

1 BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
2 OF THE CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD
3 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
4 In the Matter of Planning Commission Agenda Minutes

5
6 Address:)
7 West Hollywood Park Public Meeting Room)
8 625 N. San Vicente Boulevard)
9 West Hollywood, California)
10 _____)

11 DATE OF MEETING: October 3, 2019

12 PLANNING COMMISSION:

STAFF:

13 Adam Bass, Vice Chair	Jennifer Alkire, Planning Mgr.
14 Rogerio Carvalheiro, Chair (A)	Antonio Castillo, Assc. Planner
15 John Altschul, Commissioner	Lauren Langer, Asst. City Atty
16 Sue Buckner, Commissioner	David Gillig, Commission Scty
17 John Erickson, Commissioner	
18 Lynn Hoopingarner, Commissioner	
19 Stacy Jones, Commissioner	

20

21 And Public Speakers.

22

23

24

1 **Planning Commission Meeting**

2 **Thursday, October 3, 2019**

3 Bass: Good evening. I'd like to call to order the
4 meeting of the West Hollywood Planning Commission
5 on October 3rd. I've asked Rob Bergstein to give
6 us the Pledge of Allegiance.

7 Bergstein: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United
8 States of America and to the republic for which it
9 stands, one nation, under god, indivisible, with
10 liberty and justice for all.

11 Bass: Thank you. Mr. Gillig, can we have a roll call?

12 Gillig: Good evening. Tonight, Chair Carvalheiro is
13 absent. In his place, we have our vice chair Adam
14 G. Bass that will be in the acting capacity.
15 Commissioner Jones?

16 Jones: Here.

17 Gillig: Commissioner Hoopingarner?

18 Hoopingarner: Present.

19 Gillig: Commissioner Erickson?

20 Erickson: Present.

21 Gillig: Commissioner Buckner?

22 Buckner: Here.

23 Gillig: Commissioner Altschul?

24 Altschul: Here.

1 Gillig: Vice Chair Bass?

2 Bass: Here.

3 Gillig: And we have a quorum.

4 Bass: Thank you. Next on our agenda is the approval of
5 the agenda. Do we have any changes? Commissioner
6 Erickson has moved to approve, and Commissioner
7 Hoopingarner seconded.

8 Gillig: And the agenda is approved.

9 Bass: Thank you. Next, we're moving onto approval of the
10 minutes, number five, and I believe we have some
11 changes, David, on September 5th?

12 Gillig: Yes, September 5th, staff would like to change on
13 the first page under item 3B, election of vice
14 chair, we just want to change the vote to read 4 to
15 3 vote, instead of 3 to 4 vote.

16 Bass: Okay.

17 Gillig: And that is all for September 5th.

18 Bass: Thank you.

19 Jones: Great, I'd also like to note that I will need to
20 abstain or recuse from voting on the most recent
21 meeting's minutes.

22 Bass: On the September 19th that would be?

23 Buckner: Correct, thank you.

24 Hoopingarner: Mr. Chair, I just realized that my package didn't

1 have the minutes in it, so I don't have...I have
2 not reviewed them.

3 Bass: Okay, would you like to hold until...

4 Hoopingarner: I would prefer. Yes, thank you.

5 Bass: Is there any problem...

6 Hoopingarner: There's...no, I have no minutes.

7 Buckner: Do you want to look at mine?

8 Hoopingarner: Yeah, I would prefer to read them when I can read
9 them.

10 Gillig: Because Commissioner Hoopingarner's not been able
11 to review these, I will suggest that we table them
12 until our next meeting.

13 Gillig: Confirmed, yes.

14 Bass: Without objection?

15 Altschul: No objection.

16 Buckner: No objection.

17 Bass: Next is public comment. And I would like to thank
18 everybody for being here. We have quite a few
19 folks here tonight. You'll be invited to come up
20 and speak to the planning commission's purview. If
21 you're here to discuss the 7811 Santa Monica
22 Boulevard Project, we'll call on you when we get to
23 that item. But if you have something else to speak
24 about this evening, we would invite you to turn in

1 a speaker card to Mr. Gillig over here. And we
2 would be glad to hear from you. David, do we have
3 any speakers?

4 Gillig: We do. We have one for public speaking, Polly
5 Businger.

6 Bass: Thank you.

7 Businger: Do I speak into this? I haven't done this before.

8 Bass: Yes, please just step right up here and if you
9 could just say your name and city of residence for
10 the record.

11 Businger: Polly Businger, West Hollywood. I've been talking
12 to residents all over the city. The consensus is
13 that the city favors the developers over the people
14 who live here. They do not believe that this will
15 change. They have seen encroachment into their
16 neighborhoods, increased noise levels from constant
17 building, and partying late into the night, and
18 increased traffic which is often at a standstill.
19 Why do we continue to allow rampant development?
20 What has happened to the neighborhood of West
21 Hollywood?

22 Bass: Thank you. Any others?

23 Gillig: That was our last public speaker.

24 Bass: Thank you. Next item on our...if you didn't get a

1 chance to speak now and there's something you want
2 to address, we will have another opportunity at the
3 end of the meeting to do that as well. Next item
4 on our agenda, number seven, is director's report.

5 Keho:

6 Good evening Chair and members of the commission.
7 My name is John Keho. I'm Director of Planning and
8 Development Services. I have a couple of things to
9 announce. The first is just to go over the city
10 council agenda as it relates to items that are of
11 interest to the planning commission. So on Monday,
12 October 7th, the city council will be holding the
13 hearing on the Tall Wall Development Agreement for
14 the 8440 Sunset Boulevard building. So that
15 agreement went before the commission. It's now at
16 council. And then at the last city council
17 meeting, there are two zone text amendments that
18 the council looked at. And they continued
19 two...there were three, but they continued two to
20 the next city council meeting. So one was
21 continued before they opened it. There was no
22 discussion on it. And that was a zone text
23 amendment regarding setback deviations in the
24 development review process. So that one, they've
not heard any discussion of that one. The other

1 one, they did open and have a discussion, and that
2 had to do with the zone text amendment regarding
3 projects that span commercial and residential
4 districts. So they did hold a discussion on that,
5 and they tabled it to the next meeting. And they
6 did direct staff to bring back a resolution that
7 would be different than either the resolution that
8 the planning commission had or different from what
9 the staff had. And that...excuse me...that zone
10 text amendment resolution, should they go forward
11 with it, that would allow projects to span the two
12 zones as long as the parking was totally
13 underground. Then the buildings above ground would
14 have to be totally separated and have the
15 appearances if they were built according to the
16 zoning districts. So that's all going back to the
17 city council on October 7th. Also, I want to
18 mention that we are having our second annual
19 planning and development services open house. This
20 is going to be on Tuesday, October 15th at Plummer
21 Park Fiesta Hall at 6 p.m. Last year, we had it,
22 and it was just primarily about long range planning
23 issues. We're going to expand it and have all of
24 the divisions there. So our long-range planning

1 division will be talking about the Willoughby
2 Vista-Gardner Greenway, getting input on that.
3 They'll also be talking about personal delivery
4 devices. Those would be robots that would be on
5 the streets delivering...on the sidewalks, excuse
6 me, delivering items. We'll have someone there
7 talking about sustainability and green programs,
8 and then we'll have...also have some discussion or
9 a table on parklets. Our current and historic
10 preservation planning division will have someone
11 there to talk about what we're doing with historic
12 preservation. Our building and safety staff will
13 be there talking about our seismic retrofit,
14 because as you know, we've recently sent out lots
15 of letters to owners of soft-story buildings
16 letting them know that they need to retrofit their
17 buildings. So this is an opportunity for people
18 who don't know about that can come and talk to our
19 building staff. And then the other thing that
20 we'll have someone there is to talk about our
21 efforts in trying to get...bring the subway to the
22 city of West Hollywood. We also have an item on
23 that agenda Monday night. We're very happy that
24 metro is now looking at the extension of the line

1 into West Hollywood as a positive thing. And
2 they're really moving forward. They've actually
3 released video talking about moving that item
4 forward. So we're really pleased with the momentum
5 that we have currently on metro. And then my last
6 update is to let everyone know that it's official,
7 Jennifer has been officially promoted into the
8 Planning Manager position for current and historic
9 preservation. And so with that, that's my update.

10 Bass: Thank you. Do any of the commissioners have
11 questions for the director?

12 Erickson: John, is there any way...I know other commissions
13 got specific tours with the metro tour and stuff,
14 like individual tours for their commissions. I
15 wasn't able to make any of the public ones because
16 like everyone, we're very busy. And...but I've
17 only heard wonderful things about it. And I'm
18 really jealous that I wasn't able to go. So this
19 is more of a personal request but is there a way in
20 which the planning commission could have a metro
21 tour because we've been hearing a lot about it
22 specifically for us. I would...

23 Keho: Sure, we could certainly take a look at that. I
24 mean because you're right. We have gotten a lot of

1 positive feedback. And the more that people learn
2 about what metro's doing in other areas, it would
3 really help as things proceed. So I will check
4 into that.

5 Erickson: Thank you.

6 Bass: Commissioner Hoopingarner, did you have something?

7 Hoopingarner: Just an observation that there's potential Brown
8 Act issues of all of us congregating around it,
9 subject matter.

10 Keho: Yeah, there is that issue, so we do have to...

11 Erickson: We can have two of us go or whatever.

12 Keho: We can have...we can't have every commissioner at
13 the same time. That's why we had multiple tours
14 previously, so people would be separated.

15 Erickson: I figured the city planning director wouldn't put a
16 planning commission in a Brown Act violation
17 situation. But I mean, I've been wrong before,
18 so...

19 Bass: Thank you.

20 Keho: Right.

21 Bass: Next on our agenda, number eight, is items from
22 commissioners.

23 Bass: Commissioner Erickson?

24 Erickson: Yeah, I just want to...there is a...we all had a

1 flyer for the human trafficking education forum
2 that was laid before us. And it's also out in the
3 hall for individuals in the public in attendance
4 tonight. Human trafficking is an under reported
5 and under...and an issue that is...does not get the
6 attention of which it deserves. But thankfully for
7 individuals who represent us, like Senator Ben
8 Allen and many others in the state legislature,
9 they have made reporting requirements and poster
10 requirements in a lot of public spaces more...out
11 there more. And so I would really...really would
12 encourage everyone to come out to next week's
13 education forum because people don't understand
14 that human trafficking happens right before you.
15 You might have even seen something today depending
16 on where you were going or where you were traveling
17 or what you were doing. This is a grossly under
18 reported thing for 24.9 million people. So we need
19 to do something about it. And I hope you'll come
20 out and learn on how you in your neighborhoods, as
21 well as if you're a business owner or anywhere
22 else, in which you can be a champion to end human
23 trafficking today. So I really hope that people
24 will come out to this forum. And that's all.

1 Thank you.

2 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Hoopingarner?

3 Hoopingarner: Yes, I just wanted to note to the public that the
4 item that the director was speaking about about the
5 lot ties has been before this commission two times.
6 And two times, this commission voted unanimously to
7 remove lot ties completely from our zone text. And
8 I just wanted to make that clear because I don't
9 know that it was that clear in the staff report
10 that that in fact is how this commission voted
11 based on the input from the public at these
12 hearings. Thank you.

13 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Buckner? Okay,
14 Commissioner Jones?

15 Jones: Yes, I just want to give a hearty congrats to
16 Jennifer Alkire for her promotion. And that's it.
17 Thanks.

18 Bass: Thanks. Congratulations, we're excited for you.
19 Next, consent calendar. We don't have anything.
20 Public hearings, none. And new business is 7811
21 Santa Monica Boulevard. Do we have a staff report
22 on this?

23 Castillo: Yes. Good evening, Vice Chair Bass and members of
24 the commission. The item before you this

1 evening...well, first, Antonio Castillo, Associate
2 Planner with the Planning Division. The item
3 before you this evening is the draft environmental
4 impact report for the bond project, a hotel mixed-
5 use development located at 7811 Santa Monica
6 Boulevard. The purpose of this meeting is to
7 provide that the commission and members of the
8 public with an additional forum to provide comments
9 to staff and the city's consultant on the adequacy
10 of the environmental impact report, this draft
11 version. The draft has been prepared by the...for
12 the city by the city's environmental consulting
13 firm of Dudeck to evaluate the potential
14 environmental effects that would result from the
15 development of this project. With me this evening
16 in Nicole Cobleigh, senior project manager at
17 Dudeck. And in just a moment, Nicole will provide
18 an overview of the CEQA process and the status of
19 the CEQA analysis. Afterwards, we'll be gathering
20 comments on the draft EIR. These comments will be
21 responded as part of the final EIR that were
22 returned back to this commission during a notice of
23 public hearing in the near future when the project
24 has been considered in...will be considered in its

1 entirety, including the final EIR. The draft EIR
2 is available on the city's website for review and
3 download. Hard copies are available at City Hall
4 as well as at the West Hollywood Library upstairs.
5 The project site consists of three parcels
6 including 7811 Santa Monica Boulevard, the main
7 address to the project, 1114 Orange Grove, and 1125
8 Ogden. The parcel fronting Orange Grove is a
9 rectangular-shaped lot currently used as a surface
10 parking lot. And the parcel fronting Santa Monica
11 Boulevard is an irregular L-shaped parcel and
12 currently occupied by a gym and a surface parking
13 lot to the east. And the parcel fronting Ogden is
14 a rectangular shape, is...and currently occupied by
15 a multi-family residential building. Together,
16 they encompass an...approximately 40,186 square-
17 foot project site. The project includes the
18 construction of mixed-use development of
19 approximately 214,483 square feet in gross building
20 area with a maximum height of 71 and a half feet
21 in...at the highest portion. The development would
22 consist of 86-room hotel, a restaurant facing Santa
23 Monica Boulevard, and 70 residential units
24 including an art gallery fronting on Orange...onto

1 Orange Grove. The construction of the proposed
2 project would involve demolition of the existing
3 10,000 square foot commercial building located at
4 7811 Santa Monica and parking lots adjacent to
5 the...to that commercial building, the public
6 parking lot currently leased by the city,
7 the...that's located on Orange Grove and the seven-
8 unit apartment building located on the parcel
9 facing Ogden. Of the 70 residential units, 11
10 units would be affordable housing including six
11 very low income and five moderate income units.
12 The residential units would be composed of 9 two-
13 bedroom units including...within the building
14 facing Ogden and 23 one-bedroom units. The
15 building height of the proposed project would range
16 up to 6 stories above ground up to 71 and a half
17 feet in certain areas with 2 subterranean parking
18 levels. The project would have a FAR of 3.71 which
19 is slightly less than what is allowed for the site.
20 The building would include 175 parking spaces.
21 Approximately, 130 spaces would be available to
22 serve the project. And the 45 additional spaces
23 would be excess that would be available for public
24 parking which are intended to replace the existing

1 45 spaces that are currently there on the
2 Ogden...I'm sorry, on the Orange Grove surface
3 parking lot. Access to the project would be
4 available from three separate driveways, one on
5 each street. Access for the hotel guests,
6 residents, and the public is available from Santa
7 Monica and Orange Grove with a separate vehicular
8 ingress and egress for residents only along Ogden.
9 The...and an entrance would be constructed on Santa
10 Monica Boulevard to serve the commercial patrons
11 arriving to the project's sites. These are photo
12 simulations of the building. And this simulation
13 would be as if you're driving westbound on Santa
14 Monica Boulevard, this, from the intersection of
15 Fairfax and Santa Monica facing eastbound. This
16 would be from the...facing southbound on Orange
17 Grove and from southbound on Ogden. And this would
18 be northbound on Orange Grove south of Santa Monica
19 Boulevard. The discussion for the commission
20 during this common period is centered on the draft
21 EIR only. The commission will not be deliberating
22 on the merits of the proposal or making any
23 decisions to support the project at this time. In
24 the coming weeks, staff will gather all comments

1 received during this period and work with the
2 environmental consultant to respond to each of the
3 comments received during this comment period.
4 Subsequently, the planning commission will hold a
5 public hearing, receive public comments, and go
6 through the normal process of deliberation, and
7 ultimately take an action on whether to approve or
8 deny the project and certify the final
9 environmental impact report. The comment period
10 began when the draft EIR was published back in
11 August, August 14. And we extended the minimum 45-
12 day comment period an additional 10 days to 55 in
13 order to maintain it open until the planning
14 commission meeting. So the end of the comment
15 period will be on Monday, October 7th at 5 p.m.
16 Before I pass the microphone to Nicole, I do want
17 to mention that staff has received comments from
18 members of the public. As I stated earlier, those
19 comments will be...will be responded to in the
20 final EIR, so everyone has the opportunity to see
21 the comments and the responses. And with that, I
22 will pass the microphone to Nicole...

23 Bass:

24 Just before you pass it along, this is actually
looking north...the picture on the screen is

1 looking north on Ogden.

2 Castillo: North on...

3 Bass: Not Orange Grove.

4 Castillo: I apologize. I misspoke there. Yes, sir.

5 Bass: Thank you. Well, that's what it says on the...it
6 says Orange Grove on the caption, but it is Ogden.

7 Castillo: That as my error.

8 Bass: Thank you.

9 Castillo: Thank you for catching that.

10 Cobleigh: Good evening commissioners. Thanks for having us
11 tonight. We are here tonight to focus on CEQA, the
12 California Environmental Quality Act, and the
13 findings in the draft environmental impact report
14 that Dudeck prepared with city staff for the
15 proposed bond project. A little history on CEQA,
16 CEQA was enacted in 1970 and requires
17 states...state agencies and local agencies to
18 evaluate and consider the environmental impacts of
19 a potential decision during the decision-making
20 process. So the purpose of CEQA is to inform
21 decisionmakers and the public of what the
22 impacts...environmental impacts would be of a
23 proposed project if it were to be approved.
24 Secondly, CEQA allows the opportunity for

1 agencies and the public to comment on these issues.
2 That's the focus of tonight. And finally, the
3 third focus of CEQA is to identify ways to avoid or
4 reduce environmental impacts or come up with
5 project alternatives if we find that significant
6 impacts are identified. So here's an overview, a
7 flow chart, of the entire CEQA process with the
8 yellow box indicating where we are in this process.
9 So we began this process in October of 2016 by
10 circulating a notice of preparation which is box 1.
11 We then distributed that notice of proportion and
12 an initial study and held a 30-day scoping comment
13 period for...prior to preparing the draft EIR. We
14 then...which is box three. We then prepared the
15 draft EIR, and as Tony mentioned on August 14th, we
16 issued the draft EIR for public review for the 55-
17 day public review period which we're in right now.
18 In response to comments received tonight and
19 throughout the 55-day comment period, we will then
20 prepare the final EIR which takes into account all
21 the comments we've received, responses to those
22 comments, and any edits or minor changes to the
23 document that might be needed to...in...raised in
24 response to issues or raised by the comments from

1 people or the commission. We then provide the
2 document...the draft of the final EIR available for
3 the public to review prior to the project coming
4 before the planning commission along with the EIR.
5 So the final action would be, as Tony mentioned,
6 later this year, hopefully, where we present the
7 final EIR and the project together. Upon
8 certification of the final EIR, a notice of
9 determination would be filed which starts a 30-day
10 statute of limitations period. So the
11 environmental issues that we evaluated in the draft
12 EIR that we're discussing tonight are aesthetics,
13 air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas
14 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, noise,
15 public services, transportation, utilities, and
16 energy. And of these environmental issue areas,
17 the majority were found to result in less than
18 significant impacts using the thresholds that are
19 adopted by the state of California and the city.
20 With the exception of cultural resources, where we
21 have some standard mitigation measures for
22 potential inadvertent discovery of any resource, as
23 well as a paleontological monitoring plan, and then
24 also for noise. We did identify that there are the

1 potential for noise impacts during both
2 construction and operation of the project. And
3 we've included mitigation measures to reduce noise
4 impacts to below the thresholds of...that are used
5 in the city to determine noise impacts. So with
6 that, we turn it over for comment.

7 Bass: Thank you. I appreciate the report. Before we go
8 into any comment...and we will take the comment
9 from the public first, since we're not deliberating
10 anything tonight. I just want to kind of set the
11 expectation for all of us that the commission will
12 be taking no action tonight. This public hearing
13 is just to the opportunity to provide our
14 consultant on the environmental document ideas that
15 they should consider for the final report. Once
16 that final report is done, it will come back here
17 for an actual deliberation and debate and approval
18 or rejection and all of that process. But based on
19 the letters we received, I want everyone to know
20 that there will be no approval or denial of any
21 project tonight. That's not the stage of the
22 process we're in. So although we welcome all of
23 your comments, I would encourage folks to really
24 focus on the environmental report and what is in

1 there and if something's missing in there, to make
2 sure it's included in the final environmental
3 report. And with that, we have...unless there are
4 questions. Commissioner Hoopingarner?

5 Hoopingarner: Yes, I have a couple of questions about the actual
6 initial study as well as the EIR. In particular,
7 number one is this EIR contains no chapter on land
8 use and planning. And I'm curious as to why that
9 is. Excuse me?

10 Altschul: (INAUDIBLE)

11 Hoopingarner: Oh, okay. This does not include a chapter on land
12 use and planning which is normal and standard in
13 every EIR. And I was curious as to why that might
14 be. So I went back to the initial study to see the
15 determination, and the initial study says that this
16 is a less than significant impact that the project
17 site is zone CC2 and is described in your general
18 plan as community commercial 2. And it goes on to
19 speak about CC2. But this project actually has
20 also got an R3 project property in it. And that's
21 not included in the initial study, and I'm
22 wondering how a project that spans two lot zones is
23 proposing to be a mixed-use, combined project which
24 under our current code is not even entitled...it's

1 not even an option. It's not even something that's
2 waivable. It's an eligibility criterion that you
3 must have 60,000 square feet to even do this
4 project, how that...and that land-use item was
5 completely excluded from this study.

6 Cobleigh: I can address that. So if you look at the project
7 boundaries that were outlined in the initial study
8 for the project description included in the initial
9 study, that didn't include the residential
10 property. After circulation of the initial study,
11 the project was revised to include that additional
12 parcel. So that is why the land-use section in the
13 initial study only addressed CC2.

14 Hoopingarner: I appreciate that, but that still doesn't address
15 why the EIR itself doesn't have a land use and
16 planning study given that there are definitely
17 land-use and planning impacts of this project.

18 Alkire: So we can answer points of clarification in the
19 document. But questions that are a little more in
20 detail like that, we will address in the final EIR.
21 That's what we're here...to take those questions
22 and comments in, and then we'll address them in the
23 final in writing.

24 Hoopingarner: Okay, so the next question that's sort of big

1 picture is to the traffic study. And in my
2 experience, traffic studies study the project. And
3 then if impacts are discovered, mitigations are
4 identified that can potentially address that. But
5 in this study, in fact, the mitigations were...the
6 proposed mitigations were included in the study.
7 The study basis included the potential mitigations
8 instead of studying the impact of the project. So
9 I'm curious as to that precedent. Shall I read the
10 words?

11 Langer: No, I mean it's the same answer that we want to
12 hear if you think that there are some problems with
13 the document or information missing, so it can be
14 added in and explained in the final EIR. But I
15 don't think staff will be able to respond point by
16 point to every factual issue raised tonight. But
17 we want to hear all the issues, and it will be put
18 in the final EIR in writing.

19 Bass: So that concern will be...will be specifically
20 spelled out in writing with a written response, and
21 if...

22 Langer: Yes.

23 Bass: ...there is an error...an error, an oversight, or
24 something like that from anything people say

1 tonight, that that will be corrected in the final.

2 That's kind of the purpose of this, I believe.

3 Langer: That's the part of this process, yes. So please
4 give us all those comments, and we'll make sure
5 that they're addressed in the document.

6 Hoopingarner: The third one is around the shade and shadow
7 studies. And I appreciate that the study says that
8 based on SB743 that shade and shadow is not an
9 aesthetic impact. It is however under net zero an
10 impact to the community. And it is my
11 understanding that net zero and the...excuse me,
12 I'm skipping so that people...I'll explain for the
13 public. The state has a new law that's rolling out
14 in phases that requires new projects to be net zero
15 themselves and to not prevent other projects from
16 being net zero in their energy usage. So shade and
17 shadow, yes, would be excluded under the aesthetics
18 exclusion, but shade and shadow wouldn't be
19 excluded under the state law for net zero. Is that
20 something that should be incorporated in an EIR, or
21 is that just another thing that the commission
22 should consider when it does actually come before
23 us?

24 Alkire: We will respond to that in the final EIR.

1 Hoopingarner: Okay, I think those were my questions. I have
2 other comments that we'll save for later. But
3 those were my questions.

4 Bass: Thank you. Anyone else have questions up here?
5 Commissioner Altschul?

6 Altschul: I don't generally like to do this, but there were
7 some errors in the EIR with respect to
8 identification of streets and perhaps other things
9 that I didn't catch. But for instance, I spent my
10 time scratching my head. Where is this street
11 called Fairburn or something like that? Fairview,
12 and I suspect that somebody meant Fairfax. Is
13 there a Fairview? Because I never saw it.

14 Alkire: I'm not sure what page you're talking about, but we
15 will take a look over it and...

16 Altschul: I'm sure...I'm not sure either, but there was a map
17 and some other references to Fairview. Also, there
18 was an identification of a street called Ogden
19 Grove. I would, I would...but there's...there is
20 an Orange Grove.

21 Alkire: Yeah.

22 Altschul: But I never saw an Ogden Grove.

23 Alkire: Someone completed those. We'll definitely take a
24 look and scrub through those.

1 Bass: it's what it...it's where it spans the two streets.

2 Altschul: I think if this came from the preparer of the EIR,
3 you know, I think it's a little bit sorry that they
4 don't take the time and the effort to get their
5 surroundings straight. So I would suggest that
6 this be corrected in the final draft.

7 Hoopingarner: And I guess to the commissioner's point, I
8 did...yes, circle that. And my question was this
9 is a city map. How is it that the map has been
10 changed in a way that caused that name to be
11 changed because I have that map right here in my
12 little guide to planning commission? And that map
13 is spelled correctly. And so I'm wondering
14 how...what else has changed here on this map in
15 addition to street names.

16 (INAUDIBLE)

17 Hoopingarner: Page number...well, it's the first fold-out map on
18 the...and it's Figure 2.6. It follows Page 2-26.

19 Bass: Thank you. I think that's it for commissioner
20 comments, so we're going to move to public comment.
21 I would like to encourage everybody who would like
22 to speak to turn in a speaker slip. We allow three
23 minutes for...per speaker. When you approach the
24 microphone, if you could just identify yourself and

1 your city of residence. Our first speaker is David
2 Logan to be followed by Gary Turr (phonetic).

3 Jones: Sorry, there's...that's not the order it's
4 appearing in.

5 Bass: I'm sorry.

6 Gillig: Robert Wheek.

7 Bass: I had scrolled down to count the number of
8 speakers, so I apologize. Robert...this is my
9 first time chairing this meeting, so I'm going to,
10 I'm going to use that as the excuse. I had
11 scrolled down on my screen. So Robert Wheek is the
12 first speaker...I'm bright red...followed by Loren
13 Kalin. And for those speaking for the first time,
14 you do have a timer on the screen here.

15 Wheek: Good evening commissioners. My name is Robert
16 Wheeler. I reside at...I reside at North
17 Hollywood. Good evening and thank you for your
18 time regarding the Bond Project. I'm professional
19 union carpenter. I work in local...a lot of work
20 in West Hollywood. I travel the Santa
21 Monica/Fairfax Streets often. There's already a
22 lot of traffic there. I'm not against
23 construction. That's how I make my living. That's
24 how I provide for my family. I'm against bad plans

1 and bad ideas. And a bad idea that prevents me
2 from getting home to my family at a reasonable
3 time, I just...I'm asking you to rethink it and
4 reconsider it to better barriers and methods. And
5 thank you.

6 Bass: Thank you. Loren Kalin to be followed by Rob
7 Bergstein.

8 Kalin: Hello, I'm (INAUDIBLE)...I'm Loren Kalin. I'm the
9 owner of 1121 through 1123 North Ogden Drive. I
10 want to describe the property and then you...to be
11 able...I'm a little nervous, but I want to describe
12 the property. In 1923, there was a duplex built on
13 1121/1123 North Ogden Drive. At 1119 North Ogden
14 Drive, there was a garage. The middle part of the
15 property was vacant. Now in around 1941 or 1942,
16 they built wood or Hollywood bungalow-type units.
17 What I'm trying to say is the material composition
18 of these units are different. And in the
19 environmental impact report, you won't find
20 anything said about that. So if you could imagine
21 when the design center was built, and they had that
22 locksmith in the middle property there who wouldn't
23 sell, this is where my property is located, right
24 there. We're right in the middle next to 1125 and

1 7811. My concern is the safety of the residents
2 because of the different building composition on
3 these properties, okay? Not only decay that...the
4 peace and enjoyment which is understandable, but
5 the safety of the residents because of the
6 different building compositions. So that was not
7 addressed in any environmental impact report. So I
8 am...the liability is my main, main concern, okay?
9 Thank you.

10 Bass: Thank you. Rob Bergstein followed by Laura
11 Boccaletti.

12 Bergstein: Excuse me. Good evening, commissioners. My name
13 is Rob Bergstein. I'm a resident at The Eastside
14 just east of the proposed project. My comments are
15 mostly more general towards the project and less
16 specific on the EIR. But as Commissioner Altschul
17 taught me many years ago, as far as construction
18 mitigation, unless you are the original resident of
19 the first building on any street in West Hollywood,
20 everyone lives through some kind of construction.
21 It's just a fact of life in any city. And I have
22 enormous respect for Faring Capital and the
23 Illoulilian family. They run good projects, and I
24 know in my heart they will do everything in their

1 power to mitigate any construction issues while the
2 process is undergoing. As far as the project
3 itself, I'm in favor of this. There is no hotel in
4 the eastside of West Hollywood. You know, all the
5 years I've had more family and friends than I could
6 house in my home, put them up at the Orlando or at
7 Hollywood and (INAUDIBLE 00:37:45) because there
8 was no hotel within walking distance. I think it's
9 an ideal location with galleries, gyms,
10 restaurants, and the grocery store nearby. And
11 while there will be some rent-stabilized units that
12 are removed, they're being replaced by permanent,
13 affordable housing. I think sometimes there's a
14 misconception that our rent-stabilized housing is
15 income-based affordable when it is not, and this
16 would give the city a net increase in permanent
17 affordable housing. I think that's it. Thank you
18 for letting me share.

19 Bass: Thank you. Laura Boccaletti followed by Jenny
20 Kriendler.

21 Boccaletti: Good evening commissioners. Laura Boccaletti, West
22 Hollywood. I don't think we've logged in the DEIR
23 the complaints that came for years from neighbors
24 surrounding (INAUDIBLE) regarding noise at their

1 rooftop pool. Bond Hotel would like a rooftop pool
2 to play music all night, consume liquor until 2
3 a.m., and be open 24/7. Let's talk about how loud
4 people talk whether they are drunk or not in terms
5 of decibels and not just the music and what is in
6 place to control this except placing the burden for
7 it on neighbors having to constantly complain in
8 the middle of the night. Let's talk more on the
9 DEIR about walkable neighborhoods which this type
10 of project is supposed to create. Let's talk more
11 about how it maxes out vehicle intrusion along the
12 sidewalk on three sides, and the pedestrian safety
13 there is compromised because of it. This needs
14 further study. And why would we think that a
15 loading dock should be open for business and
16 adjacent to a residential neighborhood until 10
17 p.m.? This needs further study. Let's talk more
18 about what this project is lacking as a Type A
19 project that spans CC2 and R3B. It does not create
20 a walkable neighborhood. It does not encourage
21 pedestrians to gather, create clauses, or
22 strengthen neighborhood character or sense of
23 public place. This project poses no public
24 benefit. It does not deserve concessions to

1 eligibility criteria in the zoning code. Thank
2 you.

3 Bass: Thank you. Jenny Kriendler followed by Andrew
4 Rakos.

5 Kriendler: Hi, Jenny Kriendler. I live at 1122 North Ogden
6 directly across from this project. And thank you
7 for the opportunity to speak to you all tonight. A
8 section engaging specific topics of public safety
9 and the input of our public safety department of
10 West Hollywood is absent from the DEIR. The
11 developer of this project has assured us many times
12 that having a hotel in our neighborhood will
13 increase our measure of public safety. We think
14 this should be studied and that public safety
15 should be a part of the conversation to make such
16 determinations. Who will supply the statistics
17 about a hotel being brought to a community and its
18 ramifications for public safety including
19 livability, traffic, traffic enforcement, transient
20 behavior, noise complaints, and calls to dispatch.
21 There is grave concern in our neighborhood about
22 access from emergency response like Fire
23 Department, and paramedics, and ease of being able
24 to do that. Regarding public health concerns,

1 let's talk about the impact of paint and welding
2 fumes emanating from the collision center on the
3 corner of Orange Grove and Santa Monica Boulevard.
4 Fumes known to the state of California to cause
5 birth defects and cancer will be available for
6 inhalation by guests with balconies on both side of
7 the project adjacent to the collision center
8 including those facing west and south. There needs
9 to be more serious study about hazardous materials
10 from the woodworking, welding, and neon work, and
11 the use of chemicals related to these processes
12 that used to take place for years on this property.
13 And the fact that the collision center used to be a
14 gas station, we think that any underestimation of
15 the presence of a myriad of chemicals known to the
16 state of California to cause birth defects and
17 cancer merits further study before the lid of
18 payment is pulled up from the parking lot on Orange
19 Grove. The variety and toxicity of the chemicals
20 present in the existing structures and the soil and
21 the materials to be used for the construction
22 create a toxic soup for 19 months and beyond during
23 demolition and construction. Additionally, this
24 project has no public benefit, minimal greenspace,

1 no walkability, and severe encroachment into our
2 neighborhood. It does not merit the concessions
3 for eligibility criteria in the zoning code. The
4 parcel is 20,000 square feet too small, and it
5 should not be eligible for the bonuses and
6 entitlements. It does nothing to create sense of
7 community by walling itself off from the rest of
8 the neighborhood and surrounding itself with
9 driveways. The criteria for the concessions this
10 project is asking for requires that the project
11 pose no threat to public safety, public health, and
12 the physical environment. Where is this treated
13 specifically in the DEIR? It needs further study.
14 Thank you.

15 Bass: Thank you. Andrew Rakos followed by Max Thayer.

16 Rakos: Good evening commission and congratulations, Adam
17 Bass, for chairing your first meeting. My name is
18 Andrew Rakos. I'm a West Hollywood resident. And
19 I also speak on behalf of Fountain Day School which
20 is directly next to it. I'm the daily manager as
21 well as the CFO of Fountain Day school which has
22 been in that location on 1128 North Orange Grove
23 for over 64 years. Right now, Fountain Day School
24 exists as a preschool for children age two through

1 five years old. And we have over 150 families, 150
2 children there. And every year, we get 45 new
3 families as 45 leave to go onto elementary school.
4 We've served the community for quite a while. And
5 almost everyone has...if not, they've heard of it
6 then. Lots of families through West Hollywood and
7 the city of Los Angeles have gone through our doors
8 in those years. We've been...since we first found
9 out about the project, we've been in touch with the
10 Illouliau family and Faring Capital for over three
11 years negotiating some of the issues around it.
12 We're in support of development, and we are
13 definitely in support of Faring Capital especially
14 because they do have a history of working with the
15 community as a generality. I've come before
16 various commissions and spoken on this. But I do
17 want to make sure that in the EIR, in the
18 mitigation, there are some serious issues that even
19 if we have been negotiating it with Faring Capital,
20 they need to be included. The first one of course
21 being noise. Our 150 kids go to nap from 1:00 to
22 3:00 every day, and that's a serious issue. If the
23 children don't nap, then it leaves them very
24 irritable. It's part of their healthy development

1 stage to growing up to be good, wonderful, joyous
2 children. The air quality's of course very, very,
3 very important. And we've spoken to Faring
4 Capital, and they're going to mitigate that and
5 create barriers and walls to try and protect the
6 children from any kind of materials that would go
7 over their area. Very big one is parking.
8 Obviously, with the loss of the 45 spaces, we're
9 looking at a horrendous situation for the school
10 and a lot...a tremendous loss of business. The
11 reason being it's not just enough to drop off a
12 child. Social Services suggests...or not suggests,
13 they require that a child sign...a parent sign a
14 child in and out of school when they are under the
15 age of five. So a car must stop, must park, and
16 then continue on. So there's about a 10
17 minute...we've been very fortunate working with the
18 city and working with the parking lot that our
19 families already have 15-minute drop off for free
20 and 15-minute pickup. And we're very grateful for
21 that, but we have to try and figure out some kind
22 of median for the mitigation. But this is a
23 situation that will continue for a long time,
24 especially even if we have parties. You can

1 imagine if only one group of 45 families need a
2 parking space at one time. But thank you.
3 Please...

4 Bass: Thank you.

5 Rakos: ...feel free to contact us as well if you need any
6 more information or you want to come and take a
7 tour to see the school and how it relates to the
8 property. Thank you.

9 Bass: Thank you. Max Thayer followed by Mike Carter.

10 Thayer: Hello everybody. My name is Max Thayer. I've been
11 a resident of West Hollywood since its inception.
12 I've been very lucky to live at the same apartment
13 in the corner of Ogden and Santa Monica for 36
14 years. I know that neighborhood, and I know my
15 street, Ogden. And it's pretty well organized, and
16 quiet, and residential. I'm a little worried right
17 now because of the egress from Ogden. It's
18 supposed to only be for residents of the new
19 project. But how soon will people be able to
20 figure out how to get in and out of there, maybe a
21 delivery guy or somebody that works there and
22 figures out that getting out on Ogden is going to
23 be a lot easier? And pretty soon, you've turned my
24 residential street into a commercial street. What

1 I want to address is the historical/cultural
2 significance of 7811. The Brick Gym is something
3 that lends a sense of community to our
4 neighborhood. And it's a gym that infuses the
5 neighborhood with positive energy and a community
6 feel. We believe that 7811, back in the 1920s and
7 '30s was a film production facility of some sort,
8 perhaps a support facility for the burgeoning
9 Pickford Fairbanks United Artists lot on Santa
10 Monica Boulevard and Formosa. This should be
11 investigated in any EIR because a designation of
12 this property as 7811 would be more suitable for
13 artists' lofts and a gallery and not to be razed
14 for a hotel. We welcome further study required on
15 the historic and cultural significance of this
16 structure. Thank you.

17 Bass: Thank you very much. Mike Carter to be followed by
18 Steve Weinstein.

19 Carter: Good evening commissioners. My name's Mike Carter.
20 I'm a 33-year resident at ground zero at 1123 North
21 Ogden Drive. And I'm a neighborhood watch captain
22 there. And the neighbors and I do not understand
23 how a section on land use and planning can be
24 omitted from the DEIR when this project is riddled

1 with issues that require concessions to the zoning
2 code. These maneuvers are unprecedented even if we
3 were to consider them individually. Yet, they co-
4 occur. This needs to be looked at further. Here
5 they are. This the...this is the litany. The
6 parcel's 20,000 square feet too short. It cherry-
7 picks a zoning code for the residential use of two
8 types of projects, 1936.170a and 1936.170b. The
9 projects height where it meets two residentially
10 zoned perimeters...residentially zoned perimeters
11 exceeds the allowed 35 feet according to
12 1922.050e2. It requests a concession also for 71
13 and a half feet. Planning commissioners recently
14 expressed doubts concerning the 5,000 square foot
15 shortage of aggregate parcel size on the 8555
16 project. The project shows no compliance in
17 this...the project now shows compliance in this
18 regard. The eastside therefore hopes and expects
19 consistency in any rulings on concessions to zoning
20 code eligibility criteria for a parcel too small.
21 The crux of any opposition to the Bond Hotel
22 Residence Project, it is that it is dependent upon
23 an unprecedented concession to West Hollywood
24 zoning code eligibility requirements. It's 20,000

1 square foot short of the required aggregate parcel,
2 and lot spanning is not a right, but discretionary.
3 Regardless, the project will take for itself 58
4 percent increase in height and a 75 percent
5 increase in density. We liken this to dressing a
6 child in clothing and shoes that are too small.
7 The result is problems now and more problems later.
8 Additionally, mixed-use incentives for projects
9 spanning commercial and residential zones are only
10 available for a 60,000 square foot site, so there
11 is no requisite justification for any waiver for
12 density for height...for density or height bonuses
13 sought. And there has been a failure to disclose
14 this. We need to look further at the impact of
15 height and larger buildings to the smaller adjacent
16 (INAUDIBLE). During construction, there was a huge
17 impact on all adjacent properties, and study needs
18 to involve mitigation measures to address this as
19 well. The height of the proposed structure also
20 dwarfs the neighboring and adjacent structures with
21 total disregard for the environment and human scale
22 because the Bond Hotel Project requires so much
23 maneuvering of the zoning code and encroachment on
24 our neighborhood to achieve its Machiavellian ends,

1 it is not deserving of our approval or that of the
2 planning commission. No concessions should be
3 granted for 1936.170a, 60,000 square feet minimum
4 parcel. This project is not worthy.

5 Bass: Thank you. Steve Weinstein to be followed by
6 Cheryl Dent.

7 Weinstein: Hi, good evening. My name is Steve Weinstein. I
8 live right across the street from this project on
9 Ogden at 1134 North Ogden. We have a nice three-
10 story, six-unit building built in 1927. Most of
11 the neighborhood, there are some newer building
12 from the '60s and '70s, but they're all residential
13 buildings. As Commissioner...I'm sorry; I've never
14 pronounced your name before...Hoopingartner said
15 before there is no right to span a commercial lot
16 onto a residential lot especially in the middle of
17 a block. This is not at the end of a block where
18 you can say, oh, maybe, that could work. This is
19 in the middle of the block with residential on one
20 side, residential on the other side. The driveway
21 going into Ogden, the gentleman here said it would
22 only serve that lot. But I don't understand why
23 this project needs to have commercial attached to
24 residential if they don't need that driveway for

1 the commercial. This driveway, as I understand it,
2 will be twice as big as any other driveway on the
3 street. Every other building has a one-way
4 driveway, 9, 8, 10 feet...I'm not exactly sure.
5 This one is double for both directions. And as I
6 understand it, it will serve the 70-unit
7 residential building on Orange Grove. All that
8 traffic will flood onto Ogden. There are many
9 pedestrians. There are many children. There are
10 many pets that walk up and down the street all day
11 long. With that many cars, even if there are no
12 commercial trucks serving the hotel or serving any
13 other buildings, it will be very dangerous for
14 people walking on that sidewalk. I don't
15 understand why this residential plot is attached to
16 a commercial plot. I believe they only bought it
17 because the first project, which did not include
18 this, was suspect and/or about to be rejected. So
19 they paid a lot of money, millions of dollars for
20 this one building on our street so that they can
21 get more square footage and therefore ask for more
22 concessions to the height and everything that Mike
23 just talked about. So I think the impact of the
24 traffic coming onto our residential street through

1 this driveway that will be attached to the
2 commercial unit on the other street needs to be
3 studied much further. It's a menace to public
4 safety, and it's going to ruin the traffic on our
5 street which is already pretty bad. We had to have
6 speed bumps put on our street because cars coming
7 down from Fountain cutting through when Fountain
8 blocked up, came streaming down our street before
9 the speed bumps were put in and hit some animals.
10 And I think this needs to be studied, the impact of
11 the traffic on a residential street from a
12 commercial property much more. Thank you.

13 Bass: Thank you. Cheryl Dent to be followed by David
14 Logan.

15 Dent: Thank you so much for allowing the public comment.
16 Cheryl Dent, West Hollywood resident. I'm also
17 going to piggyback a little bit about what Steve
18 Weinstein said about traffic. Last Saturday at
19 11:50, firefighters could not get through Santa
20 Monica Boulevard. It was at an impasse. They
21 could not get through. They had to honk. The
22 hooking ladders could not get through. This
23 project is going to make first responders unable to
24 do their job. I don't think people are really

1 taking into consideration what a hotel involves,
2 the workers, the deliveries, the guests, 145
3 parking units, are you kidding me? Just to staff a
4 hotel, you're going to need dozens, dozens, dozens
5 more parking spots. Where are they going to park?
6 They're going to take Uber, and they're going to
7 take Lyft. Uber and Lyft are going to circle and
8 park and circle and park. And it's going to make
9 the first responders unable, the sheriff, the
10 police, emergency vehicles impossible to get
11 through. It is right now...Santa Monica Boulevard,
12 it is critical that first responders can get to
13 their jobs. And this is not addressed in the
14 safety and transportation in the DEIR. I saw
15 nothing of it. They said that it...it's just fine.
16 The Bond Project will obliterate any hopes for
17 residential parking. It's going to create
18 excessive and toxic noise pollution emanating from
19 the hotel, its bars, rooftop parties. It's going
20 to create dangerous and deadly traffic impediments
21 making traffic flow on Santa Monica Boulevard.
22 It's going to be nearly impossible. The Fire
23 Department has said they have a very difficult time
24 right now in Santa Monica Boulevard. I really urge

1 you to look at this and think about traffic and
2 think about safety because this driveway on Ogden
3 is going to be impossible to have a safe living
4 situation. There's children. We have that
5 wonderful daycare. And where are these cars going
6 to go? There's not going to be enough parking.
7 And it's going to be very, very dangerous. So this
8 needs to be addressed in the DEIR. I have not seen
9 much of that. And I also want to talk just quickly
10 that this idea, the net zero with the shade and
11 shadow, we are not going to achieve net zero with
12 that...with this project. The impact, we need to
13 further study, and treatment for the mitigation in
14 any DEIR on this project. Thank you.

15 Bass: Thank you. Next, I have Gary, and I don't have
16 your last name, Gary Tr... followed by Cynthia
17 Blatt.

18 Truano: My name is Gary Truano (phonetic). I live at 1120
19 North Ogden. I've been there 33 years. I want to
20 talk more about the DEIR in terms of ground zero.
21 The property will be surrounded on three sides by
22 demolition, and noise, and driveways, and traffic,
23 and fumes, and suffocated and darkened by the
24 project. Let's talk more about how ground-borne

1 vibrations will affect the structures on this
2 property and if that can be mitigated. These
3 structures don't have properly sealed windows or
4 central air or heating. They rely on keeping their
5 windows open. Let's talk more about that in the
6 DEIR because the residents on this property are
7 supposed to endure many hours of demolition and
8 constraint...construction and then a lifetime
9 living next to a hotel full of transients.
10 Residents around this project are elderly and home
11 most of the day. And we're talking about here
12 tonight will be going on three sides of them. And
13 my neighbors will be getting all of that as well as
14 myself. These buildings were...my building was
15 constructed in 1953, same year I was born. And
16 where does the DEIR talk about aging in place for
17 my neighbors and myself that live at 1120? Why are
18 they not in any shape...and most of us are not in
19 any shape to withstand the rigors of this
20 construction. Where's that in the DEIR? Thank
21 you.

22 Bass: Thank you. Cynthia Blatt followed by Polly...and
23 is it Bunsinger?

24 Bass: Businger.

1 Blatt: Hi. Cynthia Blatt, West Hollywood. There are
2 quite a few problems with this TER/DIER and I've
3 chose to speak about two of them. My first point
4 is Section 13.36.170(a)(1), minimum site area. The
5 project size must be at least 60,000 square feet.
6 This project is 20,000 square feet short of the
7 requirement and the...and thus does not meet the
8 standard required by the zoning code and is not
9 eligible for the entitlement or the bonuses as a
10 result. Because requirement is an entitlement in
11 this project plain and simple, does not meet the
12 requirement. And because of that as a result the
13 code, it can't...the code can't be waived. So the
14 eligibility is...they're not eligible. So, since the
15 project does not meet the non-waivable standard.
16 However, since it is before this body, go figure,
17 must be noted that the DEIR has no land use in
18 planning section. The reason it has no land use in
19 planning section is because the developer states
20 that it's not needed because the initial study...I
21 guess I'm not the only one who read it, said it
22 wasn't needed because the proposal was to cite the
23 project in the CCT zone, but opps, that's not okay.
24 And it is needed because the initial study failed

1 to take into account that the project in fact spans
2 two zones. And the second zone, the R3B zone was
3 not included. The aergo, the initial study on
4 which is this DIER is based is wrong and should...and
5 this whole thing should be thrown out. My second
6 point is the traffic study such as it was, was
7 based on specious assumptions, false and meant to
8 be false. The so-called study assumed that the
9 mitigations they stated they were going to impose
10 were already in place and that those mitigations
11 consisting of signs saying no turns would be
12 effective. Oh, please. If you believe that signs
13 saying no turns are an effective method of traffic
14 control, I have a bridge to sell you. And finally,
15 in October 2009 the City Council adopted the city's
16 traffic study threshold's memo which stated that
17 statistical analysis of traffic impacts would
18 suffice for traffic studies as long as they
19 'captured the change in travel patterns and land
20 use interaction when multiple developments take
21 place and provide consistency between studies, how
22 future projects will interact with each other, and
23 the cumulative effect of traffic not only on the
24 project itself, but from all surrounding and

1 existing in the...in the progress developments. The
2 city immediately started ignoring these
3 requirements and began assessing traffic impacts in
4 isolation. In this case, the violations is
5 particularly egregious as the developer didn't even
6 bother with the study because he stated that the
7 signs that were not in place were actually in
8 place. And based on his failure to actually
9 conduct a traffic study was because therefore it
10 wasn't needed. This is weird. All right.

11 Bass: Thank you.

12 Blatt: Other people have discussed the actual impacts
13 which are in fact egregious. So, thank you and
14 this whole thing should go. Thank you.

15 Bass: Thank you. Polly Businger to be followed by
16 Stephanie Harker.

17 Businger: Hi. Polly Businger, West Hollywood. I'm reading
18 this letter on behalf of someone who couldn't be
19 here. His name is Lucas Latore. He lives on
20 Ogden. He says 'I am one of the residents who will
21 be directly impacted by this project. My house is
22 located at 1119 ¼ North Ogden, immediately adjacent
23 to the proposed development. Additionally, I'm a
24 member of the Brick Gym which will be leveled to

1 make this project happen. I'm deeply concerned by
2 the way in which this project violates rules that
3 are in place to limit the impact of development on
4 residents and communities. The lot is too small.
5 The building is too tall.' I feel like I'm reading
6 a fairy tale. 'The noise will pose an extreme
7 nuisance for the'...I should have read this ahead of
8 time. 'The noise will pose an extreme nuisance for
9 me because I work in studio production. And part
10 of the reason I moved here is that my home is a
11 nice, quiet lot. I don't want this building to be
12 that close to my house. I'm also a member of the
13 gym, Brick Gym, which will be destroyed as part of
14 the project. It's hard to imagine it not being
15 there. The gym is an essential part of our
16 community. They do monthly community programming,
17 wellness activities. Leaders who work at the gym
18 make sure everyone feels like they're part of a
19 family. Disruption of the health and wellness
20 community will hurt the surrounding area.
21 Honestly, when the members of this gym find out
22 that it's going to be destroyed, they'll be
23 heartbroken. They go there religiously; many of
24 them are model members of our community. Why

1 disrupt that when the project is not even doing its
2 best to meet the codes as required? Don't let this
3 project harm our neighborhood. Before you consider
4 the development moving forward, ask yourself if
5 this was next to your home would you have
6 legitimate cause for objection. I'm not asking for
7 more than following the development rules put in
8 place to respect our neighborhoods and preserve
9 their purposes. Our communities matter. I trust
10 that the Planning Commission will do its due
11 diligence and find that this project does not meet
12 the standards set forth. I'd be there in person to
13 object to this, but my father is dying. Please do
14 not take my absence as a sign that I do not care.
15 Best regards, Lucas.'

16 Bass: Thank you. Stephanie Harker to be followed by
17 Cathy Blaiivas.

18 Harker: Good evening, Commissioners. I had a whole thing
19 prepared here about land use, but since we were
20 sort of instructed that that's not the topic
21 tonight and the fact that the land use chapter is
22 missing from the draft DIER makes it, I think it's
23 been covered by previous speakers. But I do have a
24 comment on the traffic study. And that is I

1 attended the Transportation Commission's meeting on
2 this very DEIR, which as you know was the first
3 time that the city has presented it to the Traffic
4 Commission first, and I think it's an excellent
5 idea. But one of the Commissioners noticed that
6 the traffic study was done before, prior to this
7 new configuration where they have blocked off...they
8 put a larger island in the middle of the Santa
9 Monica Boulevard as the street dead ends into it.
10 You used to be able to sneak through there when
11 there was no traffic and turn left. Now that's
12 blocked off. You can only turn right. And there's
13 just to the east of that there is a new crosswalk
14 with a signal at it. This traffic study was done
15 before that was done and they haven't reconsidered
16 it. So I believe that an entirely new traffic
17 study needs to be written up. And I...I also recall
18 at that meeting there was a comment that there's no
19 significant impact. Well, that's because, and I
20 learned that from Mayor John D'Amico on another
21 project, if the traffic is...and we discussed it at
22 the Traffic Commission, that Transportation
23 Commission that night. If the traffic is already
24 an F, it can't get any worse; therefore it's not

1 impacting it. There's no G, H, or I. So, this
2 really will be a disaster in terms of traffic. And
3 even if it goes ahead, I think they should be
4 required to come back with a new traffic study with
5 a configuration. They studied old plans or old map
6 of the city somehow. And obviously it had
7 different names then too. I just feel that if this
8 is missing things, if there's inaccurate traffic
9 study, do we get to see the next draft or does this
10 just get pushed through into the final EIR and
11 we're all left out here hanging? I feel that the
12 hazardous waste stuff has not been considered on a
13 serious basis. The domain on the east side of town
14 had faith plating on it and it took them an extra
15 two years, I believe, to clean up the toxic waste
16 that had dripped in it for 70 years. And I see
17 that happening here with the school close by, not a
18 good thing. The hazardous materials can drift a
19 radius of four miles an hour...to a four-mile radius
20 around and I don't think that that's a good thing.
21 So, I hope we get to see a new draft, round two,
22 before it goes to the final EIR. Thank you.

23 Bass: Thank you. Cathy Blaivas followed by David Logan.

24 Blaivas: Good evening. Cathy Blaivas, City of West

1 Hollywood. Everything this evening that was stated
2 about the DEIR, what's missing, what should be
3 included, I agree with. I'm not going to rehash
4 any of that. I'm also very concerned about the
5 hazardous waste. I'm also very concerned about
6 traffic. And the person who mentioned traffic
7 signs as being in mitigation. Every day I come
8 home from work, I take El Lavato. From the west I
9 come east. At El Lavato and Doheny, are large
10 signs. At least three of them that say no left
11 turn. It's difficult to get to Doheny because of
12 the all the traffic turning left. I've even called
13 on several occasions. I've called the Beverly
14 Hills Sheriff's Department. I said station
15 somebody there. You're going to make tons of
16 money. So that's not...the point being that's not
17 mitigation. I'm...I've been concerned about this
18 project from day one. I know this evening we're
19 here only to address the DEIR. But I just want to
20 mention something that I've said before to any
21 number of developers. Just because you can, do you
22 have to? This project is just too big for the...for
23 the area. It's just asking too much. Again,
24 progress is what's happening all over this city.

1 But I think people need to take a step back and
2 really consider and maybe should be a part of the
3 DEIR. Whether or not all the housing, especially
4 on the east side that's been built in the last five
5 years, is at 100 percent vacancy. Is it 100
6 percent vacancy residents or is it Air B&B or what
7 exactly are we building more residential properties
8 for? We really don't need any more luxury
9 apartments. Yes, we do need affordable housing.
10 But I think this is 150 pounds of sugar in a five-
11 pound sack. Thank you very much.

12 Bass: Thank you. David Logan who will be our last
13 speaker. David? Did...I'm sorry. Did I see
14 somebody said...if you filled out a card, come on up
15 and we can...you can come now because I'm not seeing
16 David. And just when you're done, could you
17 coordinate with David so we can make sure we get
18 your name and information correctly?

19 Lynn: Of course. Thank you.

20 Bass: Thank you.

21 Lynn: Good evening and thank you very much. And it's my
22 first time too.

23 Bass: Just your name and city of residence and...

24 Lynn: Okay. D. Lynn, West Hollywood resident.

1 Transportation, everything. Oh, my gosh. Okay.
2 So, the eastbound left hand turns into the Santa
3 Monica Boulevard entrance. That would cause major
4 traffic backup to the other side of Fairfax.
5 Simultaneously right and left hand turns into the
6 hotel entrance will back up traffic on Santa Monica
7 Boulevard, likely affecting north, south traffic on
8 Fairfax as well. Concern for traffic delays and
9 traffic flows at Santa Monica Boulevard and Fairfax
10 and nearby intersections. The entrance on Santa
11 Monica Boulevard is a single lane. There is little
12 promise for a new left-hand turn lane into the
13 Santa Monica Boulevard entrance. The proposed
14 signs and curved driveways will not be effective in
15 preventing traffic from heading north on the two
16 side streets, Ogden and Orange Grove, where all
17 traffic will exit. The burden of all exiting
18 vehicles is placed on the two residential side
19 streets, neither of which have traffic lights and
20 we don't want them. The three driveways
21 surrounding The Bond Project active 24/7 will not
22 provide for a safe and walkable pedestrian
23 experience. Concern that the DEIR does not include
24 studies of how Lyft, Uber will congest the...will

1 further congest the area since the transportation
2 study was done in 2016. Where is the parking for
3 employees of the restaurant, hotel, and art
4 gallery, and resident's guests? Because of a lack
5 of adequate parking at this project, will these
6 people all be forced to poach our street parking?
7 We don't have parking as it is, oh my gosh. I
8 notice there is one parking space allotted for the
9 art gallery. That won't bring in business. And
10 what about parking for gallery showings? This
11 needs further study. I go with alternative one.
12 This project does not merit the concessions to
13 eligibility criteria in the zoning code. And yeah,
14 thank you. I really hope you reconsider this. And
15 the 24-hour party pool sounds so cool and fun but
16 let me introduce you or suggest Sunset. I think I
17 would be happy to promote sending my guests there
18 and having parties there. Please reconsider this
19 is not the area to have a structure of this
20 greatness. It's too big for a small little area.
21 And nobody has mentioned the senior people. I mean
22 it'll be...it's already mayhem with whatever that App
23 is, Waze. We have traffic from Santa Monica
24 Boulevard to Fountain. It's like sometimes it

1 doesn't move. Please try to find another area for
2 this project. Thank you so much.

3 Bass: Thank you. And if you could just go speak to
4 David. Thank you. That was...those were all our
5 public speakers and so now we will open it up for
6 comments from the Planning Commission. Who would
7 like to go first? Commissioner Hoopingarner.

8 Hoopingarner: I'm going to do these in no particular order. The
9 renderings, the photo montages that are included in
10 Figures 3.15, etcetera, I think they are not
11 accurately representing to the public what this is
12 going to look like. If you compare them to the
13 existing one-story buildings, these are at most
14 five story buildings and this is a six-story
15 project. You can just count windows if nothing
16 else. And I think that in terms of communicating
17 with the public, that is not very representative.
18 The alternatives. This is again a question for
19 staff that it's my understanding that the
20 alternatives should be of an equal or lesser size
21 and impact. When one is looking at a...the potential
22 impact of the proposed plan, the alternatives
23 should propose something that would be less
24 impactful. And I am...did a little spreadsheet,

1 that's me, comparing the sizes of the...of the
2 alternative projects. This project is 214,000
3 square feet with a FAR of 3.47. The plan...the EIR
4 represents that Alternative 3 is the less impactful
5 alternative. Alternative 3 is 33,000 plus square
6 feet bigger than this project. In addition, the
7 EIR states that that FAR is 3.38. So, more square
8 footage and the FAR is smaller. How is that
9 mathematically possible? It just isn't, which
10 calls into question just about every one of the
11 underlying assumptions in the traffic studies,
12 etcetera. So, I could go on and on about that and
13 all the elements of it, but I seriously think that
14 needs to be revisited and make sure that it's
15 accurate. When looking at those component parts of
16 all of the various square footages, and I added
17 them all up, none of them adds up to the square
18 footage of either the project or the various
19 alternates. They vary anywhere from 3,000 to 9,000
20 square feet in terms of how many square feet of
21 housing and parking and all that adding up, it does
22 not in any way, in any circumstance, add up to the
23 stated square footage of the project or the
24 alternatives. Setbacks. The setbacks that are

1 required, we...many people have spoken about this
2 depending on what type of project it is, but what
3 isn't stated is the setbacks assumed in the shade
4 and shadows studies. That matters. How much of a
5 setback is...is the assumption determines then what
6 the resulting shade and shadow is. I think that
7 should be disclosed and it should be disclosed in
8 context of the land use study...and we have no floor
9 plans, we have no plans so we don't know the exact
10 layout proposed and what's being used as the...as the
11 shade and shadow study. I've already brought up
12 the solar impacts. Traffic study. It's been
13 brought up, but I cannot emphasize enough the fact
14 that a sign on an entrance at Ogden saying don't
15 turn left is going to mitigate the traffic when
16 anybody who lives there, it will take them about 24
17 hours to figure out that if you're going to go
18 eastbound, you are going to go north and you're
19 going to go on Fountain Boulevard to go east. You
20 are not going to go south and try to take a left
21 turn into nightmare traffic on Santa Monica. So
22 the fact that this study proports that a no turn
23 sign is going to mitigate the traffic. To one of
24 our speakers comment about Elevado, those who have

1 ever been to the Tender Greens, wherever there are
2 those signs, they are categorically ignored. So to
3 think that this traffic impact, which wasn't even
4 studied because the signs were included in the
5 mitigation...in the study before the study was done,
6 I think is a gross misservice to this community.
7 There's no discussion of the delivery trucks. And
8 I'm not sure where this would fit into CEQA. Let's
9 talk about airflow. You're building a 71-story...71-
10 foot building completely blocking the airflow for
11 the neighboring residences. There's no open...I mean
12 you're literally building a wall around those
13 buildings at 1123 or whatever. You're building an
14 entire wall around those bungalows. There will be
15 no airflow. And this is a community that lives and
16 thrives on our wonderful east west or west east air
17 flow through our homes. And you want to talk about
18 green impacts of that. Rideshare. Rideshare was
19 not addressed. It is not discussed whether the
20 City continues to plan to keep the entire Santa
21 Monica Boulevard portion of this project as a red
22 zone. It's a red zone from Ogden to Orange Grove.
23 And as a red zone, there is supposed to be no drop
24 offs, no stopping, no delivery trucks, no Amazon

1 running in to give you...bring you your toilet paper.
2 That is not going to be the truth. Rideshares are
3 going to be stopping on Santa Monica because that's
4 the building address. And what is that going to do
5 to the traffic? That was not incorporated. At
6 least I didn't see it anywhere in the study. And I
7 think with that, those are the major areas that I
8 saw that some of which have not been addressed to
9 date. Thank you.

10 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Buckner?

11 Buckner: Well, I wanted to thank the public for all their
12 comments. I think it was very helpful. Loud and
13 clear I've been hearing that there's a lot of
14 issues with traffic and I think that probably it
15 would be a good idea to do a more updated traffic
16 study before the EIR comes for final review. I
17 think it would serve both the community and the
18 developers so that we know what we're really
19 dealing with. I think also the size of the
20 building. A lot of comments about it being much
21 too large for that space and overwhelming there.
22 The land use study probably should be included in
23 the next addition of this EIR. Our job here
24 tonight is not necessarily commenting on specific

1 details, but I think that there's a lot of
2 information for both the developer and the people
3 who provided this study to take another look and do
4 a little bit more homework before they bring it
5 back in its final form. So that's my view.

6 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Altschul.

7 Altschul: Yeah. I agree with what Lynn said and what Sue
8 said. The only thing...the only...the disagreement or
9 difference I have in what Lynn said is you can get
10 a different...you can get a different set of figures
11 on the...on the FAR all you have to do is get bigger
12 plot of land. This EIR...and that ain't so cheap.
13 This EIR has a lot of deficiencies and omissions
14 that have already been pointed out. We went
15 through a long period of time for several years
16 without having these comment periods on the draft
17 EIRs and I think this shows how important it is.
18 So I hope that the City keeps these things in place
19 and that the draft EIRs get the attention that we
20 can see tonight that they've gotten. And they get
21 the community out. They get the community
22 invested. And they get the community to tell us
23 what the problems are. Again I think you have a
24 lot of comments that show how inefficient and

1 insufficient this EIR is. Let's get it right.

2 Jones: Thank you. And again, I just want to thank
3 everybody from the public who came out tonight.
4 Your input is really important to us. And we
5 don't...when did we start doing these hearings? Like
6 a year ago? Just very recently. So we haven't had
7 very many of these. So your participation is very
8 critical to our decision-making process and just to
9 the process in general. So thank you. I don't
10 want to take up a lot of time. I'm kind of echoing
11 what my fellow Commissioners and members of the
12 public have said. I am still a little jet lagged
13 from an international vacation. I think it's, I
14 don't know, like 2 p.m. in Tokyo right now
15 tomorrow, so but I do want...I don't think I got this
16 earlier. Why...why was the land use...the land use
17 chapter omitted from the draft EIR? Like why was
18 it not included in what we received or what is
19 available to the public?

20 Alkire: So when a project is consistent with the applicable
21 zoning and state law regulations, then it is
22 considered not to have a significant impact or have
23 a less significant impact on land use and planning
24 goals. And so it remains consistent with local and

1 state laws and so it remains scoped out.

2 Jones: So does that mean we won't see that chapter in the...

3 Alkire: Okay. So I'm giving you that answer, but any
4 further detailed answers we will address in the
5 final EIR so that we can coordinate all of the
6 responses to all of the comments. I don't know the
7 answer to that question...to your last question at
8 this point in time. We have to go back and look...

9 Jones: Okay.

10 Alkire: ...at...look through what happened.

11 Jones: I just want to make sure we're seeing the full set
12 of information and because I'm not well versed in
13 doing this, I think we've had one other draft EIR
14 hearing since I've been on commission and I just
15 want to make sure I understand. So, okay. It's
16 not just my jet-lagged brain. Yeah. I was going
17 to say my only additional comment. One of the
18 things I really perked up about was the traffic
19 study. The physical environment in that area has
20 changed. I live nearby. I drove by the site
21 today. And rideshares has surged. I mean I live
22 at Laurel and Sunset and let me just tell you
23 people stop at the fucking red curb all the time.
24 And it's a problem. So we also have one of the

1 don't turn right arrows and it is largely ignored
2 from Crescent Plaza. So, I do think that the
3 traffic study is something that needs to be
4 addressed to address the current condition, not the
5 condition as it was when this was submitted. And
6 those are really all my comments. Again, I just
7 want to thank everyone for their participation in
8 this process. And for people for reaching out to
9 us in advance of the meeting tonight.

10 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Erickson.

11 Erickson: Thank you. I will try to keep my remarks short.
12 I've had dental issues so it actually hurts to
13 talk, so you're welcome. But I'll power through
14 just for you. I had a question for staff regarding
15 the mixed messages I feel like I'm getting
16 regarding the tribal issues. There was a letter
17 that regarded the state law for the state's Tribal
18 Commission, but then there was I feel like another
19 conflicting letter that said no, we have authority
20 over this land. It was the Tongva Nation because
21 we do have to acknowledge we are on stolen land.
22 This is not our land, right? So if you...could you
23 clarify if you will address this in the final EIR.
24 Great. Thank you. So that is something I think

1 lacks clarity. And it is a culturally significant
2 part, I think of the EIR that lacked the detail
3 that it deserved. I do too wonder about the land
4 use issues. The traffic study is malfeasant. It
5 is bad. So in regards to I understand the traffic
6 studies. We see traffic studies all the time. And
7 it's, you know, you put your effort into it. But
8 anyone that drives on Santa Monica Boulevard in
9 that area, especially with that median curb. I
10 think that was Stephanie who pointed that out, is
11 gone now...it's there, right. People still walk
12 through that middle road, which is just dangerous
13 regardless, right? That's happening and then the
14 pedestrian safety walks. So I think understanding
15 and getting a better picture of the traffic impacts
16 is quite significant. Because I think that is
17 missing just little pieces here. Especially for
18 the sake of the public because that's the main
19 thing with parking and traffic that we're hearing.
20 And then additionally, and can in the traffic
21 study, you study the Lyft and Uber impacts? Would
22 that be included in a traditional traffic study
23 here based on what the City has done? You will...you
24 can suggest it and we'll answer it in the final

1 EIR. Wonderful. I'm just saying that I don't know
2 how those...if those are two separate reports now
3 because Lyft and Uber and Waves are such problems
4 and a lot of these things that need to be studied
5 separately. I, too, did point out the shade and
6 shadow issues that I know my fellow Commissioner
7 talked about. So I do think that might need more
8 attention. And additionally...I thought I wasn't
9 going to talk and here I'm fucking talking. I do
10 want to implore or and also thank you to all the
11 members of the community who have been very active
12 on this issue since 2016 and beyond and who have
13 taken their time out of their days, night to come
14 here and talk to us. I do hope that staff, the
15 developers, and the community can...we'll lock you in
16 a room or figure out something. But I do think
17 there's a lot of disconnect with communication
18 going on. And I don't know if it's misinformation
19 or if it's just...I'm grasping at my right side
20 because it's...my...that side of my mouth. So I'm not
21 doing this out of pure joy. But I would love to
22 see more of a community impact. There needs to be
23 some...there needs to be some extra step done in
24 here. I just don't know. There's something

1 cultural about this community that isn't addressed
2 in here that really addresses the ways in which
3 West Hollywood...who West Hollywood is in a cultural
4 impactful way, probably not applicable in a draft
5 EIR. And you're shaking your head no which is
6 totally fine. But I don't know, I'm just hearing a
7 lot of cross talk and it bothers me. And I don't
8 want to come to a final EIR hearing and have to
9 relitigate those conversations in a way that could
10 have been addressed in some way that maybe we can
11 find an end road. That's just a general comment.
12 And then I think...I think that is all. So, thank
13 you.

14 Bass: Yes, Commissioner.

15 Hoopingarner: I had a question for legal. Ms. Harker brought up
16 a very good point. We are potentially looking at
17 some rather substantial changes in this EIR if a
18 land use section is added, if the traffic study is
19 substantially revisited. What is the process? I
20 know we had our little...lovely little chart here
21 and, you know, step one, step two, step three. And
22 theoretically the next step is FEIR. But given a
23 potentially dramatically different, is there A, a
24 threshold of, you know, if X amount changes then it

1 has to go back through another public comment
2 period?

3 Langer: Yes. The typical process as the city will respond
4 to comment and the next thing you will see is the
5 final EIR. There is guidance and sequel for when a
6 draft EIR would be recirculated because of
7 something that come up during the comment period or
8 there's some deficiency in the document that it
9 trigger stat recirculation statute. I don't have
10 the language in front of me but it typically has to
11 do with if it's a new impact identified or
12 significant increase in an already identified
13 impact. That's the language that CEQA uses and
14 we'll obviously be looking at that as we work
15 through all these questions and all these issues
16 that have come up tonight.

17 Hoopingarner: Because I think given the public's comments
18 etcetera, etcetera, I think that it sounds like
19 that threshold should be addressed and not just go
20 straight to final.

21 Langer: We won't know until we've...I mean we dig down
22 through all these questions and all of the
23 documentation to provide thorough written responses
24 and it's not until we have all that work down that

1 that assessment can be made.

2 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Erickson.

3 Erickson: So sorry. Lauren, for the sake of public...the
4 public understanding because we talked about...John
5 talked about that could be...that is on the agenda
6 for council on Monday regarding lot spanning that
7 was tabled. Just for the sake of the public, could
8 you talk about how this application applied on
9 Tuesday and so it is adhered to those standards
10 versus like if the Council changed the rules two
11 weeks after that, it is still held the same
12 standards. Just so the public understands.

13 Because that's a potentially significant thing that
14 could occur and I don't want there to be confusion.

15 Langer: It's a very similar topic and that question
16 actually came up at the City Council meeting.
17 There's a provision in the zoning code that says a
18 project is processed in accordance with the
19 standards that are in affect at the date the
20 application is deemed complete. So we're not
21 changing the rules as the process is moving
22 through. So if there is a change in the standards,
23 we'll be looking forward at projects coming in the
24 future. It wouldn't apply to this project.

1 Bass: Thank you. One of the advantages to going last
2 here is that you've all pretty much said what I
3 wanted to say. But I'm going to reiterate some of
4 it anyway. So, forgive me. First of all, thank
5 you for everyone who came. This is fantastic and I
6 think I would like to echo what Commissioner Jones
7 said that I...that I believe that it makes the
8 process better. Commissioner Altschul also said
9 that as well. I, you know, I come at this from
10 quite a novice perspective as a resident. And so
11 these sorts of comments inform my study process so
12 that I can ask the right questions when the project
13 actually comes before us. I live...this is my
14 neighborhood. I'm outside the 500 feet that would
15 disqualify me from participating in this
16 conversation. But I live at Ogden and Romaine so
17 this is...this is my neighborhood. And so I'm
18 familiar with quite a few of the things people said
19 and echo a lot of what the public had to say with
20 traffic and those sorts of impacts. I also just on
21 the offset I made a note to myself here. A lot of
22 the letters we received were directed to us
23 personally. My email has my middle initial in it.
24 Adamgbass@yahoo.com. So if I didn't respond to

1 anybody, please know you can reach out to me at any
2 time. I'm happy to meet with you, but my email
3 address was wrong on most of those that got bounced
4 back. It's a house cleaning issue. As we look at
5 these things, somebody mentioned the emergency
6 personnel. Is it a question? Do the emergency
7 services, do they comment on these? Right. And
8 specifically around the fire department. Somebody
9 alluded to the idea that the fire department
10 expressed concerns, which I didn't see in the
11 letter. Is that something we would follow up on
12 based on comments tonight? Thank you. So on the
13 traffic study. You know, these signs for no left
14 turn, I'm going to...I'm going to give myself away
15 here, but there's one right behind this parking
16 structure here and I turn left every time I leave
17 this meeting. So, I won't...

18 Erickson: I never turn left.

19 Bass: I won't do it tonight. Yeah. In case the sheriff
20 is listening, I'm not going to do it tonight, but
21 they don't work.

22 Erickson: WEHO is here though.

23 Bass: They don't work. I'm a law-abiding citizen and I
24 break that rule every time. So I really think we

1 need to look at those mitigation efforts a little
2 bit better. She's surprised I admitted to breaking
3 the law, but anyway. There you go and it's on
4 tape, so whatever. I'll take the ticket, I guess.
5 But anyway, so I know that I've asked this question
6 on a previous...a previous project. But the traffic
7 study, you know, we can't constantly be changing
8 when we study it based on changing conditions and
9 we have to find a snapshot in time. But I believe
10 that the City instituted parking or planting strips
11 and crosswalk and getting rid of two crosswalks and
12 all of this process so drastically changed the
13 configuration of that intersection, that we really
14 need to take a consideration of a different
15 snapshot in time. I just don't believe it's the
16 same street. And so that needs to be reconsidered.
17 And...and on the land use residential portion. You
18 know, again, alluding to another project here.
19 This commission tied three to three on a lot tie
20 issue on another project and since Commissioner
21 Hoopingartner was recused from that project but is
22 the one who raised this particular issue, I think
23 this commission feels pretty strongly about the...the
24 lot ties and concerns around bringing that

1 residential piece in. That's getting into the heart
2 of the actual project and I know that's not what
3 we're discussing tonight, but I believe because
4 we're looking at this draft EIR based on not
5 including the residential piece, but now we are
6 including the residential piece, I'm having a real
7 hang up around that. And I see you're itching to
8 respond to my comments, so please.

9 Alkire: I'm breaking my own rule here and we're just going
10 to jump in really fast, super high level. We will
11 explain all this in a lot of detail when it comes
12 forward. I think Tony's staff report will explain
13 all of how they reached each of these points. But
14 quickly, it's a different instrument. It's a
15 concession versus a waiver that makes it different
16 from the project that we had before. So that's all
17 I'm going to say but just because you guys keep
18 asking, I will bring that up.

19 Bass: And I appreciate that, but I just...

20 Alkire: And we will make sure we address it clearly and
21 explain and give the options.

22 Bass: And that takes me really to the last point that I
23 have as far as my concerns go. And that is the
24 particular, the bungalows at the...that are

1 essentially going to be encircled here. And, you
2 know, normally when we see a project there's
3 setbacks and things like that that allow wind and
4 space and...and life to go between buildings. So
5 just because of the particular configuration of
6 this building, I'm concerned that it's going
7 to...that we really need to study the impacts of that
8 particular property even though it's not part of
9 the project because it will have such an
10 overwhelming impact on that property that it
11 wouldn't any other property in the neighborhood.
12 And, you know, I will tell you somebody read a
13 letter from Lucas this evening. Because he
14 mentioned that he was going to be out of town due
15 to his father dying, I went and knocked on his door
16 the other day so that I could actually have...and
17 have the opportunity to hear his concerns. And,
18 you know, so I stood on that property and I
19 actually kind of felt how massive it would be
20 around there. So it strikes me as something we
21 need to study. And the last thing I want to say is
22 that this is a...you know, this is an opportunity to
23 provide comment, but people will leave here if
24 you're anything like me, you'll leave here tonight

1 and wish you had said something additional or
2 something different. And the comment period is
3 open until when?

4 Altschul: Monday.

5 Castillo: Next Monday, October 7th at 5 p.m.

6 Bass: And where do they...where do they send the comments?

7 Castillo: The comments can be emailed to myself at
8 acastillo@weho.org. Mailed to the planning
9 division or brought in. Give me a call we could...in
10 any fashion.

11 Bass: I would encourage people not to mail it at this
12 late point, but...

13 Castillo: Postmark would be...

14 Bass: Okay.

15 Castillo: ...would be fine.

16 Bass: Well, regardless, I wanted to make the point that
17 anyone who leaves here tonight wishing that there
18 was more to be said will have that opportunity and
19 I would encourage you to do that. And I believe
20 that is the end of our comment period. And I
21 will...we will move on.

22 Altschul: Excuse me. The delivery address would be 8300
23 Santa Monica Boulevard.

24 Castillo: That is correct. City Hall. 8300. Attention to

1 Antonio Castillo or to the Planning Division. As
2 long as it gets to City Hall it will get to my
3 desk.

4 Bass: Is there any action we need to take at this point
5 in time with closing a public hearing or anything
6 like that? Okay. Thank you. Next is unfinished
7 business. We have none. Nothing on our excluded
8 content calendar. Do we have any items from staff
9 for our new no longer acting manager?

10 Alkikre: Thank you. I'll just hit a couple highlights on
11 the upcoming agendas. On October 17th, we're set
12 to have on consents, the resolution reflecting the
13 action from last meeting regarding the expansion of
14 the Equinox Gym as well as a nine-unit town home
15 subdivision development on Hilldale. It's 917 to
16 927 Hilldale. And we will be discussing a staff
17 update on the city-wide traffic mobility study.

18 Bass: Thank you.

19 Erickson: Is there any way...November 7th is like really full.
20 Is there any way you can reexamine that amount of
21 public hearings on that day? I just feel like
22 we're doing a disservice to the public by having
23 one very significant, obviously, public hearing. I
24 feel like the...I mean all public hearings are

1 significant. But I feel like the public might not
2 have the opportunity to fully weigh in on all of
3 them and I just feel like it's a pretty jam-packed
4 schedule.

5 Alkire: We always do our best to balance what needs to come
6 forward versus...with timelines per council
7 directives as well as date established timelines
8 for developments with respecting your time and the
9 public's time as well. So we'll do our best to
10 reevaluate and see what we can do.

11 Bass: Thank you. Public comment. This is an opportunity
12 for anybody who didn't get a chance to speak
13 earlier or who came up with an idea in the
14 meantime. Anyone?

15 Gillig: We have three public speakers. Our first one would
16 be Jenny Kriendler. Followed by Mike Carter.

17 Bass: This is on anything...anything related to the
18 Planning Commission other than what we've already
19 discussed tonight.

20 Kriendler: All right. I just want to speak in general about
21 what I value here in West Hollywood and what I hope
22 you, as Commissioners, keep in mind for us
23 residents as well. As far as seeking development
24 that is appropriate for its neighborhood location

1 and fits in with the existing neighborhood.
2 Includes at least a third parcel of greenspace.
3 Positively impacts neighborhood parking or doesn't
4 have much impact. Is pedestrian friendly and
5 positively impacts pedestrian safety. Positively
6 impacts traffic flow. Positively impacts the
7 ability of emergency vehicles to serve local
8 residents. And positively impacts the continued
9 enjoyment by surrounding neighbors of their
10 dwellings. And positively impacts the quality of
11 life of the surrounding residents. And positively
12 impacts the availability of low-income housing in
13 the City. And consists of small boutique stores of
14 no more than two stories with plenty of free
15 parking. Thank you.

16 Bass: Thank you. Mike Carter to be followed by Stephanie
17 Harker.

18 Carter: I'd like to introduce myself this time. It's Mike
19 Carter, Advanced Placement American History
20 Teacher. And something is afoot here in West
21 Hollywood and you know what it reminds me of. What
22 it reminds me of is how Great Britain treated the
23 colonies in the 17th and 18th centuries and why all
24 Great Britain did then was to suck out every dime

1 they could from the colonies looking out for only
2 their best interests. Then what happened? Well,
3 the spirit of 76 is what happened is this is the
4 revolution right here. Nor is it the middle ages.
5 Nor do we want to become a chiefdom. We're a
6 residential neighborhood for heaven's sake. And
7 meanwhile, Planning Department, Planning
8 Commission, and City Council go around and round
9 for two years over 1936170a, the root of The Bond
10 Project Plan and hopefully it's Achille's heel and
11 fateful flaw. Thank you, Commissioners.

12 Bass: And Stephanie Harker.

13 Harker: Stephanie Harker, City of West Hollywood. I got
14 away with not saying that last time.

15 Bass: Commissioner Altschul suggested I interrupt you,
16 but I knew you so I didn't earlier so thank you for
17 correcting that.

18 Harker: Oh, he knows who I am.

19 Erickson: It's going to be in the official minutes though,
20 right?

21 Harker: I'm another historic relic that resides on the east
22 side. I just wanted to talk a little bit about
23 Monday night's Council meeting and item 3B. I
24 believe someone mentioned it about the fact that

1 ya'll on this commission voted this down twice
2 spanning lot tying, whatever you want to call it.
3 Building buddies. I don't know. But to me the
4 project discussed tonight really is spanning,
5 starting. Its commercial entities creeping up into
6 the neighborhood and this one snakes around a
7 residential building. And you see it with the...I
8 had a project before you a couple weeks ago that,
9 you know, we're going to let the preschool come
10 down into the residential district then you get a
11 CUP for that. But I just feel that this commission
12 voted it down twice. The Council voted it down
13 once. And now it's reared its ugly head again. It
14 seems to me that this is like a politician asking
15 for a recount again and oh, it didn't turn out my
16 way, can we count them again. Lot tying of
17 commercial and residential is not wanted by the
18 public who have spoken. It's not wanted by the
19 Planning Commissioners. And at least one vote
20 against by the Council. And now it's up again.
21 Even if this new version has changed a bit, the
22 citizens, the Commissioners, and the majority of
23 the Council did not want it. The old saying is
24 true. You can put lipstick on a pig, but it's

1 still a pig. Thank you.

2 Bass: Thanks, Stephanie. Are there any items from
3 Commissioners? Commissioner Erickson.

4 Erickson: Because Stephanie Harker, City of West Hollywood,
5 came to our last commission meeting and talked to
6 us about the new voting system, I hope people got
7 out to go do that. Adam came right after me
8 to...it was on Saturday. But I hope more people
9 understand how easy it will be to vote. It was so
10 simplistic and wonderful. It was so nice to see
11 Plummer Park utilized in this way. It felt
12 really...they can fit a lot more machines than that
13 in the hall. I will say that much. But it was
14 really simplistic and I want to thank Yvonne and
15 Melissa for facilitating that. And for a good
16 number of people that came out. I believe there
17 was well over like 300 people both days in total,
18 but more people need to know because it's going to
19 be a big shock on March when you go in there any
20 you get a paper ballot and scan it and all this. I
21 mean it's a lot. So make sure you're registered to
22 vote because it was alarming the number of people
23 that weren't.

24 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Hoopingarner? Nothing.

1 Commissioner Buckner. Yes, Commission Altschul.
2 Altschul: During the public comment, Mr. Raykos who runs a
3 school talked about a state law saying that when
4 you sign...when you come to a preschool with a
5 toddler under five you have to sign in and out. We
6 didn't hear that on the Sandy Preschool that I
7 recall. So I had heard that that item might have
8 been appealed or might be going to be appealed. If
9 that is the case, I would recommend that the staff
10 make sure that that item is investigated and
11 included in the staff report if in fact correct
12 because she had it in there nanoseconds for
13 dropping off the children. And he allows...he allows
14 15 minutes when they have to be signed in and out.
15 Bass: Thank you. Commissioner Jones?
16 Jones: Nothing.
17 Bass: With that, we will adjourn our meeting to our next
18 meeting on...
19 Hoopingarner: Excuse me.
20 Bass: I'm sorry.
21 Hoopingarner: You have your subcommittee management.
22 Bass: Subcommittee management, yeah. It's right there in
23 black and white. Do we have any comments on
24 subcommittees?

1 Jones: Can we get a date for the next long-range planning
2 committee or do we have one at this time? It is
3 the 17th? Okay. I don't have...

4 Bass: Are we having one? Okay.

5 Jones: I don't have a conflict. I will be there. If I'm
6 still on long range. I'm on long range, right?

7 Bass: You are a chair.

8 Jones: I was on at the last meeting.

9 Bass: You are our chair.

10 Jones: Oh, great. Thank you very much. Thank you very
11 much.

12 Erickson: I will be there. I am in Sacramento that day
13 barring...I'm coming in early but barring a flight
14 problem I will be there.

15 Gillig: Noted.

16 Hoopingarner: David, at design review you mentioned that 8555 is
17 coming up I believe on November 15th?

18 Gillig: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

19 Hoopingarner: Okay. I will have to recuse myself from that
20 design review. I...you said there was another
21 project.

22 Gillig: We do have two items at this time for that date.

23 Hoopingarner: Okay.

24 Gillig: So you would be able to sit in on one if...

1 Hoopingarner: I may also be out of town.

2 Gillig: Okay.

3 Hoopingarner: I still have to confirm that.

4 Gillig: Okay.

5 Bass: Okay. With that, we will adjourn our meeting until
6 Thursday, October 17th at 6:30 in this room. Thank
7 you.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of
the City of West Hollywood at a regular meeting held this
17th day of October, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioner: Altschul, Buckner, Erickson,
Hoopingarner, Jones, Vice-Chair
Bass.

NOES: Commissioner: None.

ABSENT: Commissioner: None.

ABSTAIN: Commissioner: Chair Carvalheiro.



ROGERIO CARVALHEIRO, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:



DAVID K. GILLIG, COMMISSION SECRETARY



Written Communications, Inc.

worldwide transcription services

CERTIFICATE AND

DECLARATION OF TRANSCRIBER

I, KIANA KILBEY, hereby declare as follows:

I am located at 21220 Devonshire Street, Suite 202-B, Chatsworth, California 91311. I am the person who transcribed the foregoing Planning Commission minutes of June 2, 2016. Present were the Planning Commission, Staff - John Keho, Jennifer Alkire, Stephanie Reich, Lauren Langer, and David, Gillig. Also present were consultants: John Lesak and Flora Chou from Page & Turnbull, and Donovan Rypkema, Place Economics.

I have transcribed this transcript to the best of my ability and certify that this written transcript is a true and accurate account thereof. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in the foregoing matter or in any way interested in the outcome of the matter set forth in this transcript.

EXECUTED this 8th day of August 2019 at Chatsworth, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Kiana Kilbey', written over a horizontal line.

Kiana Kilbey
Written Communications, Inc.