



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Regular Meeting
September 4, 2008

West Hollywood Park Auditorium
647 N. San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood, California 90069

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Altschul called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:42 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Ira Handleman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Bernstein, Guardarrama, Hamaker, Yeber, Vice-Chair DeLuccio, Chair Altschul.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff Present: David DeGrazia, Senior Planner, Susan Healy Keene, Community Development Director, John Keho, Planning Manager, Michael Jenkins, City Attorney and David Gillig, Commission Secretary.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

ACTION: Approve the Planning Commission Agenda of Thursday, September 4, 2008 as presented. **Moved by Vice-Chair DeLuccio, seconded by Commissioner Hamaker and unanimously carried.**

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

A. August 7, 2008

ACTION: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of Thursday, August 7, 2008 as presented. **Moved by Vice-Chair DeLuccio, seconded by Commissioner Bernstein and unanimously carried.**

B. August 21, 2008

ACTION: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of Thursday, August 21, 2008 as presented. **Moved by Vice-Chair DeLuccio, seconded by Commissioner Bernstein and unanimously carried.**

6. PUBLIC COMMENT.

JEANNE DOBRIN, WEST HOLLYWOOD, commented on the upcoming retirement of city employee Bob Abrahams, CATV Supervisor, the Women's Equality meeting and the General Plan update meeting.

7. **ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS.** None.

8. **CONSENT CALENDAR.** None.

9. **PUBLIC HEARINGS.**

- A. **7141-7155 Santa Monica Boulevard (Formosa Draft EIR)
Demolition Permit 2006-036, Development Permit 2006-050, General
Plan Amendment 2006-005, Specific Plan 2006-002, Tentative Trace
Map 2006-019, Zoning Map Amendment 2006-001:**
Draft Environmental Impact Report public comment hearing. Project is a
request to demolish the existing structure and construct a 145-unit mixed-
use building.

[VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION]

Provided and certified by Written Communications, Inc.

Altschul: *Demolition Permit, Development Permit, General Plan Amendment, Specific Plan, Tentative Tract Map and Zoning Map Amendment as numbered on the agenda relating to the property at 7141-7155 Santa Monica Boulevard. This is the meeting where we receive public comment and comments with respect to the Draft Environmental Impact Report and David DeGrazia would you please give us the staff report?*

DeGrazia: *Thank you Chair Altschul. Before you tonight is the Draft Environmental Impact Report, DEIR, for the proposed Formosa Specific Plan project and related development permits. The DEIR was released on August 15th, 2008. This meeting is an opportunity for interested parties to comment on the adequacy of the DEIR in assessing and mitigating the project's impacts. The meeting is intended to receive comments on the DEIR only. It is not a meeting on whether the project itself should be approved. The verbal comments received from the Planning Commission and the public regarding the DEIR as well as any written comments received during the review period will be addressed in the final EIR. Hearings on the approval of the project itself and all related permits will be held at a later date. This DEIR evaluates potential significant impacts and proposes mitigation measures to reduce impacts. The environmental review process provides an opportunity for the public input into the environmental analysis. This DEIR does not make recommendations regarding the approval or denial of the proposed project. The 1.3 acre project site is bound by Formosa Avenue to the west, Santa Monica Boulevard to the south, Detroit Street to the east, with residential uses to the north. The Applicant, Formosa Partners, LP, has prepared and submitted the Formosa Specific Plan and the related development permits. The Specific Plan has been prepared to facilitate the processing and approval of the development of the project. The Applicant proposes to construct up to 130 residential units and approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial uses in a six-story mixed-use building. The commercial uses would be restricted to the ground floor level and would front Santa Monica Boulevard. The proposed project would be a maximum of six stories above*

grade, a maximum of 75 feet in height plus architectural features along Santa Monica Boulevard. The height would step down from six stories at the southern boundary on Santa Monica Boulevard to three stories or 36 feet at the northern boundary adjacent to the neighboring apartment buildings. In addition, the proposed project would provide a view portal from Santa Monica Boulevard of the Hollywood Hills to the north of the project site. I will now turn it over to Melissa Hatcher from EDAW, the Environmental Consultant to give a presentation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Hatcher: Good evening everyone. Okay, just to give you a brief overview of the SEQUA process as we've been going through it. We're at step seven right now tonight. It's highlighted in yellow. I would like to point out that we prepared the Notice of Preparation and initial study in August of last year that was circulated for a 30-day public review period. The comments we received during the scoping process were then incorporated into the Draft EIR. As David mentioned, the Draft EIR is available for public review from August 15th through September 29th. And what we'll do is take all the comments we receive on the Draft EIR and prepare written responses that will be included in the final EIR. Next slide. Before I go into the Draft EIR, I just want to explain the types of impacts. Thresholds are kind of like bars and they vary by issue area, but we analyze the impacts against these thresholds. A less than significant impact or no impact is below the bar and a significant impact with mitigation is above the bar, but when we add mitigation, we can get it below the bar, whereas a significant and unavoidable impact is above the bar and even with mitigation it still exceeds that bar and at that point we need to do a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which essentially says that the benefits of the project, whether they're economic, technological or social, outweigh the environmental impacts of that project that cannot be mitigated. Just to give you a quick background, again the initial study was released in August of last year. We looked at 16 environmental issue areas and we were able to eliminate these six issue areas because we had enough information at that time to make a determination of the impact. The initial study is included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR. For the Draft EIR, the less than significant impacts, I'll start with Cultural Resources. We prepared a historic and archeological resource assessment of the project sites. One of the offices on the project site was designed by Frank Gary. It turns out that none of the buildings on site are historically significant. We also looked at archeological and paleontological resources and it was determined that these are not likely to be present and if they are encountered during construction, there are procedures under the California Environmental Quality Act to deal with them. Moving on to Hazards, as many of you are aware, the project site is a listed hazardous waste site. It currently produces volatile organic compounds, toxic air emissions and there's contaminants in the soil and in the groundwater. A Phase I environmental site assessment and a Phase II environmental site assessment were prepared. A limited Phase III environmental site assessment was prepared and a health risk assessment was prepared to determine the kinds of contaminants that are located on site and their extent and how to treat them. The Applicant for this project entered into a voluntary cleanup agreement with the Department of Toxic Substances Control. That is the State agency with regulatory oversight for hazards and cleanup of hazardous waste, otherwise known as DTSC. So the Applicant, as part of the voluntary cleanup agreement,

produce what's called a remedial action work plan and that details exactly how they will clean up the site prior to building construction and that has to be signed off by the State and the cleanup has to occur and the State then signs off on that as well to say that they've remediated all the hazards before any kind of building construction could occur at the site. Some of you may have received this facts sheet from the Department of Toxic Substances Control. They are currently soliciting comments on the remedial action work plan. It's separate from the EIR, but it is in public review right now. And moving on to Land Use, we did a consistency analysis between the proposed Specific Plan with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance and the Housing element. In general, the proposed project is consistent with those documents. However, it would exceed the height limits and the floor area ratio that are in the Zoning Ordinance, however, approval of the Specific Plan would supersede those Zoning requirements and the project would be consistent. So moving on to Less Than Significant Impacts with Mitigation, the first is esthetics and we looked at the Scenic Vista. As David mentioned, this project actually involves a view portal along Santa Monica Boulevard and this would add a new view from Santa Monica Boulevard of the Hollywood sign. So it actually has a net benefit related to Scenic Vista. For visual character, we looked at whether the design of the project, the building size, the massing would be consistent with the surrounding area. The building is taller. It's six stories along Santa Monica Boulevard and it scales down to three stories along the northern boundary in order to be more consistent with the adjacent residential uses. Although the building would be taller and it's a new modern structure, it would actually be more visually unifying than the current industrial uses that are located at that site. For light and glare, there could be impacts depending on the type of lighting that's used, how it's focused and what type of building materials that are used. So the checkmarks up here are mitigation measures. The Applicant is required to make sure that the lighting is focused on to the project site and not on to the adjacent uses and the building materials cannot be reflective. We also did a shade and shadow analysis because of the adjacent residential uses and the height of the structure and during the longest day of shadows, which is the winter solstice or December 21st, the adjacent residences would be shaded from two to four hours maximum. During the summer there would be virtually no shading. So it's only during the winter solstice that there would be shading on the adjacent residents. For air quality, we modeled both construction and operational air quality emissions and we compared that to the South Coast Air Quality Management District standards for daily emissions and so as it says up here on the slide, the nitrogen oxides produced at the project site during construction would exceed the thresholds and so we can mitigate this by limiting the distance that the haul trucks would travel in order to get that below the thresholds. We also looked at operational emissions and these are basically generated by vehicle trips and energy used at the site and other stationary sources and these would not exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District thresholds. Lastly, we looked at the impact to sensitive receptors. They would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations, carbon monoxide or CO hot spots or toxic air contaminants. I would like to point out that the existing uses produced toxic air contaminants and hazardous air quality emissions. These would be eliminated with the proposed project. Therefore, the project during operation would have a net benefit to air quality in the neighborhood. For public services, utilities and

recreation, we contacted the police and fire departments to make sure that they had adequate personnel and equipment to serve the new residential uses and the additional calls for service that could be created by the project and they have adequate personnel, equipment and they do not need to construct new facilities to accommodate this project. For waste water or sewer, based on the lot development, which is across the street, we knew that there was a sewer capacity problem downstream of the site actually in the City of Los Angeles and so a sewer capacity report was prepared and they coordinated with the City of West Hollywood and the City of Los Angeles. The City of Los Angeles said as of today, they have the capacity to support this project, however, at the time of occupancy, they may not have that, so the Applicant is required to go back to the City of Los Angeles when they're trying to get their Certificate of Occupancy, have a sewer capacity availability request submitted, make sure that that capacity is there. If it's not there, the Applicant would be required to upgrade those facilities in order to accommodate the project and that would be done in coordination with the City of West Hollywood, Department of Public Works, and the City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering. Landfill capacity in the County is limited and the City is required to comply with recycling mandates per the State, so during construction the Applicant is required to recycle building materials and submit a building demolition recycling plan to the City of West Hollywood, Department of Public Works and also during operation of the project. They need to figure out how they're going to recycle materials generated that's on the site in order for the City to continue to meet its State mandates. Lastly would be recreation and parks. The project would add 130 net new residential uses units at the site and likely increase the demand for Plummer Park and other recreational facilities in the City. The Applicant in lieu of providing park space is required to pay a fee that the City can then use to offset those impacts by providing additional programs. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. So now I'm moving on to significant and unavoidable impacts. These are impacts that even with mitigation would remain. The first is noise. During construction of the proposed project, the adjacent residences are very close to this site and there would be an increase in noise levels during construction. So the Applicant would be required to install a 12-foot temporary noise barrier, like a wood wall during construction, during excavation and site preparation in order to reduce the noise levels experienced by the adjacent residents. Also during construction some of the heavy equipment that will be used on site will generate vibration that will be felt by the adjacent residences. The Applicant is supposed to minimize the use of heavy equipment near the residents to the extent that they can, however this impact will remain significant and unavoidable even with this mitigation measure. During operation of the project Santa Monica Boulevard, the traffic that's on it and the uses are really loud right now under the existing conditions and they actually exceed the City of West Hollywood noise levels for residential uses. So in order to protect the residents that would live at the site, the Applicant will be required to install special window glazing and insulation in order to meet the State interior noise standards of 45 DBA and they have to submit an acoustical study prior to occupancy to prove that. The other significant and unavoidable impact is transportation and traffic, typical one. So the traffic was modeled, the proposed project is going to add approximately 3,500 net new vehicle trips to the City's traffic system. This would create significant impacts at seven intersections and

five residential street segments. With implementation of mitigation, which includes moving a traffic signal from Poinsettia and Fountain to Formosa and Fountain, adding a left turn signal at Fountain and La Brea, and installing a traffic signal at La Brea and Lexington, we could reduce the traffic impacts. However, even with this mitigation, there would still be five intersections that are significantly impacted and three residential street segments. There's no feasible mitigation to further mitigate these impacts without widening roads, which is not the City's policy. So this impact will remain. We also looked at whether or not the project would exceed the County's congestion management program standards and although the project would add vehicle trips to the nearby streets, it would not exceed their thresholds. Moving on to hazards created due to design features, the parking structure for the retail and guest parking, there could be issues in that parking structure with circulation pattern, so the Applicant is going to be required to provide a parking attendant to help people find parking spaces, make sure there's appropriate traffic flow. The other issue is when cars are leaving this parking garage for the retail and guest uses, there is limited visibility when they're turning on to Formosa, so the curb in front of the project site 10 feet on either side of the garage would be painted red to increase that line of sight and reduce vehicle hazards. And lastly is parking supply. The proposed project would provide 206 parking spaces. City Code requires 245 parking spaces, which is a 39 space shortfall. However, the Specific Plan can establish new parking standards and under those standards the proposed project would actually have six more parking spaces than they are required. So approval of the Specific Plan results in an adequate parking supply. In addition to the environmental impacts that I just described, I'm required to look at alternatives to the proposed projects in the EIR and just a brief summary. The no project alternative looks at doing nothing at the site. The reduced density alternative looks at consistency with the underlying zoning and the General Plan and what that results. And the mixed use with retail uses only alternative, we were trying to limit the number of new vehicle trips that are created by the proposed project. So there would only be retail uses as part of the commercial. There would be no high turnover restaurant or banking uses because those are the high trip generators. Still the same number of units and that was able to reduce traffic impacts. As David mentioned, the Draft EIR is available for public review and for the benefit of the public, it's available on the City's website. It's here at the West Hollywood Library and it's at the Planning counter at City Hall. We do encourage you to go look at that and submit your comments by September 29th. And there are a couple different ways to comment. Can you do the next slide? The purpose of the meeting today is to take verbal testimony by the Planning Commissioners and the public. I've also provided comment cards that are available on the sign-in table. In case anyone doesn't feel comfortable speaking, they can fill this out. David's contact information is on it and they can send it back in. The Notice of Availability is provided as well that gives a more detailed description of the project and where the documents are located. And any other written comments can be submitted to David. His contact information is available on the Notice of Availability. Again, comments should be postmarked by September 29th, so we can get them in the final EIR. And I'll turn it back to David now.

DeGrazia: *That would be all we have for the presentation. We're open for comments or questions. Thank you.*

Altschul: *Thank you, ma'am, that was an excellent presentation.*

Hatcher: *Thanks.*

Altschul: *Any questions of the staff or the EDAW representative? Barbara?*

Hamaker: *Yes. Yes, I do have a few. First of all, I have a disclosure and a question for the City Attorney. I am an employee of the West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation, which is immediately adjacent. Has a property, the little bungalows north of this property line. So Mike, is it appropriate that I participate in this or as an employee do I have to recuse myself?*

Jenkins: *Well, I...is the property that the Housing Corporation owns within 500 feet?*

Hamaker: *Yes, it's immediately adjacent.*

Jenkins: *Well, I think for purposes of tonight, you should recuse yourself and I think I would need a little bit of time to do a fuller analysis of it, in light of the fact that you're now an employee...*

Hamaker: *Right, rather than being a Board member.*

Jenkins: *...as opposed to being a Board member.*

Hamaker: *Yes.*

Jenkins: *That would be my suggestion.*

Hamaker: *Okay, thanks.*

Jenkins: *It's possible I could ultimately conclude that you're not conflicted in which event this matter will be coming back on future occasions and you would be able to participate, but I think it would be safer for you not to participate tonight.*

Hamaker: *Not to participate tonight?*

Jenkins: *That's correct.*

Hamaker: *Oh. But what am I going to do with all my questions?*

Jenkins: *Well, I'm sorry, I had no idea you had this conflict question until this very moment.*

Hamaker: *I know, I didn't....*

Jenkins: *So I....*

Hamaker: *It didn't occur to me until I had written all these down. Okay. I'll take your advice.*

Altschul: *Barbara, then are you going to leave the table?*

Hamaker: *Should I leave the table?*

Altschul: *Yes.*

Hamaker: *Okay.*

Altschul: *Any other questions of staff at this time? Seeing none, we'll open the public testimony and again this is specifically directed to the Draft Environmental Impact Report and all of your comments and questions will be addressed in the preparation of the final Environmental Impact Report. Jeanne Dobrin?*

Dobrin: *Jeanne Dobrin, resident of West Hollywood. First of all I wanted to compliment the EDAW Company and their representative, Ms. Melissa. She is handling right now as far as I can tell three of the largest projects in West Hollywood and all of those projects as far as I've been able to ascertain exceed the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan. For one thing, this property is in a zone where the underlying zoning is 35 feet and three stories and is proposed to be up to 75 feet and six stories. But she...I believe that all of her preparations that I've seen so far are extremely fair and comprehensive and I have a lot of good faith in her. I looked up this project on my laptop and there wasn't that much information that I could find out about it and it isn't in the report, but I will be looking at it. It puzzles me as to why our City all of a sudden, we don't have a new General Plan. We had Specific Plans under our previous General Plan, but we don't seem to have that...that we're getting specific plans that are not outlined in our General Plan, which is in the works now. So I think that the City is overdoing it and is allowing too much. The traffic during construction is going to be a big problem, I know, and of course everything that was ever built caused a lot of noise and problems as far as construction is concerned, but this will be massive. In addition to that, I bring to your attention the gateway mall at the corner of Sun...of La Brea and Santa Monica. That used to be a car wash and some other businesses, which were taken I think maybe by eminent domain or voluntarily or whatever and if you ever try to drive north on La Brea and turn left on Santa Monica, forget it, you'll have to go through three traffic lights, so as far as I know the people in the know, and I hope I'm one of them, take circuitous routes. I think that this project is going to be far too massive for its impact on the City and that would include not only on the utilities such as gas, electric and water, but also especially on waste disposal with 130 units of which only 17 will be for moderate and low income. All the others will be at market rate. I also*

wanted to point out something that is kind of obscure in a way, but when all of these properties that are being demolished every two weeks upon, you know, request of course, most of those buildings don't have washing machines in them, our older affordable building and people go to washaterias or whatever, but all of the new buildings will have a washing machine in every unit. So that means that there is going to be...it's going to be much easier to wash your clothes and your bedding and whatever and therefore there will be a tremendous amount of water being used more than for people who had to go out of their way...

Altschul: Thank you, Jeanne.

Dobrin: ...to have their clothes washed.

Altschul: Thank you. Your time is....

Dobrin: What?

Altschul: Your time is up.

Dobrin: Oh, I thought maybe since there's only two....

Altschul: Thank you, your time is up.

Dobrin: May I say, it's...

Altschul: No. Your time is up.

Dobrin: ...only a few slips that we could have some extra time?

Altschul: Your time is up.

Dobrin: Well, that's the Commission to decide.

Altschul: No, it is the Chair's decision that your time is up, Jeanne. You know, you make this argument every time there's...there are less than 100 people in the room that they're....

Dobrin: Well, it does say here in the rules that the time could be shortened or lengthened and since there are so few people to speak, I would ask for the extra time for me and the other speakers.

Altschul: Your time is up, thank you Ms. Dobrin.

Dobrin: Thank you.

Altschul: Steve Levin?

Levin: *Hi, Steve Levin, I'm a resident of West Hollywood. I live on Formosa. Just a few comments. First the good things are, I'm really excited that this project's finally got to this point where we're officially in the process of this. This is such an important project and I think we are so fortunate to not only have the opportunity to be rid of Faith Plating, but to have a building that's going to be designed so interestingly. I'm really excited that the developer has responded to the neighborhood's requests as far as an improved design and things like that, but I realize that's for further along. So sticking to the EIR, I actually went through this thing, so don't tell my boss because I did that at work, but it was, you know, there weren't really any big surprises there and, you know, I think it's everything that we always expected it's going to be. It certainly is a larger building, but I feel comfortable that I think it fits in the neighborhood. I think it fits with the vision of what's probably going to be what we want to see on the east side. My concerns are specifically which she talked about just now were obviously I live on Formosa, so the traffic light being moved to Formosa, I'm not thrilled about that idea. If that does happen, I think it's crucial that we get 24-hour permit parking on that street and I realize that there's a new way to go about doing that, but I think this should supersede that, especially because I imagine most of the people making a left-hand turn out of there will be residents. I'm not as concerned even about the commercial visitors because there's just not going to be as many of them, but there's going to be a lot of residents there and that left-hand turn and going up to Fountain is going to really be backlogged and I think at least with not encouraging parking on there will...would be a help. You know, as far as traffic, I did a little experiment today. I took the bus down here. It was easy. It was no problem. It took me 15 to 20 minutes. These kinds of projects are going to encourage that. People are going to take the bus. I don't care what people say, it's easier. It was no problem. You put 130 new people there or plus or minus, they're going to realize that it's easier to take a bus too and they're not going to have to take a...travel as much because there's going to be restaurants and there's going to be Laundromats and there's going to be things for them to use there. We're creating something new over there on the east part of town and it's very exciting. The EIR I don't think showed anything that was unexpected. And I'm very excited to have this process go through. I'm very much in support of this and I think they did a fantastic job with the EIR. I think it was very comprehensive. Thank you.*

Altschul: *Thank you and I apologize Mr. Levin, half of my friends' names will be...are Levin.*

Levin: *Oh, you got it, that's okay.*

Altschul: *Anson Snyder?*

Snyder: *Commission, good evening, Anson Snyder. I'm a resident of West Hollywood. It's a good project, well designed. I think many in the community have participated in this. The big issue and the consultants pointed it out tonight is going to be the traffic. There's going to be a lot of traffic in the area. I ask as a mitigant if you consider the various mitigants with this EIR is to relook at the parking plan. Right now there's no guest parking included. You'll*

have less than what's required parking and look at tandem parking. These will be higher rents and many of our areas where we already have increased density there are often two or three people if it's a roommate situation with cars living at these units. So I just ask that you work with the community and look at that parking plan and try to figure out something that might work to mitigate some of the addressed issues. Thank you.

Altschul: Thank you and our last speaker is Stephen Martin.

Martin: Stephen Martin, West Hollywood. There seems to be a lot of concern as to how we approach this whole issue of Specific Plans because clearly what's being asked of the City is to change our Zoning Ordinance, our Codes and our General Plan to accommodate a single developer. Now the only other Specific Plan that I had ever participated in was the Sunset Specific Plan, which included all of Sunset and that did engage in a really looking at how we look at specific sites and make certain allowances for greater densities or whatever. It looks like the process has been, well, shall we just say changed and now it's just an issue of if we don't want to embarrass the City and we want to...by amending the General Plan or just telling people we're going to throw out our Zoning Codes or our parking requirements, we're simply going to go through this device called the Specific Plan and then everything is up for grabs and it doesn't matter what the General Plan says, doesn't matter what our Zoning Codes say, we can do whatever we like. I don't even know what the threshold is to obtain a Specific Plan approval, whether is it what the benefit is to the community, is it the size of the project, the size of the lot, the amount of campaign contributions? It's not clear. There just seems to be a willy-nilly process that whatever the whim of someone at City Hall that we're going to do a Specific Plan and it just doesn't seem fair and it really mocks the City's request that we citizens come and participate and go through these long meetings and you get our input and then we come up with whatever, say we come up with next year with the General Plan, it won't matter because the next time a developer who's favorite comes through, they'll get a Specific Plan and whatever the Council has approved and whatever we the constituents think we've done to protect our neighborhoods, it's all going to be thrown out. So I really...this is just one site and it's really hard to speak against this project because Faith Plating is so ugly and so horrific and such a blight on the neighborhood. But I really think that you need to look at a project that's smaller and honestly look when the consultants issue cannot mitigate the traffic issues, then you need to look at the size of this project. Probably the most glaring example is that no one says our parking requirements are too strict, but...

Altschul: Thank you, Mr. Martin.

Martin: ...we're giving substantial decrease to (TALKING OVER).

Altschul: Mr. Martin, your time is up. Thank you.

Martin: I was going to cede my extra time to Jeanne Dobrin.

Altschul: *No can do. And that concludes the public testimony. If you will...well, I don't suppose there's any reason to terminate the public testimony portion of the public hearing. We'll now go back to Commissioners and comments, discussion. Who first? Donald?*

DeLuccio: *I just have a...I don't have much to say right now, I'm going to wait until it comes back to us and then we, at that time, we can address the Specific Plan when it comes forward because I would probably want to see what's in there. One thing does concern me, if you're going to make a new project and I don't even know what's going to be in that plan, but a preview would be that they want to under park the project and I would...being that there are...that the big issues here would be traffic and circulation and parking, that I would think if you're building a new project, you would be able to accommodate enough parking spaces. So that's just one red flag that comes to mind at this time. The other issues I will address when the project comes back before us. Thank you.*

Altschul: *Joe?*

Guardarrama: *I just wanted to congratulate the City and the EIR consultant for preparing a report that was extremely easy to read and extremely easy to digest the issues, especially the issues that were unmitigatable and I just wanted to say thank you because we read a lot of these, not all of them are this well written.*

Altschul: *Any other comments at this...Marc?*

Yeber: *Yeah, I wanted to find out, it was curious in reading through, there was the alter...one of the alternative...in going through the alternatives, it mentioned the issue of the existing use, which is industrial, gives off certain particulate in the air and I was wondering, and it struck me that the alternative actually said that if they left the site alone that the air quality would be worse than adding 20...206 cars to that site and I just want to know how they measured that, because that seemed a little odd to me that they would point that out, but then ignore the pollution created by those 206 cars that are in the parking structure or if there's any...even any relationship. I don't have a problem with it being under parked. It is a mixed use project. It is on a major transit corridor and I actually encourage projects, mixed use projects on the boulevard to go down that path, so that's something we can discuss further once it comes back maybe, but those were my only two questions.*

Altschul: *Alan, do you have any comments?*

Bernstein: *I did have just one or two questions on things that I was curious about. One is...one of the unmitigatable things is the traffic and one of the solutions is the installation of a left turn signal and I'm just curious, it's going to be apparently installed for the westbound traffic at Fountain and La Brea and there may be a simple explanation for it, but it just seemed to me that the eastbound traffic is what would build from this project. So I was wondering why*

and then I was just also curious, under visual number four which is whether or not the new source...new project would be a source of substantial shade and shadow, it seems to me that a six-story building would almost by definition create some shade and shadow. It may not be terribly significant, but I was just curious why it was considered to be below any threshold of significance.

Altschul: *Thank you. I would like to see a further study or a further explanation of exactly what a Specific Plan is. In this document, it just categorically states that in our City anything over 100,000 square feet may be considered to be a Specific Plan, but I think we should provide an inventory of what Specific Plans we already have and to my recollection it's only two. It's the Sunset Specific Plan and the Pacific Design Center, which I believe was created as a Specific Plan long before we became a City. I don't...I am not aware of any other Specific Plans in West Hollywood that are existent at the present time. It might also be interesting to inventory whether or not there have been any other applications for other Specific Plans that are not proceeded and also I think it would be certainly...well, dealing with the two Specific Plans we have, Sunset and Pacific Design Center, whether there are any parking standards that have been reduced or have been granted at less than the zone...than the underlying zoning requirement. Also I think again a further and a much more complete and extensive definition of what a Specific Plan is should be, could be, rather than just, okay, if it's 100,000 square feet or more, we can mandate that it be a Specific Plan. There must be some kind of an accepted standard that is either statewide or in regional cities that abut West Hollywood, such as Los Angeles, Beverly Hills, Culver City, Santa Monica and so forth. And with that, if there's no other comments or questions, then we will consider this item concluded for this evening and look forward to it coming back with the final Environmental Impact Report and with answers to all comments and questions. Thank you. And thank you everyone for coming.*

(ITEM 9.A. OFFICIAL RECORDING ENDS).

10. NEW BUSINESS. None.

11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS. None.

12. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR. None.

13. ITEMS FROM STAFF.

A. General Plan Update.

Susan Healy Keene, Community Development Director, commented on the first General Plan community workshop meeting held on Wednesday, September 3, 2008. She stated there are two other meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 9, 2008 and Wednesday, September 10, 2008 at Plummer Park Community Center; 6:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.

B. Director's Report. None.

C. Planning Manager's Update.

John Keho, Planning Manager, provided an update of upcoming projects tentatively scheduled for Planning Commission.

14. PUBLIC COMMENT. None.

15. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS. None.

16. ADJOURNMENT: The Planning Commission adjourned 7:32 P.M. to a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission, which will be on Thursday, September 18, 2008 at 6:30 P.M. at West Hollywood Park Auditorium, 647 N. San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood, California. **Motion carried by consensus of the Commission.**

APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS 18TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2008.



CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR