

MINUTES
WEST HOLLYWOOD CITY COUNCIL

July 11, 1985

- CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 12:45 P.M. at Fiesta Hall, Plummer Park, by Mayor Terrigno.
- ROLL CALL: Present: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
Absent: None
Also Present: City Manager Brotzman
City Attorney Jenkins
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: The Pledge of allegiance was led by the Mayor.
- APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Councilmember Heilman requested that Item 1 be removed from the consent calendar.
- Mayor Terrigno asked to combine Items 12 & 24 as Item 26a;
- Councilmember Schulte requested Item 26b, Direction on social services RFP.
- Councilmember Viterbi asked for a discussion on the workshop date under item 33a.
- ACTION: To Move the agenda as amended.
Motion Schulte seconded by Heilman
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.
- FURTHER ACTION: To adjourn the meeting at 6 P.M.
Motion Schulte seconded by Albert
AYES: Albert, Schulte
NOES: Viterbi, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
The motion failed.
- STUDY SESSION: Woody Tescher of Envicom started the presentation by indicating what the purpose of the meeting was: First, one of the priorities for the City of West Hollywood has been the preparation of an interim zoning ordinance and he would like to start off with an overview of the time frame, target dates for completion of draft documents, public meetings and meetings with the council. Secondly an overview of what a zoning ordinance is; how it fits into the General Plan, what it can and can't do for the community. Thirdly, review thoughts about the structure for the zoning ordinance, which he thought should be very different from the County's existing document. Fourthly, would like to state and review with the Council, some of the base line assumptions that Envicom will be using in the preparation of the document; specifically, will this be a totally new ordinance or does the council want to rely on some existing ordinance provisions that are in the County Ordinance. Lastly, 5 key topics; specific plans, height districts, height limits adjacent to residential, parking and signage that they will present some options on and would request some feedback from the Council.
1. Time frame for preparation of the zoning Ordinance. Series of meetings with the City Council and series of meetings with the public. Target is a hearing draft by the 2nd week in September (September 12), to be able to meet that date there are some very critical deadlines and meetings to conduct before that. If there is any shifting of dates by a week or so, there

- STUDY SESSION: will be a commensurate shifting of the target date for the release of the hearing draft.
(Cont'd.)
- TIME FRAME: July 18th - working session with the community; the purpose of this being to present a forum at which the general community can talk about their thoughts and wishes and issues regarding zoning.
July 25th - Second workshop with the City Council to present additional issues not being addressed today. At the close of this session should monitor where they are and if needed set a 6 hour session with the City Council .
1st week of August - present an internal working document to be presented to the Council of some of the specifications of the interim ordinance. Will not be a public hearing draft, will be some of the discussions on some of the specifics, such as yard setbacks, specific numbers on parking standards, etc.
2 weeks later - public hearing scheduled for public testimony on the interim zoning ordinance. This is a very constrained and tight time frame.
- Councilmember Schulte asked when the first vote would be on the ordinance. Mr. Tescher replied that he would defer to the City Attorney, but felt that the day the Council conducted the public hearing it could be adopted as an urgency ordinance.
- Councilmember Heilman stated that the schedule on the zoning ordinance was only important if the Council intended to lift the moratorium at the same time that they adopted the ordinance. Mr. Tescher replied that that was the objective in trying to meet this time frame.
- GENERAL APPROACH: The document under discussion is to be an interim zoning ordinance to replace the County ordinance which has raised many objections and concerns in the community about the provisions and the standards and how they effect the City of West Hollywood. We are operating under a limited time frame in the preparation in a totally new ordinance, from scratch. Therefore, the ordinance that is being prepared for consideration will be, in effect, an improved implementation tool for the existing community plan; there is no intent to relook the overall allocation of land uses of the existing community plan. The proper place to look at land use is in the longer period of time for the overall land use planning process as part of the General Plan. Start point is the existing Community Plan and will be looking at specific areas of concern such as parking, signage, adult businesses, and liquor stores. Propose to take the more technical elements directly from the County Ordinance and incorporate them directly into the zoning ordinance. The existing County Code will be streamlined; a complete restructuring of the document to make it more understandable and useful. To make it more useable.
- BASIC COMPONENTS: At this time, Mr. Tescher introduced Lynn Goldberg, a planner with Envicom; Larry Greer, Traffic and Parking consultant; and Soren Alexanian with Regional Planning.

BASIC COMPONENTS:
(Cont'd.)

Lynn Goldberg gave a basic overview of what a zoning ordinance is, the basic components of it and some of the procedures. There are two parts to the zoning ordinance - 1. The text, which includes the regulations controlling the manner in which property may be developed in each zone as well as procedures for reviewing and approving permits and 2. The map, which delineates the actual boundaries of the zoning districts. Basic land use zoning districts - R-1, R-2, C-3, in the case of West Hollywood they are considering mixed use zone. In each zone there is a description of the permitted and the conditionally permitted land uses, usually development standards such as maximum lot coverage, minimum building setbacks, those kinds of things, and any special design standards for that particular zone. Envicom is suggesting using a non-cumulative zoning ordinance approach, that is, distinctions will be kept in the land use zones, no residential uses will be permitted in the commercial zone except perhaps in the mixed use zone, and no commercial permitted in the residential zone, trying to maintain the integrity of each of the land use districts. Then they are proposing the use of overlay districts. These are applied to the base zone such as R-1 to allow additional uses or apply additional standards, an example would be a parking overlay or a pedestrian orientation overlay where the uses permitted by the base zone would also be required to incorporate design elements into a project to enhance the pedestrians experience. This also contains general regulations which would apply throughout the city to all parcels and those would be related to such things as signs, parking, design and landscaping. The zoning ordinance also sets forth procedures governing the review and approval of the various permits. One of the major permits is the development permit, and it is being suggested that just about every kind of development require this permit. It would allow the review of a proposed project to determine if conformity to general plan policies and objectives and also all of the zoning ordinance provisions. It will also provide for some form of public hearing and the imposition of any necessary conditions of approval. The recommendation will be that the planning director have the authority to approve most of the development agreements and the City Council would be informed of any actions on the permit. Also recommend that major development permits require approval of the planning commission. Will very carefully define the distinction between major and minor permits. Another major permit will be the Conditional Use Permit, required for a use which may have a unique impact that cannot be determined until the project and the surrounding circumstances are reviewed. Examples of conditionally permitted uses include schools and car washes. Again, the recommendation will be that minor projects can be approved by the planning director with major projects going to the planning commission for approval.

DEVELOPMENT
PERMITS:

DESIGN REVIEW:

Recommending that a Design Review Board be appointed to review new construction and exterior building modification and major sign permits. The emphasis of their review will be on architectural elements and the design quality of the project. Their recommendations would go to the planning director or the planning commission for approval. The Planning Commission and the Design Review Board to be appointed after the adoption of the zoning ordinance.

STUDY SESSION:
(Cont'd.)

Woody Tescher commented that guidelines for the Design Review Board would be in the interim ordinance for the Council to review right now, but this would not preclude the Council from adopting and developing other guidelines.

Councilmember Heilman questioned Envicom about the noncumulative issue. On the chart there are some mixed use zones. Lynn replied that they anticipate including standards in the mixed use zone that would specifically address and try to avoid any possible problems.

DISCUSSION OF
ISSUES:

Envicom has given the City Councilmembers a series of options on each of the issues and what they want from the council at this meeting is direction as to which of the approaches they should follow in preparing the interim ordinance. Once they establish a conceptual approach to an issue, they will go out and formulate some standards and bring them back for the Councils review. For some of the issues they have some very specific recommendations as to what may be the best approach, but they look for the Council's direction in each of the particular areas.

SPECIFIC PLANS:

Lynn Goldberg stated that right now the Community Plan designates four future specific plan areas: The metro site at Fairfax and Santa Monica, a 90,000 square foot site on Sunset Blvd., the Pacific Design Center site, and Northwest of the intersection at Beverly and San Vicente. In addition to these four sites, the Community Standards District also permits specific plans to be submitted for commercial or industrially oriented parcels which are greater than 40,000 square feet. Beyond designating the four specific plans on the land use map of the community plan, there are no goals, standards, or policies for each of these sites, and therefore, Envicom is suggesting that, in the zoning ordinance and in the land use element of the general plan, there be included certain issues that should be addressed at each site, parameters for development should be set and in order to give some guidance to the developers submitting proposals for those sites as well as guide the decision makers in reviewing the projects themselves. Under the various alternatives, Envicom is listing ; 1- incorporate the community standards district specific plan provisions unchanged as they are; 2- Develop the goals, policy and development standards; 3- Also unlimited height which is currently permitted for the specific plan areas in the community standards district, give Envicom direction to come back to the Council with some suggested parameters for development and issues that should be addressed at each site. They would also like some direction from Council on the unlimited height provision on the specific plan sites.

Councilmember Schulte stated that the second alternative appeared to be more inclusive, however it does not mention height limits. He also asked for some expansion on what is meant by goals, policy and development standards in general.

Woody Tescher stated that what they would like to do is suggest by their intent in the second alternative is to take a look at each site. Each specific plan area is currently designated as different from another. Pacific Design Center site is different from metro-rail site, etc. and each of those sites need standards that reflect on the character of the surrounding land uses, the neighborhoods, the potential impacts on the

SPECIFIC PLANS:
(Cont'd.)

adjacent areas, etc. The suggestion is that they would come back to the Council when they do talk about the interim ordinance and the provisions of that ordinance, to include some standards that are site specific to those areas. Councilmember Schulte noted that, just to keep the record straight, the Council had gone on record, increasing the size of the lots to 100,000 square feet. Mr. Tescher replied that that would be something they could reflect in the provisions that they would be developing. Member Heilman stated that they decided they would allow current specific plans but not over 100,000 square feet. Mayor Terrigno asked if what they would be doing in setting up goals and policy would be allowing something more than the submission of plans.

Woody Tescher replied that yes, they would be setting up the performance criteria for each of these sites. What are the amenities that each of these sites need to provide to the community, what are the relationships that each of these need to establish with the offsite areas, what are the parking situations, what are the urban design characteristics for each of these sites. Mayor Terrigno asked if assuming they wanted to develop the goals, policies and standards, would it fit in with the September 26th date? Mr. Tescher replied that they could handle this in two ways; one is to set up some preliminary standards, etc. within the interim ordinance, which expand a little bit upon the existing community standards district. There have been some notions regarding parking, community amenities, which have been discussed with City staff and City manager and other members of consulting staff. For the full flushing out of the standards into the detail that he feels the Council is discussing at this point in time, they would suggest that those be detailed in the longer planning process.

Mayor Terrigno asked if they could keep a moratorium on a particular project for the final development and it would not necessarily be included in the zoning ordinance if the Council chose not to, or too lengthly a process or too specific a process. The City Attorney responded that generally speaking, yes, they could place a moratorium on a geographic basis if there is a very definate, and well articulated rational for doing so; special problem site, a site that has unique characteristics, a site that has some significant impact on the city. The Council could utilize whatever reasonable standards they wished as befit the individual characteristics of each site. Councilmember Heilman asked if the Council could lift the moratorium only in part for certain categories of building; for development of only a certain percentage and leave it in place for larger developments and let them wait until they have a community plan adopted. The City Attorney replied that yes, the thing to keep in mind here is that ordinarily a general plan precedes the zoning ordinance. In this case, because the Council will be adopting the interim zoning ordinance preceding the final adoption of the general plan, there is a requirement in State law that any project approved prior to the adoption of the General Plan that a finding be made that it is consistent with what is likely to be in the general plan, and so if there are categories of properties or uses that the Council contemplates there will be substantial changes made in the general plan, the Council would obviously not be able to make that consistency finding and would not be able to approve that project.

SPECIFIC PLANS:
(Cont'd.)

Woody Tescher asked if it were fair to summarize the sentiment of the Council that yes they do take the approach that in this interim ordinance go beyond the County's stipulations and do develop some criteria for each of these. Being no dissenting opinion on this matter, Mr. Tescher informed the Council that that would be the approach they would take in the preparation of the specific plan section. Also the height standards.

HEIGHT DISTRICTS:

Woody asked the Council if they would like to have ultimately a limited height in those areas, or left as an unlimited height situation. Councilmember Albert felt they were all in favor of limited heights but Councilmember Viterbi felt they should explore their options and asked that Envicom explain to them the ramifications of each. Member Schulte felt that down the road they would also look at this issue in the economic analysis that they would get as part of the planning study.

Lynn Goldberg reported that there presently eight districts in the city with height limits ranging from 25 to 90 feet. They basically correlate with the zoning districts. The map 2 in the community development plan provides for an increase in height from 45 to 60 feet for commercial structures on Sunset, and an increase to 60 feet for residential structures on Doheny, as well as the unlimited height talked about in the specific plan areas. What Envicom is looking for from the Council is some input as to whether the Council is satisfied with the height limits as they are basically by zone, and should be incorporated into the zoning ordinance so that for each zone there is a certain height limit, or are there concerns about some of the height districts as they stand now, or are there concerns about height in general on specific parcels.

Mayor Terrigno stated that she had concerns about just going with the zone. Although the zone may allow 90 feet there may be an entire block that is 45 feet and there would need to be consistency in that area. Would be interested in seeing what the difference is in real height and zone height. In addition would like to see what the differences would be in height in feet and height in stories. Lynn stated that most zoning ordinances provide both for instance 2 stories or 35 feet. The 90 foot limit is currently for M-1, Studio area. Most of the general commercial district is 45 feet. The areas are mostly built out to the height limits allowed under the County. Woody stated that they could look at blocks and the overall characteristics of blocks, primarily through windshield surveys, within the time frame.

Ms. Goldberg asked if the Council felt it was appropriate to look at the height on a district basis or specific parcels.

Councilmember Schulte stated that he felt there should be as much discussion as possible, including the economic impact, on various heights on the commercial streets such as Sunset, Santa Monica, San Vicente, as opposed to other areas of the City. If they are looking at a revitalization, redevelopment in certain parts in West Hollywood, they should look at the implications there if they are trying to encourage development without losing the particular character of the neighborhood. It is a very mixed kind of process.

HEIGHT DISTRICTS:
(Cont'd.)

Woody stated that this is part of the dilemma of doing the zoning ordinance now. The question is, what do we do at this point in time versus the full plan. Part of the full planning program is indeed the economic impacts questions, which within the time frame of the interim ordinance, they are not going to be able to take a look at now in detail because part of the process as they look at and evaluate alternative land use patterns in the future is to look at the economic consequences. Right now we either go with the existing height districts or need to define some kind of criteria to modify them with.

Mayor Terrigno stated that was why she wanted to look at what is real and what is allowed. She is more inclined to go along with what is there and maintain the neighborhood characteristics.

Mr. Tescher replied that they could indicate where there are neighborhoods that are 80 to 100% built close or to the height limit or those that are 10%.

Councilmember Schulte felt they should make the process as easy for the community to follow as possible. He would like to see very clear criteria for the options in terms of designating height with respect to zoning.

Mayor Terrigno requested that they have feet and stories in the ordinance.

Councilmember Heilman stated that they must address where you measure the height from. Mr. Tescher replied that was correct and could make a drastic difference in the height and that was one place where the County ordinance had shortcomings.

Ms. Goldberg stated that one area of concern as related to height was the height limits adjacent to residential areas. The County ordinance does not require the reduction in height or the provision of building setbacks for commercial or industrial uses abutting residential uses. They are suggesting that the Council may want to require reduced height limits or building setbacks in these areas, to provide more of a separation in these areas.

Mr. Tescher stated that they would be presenting information that would show the Council what the impacts and locations where they would be affected.

PARKING:

Mr. Greer stated that West Hollywood has adopted the County parking ordinance as an interim requirement. Under the moratorium the developer must furnish 50% increase in parking to qualify. Before incorporation, the County initiated a study to determine parking supply, parking needs, current deficiencies and surpluses by location within the community. That study has issued a draft report which they are presently reviewing. They have gone back to look at night time and entertainment uses and will be reporting on that very shortly. One thing that has been established is the preferential permit parking area, in answer to specific parking problems.

There are 3 or 4 primary concerns that pertain to the interim ordinance. 1. The parking requirement themselves. Feeling that the County ordinance does not require enough parking and a concern about employee parking. There are

PARKING:
(Cont'd.)

three alternatives they have identified.

1. Continue to use the parking requirements as specified in the county ordinance.
2. Continue to use the county ordinance plus the 50% increase.
3. Examine some selective uses (office, retail, hotel, restaurant and entertainment uses) as to whether the parking requirements in the ordinance are adequate. The thought is that they would probably increase the requirements for those uses. Along with that they will be looking at using overlapping parking uses, particularly where there are multi-use projects.

Councilmember Schulte stated he favored the later alternative but felt there were some companion issues that need consideration. Do we push the burden onto new businesses? There should be a perspective on the entire parking issue. Is there a responsibility for the city to establish a parking authority to look at some long range municipal plans? Time to start looking at this.

Mr. Greer stated that there is the issue of existing parking deficiencies and whether new businesses have any responsibility for making up that responsibility. They have the responsibility for meeting their own parking requirements. In the larger planning sense you get into the issue of how they provide for that. Should each business provide for their own needs on site or should we look at a centralized parking program that could be administered mostly by the public, or some joint programs like the Pacific Design Center parking. That gets into a larger planning issue. We are definitely going to need a public parking program to help with the parking deficiencies, new development will not make up for that. With that in mind, the interim administration of parking ordinance might appropriately take the direction of each individual project providing for their parking on site, however, at the point where the moratorium is lifted and people are coming in for permits and variances, etc., that are being renewed and are short on parking, maybe they should proceed in the interim ordinance with establishing a parking authority and provide a mechanism for these people to pay an in-lieu fee or some other method such as an assessment district or parking authority. At least establish the mechanism in the ordinance by which they could get approval subject to payment of some kind of fee that would not immediately provide for the parking but would put funds into the parking program and ultimately provide for the parking demand. The fees would be established outside of the ordinance.

Mayor Terrigno brought up the question about charging for parking.

The City Attorney stated that they had a great deal of flexibility in addressing that question.

The Council requested that they get information back on how to handle charging for parking, the requirement for employee parking, number of spaces be required per square feet at no cost.

Mr. Greer stated that one other issue to be handled in the interim ordinance is the design of parking spaces. The County requirement is too small. This can include the access point, the number of access points, where located, control of the access and landscaping. Location of the parking is a planning issue.

PARKING:
(Cont'd.)

Councilmember Heilman stated that they would like to discourage the 7-11 type development with parking in front, but would like to look at the impact on the residential areas if they required the parking in the rear.

Mayor Terrigno asked if the 50% increase in parking that is required in the exemption would be the figure they would be working with as a starting point.

Mr Greer replied that will be one of the figures they will relate things to; the existing County ordinance, to the existing plus 50% and to other City ordinances. Even at the 50% increase, all 5 areas will still be deficient in parking.

Mr. Greer spoke about the Parking overlay, which allows for parking as a primary use to be provided in a residential zone where it is adjacent to commercial. In the current community plan, this has only been applied in some areas. There are a couple of ways to approach this in the interim ordinance. One, to maintain the parking overlay as presently shown in the community plan, to be reviewed in the land use planning for the General plan, or two, to amend the overlay to either delete or apply universally to all areas where commercial abuts residential. The suggestion was to maintain the parking overlay in the interim ordinance and look at in depth in the general plan. There was no opposition to this recommendation.

Mr. Greer will also be talking to the City Attorney about setting up a parking authority and the mechanism in the zoning ordinance. In order to talk about a centralized parking program they will need to talk about the acquisition of property.

SIGNAGE:

Mr. Tescher announced that in the area of signage they were making specific recommendations. that are outlined in the attached report.

Ms. Goldberg presented the report on what is currently allowed under the County Ordinance and what is being recommended for the City. (see attached).

Councilmember Viterbi felt that they would want to restrict the number of signs allowed on any building - more restrictive for buildings with one business, less for multi-tenant buildings. Mayor Terrigno expressed the opinion that what is proposed here is not limiting enough. Member Heilman concured.

Ms. Goldberg noted that they are recommending that roof signs, animated or flashing signs, wind blown devices, portable signs, pole signs and changeable copy signs except for some exclusions, not be allowed.

Councilmember Schulte wanted 2 additional signs be prohibited - Streamers, pennants and banners and off premise signs. He also questioned whether they are allowing any consideration of creativity.

Ms. Goldberg replied that they are looking at the maximum area allowed for signs, not a the design or configuration of the sign.

The City Attorney stated that the merchant could apply for a variance or could include a sign modification process that would be less formal.

SIGNAGE:
(Cont'd.)

Mr. Tescher brought up the issue of billboards and projecting signs and options:

1. establish zones within the city where billboards are permitted.
2. not allow billboards.

He suggested that the best position for the city at this time may be to prohibit billboards, giving the city some leverage in dealing with the owners of billboards presently in the city.

Originally considered the prohibition of projecting signs but developed a preliminary set of standards especially for pedestrian oriented environment. They should maintain an adequate height, have protection from the facade, and a maximum allowed square footage. The envelope in which the sign can occur.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: Mayor Terrigno asked about the neighborhood preservation zones. Mr. Tescher felt this would be part of the long term planning process but they would be bringing this item up at the meeting with the Council on July 25th.

Councilmember Schulte asked how they plan to address mixed use. Developing standards for mixed use will be discussed at the second community workshop.

Member Schulte also asked about protective areas for small businesses. Mr. Tescher informed them that there are various options: 1. Definition of community business zones, i.e., designating certain areas for community oriented business; 2. create an ordinance that restricts the kind of uses in a given area. Do we want to inter-mix uses in key entertainment districts, or do we want to create discrete districts?

Mayor Terrigno asked about the median strip and changes in traffic. Mr. Greer stated that this is an item under study for further report.

A recess was called at 2:45 P.M.
The meeting was reconvened at 3:12 P.M.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

ITEM 1:
Tract No. 37814: Removed from the consent calendar for separate discussion. Councilmember Heilman asked for correction of the date of extension to read, "March 1986".

ACTION: To grant the subdivider a time extension to March 19, 1986.

Motion Heilman seconded by Viterbi
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

ITEM 2:
Tract No. 41894: ACTION: That the street improvements be accepted and the Bond issued by Firemen's Fund Insurance Company in the amount of \$8,800 be released.

ITEM 3:
Status report on Sign Permit Ordinance: ACTION: To receive and file the report and set a Public Hearing for July 25, 1985.

ITEM 4:
Status Report on Issuance of Permits & Tract Maps: ACTION: To receive and file the status report on the issuance of permits and processing of Tract Maps and set a Public Hearing for July 25, 1985.

ITEM 5:
Sidewalk Ramps: ACTION: That the City Council authorize the installation of 3 handicapped ramps at the

ITEM 5: intersection of Westbourne and Melrose.
Ramps (Contd.)

ITEM 6: ACTION: To receive and file the report on the
Status Report on interim zoning ordinance and set a Public Hearing
Interim Zoning Ord: for July 25, 1985.

ITEM 7:
Keith Avenue: ACTION: That the City Council authorize the
acceptance of a deed for a ten foot strip on
Keith Avenue for street widening purposes.

The above actions Items 2-7, were all accomplished
with one motion to approve.
Motion Schulte seconded by Heilman
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

ITEM 8: The City Manager gave the staff report on the
Role of Council future role of Administrative Aide to the City
Aides: Council, with the recommendation that the
City Council designate the aides as Administrative
Aides in the City Manager or Administrative
Services Department and that we continue with
the existing arrangement through the end of the
fiscal year, at which time we transition
into the administrative aides and determine the
number of aides necessary at that time.

PROPOSED ACTION: The positions of 5 Council
Aides shall be permanent with review by the
Council in June of 1986. As permanent positions
the aides shall be administrative assistants,
assigned specifically to and supervised by
Councilmembers, but shall be coordinated on a
daily basis by the City Manager. The City
Manager shall return in 30 days with a recommend-
ation for appropriate salary level and job
descriptions. Offices for the Aides shall be
within the offices of Councilmembers.
Motion Schulte seconded by Albert.

Councilmember Heilman asked who hires the aides
and who supervises them. Member Schulte stated
that under the motion the hiring will be done
by the Councilperson but this is to be done in
conjunction with the City Manager and the day to
day coordination will be done by the City Manager.
What's important from the councilmembers stand-
point is to have the leeway to assign the work
and have the person specifically responsive to
them. On the other hand since the members are
not there in City Hall every day and the City
Manager is, it is important to have some direction,
delegation of tasks if necessary, maybe some
training for the Aides, but not the ability to
hire and fire which remains with the individual
councilmember. Since they will become permanent
employees they will remain after the tenure of
the councilmember is over.

Councilmember Viterbi felt the proposed action
is too vague. Member Schulte stated that they
were looking at not just a political appointment
but at a permanent job where the City Manager
does not have the ability to hire and fire, as
they are not directly his employees.

The City Manager informed the Council that if
the aides are hired as permanent classified
employees, they would be covered by the Skelley
rights which means they could not be fired by
anyone at will but could only be fired for non-
performance or malfeasance. If they are hired
as nonclassified employees they can then serve
at the will of the councilperson, and would not
be under the Skelley rights.

ITEM 8: Councilmember Viterbi requested that the
Council Aides: motion be seperated.
(Cont'd.)

PROPOSED ACTION: To bring back some guidelines to restrict certain of the functions of the Council Aides, to be adopted by the Council.
Motion Viterbi

Councilmember Schulte asked if he had to remake the motion. Mayor Terrigno asked if anyone objected to the motion being severed. There was no objection.

ACTION: The positions of 5 council aides shall be permanent with review by the Council in June of 1986.
Motion Schulte seconded by Albert.

Councilmember Heilman stated that he felt the people serving as Aides had all done a very good job but that both Fred Bien and Paul Brotzman have stated that from a managerial point of view, hiring full time Council Aides is not a good idea. It creates Management and supervisory problems; there are problems with the people in those positions as to what their role is. This question has not been resolved. There should be professional people on City staff that can meet the needs of the Council.

Councilmember Schulte stated that this is not a management question; it is a political question. It is the ability of part time Councilmembers to stay in touch with their constituents and to receive a wide view-point on the issues. Councilmember Viterbi pointed out the he felt it would cut down on their accessability to the public.

Councilmember Heilman stated that he felt that everyone agreed that the members should stay in touch with and responsive to their constituents but regular City staff could do the same job and work better with the system in City Hall.

Mayor Terrigno called for the vote on the motion on the floor.

AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Mayor Terrigno
NOES: Heilman

ACTION: The City Manager shall return in 30 days with recommendations for salary levels and job descriptions.

Motion Schulte seconded by Albert
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman,
Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None

PROPOSED ACTION: As permanent positions the Aides shall be Administrative Aides, assigned to and supervised by Councilmembers, that shall be coordinated by the City Manager.

Motion Schulte
Died for lack of a second

PROPOSED ACTION: That the Administrative Aides be part of the classified system.
Motion Heilman seconded by Albert

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: That the Aides be hired, fired and supervised by the Councilmembers; that they operate under guidelines recommended by the City Manager and adopted by the City Council.
Motion Viterbi seconded by Mayor Terrigno

Councilmember Heilman objected to the substitute

ITEM 8: motion as being the opposite of the main motion.
 Council Aides: The Council agreed to vote on his motion first
 (Cont'd.) and then, if need be, take up the substitute
 motion as a separate item.

AYES: Albert, Heilman

NOES: Schulte, Viterbi, Mayor Terrigno

ACTION: That the Aides be non-classified employees of the city; that they be eligible for all the same fringe benefits; that when the City Manager brings back a salary recommendation he also will bring back a salary structure and that they be hired and fired by the Councilmember but they be governed by very strict guidelines recommended by the City Manager to the City Council for adoption.

Motion Viterbi seconded by Mayor Terrigno

AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Mayor Terrigno

NOES: Heilman

Motion carried.

ITEM 21: MemberSchulte asked that this item be taken out
 Discrimination of order at this time as there was a person in
 against persons the audience who was present to speak to this
 with AIDS: issue. He stated that there have been a number
 of incidences that show the need for this ordinance.
 He requested that the City Attorney draft an
 urgency Ordinance for the meeting of August 1st.

Colleen Johnson from the AIDS Project L. A. spoke to the Council and cited examples of discrimination they are presently encountering: ie: dental care, skilled nursing care, home care, ambulance, housing programs, insurance, hotels, jobs and bars and restaurants.

At the end of Ms. Johnsons presentation, Councilmember Schulte asked her to return on August 1st and bring one of the Doctors from the project.

ITEM 9: The City Manager gave the staff report which
 Subcommittees: included the following recommendation:
 "That the City Council continue the standing subcommittees with the understanding that once permanent commissions have been established, the role of the subcommittee will be limited to those issues that are specifically referred by the City Council. That all subcommittee meetings will be open to the public, however, they will not serve as screening committees nor as public forums for issues that will come before the Council. The role of the subcommittee will be to gather information and research technical issues in order to provide the Council with background information and technical insight on policy issues under Council consideration."

PROPOSED ACTION: Approve the City Manager's recommendation striking "once permanent commissions have been established".

Motion Heilman seconded by Viterbi

The City Attorney recommended that the the second sentence be changed to "That all subcommittee meetings may be open to the public, instead of will be open to the public, thus making it possible for the sub-committees to meet with other jurisdictions for private meetings as well as public meetings that are not public forums.

Councilmember Viterbi stated that all committees must file a written report on any meeting to the Council within 2 weeks.

ITEM 9: PROPOSED ACTION: To amend the motion to read,
 Subcommittees: "Subcommittee meetings may be open to the
 (Cont'd.) public when authorized by the Council".
 Motion and second by consensus of the Council.
 AYES: Albert, Viterbi, Mayor Terrino
 NOES: Schulte, Heilman
 Motion carried.

The vote was then called on the main motion.
 AYES: Albert, Schulte, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
 NOES: Viterbi

ACTION: To reconsider the amendment
 Motion Albert seconded by Heilman
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered

ACTION: To remove the motion
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

ACTION: To approve the City Manager's
 recommendation striking "once permanent
 commissions have been established and changing
 will to may in the second sentence.
 Motion Heilman seconded by Schulte.
 AYES: Albert, Schulte, Heilman
 NOES: Viterbi, Mayor Terrigno
 Motion carried

The final adopted motion will now read:
 "That the City Council continue the standing
 subcommittees with the understanding that the
 role of the subcommittee will be limited to
 those issues that are specifically referred by
 the City Council. That all subcommittee meetings
 may be open to the public, however, they will
 not serve as screening committees nor as public
 forums for issues that will come before the
 Council. The role of the subcommittee will be
 to gather information and research technical
 issues in order to provide the Council with
 background information and technical insight on
 policy issues under Council consideration".

ITEM 10: ACTION: To table the request for the purchase
 W. H. Beautifi- of the median strip improvements to a later
 cation Corp: date and request that Mr. Green be present.
 Motion Viterbi seconded by Albert
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

ITEM 11: ACTION: All meetings to be held on Thursday
 Council Meeting evenings at 7 P.M.
 Schedule: Motion Heilman seconded by Mayor Terrigno
 Noting the objection of Member Viterbi it was
 so ordered.

There was some discussion of the location of
 the meetings. Due to the fact that the City
 Manager stated that the Council chambers in
 City Hall should be ready for use in about 1½
 months it was agreed to leave the locations as
 they are presently: 1st and 3rd Thursday at
 West Hollywood Park and 2nd and 4th Thursday at
 Fiesta Hall, Plummer Park.

ITEM 13: Ms. Stegman reported that 4.5 Transportation
 4.5 TDA Funds: Development Funds have been granted to the City
 and the City of Los Angeles to supplement the
 St. Barnabus Taxi Coupon program. The City
 needs to accept the funds and apply to the L.A.
 County Transportation Commission for the City
 of Los Angeles to administer the funds starting
 in October.

ACTION: To commit to the 4.5 TDA funds for 1
 year in cooperation with the City of Los Angeles
 and, hopefully make a re-assessment of the City's
 transportation needs within the next 24 months.

ITEM 13: Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
 4.5 TDA Funds: Hearing no objection it was so ordered.
 (Cont'd.)

ITEM 14: The City Manager reported that the Department
 Palm Ave. Widening of Public Works and the City Attorney have
 Tract 36370: notified the City that when the County granted
 Palm Garden Investments the permit to build an
 apartment building they included a condition of
 approval requiring the widening of Palm Avenue.
 Subsequently, Palm Garden Investments defaulted
 on the obligation and the City will need to
 put up an additional amount of \$4,400 as the
 bond the Company provided is for \$6,600 which
 will be inadequate to cover the full cost of
 the street widening. The City Council needs
 to decide whether to enforce this condition of
 approval, put up the extra money and file
 a lawsuit against Palm Garden Investments to
 recover the difference.

The Council entered into discussion over the
 advisability of widening the street and the
 need for the residents to have input into the
 decision.

ACTION: To set a Public Hearing in August
 on the Palm Avenue widening and notify all
 residents and property owners within 500 feet
 of the project and to have a representative
 from the Traffic Engineers Office present.
 Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

Jeanne Dobrin, 9000 Cynthia stated that the
 Council should be careful not to go beyond the
 Statute of Limitations and to look at the long
 goal, not just the short goal.

ITEM 15: Councilmember Schulte asked that this item be
 Sign Ordinance: tabled for two weeks.

A recess was called at 5:08 P.M.
 The meeting was reconvened at 5:26 P.M.

ITEM 16: The City Manager reported that this is an
 State Highway agreement for sharing costs of utilities between
 Electrical Cost: the City and State on a pro-rata basis on the
 State Highway system in the City of West Hollywood.
 The Fiscal impact is estimated at \$31,000.

ACTION: To adopt Resolution No. 79 and execute
 the agreement.
 Motion Schulte seconded by Heilman
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

ITEM 17: The City Manager reported that we had received
 One way traffic petitions requesting that Willey Lane be con-
 Willey Lane: verted to one-way traffic operation, northbound
 from Santa Monica Blvd. to Keith Avenue.

ACTION: To authorize the City Manager to set
 up a Public hearing in August.
 Motion Heilman seconded by Albert
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

FURTHER ACTION: That the City Manager come
 back to the Council with guidelines for petitions.
 Motion Heilman seconded by Schulte
 Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

ITEM 18: The City Manager reported that the General
 Loading zone Manager of the Sports Connection, 8612 Santa
 Sports Connec- Monica Blvd., has requested that the regulated
 tion: hours of the existing commercial loading zone
 be extended from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. to 7 a.m. to
 10 p.m..

ITEM 18:
Loading Zone
Sports Connection (Cont'd.):

PROPOSED ACTION: The City Manager to bring back a process within the next 3 months in which businesses requiring these types of services pay the cost.
Motion Viterbi seconded by Mayor Terrigno

PROPOSED ACTION: To extend the hours of the loading zone to 10 p.m..
Motion Schulte seconded by Viterbi

Jeanne Dobrin, 9000 Cynthia addressed the Council and pointed out that the applicant is now under investigation by the Planning Department on the basis of violations of their CUP. One of these violations is on overcharging for the parking. She requested that this decision wait for adjudication of the violations.

ACTION: To table this item for a report from the Planning Department and the traffic engineer.
Motion Heilman seconded by Mayor Terrigno
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

Frank Dernhammer who lives behind the Sports Connection, stated that the residents have constant problems with this business due to lack of parking. They have 122 parking places and 3,000 members.

Mr. Herbert Schockner, 8617 Rugby Drive spoke to the same issue.

Councilmember Heilman stated that he had spoken to the Manager of the Sports Connection and they are investigating the feasibility of a parking structure. In the meantime the Council can look at the idea of Permit Parking.

Mayor Terrigno requested that the residents be notified when this item comes back to the Council.

Ron Shipton, 8718 Rosewood, stated that he felt the Council should approve the loading zone just for the public safety factor, as people are double parking just to pick up people or drop people off.

ITEM 19:
Red Curb,
Sweetzer and
Romaine St.:

The City Manager reported that the Sheriff's have requested a red curb at the fire hydrant on the west side of Sweetzer Avenue at Romaine Street.

ACTION: To authorize the installation of 22 feet of red curb on the west side of Sweetzer Avenue from 16 feet to 38 feet north of Romaine.
Motion Albert seconded by Schulte
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

Councilmember Viterbi stated that it is cheaper if you do all curbs at the same time and requested a staff report in October on all these needs.

ITEM 20:
Anti-graffiti
measures:

Councilmember Viterbi reported that he has been investigating graffiti removal programs and has found that the best program is run by a company called Graffiti Removal.

ACTION: To have the City Manager solicit a proposal from Graffiti Removal.
Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman,
Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None
Motion carried.

ITEM 22:

Code Enforcement: The City Manager reported that, at Council

- ITEM 22: direction, City staff had been exploring steps that could be taken to augment code enforcement in the City. The most practical option at the present time would be to contract with the private sector while proceeding to hire in-house staff.
- Code Enforcement (Cont'd.):
- ACTION: To authorize the City Manager to purchase up to 24 hours of Code Enforcement staff from WillDan and Associates, for up to a maximum of six months, with a monthly report from the City Manager.
- Motion Schulte seconded by Mayor Terrigno
- AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
- NOES: None
- Motion carried.
- ITEM 12 & 24: Adam Moos reported that staff recommends that the City Council adopt the registration form, a maximum 1985-86 budget of \$1,153,400, a registration fee, a fee waiver and rebate policy and the table of organization.
- Rent Control;
- Registration
- 1985-86 Budget
- Fee Waiver
- Table of Org:
- ACTION: To approve the registration form, the budget, a registration fee of \$48 per unit per year, a fee waiver policy that two owner occupants with 50% ownership interest each, to a maximum of two registration fees waived per building and a fee rebate policy for low income seniors and disabled.
- Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
- AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
- NOES: None
- FURTHER ACTION: To approve the Table of Organization chart with a straight line between the City Attorney and the general counsel instead of a slanted line.
- Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
- AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Mayor Terrigno
- NOES: Heilman
- Motion carried.
- PROPOSED ACTION: To set the first general adjustment rate at 3.5%.
- Motion Schulte seconded by Albert
- On the advice of the City Attorney this action was held for discussion under Item 26.
- ITEM 26: The City Attorney reported that Ordinance No. 59 is before the Council tonight for adoption.
- Rent Control
- Ordinance No. 59:
- PROPOSED ACTION: To waive further reading and adopt.
- Motion Viterbi seconded by Heilman
- The Mayor inquired what the procedure would be to change the ordinance at this time.
- The City Attorney stated that they would need to move to amend a provision in the ordinance and if that motion prevailed they would then have to reintroduce the ordinance and it would have to come back to the Council next week for second reading and would take effect 30 days later. That would not however, have any effect on the urgency ordinance that was adopted 2 weeks ago, and they would have to have the City Attorney bring back the urgency ordinance, making that same amendment, making it consistent with the ordinance being amended tonight.
- PROPOSED ACTION: To amend section 4409, subsection a of the ordinance to read, "increased by 3.5%.
- Motion Schulte seconded by Albert

- ITEM 26: Ordinance No. 59 (Cont'd.): After discussion by the Council, with the Mayor stating that she would support the motion if the percent were changed to 3% and Councilmembers Heilman and Viterbi both stating that they felt it would not be right to make major changes at this point, after all the lengthy hearings, without the people having a chance to speak.
- ACTION: To amend the motion to read 3% instead of 3.5%.
Accepted by the maker and second of the motion.
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
NOES: Viterbi
- FURTHER ACTION: To waive further reading and introduce on first reading, Ordinance 59 as amended.
Motion Albert seconded by Schulte
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
NOES: Viterbi
- FURTHER ACTION: To adopt Ordinance 59U with the same amendment and to waive further reading.
Motion Mayor Terrigno seconded by Schulte
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
NOES: Viterbi
- ITEM 23: Resolution #86 Property Tax Allocation: ACTION: To adopt Resolution No. 86 "A resolution of the City Council of the City of West Hollywood in support of SB 1091".
Motion Heilman seconded by Schulte
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.
- ITEM 25: Fencing Vacant Lots: Ord. No. 63: The City Attorney read the title.
ACTION: To waive further reading and adopt Ordinance No. 63, "An ordinance of the City of West Hollywood requiring financing of certain vacant lots and amending the West Hollywood Municipal Code".
Motion Schulte seconded by Albert
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None
Motion carried
- ITEM 27: Business License Hearings: Ord. No. 62: The City Attorney read the title.
ACTION: To waive further reading and adopt Ordinance No. 63, "An ordinance of the City of West Hollywood concerning notice requirements for business license hearings and amending the West Hollywood Municipal Code".
Motion Schulte seconded by Heilman
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None
Motion carried.
- ITEM 28: Outdoor display Ord. No. 61: The City Attorney read the title.
ACTION: To table for one week and read Ordinance No. 61, "An ordinance of the City of West Hollywood repealing section 2 of Ordinance 28U relating to outdoor displays".
Motion Schulte seconded by Viterbi
Noting the objection of Heilman it was so ordered.
- ITEM 29: Transient Occupancy Tax, Ord. No. 65: The City Attorney read the title.
ACTION: To waive further reading and introduce on first reading, Ordinance No. 65, "An ordinance of the City of West Hollywood relating to the transient occupancy tax and amending the West Hollywood Municipal Code.
Motion Schulte seconded by Heilman

ITEM 29: AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman,
(Cont'd.) Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None
Motion carried.

ITEM 30: The City Attorney read the title.
Parking for
Schools, Ord. ACTION: To waive further reading and adopt
No. 66 & 66U: Ordinance No. 66U, "An ordinance of the City
of West Hollywood amending the interim zoning
Ordinance regarding parking for schools and
amending the West Hollywood Municipal Code and
declaring the urgency thereof".
Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman,
Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None
Motion carried

ACTION: To waive further reading and introduce
Ordinance No. 66 on first reading.
Motion Viterbi seconded by Schulte
AYES: Albert, Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman,
Mayor Terrigno.
NOES: None
Motion carried.

ITEM 31: Resolution #84: ACTION: To adopt Resolution No. 84, "A resolution
of the City of West Hollywood amending resolutin
No. 81 and Demand Register No. fifteen.
Motion Albert seconded by Schulte
Hearing no objection it was so ordered.

The Council requested that in the future if there
is an amending resolution, the original resolution
being amended be included in the information in
their packet.

ITEM 32: Resolution #85
Demand Reg. #16: ACTION: To adopt Resolution No. 85, "A resolution
of the City Council of the City of West Hollywood
allowing and approving for payment demands pre-
sented on Demand Register No. sixteen".
Motion Schulte seconded by Heilman
AYES: Schulte, Viterbi, Heilman, Mayor Terrigno
NOES: None
ABSENT: Councilmember Albert left the meeting
at 6:50 P.M..

The City Council adjourned to a personnel session
at 6:55 P.M.

The meeting was reconvened at 6:58 P.M. Mayor
Terrigno announced that they had met on items
concerning personnel.

ITEM 33: Communications: The City Manager distributed the tentative
agendas for July 18, and July 25; please
add on a litigation session on the median
strip to the meeting of July 25th. He
requested that the Council allow these agendas
to be closed except for emergency items.

The City Hall reception will be held on the
25th. An invitation list has been prepared and
would like the Council to supplement. Anticipate
that over 200 people will attend. The City
Council discussed advertizing in the press as an
open house.

ACTION: That the only invitations issued
would be to elected officials, contract agencies
and staff.
Motion Mayor Terrigno seconded by Heilman
Noting the opposition of Heilman and the absence
of Albert it was so ordered.
Motion carried.

ITEM 33:
Communications
(Cont'd.):

The City Manager announced that the facilitator for the team building workshop will be in City Hall on July 25th and would like to set interviews with the Councilpersons on that day.

The City Manager reported that there were 4 oral boards coming up for Department Heads. Wants each Councilmember to name at least 2 persons who can sit on these boards and get them to him by tomorrow. It was decided that each member would select 2 names and the City Manager would then make a random selection for each board.

Councilmember Schulte reminded the members that he only had 2 appointments to the 5-10K run and the committee needs the other 3.

Mayor Terrigno requested that the Council receive information next week on the contracts that come due in July.

Joan Wolpert, Spaulding and Willoughby addressed the Council concerning the City installing sign boards or public kiosks for posting notices on; a massive PR campaign to get one zip code for the City; and a traffic survey for her corner due to the traffic and number of accidents there.

Ira Stein questioned the Council about the City repealing the religious non-discrimination Ordinance and if they were going to cancel the Envicom contract due to a conflict of interest. The City Attorney stated that he had just received the materials and had not had a chance to study them.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Terrigno adjourned the meeting at 7:27 P.M., to a meeting on July 18, 6 P.M., at West Hollywood Park.