established by the Council. Ten members were appointed to the Task Force by the Council on October 13, 2014 (Attachment 2 – Resolution No. 14-62). The Task Force is charged with: 1) providing feedback to MIG and City staff on the results of the two planned community workshops; and 2) providing feedback on the Civic Center Design Standards.

The first community “Open House” workshop was held on Friday, October 17 and Saturday, October 18, 2014. Since the Open House workshop, two documents have been prepared by the consultant team and distributed to the Task Force via email: 1) Community Open House Summary Report; and 2) Malibu Civic Center Design Setting the Stage Workbook (Attachments 3 and 4).

During this meeting, the consultant team (MIG and John Kaliski Architects) and staff will lead the Task Force through the following:

1. Discussion of the Civic Center Design Standards Task Force’s purpose and responsibilities;
2. Discussion of the Civic Center’s planning and design context, including review of the Malibu Civic Center Design Setting the Stage Workbook;
3. Review of results of the October 2014 Community Open House Summary Report;
4. Review and affirmation of five to eight “Big Ideas” from the workshop and the issues the design standards need to address; and
5. Discussion of next steps.

CONCLUSION: This meeting is identified as Task 4.3 (Task Force Meeting #1 and Summary) in MIG’s scope of work. Following this meeting, the consultant team will prepare a summary of the meeting results and, depending on input from the Task Force, develop a draft vision document for the design standards.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. MIG Scope of Work
3. Community Open House Summary Report
4. Malibu Civic Center Design Setting the Stage Workbook
5. Correspondence
Malibu Civic Center Area Design Standards
Scope of Work

**TASK 0 – ON-GOING TASKS**

Task 0.1 – Staff Coordination – Calls and Meetings
Regularly scheduled staff meetings (phone meetings and meetings in Malibu) and miscellaneous project coordination, including scope and schedule review, will be held for the duration of the planning process between City staff and MIG. The summaries of these meetings will be included in the monthly invoicing process.

Task 0.2 – Project Management
MIG will meet periodically with the subconsultants for coordination and management purposes. This task also covers day-to-day project management tasks, including invoice review and preparation and contract administration. Assuming an approximate one-year program, the budget includes an allowance for this task.

**Task 0 Deliverables:**
- Bi-weekly Meeting Summaries

**TASK 1 – PROJECT INITIATION**

Task 1.1 – Refine Tasks and Schedule
MIG will meet with City staff to:
- Refine and tailor work the program to ensure that timing, responsibilities and objectives are clearly understood
- Establish coordination and logistical procedures
- Refine desired outcomes
- Prepare a detailed project schedule
- Develop a management structure to help ensure project deadlines are met and work is completed on time and on budget
- Determine the need and structure of input venues for various interests, such as stakeholders, the general public, the Task Force, other governmental agencies, etc.
- Identify potential members of the Task Force (if not already established)
- Identify potential Stakeholders for the stakeholder interviews
- Outline roles and responsibilities of consultants and City staff—expectations and protocols for how we will all interact, communicate, cooperate, invoice, and bill

MIG will develop a comprehensive Public Engagement Plan in coordination with City staff to identify how best to conduct outreach to community members regarding the Civic Center Design Standards. The initial Public Engagement Plan will include components such as a schedule, key priorities, structure, public involvement and
outreach activities, and identification of key relationships. It will also include a detailed process diagram to illustrate the sequence and timing of project activities in a succinct format.

Task 1.2 – Preliminary Data Collection and Review
The consultant team will collect and review existing plans and additional key data pertaining to the Civic Center Design Standards, and will identify potential current and future issues. MIG will obtain GIS data from City consultants.

Task 1.3 – Organize and Conduct Project Area Tour
MIG and City staff will coordinate the initial meetings. Areas addressed include: 1) identification of additional data and information needs; 2) preparation of agendas and questions for the kick-off meetings; 3) next steps for organizing the Task Force; and 4) identification of responsibilities of staff and other technical sources. City staff will lead the MIG Team on a tour of the Civic Center area. The tour will be conducted via a windshield survey and walking, and will identify conditions not acknowledged in existing data. MIG will document landmarks, opportunity areas, circulation, access, and visibility. MIG will photo-document the Malibu Civic Center area’s design character (towers, cupolas, roof parapets, kiosks, changes in roof elevations, roof monuments, signage, landscape features, pedestrian walkways, lighting and pavement materials) for use in subsequent presentations and work products. The City will be responsible for tour logistics.

**Task 1 Deliverables**
- Refined Scope of Work and Public Engagement Plan
- Summary of MIG/City Staff Meeting
- Photos from Project Area Tour

**TASK 2 - INITIAL LEARNING AND EDUCATION**

Task 2.1 – Work Session with City Staff
The MIG Team will meet with the City staff to discuss prominent issues and opportunities, and to prepare for immediate work tasks.

Task 2.2 – Stakeholder Interviews
The MIG Team will conduct two full days of one-on-one and small group stakeholder interviews/meetings. These interviews are expected to be informal meetings that last approximately one hour. Potential participants/interviewees include representatives from business representatives (Chamber of Commerce, local merchants), development industry, environmental organizations, and community and neighborhood organizations. The final list of interviewees will be developed by MIG in close coordination with City staff. City staff will be responsible for contacting the interviewees and setting up the meetings.

**Task 2 Deliverables:**
- Summaries of Work Session with City Staff
- Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

**TASK 3 – EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS**
The MIG Team will conduct an analysis of existing conditions and their regulatory context. MIG will prepare comprehensive and concise technical studies to support the Design Standards.

Task 3.1 – Base Mapping
The MIG Team will identify, collect, and review existing GIS data from the City. Data request is dependent on data availability but is likely to include existing and future land use, zoning, available parcel and assessor attributes (ownership, year built, value, housing, employment characteristics, height), jobs data, street
centerlines, rights-of-way, building footprints, easements, trails, and infrastructure. All information will be assumed to be accurate and up-to-date.

MIG, in coordination with the City staff, will also define and format a series of base maps to illustrate existing conditions information such as existing land use, zoning, circulation, and environmental information. We will ensure all maps have a uniform style, legend, and title block. At the culmination of the project, MIG will provide the City with the GIS maps and associated files developed during the process.

Task 3.2 – Detailed Land Use Survey
MIG will conduct a land use survey (using satellite imagery, Google Streetview, and a follow-up windshield survey for field verification as needed) to establish baseline land use conditions for planning and CEQA analysis purposes. At the culmination of the project, MIG will provide the City with the GIS maps and associated files developed during the process. All GIS data and mapping will be developed consistent with City protocols and data formats to ensure easy integration into the City’s information system upon completion of the project.

Task 3.3 – Urban Design Analysis
MIG and Kaliski Architects will conduct an urban design analysis of existing development and plans currently in process. We will note architecture, landscaping, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, signage, streetscape improvements, etc. The analysis report will be largely pictorial, with comments on themes and features that may be encouraged and those that perhaps should not be repeated. MIG will produce associated maps and graphics that illustrate existing conditions, including gateways, historic resources, major urban features, open space, character areas, and landmarks.

Task 3 Deliverables:
- Base Maps (electronic version)
- Land Survey Maps (electronic version)
- Urban Design Analysis (electronic version)
- Summary of Staff Work Session on Technical Studies (electronic version)

TASK 4 – COMMUNITY VISION

Task 4.1 – Community Workshop #1- Visioning
MIG will prepare base mapping, display materials, and a presentation for this first workshop focused on refining the Vision for the Civic Center area. MIG will facilitate a community workshop to provide an overview of the project and solicit input from the community on a draft Vision and desired outcomes. Topics include community values, confirmation of the issues to be addressed in the Design Standards, and what the vision should be for the Civic Center. MIG, in coordination with City staff and the project team, will be responsible for developing the content, printing materials, and facilitating the workshop. City staff will be responsible for securing workshop locations and printing and mailing announcements.

Task 4.2 – Summarize Community Workshop #1
MIG will prepare a summary of the information received at Community Workshop #1.

Task 4.3 – Task Force Meeting #1 and Summary
MIG will meet with the Task Force to discuss the results of the community workshop. Following the meeting, we will prepare an action summary. (We will not prepare detailed minutes of the Task Force meetings.)

Task 4.4 – Draft Vision Document
Based on the input received from the workshop and Task Force, and in close coordination with City staff, MIG will develop a Vision Document for the Design Standards. This framework will include a vision for future growth.
and revitalization in the Civic Center and draft Guiding Principles. The MIG Team will submit a draft for City staff review, and then will produce a revised version that reflects staff’s edits that will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Task 4.5 – Joint City Council and Planning Commission Workshop: Affirm Vision
MIG will conduct a joint Planning Commission and City Council workshop to review community ideas and priorities for the Design Standards and to approve the Vision Document.

**Task 4 Deliverables:**
- Materials and Presentation for Community Workshop #1 (electronic version)
- Summary Report for Community Workshop #1 (electronic version)
- Draft Vision Document (electronic version)
- Materials for and Summaries of Staff Debrief, Debrief with Taskforce, and Update with Planning Commission and City Council (electronic version)

**TASK 5 – DESIGN STANDARDS AND ALTERNATIVES APPROACHES**

Task 5.1 – Creation of Concept Alternative Design Approaches
Building upon the Vision, MIG will develop—in close coordination with City staff—three Concept Alternative Design Approaches that will be used to show architectural patterns and themes to be preserved, character elements to emphasize, and barriers to be addressed. The concept alternatives will be highly graphic and include descriptive text, diagrams, and images (including photo simulations and sketches). Our budget provides an allowance of staff hours for the photo simulations and sketches.

Task 5.2 – Department Work Session
The MIG Team will meet with City staff and representatives of City Departments to review the Concepts with the intention of identifying concerns, issues, or other concepts that should be tested. MIG will then finalize the Concept Alternative Design Approaches into a Summary Report.

Task 5.3 – Task Force Meeting #2 and Summary
MIG will prepare for and facilitate a meeting with the Task Force to discuss the Concept Alternatives. The Task Force will provide feedback to MIG on the Concept Alternatives, including suggested additions and revisions. The Task Force will also discuss the agenda and goals for Community Workshop #2.

Task 5.4 – Milestone Newsletter on Alternative Concepts
MIG will prepare a newsletter that summarizes—graphically and with narrative text—the Concept Alternatives Summary Report and what is expected at the upcoming Community Workshop #2. The newsletter will include the overall planning process, schedule, and how members of the public can get directly involved. MIG will post the newsletter on the project website and distribute it via e-blasts (in Task 5.6). The City will be responsible for distributing the newsletter.

Tasks 5.5 – Community Workshop #2 and Summary
MIG will prepare base mapping, display materials, and the presentation for Community Workshop #2. MIG will facilitate meeting to provide an update on the project and solicit input from the community. The agenda for this workshop will include: presentation of the Vision and Guiding Principles, summary of the Concept Alternative Design Approaches, and an interactive exercise to gain public input on the Design Concept Alternatives, ultimately resulting in direction for a preferred alternatives with or without modifications. We will consider using keypad polling to get real-time feedback from workshop attendees on the concept alternatives. MIG, in coordination with City staff and the project team, will be responsible for developing the content, printing materials, and facilitating. Our budget provides for attendance by three MIG staff persons and support
subconsultant staff. City staff will be responsible for securing meeting location, and printing and mailing announcements.

MIG will prepare a summary of the information received at Community Workshop #2.

Task 5.6 – Prepare Administrative Draft of Design Standard Alternatives
Based on the input received at the Community Workshop #2, MIG will adjust the Concept Alternatives into a Preferred Alternative.

Task 5.7 – Task Force Meeting #3
MIG will prepare for and facilitate the Task Force meeting to review the results of the Community Workshop #2. The Task Force will comment on the Preferred Alternative and suggest modifications.

**Task 5 Deliverables:**
- Concept Alternatives Summary Report (Descriptions and Assessment Summary) (electronic version)
- Summaries of Work Sessions with Staff and Task Force (electronic version)
- Milestone Newsletter on Concept Alternatives (electronic version)
- Materials and Presentation for Community Workshop #2 (electronic version)
- Summary of Community Workshop #2 Results (electronic version)
- Administrative Draft Design Standards – 1 copy of each document on CD (to include both a PDF and Word versions)

**TASK 6 – CEQA DOCUMENTATION, PUBLIC HEARINGS, AND FINAL DESIGN STANDARDS**

Task 6.1 – Prepare Final Design Standards for Public Hearing
Based on the input received from the Task Force and in consultation with City staff, MIG will draft the Final Design Standards. City staff will be responsible for producing the document in ordinance form, if required.

Task 6.2 – CEQA Documentation for Design Standards
As noted above, adoption of the Design Standards is considered a “project” under CEQA and will require CEQA review. We have assumed preparation of an Initial Study/(Mitigated) Negative Declaration. We will prepare such in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines and any local City CEQA regulations. The City will be responsible for all noticing and mailing.

Task 6.3 – Public Hearings on Design Standards (allowance)
MIG will prepare for and facilitate a hearing with the Planning Commission to present the proposed Design Standards. Following Planning Commission action, MIG will prepare for and facilitate a hearing with the City Council. In the budget, we provide an allowance for hearing attendance.

Task 6.4 – Final Design Standards
Based on final direction from the City Council, MIG will finalize the Design Standards.

**Task 6 Deliverables:**
- Final Draft of the Design Standards for public hearings (20 bound copies, a reproducible original and 1 copy on CD (to include both PDF and Word versions of the document)
- Administrative Draft Initial Study/(Mitigated) Negative Declaration (to include both PDF and Word versions of the document)
- Public Draft Initial Study/(Mitigated) Negative Declaration (20 bound copies, a reproducible original and 1 copy on CD; also to include both PDF and Word versions of the document)
TASK 7 – MARKET ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS (OPTIONAL)

Task 7.1 – Market Assessment

This task will be led by Andrew Kaplan of EPS. The purpose of the market assessment is to support the team by identifying the underlying real estate trends and socio-economic conditions that influence market potential in the Civic Center area for various land uses, development prototypes, and tenants, given market factors and the physical development envelope as determined by site conditions and a range of zoning and building code parameters. The findings of this analysis will inform the development of the plan scenarios, provide context for community and stakeholder discussions, and support the subsequent program and implementation strategy recommendations. The market assessment analysis will include the following sub-tasks.

Define Competitive Trade Area: The analysis will focus on the Civic Center area as well as a larger Trade Area. This Trade Area will be defined to extend beyond the Civic Center area to include areas or nodes that may compete directly with the Civic Center area for the provision of retail and commercial services, or alternatively, that may provide direct sources of land use demand. For example, retail options at the Trancas Market Shopping Center or in Point Dume Village may mitigate the need for certain kinds of retail in the Civic Center area. At the same time, Malibu attracts destination retail demand from outlying areas, which supports the inclusion of cities such as Calabasas, Agoura Hills, Pacific Palisades, and Santa Monica in the Trade Area.

Evaluate Socio-Economic Characteristics: This task will focus on factors that position the Civic Center area competitively and that drive demand for potential land uses. Specifically, EPS will analyze demographic conditions within the Study Area and Trade Area (e.g., population growth, household formation, age, income, and education levels, etc.), employment characteristics (e.g., employment mix, in-commute/out-commute patterns), and how each could evolve within the land use context defined by the proposed Design Standards, or other applicable regulatory framework. EPS will rely primarily on database resources in completing this task, such as from the census, ESRI, and SCAG.

Evaluate Real Estate Economics: In this task, EPS will review existing market metrics for retail, residential, office, hotel, and other potential land uses. As a part of this analysis, EPS will assess the implications of various influential factors, such as different design standards, formula retail guidelines, property ownership patterns, and other considerations, on the development economics of various uses. EPS will perform this task using database resources, on-site surveys, and interviews with real estate professionals and users including brokers, investors, developers, retail tenants, and office tenants. The specific land use categories to be analyzed will be determined in consultation with staff but could include the following:

- Retail and Commercial Services potential will be analyzed based on a review of existing retail performance in the Civic Center area and Trade Area, an assessment of existing and future expected competition, and a broad consideration of retail category representation and leakage. In its analysis, EPS will distinguish neighborhood retail and services supporting residents and local employees from destination retail. As part of this analysis, EPS will also prepare a summary of retail tenant physical site requirements, broken out by tenant and category. EPS will also consider how constraints on access due to the limited capacity of Pacific Coast Highway and the canyon roads influence category market potential.

- Residential potential will be analyzed through an assessment of the current housing supply and what future housing and housing types—given market and socio-economic conditions—may be supportable. Market indicators such as construction starts, rents, and housing prices will be researched and compared with competing areas. Market findings will be cross-referenced with long-term
residential and population growth projections and with findings from the City’s General Plan Housing Element.

- Office potential will be evaluated through a review of rents, vacancies, absorption rates, and historical inventory changes. Market metrics will be supplemented with interviews with land use professionals knowledgeable about the dynamics of the Malibu office market and its competitive position.

- Small visitor-serving, hospitality uses will be evaluated through a broad assessment of competitive supply and positioning using a mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches. Demand will be assessed using industry forecasts and through selected interviews with industry professionals.

**Summary Memo:** EPS will integrate findings from the market analysis and make a preliminary recommendation for market-supported uses, given market factors, site factors, findings from community meetings, formula retail restrictions, design considerations, preferred zoning envelope, and other factors to be determined in consultation with the team. Where applicable, EPS will illustrate how recommended uses may reflect trade-offs between economic and policy goals.

**Task 7.2 – Development Feasibility Analysis**

EPS will test the financial feasibility of up to two unique land use programs comprising three unique uses each to illustrate the interplay between revenue, cost, and regulatory factors in determining financial feasibility. The program options will be based on findings from the Market Assessment and developed in close collaboration with team members and staff to illustrate an appropriate range of development options for the Civic Center Area. The analysis will employ development pro forma models that consider rents and escalations, land costs, buy-out costs (if existing uses are to be redeveloped), demolition costs (if appropriate), site work, typical direct and indirect construction costs, and an assumed developer return to test development feasibility of the proposed prototypes. This modeling tool will also provide flexibility for testing and refining program ideas, such as alternative approaches to design guidelines and allowable densities.

**Task 7 Deliverables:**

- Market Assessment Summary Memo (to include both PDF and Word versions of the document)
- Feasibility Analysis (to include both PDF and Excel versions of the model)
RESOLUTION NO. 14-62

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MALIBU
ESTABLISHING THE MALIBU CIVIC CENTER DESIGN STANDARDS TASK
FORCE AND CHARTER AND RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 14-60

SECTION 1. Recitals.

A. On July 14, 2014, the City Council approved an agreement between the City of Malibu and MIG / Hogle Ireland for the preparation of Civic Center Design Standards.

B. The scope of work for preparation of the Civic Center Design Standards includes the establishment of a Civic Center Design Standards Task Force.

C. The Task Force will provide feedback to MIG and City staff on the Design Standards.

D. On September 22, 2014, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 14-60 establishing the Civic Center Design Standards Task Force which required members to reside in the 90265 zip code.

E. To allow persons who own a business, property or otherwise have an interest in the Civic Center, the 90265 zip code requirement is being removed.

SECTION 2. The City Council hereby creates the Civic Center Design Standards Task Force, composed of 10 members, two (2) members each appointed by the individual Councilmembers, to address and provide feedback on the Design Standards for the Civic Center.

SECTION 3. The Charter for the Civic Center Design Standards Task Force shall be limited to: 1) providing feedback to MIG and City staff on the results of two planned community workshops; and 2) providing feedback on the Civic Center Design Standards.

SECTION 4. As outlined in the MIG Scope of Work, the Task Force shall meet three times with MIG to provide feedback. At the conclusion of the three meetings, the Task Force shall be disbanded.

SECTION 5. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution and enter it into the book of original resolutions.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 13th day of October 2014.

SKYLLAR PEAK, Mayor

ATTEST:

Lisa Pope, City Clerk
(seal)

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Christi Hogin, City Attorney

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION NO. 14-62 was passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Malibu at the regular meeting thereof held on the 13th day of October 2014 by the following vote:

AYES: 5 Councilmembers: House, La Monte, Rosenthal, Sibert, Peak
NOES: 0
ABSTAIN: 0
ABSENT: 0

Lisa Pope, City Clerk
(seal)
Summary
Malibu Civic Center Design Standards
October 17 and 18, 2014 Open House

Overview

On Friday, October 17 and Saturday, October 18, 2014, in the multipurpose and Zuma rooms of Malibu City Hall, the City of Malibu held its first Community Open House for the Malibu Civic Center Design Standards. The open house was the first of several workshops and Task Force meetings planned by the City to hear ideas from the community. The open house was attended by approximately 30 participants, including residents, Task Force appointees, City Council members, and local business and property owners, and architects who practice in Malibu. The City’s Planning Director Joyce Parker-Bozyinski and Laura Stetson, Principal for MIG (the lead consultant firm assisting the City with the Civic Center Design Standards), moderated the open house.

The workshop was designed to introduce the project to the community and to ask participants to describe their impressions of the feel, experience, and identity of Malibu’s Civic Center. The themes discussed during the two-day open house will be used to define guiding principles for the Design Standards. Each day included a one-hour long walking tour to familiarize people with existing development within the Civic Center district.

The workshop was organized as an open house format to allow participants to come and go at any time. At the beginning of the open house and as needed throughout each day, Ms. Stetson conducted a brief orientation to provide a common foundation for those experiencing the open house activities.

The open house consisted of educational and interactive stations, and attendees were encouraged to comment on the materials presented. The interactive displays addressed:

- Malibu Civic Center Shopping Centers: Comment on What Works Today and What Does Not
• What Defines the Malibu Character?
• Design Standards versus Design Guidelines: The Design Review Process
• Open Space, Connectivity, and Landscaping and Other Components of Design Detail

In addition to providing written comments on sticky notes at the topic stations, attendees were able to provide additional feedback at the event using the following tools:

• On-line survey
• Walking Tour comment brochure
• Comment card
• “Graffiti” wall for free-form comments on any issue

Participants’ comments and responses are summarized on the following pages.
I. Welcome, Introduction, and Open House Orientation

Laura Stetson of MIG welcomed attendees to the Open House and thanked them for participating. Ms. Stetson gave a 15-minute presentation covering the planning history of the Civic Center district and questions for participants to consider as they interact with staff and the consultant team during the Open House. The presentation is included as Appendix A.

*Laura Stetson, a consultant to the City, gives an introductory presentation.*

II. Malibu Civic Center Shopping Centers

At this station, participants reviewed display boards presenting images of existing development in the Civic Center District and were asked describe what they liked and did not like. The map below identifies the location of existing and proposed projects in the Civic Center. Photos of each shopping center display board center are included in the subsequent pages.
The following comments have been grouped by display board.

**Malibu Village**

Existing stores include but are not limited to, Levis, Marmalade Café, Malibu Hollywood Cinemas, Banana Republic, and Soul Cycle.

- Like! Eclecticism
- More gathering areas
- Corporate America for mid-priced snobs
- Dislike compact parking
- Need for more local shops and not high-priced tourist shops
- Grass and open space equals gathering area
- Create more seating opportunities
- Interesting
- Don’t like gas station connection to shopping area via parking lot
- Dislike!!
- The best part about Malibu Village, which is not utilized, is the wonderful banks along the creek. Could be a walking, biking path, with restaurants, patios should open up to the back of this mall. It’s beautiful; tear down and start new!
- Need smaller businesses (not chains here)
- Ugly and uninviting facades with generic chain stores
- Does not take advantage of Malibu Creek
- Only interesting part is the egret nest trees in parking lot
- All high end stores; ridiculous for locals
- Needs open green space
- Need more services centers: shoe repair, radio shack, books, cafes
- Not enough parking
- No character; doesn’t relate to County Mart; feels separate; feels tourist
- Flat high-end money
- Boring
- Façade variation break up buildings; no box look
- Some detailed elements

**Cross Creek Courtyard**

Existing stores include but are not limited to, Urban Outfitters and Malibu Management Estate Services.

- Love my angled parking and tree/landscaped street parking
- Like! Trees near parking easy access to Urban Outfitters
- Like! Buffered parking; parking shouldn’t come straight to building
- Not excited Urban Outfitters is here
Like! Will grow into a nice space
Did not know about the space behind Urban Outfitters; shows potential
More signage; no idea what is available here
Courtyard is pleasant and inviting and landscaping includes new monarch butterfly gardens but I have no use for Urban Outfitters; – Agree
Like what they have done so far; wish it was more connected to other centers
Look like Army housing on pre-fabricated construction
Poor entrance; needs identification
Garden accessibility
No character; how did that happen?
Ugly
Modern glass, wood, and landscape
Green parking, not just asphalt, shade
Sucks

Country Mart

Existing stores include but are not limited to Juicy Couture, 5 Point Yoga, Howdy’s, John’s Garden, Westside Estate Agency, Madison, Toy Crazy, Malibu Car Wash, and L’Occitane.

Shopping prices really high, locals don’t shop a lot (except a few stores i.e., Toy)
Dislike! Big high sign
Like! Kids park
Sorry to see bookstore leave
Like! L’occitane smaller, interesting, sign
Shop signs are appropriate for unique stores of both local and tourist needs
Underparked severely
Like central quad congregation and play area safely away from traffic
Driveway traffic is safety hazard to walking patrons
Like! The great mix of shops
Like! The courtyard open space and mixed density
Dislike! Parking ingress/egress gets backed up
Wish it was more connected with park
Love the energy at the playground, green space, nice place to hang out
Like playground and open space, hate that almost all the small stores are gone, especially Tops and Diesel
Like!
1-story human scale preserves view of mountains
Center designed around open space instead of parking lot
Use native drought-tolerant landscaping
Keep lot of green open space
Spacious, not compact
• Parking: possibly use Colony
• Like playground
• User friendly
• Eclectic
• Too sterile
• Parking lot circulation poor; lots should be joined
• Open air
• Safety, truck parking, street truck unloading in Cross Creek Road and Civic Way medians
• Access to park should be integrated
• Separation different spaces, seating
• Lack of parking

Cross Creek Road Area

Existing stores include but are not limited to, Malibu Hardware and Supply, Cross Fit Malibu, and Artifac Tree Thrift Store.

• Needs to connect to creek
• Love this area as a rural part of community
• Would hate to see this wiped out and replaced with another big box development
• Hardware store is wonderful; like old Malibu rural feel of road and horse farm at the end of the road
• Love eclectic vibe
• Feels like the “real” Malibu
• Human need/nature interface is positive attribute to this area
• Local need serving use on perimeter of commercial area helps repurpose instead of landfill
• Interim use but effective temporary utilization
• Dislike! We should allow owner to plan/build
• Dislike! Chain link and closed off feeling – Agree
• Keep rural Malibu like this area!
• Love hardware; wish it was more connected to other shops
• Love to have the hardware store in town, even if inventory is somewhat limited, but the staff is super friendly and helpful
• Reused space, old World War II design
• Reflect Indian Chumash in design of shops, themed beautiful tents/tepees (handiwork), feathers blades, statuary
• Keep zoning; mish-mosh but landscaped well and other uses -> Intrigue
• Fits into creek area
• Rural character! But needs signage
• Needs traffic safe drop-off area (off street!)
• Transient people services, charity
• Good rural use of service space!
• Walk for riverfront
• Poor access
• Connectivity between these shopping centers! Overlay design

Malibu Lumber Yard

Existing stores include but are not limited to, Café Habana, J. Crew, kiston, Tory Burch, and Canyon Beachwear.

• Like non-reflective and natural wall finishes
• Like architecture of wood; modern feel
• Like architecture: wood or modern
• I never go here: too expensive, poor parking plan and uninviting design. One thing I like: drought-tolerant plants
• Like materials used
• Boring landscape bordering on weeds
• Like! Finish, landscaping, parking in back, 2 floors
• Too dense; like courtyard, but no green space
• Love the aquariums, outdoor space
• Parking can be painful when it’s busy
• Do not like the second story; it darkens the interior and has high vacancy rate
• Like central courtyard theme and continuous elements unifying the shopping experience
• Like landscaping
• Like decking and patio
• Stores too expensive for regular families in Malibu to shop
• Like openness of stores
• Second story! Uses design accessibility, marketing to locals if that was intention
• Like second-story areas
• Underparked
• Landscape softens flat store fronts
• Glass, modern, very square, no soft edges, color
• Reuse of woods and (a little) dimensional, natural colors or light
• Wood rustic; blends in
Malibu Colony Plaza

Existing stores include but are not limited to, Ralph’s Fresh Fare, CVS Pharmacy, First Bank, Starbucks, Subway, and US Post Office.

- Dislike! Length equals strip mall
- Too much hardscape and obstruction in outdoor areas
- Shabby
- Appreciate moment sign scale; fits the shopping center’s architectural style
- Classic and timeless style but unimaginative
- Needs updating
- Too much like generic strip mall
- Dislike landscaping
- Don’t like cement footprint; seems way too big
- Dislike outdated style
- Terrible pedestrian flow from parking to stores because main driveway splits so trees from parking (everyone has to jaywalk in front of traffic flow)
- Like the sycamores in parking lot; otherwise unlovely design, looks cheap and generic – Ditto
- Thank you for giving a bit of historic flavor
- Pedestrian and bicycling walkway to connect (safely) Colony Plaza to Lumber Yard
- Needs to be cleaned
- Like water element; could be restyled
- Traffic, repaving, encourage more walking, pedestrian connectivity to Country Mart
- Connect to rest of Civic Center
III. Malibu Character

At this station, display boards depicting various design characteristics were exhibited. Participants were asked to consider the question: What is Malibu? A range of design features, architectural styles, materials, and ideas where shown to spark ideas from participants about what Malibu means to them. Participants also had the opportunity to comment on the boards using sticky notes.

General Comments (What is Malibu?):

Inspired by the Coast
• Losing simple coastal feel, just blue doesn’t make it coastal
• Connectivity from Civic Center to pier

How do we use open space and nature?
• Blending in good use color design, open, blends in

Sustainable?
• Yes, drought resistant
• Lighting ordinance, but nightlife is an important aspect

Contemporary?
• Soften the look

Rural?
• Don’t forget this aspect please; it is getting lost
• Rural; this element needs space; too many parked cars in the way!

Eclectic Architecture
• Mix it up in different areas; do not overbuild
• Would make it interesting, contemporary and futuristic, Mediterranean, rural, natural, Chumash
• Eclectic is nice, uniformity is boring
• Parking is an Issue; create parking lots hidden by trees and artistic buildings
• Beach tourism: create parking lots to shuttle beach goers
IV. Design Standard and Guidelines

This station presented several related topics as a means of getting participants to think about design review and how it works today in Malibu and might be applied within the Civic Center district. The first display board illustrated the City’s current design review process and summarized the practices of five coastal communities with similarities to Malibu: Fort Bragg, Sausalito, Carmel, Santa Barbara, and Del Mar. Two companion boards compared the design goals and implementation practices from the sample cities, indicating whether design criteria were simply guidelines (“should”) or mandatory requirements (“shall”) and showing in graphic form the level of review scrutiny applied (see boards below).

The activity related to these displays was a survey, described below, that asked questions about design review.
Design Guidelines
What is the focus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>Del Mar</th>
<th>Carmel</th>
<th>Sausalito</th>
<th>Fort Bragg</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Compatibility of New Development with Existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a Human Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage a Relationship between Development and Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a Pedestrian Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Visibility of Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Design Standard
- Design Guideline
Design Guidelines
Design Guidelines vs. Design Standards

DESIGN STANDARDS

“SHALL”

Sausalito’s Building Material Standard
Building materials shall appear similar in scale color
texture and finish to those seen historically in context.
Sausalito Design Guideline 4.2

Fort Bragg’s Site Planning Standard
Cluster buildings on the site
to encourage a higher level of
pedestrian activity.
Fort Bragg Guideline 2.33b

Santa Barbara’s Siting Standard
On lots with one street
frontage, place the primary
mass of buildings parallel to
the street.
Santa Barbara Design Guideline 3.2.1

Carmel’s Window Pattern Standard
Such window treatments as mitered corners, etched glass, and
glass block are to be avoided.
Carmel Design Guideline C.2

Del Mar’s Construction Standard
Development for the zone shall be designed to maintain a
pedestrian-oriented, predominantly retail village character,
with attractive walkways and courts which encourage social
interaction and talking.
Del Mar Municipal Code 30.22.080

DESIGN GUIDELINES

“SHOULD”

Sausalito’s Building Materials Guideline
Alternative materials
should appear
similar in scale,
proportion, texture
and finish to those
used traditionally.
Sausalito Design Guideline 4.22

Fort Bragg’s Site Planning Guideline
View corridors that offer unobstructed
views of the shoreline and/or sea from
public rights-of-way should be provided.
Fort Bragg Guideline 2.33d

Santa Barbara’s Siting Guideline
When siting a new
building, consider the
setbacks and scale of the
existing neighborhood
and adjacent buildings.
Santa Barbara Design Guideline 3.2.3

Carmel’s Window Pattern Guideline
Large sheets of glass, unbroken by divisions,
can appear too urban or modern and should be
avoided.
Carmel Design Guideline C.1

Del Mar’s Construction Guideline
Del Mar has no Design Guidelines.
V. Retail Architecture

This station summarized Malibu’s formula retail ordinance (effective September, 2014) and depicted standardized features associated with formula retail establishments. It should be noted that the retail ordinance will be rescinded by the City Council on December 8, 2014 due to the approval of Measure R by voters on November 4, 2014 election.
VI. Environmental
At this station, participants were provided with an overview of environmental strategies commonly used to conserve resources. Four categories were covered: water conservation, permeability, retention, and energy conservation.
VII. Open Space Connectivity, and Landscaping

At this station, participants reviewed a display board that included images of open space, connectivity, and landscaping. The images were color coded and arranged by category into three rows. Participants were given five colored dot stickers and directed to place a dot beneath features they would like to see in the Civic Center District.

Five features of the nine represented were supported by the majority of participants; however all of the features had some level of support. The following summarizes the results of the activity from both days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Features you would like to see in the Malibu Civic Center District</th>
<th>Courtyard</th>
<th>Public Plaza</th>
<th>Paseo/Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Courtyard Public Plaza Paseo/Passage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Pedestrian Pathways Pedestrian Bridge Access to Natural Habitat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Outdoor Furniture Drought tolerant Landscaping Tree Canopy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. On-line Survey

At the Open House, laptop computers were provided for participants to complete a survey relating to the materials presented at the event. Paper survey copies were also made available, and the survey could be completed on a smart phone or personal tablet computer. The survey asked questions about vision and character, design elements, and design guidelines for the Civic Center District. The following is a summary of the responses. Raw data are available in Appendix D. Following the Open House, the survey was placed on the City’s website to collect additional responses.

- A majority of respondents described the Civic Center District as eclectic, visitor oriented, and town center oriented.
- A majority of respondents indicated that the Civic Center District is not equestrian oriented, 24/7, or bicycle friendly.
- A majority of respondents want to see a Civic Center District that is pedestrian friendly, family oriented, local, organic, town center, green, bicycle friendly, and coastal.
- A majority of respondents would like to see more design elements such as landscaping, outdoor furniture, benches, shading, and awnings in the Civic Center District.
- A majority of respondents would like to see more of the following public spaces and connectivity features: pedestrian connectivity, plaza and courtyards, public seating areas, public square, and bicycle connectivity.
- Respondents were evenly split when asked whether new development should comply with formal design standards (mandatory or “shall”) and guidelines (suggestive or “should”).
- Respondents who agreed guidelines or standards should be required in the Civic Center District were split on when design review should be applied. However, most agreed that design review should apply to most new developments and all exterior modifications.
- Respondents who agreed guidelines or standards should be required in the Civic Center District thought those guidelines or standards should regulate lot coverage of buildings, outdoor open spaces, site design, building height, landscaping, signs, fencing and walls, sustainable design features, and connections between developments.
- Respondents who agreed guidelines or standards should be required in the Civic Center District designated City staff, community members, the Planning Commission, and City Council to be involved in the design review process.
- A majority of respondents expressed a preference for general design consistency if design standards or guidelines were adopted.
- Respondents were split on the flexibility of regulations if design standards or guidelines were adopted.
- Respondents were split on the type of design review and appeals processes.
IX. Comment Cards

Below are the main points captured on the comment cards. All comment cards received during the open house held on October 17, 2014 and October 18, 2014 have been photographed. The comment card photographs are presented in Appendix B.

- Main emphasis on any project should be to keep green open space.
- Lots of mature tree are needed to soften the impact of any development (native drought-tolerant).
- All development needs to be one story (15 feet high) to maintain human scale and broken up into small structures to remain residential in style.
- Development should be designed around court yards, not parking lots.
- Buildings should meet platinum LEED standards and use recycled water.
- Malibu cannot sustain very much more development in this area because of limited infrastructure, so the FAR needs to reduced.
- Parking should be underground and the spaces utilized normally for parking should remain green open space.
- Rooftops should be gardens.
- The design of the Adamson House and Ed Niles project (Cantina and Zuma Sushi) are pleasing.
- Signage should be small, discrete and, understated, with no lighting of signs.
- No corporate logos like McDonalds, Wells Fargo should be allowed.
- Night lighting should be LZ1 and needs to be turned off by 11am.
- All trash needs to be put in sealed containers and bait boxes prohibited to protect wildlife.
- All facades need to blend with the mountain background.
- Supermarkets like Whole Foods should not exceed 5,000 square feet; if it is larger, it should have small satellite structures.
- If parking lots are not underground, they need to be planted with mature natural trees (like Ralph’s center), and these landscaped medians should not be counted in the 45% green open space requirement.
- Need open space for emergency vehicle parking
- Should have outdoor places to sit and rest, which are part of the remaining 25% open space
- Instead of development emphasis, all building materials must be of the highest quality, the conclusion less development is more, keep the rural feeling.
- Encourage creativity and individuality by not having a lot of rules.
- Design guidelines, not standards
- Encourage use of recycled materials.
- Need dedicated safe bike paths that could join up to Legacy Park
- The part of the highway over the creek from the pier towards Malibu Lagoon: make this a pedestrian-friendly walkway. A barrier is needed to separate the traffic from the sidewalk. Add trees, boardwalk, plants. Perhaps it should be a pleasant experience to walk from pier towards shopping in the Civic Center.
- Malibu Creek as a natural waterway and should be a feature of the Civic Center.
X. **Graffiti Wall**

At this station, participants provided general written comments about the Civic Center area that generally were not addressed at any of the activity stations. While the comments on the wall were free-form, they have been organized below by topic. The graffiti wall comments can be viewed in Appendix C.

**Connectivity**

- Free transit shuttle, possible shuttle stop at pier
- Create connections to all five shopping centers and PCH
- Decide on access or no access to Pepperdine
- Design projects to accommodate delivery trucks off the streets due to safety and air quality concerns
- Traffic issues; feels congestive
- Create connections to the proposed “ballparks”
- Accessible walkway to pier
- Design connection to the mountains and beach
- More pedestrian friendly
- Pedestrian connection across PCH, possible bridge
- Traffic flow: horses, mini horses, bikes, dogs, cars
- Walking paths, bikepaths, and bike racks

**Design**

- Creative frontage designs, no flat boxy look (Malibu Village)
- Behind Country Mart: hire architect to work with artist to do fabulous oceanic theme! Could be contemporary, shells, fish, birds, water, waterfalls!
- Create patterns along sidewalks and PCH
- Improved open space areas
- Beachy, fun design
- Love wood siding on Trancas vintage market
- Colors should reflect mountains and local greenery
- Incorporate Malibu’s history (Adamson house), nature (Legacy Park), and water (creek)
- Reflect the heritage of the Chumash in the art and architecture; this is part of Malibu’s character
- Quaint and local
- Need water elements, simple design
- Maintain small town charm
- Architectural diversity and authenticity
- Maintain human scale
- Raised landscape features to obscure parking lots/headlights from street view
- Underground electrical lines and telephone poles
• Retail signs and building materials should be tastefully restrained so as to relate and flow with other adjacent, or competing stores themes as viewed from a distance to resist the urge to out-attract other nearby uses (Malibu Country Mart does this well)
• No excessive hardscapes
• Pier should be simple, nautical, historic

Safety
• Concerned about wildland fires and evacuation routes
• Fire staging-prevention areas
• Disaster resource open space, gathering areas
• Trucks should not unload in the middle of the street
• Noise! Civic center is an amphitheatre. Noise travels to ocean, canyon to creek. Noise base is heard in adjacent Serra Canyon, library, Legacy Park, and along Cross Creek.

Landscaping, Sustainability, and Environment
• Natural, non-invasive plant palates
• Respect wild life in the creek: ducks, egrets, herons
• Protect vernal pool site to east of condos and connect to Legacy Park
• Malibu is part of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area and a unique coastal community featuring marine protected areas; commercial development must respect those regulations and be compatible.
• More green open space
• Solar integration for energy efficiency
• Public parking with solar panels
• Malibu creek should be utilized as front yard of development/restored habitat.

General Comments
• Young people and gathering spaces, pods of uses: coffee shops, civic space
• Fair design review board with professional designers
• Malibu is a city made up of strong-willed individual used to running whatever they are involved in. Homogenized design standards are not the character of Malibu; this is not Orange County.
• Reasonable food costs
• Trade-off for providing public benefits
• Be careful of trade-offs for providing public benefits
• Include common sense in interpretation of LID and zoning ordinance
• Centrality: where is The Malibu?
• Be careful of Trancas situation
• Maintain history in Malibu bring back mom and pop stores
• Dream what Malibu can be; create a 100-year incremental plan, not limited to ordinances.
• Integrate live/work lofts
• Remodel courthouse
• Equal FAR ratios or tenant leasing opportunities for all commercial land owners, both existing and future
• Fun, inspiring, innovative
• Limited infrastructure doesn’t allow for Civic Center to be built out
• Owner-donated land for pedestrian way; owner retains right to develop original FAR for original property retain parcel
XI. Appendices

Appendix A: Orientation PowerPoint Presentation
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Appendix A – Power Point Presentation

MALIBU CIVIC CENTER
DESIGN STANDARDS

Community Open House
October 17 and 18, 2014

Welcome!

• We are here to listen to you
• No ideas are bad ideas
• Your charge: Envision the future for the Civic Center District
Questions for You

- What is working? What is not?
- What defines the Malibu character and how should that be reflected in the Civic Center District?
- What development/design features should be incorporated into new development?
- What haven’t we asked but need to know?

Why these questions?

LU OBJECTIVE 2.3: DEVELOPMENT OF APPROPRIATE SCALE AND CONTEXT.

LU Policy 2.3.1: The City shall protect and preserve the unique character of Malibu’s many distinct neighborhoods.

LU Policy 2.3.2: The City shall discourage “mansionization” by establishing limits on height, bulk, and square footage for all new and remodel single-family residences.

To implement these policies the City shall:

LU Implementation Measure 52: Adopt community design standards that recognize Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) as a residential corridor with centers at Las Flores, Civic Center, Point Dume and Trancas. Each center should have its own character, identity and scale with landscaping along PCH having an overall unifying theme.

 attain privacy measures to pre enhance security to ensure seamless transitions to the civic centers;
Activities for Today Focus on Design Standards:

- Site design
- Architecture
- Landscaping
- Open space
- Public space
- Signage
- Connections
- Amenities

Activities for Today

Share your thoughts about existing development in the Civic Center District
Activities for Today

Take the survey:
Defining the Malibu character for the Civic Center District

Activities for Today

Priority Exercise:
Identify amenities and features to be included in the Civic Center District
Activities for Today: What Didn’t We Ask?

Process and Schedule

- Community Workshop #1: Ideas for the Future
  - MIG/City Staff: Vision Concepts
  - Task Force #1: Define the Vision
  - Joint CC/PC Meeting

- Community Workshop #2: Review Alternatives
  - MIG/City Staff: Develop Alternatives
  - TF #2: Consider Alternatives

- MIG/Staff: Refine Alternatives
  - TF #3: Recommend Preferred Approach

- MIG/City Staff: Prepare Design Standards
  - Planning Commission Hearings
  - City Council Hearings

Timeline:
- Oct 2014
- Jan 2015
- Mar 2015
- Jun 2015
Thanks for participating
Appendix B – Comment Cards

Malibu Civic Center Design Standards

Thank you for your attendance and participation in today’s open house. Please add any additional comments below.

1. The footprint on any project should be small.

2. Let’s be creative with minimal disruption of the natural environment.

3. All development to be one story (12’)

4. Maintain green space (trees) and open space.

5. Development should be designed.

6. Ground courts over the parking lot.

7. Buildings should have green roofs.

8. Seed standards + use reclaimed water.

9. Malibu can’t sustain very much more development in this area because of limited pizza structures and the FAR needs to be reduced.

10. Paving should be underground +

11. The open and close spaces need parking.

12. Trees should be gardens.


14. I like the design of the Susan Alice &

15. A future project where Continua + Emma Sotnik

16. PB signage should be seamless – no lighting of sign.

17. No corporate logos, etc., like McDonalds, Westminster, etc.

18. I like the drawing of the stairs and
gardens.

19. The event should be in the open.

20. I love the concept of the re-use and
desire to be recycled.

21. Don’t consider all materials.

22. Need detailed site plan.

23. That could be up to the owner.

24. The site of the highway on the west.

25. The site towards Malibu Lagoon.

26. This is a pedestrian-friendly walkway.

27. A barrier is needed to separate the

28. Traffic from the sidewalk.

29. Sidewalk plantings, perhaps.

30. It should be a pleasant experience to walk from Pier
towards shopping in Civic Center.

Benefits include:

* Visual Awareness + Attention

To Waterfall: Fresh Water

To Ocean: Habitats, etc.

* Once you see it you’re

more reluctant to break it.

Malibu Creek – as a natural

waterway – should be a feature

of the Civic Center.
Appendix C - Graffiti Wall
Malibu Civic Center District Design Standards
Open House #1
Friday, October 7, 2014
Q1 1. This question asks about the Civic Center District as it is today. Which of the below DOES describe the Malibu Civic Center District? Mark all that apply.

Answered: 12  Skipped: 0

- Eclectic: 75.00%
- Visitor oriented: 66.67%
- Town Center: 58.33%
- Pedestrian Friendly: 50.00%
- Family Oriented: 50.00%
- Automobile Oriented: 50.00%
- Contemporary: 41.67%
- Mixed Use: 41.67%
- Green: 41.67%
- Coastal: 41.67%
- Mediterranean Influenced: 41.67%
- Organic: 33.33%
- Local: 33.33%
- Sustainable: 33.33%
- Main Street: 33.33%
- Independent: 25.00%
- Strip Mall: 25.00%
- Local Retail: 25.00%
Malibu Civic Center Design Standards Survey

Answer Choices | Responses
--- | ---
Eclectic | 75.00% 9
Visitor oriented | 66.67% 8
Town Center | 58.33% 7
Pedestrian Friendly | 50.00% 6
Family Oriented | 50.00% 6
Automobile Oriented | 50.00% 6
Contemporary | 41.67% 5
Mixed Use | 41.67% 5
Green | 41.67% 5
Coastal | 41.67% 5
Mediterranean Influenced | 41.67% 5
Organic | 33.33% 4
Local | 33.33% 4
Sustainable | 33.33% 4
Main Street | 33.33% 4
Independent | 25.00% 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strip Mall</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Retail</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human-scale</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Friendly</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Life</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents: 12**
Q2 This question asks about the Civic Center District as it is today. Which of the below DOES NOT describe the Malibu Civic Center District? Mark all that apply.

Answered: 12  Skipped: 0

- Equestrian: 75.00%
- 24/7: 58.33%
- Bicycle Friendly: 58.33%
- Pedestrian Friendly: 41.67%
- Town Center: 41.67%
- Family Oriented: 41.67%
- Traditional: 41.67%
- Night Life: 41.67%
- Sustainable: 41.67%
- Coastal: 33.33%
- Local: 33.33%
- Strip Mall: 33.33%
- Rural: 33.33%
- Local Retail: 33.33%
- Main Street: 33.33%
- Automobile Oriented: 33.33%
- Independent: 25.00%
- Generic: 25.00%
## Malibu Civic Center Design Standards Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Friendly</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Friendly</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Oriented</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Life</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Mall</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Retail</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Oriented</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Style</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human-scale</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Influenced</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor oriented</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents: 12**
Q3 Which of the below describes the Malibu Civic Center District you WANT to see in the future? Mark all that apply.

Answered: 11  Skipped: 1

- Pedestrian Friendly: 100.00%
- Family Oriented: 90.91%
- Local: 90.91%
- Organic: 81.82%
- Town Center: 81.82%
- Green: 81.82%
- Bicycle Friendly: 81.82%
- Coastal: 72.73%
- Independent: 63.64%
- Sustainable: 63.64%
- Contemporary: 54.55%
- Human-scale: 54.55%
- Mixed Use: 54.55%
- Eclectic: 54.55%
- Local Retail: 54.55%
- Main Street: 54.55%
- Rural: 45.45%
- Mediterranean Influenced: 27.27%
Malibu Civic Center Design Standards Survey

Visitor oriented: 27.27%

24/7: 18.18%

Traditional: 18.18%

Night Life: 18.18%

Equestrian: 9.09%

Automobile Oriented: 9.09%

Strip Mall: 0%

Generic: 0%

Answer Choices

<p>| Pedestrian Friendly | 100.00% |
| Pedestrian Friendly | 11 |
| Family Oriented | 90.91% |
| Family Oriented | 10 |
| Local | 90.91% |
| Local | 10 |
| Organic | 81.82% |
| Organic | 9 |
| Town Center | 81.82% |
| Town Center | 9 |
| Green | 81.82% |
| Green | 9 |
| Bicycle Friendly | 81.82% |
| Bicycle Friendly | 9 |
| Coastal | 72.73% |
| Coastal | 8 |
| Independent | 63.64% |
| Independent | 7 |
| Sustainable | 63.64% |
| Sustainable | 7 |
| Contemporary | 54.55% |
| Contemporary | 6 |
| Human-scale | 54.55% |
| Human-scale | 6 |
| Mixed Use | 54.55% |
| Mixed Use | 6 |
| Eclectic | 54.55% |
| Eclectic | 6 |
| Local Retail | 54.55% |
| Local Retail | 6 |
| Main Street | 54.55% |
| Main Street | 6 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Influenced</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor oriented</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/7</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Life</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Oriented</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Mall</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 11
Q4 Please check all that apply. Which of the following design elements would you like to see more of in the Malibu Civic Center District?

Answered: 10  Skipped: 2

- **Landscaping (plants, trees, shrubs, etc.)** - 90.00% 9 responses
- **Outdoor furniture** - 90.00% 9 responses
- **Benches** - 80.00% 8 responses
- **Shading: awnings, umbrellas** - 80.00% 8 responses
- **Water features(such as fountains)** - 70.00% 7 responses
- **Art sculptures** - 50.00% 5 responses
- **Paintings/mural** - 50.00% 5 responses
- **Entry signage** - 50.00% 5 responses
- **Covered walkways** - 40.00% 4 responses
- **Light posts** - 30.00% 3 responses
- **Directional signage** - 30.00% 3 responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paintings/murals</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry signage</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered walkways</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light posts</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional signage</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 10
Q5 Please check all that apply. Which of the following public spaces and connectivity features would you like to see more of in the Malibu Civic Center District?

Answered: 11  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza and courtyards</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public seating areas</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public square</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle connectivity</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian pathways</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike parking</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseos/Passage</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit connectivity</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding signage</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf cart parking</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse parking</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Malibu Civic Center Design Standards Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity to parks and civic uses</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity to natural habitat</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza and courtyards</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public seating areas</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity between shopping centers</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public square</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity across Pacific Coast Highway</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle connectivity</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian pathways</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike parking</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseos/Passage</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit connectivity</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding signage</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf cart parking</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse parking</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents:** 11
Q6 Should new developments within the Civic Center District be required to comply with formal design standards (mandatory or "shall") and guidelines (suggestive or "should")? Select one.

Answered: 12  Skipped: 0

**Answer Choices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes- Guidelines Only</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes- Standards and Guidelines</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes- Standards Only</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No- Standards</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No- Guidelines</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No- Standards and Guidelines</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 12
Q7 If you answered "Yes" in question #6, when should design review be required? Mark all that apply.

Answered: 8  Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOST new developments- some smaller or special developments should be exempt from design review.</td>
<td>50.00% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL exterior modifications should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>50.00% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO interior modifications should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>37.50% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL new development, regardless of size should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>25.00% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME interior modifications should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>25.00% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO developments should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>12.50% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME exterior modifications- some special development should be exempt from design review.</td>
<td>12.50% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO interior modifications should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>12.50% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL interior modifications should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>12.50% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO exterior modifications should be subject to design review.</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 8
Q8 If you answered "Yes" in question #6, what do you think the design standards or guidelines should regulate? Please mark all that apply.

Answered: 8  Skipped: 4
Lot Coverage of Buildings: 100.00%
Outdoor Open Spaces: 87.50%
Site Design: 75.00%
Building Height: 75.00%
Landscaping: 75.00%
Signs: 75.00%
Fencing and Walls: 75.00%
Sustainable Design Features: 75.00%
Connections Between Elements: 75.00%
Building Size: 62.50%
Building Orientation: 62.50%
Building Colors: 50.00%
Styles and/or Shapes of Roofs: 50.00%
Parking Areas: 50.00%
Building Shape: 37.50%
Building Materials: 37.50%
Windows and Storefronts: 37.50%
Architectural Style: 25.00%

Answer Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage of Buildings</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Malibu Civic Center Design Standards Survey
### Malibu Civic Center Design Standards Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Open Spaces</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Design</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing and Walls</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Design Features (e.g., solar access, water conservation)</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections Between Developments</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Orientation</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Colors</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styles and/or Shapes of Roofs</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Areas</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Shape</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows and Storefronts</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Style</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents: 8**
Q9 If you answered "Yes" in question #6, who should be involved in a design review process? Please mark all that apply.

Answered: 8  Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members and Volunteers</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Review Board</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Professionals/Consultants</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Design Volunteers</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Review Committee</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 8
Q10 If design standards or guidelines were adopted to address architectural style and or character, which approach would you choose for the Malibu Civic Center District? Select one.

Answered: 9  Skipped: 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Design Consistency plus Flexible Design Parameters- new projects must meet general landscape, building form, material, and other such design standards and guidelines and there is flexibility to encourage innovative design.</td>
<td>66.67% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Design Consistency- new projects must meet design standards and guidelines that establish general landscape, building form, material, and other such characteristics.</td>
<td>11.11% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines Only- projects should meet base standards, but only design should be subject to design guidelines and processes.</td>
<td>11.11% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Design and Landscape Guidelines- I don't think Malibu should regulate architectural and/or landscape design character.</td>
<td>11.11% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Style Consistency- new projects must be designed utilizing specific style(s) and landscape parameters.</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Guidelines Only- projects should meet base standards, but only landscape should be subject to design guidelines and processes.</td>
<td>0.00% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11 If design standards or guidelines were adopted, how flexible should the regulations be? Select one.

Answered: 10  Skipped: 2

Answer Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New development must comply with clear design objectives and design guidelines, but there is some flexibility for applicants to choose which objectives and design guidelines to comply with.</td>
<td>40.00% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development should comply with design standards but Malibu should not regulate them.</td>
<td>30.00% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development must comply with each of the design standards and the design guidelines.</td>
<td>20.00% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development must comply with each of the design standards and the design guidelines are educational and voluntary.</td>
<td>10.00% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 What process do you think is appropriate for projects within the Civic Center District? (Through an appeals process, the City Council would always have the ability to make the final decision.)

Answered: 8   Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning staff review and approval, with appeals of decisions to the Planning Commission.</td>
<td>50.00% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a Design Review Board to conduct design review, with City staff making recommendations to the Board for action.</td>
<td>37.50% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission conducting design review.</td>
<td>12.50% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 Let us know what additional ideas or thoughts you have that City staff and the consultant team working on the Malibu Civic Center Design Standards should consider.

Answered: 8  Skipped: 4
Appendix E - Hard Copy Survey
The City is interested in your ideas regarding the Malibu Civic Center Design Standards.

Thanks for participating in this survey.

While the survey is designed for your use via your computer, tablet, smart phone, or other mobile device, you can also do it the old-fashioned way with pen and paper. Just fill out this form and leave it in the basket provided at the workshop. Or you can take this paper copy home to read before going on-line to complete the survey. Feel free to make copies to share with friends and neighbors.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MalibuCC_Design_Standards

Questions?

Contact: Bonnie Blue, Senior Planner
City of Malibu
23825 Stuart Ranch Road
Malibu, CA 90265
(310) 456-2489 ext. 258
bblue@malibucity.org
1. This question asks about the Civic Center District as it is today. Which of the below DOES describe the Malibu Civic Center District? Mark all that apply.

- Organic
- Pedestrian Friendly
- Contemporary
- Human-scale
- Mixed Use
- Independent
- Eclectic
- Town Center
- 24/7
- Family Oriented
- Green
- Equestrian
- Coastal
- Local
- Bicycle Friendly
- Strip Mall
- Traditional
- Generic
- Night Life
- Mediterranean Influenced
- Rural
- Sustainable
- Local Retail
- Main Street
- Automobile Oriented
- Visitor oriented

Other (please specify)
2. This question asks about the Civic Center District as it is today. Which of the below DOES NOT describe the Malibu Civic Center District? Mark all that apply.

☐ Organic
☐ Pedestrian Friendly
☐ Contemporary
☐ Human-scale
☐ Mixed Use
☐ Independent
☐ Eclectic
☐ Town Center
☐ 24/7
☐ Family Oriented
☐ Green
☐ Equestrian
☐ Coastal
☐ Local
☐ Bicycle Friendly
☐ Strip Mall
☐ Traditional
☐ Generic
☐ Night Life
☐ Mediterranean Influenced
☐ Rural
☐ Sustainable
☐ Local Retail
☐ Main Street
☐ Automobile Oriented
☐ Visitor oriented

Other (please specify)

NON OF THE ABOVE
3. Which of the below describes the Malibu Civic Center District you WANT to see in the future? Mark all that apply.

- Organic
- Pedestrian Friendly
- Contemporary
- Human-scale
- Mixed Use
- Independent
- Eclectic
- Town Center
- 24/7
- Family Oriented
- Green
- Equestrian
- Coastal
- Local
- Bicycle Friendly
- Strip Mall
- Traditional
- Generic
- Night Life
- Mediterranean Influenced
- Rural
- Sustainable
- Local Retail
- Main Street
- Automobile Oriented
- Visitor Oriented

Other (please specify) [ ]

[Handwritten text: Does not like the scenic area adjoining MALIBU CREEK. How about making it where people can walk and enjoy the beauty of creek, some flowers would be nice. Pedestrian walkway]
4. Please check all that apply. Which of the following design elements would you like to see more of in the Malibu Civic Center District?

- [ ] Benches
- [ ] Light posts
- [ ] Landscaping (plants, trees, shrubs, etc.)
- [X] Shading: awnings, umbrellas
- [ ] Art sculptures
- [ ] Paintings/murals
- [ ] Outdoor furniture
- [ ] Directional signage
- [ ] Entry signage
- [X] Water features (such as fountains)
- [ ] Covered walkways

Other (please specify)  

Picnic Area
5. Please check all that apply. Which of the following public spaces and connectivity features would you like to see more of in the Malibu Civic Center District?

- Public square
- Plaza and courtyards
- Public seating areas
- Paseos/Passage
- Promenade
- Wayfinding signage
- Pedestrian pathways
- Pedestrian connectivity across Pacific Coast Highway
- Pedestrian connectivity between shopping centers
- Pedestrian connectivity to parks and civic uses
- Pedestrian connectivity to natural habitat
- Bicycle connectivity
- Transit connectivity
- Golf cart parking
- Bike parking
- Horse parking

Other (please specify)

[ ]
**Design Guidelines**

6. Should new developments within the Civic Center District be required to comply with formal design standards (mandatory or "shall") and guidelines (suggestive or "should")? Select one.

- [ ] Yes- Standards Only
- [ ] Yes- Guidelines Only
- [ ] Yes- Standards and Guidelines
- [ ] No- Standards
- [ ] No- Guidelines
- [ ] No- Standards and Guidelines
- [ ] No opinion

7. If you answered "Yes" in question #6, when should design review be required? Mark all that apply.

- [ ] ALL new development, regardless of size should be subject to design review.
- [ ] MOST new developments- some smaller or special developments should be exempt from design review.
- [ ] NO developments should be subject to design review.
- [ ] ALL exterior modifications should be subject to design review.
- [ ] SOME exterior modifications- some special development should be exempt from design review.
- [ ] NO exterior modifications should be subject to design review.
- [ ] ALL interior modifications should be subject to design review.
- [ ] SOME interior modifications should be subject to design review.
- [ ] NO interior modifications should be subject to design review.
8. If you answered "Yes" in question #6, what do you think the design standards or guidelines should regulate? Please mark all that apply.

- Site Design
- Architectural Style
- Building Size
- Building Height
- Building Shape
- Building Colors
- Building Materials
- Building Orientation
- Styles and/or Shapes of Roofs
- Landscaping
- Parking Areas
- Signs
- Windows and Storefronts
- Lot Coverage of Buildings
- Outdoor Open Spaces
- Fencing and Walls
- Sustainable Design Features (e.g., solar access, water conservation)
- Connections Between Developments

Other (please specify)

9. If you answered "Yes" in question #6, who should be involved in a design review process? Please mark all that apply.

- City Staff
- Professional Design Volunteers
- Architecture Review Board
- Community Members and Volunteers
- Design Professionals/Consultants
- Sign Review Committee
- Planning Commission
- City Council

Other (please specify)
10. If design standards or guidelines were adopted to address architectural style and or character, which approach would you choose for the Malibu Civic Center District? Select one.

- General Design Consistency- new projects must meet design standards and guidelines that establish general landscape, building form, material, and other such characteristics.
- Architectural Style Consistency- new projects must be designed utilizing specific style(s) and landscape parameters.
- General Design Consistency plus Flexible Design Parameters- new projects must meet general landscape, building form, material, and other such design standards and guidelines and there is flexibility to encourage innovative design.
- Design Guidelines Only- projects should meet base standards, but only design should be subject to design guidelines and processes.
- Landscape Guidelines Only- projects should meet base standards, but only landscape should be subject to design guidelines and processes.
- No Design and Landscape Guidelines- I don't think Malibu should regulate architectural and/or landscape design character.

11. If design standards or guidelines were adopted, how flexible should the regulations be? Select one.

- New development must comply with each of the design standards and the design guidelines are educational and voluntary.
- New development must comply with each of the design standards and the design guidelines.
- New development must comply with clear design objectives and design guidelines, but there is some flexibility for applicants to choose which objectives and design guidelines to comply with.
- New development should comply with design standards but Malibu should not regulate them.

12. What process do you think is appropriate for projects within the Civic Center District? (Through an appeals process, the City Council would always have the ability to make the final decision.)

- Planning staff review and approval, with appeals of decisions to the Planning Commission.
- Planning Commission conducting design review.
- Establishment of a Design Review Board to conduct design review, with City staff making recommendations to the Board for action.

Other (please specify)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Let us know what additional ideas or thoughts you have that City staff and the consultant team working on the Malibu Civic Center Design Standards should consider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Purpose and Project Background

1.1 Purpose

This design analysis workbook is a resource for the community, decision makers, staff, and Task Force members to use in the development of the Civic Center design standards. The workbook reviews the current regulatory environment; discusses gateways, landmarks, and connections; describes urban form; and identifies the natural features in the Civic Center area. The workbook is not exhaustive but summarizes factual information to provide a basis for informed discussion by Task Force members. This information will be reviewed by the Task Force members and the community to ensure that no significant issues or considerations have been overlooked, and to provide context for the next phases of the design standards development.

1.2 Project Background

The Civic Center area (see map on page 5) is one of the most active community gathering places in Malibu, with a concentration of civic and institutional uses and retail shopping for residents and visitors. However, many properties within the area are undeveloped. New development could potentially reshape the district. The City’s General Plan includes policies and implementation measures specific to the Civic Center area and establishes a Specific Plan Overlay designation, with the intent of providing specific development and design criteria for the Civic Center area through the implementation of a specific plan. With this policy direction, the City began drafting a specific plan in September 1995. However, in 1998, the City Council voted to postpone adoption of the specific plan and analyze other alternatives. Ultimately, that project never was completed.

In late 2013, the City faced pressure from business interests and community activists in response to several development applications in the Civic Center. Community groups looked to place greater restrictions on development—and formula retail businesses in particular—via a ballot measure.

In October 2013, the City Council directed City staff to prepare a specific plan and design standards for the Civic Center area. The design standards would be used in the interim to guide development within the Civic Center area until a specific plan could be adopted. The design standards subsequently would be incorporated into the specific plan. The specific plan and design standards were envisioned as an alternative to the proposed formula retail ordinance, with the goal of responding to both sides of the community. However, to more immediately address community concerns—and with a measure to restrict formula retail qualifying for the ballot—in September 2014 the City Council passed Ordinance No. 376 to regulate formula retail businesses in the Civic Center. Ordinance No. 376 defines formula retail businesses (commonly called “chain stores”) as businesses with 10 or more stores nationally that share features like merchandise, menu, façade, layout, uniforms, or décor. The regulations prohibit most formula retail businesses over 3,500 square feet and limit shopping centers to 45 percent of such tenants.

Measure R

On November 4, 2014, Malibu voters considered and approved Measure R. The measure puts in place regulations that make two categories of change affecting commercial property citywide.

1. Requires voter approval of specific plans for commercial and commercial-residential projects over 20,000 square feet. In general, specific plans are planning tools that may establish project-specific development rules. Legally, voter approval may be a prerequisite for specific plans that propose new rules. Measure R is not limited to projects that propose new rules. The measure also mandates specific plans for projects that comply with existing rules. Specific plans may be rejected by the voters.

2. Creates alternative formula retail regulations. Measure R supercedes the previously adopted formula retail requirements as follows: 1) changes the definition to regulate businesses with 10 or more stores worldwide, instead of nationally; 2) decreases the maximum size of a formula retail business from 3,500 square feet to 2,500 square feet; and 3) decreases the limit in shopping centers from 45 percent to 30 percent of formula retail tenants. The measure also allows exempts formula retail businesses from the conditional use permit requirements in the five existing Civic Center shopping centers for existing tenant spaces between 1,400 square feet and 5,000.

Portions of Measure R and Ordinance No. 376 conflict. The City Attorney has recommended to the City Council that Ordinance No. 376 be repealed in its entirety to avoid confusion.
Retail stores located in the Civic Center shopping areas today
2.0 Planning Analysis

2.1 Introduction

This section summarizes planning information having a bearing on design standards for the Civic Center area:

- The Study Area
- Project Background
- Development Pattern
- Development Projects and Applications
- Regulatory Environment
- Implementation of Design Criteria

The Study Area

Located in the northwest portion of Los Angeles County, the City of Malibu was incorporated on March 28, 1991. The City, which stretches from Ventura County in the west to Topanga Canyon and the City of Los Angeles (Pacific Palisades), covers more than 20 square miles of land, 21 miles of Pacific Ocean coastline, and a portion of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area. As of January 1, 2014, the City was home to an estimated 12,865 residents. Known for its beaches, restaurants, and increasingly, for its shops, Malibu draws more than 15 million visitors annually.

After incorporation, the City adopted its first General Plan in 1995. The General Plan specifically identifies the Civic Center area, which is generally bound by Malibu Creek to the east, Pacific Coast Highway to the south, the Malibu Knolls neighborhood to the north, and Malibu Canyon Road to the west. However, for the purpose of this study, the Civic Center area boundary has been expanded to include the commercial areas south of Pacific Coast Highway (as shown in Figure 2.1, Project Boundary).

The Civic Center area contains Malibu’s civic institutions, including City Hall, the Malibu Library, and the now-closed Los Angeles County Superior Courthouse. Additional land uses include several shopping centers and office buildings that support a mix of retail, office, and restaurant uses. Signature open space areas frame the district: Legacy Park, Malibu Creek State Park, Malibu Lagoon State Park, and Surfrider Beach. Notably, the Civic Center area has a number of vacant parcels, some of which have active development entitlements or applications under review.
Retail stores located in the Civic Center shopping areas
Figure 2.1 Project Boundary
2.2 Civic Center Development Pattern

Land Use

The Civic Center area is comprised of 51 parcels encompassing 197.3 net acres. Land uses within the Civic Center area include civic, commercial, commercial recreation, office, open space, and utilities. As shown in Figure 2.3, Existing Land Use, commercial uses are located primarily along Pacific Coast Highway and Cross Creek Road, while open space, office, and civic uses generally are located along Civic Center Way and Stuart Ranch Road. Commercial recreation uses (Sycamore Farms and the Malibu Racquet Club) are located at the eastern and western boundaries of the Civic Center area, respectively. A utility building occupied by Verizon Wireless is also located adjacent to Sycamore Farms. Most of the area remains undeveloped, at 56 percent. Table 2.1, Existing Land Use Acreages, displays the total acres and percentage of land occupied by each use.

Of the 197.4 acres, 87.0 acres are developed. A majority of developed land is occupied by civic, commercial, and open space uses. Legacy Park, a 15-acre park that provides both passive recreation and groundwater recharge functions, is a community focal point and provides a connection for pedestrians between the library and the shops along Cross Creek Road. Two distinct shopping areas offer approximately 283,000 square feet of commercial space. The Malibu Country Mart, Cross Creek Courtyard, and Malibu Village shopping centers take immediate access from Cross Creek Road. Malibu Colony Plaza fronts Pacific Coast Highway, forming the western boundary of the Civic Center area. This shopping area includes restaurants, a Ralph's supermarket, CVS pharmacy, and other service commercial uses. These shopping areas are identified in Figure 2.3, Existing Land Use (2014).

Table 2.1 - Existing Land Use Acreages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Recreation</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Uses</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>197</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.2 - Shopping Center Square Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Center</th>
<th>Building Square Feet</th>
<th>Lot Acres</th>
<th>Floor-Area Ratio (FAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Mart</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu Village</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber Yard</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu Colony Plaza</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>283,000</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MIG, 2014.

Table 2.2 identifies the existing shopping center square feet, lot size and floor-area ratios (FAR). The FAR is calculated by the total square feet of a building divided by the total square feet of the lot the building is located on.
Figure 2.3 - Existing Land Use (2014)
Land Ownership

Land ownership in the project area is divided among private, public, and county entities. As shown in Table 2.3, Land Ownership Composition, the majority of land is privately owned, with the remaining under ownership of either the City of Malibu or County of Los Angeles.

As shown in Figure 2.5, Land Ownership, City-owned properties include City Hall and Legacy Park. County-owned properties include the Malibu Library and County of Los Angeles Fire Station No. 88. The remaining properties are privately owned and consist of a mix of uses, including shopping centers, commercial recreation uses, and vacant land.

2.3 Development Projects

Table 2.3 - Land Ownership Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Ownership Composition</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5 - Land Ownership (2014)
Several projects, described below, have been approved, are in the review process, or are planned within the Civic Center area (see Figure 2.6, Proposed and Approved Projects).

1. **La Paz Retail Center (23465 Civic Center Way).** This project consists of a new commercial center that includes 112,058 square feet of commercial and office space. The project was approved in 2008. However, construction of the project cannot commence until the wastewater treatment and sewer system has been established in the Civic Center area.

2. **Whole Foods in the Park (23401 Civic Center Way).** Anchored by a Whole Foods Market, this project proposes 34,425 square feet of retail and 4,000 square feet of restaurant use. The project has been submitted to the City for processing, but the project is now affected by the requirements of Measure R, including the requirement for a specific plan.

3. **Malibu Sycamore Village (23575 Civic Center Way).** This project proposes a two-story commercial center consisting of 37,698 square feet of retail space, 12,302 square feet of office space, and 10,000 square feet of restaurant space. The project has been submitted to the City for processing, but the project is now affected by the requirements of Measure R, including the requirement for a specific plan.

4. **Rancho Malibu Hotel (4000 Malibu Canyon Road).** This property owner proposed construction of a 146-room luxury hotel resort with retail shops, a restaurant, sundries store, lobby bar, library, ballrooms, meeting rooms, fitness center and spa, swimming pool, pool cabanas, and lawns. The applicant has discussed with City staff pursuing an alternative project involving a memorial park and cemetery.

5. **Civic Center Wastewater Treatment Facility (24000 Civic Center Way).** This project involves construction of a centralized wastewater treatment facility that would treat, reuse, and/or dispose of wastewater flows exclusively from properties in the Civic Center area. The project is currently under review by the City and is not affected by the requirements of Measure R. The City anticipates that the first phase of the project would be completed in June 2017. The completion date for Phase 2 is anticipated for November 2022 and Phase 3 is unknown at this time.

6. **Santa Monica College Malibu Campus (23555 Civic Center Way).** This project proposes demolition of the former Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Station and construction of a 27,500-square-foot educational facility, including a 5,700-square-foot Sheriff’s substation and Emergency Operations and Planning Center. The project is under review by the City. This project is not affected by Measure R.
Figure 2.6 - Proposed and Approved Projects (2014)
2.4 Regulatory Environment

New development in the Civic Center area is guided by several policy and regulatory documents at the local and State levels: the City’s General Plan, the Malibu Municipale Code (M.M.C.) Zoning Code, and the Local Coastal Program’s Land Use Plan and Local Implementation Plan. The following paragraphs discuss each policy and regulatory document.

City of Malibu General Plan

On November 1995, the City of Malibu adopted its first General Plan, which provides the policy framework to guide land use decisions and future growth in the City and its sphere of influence. As noted above, the General Plan calls for preparation of a specific plan to guide development within the Civic Center area.

The General Plan contains numerous policies and implementation measures applicable to the Civic Center area, addressing environmental protection and restoration, architecture and site design, financing mechanisms for new development, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and neighborhood character. The Land Use Policy Map in the General Plan establishes four land use designations for the area: Community Commercial, Visitor Serving Commercial, General Commercial, and Public and Semi-Public Institutional (as shown in Figure 2.7, Local Coastal Program Land Use Designations). Table 2.4, General Plan Floor-to-Area Ratios, displays the maximum permitted FARs for land uses within the Civic Center area.

City of Malibu Zoning Code

Title 17 (Zoning) of the City’s Municipal Code regulates the use of land, development standards, and design standards for each zoning district. However, since adoption of the Local Coastal Program (LCP)—zoning for the Civic Center area is now administered through the Local Implementation Plan contained in the LCP, unless a more restrictive provision exists in the M.M.C.

Table 2.4 General Plan Floor-to-Area Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor-Serving Commercial</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Malibu General Plan, November 1995.

City of Malibu Local Coastal Program

The entire City is located within the California coastal zone, which means that all development and activity occurring within City limits, unless exempt, is subject to the regulations of the LCP. In California coastal communities, LCPs contain the rules for protecting sensitive coastal resources and public access along the State’s entire coastline. LCPs are required in all jurisdictions located within the coastal zone. The California Coastal Commission (CCC) is tasked with overseeing certification of those LCPs before they become law at the local level.

Certified on September 13, 2002, the City of Malibu LCP implements the California Coastal Act of 1976 at the local level. The LCP policies and regulations supersede any policy or regulation of the City’s General Plan or Zoning Code. As granted through the LCP, the City has the authority to review and approve development projects located within the Coastal Zone. However, on appeal, the California Coastal Commission may also review development projects located within the Coastal Zone.

The Malibu LCP has two components: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The LUP describes the conditions and issues that exist within Malibu’s Coastal Zone, and presents land use and development policies designed to fulfill the intent of the Coastal Act. The LIP is the primary implementation mechanism for the LUP.

Local Coastal Program: Land Use Plan

The LUP provides a framework for future development and establishes policies to guide government in everyday decisions. Land use designations within the Coastal Zones, which includes the Civic Center area, are established in the LUP. As shown in Figure 2.7, LCP Land Use Designations, the following land use designations apply within the Civic Center area:

- **Community Commercial (CC):** The CC designation is intended to provide for the resident-serving needs of the community on parcels of land suitable for concentrated commercial activity. The Community Commercial category plans for centers that offer a greater depth and range of merchandise in shopping and specialty goods than neighborhood centers, although this category may include some of the uses also found in a neighborhood center. Often a supermarket or variety store functions as the anchor tenant. The maximum FAR is 0.15.
Figure 2.7 - Local Coastal Program Land Use Designations (2014)
The FAR may be increased to a maximum of 0.20 where public benefits and amenities are provided as part of a project. Uses that are permitted and/or conditionally permitted include all permitted uses in the Commercial Neighborhood designation, financial institutions, medical clinics, restaurants, service stations, health care facilities, offices, and public open space and recreation.

- **Commercial Visitor Serving (CV):** The CV designation provides for visitor-serving uses such as hotels and restaurants that are designed to be consistent with Malibu’s rural character and natural environmental setting. Public open space and recreational uses are also permitted. Uses allowed in the other commercial categories (Commercial Neighborhood, Community Commercial, and Commercial General) may be permitted as part of projects approved on parcels designated CV, as long as at least 50 percent of the overall floor area of any individual project is devoted to visitor-serving uses. The maximum FAR is 0.15. The FAR may be increased to a maximum of 0.20 where public benefits and amenities are provided as part of the project. CV designations are divided into two levels of density: CV-1 and CV-2. Motels and bed and breakfast inns are allowed in CV-1. Hotels are only permitted in CV-2.

- **Commercial General (CG):** The CG designation provides for more intense commercial uses, visitor-serving uses, and light industrial uses on larger sites. The maximum FAR is 0.15. The FAR may be increased to a maximum of 0.20 where public benefits and amenities are provided as part of a project. Uses that are permitted and conditionally permitted include all permitted uses in the CN and CC designations, mixed commercial and residential projects, masonry supplies, plant nurseries, restaurants, movie theaters, performing arts facilities, offices, and public open space and recreation. Affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income families may also be permitted.

The LUP also contains land use policies related to the Civic Center, including creation of a specific plan. As a result, an overlay has been applied to the Civic Center area, consistent with the General Plan. The overlay encourages and provides for preparation of a specific plan to allow land uses, development standards, and design guidelines to be tailored to satisfy the unique characteristics and vision for the Civic Center.

Upon its adoption, the LUP prohibited new development within the Civic Center area for a period of two years commencing September 15, 2002, or until a specific plan could be adopted. A specific plan was not adopted within the two-year time limit. Consequently, the moratorium on new development within the Civic Center area expired on September 15, 2004. Subsequent to that date, new development was allowed on the properties located within the Civic Center area.

### Table 2.5. LCP Floor-to-Area Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial(^1)</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor-Serving Commercial(^1)</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial(^1)</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0.15 to 0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The FAR may be increased to a maximum of 0.20 where public benefits and amenities are provided as a part of the project.

Source: City of Malibu Local Coastal Program, September 2002.
Local Coastal Program: Local Implementation Plan

Zoning for the Civic Center area is administered through the LIP and its corresponding map, which is analogous to a zoning map. The purpose of the LIP is to implement the policies of the California Coastal Act of 1976 and City of Malibu Land Use Plan (LUP), and to (as stated in the LIP):

- Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources, taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of this City and of the State.
- Protect, maintain, and where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and man-made resources.
- Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resource conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.
- Provide a definite plan for development so as to guide the future growth of the City.
- Protect and enhance the quality of the natural environment.
- Promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.
- Ensure that any development in the coastal zone preserves and enhances coastal resources; and protects coastal views and access; and guides growth, development, and environmental management in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Land Use Plan of the Local Coastal Program.

The zone districts are shown on Zoning Map 5: Civic Center Overlay Area of the LIP and mirror the LUP land use designations:

- **Community Commercial (CC) Zone.** The CC zone is intended to provide for the resident-serving needs of the community similar to the Commercial Neighborhood (CN) zone, but on parcels of land more suitable for concentrated commercial activity.

- **Commercial General (CG) Zone.** The CG zone applies to commercial uses oriented along Pacific Coast Highway (PCH). Uses include a wider range of resident- and visitor-serving uses.

- **Commercial Visitor Serving 1 (CV-1) Zone.** The CV-1 zone is intended to provide for visitor-serving uses, including motels and bed and breakfast inns. Uses must be designed to be consistent with the rural character and natural environmental setting.

- **Commercial Visitor Serving 2 (CV-2) Zone.** The CV-2 zone is intended to provide for visitor-serving uses, including hotels. As with the CV-2 district, development must be consistent with the rural character and natural environmental setting.

- **Institutional (I) Zone.** The I zone accommodates public and quasi-public uses and facilities. Allowed uses include emergency communications and services, libraries, museums, maintenance yards, educational (private and public), religious institutions, community centers, parks, and recreational and governmental facilities.

The LIP regulates permitted land uses, development standards, and design guidelines, consistent with the policies specified in the LUP. Furthermore, the LIP allows additional square footage for commercial development within the Civic Center area, if approved through an adopted specific plan and the development does not exceed the maximum FAR identified in the LUP. Section 3.0, Urban Form, of this workbook reviews the development and design standards for the various LIP zones.

South facing view of Pacific Coast Highway and the Malibu Lagoon.
Implementation of Design Criteria

Implementation of design criteria can be administered through a variety of methods. The three most common methods are a specific plan, a set of design standards, or a series of design guidelines. The following paragraphs discuss each.

Specific Plan
A specific plan is a planning tool used for the systematic implementation of the General Plan for a defined portion of the community. Pursuant to State law, a specific plan must be consistent with the goals and policies contained in the General Plan and, when applicable, an LCP. In addition, a specific plan must include the following:

- A description of proposed land uses
- A description of public and private facilities required to support the proposed land uses
- A set of standards and criteria by which development will proceed and natural resources will be conserved
- A program of implementation measures, including but not limited to regulatory and financing measures

The implementation of a specific plan ensures that an area develops in a coordinated fashion, with adequate consideration given to the compatibility of land uses, maximum development intensities, infrastructure, and public safety. It also clearly defines the land uses that are permitted, as well as design guidelines for structures and related onsite improvements. Upon adoption, a specific plan guides development within the specific plan area, serving as the zoning.

Design Standards and Design Guidelines
Design standards and design guidelines can be used to establish design criteria tailored for a particular area. Design standards are a set of design criteria that are more prescriptive in nature and typically are incorporated into a jurisdiction’s municipal code. The advantage of design standards is that they can clearly define what criteria must be satisfied in order for a development project to be approved. Conversely, design guidelines generally are advisory in nature and not prescriptive, and are usually used to communicate the general vision and objectives for a particular area. Design guidelines allow for more flexibility and creativity in the design of development projects, but sometimes applicants and staff find challenges or may disagree in the interpretation. Typically, design guidelines are reviewed by a design review committee or architectural review board to determine whether a development project satisfies the design guidelines’ objectives. Design guidelines usually consist of a stand-alone document and are not incorporated into a municipal code.
3.0 GATEWAYS, LANDMARKS, AND CONNECTIONS

3.1 The Civic Center District

The Civic Center district is one of the most recognized areas in Malibu. The area has been described as the "Civic Center Bowl," bounded by the Santa Monica Mountains to the north and the Pacific Ocean to the south. The adjacent aerial photo gives the impression of a district with isolated pockets of development separated by vacant lots and bisected by the heavily trafficked Pacific Coast Highway.

Adjacent Uses
- Residential developments bound the district along the beach and at the base of the mountains.
- Malibu Creek bounds the district to the east.
- Pepperdine University bounds the district to the west.

Community Workshop Comments
- At the October 17-18, 2014 community workshop, participants offered many insights and comments.
- Everyone was familiar with the area.
- Shopping centers were frequently discussed.
- Concerns include, but are not limited to, difficulty with parking, traffic congestion, and the dominance of luxury brands and associated architecture.

Malibu’s Civic Center district includes a mix of civic uses, retail, and open space. Existing projects are separated from each other by vacant lots and busy roads.
3.2 Civic Center District Perceived Boundaries

Conversations during the first community workshop and an analysis of the Civic Center urban fabric revealed that Pacific Coast Highway, the Santa Monica Mountains, Malibu Lagoon, and Malibu Canyon Road were perceived boundaries that limit movement through the Civic Center.

Pacific Coast Highway (PCH)
Description
- A major four-lane, state highway
- Starts at I-5 in Orange County and ends at US-101 in Mendocino County
- Functions as Malibu’s main thoroughfare
- Spans the entire 21-mile length of Malibu
- Cross Creek Road and Webb Way afford crossings of PCH in the Civic Center district.

Why it is perceived as a boundary.
- Divides City Hall, Legacy Park, Malibu Public Library, Malibu Country Mart, Malibu Village, and the Malibu Lumberyard on the north side of the PCH from Malibu Colony Plaza and the ocean on the south side of PCH
- Limited opportunities for non-vehicle connections across PCH

Malibu Canyon Road
Description
- Designed as a scenic two-lane mountain road
- Connects Malibu with Agoura Hills and Calabasas

Why it is perceived as a boundary.
- Becomes heavily trafficked with “Z” traffic. Morning Z-traffic consists of eastbound traffic from US-101 that exits on Malibu Canyon Road, turns east on PCH, and connects to I-10
- The heavy and fast traffic along Malibu Canyon Road isolates Pepperdine University from the Civic Center District.

The Santa Monica Mountains
Description
- Extends approximately 40 miles east-west from the Hollywood Hills to Point Mugu in Ventura County
- Separates Conejo Valley, Agoura Hills and Calabasas from Malibu

Why it is perceived as a boundary.
- Portions of the mountain range are nearly impassible.
- Development is typically limited to the canyons and the less steep parts of the mountain range

Malibu Creek
Description
- A year-round stream
- Runs from Agoura Hills through the Santa Monica Mountains to the Santa Monica Bay in Malibu

Why it is perceived as a boundary.
- Physically separates the Civic Center district from the Malibu Pier, the Adamson House and the rest of eastern Malibu
- Only access across the creek is along PCH and in private Serra Canyon neighborhood
- No pedestrian access across Malibu Creek
The edges of the Civic Center district are marked by the Santa Monica Mountains, Pacific Coast Highway, the Malibu Pier, and Pepperdine University.
3.3 Civic Center Paths

Malibu’s Street System
- Malibu has a branching street system.
- The regional Pacific Coast Highway intersects with wide local streets like Malibu Canyon Road that branch into smaller local roads that eventually feed into residential cul-de-sacs.
- Malibu has few streets that traverse its entire length.
- The Civic Center’s branching street network diverts through traffic away from residential areas to major roads such as Malibu Canyon Road and PCH. Traffic on these major vehicular paths is therefore concentrated rather than dispersed.
- Through traffic and local traffic are mixed on all of the major roads.
- Almost everyone at the first Community Workshop complained about traffic and how it affects daily life and evacuation plans in the event of an emergency, such as a fire.

Malibu’s “Superblocks”
- High traffic generators such as the shopping centers, Malibu Library, and gas stations create “superblocks” with their own internal pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems.
- Superblocks are internally organized, and pedestrian movement is easy and pleasant within each superblock.
- Moving between superblocks is difficult for pedestrians.
- Superblocks encourage more car travel between destinations within the Civic Center and re-parking at each local destination.
Malibu’s street pattern directs the majority of traffic to the major vehicular paths of Pacific Coast Highway and Malibu Canyon Road.
3.4 Civic Center District Nodes

The Civic Center district contains numerous big superblocks surrounded by wide roads with fast-moving traffic. For example, the Civic Center Way frontage between Stuart Ranch Road and Cross Creek Road is 1,825-feet long, six times longer than a typical 300-foot city block. The lack of a finer grid of streets and intersections concentrates traffic on fewer roads, cuts the Civic Center area into isolated units, and given the lack of active transportation amenities, limits the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists between superblocks.

Nodes in the Civic Center

Malibu Country Mart + Malibu Village + Malibu Lumber Yard Node
- Is the most prominent node in the Civic Center district
- Is made up of the Malibu Country Mart, Malibu Village, and the Malibu Lumber Yard
- Encompasses over 13 acres and approximately 170,000-square-feet of retail, food, and services
- Has an increased traffic impact due to the spatial proximity of these three shopping centers to each other
- Has been criticized by locals for the large number of luxury retailers. One local commented that there are a “multitude of places to buy a $200 T-shirt, but no place to buy a hammer or a nail.”

Malibu Colony Plaza Node
- Was built in 1988 - 1989
- Is located on the beach side of PCH
- Includes a Ralphs grocery store, several restaurants, stores, and services, including a post office, a dry cleaner, and several banks
- Its practical offerings are appreciated by Malibu residents.
- Was almost universally dismissed during the first community workshop for its adherence to a faux-Spanish Mediterranean architectural style

Malibu Lagoon Node
- Is located where the Malibu Creek meets the Pacific Ocean
- Is divided by PCH into a northern and southern portion
- Lacks a safe and comfortable connection between the northern and southern portion
- Was recently restored. The restoration included the removal of excess sediment from the lagoon, re-contouring of the western channels to improve water flows, removal of invasive plants, redesigned viewing areas, and new paths to the southern section of the lagoon from PCH and the Malibu Lagoon State Beach.
- Is difficult to access from the north of PCH

Malibu Library and Legacy Park Node
- Includes the Malibu Public Library, the future Santa Monica College extension, and Legacy Park
- Provides a pedestrian connection between Civic Center Way and the three shopping centers located along Cross Creek Road
- Includes a strict “passive use” restriction in the land purchase agreement that prohibits all ball sports, running, jogging, and other similar use

City Hall Node
- Is located on Stuart Ranch Road
- Is six acres and 40,000-square-feet
- Contains Malibu’s first permanent City Hall
- Is isolated from the rest of the Civic Center district by topography and the numerous vacant lots along Stuart Ranch Road

Surrounding Nodes

In addition to the five nodes located within the Civic Center, additional key nodes are located directly outside the district’s boundary.

Residential Node
- Is located on the hillsides surrounding the Civic Center bowl
- Transitions and buffers between residential areas and the Civic Center have been discussed by homeowners.

Pepperdine University
- Pepperdine’s main campus is located on the ridges one mile west of the Civic Center district.
- The main entrance off of Malibu Canyon Road is marked by a turf slope and a large stylized cross.
- Little pedestrian and bicycle traffic is observed between the University and the Civic Center district.

Malibu Pier
- Was built in 1905
- Was described by Pamela Conley Ulich, the former mayor of Malibu, as the “archway into Malibu”
- Is less than one mile from the Malibu Public Library
- Is separated from the Civic Center district by PCH
- Limited pedestrian connectivity between the pier and the Civic Center district
The nodes in the Civic Center area are weakly connected and encourage intra-district vehicle trips.
### 3.5 Civic Center District Landmarks

When people talk about landmarks in Malibu, “landmarks” generally fall into two groups: 1) large building features such as signs and towers that were designed to catch drivers’ eyes and 2) large structures, such as HRL Laboratories and Pepperdine University, that are visible from their prominent locations on the ridges above the Civic Center district.

Two frequently mentioned landmarks, the sign for the Malibu Country Mart and the Exxon sign, were not seen as pleasant or beautiful by residents attending the first community workshop. These signs are seen as foreign to local Malibu culture and described as clashing with Malibu’s surroundings.

The Malibu Pier and Adamson House seem to be landmarks with universal affection. People at the first community workshop spoke of a strong attachment for places and things that showcase Malibu’s history.
Key landmarks in the Civic Center district include the Exxon sign on PCH and the HRL Laboratories located on the cliffs above the district.
3.6 Civic Center District Opportunities

Conversations with community members at the first community workshop reinforced concerns about vehicular traffic, lack of connection within the district, dominance of chain retail, and the desire for a sense of local identity and space. Addressing these issues will enhance people’s experiences when they visit and use the Civic Center district and encourage the evolution of the Civic Center as a unique, local district.

Three themes emerged during the initial phase of work.

Connect Civic Center nodes
- Link the northern and southern sides of the Civic Center district by creating additional opportunities for pedestrians and bikes to cross PCH.
- Differentiate regional from local paths and encourage active transportation with dedicated pedestrian and bike paths, within the Civic Center area along local streets.
- Increase visual interest on locally designated paths by adding elements that include, but are not limited to, street furniture, street trees, artwork, and vegetation.

Encourage a design that creates a district sense of local place.
- Create human-scale character with design that reduces the apparent size, bulk, scale, and height of buildings.
- Orient buildings and development to local streets to enhance an emerging pedestrian realm.
- Design development to complement and enhance the character of the Civic Center, the surrounding neighborhoods, and existing adjacent development while allowing each development to retain a distinct visual identity.

Showcase Malibu’s natural beauty in relationship to the development of open space.
- Enhance access to the Malibu Lagoon with pedestrian paths into and along Malibu Creek.
- Encourage connection between the Civic Center and Malibu Pier with paths across Malibu Creek.
- Incorporate natural features and landscaped open spaces into developments to provide a sense of openness and views to and from the natural environment.
There are opportunities to enhance the Civic Center through place making, developing complete streets, and creating additional crossings.
4.0 EXISTING DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS

Existing development and design standards in the Malibu Civic Center District are regulated by Title 17 of the City’s Municipal Code and Local Implementation Plan contained within the LCP. Section 2.0 details the regulatory environment, and Table 4.1 below indicates the specific development requirements in the Civic Center District.

Table 4.1 - Existing Civic Center Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USES</th>
<th>Community Commercial CC</th>
<th>Visitor Serving Commercial CV-1 and CV-2</th>
<th>General Commercial CG</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Intense commercial uses such as a supermarkets, department stores and restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visitor-serving uses, including motels, beds and breakfast and inns</td>
<td>• Intense commercial use such as a supermarkets, department stores and restaurants</td>
<td>• Public and quasi-public uses and facilities, such as libraries, museums, and government facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Light industrial uses such as service stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visitor serving uses such as movie theaters</td>
<td>• Emergency services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT SIZE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area                                                         5 acres</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>0.5 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width                                                        300 feet</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>80 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth                                                        500 feet</td>
<td>500 feet</td>
<td>500 feet</td>
<td>125 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING FORM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Far                                                             0.15 / 0.20(^1)</td>
<td>0.15 / 0.20(^1)</td>
<td>0.15 / 0.20(^1)</td>
<td>0.15 / 0.20(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height                                                 18 feet / 24 feet(^2) / 28 feet(^3)</td>
<td>18 feet / 24 feet(^2) / 28 feet(^3)</td>
<td>18 feet / 24 feet(^2) / 28 feet(^3)</td>
<td>18 feet / 24 feet(^2) / 28 feet(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Landscape %                                                      40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Open Space %                                                     25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETBACKS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Minimum                                                       20% of the depth</td>
<td>20% of the depth</td>
<td>20% of the depth</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Minimum                                                       25% of the width (both sides)</td>
<td>25% of the width (both sides)</td>
<td>25% of the width (both sides)</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Minimum                                                       15 feet</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Developments that provide community benefits

\(^2\) Flat roofs with site plan review

\(^3\) Pitched roofs with site plan review
4.1 Commercial Zone Requirements

Site Standards
Standards in the Zoning Code and the LIP allow for very little flexibility. Existing Zoning Code and LIP regulations generally push buildings to the center of a site. A by-right development would devote the majority of the lot to landscaping and open space. A typical development would take up 15% of the lot, and 25% of the lot would be used to fulfill parking requirements.

Table 4.2 - Commercial Zone Site Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STANDARD</th>
<th>LOT SIZE</th>
<th>LANDSCAPING</th>
<th>OPEN SPACE</th>
<th>BUILDING FOOTPRINT</th>
<th>PARKING REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40% of the lot area minimum</td>
<td>25% of the lot area should be devoted to landscape minimum</td>
<td>Gross square footage is limited to 15% of the lot.</td>
<td>1 space for each 225 SF of gross square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 - Example Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-ACRE LOT</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE (assuming a five-acre parcel)</th>
<th>% LOT AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>87,120 SF</td>
<td>40% minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>54,450</td>
<td>25% minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING FOOTPRINT</td>
<td>32,670 SF</td>
<td>15% maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>43,800 SF (146 spaces)</td>
<td>20% minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>218,040</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Commercial Zone Requirements (Cont.)

Building Standards
A low-scale Civic Center district is ensured by current development standards that restrict building heights to 28 feet for pitched roofs, require front setbacks that create space between buildings and the street, and require side setbacks that ensure that buildings avoid crowding each other.

Table 4.4 - Commercial Zone Building Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT WIDTH</td>
<td>ZO 3.3.3</td>
<td>300 feet Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT DEPTH</td>
<td>LIP 3.8.5.A</td>
<td>500 feet Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE SETBACK MINIMUM</td>
<td>LIP 3.8.5.A</td>
<td>25% of the lot width minimum (cumulatively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT SETBACK</td>
<td>ZO 3.8.2.A</td>
<td>20% of the lot depth minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR SETBACK</td>
<td>ZO 3.8.3.C</td>
<td>15 feet minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>ZO 3.8.1.B</td>
<td>18 feet by right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ZO: Zoning Ordinance; LIP: Local Implementation Plan.
4.2 Institutional Zone Requirements

Site Development Standards
Standards in the Zoning Code and the LIP account for approximately 58% of an institutional lot’s site capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STANDARD</th>
<th>0.5 ACRE LOT</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE (assuming a half-acre parcel)</th>
<th>% LOT AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT SIZE</td>
<td>ZO 3.J.3</td>
<td>0.5 acres minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LIP 3.9.3.B</td>
<td>25% of the lot area minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING FOOTPRINT</td>
<td>LIP 3.9.3.A</td>
<td>Gross square footage is limited to 15% of the lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>LIP 3.14.13</td>
<td>1 space for each 250 SF of gross square footage minimum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>5,445 SF</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING FOOTPRINT</td>
<td>3,267 SF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING REQUIREMENT1</td>
<td>3,920 SF (13 spaces)</td>
<td>Assuming 300 SF per parking space</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. Parking cannot be located in front setback.
4.2 Institutional Zone Requirements (Cont.)

Development Standards
Compared to the commercial zones, the Institutional Zone has smaller setback and parcel size requirements. This creates a tighter cluster of buildings and a more pedestrian-friendly environment.

Table 4.8 - Institutional Zone Building Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STANDARD</th>
<th>ZONING STANDARD</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT WIDTH</td>
<td>ZO 3.3.3.A</td>
<td>80 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT DEPTH</td>
<td>ZO 3.3.3.A</td>
<td>125 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE SETBACK MINIMUM</td>
<td>ZO 3.9.2.B</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT SETBACK</td>
<td>ZO 3.9.2.A</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR SETBACK</td>
<td>ZO 3.9.2.C</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING HEIGHT</td>
<td>ZO 3.8.1.B</td>
<td>18 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Summary of Development in Commercial and Institutional Zones

**Building form in Commercial Zones**
- Zoning Code and LIP account for 100% of a commercial lot’s site capacity
- Minimum parcel size is 5 acres
- Creates an urban fabric of building strips surrounded by surface parking with little connection between lots

**Building form in Institutional Zones**
- Zoning Code and LIP account for 60% of a lot’s site capacity
- Minimum parcel size is 0.5 acres
- Creates an urban fabric of smaller, more varied lots

Figure 4.10 - Commercial and Institutional Development

Development in a Commercial Zone

Development in an Institutional Zone
5.0 MALIBU CIVIC CENTER’S EXISTING ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER

The existing architectural character in the Malibu Civic Center district reveals common themes.

- Development is typically offset from the road to allow for surface parking lots.
- Pedestrian connections between commercial developments—and frequently within a development—are generally weak.
- Malibu architecture is an eclectic mix of styles, including but not limited to Contemporary, Spanish Revival, Rural, and Mid Century Modern. Additionally, many of the national chains represented in the district utilize recognizable national brand identity programs.
- Developments are all low density, with FARs well below 0.5.
- Almost all the development respond to the desire for more sustainable open spaces, from the Malibu Lumberyard’s stormwater program to the creation of parklets in the Malibu Village parking lot.
5.1 Malibu Civic Center Complex

- The Civic Center opened in 1970 in the previously undeveloped Malibu Creek floodplain area.
- The complex previously housed the Sheriff’s Office, the Malibu Library, and the Los Angeles County Superior Court.
- The exterior of the building has remained unchanged since its establishment in 1970.
- The courtyard and front lawn are landscaped with turf and non-native trees.
- A 160-foot deep parking lot fronts onto Civic Center Way.
- The main entrance is set back ~ 165 feet from the sidewalk.
- The proposed Santa Monica College (SMC) Malibu Campus will occupy the eastern portion of the site. The County Superior Court (currently closed), the helipad, the newly renovated library, and associated parking and maintenance areas will not be affected by the SMC Malibu Campus development.
### 5.2 Malibu Country Mart

- **Year Built**: Varies
- **Type**: Strip center with a courtyard shopping center
- **Character**: Spanish Revival and Contemporary
- **Frontage**: Parking
- **Orientation**: Internal
- **Square Footage**: 90,000 square-feet
- **Parcel Size**: 6.0 acres
- **Approximate FAR**: 0.34
- **Building Height**: One to two stories

- Located on both sides of Cross Creek Road
- Formerly a motel
- The Malibu Country Mart combines high-end retail, dining, with leisure amenities, such as gardens and sculptures with a strip shopping center. Sometimes referred to as a “Boutique Mall.”
- In the original plan of the Malibu Country Mart storefronts faced each other across a pedestrian walkway. As the shopping center expanded, stores were added that faced parking lots.
- The buildings are a mix of architectural styles, displaying Spanish, Mediterranean, Modern, Rustic, and Rural influences.
- The Country Mart includes unique gardens and sculptures, outdoor dining and picnic areas, and a pesticide and chemical free children’s playground.
- The landscape features artificial turf, California natives and drought tolerant landscaping such as lycemus grasses, agaves, aloes, and fruitless olive trees.

---

**Malibu Country Mart advertises its “abundant free parking.”**

**Expansions of the Malibu Country Mart include rows of retail that face the parking lots.**

**In the original Malibu Country Mart plan, stores faced open spaces and pedestrian paths.**

**Today’s Malibu Country Mart extends from Legacy Park to the Malibu Lagoon.**

**The popular Country Mart playground is pesticide and chemical free.**
5.3 Malibu Village

Year Built 1966
Type Suburban strip center with surface parking
Character Eclectic Contemporary
Frontage Parking dominates
Orientation Internal
Square Footage 50,000 square feet
Parcel Size 4.8 Acres
Approximate FAR 0.24
Building Height One story

- Malibu Village is an L-shaped shopping center made up of three stand-alone buildings located off the northeastern corner of Pacific Coast Highway and Cross Creek Road.
- The stores all face onto the Malibu Village parking lot.
- Small parklets with Adirondack chairs, umbrellas, and a boxwood border were created within the parking lot.
- Malibu Village mixes contemporary, rural, and national chain architecture.
- Malibu Village’s eastern parking lots front directly onto the Malibu Lagoon, but there are no access paths between the shopping center and the lagoon.
- Malibu Village management notes that their key tenants include Wells Fargo, Chipotle, Banana Republic, Nike, True Religion, Sephora, Levi’s, and Radio Shack, all national chains.
5.4 Malibu Colony Plaza

Year Built: 1988-1989
Type: Strip center with surface parking
Character: Spanish Revival
Frontage: Parking
Orientation: To parking lot
Square Footage: 113,000 square feet
Parcel Size: 20 acres
Approximate FAR: 0.13 FAR
Building Height: One to two stories

- An open air shopping mall with stores arranged in a row connected by a sidewalk colonnade
- The 1,250-foot long shopping center is divided by four courtyards with a small plaza space, fountains, landscaping and outdoor seating.
- The Malibu Colony Plaza is directly accessible from the Pacific Coast Highway. However, the building is set back over 200 feet from Pacific Coast Highway to allow for a parking lot.
- The shopping center was built with a Spanish Revival theme that extends from the red tile roofs, to the Mediterranean planting choices and colonnaded passageways.
- Malibu Colony Plaza is anchored by Ralphs’ Supermarket and a CVS pharmacy.
- The one pedestrian connection to the Malibu Colony Plaza is a crosswalk across Pacific Coast Highway at Webb Way.

The Malibu Colony Plaza is primarily organized linearly.

Sidewalks in the Colony Plaza are treated as an attached colonnade.

Colony Plaza is punctuated by plazas with fountains, trees, and outdoor dining.
### 5.5 Malibu Lumber Yard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Year Remodeled</strong></th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Courtyard shopping center with two frontage buildings surrounded by surface parking and aisles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character</strong></td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frontage</strong></td>
<td>Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td>From parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Square Footage</strong></td>
<td>30,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel Size</strong></td>
<td>2.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height</strong></td>
<td>One and two stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An adaptive reuse development that converted the former Malibu Lumber Yard into a shopping center.
- The perimeter walls of the original structure were retained and re-clad.
- The historical significance of the site was honored by using materials once produced at the original Malibu Lumber Yard.
- Retail fronts onto an ellipse-shaped internal courtyard.
- The building is surrounded by a border of 116 parking spaces.
- Sustainability measures include low-water use planting, maintaining all stormwater runoff through bioswales under the wooden deck of the central courtyard, and use of recycled and permeable materials.
- The shopping center is accessible from Legacy Park and Cross Creek Road.
- The main pedestrian access is from the northern parking lot rather than Cross Creek Road.
6.0 Natural Features

6.1 Natural Features
Distinctive open space areas in and around the Civic Center include Legacy Park, Malibu Creek, and Malibu Lagoon. Each of these open spaces is part of a complex ecosystem, and the City has managed these areas to preserve and enhance natural resources.

6.2 Legacy Park
Legacy Park is centrally located in the Civic Center district and exemplifies the City’s commitment to improving water quality and environmental health. The park provides approximately 15 acres of open space, a series of interconnecting trails, a learning center, and informational kiosks, and serves as an outdoor classroom and cultural interpretive center. To highlight the biodiversity within Malibu, the park was designed to showcase six regionally significant habitats, including the coastal prairie, woodlands, coastal bluffs, riparian corridor, wetland meadows, and vernal pools. Each habitat area includes artistic large-scale animal mosaic sculptures that highlight the characteristics of that ecosystem.

Another key objective of the park was to improve local water quality and reduce impacts to the nearby sensitive watersheds of Malibu Creek and Malibu Lagoon. The park is capable of capturing up to 2.6 million gallons per day of stormwater and urban runoff for treatment and disinfection at the nearby Civic Center Stormwater Treatment Facility. Once treated, the water is reused for irrigation of the park. For its innovative design, the park has received accolades from the American Society of Civil Engineers, California Stormwater Quality Association, and American Public Works Association.
6.3 Malibu Creek

Malibu Creek runs along the eastern boundary of the Civic Center area and is a significant biological resource comprised of fresh and brackish water and riparian vegetation. The creek’s mainstream begins south of Westlake Village at the confluence of Triunfo Creek and Lobo Canyon Creek and meanders through the Santa Monica Mountains for approximately 11 miles.13 The creek then drains into Malibu Lagoon, which outlets into Santa Monica Bay. Malibu Creek forms the largest perennial drainage system within the Santa Monica Mountains.14 The creek also serves as an important wildlife corridor for a variety of fish species and is used by birds and other wildlife for nesting and hunting.

In 1974, Malibu State Creek Park was established to preserve the creek. The park consists of over 8,000 acres of riparian habitat, 37 miles of trails, and outdoor recreation amenities, including benches, shower facilities, and campsites.15 Portions of the park have also been used to film numerous movies and television shows, including M.A.S.H. and Planet of the Apes.16

6.4 Malibu Lagoon

Malibu Lagoon lies east of the Civic Center and is where Malibu Creek meets the Pacific Ocean. The lagoon supports a diversity of riparian vegetation and wildlife. Malibu Lagoon State Park was established in 1951 to preserve the lagoon and its habitat. The park features protected wetlands, sandy beaches, and flower gardens.

Malibu Lagoon suffers from poor circulation, and ongoing restoration efforts aim to improve its condition and function. The poor circulation causes the water’s oxygen levels to plummet near zero in some sections (below five milligrams per liter), which threatens fish and wildlife and promotes the proliferation of bacteria. Restoration efforts will improve the estuary’s water flows, allowing cleaner water to return to the surf and a greater diversity of wildlife species to thrive.17

One of the park’s most notable landmarks is Surfrider Beach, which has a long-standing reputation as a premier surfing beach, and was enshrined as the first World Surfing Reserve in 2010. Other notable features include Malibu Pier and the Adamson House, which overlooks the pier and Surfrider Beach. The Adamson House is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and showcases historical artifacts significant to Malibu. The home was built in 1929 for Merritt Huntley Adamson and Rhoda Rindge Adamson, daughter of Frederick Hastings Rindge and May Knight Rindge, the last owners of the Rancho Malibu Spanish land grant.18 Adjacent to the Adamson House is the Malibu Lagoon Museum, which offers visitors the opportunity to explore the unique history and ecosystem of the area.

2013 Bird’s-eye view of the Malibu Lagoon and Civic Center area.
7.0 Gateways, Landmarks and Connections Findings

BOUNDARIES
Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu Canyon Road, the Santa Monica mountains and Malibu Creek limit pedestrian connections, physically separate areas in the Civic Center district and create a culture where people drive to destinations that are easily walkable.

How can the design standards encourage a continuous, convenient network of pedestrian facilities?

PATHS
The Civic Center district contains superblocks surrounded by wide roads and fast moving local and through vehicular traffic.

How shall the Civic Center design standards differentiate local Malibu streets from state routes in terms of character, walkability and traffic congestion? What kind of landscape improvements and streetscape improvements should be encouraged in the Civic Center District?

NODES
There are a number of nodes of heightened concentration in the Malibu Civic Center district. But, these nodes are weakly connected to each other.

How should the design standards orient buildings and open spaces on adjacent sites to provide a sense of connection and circulation between sites?

LANDMARKS
Landmarks in the Malibu Civic Center district are primarily large signs visible from a moving vehicle.

How shall the design standards encourage a more human-scale environment?

Should the design standards encourage pedestrian activity by orienting buildings and locating entrances in respect to streets, sidewalks and paths?

BUILDING TYPOLOGY
Existing commercial zoning standards encourage a suburban building fabric with buildings surrounded by surface parking.

Should the Civic Center standards encourage another type of building typology? What kind of typology would complement and enhance the character of the Malibu Civic Center district?

ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER
Malibu’s Civic Center incorporates an eclectic mix of architectural styles including Spanish Revival, Contemporary, Spanish, and Rural expressions.

What types of pedestrian amenities should be encouraged?

How should the design standards encourage landmarks that reflect Malibu’s culture?

How can the design standards reflect Malibu’s historical character?
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Bonnie,
Please find attached my Civic Center design approach draft for review by the committee and consultant. Please distribute the attached document to both the consultants and committee members. If this is a problem please contact my office.

Thank you,

Ed
Civic Center design approach draft notes for discussion (January 13, 2015):

Dear Committee Members;

In an attempt to approach the Civic Center design issues, I have taken the time to try and identify a direction that neither limits creativity nor creates a preconceived “Architectural Time Warp”. In this regard I am looking at identifying a “Visual Language” by the establishment of a “Palate” of materials, where the architecture will be subordinate to Nature.

I am opposed to any selection or preconception of a “Style” of architecture as a means of a design process. We must establish design tools, where creativity and the demands of Malibu’s unique geographic setting can be responded to. The selection from a “Palate” of visual materials, colors, plant materials and, architecture strategies will allow us a timeless sustainable design process.

Site Planning and the critical integration of the native landscape:

The integration of native landscape materials and mass, into and woven through the entire site and buildings, is critical for the extension of the indigenous landscape habitat of Malibu. Recognition of the dominance of Malibu’s native landscape over the architecture is the critical element that will diminish the intrusion of the built mass within the natural environment.

The general site planning of the buildings location and cumulative mass must not violate the natural configuration of the “Landscape Corridors”. These corridors must be derived, not only as a response to the camouflage of the building mass but as a means of visual connectedness within the Civic Center.

By definition the need to weave the landscape through and around the building mass requires an architectural and site planning approach of a “Village Cluster” other than a continuous or linear building mass. This type of site planning requires the breaking down of the building size and scale to respond to the “Landscape” concept and human scale.

2. Parking lots, use and design;

Street parking and site parking, all should be counted as a cumulative number. Funding must be established for future public parking requirements. Parking lots represent one of the major negative visual impacts within the Civic Center.

   a. Reduce site requirements in lieu of off street parking by the City.
   b. Landscape corridors
   c. Identify “Parking Parks”, parallel with existing Rights of way.

3. Building configuration;

Building configuration must be subordinate to the landscape.

   a. Building shape and volume must be in scale with human activity interfaces, circulation and, street edges.
   b. Building shape and volume must be articulated in plan and height to allow the penetration of light and landscape.
   c. Building geometry must not be a preconceived “Historical Style” or preconceived “commercial” template.
   d. Buildings must draw from the “Palate” of established materials, colors and landscape materials, as outlined below;
**Wall and vertical surface veneer palate**

1. Tile
2. Stone
3. Wood Siding
4. Weathering Steel (Rust)
5. Natural Copper
6. Natural colored metal screens
7. Exterior Plaster
8. Exposed Masonry (brick)
9. Green Wall (Planted Screen)
10. Natural muted “Kynar” color applied to aluminum panels, corrugated, panels, etc.
11. Patterned etched Glass
12. Translucent panels
13. Glazing with large openings to courts and the public realm.

**Roof and horizontal surface palate**

1. Pitched roofs;
   a. Natural Copper
   b. Weathering Steel (rust)
   c. Natural muted “Kynar” color applied to aluminum panels, corrugated, panels, etc.
   d. Translucent etched glass
   e. Flat Clay Tile
   f. Slate Tile
   g. Tile Veneer
   h. Stone Veneer

2. Flat roofs;
   a. “Green”; sod, landscaped
   b. Tile; stone, clay and ceramic
   c. Natural colored membrane roofs

3. Roof Terraces and walkways;
   a. Trex composite decking
   b. Stone Tile
   c. Tile
   d. Etched Glass
   e. Gravel
   f. Flat clay tile
   g. Sod

4. Trellis, sun visors and awnings;
   a. Heavy timber
   b. Natural muted “Kynar” color applied to aluminum grating.
   c. Translucent etched glass
   d. Tension mounted Sail Cloth
   e. “Green” screen arbor

5. Color Palate, from nature, muted, and subtle.