

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

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

11 DATE OF MEETING: November 16, 2023

12 PLANNING COMMISSION:	STAFF:
13 Rogerio Carvalheiro, Chair	Roger Rath, Associate Planner
14 Michael A. Lombardi, Vice-Chair	Jennifer Alkire, CAHPPM
15 Kimberly Copeland, Commissioner	Jerry Hittleman, SR. Contract
	16 Pl.
17 Mark R. Edwards, Commissioner	Isaac Rosen, Legal Council
18 David Gregoire, Commissioner	David Gillig, Comm. Secretary
19 Erick J. Matos, Commissioner	

20 Consultants:

21 And Public Speakers.

22
23
24

25 **Planning Commission Meeting**

26 **Thursday, November 16, 2023**

27 **Carvalheiro:** Hello, everyone. I'll start with our land
28 acknowledgment tonight. The West Hollywood Planning
29 Commission acknowledges that the land on which we
30 gather and that is currently known as the City of
31 West Hollywood is the occupied, unceded, seized
32 territory of the Gabrieleño Tongva and Gabrieleño
33 Kizh peoples. This Planning Commission meeting is
34 being live broadcast and teleconferenced on the
35 City's website and as a courtesy, this meeting is
36 also available on the City's YouTube channel at
37 [YouTube.com/wehotv](https://www.youtube.com/wehotv) and on Roku, Apple TV, Fire TV,
38 and Android TV. You may call in to make a comment
39 and you may also listen to this meeting by dialing
40 669-900-6833. Again, that's 669-900-6833 with the
41 meeting ID: 82114675792. Again, that's 82114675792,
42 and then press the pound sign. I will now
43 officially call this...this meeting of the West
44 Hollywood Planning Commission to order. It is 6:33
45 and we have a pledge of allegiance and Vice-Chair
46 Lombardi's going to lead us on that.

47 **Lombardi:** Thank you.

48 **Carvalheiro:** Thank you.

49 Lombardi: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United
50 States of America and to the Republic for which it
51 stands, one Nation under God, indivisible with
52 liberty and justice for all.

53 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Roll call, David?

54 Gillig: Good evening Commissioners. Tonight, Commissioner
55 Jones is absent so the record...digital voting record
56 will reflect that on all votes. Commissioner Matos?

57 Matos: Present.

58 Gillig: Commissioner Gregoire?

59 Gregoire: Here..

60 Gillig: Commissioner Edwards?

61 Edwards: Here.

62 Gillig: Commissioner Copeland?

63 Copeland: Here.

64 Gillig: Vice-Chair Lombardi?

65 Lombardi: Present.

66 Gillig: Chair Carvalheiro?

67 Carvalheiro: Here.

68 Gillig: And we have a quorum.

69 Carvalheiro: Thank you. So, Approval of the agenda. Do I have
70 any changes to the agenda tonight?

71 Gregoire: I move approval.

72 Carvalheiro: Do I have a second?

73 Edwards: Second.

74 Carvalheiro: Thank you. David?

75 Gillig: Motioned by Commissioner Gregoire. I'm sorry, who
76 made the second? Thank you. Seconded by
77 Commissioner Edwards. And the agenda is approved
78 for November 16th, 2023, as presented, noting
79 Commissioner Jones absent.

80 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Approval of the minutes from October 19,
81 2023. Do I have any comments or changes on those
82 minutes?

83 Matos: I'll move approval.

84 Gregoire: I will second.

85 Carvalheiro: Thank you.

86 Gillig: Motioned by Commissioner Matos, seconded by
87 Commissioner Gregoire. And the motions passes
88 approving the minutes for October 19th, 2023, as
89 presented and noting Commissioner Jones absent.

90 Carvalheiro: Thank you. David, do we have any public comments at
91 this time? And this time is set aside for those
92 items that are not up on the public hearing
93 tonight.

94 Gillig: We do chair. Before...okay, there is...we...if there is
95 anybody on the Zoom platform that would like to
96 make a general public comment, please star nine for

97 me at this time. I do have a couple people in
98 chambers here that would like to make a comment
99 regarding the consent calendar item, which was just
100 approved. And they have that...the right to do that.
101 So, our first public speaker will be Andrew
102 Soloman. He will be followed by George Nickles.
103 Soloman: Hi, good evening commissioners. Good to see you
104 tonight. I just wanted to...it's on the consent
105 calendar. So, for the record, I just wanted to, to
106 voice my opposition to the, the standards for the,
107 the tree canopy. The language that was still
108 included in the...in the actual resolution about what
109 constitutes a hardship says that designing a new
110 structure around a mature tree because it's...because
111 it is an inconvenience does not necessarily
112 constitute a hardship. I just think for a builder
113 one day to come in, and they bought, you know, two
114 lots that are upzoned and they want to replace
115 those two single-family lots with a lot more units,
116 a lot more houses, a lot more people, and there is
117 a big tree in a backyard, just because it makes
118 it...this language says that just because it makes it
119 a lot more difficult does not constitute a
120 hardship. I, I think that that is an impractical

121 standards in real life. That is a hardship. That it
122 does make it a lot more expensive, a lot more
123 difficult to build, and I think it makes it tougher
124 for us to meet our housing goals and housing
125 standards. So, thanks for your time tonight.

126 Gillig: Thank you, Andrew. Our next and final speaker in
127 chambers will be George Nickles.

128 Nickle: Hi, George Nickle, 19-year resident of West
129 Hollywood. I wanted to speak tonight in favor of
130 the piece that was just on the consent calendar,
131 the tree canopy standards. When I moved here 19
132 years ago, one of the reasons why I moved is
133 because in front of my house there is a big,
134 gorgeous magnolia tree and it shades us. And at one
135 point, the city trimmed it back and that summer our
136 electric bill went up. It was a lot more expensive
137 to cool our house because when the tree was at its
138 full height, it cooled our home naturally. So, the
139 Staff Report had mentioned all of the things that
140 trees do for the environment, and we're all worried
141 about having a, a world that is worth living in. It
142 can sequester carbon. Trees shade us. Trees can
143 lock the soil down so that there's less water
144 runoff and quick rains. So, I'm glad that you

145 passed this, and I would just urge you to always
146 vote for trees, vote for green spaces, and vote for
147 all the lovely things that make this a good place
148 to live in, and you'll always be on the right side
149 of things. Thank you.

150 Gillig: Thank you, George. Chair, I believe that is our
151 last public speaker in chambers. We have no public
152 speakers on the Zoom platform. We are clear.

153 Carvalheiro: Okay, thank you. Director's Report?

154 Gillig: Chair, I'm sorry, we have one more public comment
155 for this item.

156 Carvalheiro: Okay.

157 Gillig: Aaron Green.

158 Carvalheiro: Good evening, Chair, members of the commissions.
159 Aaron Green. Wanted to briefly comment. I did
160 submit a letter on this item. I appreciate the work
161 that the commission did at this last hearing and I
162 think that there were some important changes that
163 were made. I would note two quick things...or
164 actually, three. First, while you have adopted the
165 agenda tonight, you have not approved this item,
166 and you're not required to approve this item should
167 you choose not to or if as a commission you decide
168 that more work does need to be done. The...there are

169 a number of concerns that our clients have, but I
170 think perhaps the most pressing is the fact that
171 this ordinance...or I should say the draft's ZTA
172 still lacks specificity in several areas. The
173 commission made it clear during the last
174 commiss...during the last meeting that it did not
175 want this proposal to get in the way of the
176 construction of housing or educational institutions
177 or other vital pieces of the future of the City of
178 West Hollywood. Yet the language that was inserted
179 by staff subsequent to the last hearing provides a
180 lot of ambiguity. It says, for example, that "If
181 it's infeasible to build around a tree, then you
182 can apply to relocate it. But what's the definition
183 of infeasible? Or, for example, "If it's required
184 that one relocate it..." But there's no definition of
185 what is necessary for a relocation. And so, what
186 does that mean? That means that unless the planners
187 that are looking at this in the future watch the
188 two-hour hearing that you all had last month about
189 what your intent is, they don't know what your
190 intent is because it's not in the ordinance. It's
191 very vague and that makes it subjective. And the
192 entire purpose that...and the entire reason that

193 staff said that they brought this to you was to
194 create objective standards. But there are no
195 objective standards for when to pre...to preserve
196 trees in certain locations when it comes to
197 development, when it comes to housing, public
198 facilities, educational institutions, and when you
199 should remove or relocate those trees. So, the
200 effect if you approve the language this evening is
201 that when it goes to a planner's...when a...an
202 application lands on a planner's desk after the
203 submittal of an application, I'm going to decide
204 what I think is infeasible, you're going to decide
205 what you think is infeasible, and you're going to
206 decide what you think is infeasible, and that's the
207 way that this ordinance will be executed. And
208 that's a very I think unintended, and it would be
209 an unfortunate consequence. And so, I would
210 encourage the commission to continue to look at
211 this. Thank you very much.

212 Gillig: Thank you, Aaron. And, Chair, that is our last
213 public speaker.

214 Carvalheiro: Thank you.

215 Gillig: And apologies for that.

216 Carvalheiro: No issue. Item Seven, Director's Report.

217 Maricich: Good evening, Chair Carvalheiro, Vice-Chair
218 Lombardi, and Planning Commissioners. Nick
219 Maricich, Director of Community Development, and
220 it's been just about two months since I've started
221 here in this role with the City of West Hollywood.
222 So, it's great to be with you again this evening.
223 This past Monday was my first Director's Hearing
224 and we did have an item 9045 Nemo Street. It was a
225 request for late-night alcohol service on the patio
226 of a new restaurant, and that item was approved.
227 Next week on November 20th, the city council will
228 be hearing a report on the small business
229 initiative's implementation plan, which was
230 prepared in response to a series of recommended
231 initiatives by the West Hollywood Chamber of
232 Commerce as well as prior council directives. And I
233 just wanted to highlight that because some of those
234 items may be coming to the Planning Commission at a
235 future date. So, we'll be happy to report back on
236 the council's action at the next Planning
237 Commission meeting. And then finally, I wanted to
238 announce for everyone that the Long-Range Planning
239 Division will be hosting a mobility pop-up to take
240 place on Monday, November 27th between 5:00 and

241 7:00 PM. And this event is going to take place
242 along Santa Monica Boulevard in the westbound
243 direction at Hilldale, and in the eastbound
244 direction at San Vicente. This event is a
245 partnership between the city and the West Hollywood
246 Bicycle Coalition to share information and
247 opportunities for public input on mobility projects
248 that are underway in the city. And we'll also be
249 encouraging safe cycling by helping bi...bicyclists
250 light the way and be more visible during nighttime
251 riding. So, there will be a distribution of free
252 bike lights to those who show up to the event and
253 bring their bicycles with them. Those will be given
254 out on a first come, first serve basis, and
255 supplies are limited. There will also be
256 information available about several mobility
257 projects underway in the city and opportunities to
258 give public input on those. Those include the
259 city's ongoing dockless mobility and autonomous
260 delivery programs, transit services such as the
261 city line, and the pickup, and new bike ways being
262 designed concurrent with two related planning
263 initiatives, which is Fountain Avenue, and the
264 Willoughby, Vista/Gardner Corridors. The city is

265 also developing its new target Vision Zero Action
266 Plan as well as a Metro K-Line North First/Last
267 Mile Plan. And those are...will include
268 recommendations to improve bicycle and pedestrian
269 safety and access. So, residents, employees,
270 visitors, and stakeholders are all encouraged to
271 stop by the mobility pop-up. Again, it's Monday,
272 November 27th between 5:00 and 7:00 PM on Santa
273 Monica Boulevard. To learn more about these
274 projects you can also visit weho.org/mobility for
275 additional information. That concludes my report
276 for this evening and I'm available for any
277 questions. Thank you.

278 Carvalheiro: Great. Thank you. Do we have any questions for our
279 director? No? Thank you. Okay, that brings us to
280 Item Eight, our consent calendar. Do I have any
281 comments on our consent calendar? No?

282 Lombardi: Does this require a motion?

283 Carvalheiro: Does this require a motion?

284 Rosen: Yes, we would take a first and a second.

285 Carvalheiro: Okay.

286 Lombardi: And then...

287 Carvalheiro: I feel like this text amendment...zone text amendment
288 does need a little bit more clarification and I

289 would like to drop it to consent if we can. So, I'd
290 like to make a motion to remove it from consent.

291 Rosen: So, Chair, the...to remove it from consent if it
292 requires sort of further substrative edits or
293 things of that nature, we would recommend it be re-
294 noticed as a public hearing so that the public has
295 the opportunity to show up and appear if there are
296 going to be substrative changes to the, the
297 ordinance versus what was approved at the least
298 meeting, which is on consent this evening.

299 Carvalheiro: So, are we allowed to discuss it generally in terms
300 of the comments?

301 Rosen: The purpose of the consent item is really to ensure
302 it captures the motion that was made and approved
303 at the last Planning Commission. If there is a
304 desire from the commission to sort of discuss it
305 generally or consider sort of clarifications or
306 amendments to the language of the Zone Text
307 Amendment, the city would sort of re-notice that as
308 a public hearing so the public had the opportunity
309 to weigh into the extent there's a discussion or
310 potential additional changes.

311 Carvalheiro: Okay. Great. Thank you. So, Vice-Chair Lombardi, do
312 you feel like the comments reflect...the notes

313 reflect all the comments that were made at the last
314 commission meeting?

315 Lombardi: I, I do personally. Yes.

316 Carvalheiro: Okay. Then we'll leave the consent item as is.

317 Rosen: Sure. So, I think the, the commission has two
318 options. You can approve and, and both would
319 require a motion, a second, and then a full vote.

320 So you can approve what is on consent, which is
321 meant to reflect the vote that was taken and the
322 motion approved at the last meeting. Or

323 alternatively, there could be a motion to pull it
324 and to re-notice it as a public hearing to discuss
325 the substance and make further amendments.

326 Carvalheiro: Can you go over the first option again?

327 Rosen: Sure. The first option would be to approve the
328 consent calendar item, which reflects the changes
329 that were made to the draft Zone Text Amendment at
330 the last meeting.

331 Carvalheiro: Okay.

332 Rosen: And doing so would send that up to city council for
333 public hearings associated with their consideration
334 of that Zone Text Amendment.

335 Carvalheiro: Okay. Then I'll make a motion to approve...approve
336 the Zone Text Amendment with the inclusion of all

337 the comments that were made at our last commission
338 meeting. Do I have a second?

339 Lombardi: I will second.

340 Carvalheiro: David?

341 Gillig: Motion by Chair Carvalheiro, seconded by Vice-Chair
342 Lombardi. And the motions passes, noting
343 Commissioner Jones absent on this vote. There is no
344 appeal process. This is a recommendation going
345 towards...forward to City Council.

346 Carvalheiro: Thank you, David. So that brings us to our first
347 public hearing, Item 9A. So, this project is
348 subject to the Housing Accountability Act. The
349 commission has been asked to consider a request to
350 construct a 7-story, 89-unit, 100 percent
351 affordable multi-family residential building over 3
352 levels of subterranean parking located at 910
353 through 916 North Wetherly Drive. And I believe
354 Roger Rath has a Staff Report for us tonight.

355 Rath: Yes. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair and
356 commissioners. My name is Roger Rath, and I am one
357 of the associate planners for the Current and
358 Historic Preservation Planning Team. As stated
359 earlier, the request is for the demolition of all
360 existing structures on the subject property, a lot

361 merge of three abutting parcels, and the
362 construction of a new, 7-story, 89-unit, 100
363 percent affordable multi-family building. The
364 subject property spans three parcels, 1916
365 Wetherly, 914 Wetherly, and 910 Wetherly that would
366 be merged to...through a lot tie. The subject
367 property is located north of Cynthia Street on
368 Wetherly Drive and is adjacent to a designated
369 culture resource at 9025 Cynthia Street. The
370 designated culture resource is First Baptist Church
371 of Beverly Hills. This image is the existing
372 conditions of the subject property, 916 Wetherly is
373 currently developed as a surface parking lot. Both
374 914 Wetherly and 910 Wetherly is currently
375 developed with a single-family dwelling. Part of
376 the project proposal is to demolish all existing
377 structures on this site. The subject properties
378 were reviewed for potential historic or cultural
379 significance through two H...Historic re...Resource
380 Assessments that were verified by city staff,
381 Chattel Inc, the city's on-call preservation
382 consultant, and GPA Consulting, all concluding that
383 the existing properties are not eligible for
384 listing as a historical resource under local,

385 state, or national criteria. This image shows the
386 proposed building. The building is 7 stories tall
387 with 89 residential units with a contemporary
388 design. This is a 100 percent affordable housing as
389 defined by the West Hollywood Municipal Code. The
390 code definition is that all units are 100 percent
391 affordable with up to 20 percent of the unit for
392 moderate-income households and the remainder of the
393 units are for very low and low-income units, except
394 for the manager's unit. Specifically, this project
395 provides one manager unit, two units for moderate-
396 income households, and the remaining 86 units are
397 for very low and low-income households. Affordable
398 housing ensures that people or families with lower
399 income can afford to live in this development,
400 aligning with the City's dedication to addressing
401 housing need for a wide range of residents. The
402 project includes 62 studio units, 20 one-bedroom
403 units, 6 two-bedroom units, and 1 three-bedroom
404 unit. There are transom windows included in these
405 units that enhances cross breeze and lighting
406 within the units. The materiality of the building
407 includes corrugated metal panels, fiber re-enforced
408 cementitious panel with a wood texture, perforated

409 metal railing and screens, and aluminum window
410 frames. The creative design strategies, including
411 changes in material, stepping in reassessing planes
412 and volumes, architectural projections, and shading
413 devices all aid in reducing some of the visual
414 impacts that could arise in the building's form.
415 The Design Review Sub-Committee Meeting reviewed
416 and co...commented on the design on March 23rd, 2023.
417 Discussion for the meeting included configuration
418 to common and an open...private open space, unit
419 configuration, laundry facilities, and
420 materiali...materiality and design. Commissioner
421 Lombardi was at the meeting and could provide more
422 clarity to the design comments. The proposed
423 building is set back nine feet from the side
424 property line. The church is approximately three
425 feet away from the side property line. In total,
426 there is about 12 feet between the side elevation
427 and the church. On April 24th, 2023, the Historic
428 Preservation Commission reviewed and commented on
429 the project to determine whether there is a
430 potential for a new project to create a substantial
431 adverse change to significance of the resource.
432 Because there is no physical demolition,

433 destruction, or alteration of the First Baptist
434 Church of Beverly Hills, there is nothing that
435 would affect the inclusion of the church as a
436 local, cultural resource. However, the commission
437 has provided comments regarding a setback between
438 the property and the church that suggested that the
439 shadow would be casted on the church stain glass
440 that faces north would affect the church's
441 historical significance. Since that meeting, the
442 applicant has reduced the number of balconies on
443 this elevation. The seventh floor includes a
444 community room, two offices, a laundry room, the
445 manager's unit, and a rooftop deck. The rooftop
446 deck includes a barbeque dining area, a lounge, a
447 communi...a community garden area, and a work cabana.
448 The hours of operation for the roof deck has been
449 conditioned in the draft resolution as Condition
450 15.1 and 15.2, which requires the rooftop deck
451 operations to comply with the city's noise
452 ordinance and limit the hours of operation within
453 the rooftop deck to 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM. The image
454 in this slide was the primary entrance when
455 reviewed by Design Review Subcommittee in March of
456 this year. The main entrance to the second-floor

457 courtyard was originally accessed from the first
458 floor through a large stairway that is shaded with
459 a large second-floor eyebrow canopy identified here
460 with my mouse. In response to the Design Review
461 Subcommittee comments, the applicant has revised
462 the primary entrance creating additional open space
463 on the second floor by reorganizing how the second
464 floor is accessed and reconfiguration of the ground
465 floor for different uses. So, the subject property
466 is located in the Fall Precaution One zone, FP1 for
467 short. The Fall Precaution Zone Map is based on the
468 state's Alquist-Priolo Earthquake's Fault Zone Map
469 that intends to ensure public safety by prohibiting
470 structures for human occupancy unless a site-
471 specific geological...geologic investigation called a
472 Fault Rupture Investigation demonstrates that the
473 proposed development will not be constructed within
474 50 feet of an active fault. The Fault Rupture
475 Investigation was reviewed and provisionally
476 approved by the city's contract...contracted
477 geologist, which was provided as Exhibit F in the
478 Staff Report. For code and state law requirements,
479 the building is set back 50 feet from the the fault
480 line based on the study. So, in accordance with the

481 West Hollywood Municipal Code and the State Density
482 Bonus Laws, projects with 100 percent affordable
483 housing are eligible for a density bonus, an
484 additional 3 stories, or 33 feet in additional
485 height, and reduced parking requirements. These
486 specific bonuses are not discretionary. As such,
487 the applicant is providing 89 units, a bonus
488 density of 72 additional units, the project has an
489 additional 3 stories, and although no parking is
490 required the applicant has provided 62 parking
491 spaces on site. Part of the affordable housing
492 incentives, the applicant may apply for four
493 concessions as long as the concessions result in
494 identifiable and actual cost reductions,
495 it does not have specific adverse impact upon
496 public health and safety or designated cultural
497 resources. The applicant has requested four
498 concessions. One, to eliminate the additional six-
499 foot setback for the second and upper stories in
500 addition to the front yard setback. Two, a
501 reduction of twenty-six percent to the common and
502 private open space. Three, relocation of
503 the required common open space from the first floor
504 to the second floor. And four, providing non-

505 residential parking for the church use. For each
506 concession, the applicant has highlighted the cost
507 reduction, which is consistent with the municipal
508 code and state law. The project requests three
509 modifications. Two modifications for a ten percent
510 or a one-foot reduction to each side yard setback,
511 and a 10 percent or a one-foot six-inches reduction
512 to the rear yard setback. Unlike the affordable
513 housing incentive, this is discretionary. The
514 commission may approve the modification if it is
515 determined that the request will not have a
516 significant impact on adjacent properties and a
517 hardship exists. It is important to clarify that
518 the modification request is not a variance. The
519 modification is temperate...is a temperate set
520 flexibility provided by the code that doesn't rise
521 to the same findings as a variance as there is a
522 higher bar for a variance. The code provides a
523 flexibility of a modification to development
524 standards to account for things like required
525 dimensions by the building code that are standard.
526 Such as doors, windows, room dimensions, etcetera,
527 and other conditions that may restrict a
528 development footprint such as a fault line setback.

529 As such, the hardship for this side yard setback
530 reduction comes from the required fault line
531 setback which prevents a portion of the ground
532 floor to be developed. The hardship for the rear
533 yard setback reduction comes from the granting of a
534 permanent eight-foot easement to reconfigure the
535 public right away along the entire property
536 frontage. Therefore, the buildable area is
537 restricted, and the development of the building is
538 required to be pushed back. Additionally, because
539 the side of slope, the applicant stated that
540 another hardship is that the development will
541 require more shoring, retaining walls, and
542 infrastructure to accommodate the land's height
543 differential seeing as each side yard modification
544 results in just a one-foot reduction, and the rear
545 yard modification results in a one-foot six-inch
546 reduction. Staff used the reduction as minimal
547 difference. The project will still be all
548 requirements by all the other departments, such as
549 the fire department. The modification will not have
550 a significant impact on the neighboring properties.
551 While the modifications requests are discretionary,
552 they provide critical flexibility to allow the

553 density requested in this project. Elimination of
554 the 10 percent reduction of the side and rear yard
555 setbacks would have impact on a design of the
556 project and a number of units being proposed.
557 Indicated with the blue lines are the setback for
558 the modified 10 percent reduction. The red line
559 indicates the building façade on all four sides.
560 The purple box on the side pan indicates the
561 sidewalk dedication. The required front yard
562 setback is measured from the property line. So,
563 despite the dedication, the building could be
564 potentially built against the dedication line. But
565 staff strongly supports the increased setback in
566 the front because it maintains consistency of the
567 street wall. The orange line indicates the 50-foot
568 fault line setback. The red outline makes it easier
569 to see that the ground floor of the building and
570 subterranean levels are outside the fault line
571 setback area even with the additional one-foot
572 modification to the side yard setbacks. So, the
573 project aligns with California's housing goal in
574 that the project furthers the Regional Housing
575 Needs Assessment Goal of 3,933 Units, which is
576 divided into 4 income levels: 1066 units for very

577 low-income households, 689 units for low-income
578 households, 682 units for moderate-income
579 households, and 1496 units for above moderate-
580 income households. Specifically, this project will
581 provide 88 units which will reduce the, the
582 Hou...Regional Housing Needs Assessment for very low-
583 income households by 39 units, low-income units by
584 47 units, and moderate-income units by 2. The
585 property will be deed restricted to ensure that the
586 units are available for low-income household for at
587 least 55 years. The project addresses diverse
588 housing needs, especially for lower-income
589 households. This goal is also identified in a
590 general plan. The Housing Accountability Act and
591 State Density Bonus Laws limit the ability to deny
592 or require changes to the project in respect to the
593 number of units, height of the building, the
594 parking count, the use of the parking by the
595 neighboring church, the additional six-foot setback
596 in the front of the building above the first floor,
597 the total amount of open space provided in the
598 building, and the location of common open space.
599 Where the commission has the discretion is within
600 the modification requests to the side yard setback

601 and the rear yard setback. The commission is tasked
602 with competing priorities with state and region-
603 wide need for housing. Particularly, more
604 affordable housing and the concerns of the public
605 regarding the side back...the setback modifications.
606 There has been extensive comments from the
607 neighborhood through letters received and meetings
608 held with staff. On the screen are just some of the
609 comments received. I won't delve too deep into the
610 specifics because we have residents in the audience
611 who can share their thoughts on these matters more
612 effectively. But to highlight the primary concerns
613 voiced by the neighborhood, the height and the
614 density of the, the project have garnered
615 significant attention and feedback. It is important
616 to note that these are aspects that the Planning
617 Commission does not have discretion over. The
618 project qualifies for exemption under CEQA
619 guidelines Section §15332 for in-fill development
620 projects and CEQA guideline section §15194 for
621 affordable housing. Section §15332 for in-fill
622 development projects apply to classes of projects
623 which have been determined, do not have a
624 significant impact or effect...significant effect on

625 the environment, and shall therefore be exempt from
626 the provisions of CEQA. The project has five
627 thresholds required to qualify for the exemption.
628 The project is consistent with the general plan
629 designation and zoning designation including
630 provisions in the zoning ordinance that allow
631 requests for minor modifications throughout to 10
632 percent. The proposed development occurs on a site
633 less than 5 acres, .33 acres to be exact. The
634 project site has no value as a habitat for
635 endangered rare or threatened species as the site
636 is located in an urban environment. And approval of
637 the project would not result in significant effects
638 relating to traffic, noise, air, or water quality.
639 This project does not rise to the level to require
640 a Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis. Noise is
641 expected to be affected on a temporary basis during
642 construction, which is typical for developments of
643 a housing project. A project's specific
644 construction air quality study was provided and
645 found that the project would cause less than
646 significant impact and that no mitigation measures
647 are necessary as the proposed project would provide
648 new meter service connections as needed to connect

649 the existing water mainlines adjacent to the
650 project site. And lastly, the site can be
651 adequately served by all required utilities and
652 public services. There has been no evidence
653 presented indicating a significant impact that
654 would necessitate an EIR. The project has also met
655 the element required...elements required for a
656 Section §15194 exemption for affordable housing.
657 For instance, the project meets all the threshold's
658 criteria set forth in section §15192 as outline in
659 the Staff Report. As noted previously, the site is
660 .33 acres less than 5 acres in area. The project is
661 located within an incorporated city of at least
662 1000 people per square mile. The project site has
663 also been previously developed for qualified urban
664 uses and is adjacent to project sites developed
665 with qualified urban uses. And lastly, the project
666 consists of 89 units of which 47 are affordable to
667 low-income households, and an applicant will
668 provide legal commitment to ensure continued
669 availability in the use of the housing units for
670 lower-income households for a period of at least 55
671 years. So, overall, the project meets the
672 applicable development standards for the 100

673 percent affordable housing projects with the
674 approval of the modification requests. Staff
675 acknowledges the significant opposition from the
676 neighborhood. The project, however, represents a
677 substantial step towards addressing the pressing
678 need for affordable housing in the City of West
679 Hollywood in the State of California. The project
680 fulfills the commitment to increasing affordable
681 housing opportunities and adheres to city goals and
682 policy objectives, which benefits are substantial
683 and far-reaching. Therefore, staff recommends
684 approval of the application with the adoption of
685 Draft Resolution PC23-1534 as conditioned with the
686 3 modifications. That concludes my presentation.
687 I'm here for any questions you may have.

688 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Do we have any questions for staff?
689 None? Vice-Chair Lombardi? Okay. No? What? Okay.
690 Commissioner Matos, do you want to start?

691 Matos: Yeah. Cool. Thank you, Chair Carvalheiro. A couple
692 quick questions for staff pertaining to resolution
693 conditions and the attachment. Specifically looking
694 at page 12.6...or sorry, page 30 item 12.6. This
695 exempts the building from applicable guest permits
696 and street permits and provides an allotment of 50

697 1-day pass...visitor passes per year. Is this a
698 standard condition that we have and is the 50
699 visitor passes a discretionary item?

700 Rath: Yeah, so this is a common condition that's applied
701 to new development projects or housing projects.
702 And the second part of the question, I'm sorry
703 what...what did you ask for the second part?

704 Matos: About the 50 visitor 1-day passes, is that a
705 discretionary item?

706 Rath: Yes, so that is discretionary if you would like to
707 change that.

708 Matos: Okay. And then an additional question looking at
709 page 12, Items 1.9 and 1.10, it outlines that
710 there's minimum lease requirements for the
711 building. Could you go over that briefly for us?
712 Those two specific conditions?

713 Rath: Sure, let me just pull up those conditions. All
714 right. So, these conditions cover short...short-term
715 rental ordinance. Basically, we require that the,
716 the properties not be used for uses like AirBnb.
717 So, they have to have a long-term occupancy. And
718 there's also a condition that requires that the,
719 the apartment leases are, are at least a year and
720 that's the condition for the 1.9 and 1.10 in a

721 nutshell.

722 Matos: Thank you. That will be...those will be my questions
723 for right now. I'll have additional questions when
724 the time is appropriate to raise them. Thank you.

725 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Copeland?

726 Copeland: Okay. Thank you, Chair. I'll, I'll begin with some
727 Historic Preservation Commission questions if you
728 don't mind. I know this went before HPC, and they
729 had concerns that they did not receive sufficient
730 information to pass comments onto or
731 recommendations onto Planning commission. And I
732 notice that we did not in our packet have the
733 original resolution regarding the local cultural
734 resource designation of the church because it is
735 men...mentioned on page 11 of the staff report that
736 CEQA guidelines mention substantial adverse change
737 as being relocation, destruction, or alteration of
738 the resource or its immediate surroundings. So, I
739 know the homes were not eligible for designation,
740 but are we saying that the landscaping and the
741 homes that are part of the immediate surroundings
742 that will be demolished are not relevant to the
743 CEQA exemption? Is that correct?

744 Alkire: Sure, I can take that one. So, if I can just make

745 sure I'm understanding your question correctly, you
746 are asking about the language that defines a
747 substantial adverse change to a historic resource
748 and it includes the building and its immediate
749 surroundings?

750 Copeland: Correct.

751 Alkire: And your question is, are the, the fact that this
752 was once one site even though these buildings are
753 not in and of themselves historic, do they
754 constitute the immediate surroundings that would
755 create a substantial adverse change on the
756 resource?

757 Copeland: Correct.

758 Alkire: Okay. So, in short, no. We've, we've looked at this
759 and there's been Historic Resource Assessments
760 done. Our, our Historic Resource Consultant has
761 looked at it as well. And I don't...the, the fact
762 that this is a separate site now and the, the
763 surrounding area is not included...the surrounding
764 area that is affected is not included in the
765 designation. So, it doesn't...it would not represent
766 a substantial adverse change on the resource.

767 Copeland: So, it would have to be part of the designation to
768 be considered immediate surroundings?

769 Alkire: It would have to contribute to the resource. It
770 would have to be part of the designation in that
771 the, the tests here for CEQA is a pretty high bar
772 for projects that don't...that aren't occurring on
773 the same site. It would have to degrade the
774 resource in such a way that it is no longer able to
775 convey its significance as a historical resource.
776 So, if...you know, if this building were built and,
777 and the church no longer is recognizable as what it
778 is it's, it's very hard to have a development
779 adjacent or next to a resource that, that affects
780 it to that level. But, you know, they...this church
781 is on a corner. It would still be visible. All of
782 the components of it are still intact and still
783 visible from, from most of the public angles where
784 they would be visible. It...it's not being damaged or
785 it's not being demolished. It's not being moved. I
786 mean, these are the, the big more substantial
787 changes that would rise to that level for a project
788 that's on a separate lot.

789 Copeland: Okay. Right now, there are no limitations on what
790 percentage of a cultural resource can be obscured
791 by construction because I know in the resolution
792 for designation, it does mention the leaded and

793 stained-glass windows on the north...

794 Alkire: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

795 Copeland: ...and south of the building. So right now, there is
796 nothing either on a state level or a local level
797 that says 50 percent of the building cannot be
798 obscured or there's nothing that's...

799 Alkire: No, no there isn't.

800 Copeland: ...against that. Okay.

801 Alkire: Uh-huh (NEGATIVE).

802 Copeland: I think that's the only...the questions that I had
803 about historic preservation. I do have some
804 questions about UDAS (phonetic) and the agreement.
805 If someone else has questions related too, I can...I
806 can address that later if other commissioners have
807 questions right now. Or should I go ahead?

808 Carvalheiro: Just go ahead, yeah.

809 Copeland: Okay. Thank you, Chair. So, to confirm there was...we
810 don't have access to that, but there was an
811 agreement in place with, with UDAS as far as...as
812 part of this loan guarantee there was to be
813 cooperation between UDAS and the...and the applicant.
814 Is that correct? We don't have access to that in
815 our packets.

816 Alkire: We don't and it's not within the commission's

817 purview tonight.

818 Copeland: Okay. We can confirm that in the Staff Report there
819 were...there was mention of quite a few
820 recommendations for design changes that were not
821 implemented. Is that correct? We can...we can confirm
822 that since it's in the Staff Report. Is that right?

823 Alkire: Right. It's in the Staff Report. Uh-huh
824 (AFFIRMATIVE).

825 Copeland: Okay. So, with regard to the laundry facility
826 location and disbursement, this isn't...that's an
827 objective can...standard in our municipal code, but
828 we can't enforce that because of insufficient
829 specificity in the code. Is that correct?

830 Rath: Yeah, that's correct.

831 Copeland: Okay. So, we cannot compel a more...a distribution
832 that might be more equitable or, or sensible in
833 this situation?

834 Rath: Well, the code does say that it has to be
835 accessible by the residents. And this laundry room
836 on the, the seventh floor is accessible to all the
837 residents by the elevator.

838 Copeland: I just think it...like, so from say a senior or a
839 mobility standpoint, the difficulty of going up to
840 the roof to do laundry or whatever that's

841 not...that's not an issue. That's, that's relevant to
842 the location of that?

843 Rath: So, for the building code accessibility it means
844 that they have access to it, but you...the elevators,
845 they, they have access to it.

846 Copeland: Okay. So that's, that's enough as far as
847 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) is concerned?

848 Rath: Yeah.

849 Carvalheiro: Okay. Because I know that's another thing that,
850 that UDAS did recommend, relocation of the
851 manager's unit, and the laundry from the, the upper
852 floor. So how many housing units will that upper
853 floor be providing? Just the manager's unit, is
854 that correct?

855 Rath: That's correct.

856 Copeland: So that state requires us, if I understand this
857 correctly, to allow three extra stories in an
858 affordable building. But there's no requirement
859 that any or all of those extra floors actually
860 provide any additional units. There's no
861 requirement that there has to be a certain number
862 of units on that floor or any other of those three.

863 Rath: Correct. Correct, there is no requirement like
864 that. As long as it's going to be used for that

865 residential use, then it's, it's fine.
866 Copeland: Okay. There was also mention of the use of
867 materials that...from UDAS that the city discourages
868 that aren't in line with our Climate Action and
869 Adaptation Plan. Is that correct? That's again
870 some...you know, something that's not an objective
871 standard or not something that we can compel to be
872 changed. Is that right?

873 Rath: Yeah, that's right.

874 Copeland: Okay. The two-bedroom units that are reserved for
875 the church.

876 Rath: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

877 Copeland: In order to make this building 100 percent
878 affordable or I know there has been some question
879 about that. So, those are moderate-income
880 requirement, correct?

881 Rath: Right. So, they are restricted to moderate.

882 Copeland: Okay. So would we know specifically who they were
883 for or this is a...they would have to meet the same
884 requirements as any other tenant would as far as
885 income and..

886 Rath: Yeah, yeah.

887 Copeland: ...the same proof of as any other tenant?

888 Rath: Yeah, so they would follow the same rules of..

889 Copeland: They just would not come from our inclusionary
890 list, they would come from...the church itself would
891 be providing "These are the, the tenants that are
892 going to be there." Is that correct?

893 Alkire: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) understanding?

894 Rath: That's...yeah, that's our understanding.

895 Copeland: Okay. The units that they named...the units that are
896 in this, particularly the, the micro-unit with the,
897 the studios are 242 to 349 square feet for studios.

898 Rath: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

899 Copeland: And the bed...one-bedroom is 376 to 632. So, those
900 are a considerable number of what we would call
901 micro-units, is that correct? I mean, it doesn't
902 say micro-units in the Staff Report. But...

903 Rath: Yeah, so we don't have a definition for...

904 Copeland: We don't have a size standard or design standards
905 in place yet for...

906 Rath: Right.

907 Copeland: ...micro-units. But we know that the standard studio
908 is 400 to 600 square feet. So, these would be
909 considerably smaller than average even if they're
910 not defined as micro-units.

911 Rath: Right.

912 Copeland: Okay.

913 Rath: Yeah.

914 Copeland: Do we have a standard in place or can we condition
915 any requirement for a universal design so that
916 aging in place is possible? How many units are
917 going to be configured for those who have
918 disability or mobility issues or perhaps they could
919 be ambulatory now and then have wheelchair or, or
920 walker needs later? What are the door...you know,
921 hallways, doorways, everything, is that going to
922 be...is that a consideration or a requirement that
923 they're wide enough?

924 Rath: So, we can talk about that with the applicant. So,
925 I'll defer that to the applicant.

926 Copeland: I don't know if we had any standard..

927 Rath: Yeah.

928 Copeland: ...in place. We don't have it? (Talking over).

929 Rath: No, we do...yeah, we do not have any standards. But...

930 Copeland: Okay.

931 Rath: ...(UNINTELLIGIBLE) standards.

932 Copeland: The urban art requirement, is there any mention yet
933 of the...how that's being met? I didn't see that in
934 the...

935 Rath: So, there is a condition that they can either pay
936 the, the in-lieu fee or they can provide art on

937 site. So, the applicant has a choice. They can
938 speak further to that.

939 Copeland: Okay. I think...I think that's all for me right now.
940 Again, the applicant may answer the remaining few
941 questions. So, I appreciate your patience and...

942 Rath: No problem.

943 Copeland: ...and thank you for answering. Thank you, Chair.

944 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Commissioner Edwards, do you have any
945 questions?

946 Edwards: No.

947 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Gregoire?

948 Gregoire: My question was already asked and answered.

949 Carvalheiro: Vice-Chair Lombardi? Nope? Great. Nope? Okay. So,
950 commissioner disclosures. Commissioner Matos?

951 Matos: I met with residents, and we discussed matters
952 contained in the Staff Report. And I also met with
953 the applicant's representative, and we discussed
954 matters contained in the Staff Report as well.

955 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Gregoire? No?

956 Gregoire: No, thank you.

957 Carvalheiro: Vice-Chair Lombardi?

958 Lombardi: No disclosures.

959 Carvalheiro: I met with the applicant's representative, and we
960 discussed items in the Staff Report. Commissioner

961 Copeland?

962 Copeland: I met with residents, and we discussed matters
963 contained in the Staff Report. And I did make
964 multiple visits to the site. Thank you, Chair.

965 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Edwards?

966 Edwards: I made multiple visits to the site.

967 Carvalheiro: Great. Thank you. Vice-Chair Lombardi will give us
968 a brief Design Review update.

969 Lombardi: Thank you. I will start with saying that if you do
970 read the paragraphs in page 11 of the Staff Report,
971 I think that that does capture our overall
972 sentiment pretty well during the Design Review
973 Subcommittee meeting that we had in March. And, you
974 know, some of...to, to sort of add to what was
975 included in the Staff Report, there were some
976 discussions about improvement to the ground level
977 experience. Well, let me start just back for a
978 minute. Overall, we felt like the design was nice.
979 It was...it was fairly well received. We did note
980 that the massing was quite large, and we did
981 discuss about the south elevation in particular and
982 trying to help create some better variety there and
983 a little bit of the front elevation as well at the
984 entrance. And then the ground level, the experience

985 at ground level at the southwest corner, which is
986 sort of the most prominent corner as you walk up
987 the street was also a topic of discussion. So, so
988 overall, those...that was sort of the, the framework
989 of what we're looking at. I...there was some
990 discussion about materiality. That's mostly
991 concentrated around the courtyard, which is fairly
992 narrow, and we saw on the renderings what felt like
993 a lot of hard surfaces. So, we, we did have some
994 questions about materiality and trying to make sure
995 that it didn't become this sort of acoustical echo
996 chamber. There is also a general note about trying
997 to improve and create as much open space as
998 possible within the structure, including smaller
999 open space opportunities, and there has been some
1000 reconfiguration of, of the building and design
1001 since our meeting. We did also talk about...or, or
1002 recommended the relocation of the manager's unit to
1003 the ground floor from the upper floor, the, the
1004 rooftop. And then also there was discussion about
1005 trying to more evenly distribute laundry
1006 facilities. Not necessarily on every floor, but
1007 maybe stagger them in a few locations. And then,
1008 you know, the building height was noted. It seems

1009 like the only real way to work around that may be
1010 to reduce the actual unit count. And then also
1011 relating to the units, they are...they are fairly
1012 tight. So, we had a lot of questions about the
1013 configuration of the units, discussion of making
1014 them efficient within a limited amount of space,
1015 making sure ventilation is well addressed, and, and
1016 the like. I, I think also, you know, within that
1017 discussion there was talk about the balconies, and
1018 I think that some of that's included in the
1019 material we have today from the applicant as well.
1020 But, you know, one suggestion that was made was in
1021 an effort to help regulate the façade that not all
1022 of the balconies need to, to project as much or
1023 that there could be almost like a Juliet balcony to
1024 have the sudden outdoor space. The doors could open
1025 and maybe there was more interior space and less
1026 exterior space. So, some of that has been
1027 implemented, but maybe a little bit differently
1028 than we envisioned. What else did we talk about? I
1029 mentioned noise. We did note the dog run and the
1030 setback with a dog run and that experience. It's
1031 been shuffled backwards a little bit on the site I
1032 believe relative to what we saw before. And then we

1033 did offer the opportunity to come back to Design
1034 Review Subcommittee, but we noted that it was a
1035 compressed timeline on this project and just said
1036 we were available if desired. But that was our, our
1037 overall take on the project. So, it was really
1038 focused on the refinements of the interior use of
1039 the space and improving some of the elevations. And
1040 so, some of that's been incorporated in this design
1041 and other parts kind of remain as they were.

1042 Carvalheiro: Thank you, Vice-Chair Lombardi. So now we have our
1043 presentation from the applicant. I understand the
1044 applicant is in the house. And you have 10 minutes.
1045 Please state your name and city of residence upon
1046 approaching the podium.

1047 Seymour: Chair, members of...Chair, members of the commission,
1048 I'm Jeff Seymour, Westlake Village, Seymour
1049 Consulting Group. Miss Chairman what we wanted to
1050 do is request for an additional five minutes. This
1051 is a very detailed project and in order for us to
1052 provide the kind of presen...presentation we believe
1053 we need to have, we're requesting the
1054 five...additional five minutes.

1055 Carvalheiro: Yeah, Staff recommends against that. We think that
1056 we'll be able to handle all the details during the

1057 question...

1058 Seymour: I'm sorry.

1059 Carvalheiro: ...during questions and answers. So...

1060 Seymour: I understood.

1061 Carvalheiro: Yeah.

1062 Seymour: It's difficult to hear you.

1063 Carvalheiro: Sorry. Okay, so we discussed this earlier, and
1064 staff recommends that we don't add five...get into
1065 precedence of adding additional minutes to the...your
1066 public presentation and that most of those items
1067 could be handled during question and answers.

1068 Seymour: Oh. Yeah, I...what I, I think I heard you say is that
1069 you would extend...if you extend the, the time for
1070 those who are wanting to speak. I'm having trouble
1071 hearing you. I'm sorry.

1072 Carvalheiro: Can we have legal help me out with this one? This
1073 is an odd question given what we discussed earlier
1074 today.

1075 Rosen: I would say it's up to the Commission and in their
1076 discretion whether or not they want to grant the
1077 additional time from the applicant. So, I would say
1078 it rests with the Commission and I don't know if
1079 there's...yeah.

1080 Carvalheiro: Should I call a vote?

1081 Matos: Can, can I make a comment?

1082 Carvalheiro: Should I call a vote?

1083 Rosen: I'd say you can discuss amongst one another. I
1084 don't know that a formal vote is required. But you
1085 can take a vote if you'd like just to ping the, the
1086 rest of the commission on that request.

1087 Carvalheiro: So, is the Commission open on having an additional
1088 five minutes? Mister Matos?

1089 Matos: May I make a comment, Chair? I would be open to
1090 granting the additional five minutes. However, I
1091 would only support that if we allow members of the
1092 community the maximum amount of time to address the
1093 Commission. I think it's only fair that we extend
1094 the public comment period if we do extend the
1095 applicant's time.

1096 Carvalheiro: Thank you, that's what the Commission's done in the
1097 past. So, if all the commissioners, commissioners
1098 are open to that. Vice-Chair Lombardi?

1099 Lombardi: My note would be that historically there have been
1100 times where we have a lot of members of the public
1101 and we've actually reduced the time from three to
1102 two minutes. So, in that framework, I'd be
1103 concerned about giving the applicant an additional
1104 five minutes and not giving the public more time.

1105 So, I would...I would recommend we just leave
1106 everything as is and try to have the applicant's
1107 presentation stay within the allotted timeframe as
1108 best as possible and maintain the allotted
1109 timeframe for the public as well.

1110 Gillig: And, and, Chair, if I can intervene, we have
1111 approximately 40 speakers signed up to speak.

1112 Carvalheiro: Right. Any comment? Commissioner Edwards?
1113 Commissioner Copeland?

1114 Copeland: I, I would lean towards leaving as is, but as long
1115 as the public is given additional time if the
1116 applicant is, you know, I, I could go either way.
1117 But I think it has to...in fairness, it needs to be
1118 either that way or leave it as it is.

1119 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Edwards?

1120 Edwards: I lean towards where Commissioner Matos
1121 recommended, and I just add I have plenty of snacks
1122 and ready.

1123 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Gregoire?

1124 Gregoire: I want the public to have an opportunity to speak
1125 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) tonight.

1126 Male 2: We can't hear you.

1127 Edwards: The mic.

1128 Carvalheiro: Your mic.

1129 Gregoire: The time we're taking to debate this, we should
1130 just give him an extra five minutes.

1131 Carvalheiro: All right. So, we never implied that we would cut
1132 the public comments short. So, I'm...I'm thinking
1133 that there's at least four of us who are in favor
1134 of extending the presentation for five minutes.

1135 Seymour: Thank you, Mister Chairman. Again, Jeff Seymour,
1136 Seymour Consulting Group. First and foremost, we
1137 want to thank staff, especially Mister Rath and
1138 Alkire, for assisting us as we move forward, coming
1139 here tonight in order to move as quickly as we can.
1140 Just to let you know who our present presenters
1141 will be, we'll begin with Jesse Slansky, the
1142 president of the corporation. It'll be followed by
1143 Michael Contento, partner at Office Untitled. And
1144 then it'll follow finally with Ryan Leaderman, a
1145 member of the corporation's board and our pro bono
1146 project council.

1147 Gillig: And Chair, while they're setting up if we can just
1148 remind everyone to speak directly into the
1149 microphones for our viewers on Zoom can completely
1150 hear us and in the audience. It's a little
1151 difficult.

1152 Carvalheiro: Thank you.

1153 Slansky: All right. Hi, good evening. I'm thrilled to be
1154 here tonight. My name is Jesse Slansky, and I'm the
1155 president and CEO.

1156 Audience: Louder. Louder. We can't hear you.

1157 Slansky: And I'm hearing...it's coming from the Zoom, sorry.
1158 Is that okay? Okay, how's that? Okay, great. Okay.
1159 Good evening. I'm thrilled to be here tonight. My
1160 name is Jesse Slansky. I'm the president and CEO of
1161 West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation. We're
1162 a community-based non-profit organization. Our
1163 mission is building homes and providing services
1164 that move people from insecurity to stability, and
1165 we've been doing it for 19...since 1986. We got our
1166 start in West Hollywood and over the years we've
1167 expanded. We currently house over 1200 residents in
1168 785 units in 22 buildings in 3 cities. Fifteen are
1169 right here in West Hollywood. We transform the
1170 lives of individuals and families. We pair the
1171 stability of housing with onsite support of
1172 services. Our beautiful buildings house people.
1173 It's our supportive services that keep them housed.
1174 Across our portfolio these services are voluntary,
1175 offered free of charge, and have increased health
1176 outcomes across the board, reduced isolation for

1177 seniors, and broken the cycle of poverty for
1178 working families. I don't think I have to tell you
1179 there is a housing crisis. We just opened our
1180 Miracle (UNINTELLIGIBLE) property in Korea town. We
1181 received over 10,000 applications for 42 units. At
1182 our grand opening, one of our new residents came up
1183 to me, hugged me with tears in her eyes, thanking
1184 me for the life-changing opportunity of affordable
1185 housing. She's worked the same full-time job for
1186 years, but her salary was never enough to keep up
1187 with the constantly rising rents. Despite gainful
1188 employment, she was forced to navigate unstable
1189 living situations. Here in West Hollywood, the
1190 residents of the Courtyard La Brea are about to
1191 celebrate 10 years. One resident Angelo is here
1192 tonight. He is a life-long actor who was
1193 compromised from the stress of figuring out how to
1194 afford rising rents with a stable income. Now as he
1195 marks 10 years of, of housing stability, you'll
1196 hear from himself tonight. Affordable housing is a
1197 lifeline. There is a housing crisis. Big challenges
1198 require bold actions. When completed, 910 Wetherly
1199 will be the foundation of a new life for those
1200 lucky enough to win the lottery. On behalf of the

1201 LGBT youth transitioning out of foster care, those
1202 living with chronic illness, and the many, many
1203 members of West Hollywood's workforce who can't
1204 afford to live in their own community thank you
1205 very much for allowing us to be part of the
1206 solution.

1207 Contento: Thank you, Jesse. Thank you, commissioners. My name
1208 is Michael Contento. I am a principal at Office
1209 Untitled, and we're excited to share the project
1210 with you tonight. As you know, the project site is
1211 at 910 North Wetherly Drive in an area
1212 characterized by other multi-family developments.
1213 The proposed project is a 100 percent affordable...a
1214 7-story 100 percent affordable housing project with
1215 89 units in an R4B zone, which allows for unlimited
1216 density and a maximum height of 7 stories and 78
1217 feet. Shown here with the height of the adjacent
1218 residential building at 55 feet 4 inches. Now, we
1219 don't...we don't intend to build to that maximum
1220 height. The goal of the project is to find a
1221 balance between the need for housing and an
1222 understanding of the context. So, the first thing
1223 we did was to set a portion of the building below
1224 grade and remove the upper level on the north half

1225 of the building to lower that north height to 6 and
1226 a half stories and 69 feet 8 inches. We also
1227 removed the south half of the upper level to create
1228 an outdoor amenity area and lower that south height
1229 to 6 stories and 68 feet 4 inches. We then extended
1230 that deck level around the building as an
1231 additional setback to recess that partial upper
1232 level and reduce the height of the main volume to
1233 59 feet measured from the north grade. In addition
1234 to reducing the height, we also carved out portions
1235 of the façade to further reduce the massing and
1236 create a collection of smaller volumes as opposed
1237 to one larger building. And lastly, we carved out a
1238 series of alternating inset balconies to create a
1239 dynamic façade that emphasizes depth, texture, and
1240 movement. And the result is a project that can
1241 provide much needed affordable housing in West
1242 Hollywood with the unique design that can fit
1243 within its context. The design language of the
1244 alternating balconies wraps the building providing
1245 natural light, shade, and ventilation for the
1246 units. And we carved out of that envelope to break
1247 up and split the massing into smaller elements.
1248 Seen here is a five and a half story volume to the

1249 north on the left stepping down to a five-story
1250 volume to the south on the right. Each with a
1251 recessed six level setback from the edge above. And
1252 with the cutout serving as a connection between
1253 open spaces and amenities. The exterior is clad in
1254 a profile metal panel, which contrasts with the
1255 composite wood material in the insets. Both of
1256 which provide depth and texture at the surface. So,
1257 the building creates that depth, texture, and a
1258 play of light and shadow across the façade at the
1259 scale of the cutouts, the inset balconies and
1260 screens, and the material itself. The view from the
1261 northwest shows the building in context with a
1262 five-story residential building to the north and
1263 the church tower to the south. And here the west
1264 elevation shows the proposed building height well
1265 below the allowable height as it steps down to
1266 follow the slope of the site. The project is also
1267 required to widen the street. So, the building is
1268 shifted approximately 3-feet 8-inches to the east
1269 in order to accommodate that widening. The building
1270 is also placed outside of the earthquake fault zone
1271 to the north. And the distance between the proposed
1272 building and the existing residential buildings

1273 ranges from 15 to 18 feet to the north, 20 feet 2
1274 inches to the east, and 18 feet 10 inches to the
1275 south. The ground floor contains the lobby, office,
1276 residential units, amenities, outdoor space, and
1277 landscaping. Level two contains a central
1278 courtyard, which is connected to the lobby by a
1279 main stair. And by removing a unit on the west
1280 façade, the courtyard is able to extend out to
1281 Wetherly Drive to provide more light and usable
1282 space. And here you can see that connection to the
1283 lobby as the courtyard extends west, as well as the
1284 emphasis on outdoor space amenities, and
1285 landscaping within the project. All of the units
1286 are organized around the central courtyard, which
1287 allows for natural ventilation through the units.
1288 Level seven is a partial floor as most of the area
1289 is outdoor space, which is divided into smaller
1290 programmed areas. This level also contains the
1291 community room, offices, and laundry facilities.
1292 All of which is setback from the edge by the
1293 additional 2 to 8-foot setback on this level. Above
1294 that we have the roof with a combination of
1295 vegetative roof elements and PV panels. The project
1296 also proposes three levels of subterranean parking

1297 with 62 total parking stalls. And the studio units
1298 shown here are similar in design to...and layout to
1299 our recently approved units at 8025 Santa Monica
1300 Boulevard. And like those units, these emphasize
1301 flexibility and storage and prioritize flexibility
1302 and storage within a limited footprint by providing
1303 built-in storage walls that contain closets,
1304 utility closets, kitchen, refrigerator, pantry,
1305 fold down tables, and additional storage. In
1306 addition to the large exterior windows, each unit
1307 also contains an operable transom window on the
1308 opposite wall above the entry door to provide light
1309 and natural ventilation through the unit. Overall,
1310 this is a project that addresses the urgent need
1311 for housing with a unique design that also
1312 addresses the context and emphasizes depth,
1313 texture, natural lighting, ventilation, amenities,
1314 outdoor spaces, and landscaping.

1315 Leaderman: Hi, good evening, commissioners. My name is Ryan
1316 Leaderman and it's a privilege to be here tonight.
1317 I just want to address a few items. Your discretion
1318 is quite limited tonight because of the State
1319 Density Bonus Law, the Housing Accountability Act,
1320 and as well as the CEQA Exemptions which apply to

1321 this project. Staff in the Staff Report covered
1322 extensively the limited discretion that this
1323 commission has. We know that there is such a
1324 chronic need for affordable housing in the city,
1325 especially considering the recently approved
1326 housing element which identifies the need for
1327 housing in the city. I went on the HCD website this
1328 morning. This city has accomplished four percent of
1329 its RENA allocation in this compliance period. So,
1330 the need is real, the need is great, and the need
1331 is for this project. Thank you and I believe we're
1332 available to answer any questions. Thank you.

1333 Carvalheiro: That concludes the applicant's presentation?

1334 Seymour: I believe so, yes.

1335 Carvalheiro: Yeah? Okay. So, we will now begin our public...sorry,
1336 do we have any questions for the applicant?
1337 Commissioner Matos?

1338 Matos: Thank you, Chair Carvalheiro. Quick question for
1339 probably the design team. I actually have two of
1340 them. The first question I have is with reference
1341 to the design and windows in the interiors of the
1342 units. My understanding is that there's going to be
1343 the main window that faces the exterior and there
1344 will also be an additional small window on the

1345 opposite side of the unit. Is that correct?

1346 Contento: That is correct, yes.

1347 Matos: Okay, so that there will be abled...ability to open
1348 that window, create airflow, and things like that
1349 throughout the unit?

1350 Contento: Yes.

1351 Matos: My next question is with regard to how the parking
1352 would be operated in the facility. The spaces that
1353 are in the facility that are going to be used for
1354 the church, those will not be assigned to a
1355 resident in off times, correct? So, they would be
1356 free and open for, let's say, visitors or loading
1357 zones or things like that?

1358 Contento: Correct. Yes.

1359 Matos: Has, has the applicant team considered implementing
1360 a loading zone on site with those spaces on...during
1361 off hours? Just curious.

1362 Slansky: I'm sorry, the question was the spaces inside
1363 the...inside the building?

1364 Matos: Yes, for residential use when they're not being
1365 used by the church.

1366 Slansky: Have we considered it as a loading zone? We
1367 haven't, but they are open and available for...

1368 Matos: So, they would be open if, you know, there was an

1369 Amazon delivery or something like that?

1370 Slansky: Sure.

1371 Matos: Okay.

1372 Slansky: Yeah, I mean, they are...it will be opened first
1373 come, first serve guest parking.

1374 Matos: Okay.

1375 Slansky: It's not reserved for the church.

1376 Matos: But there has been no plan so far to implement one
1377 of them as, like, a permanent pack...delivery zone or
1378 something like that?

1379 Slansky: No.

1380 Matos: Okay. Thank you.

1381 Carvalheiro: All right. Any other questions? Vice-Chair
1382 Lombardi?

1383 Edwards: Oh, yeah. Just a quick follow-up question to Matos.

1384 Carvalheiro: Oh, Commissioner Edwards?

1385 Edwards: Yeah.

1386 Carvalheiro: Go ahead.

1387 Edwards: So a quick follow-up question about the parking.
1388 What is your experience...is, is what you mapped out
1389 for your parking, is this based on what's required
1390 and also your experiences with your other 100
1391 percent affordable units?

1392 Slansky: So, the requirement is zero. This is assigning a

1393 half space per u...half to one ratio of parking to
1394 units, which is line with our experience across our
1395 portfolio.

1396 Edwards: Well, no, like, as far as, like, loading the...to his
1397 question, Commissioner Matos about the loading.

1398 Slansky: A specific...

1399 Edwards: Or having...like, assigning a specific area.

1400 Slansky: Generally, what is most favorable is having a
1401 loading zone in front of the property, which would
1402 involve taking away a street spot which is at the
1403 discretion of the city, and that's not something
1404 that we, we are advocating or requesting.

1405 Edwards: Thank you.

1406 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Copeland?

1407 Copeland: Thank you, Chair. We're still on the subject of, of
1408 parking that some of which is going to be shared
1409 according to the report during certain hours and
1410 then would be available to residents during other
1411 hours. How is that going to be enforced? Is there
1412 any plan in place for that? I mean, supposed...it's
1413 supposed to be for the church, but a resident still
1414 park there how, how would you logistically handle
1415 the sharing?

1416 Slansky: Sure. Sure. Well, there will be signage reserving

1417 the spaces.

1418 Copeland: Right.

1419 Slansky: And it would be handled the way any parking vio...the
1420 other spaces for the residents will also be
1421 assigned to specific units. And it would be handled
1422 the way any parking violation would be handled,
1423 which would be a lease violation to the resident,
1424 and their car would be tow...their car could be
1425 towed, there could be a lease violation, it could
1426 eventually result in an, an eviction if somebody
1427 were not following the building's rules.

1428 Copeland: And if it were a visitor or a delivery person, a
1429 rideshare person, and they just were, were
1430 lingering, they would receive a ticket or parking
1431 enforcement? Because this is on private (talking
1432 over) property.

1433 Slansky: Well, it would be unusual for it to be some kind of
1434 person who is not a resident or a resident's guest
1435 because it will be a secured parking structure.

1436 Copeland: Right.

1437 Slansky: So, it would...the car would be towed.

1438 Copeland: It shouldn't...you would only anticipate a lot of
1439 problems with that with the sharing then. With
1440 regard to my question for staff earlier about ADA

1441 accessibility, are there any units that are being
1442 designed or reserved for those with mobility
1443 issues? And would it be a problem as far as
1444 hallways, doorways, for someone who lost some of
1445 that mobility and had to use a wheelchair or walker
1446 without having to move and allowing them to age in
1447 place?

1448 Slansky: I'm happy to say a hundred percent of the units
1449 will be designed for aging in place. We pride
1450 ourselves at being at the vanguard. We instituted
1451 universal design principles in our properties about
1452 five years ago, which means all of our units
1453 with...every single unit is designed to work for
1454 people both with and without mobility impairments
1455 and be, be adaptable for whatever their changing
1456 needs are.

1457 Copeland: Okay. And you don't anticipate any issues with...even
1458 though there's an elevator, if someone did have a
1459 wheelchair or accessibility issues, mobility issues
1460 to get in an elevator, maybe go up several floors
1461 with their laundry, to do laundry, and come back
1462 down?

1463 Slansky: Now, our Westmore Linden property in Koreatown is 7
1464 stories 93 units for seniors.

1465 Copeland: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

1466 Slansky: There is one central laundry room on the ground
1467 floor. So, the residents who are on the seventh
1468 floor need to come downstairs...

1469 Copeland: To come down?

1470 Slansky: ...in the elevator. And it happens to be a wonderful
1471 amenity. It becomes a second community room for the
1472 building. It's a social hub. And particularly for
1473 our seniors, social isolation is so crippling. It
1474 results in negative health outcomes, cognitive
1475 decline. So having this opportunity to socialize
1476 with the residents...with the other residents, it, it
1477 really is a...not only a physical design element, but
1478 it's a social design element that works quite
1479 successfully.

1480 Copeland: Thank you. Those are all my questions right now,
1481 Chair. Thank you.

1482 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Vice-Chair Lombardi?

1483 Lombardi: Yes, I have one more parking and design-related
1484 question. So, I was looking through the plans. Is,
1485 is there a gate into the parking garage?

1486 Slansky: Yes, it'll be a secured parking structure.

1487 Lombardi: Where is the gate located?

1488 Contento: The gate will be at the bottom of the ramp.

1489 Lombardi: That does (talking over).

1490 Contento: As you go in...because we do have structure. Yeah, we
1491 do have structure near the top. So, it would have
1492 to be behind that because we do have necessary
1493 structure that comes down to the driveway.

1494 Lombardi: So, if, if someone comes down there and it's locked
1495 and they, they can't get in or whatever, they have
1496 to back up the ramp to get out?

1497 Slansky: We'll have an intercom box...

1498 Contento: Yeah, there will be...

1499 Slansky: ...mounted much higher up the driveway. Yeah.

1500 Lombardi: Okay. So, in theory, they would only make it that
1501 far before they would go down the ramp if they
1502 weren't able to get in for some reason?

1503 Contento: Yeah or...yeah.

1504 Lombardi: Okay. And then from an operational standpoint, how
1505 is that being managed with the idea that some of
1506 the parking is accessible for use by the church at
1507 certain times of day?

1508 Slansky: So, the church is our partner, and these will be
1509 their spaces to manage. And there are a couple of
1510 options, but we'll see what works in practice. One
1511 of the options is for people to call the intercom
1512 and for the pastor, who will be living onsite, or

1513 the groundskeeper, who will be living onsite, to
1514 let them in. Alternatively, a church volunteer can
1515 be, like, an usher greeting people on Sunday
1516 mornings and, and opening the gate. A third is for
1517 perhaps the church to only allow the...their trustees
1518 to use this parking and they can give them garage
1519 door openers. So, it's really...we'll have to work
1520 this out in practice, but there are a lot of...a lot
1521 of options for us to con...for us to...for us.

1522 Lombardi: Okay. Okay. And one unit is for the, the church,
1523 right?

1524 Slansky: Two units are for the church.

1525 Lombardi: Two, two, okay. And those are low or moderate-
1526 income?

1527 Slansky: Moderate-income.

1528 Lomardi: Moderate-income. Okay, thank you.

1529 Slansky: Sure.

1530 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Gregoire, do you have any questions?

1531 Gregoire: No questions.

1532 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Matos?

1533 Matos: Thank you. Just have a quick follow-up question if
1534 I may. This is with regards to the discretionary
1535 modifications to the north and the south and then
1536 to rear of the property. You all are requesting a

1537 10 percent deviation from both, about 1 foot
1538 reduction from the north and the south, and then
1539 you're looking at another 1 foot 6 inches in the
1540 rear. What does this allow you to accomplish in
1541 terms of unit size? In terms of building scope?
1542 What does...what does this modification allow for you
1543 all to accomplish in terms of housing?
1544 Contento: So, with those modifications, basically we are able
1545 to provide the units that are proposed on site.
1546 Without those modifications, even though it's a
1547 very small amount of space, one...one foot on the
1548 north, one foot on the south, one foot six on the
1549 east, without those we would not be able to provide
1550 the unit layouts to have livable units. So, we
1551 would be talking about a reduction in units without
1552 those.
1553 Matos: Is that just across the board? A, a reduction of
1554 units as across the board, should that one foot
1555 deviation not be granted?
1556 Contento: Yeah, basically without those...without the two feet
1557 in the north and south direction and the one foot
1558 six in the east, there would be several stacks of
1559 units that would need to be removed because they
1560 just simply wouldn't fit or we wouldn't be able to

1561 lay them out as livable units.

1562 Matos: So that would redu...reduce, reduce the amount of
1563 units in the...

1564 Contento: It would. It would reduce the unit count, yes.

1565 Matos: Okay. Thank you. No further questions. Thank you,
1566 Chair.

1567 Carvalheiro: Thank you. All good? Okay, great. We will now begin
1568 the public comment portion of the hearing. All
1569 questions and comments on this matter are to be
1570 directed at the Commission, not the audience.
1571 David, do we have any public comments?

1572 Gillig: We do, Chair. We will start our public comments
1573 here in the council chambers, and then we'll follow
1574 up and close it up with Zoom platform. Our first
1575 public speaker will be Arthur Bernstein followed by
1576 Karl Lott. You will have three minutes. Please
1577 state your name and city of residence.

1578 Bernstein: Good evening. Arthur Bernstein, West Hollywood
1579 resident 35 years and 25-year resident of the
1580 building right next door, and I'm speaking in
1581 opposition. First of all, on behalf of myself, the
1582 individuals Homeowner's Association, and the
1583 residents of the neighboring buildings, I'm
1584 affirming everything that's contained in the letter

1585 received by the city on behalf of attorney Goren
1586 Khan (phonetic) dated November 3...13th, 2023, which
1587 is in the record. Now, given our small amount of
1588 time to speak, I'm assuming that the Planning
1589 Commission has taken the time to, to read and fully
1590 understand all of the arguments, both legal and
1591 practical in Mister Khan's letter. The Commission
1592 should also be aware that we feel the ability to
1593 present all of the arguments hosted on tonight due
1594 to the city's failure to respond to our public
1595 records request in a timely fashion or in one case
1596 not at all. The develop...the neighbors of this small
1597 part of West Hollywood have always supported
1598 affordable housing project on this property,
1599 included a...including what was to be a 20-unit
1600 project that was promised to the char...church and,
1601 and a part...a material part of their agreement when
1602 they sold the property, not an 89-unit monstrosity.
1603 To the point just made the...that you had to give
1604 this new relief for the setback. All along they had
1605 89 units, suddenly they're now saying that they
1606 wouldn't be able to have 89 units. So that's a
1607 sudden change that is kind of perplexing. In view
1608 of the, the loan covenants that you spoke of

1609 earlier, the Design Review Board spent hours, and
1610 that apparently went very...went nowhere. Mister
1611 Lombardi and Miss Jones took great effort to put
1612 together large binders of materials and questions
1613 to attempt to explain issues impacting all of the
1614 stakeholders, and that seemed to go nowhere. The
1615 loan agreement does provide for the developers to
1616 collaborate (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and, and that does not
1617 seem to have happened. Maybe the, the intent of
1618 the...of that needs to be made more clear in future
1619 agreements. The city should require a complete EIR.
1620 This would give the residents, stakeholders, and
1621 our city the information, backup, and comfort to
1622 know that we are protected. We want more than the
1623 bare minimum that has to be done. We want actually
1624 the EIR to protect us. Mister Slansky instead found
1625 various consulting firms that would evaluate
1626 different aspects of the project and give them
1627 reports that supported the outcome that he desired.
1628 The city owes it to itself and the current and
1629 future stakeholders to do a full EIR. The loan
1630 agreement provided several matters including that
1631 the project be 100 percent affordable housing, not
1632 98 percent. I know we just heard that they would be

1633 moderate-income, but they...but this deal was part of
1634 a multi-million-dollar transaction with the church
1635 that employs the people that will be in those two
1636 units. And to say now that they're simply moderate-
1637 income people that are not...implying that they're
1638 not associated with the church is a loosery. This
1639 was a multi-million-dollar deal that that was a
1640 significant part of it. So, I don't know whether or
1641 not this truly is 100 percent affordable housing.
1642 The, the modification that is being requested on
1643 the setbacks is, is, is something that is new
1644 I...that the Commission has discretion. This should
1645 have been quite frankly something that would have
1646 been dealt with in those Juliet balconies if, if,
1647 if they would have listened. The see-through
1648 materials on the balconies are a terrible
1649 tr...trouble given that everybody will be able to see
1650 the belongings, the unsightly belongings of the
1651 neighbors.

1652 Gillig: Arthur, your time has expired.

1653 Burnstein: Okay, thank you.

1654 Gillig: Thank you. Karl Lott followed by Abbe Land.

1655 Lott: My name is Karl Lott. I'm a resident of West
1656 Hollywood. I've lived in West Hollywood for more

1657 than 30 years. I live two blocks from this project.
1658 I am the chair of the board of West Hollywood
1659 Community Housing Corporation and I'm speaking in
1660 support of the project. I joined the board a number
1661 of years ago because of my commitment to addressing
1662 housing instability in Los Angeles, in West
1663 Hollywood, throughout our community. I have been
1664 very proud to be part of this organization, which
1665 is actually taking action that addresses housing
1666 instability. We have such a need in this community
1667 to, to provide additional housing at every level,
1668 but especially at the level of, of...for people who,
1669 who can't otherwise afford to live anywhere near
1670 where they work. This project was designed to
1671 provide as many units as possible, not the minimum
1672 amount. We are trying to provide housing from...for
1673 more people, not fewer people. So, I...I'm actually
1674 very pleased that we were able to come up with a
1675 design that I think fits the neighborhood and
1676 provides housing for the maximum number of people
1677 that we can fit on this site in a comfortable and
1678 beautiful environment. When we...the other
1679 communities that our, our organization has built
1680 have been beautiful, have blended into the

1681 neighborhood. If you walk down the street next to
1682 them, you would never know that you were walking
1683 next to an affordable housing community. The, the
1684 residents thrive when they move in. It...it's
1685 heartbreaking to hear the stories of each of these
1686 residents who before this had lived such...had such
1687 struggles in their lives. Providing secure, stable
1688 housing transforms their lives. And I think that
1689 it's really incumbent on all of us and every
1690 community to try to do what we can to provide as
1691 many units as possible of affordable housing. And
1692 I'm very pleased to support this project for that
1693 reason. Thank you.

1694 Gillig: Abbe Land to be followed by Andrew Solomon.

1695 Land: Thank you. Good evening, commissioners. My name is
1696 Abbe Land and I'm a long-time resident here in the
1697 city of West Hollywood. I'm also a long-time
1698 supporter of the West Hollywood Housing Corporation
1699 because I so believe in their mission to develop
1700 affordable housing that is perfect for communities.
1701 I beg you tonight to please approve the staff
1702 recommendation and the resolution for 910-916 North
1703 Wetherly. You have an opportunity tonight as you've
1704 heard and you've read your Staff Report. We need

1705 more affordable housing. This project was designed
1706 to maximize an opportunity. An opportunity to
1707 change people's lives. This project will give young
1708 people, people coming out of the foster system, a
1709 chance to begin their life here in West Hollywood,
1710 a chance to be again building for the next stage of
1711 their life. And, you know, when I was reading the
1712 Staff Report I was thinking back to when I first
1713 came to West Hollywood. I didn't come out of the
1714 foster care system, but I had hardly no money. And
1715 if I had not found an affordable unit here, I
1716 wouldn't be able to live in West Hollywood. The
1717 time was then I was able to do that. This makes a
1718 big, big difference. The West Hollywood Housing
1719 Corporation has an amazing reputation of building
1720 quality, quality units. And in fact, not that I
1721 have exact evidence, but I don't think anyone's
1722 property value ever went down because one of their
1723 projects were there. In fact, it probably
1724 increased. The thing, too, that people need to
1725 realize is folks that come into these units,
1726 they're going to be scrutinized more than any of
1727 our neighbors are scrutinized. I live in a condo. I
1728 can't do a background check on a new homeowner. I

1729 have to just accept a neighbor who comes in. All of
1730 these people will be...have background checks, will
1731 make sure that they meet all of the qualifications.
1732 And when they move in, they get the services that
1733 they need. So, especially for those folks with
1734 chronic disease to be able to live in a quality
1735 unit, to know what their unit is going to cost, and
1736 be able to get the services as we heard, it's life-
1737 changing for people. This city has a long history
1738 of caring about people. I know that this is a tall
1739 building. But you know what, I bet when they built
1740 the five-story building next door neighbors came
1741 out and said, "It's too tall, it's horrible." And
1742 you know what, now those people are part of our
1743 community. We have an opportunity to bring in 89
1744 units, 88 units of...for people who really need
1745 affordable housing who can become part of our
1746 community, part of the fabric of our community, and
1747 help us continue. Because when you...people see this
1748 project, then I know that they're going to want to
1749 see more projects as well, and I hope we always get
1750 to support the development of affordable housing
1751 here in our city. Thank you very much for your
1752 consideration.

1753 Gillig: Andrew Solomon to be followed by David Nash.

1754 Solomon: Hi, good evening. Andrew Solomon. I've lived in
1755 West Hollywood for nine years. I support the
1756 housing project at 910 Wetherly and I support the
1757 West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation. West
1758 Hollywood is a beacon, it's a sanctuary city, it's
1759 a city on a hill for all the misfit toys to come
1760 here and belong. But we're out of space. There's
1761 nowhere that we could...that we have in our city to
1762 accept these new, new people who, who need a place
1763 to belong. So, I'm glad to see this project which
1764 provides 89. It's a drop in the bucket that
1765 provides a chance and opportunity to change the
1766 lives of 89 people. As I read through the Staff
1767 Report, I'm glad that the West Hollywood Community
1768 Housing Corporation took every advantage of state
1769 law available to them to provide the most units. In
1770 most of that, discretion is, is out of your
1771 control. That's the state law and, and it's...that is
1772 what you all have to abide by. As I read through
1773 the staff report, I note on page 29 it's the Staff
1774 Professional Assessment. Based on the evidence, the
1775 city has an extremely limited ability to deny or
1776 require changes to the project. Where the city does

1777 have discretion in the requested modification for
1778 10 percent in both of the side yards setbacks and
1779 10 percent in the required rear yard setback. So,
1780 you have a very limited amount of discretion, a
1781 very limited light to look through. It is 12
1782 inches. But in that very limited light, you get...you
1783 get the opportunity to change the lives of
1784 potentially 89 people, and that's an awesome
1785 responsibility. You've earned your 75 dollars for
1786 tonight. So, I hope that you will support this
1787 project. I hope that you will support the future
1788 lives that it will change. Thank you.

1789 Gillig: Thank you. Our next speaker is David Nash, followed
1790 by Christian Robert.

1791 Nash: Thank you. David Nash. This January I will become a
1792 25-year resident of West Hollywood. I live in a
1793 beautiful building on Palm Avenue that the West
1794 Hollywood Community Housing Corporation and
1795 developed in coordination with the Actor's Fund. I
1796 have become a reasonable active member of the
1797 community. I'm honored and so pleased to live in
1798 West Hollywood in an affordable, beautiful
1799 situation. This building is not monstrous. The
1800 executive director of the Actor's Fund, Keith

1801 McNutt explained to me recently how size matters
1802 and bigger is better. If you don't have enough
1803 units on a property, the building will not support
1804 itself. It will operate at a loss. So, you need the
1805 units not just to house people, but to make the
1806 entire project supportable. So, I, I greatly
1807 encourage you all to let this project move forward
1808 as soon as possible and to continue to support
1809 affordable housing for people who have needs.
1810 Whether they be senior, disabled, or struck by some
1811 circumstance in their life that they can't afford
1812 \$3,000 dollars a month to live here. So please show
1813 your support for those people and move ahead with
1814 this project. Thank you very much.

1815 Gillig: Christian Robert to be followed by Martha Orellana.

1816 Robert: Good evening, commissioners. Christian Robert,
1817 resident of Los Angeles. I'm in a little unusual
1818 position here. I'm actually speaking as a private
1819 citizen. I'm also a co-founder and principal of
1820 Office Untitled the architect. I want to take you
1821 back when I first arrived in Los Angeles. I came
1822 here about 2000 and...2001. I had just lost my job.
1823 My dad was in Germany. My mom...and I called my dad
1824 and was like, "Please, I need \$2500 dollars to make

1825 it to the next paycheck." I would luckily find a
1826 job in an animation firm and, and I found a room to
1827 live for \$328 dollars a month. That now
1828 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) about three to four years, I
1829 shared it with roommates, and now I'm proud co-
1830 founder of a firm. We employ 50 people. And I would
1831 say 75 percent of our staff members would qualify
1832 for the...for the low-income. Not that we don't pay
1833 them enough, but I think the median income that
1834 qualifies is about \$75,000 dollars a year. So,
1835 we're going back to the project. And as you know,
1836 our Harland project is an incredible success in
1837 this city. It provides with 37 units, 12 market
1838 rate un...12 affordable units. Those affordable units
1839 are incredibly inconspicuous. There's people there
1840 that live...that make a living that work in the city
1841 and we need more of those projects. The question
1842 about the setback came up. I would say every unit
1843 counts, but also every inch counts. I understand
1844 that we might lose a few units, we can make the
1845 units also smaller. But in a way, we're really
1846 there to provide a balance. You know our work.
1847 We've done over 10 projects in this city. This is
1848 not about creating a monster. And, and about

1849 fitting density and this is one of probably the
1850 most challenging projects of our career, right? I
1851 think it's an incredibly tight sight, tight street.
1852 We fully recognize and have really compassion for
1853 all the neighbor's concerns. We really tried our
1854 best. Hopefully, that...as we always do in
1855 collaboration with city, with the staff, with the
1856 members of the public. But it's, it's always a
1857 compromise. So, thank you.

1858 Gillig: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Martha
1859 Orellana. Is followed by Mark Yusupav.

1860 Orellana: Hello. By the way, are we straightened out the
1861 phone...the, the actual timer? Because didn't we say
1862 that we were going to get more time? That was in
1863 the agreement? Yes? When you guys made...yeah?
1864 Because I know that Mister Bernstein got cut off at
1865 three minutes. And if they got additional five
1866 minutes, we were going to give everybody more time.
1867 Is that not the deal? Did I just...

1868 Rosen: I would just note that the agenda states that
1869 public receives three minutes. Our understanding
1870 from Commissioner Matos request was if the
1871 applicant received an additional five minutes, the
1872 public would be allowed to go at their full three-

1873 minute threshold. And I would also just note for
1874 public comment that the commission can't respond to
1875 questions that are posed during public comment.

1876 Orellana: My name is Martha Orellana. I've lived here for 29
1877 years. And I just want to straighten out something.
1878 The building next door is not five feet...five
1879 stories, it's three stories with a loft. So, I
1880 don't know where that, that number or that
1881 misconception came from. I'm here to talk to you
1882 about light and darkness, shade and shadow. A
1883 building almost twice as tall as any other
1884 residence that, that is definitely there will
1885 create major problems, eliminate light, take away
1886 the sunlight, and be completely encased by this
1887 seven-story building. From dozens of residents,
1888 they will have no light it...as soon as it...it's
1889 built. So, what, what happened to allowing
1890 residents to enjoy sun...sunlight? All of a sudden
1891 their rights will be violated. Transparency? We had
1892 such dark shadows run deep with this project. How
1893 the land was acquired, how the church sued the
1894 developer along with the city of West Hollywood and
1895 the Planning Commissioner, and how the developer
1896 gave church a big chunk of money to get the land.

1897 Now they expect us to pay for some of that? The
1898 height of...I, I got time guys. The height of this
1899 monstrosity, it is a monstrosity because it's not
1900 equivalent to anything that's on Harland. Harland
1901 is not a monstrosity, and it should be allowed to
1902 be the same...similar. You can put Harland right
1903 where we are and that would be lovely. But the...it,
1904 it, it will deny the ability to install solar
1905 panels. They will be denied the right for energy
1906 efficiency buildings right next to it. Affordable
1907 housing? Two units will go to the church as part of
1908 the lawsuit agreement. That is not affordable
1909 housing. The pastor and his...they're, they're not in
1910 low-income (UNINTELLIGIBLE). So, you call 300
1911 square-feet a li...a living space housing? You
1912 promote quality of life as an equivalent to a one-
1913 car garage, a hotel room, or a small jail cell?
1914 That is not housing. This is a developer trying
1915 to...this is a developer trying to line his...a
1916 developer trying to align his pockets. Just because
1917 they call themselves non-profit, it doesn't mean
1918 that they aren't begging or being compensated
1919 extremely well and will benefit enormously from
1920 having twice as many units as it really should be.

1921 We're not opposed to, to having affordable housing
1922 there, we're just opposed to the monstrosity that
1923 will be created by the...and all the trouble that it
1924 will cost in terms of traffic, parking, whatever.
1925 But why should Slan...Mister Slansky care? He lives
1926 in a lovely multi-million-dollar home in a quiet
1927 tree-lined street outside of West Hollywood.
1928 Not...and, and also not, not...we don't...he...we don't
1929 live in Westlake Village. Parking passes for a
1930 building that refuses to provide enough parking
1931 residents? To take away parking for people that
1932 actually live there that have lived there for a
1933 long time? The church has beautiful stain-glass
1934 windows. No light shining through, so I guess we
1935 can call it stain-glass greed. Standing up for all
1936 residents, several cities in California are
1937 standing up and fighting for their residence. We
1938 have the right to dispute laws that are thoughtless
1939 and harmful to the majority of citizens. You can
1940 and you should fight certain leg...legislation that
1941 will have the detriment effects. It is your duty to
1942 do what is best for all of us, not just for a few
1943 of them. Not just...it's a...don't be a sheep that
1944 follows certain ethics that don't make sense. This

1945 project is total antithetical to the City of West
1946 Hollywood mission statement and core values
1947 "Quality of residential life." We maintain a
1948 balanced sense of community by protecting quality
1949 of life, conserving our historic neighborhoods,
1950 safeguards, housing affordability, and..

1951 Gillig: Please finish your thought up. Your time is
1952 expired.

1953 Orellana: ...proactively governing growth with care and
1954 thought. Thank you.

1955 Gillig: Thank you. Mark to be followed by Joseph Dickstein.

1956 Yusupav: Dear commissioner and city staff, my name is Mark
1957 Farhad Yusupav. I'm a 22-year resident of West
1958 Hollywood. I urge you to consider our
1959 neighborhood's voices and withhold approval for the
1960 current project. The developer needs to go back to
1961 the drawing board and integrate communities input
1962 rather than imposing their plan on us. We all
1963 advocate for affordable housing, but we emphasize
1964 also the need for neighborhood-specific
1965 considerations. As we know, the project history
1966 involves broken promises, losses, and questionable
1967 dealings, and there is overwhelming public
1968 opposition. However, our concerns have been

1969 consistently dis...consistently disregarded.

1970 Community meetings that were inadequately executed

1971 limiting full participation and overlooking

1972 essential feedback. Even this hearing is postponed

1973 and scheduled about...around holiday times, when most

1974 of the residents already in vaca...on vacations or

1975 t...taking time off. And despite numerous pleas, the

1976 developer has ignored requests to adjust the

1977 building size and design. That impacts the sunlight

1978 and for example disallows our building to get

1979 solar, solar panels installed on the roofs. We saw

1980 their visual renderings and rather than being

1981 accurate, they seem to downplay the designs in

1982 compet...accountability with our area. When we ask

1983 them several times to provide the view from the

1984 east side, that was never done, and that wasn't

1985 done today either. Why? Because it's not flattering

1986 their project. This design poses significant

1987 concerns, including noise issues from the rooftop

1988 deck. And I don't know if the rooftop deck is part

1989 of the incentives allowed by the state. Also, a big

1990 concern is the metal staircase. If the design is,

1991 is...the whole courtyard is like a cube, imagine what

1992 the staircase in the middle of it will do. And

1993 while we all acknowledge the housing need we
1994 stress...we stress the balanced approach that
1995 respects both community interests and development
1996 objectives. So, we ask for responsibility in
1997 implementing this project. Balancing community
1998 needs with the development plans. This type of
1999 balance approach would set precedent for future
2000 collaborations. I'd say let's work together for a
2001 solution that genuinely considers our city and its
2002 residents, not just developer's concerns. And
2003 lastly, I want to add I think nobody talked about
2004 the cost. And I believe the average unit in this
2005 project is going to cost around \$700,000, which is
2006 way above the average cost of the much bigger unit
2007 in our community. So, we need to think about that
2008 too. Thank you.

2009 Gillig: Joseph to be followed by Susan Rosenbluth.

2010 Dickstein: Hi, I have a speech here, but I'm just going to
2011 wing it. I'm opposed to this. I'm not opposed to
2012 affordable housing. I don't think anybody in their
2013 right mind should be. But I live 20 yards away from
2014 this project, this proposed project. I don't know
2015 if you have all stood on Wetherly and looked at
2016 this project. It's a behemoth. It's going to

2017 destroy a lot of our quality of life. We are for
2018 affordable housing. Build it there. But build the
2019 right building for the right spot. This is a
2020 monstrosity. It's 36 inches away from other
2021 buildings. It overshadows everything. Just because
2022 you can do it, just because the state allows you,
2023 doesn't mean it has to be done that way. How about
2024 the quality of life for each of these individuals
2025 that you are going to house in these micro-units?
2026 They can't afford to shop in the neighborhood. They
2027 can't afford to go to the clubs. They can't afford
2028 anything. They're going to have to leave this
2029 building to go grocery shopping, to feed their
2030 families, to feed each other. It doesn't make sense
2031 and I think that's part of the worst problem with
2032 this along with the fact our tax dollars are going
2033 into it. Who owns this building? What do they get
2034 from it? Who owns the equity? Who collects the
2035 rent? None of this has any clarity to any of us.
2036 We've asked and asked and asked for financial
2037 plans. Four years ago, this building was going to
2038 cost fifty million dollars. Anybody read a
2039 newspaper? Four years ago, the interest rate was
2040 zero. Today it's 7 and a half percent to get a

2041 mortgage, 7.43. Dollars have changed. This building
2042 needs to change. It cannot destroy the lives of
2043 people who live around it. It's just not fair. And
2044 I'm the face. I live in a building. I have a wife.
2045 I have a 15-year-old daughter. This is going to
2046 change our lives completely. For the years of
2047 construction, for the density, for the amount of
2048 people that are going to walk up and down that tiny
2049 narrow street. There are not 50 parking spots on
2050 that street. Yet we're told that he doesn't have
2051 to...Slansky doesn't have to provide any parking. We
2052 can't even park. My mother-in-law can't come over.
2053 It's packed. Give us a little break. I think
2054 your...their attorney basically told you guys as you
2055 all sit here, your hands are tied. So, I guess this
2056 is all just useless. CEQA, density, everything. You
2057 can't really do anything. But I needed our voice to
2058 be heard. Thanks for your time.

2059 Gillig: Susan Rosenbluth to be followed by Todd Grandt.

2060 Rosenbluth: Good evening, commissioners and everybody here with
2061 us tonight. I am a 20-year resident of West
2062 Hollywood. I live directly across the proposed
2063 building site. Unlike the developers who live in
2064 private dwellings outside of West Hollywood, our

2065 community, particularly our block, are working
2066 people who live in multi-dwellings who very much
2067 appreciate and support affordable housing. We do,
2068 however, believe it is the responsibility of our
2069 city to protect us as well as to welcome more of
2070 us. We...what, what hasn't been said is how much our
2071 confidence in the City of West Hollywood governance
2072 has been eroding over the years of being ignored
2073 when we try to express our concerns. I assume that
2074 this commission understands that a petition has
2075 been signed by nearly 1,000 local residents of West
2076 Hollywood objecting to this proposed plan as it
2077 stands and stating our concerns. Never stating we
2078 are opposed to a building of affordable housing
2079 right here, but seriously concerned about our own
2080 safety, our own well-being. And when 1,000
2081 residents speak up and no response follows for a
2082 few years, what are we to think about our city
2083 government elected by us? When we understand that
2084 for all the talk about affordable housing, the
2085 developers here, don't live in West Hollywood,
2086 don't themselves enjoy, you know, the multi-
2087 dwellings like we live in, and yet they're asking
2088 the city for \$10 million dollars of our tax-payer

2089 money to augment the...their...the fiscal nature of
2090 this building and, and their own profits. We will
2091 not profit by this, but we will profit by a
2092 community that's inclusive. We do believe that you
2093 and the city have the right to request an EIR. That
2094 will address some of the concerns that we have for
2095 our own safety. We believe you have the right to
2096 ask for a construction plan. How will this building
2097 be built with consideration for all of us who live
2098 here? For the parents and of the school children
2099 who drop their kids off and pick them up every day?
2100 We haven't seen anything about fire and safety
2101 during this construction period. Those of you who
2102 have looked at the neighborhood see. Where is the
2103 fire truck going to be when these massive, you
2104 know, construction vehicles are there? We are
2105 worried about our safety, and we rely on you guys
2106 to protect us. So please do. Thank you.

2107 Gillig: Todd Grandt to be followed by Patrick Muñoz.

2108 Grandt: Todd Grandt. I've been a resident of West Hollywood
2109 for seven years. Dear Planning Commission, I'm a
2110 Norma Triangle resident, and writing this letter in
2111 strong opposition of the 910 Wetherly project. It
2112 is ridiculous that a project of this magnitude is

2113 brought to Planning Commission during the holiday
2114 period. This meeting should have been pushed back
2115 into the new year. Many of us cannot attend due to
2116 travel, and it is clear that the WHCHC has again
2117 disregarded and avoided community engagement when
2118 over 1,000 residents have signed a petition against
2119 this project. No major changes have been made to
2120 this project. The community requests have been
2121 completely ignored. All of the points and
2122 suggestions in the Design Review Meeting have been
2123 disregarded. All of the recommendations of the
2124 Historic Commission have been disregarded. The
2125 massive size and scale of this project is
2126 completely out of scope for a narrow in-fill street
2127 of a small neighborhood. The Design Review,
2128 neighborhood residents, and Historic Commission
2129 have all requested that the height be reduced of
2130 the proposed building. It completely overshadows
2131 the historic landmark church. No exemptions for
2132 setbacks should be granted to a building this size
2133 in scale. Instead, additional setback clearance is
2134 needed to give surrounding buildings and the church
2135 breathing room. The open-air interior metal
2136 staircase will cause noise issues for the entire

2137 neighborhood as it will be a huge echo chamber. The
2138 massive roof deck will have also major noise
2139 ramifications, and there should be double height
2140 glass railings required to help prevent noise
2141 issues. All mechanical should be in the garage to
2142 help reduce noise as well. The unit mix is
2143 outrageous. There is too many micro-units. Just
2144 because it's affordable housing, does not mean
2145 residents should be forced to live in a 250-square-
2146 foot shoe box with one small window. There should
2147 be more one to two bedrooms and overall fewer but
2148 larger studios. They are trying to squeeze 89 units
2149 into a space, which should be under 20 units. There
2150 should be more green space throughout the building
2151 in a meaningful way to counter ben...to
2152 counterbalance the density. There shouldn't be no
2153 drop off or pick up allowed on the street for a
2154 building this size. They should be required to have
2155 a circular driveway like lar...other large building
2156 so as to not disrupt the neighborhood streets. The
2157 building should not be allowed any street permit
2158 parking or visiting parking either. Thank you for
2159 your time.

2160 Gillig: ...to be followed by Eric Hoffman.

2161 Muñoz: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Patrick
2162 Muñoz. I live across the way at 9024 Cynthia. So
2163 rather close. And we really appreciate, first of
2164 all, that we've had these conversations and that
2165 people are open both by the planning planners, the
2166 builders, the architects, and the Planning
2167 Commission of the city to take our comments and
2168 listen to the concerns both for more housing, which
2169 I support. We all support. Or I support. I will
2170 speak for myself and my husband. And that we are
2171 excited that, you know, that there will be
2172 something being put in. Having said that, it is and
2173 you've heard the...both the pros and the cons, but
2174 the voices of the actual residents who live there
2175 that it is a lot on that footprint to put an 89-
2176 units on 7 stories when the tallest units on that
2177 block and even these...you know, the block's
2178 directly...besides going one block down to the hotel,
2179 are only 4 stories high at the highest. And in
2180 fact, below us on Vista Grande the houses are at a
2181 one-story...that's the only...as tall as they can build
2182 them right now is the one story. They can't add a
2183 second story. So, I do appreciate that we've had
2184 this time and the patience and everybody being here

2185 and being able to voice both opinions pro and con.
2186 I would just ask, and I realize that with the state
2187 laws as they are in favor of this, and really with
2188 no kind of modifications required on their part, on
2189 our part...on the builder's part that we would just
2190 kind of take a moment to...if they could, if the
2191 builder's could in any way reassess this and think
2192 about maybe just diminishing the footprint a bit in
2193 terms of the number of units, the 89 units and the
2194 7 stories. Even if we're taking down a bit more. I
2195 really appreciate the setback reduction, the
2196 modifications made there. Again, very thoughtful of
2197 the builders, the planners. I appreciate that. And
2198 but I do speak on behalf of a community that wants
2199 people to have housing to do so in a way that is
2200 both fair and takes into account the concerns of
2201 the United States of America to have housing for
2202 people, along with the concerns of those people
2203 directly affected. I appreciate your time and
2204 patience. Again, thank you for letting me speak.

2205 Gillig: Eric Hoffman to be followed by George Murphy.

2206 Hoffman: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Eric
2207 Hoffman. I'm a Los Angeles resident. Some comments
2208 were made about the size of sort of the smaller

2209 units and people being forced to live in those
2210 units. This is a completely voluntary project.
2211 Nobody...no one is being forced to move into these
2212 units. If someone chooses to move into these units,
2213 that is because they cannot afford a larger unit or
2214 a unit elsewhere for their...for them to be able to
2215 live in West Hollywood. The reason for that is
2216 because this city and the entire all 88
2217 jurisdictions in Los Angeles County have not built
2218 enough housing. So, the fact that these units are
2219 so small, I think is emblematic of the problems
2220 that we have because communities have not let
2221 projects like these that have a hundred percent
2222 affordable housing get built. So I wanted to
2223 register my support of this project. Thank you very
2224 much.

2225 Gillig: Thank you. George Murphy to be followed by Alana
2226 Jackler.

2227 Murphy: My name is George Murphy. I've lived in this area
2228 since 1964...before there was a West Hollywood at the
2229 risk of showing my age if I don't already. I won't
2230 go into describing how I feel about this aesthetic
2231 effect of this car buckle on our city. But I was
2232 very moved by our previous speaker Joe who was

2233 talking about the effect of the people who have to
2234 live here. Now, this is California. You have 89
2235 units and 66 parking spaces. Some of those units
2236 are going to have two cars, some of them will have
2237 no cars. How...what are you going to do with these
2238 people? Huh? How are they going to park? What's
2239 going to happen to them? The City of West Hollywood
2240 could get rich by giving out parking tickets to
2241 them. But who wants to give out...get rich by...off the
2242 backs of these people. And what are they going to
2243 do and where are they going to go? The nearest park
2244 it's a...it's a walk. They have to come down here to
2245 West Hollywood Park or maybe they'd go to Beverly
2246 Hills. I don't think they'd be welcome. I think
2247 that this is a very bad traffic. I was amazed to
2248 see that the...to see there was no traffic input.
2249 Well, if you've been on Cynthia Avenue, it's
2250 parallel to Sunset Boulevard. In the rush hour,
2251 it's jammed and it's a good fusion between Doheny
2252 and Cynthia that our folks in Beverly Hills will
2253 let us clear up. And the traffic...these people can't
2254 park. And where are the electricians and plumbers?
2255 The service the building's going to park? One nice
2256 thing about West Hollywood has been...is that the

2257 residents have had to have a place to park.
2258 Apartment units don't go up without adequate
2259 parking. Otherwise, it'd be untellable. We have the
2260 highest density population in California I think or
2261 close to it. And to make a...to upset that is going
2262 to harm both everyone living there and the people
2263 that try to move in there. Where are they going to
2264 go? What are they going to do? And the elderly will
2265 have to walk uphill or downhill or above hill. It's
2266 on a hill a half a mile to get to public
2267 transportation, which is the best transportation.
2268 No, they will have their cars. And this is no place
2269 for it. Thank you.

2270 Gillig: Thank you, George. Alana Jackler to be followed by
2271 Antonio Whiteley. Alana? No? Okay, Antonio.

2272 Male 3: Different Antonio.

2273 Rivera: Angelo Rivera. Been living in West Hollywood for
2274 almost 10 years. Wow, I've heard the pros and cons.
2275 I hear the other side, I do. I don't know anything
2276 about Wetherly Drive. I'm a tenant at the Courtyard
2277 at La Brea. And I had to let go of my ego when I
2278 moved in thinking I was moving into a low-income
2279 complex. I had to let go of that. Then when I moved
2280 in, I had to assess the situation like, what kind

2281 of people are going to be moving in here? Low-
2282 income people. Well, I'm a low-income person. And
2283 then I had to let my ego go there. And now that
2284 I've been living there for 10 years, all the
2285 complaints, all the bitching and moaning that
2286 people were doing, and I know the concerns are
2287 rightly so. They were the same for the Courtyard at
2288 La Brea. But now there's no complaints at all and
2289 it's a safe environment. Once you get in off the
2290 street, the building feels so safe and so secure.
2291 It's so quiet. And the tenants, it's diversified.
2292 Yes, but everybody respects everybody else. So, I,
2293 I can't address Wetherly Drive because I just don't
2294 know anything about that. I, I could only address
2295 low-income housing and we just need it so badly.
2296 And Abby and Eric already spoke about that. To get
2297 into a low-income building requires a whole lot of
2298 paperwork. I mean, they know and own you when you
2299 move in there. So, there's a sense of security. My
2300 God, I'm almost approaching 80. If anything happens
2301 to social security, I'm safe. I'm safe in this low-
2302 income building. They'll, they'll take that into
2303 account and lower my rent. So, for me, low-income
2304 housing is just so necessary. Just incredibly

2305 necessary right now. And the fact that West
2306 Hollywood is jumping on it compared to a lot of
2307 other places, I have to give them credit for that.
2308 Again, I feel...I feel the people that live around
2309 Wetherly Drive. I do hear what you're saying. But
2310 just give low-income housing a chance on Wetherly
2311 Drive. Whether you have to make changes to the
2312 building or whatever, just give them a chance to
2313 just keep building these places for us who are low-
2314 income. There's nothing else we can do. We depend
2315 on these buildings going up. Again, I feel bad for
2316 the people on Wetherly Drive that live around that
2317 neighborhood, but just give low-income housing a
2318 chance. See what they come up with. That's all.

2319 Gillig: Xen to be followed by Greyson Sawyer.

2320 Tara: Good evening, commissioners. Xen Tara, a 15-year
2321 resident. Excellent Staff Proposal...Report I mean.
2322 Thank you for that. As the parent of two adult
2323 children with disabilities, I'm very much in favor
2324 of affordable housing. I have been to enough public
2325 Historical Commission meetings to understand the,
2326 the questions earlier and I appreciate that. I do
2327 support this project and I just want to...I'm just
2328 going to leave it at that. Thank you. I do support

2329 the project, thank you.

2330 Gillig: Thank you. Greyson Sawyer to be followed by Mark
2331 Cregar.

2332 Male 3: He's not here.

2333 Gillig: Greyson? Okay. Mark Cregar to be followed by Angelo
2334 Rivera.

2335 Cregar: Hi, I'm Mark Cregar. Long time resident of West
2336 Hollywood. I've been in the Norma Triangle for
2337 about eight years. I do support affordable low-
2338 income housing, but I don't support this project as
2339 it currently stands. The Wetherly Palms project as
2340 it's currently conceived it's too large, it's too
2341 invasive, and above all, it's too dense. And land
2342 that was formerly occupied by just two houses, a
2343 building housing as many as 300 people is being
2344 proposed. That's equivalent to one percent of the
2345 population of West Hollywood in just one building
2346 on a lot design for two homes. Excuse me. I agree
2347 with nearly a thousand others who have signed that
2348 petition calling for changes. Such as a driveway
2349 that would alleviate traffic, larger setbacks, and
2350 a height limit of four stories. Most importantly, an
2351 Environmental Impact Study is critical to assess
2352 the impacts of this unprecedented project. And it

2353 is unprecedented. I think it's unlike anything that
2354 any of the other residents of affordable housing
2355 have, have lived in. Basically, none of our
2356 requests have been unreasonable, yet the developer
2357 has continued to ignore them. This community
2358 supports low-income housing. We just want the most
2359 potentially egregious of the project impacts to be
2360 addressed. That's it. Thank you.

2361 Gillig: Parker to be followed by Nick Perloff. No Parker?

2362 Friedrich: Right here.

2363 Gillig: Okay.

2364 Friedrich: Hi, Parker Friedrich, eight-year West Hollywood
2365 resident. I'm in support of this project. We as a
2366 city would like to commute...would like to create
2367 2400 affordable units by 2029. This would do 3.5
2368 percent of that. I think someone said we're at four
2369 percent. If we allow these innless, bad faith
2370 arguments to slow and reduce and potentially stop
2371 this project, it not only will hurt people on the
2372 street, it will set a precedent that people can
2373 come in here and they can argue and shout about
2374 conflicting view that the apartments are too small.
2375 But there's so many units. And I mean, I don't know
2376 if you know the square footage of a tent, but

2377 that's where a lot of these people would end up
2378 without the support of projects like this. It's
2379 about 70 square feet. It's hard to stand. And I
2380 just...I just want to say that I think as it stands
2381 right now, this project is so necessary, and I hope
2382 that you don't let the voices of a very loud
2383 minority change your mind. Thank you.

2384 Gillig: Nick Perloff to be followed by Sage Johnson.

2385 Perloff: Hi, good evening. My name is Nick Perloff. I'm a
2386 resident of Los Angeles. I can hear some laughter
2387 in the background. One of the reasons that I am not
2388 a resident of West Hollywood is because I was born
2389 a little bit late unfortunately, and now rent...the
2390 average one-bedroom in West Hollywood is \$3300
2391 dollars. I just want that to sink in. It's \$3300
2392 dollars. I went to college. I have a decent job. I
2393 definitely can't afford that, right? I have no idea
2394 how someone...how transition-age youth could ever
2395 afford an apartment that's 3300 dollars a month,
2396 right? So...and I think I...we know why we've gotten to
2397 a point where a one-bedroom in West Hollywood
2398 requires an income of about 100,000 dollars to
2399 afford, right? It's because we've had meeting after
2400 meeting, very well-intentioned. I understand the

2401 concerns. I really do. But we've had meeting after
2402 meeting year after year, where people say, "We're
2403 here for affordable housing. We like affordable
2404 housing. But not quite like this." Right? "It's a
2405 little too big. It's a little too, maybe, massive.
2406 I'm worried about the noise, I'm worried about the
2407 parking." I mean, I understand that. But if we're
2408 going to say that every time, these things aren't
2409 going to get built and we're probably going to live
2410 on the street. That will happen. It's already
2411 happening. People live on the street because of
2412 these decisions. And so obviously I am here to
2413 voice my incredible support for this project. I
2414 really encourage you to contemplate the moral and
2415 necessity of these kinds of things that it's very
2416 easy to pick at things, to pick at masses, to pick
2417 at parking, and I understand. And I...like I said,
2418 it's very well-intentioned. But if any of you have
2419 children, I encourage you to think about what their
2420 future in this city might look like in a place that
2421 feels, well, it's more important to preserve
2422 exactly what the city looks like now than to
2423 welcome anybody else in. Because we're looking at a
2424 future with rents at four of five-thousand, six-

2425 thousand dollars for a market rate. Right? I cannot
2426 imagine...I cannot imagine how anyone middle-class,
2427 lower-income will ever afford to live in this city.
2428 And this is a rare opportunity to provide some
2429 housing for people like that. So I really encourage
2430 you to support it. Thank you so much for your time.

2431 Gillig: Sage Johnson to be followed by Kenneth Stabins.

2432 Johnson: Good evening. Mic check, are we good?

2433 Gillig: Can you pull it a little closer? Just pull it down.
2434 There you go.

2435 Johnson: Okay. I know it's late and I understand. My name is
2436 Sage Johnson. I am speaking in favor of the housing
2437 development. I am a West Hollywood resident of five
2438 years and I've been around the city since high
2439 school. Go Fairfax Lions. The importance of 910
2440 Wetherly Drive...Wetherly Drive is vital in
2441 addressing the necessity of low-income housing
2442 units in a city as abundant as this one. Many
2443 people commute in and out of the city for work,
2444 school, community, companionship, and our wonderful
2445 amenities. It is our responsibility as a city to
2446 acknowledge and accommodate our existing neighbors
2447 and our potential residents. I'm just going to say
2448 this, I had a whole script. It's late. I have lived

2449 the experience of being in a house when I was a
2450 young...when I was a young adult, I was a transition-
2451 age youth. Due to the WHCHC, I live in one of their
2452 buildings now. I've stayed housed. Many of the
2453 young people who I know who also went through the
2454 shelter programs are now housed. So low-income
2455 housing and affordable housing has been a godsend
2456 for us. It has allowed us to continue living past
2457 our episodes and eras of trial and tribulations.
2458 Taking into consideration what the folks have
2459 brought to you today about parking, quality of
2460 live, those are all valid. But I do want to keep
2461 the forefront of affordable housing and making sure
2462 we accommodate people who are coming and residents
2463 who are currently there. Thank you so much. I yield
2464 my time.

2465 Gillig: Thank you. Kenneth Stabins to be followed by
2466 Jonathan Wilson.

2467 Stabins: Good evening. My name's Ken Stabins. I'm a resident
2468 of West Hollywood and I live in the building that
2469 is next to the proposed site. I'm for affordable
2470 housing, but not for the current design. My
2471 neighbors and I truly understand how expensive it
2472 is to live in West Hollywood and also understand

2473 the city's attempt to provide housing that is more
2474 affordable. We support that effort. But we don't
2475 support the design. The size of the building is too
2476 large for our neighborhood. Four stories would be
2477 more appropriate as it would be in line for the
2478 neighbor...in the neigh...with the neighboring
2479 buildings and have lesser impact on blocking out
2480 sun of the existing infrastructure. The 89 units is
2481 too many for the building at the propo...proposed
2482 site. Traffic will become unmanageable. Especially
2483 during the rush hours and during times parents drop
2484 off and pick up their kids at the school on
2485 Hammond. I live at 930 North Wetherly...Wetherly, and
2486 I see the traffic on Cynthia, and I see it on
2487 Wetherly and on Hammond. It stretches out to Doheny
2488 to the west and to San Vicente to the...to the east
2489 of us. It, it...it's going to be a mess. The total
2490 number of parking spots in the proposed
2491 subterranean parking will not accommodate the
2492 number of cars that may exist. On-street parking
2493 will become unavailable. It's highly unlikely that
2494 the residents will give up their parking spots for
2495 members of the church. We believe the design of the
2496 building as proposed will cause major disruptions

2497 and serious problems for us, the existing
2498 residents, and for our new welcoming residents in
2499 the Norma Triangle area. Thank you.

2500 Gillig: Jonathan Wilson to be followed by Janet Elliot.

2501 Wilson: Thank you, for the record it's J-O-N-A-T-H-A-N. But
2502 Jonathan Wilson is correct. So, thank you again for
2503 listening to me, Chair, Vice-Chair, and
2504 commissioners. I just want to think about the long-
2505 term vision for West Hollywood. And, and the reason
2506 I'm here is really more about the passion about the
2507 long-term vision. I am also in support of, of, of
2508 what the staff is saying. And partly because, you
2509 know, just a picture that the traffic that we have
2510 that's going up and down Sunset, people have talked
2511 about that a lot. Well, imagine if that traffic
2512 kind of went away because some people that actually
2513 work here could afford to live close to where they
2514 work. Imagine, imagine if an elderly person who may
2515 be five blocks away, they start leveraging the
2516 services that the city already offers allowing for
2517 that free transportation around the city. So,
2518 there's...there are things that may not impact the
2519 traffic. Just the two are not directly correlated.
2520 And then in addition to that, I did want to say too

2521 that denying projects like this will actually limit
2522 supply and drive demand, right, because the
2523 population continues to grow. So that one-bedroom
2524 apartment that the gentleman mentioned earlier
2525 that's 3300 dollars now will only get significantly
2526 higher in five years. Let's also think about
2527 equity, right? So, 70 percent of the homeless
2528 services in, in West Hollywood are being used by
2529 BIPOC individuals. BIPOC people are actually
2530 homeless here in West Hollywood on a much larger
2531 and alarming rate than other people. On top of
2532 that, you're looking at less than 20 percent of the
2533 people that live in West Hollywood are BIPOC.
2534 However, we have a high large...we have a high
2535 percentage of people that are under...are in poverty
2536 or that are in middle-class families that are
2537 BIPOC. We need to drive additional diversity within
2538 West Hollywood, and this is one of the means to do
2539 that. I'm speaking by the way as a resident of West
2540 Hollywood and a business owner. I would love for
2541 one day to employ people that actually could afford
2542 to live here. And, and that is one of the things
2543 that I wanted to talk about as well. When we talk
2544 about traffic, we talk about homelessness, we talk

2545 about prices being driven up, but we aren't talking
2546 about the fact that we are creating 89 locations
2547 for people to live. We are far...we, we have far too
2548 few places for us to be able to...for the people that
2549 want...for the demand of the people that want to live
2550 here in the city of West Hollywood. We offer a
2551 really safe haven. Let's continue to do that for
2552 people that actually want to be here. Thank you.
2553 And I'm sorry for those residents by the way who
2554 believe that their rights are being infringed upon.
2555 We have to make some radical changes and today is
2556 now. Thank you.

2557 Gillig: Thank you. Janet Elliot to be followed by Edoardo
2558 Tealdi. Janet? Go. Edoardo?

2559 Tealdi: Good evening, Commission. Edoardo Tealdi, resident
2560 of West Hollywood. I am speaking in opposition to
2561 this project. Not, not to affordable housing, to
2562 his project. Somebody said earlier it's, it's easy
2563 to pick on things like parking and density and
2564 size. Yes, it's, it's very easy because it's
2565 obviously true. Because anyone with a shred of
2566 common sense can tell that the size of this project
2567 is, is utterly disproportionate to the location for
2568 which it is proposed. If this had been on Doheny,

2569 on Santa Monica, hardly anyone would be objecting.
2570 You wouldn't have all these people objecting. But
2571 this is a tiny street on the side of a hill. And
2572 people have said it better than I have...did...than I
2573 can. The light is going to take...be taken away, the
2574 traffic that it's going to cause, the noise of the
2575 crowds going in and out of the church. It would
2576 cause a permanent deterioration in quality of life
2577 for the neighborhood. It's just a goliath. And as a
2578 resident, I and many others are simply advocating
2579 for a reduction in size for the project. Staff and
2580 the applicant, they kept reminding us that they are
2581 legally allowed to do this, and they kept reminding
2582 you of all the limitations of your powers. I know
2583 I've applied to a lot of things in my life, and I
2584 can never remember one instance of reminding the
2585 people judging my application of the limitations at
2586 their discretion. Every time...every time I hear the
2587 word discretion...every time I've heard the word
2588 discretion tonight, I thought, "God, if I was
2589 sitting up there, I would show them some
2590 discretion." Unbelievable the arrogance of these
2591 people. Anyway, because something...somebody said it
2592 before, but it's also my conclusion. It's because

2593 something can be done, it doesn't mean that it
2594 should be done. Let's have a little bit of common
2595 sense on this one, please. Thank you.

2596 Gillig: Felice Kaplan to be followed by Hector Barbosa.
2597 Felice?

2598 Kaplan: Am I next? I'm Felice.

2599 Gillig: Yes, please come down.

2600 Kaplan: I didn't know. Hello. I just heard about this a few
2601 days ago and I thought I just wanted to take a few
2602 minutes. I've been here my entire life. I've been
2603 in West Hollywood before it was West Hollywood.
2604 I've been here since 1959. And when I heard about
2605 it, I thought, "How wonderful that maybe somebody
2606 could take people whose life is so difficult and
2607 maybe you could just make it a little bit easier
2608 for them. And then maybe they have hope and a
2609 chance. Show a little empathy that maybe they can
2610 get back on their feet again and maybe they won't
2611 be low-income a year from then. And then maybe from
2612 there this is just a steppingstone. They themselves
2613 can do better and maybe one day they can help
2614 someone." I don't believe it has to do with the
2615 building. That's my opinion. I believe these people
2616 just don't like the type of people that will be

2617 living in the building. And they talk about traffic
2618 and this and that. I have a feeling the majority..
2619 Audience: (UNINTELLIGIBLE).
2620 Kaplan: I can speak.
2621 Unknown: Please (UNINTELLIGIBLE).
2622 Kaplan: I have a feeling..
2623 Unknown: Please stop. Thank you.
2624 Kaplan: I have a feeling that the majority of the people
2625 that are low-income probably don't have a car. So,
2626 I don't think they'll be using much of the parking
2627 spaces. And they say it's next to a church, I
2628 wonder how the church would feel about helping
2629 people that need help. I don't know if they would
2630 mind or not. I think they...if they truly are godly-
2631 like people and they're worried about the church,
2632 then ask maybe the people that run the church if
2633 they feel it would be good to help people who are
2634 not doing well at this time. Any of you...nobody is
2635 guaranteed another day. God forbid, can have cancer
2636 tomorrow, can lose your job tomorrow. None of us
2637 are to judge anyone. How hard can it be to just let
2638 somebody, you know, have a little hope, have people
2639 care for them for once in their life? I live near
2640 Sweetzer and Fountain. I've been there 15 years. My

2641 rent is very high too, but I love living in West
2642 Hollywood, and I, I see people's...isn't it better to
2643 have them in a low-income building than to have
2644 them laying on the street yelling and screaming,
2645 getting drunk, peeing, pooping on the sidewalk? My
2646 God, just give them a little hope. It doesn't cost
2647 anything. Thank you.

2648 Gillig: Thank you. Hector Barbosa to be followed by
2649 Alexander Bazley.

2650 Barbosa: Good evening, everyone. My name is Hector Barbosa.
2651 I've been a patron and resident of West Hollywood
2652 since 1977, and I have seen the many changes that
2653 has taken place ever since then. And I wish I could
2654 go back to the late '70s and early '80s, but
2655 obviously, we can't, and we can only think of the
2656 future at this point. I appreciate what people have
2657 said on both sides, but I like to look at things
2658 very practically, and I like to consider the future
2659 where we're going to be at, you know, a couple of
2660 decades from now. A building that has 89 units, is
2661 that going to be something very rare 25 years from
2662 now? I don't think so. Even I'm concerned about
2663 what's going to happen to us who live on Palm
2664 Avenue that it's a building of only 12 units that

2665 clearly are not meeting, you know, the needs of the
2666 people with only 12 units. And I want to dispel a
2667 few untruths here. First, the amount of space.
2668 Okay, in the last decade, a lot of apartments in
2669 West Hollywood have now eliminate...their owners have
2670 eliminated things as closets and dining rooms and
2671 stuff like that in order to accommodate two or
2672 three people in a very limited amount of space.
2673 That is the truth of not only West Hollywood but is
2674 the truth of many cities around the world. Okay,
2675 we're not going to be living in bigger spaces,
2676 we're going to be living in smaller spaces. So
2677 having a building that is only offering, you know,
2678 a certain amount of feet is going to become a...the
2679 reality of tomorrow. Also, the problem of parking,
2680 my building...like I said, we have...it is 12 units.
2681 Approximately 40 percent of the, the, the spaces
2682 are empty. Each unit has two, two parking spaces.
2683 More...roughly half of the people in that building do
2684 not even drive. I don't drive. My roommate does. He
2685 doesn't even spend that much time in, in West
2686 Hollywood. He's mostly, you know, traveling abroad
2687 and everything and yet we have all this space. The
2688 same is the truth for the building right next to me

2689 on the right side and the left side. Most people
2690 now don't require that much parking space. Okay,
2691 and also something else that...the real need for as
2692 much housing, it doesn't matter how much you're
2693 paying for your housing. The fact that the
2694 population is increasing, it's not going to
2695 decrease, and that West Hollywood be...has become an
2696 ideal place to live in not only for the wealthy,
2697 but also for everyone who wants to live within a...a
2698 certain amount of feeling safe. You know? That is
2699 going to be not only the reality of today, but of
2700 tomorrow. And let me say something, the very rich
2701 people in West Hollywood sometimes they don't even
2702 go out for a cup of coffee. It's a lot of the
2703 people who are barely getting by who truly support
2704 a lot of the small businesses in West Hollywood.

2705 Gillig: Thank you. Alexander Bazley to be followed by
2706 Javier Mulero.

2707 Bazley: Hello, good evening, Chair, Vice-Chair, commission.
2708 My name's Alexander Bazley. I have lived on Cynthia
2709 and San Vicente nearby for about 14 years. So, I'm
2710 familiar with the area. I'm here to speak in
2711 support of this item and of the project. I am a
2712 proud board member of the West Hollywood Community

2713 Housing Corporation. The reason that I joined the
2714 organization, this is a home-grown development
2715 company within West Hollywood. It is known for its
2716 award-winning design...architectural design, and
2717 amazing services that it provides its residents,
2718 which is quite critical. As you've heard from Karl,
2719 who also lives nearby, leadership of the company
2720 many of us are from the community from within West
2721 Hollywood or around West Hollywood. So, when this
2722 building was just ideated, you know, really from an
2723 inception, our concerns really were to make sure
2724 that you all were proud of what was presented, and
2725 that the community is proud of what was presented.
2726 I think the most critical item in that regards is
2727 that we are...of course that we all know in a severe
2728 housing crisis for the state, for the region, for
2729 the city. So, this is a most spectacular
2730 opportunity to actually make a transformational
2731 impact for 88 families, and something that will
2732 really help make sure that we can continue to
2733 ensure that there is some economic diversity within
2734 the community. To make sure that our community
2735 stays dynamic in terms of the people who live here,
2736 the economy that's powered here. So, once again, in

2737 great support of this project. It really is our
2738 intention on behalf of the corporation to make you
2739 all proud in terms of having a project here that
2740 not only is within, you know, sort of the, the
2741 state law and within kind of a mandate of the
2742 community, you know, regional in terms of our
2743 housing needs. But of the aesthetics of West
2744 Hollywood and of the ethos of West Hollywood to be
2745 a desirable community open to, to many different
2746 individuals. Thank you.

2747 Gillig: Thank you. Javier to be followed by Dominic
2748 Bonanno.

2749 Mulero: Hi, I'm Javier Mulero. I moved to LA 1989 in
2750 January and I've been in West Hollywood since
2751 January 1st of 2008. I'm totally for this project.
2752 This is what I call a miracle of a project in the
2753 sense that it...the entire thing it's not...it's not
2754 just 11 percent affordable housing in the building,
2755 it's 100 percent with a lot of low-income housing
2756 opportunity. This is amazing. These are people who
2757 are going to be paying about 1/4th of the rent.
2758 That is a great startup for them. It's a great step
2759 up. It's five steps up. I'm totally for this. This
2760 is a city with a lot of writers and actors and,

2761 and, and artists, painters, and just regular
2762 people. This is also...we have a housing crisis here,
2763 and this would allow 89 people, 89 couples perhaps,
2764 small families, to have an opportunity to come in
2765 and be part of this community just like the rest of
2766 us are. And so, they won't have to move to, I don't
2767 know, Compton or Lancaster or Palmdale or Downey.
2768 And there's nothing wrong with that. Like I said,
2769 that...some of us don't want to do that. And so,
2770 I...I'm totally for this. I implore you to please...you
2771 know, pretend it's a city. It's going to grow.
2772 People are going to want to move here just like you
2773 wanted to move here and stay here. Like I did, like
2774 I do. Please, I implore you to approve this project
2775 as proposed. Losing even a few units might appease
2776 some people, but will have greater negative impacts
2777 on those already struggling to make ends meet. I
2778 wish people would be more, more concerned about
2779 housing and security and homelessness. Thank you.

2780

2781 Gillig: Dominic Bonanno followed by Joel Safr.

2782 Bonanno: Hi, good evening. I'm Dominic Bonanno, a long-time
2783 resident of West Hollywood. You know, I'm going to
2784 reference Harvey Milk. He said, "Give them H-O-P-

2785 E." You know, and I'm going to reference my dad
2786 too. My dad always said, you know, "You got to meet
2787 people where they are at." And we need more
2788 housing, and I cannot applaud this project enough.
2789 I'm tired of seeing people who are homeless. I'm
2790 tired of having to walk over them. We, we walk by
2791 them every day. Do we notice them? No, we don't.
2792 Now it's time for a change and West Hollywood is
2793 that city. We always have been that city. I've
2794 always said to myself and to others that will
2795 actually listen, what...why are we not a pilot city?
2796 I mean, we, we do so much for our community. And
2797 when other people can thrive in this community. And
2798 I think that that's most important. And so, I'm
2799 going to support this project. Yes, I've heard both
2800 sides. I've teetered and I've tottered, and I've
2801 tottered and I've teetered. But at the end of the
2802 day, it's about helping families and people being
2803 able not to survive, to live, and that's what this
2804 is about. So, thank you and I honor all of you.
2805 Thank you. Keep smiling.

2806 Gillig: Joel to be followed by Matthew Saam

2807 Safronic: It's Safronic. I think that's me. (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

2808 I'm Joel Safronic. I'm a 30-year resident of the

2809 Norma Triangle. I strongly support the project.
2810 I've walked my dog in the neighborhood for decades.
2811 The fears about parking and traffic are way
2812 overblown. Wetherly's a certainly quiet street and
2813 I sympathize with the concerns of the immediate
2814 neighbors. But the overall violence against this
2815 project is I find com...incomprehensible. So please
2816 support the project. Thank you.

2817 Gillig: Thank you. Matthew to be followed by Gregor Reti.

2818 Saam: Good evening and thank you. I'm speaking on behalf
2819 of my partner, who's lived two...a block away really
2820 for 19 years. I've lived there for six years. I'm a
2821 13-year resident of Los Angeles. I am opposed to
2822 this project, but not opposed to affordable
2823 housing, and I'll tell you why. I was the
2824 beneficiary or, or I benefited from a similar
2825 project 25 years ago in Brooklyn. It might be hard
2826 to believe, but I was lucky enough to secure a spot
2827 as a broke college student in Brooklyn in a new
2828 development. That helped change the course of my
2829 life. However, it was appropriate for the scale of
2830 the neighborhood. When I think about this project
2831 coming into a street that I walk by three times a
2832 day with the dogs, and I see the flow of traffic

2833 who some dismiss as just a minor excuse, there have
2834 been countless times where the traffic flow has
2835 been disregarding the one-way signs. The difficulty
2836 of exiting those side streets, specifically Phyllis
2837 is incredibly difficult to navigate. The Cynthia
2838 stop signs are not being respected. In addition to
2839 that, there's no speed bumps that are kind of
2840 listed in that area or, like, secured in. But they
2841 are on one of the other streets, Hammond, for the
2842 school. All of this aside, you think about 89
2843 units. Okay, maybe half of them don't have cars.
2844 But even if they do, then we're really in a
2845 predicament. I don't know if the proper reports
2846 have really been done. Based on some of the
2847 feedback from the city staff, things like to my
2848 knowledge seems like there's not real enou...real
2849 evidence here that we've done the due diligence of
2850 looking at traffic flow, looking at parking,
2851 looking at the effects on the community, and even
2852 integrating design feedback from the community. The
2853 drawings that we've seen are not to scale...not to
2854 scale. How can we really sit here and decide the
2855 future when you don't even have the real
2856 information? So, the Environmental Report, that's

2857 something that we should be looking at. I mean, I
2858 could keep going. I have a few other thoughts and
2859 I'm just about out of time. So, if any of the other
2860 people that left their names, they were so
2861 frustrated with the system and its process that
2862 they left. And I'm, I'm really sad that they left,
2863 and I had a whole conversation trying to convince
2864 them to stay. But they're so frustrated that
2865 they're not being heard, and they feel like this
2866 project is just being jammed into the system
2867 because it either meets political platforms or
2868 whatever it might be. But we are all for affordable
2869 housing. But not done in this manner, in this
2870 scale. So, let's re-evaluate the height and the
2871 scale and take a minute to really make sure that
2872 you have all the proper information. Thank you.

2873 Gillig: Gregor to be followed by Andrea Sobel.

2874 Reti: Good evening the West Hollywood Planning Committee.
2875 And I have to say that I envy each one of you that
2876 you have the power to make a decision that can
2877 influence a lot of...lot of people. It's not only the
2878 apartment, but they also have families who worry
2879 about them. They have parents, they have children,
2880 they have brothers and sisters, and you can

2881 influence massively their lives. And I would say
2882 the allowance of the building is not even big
2883 enough by far of a catastrophe you are currently
2884 sitting in. And you are...individually, each one of
2885 you can counter that. That freeway 10 fire...I mean,
2886 you...we know what this was the reason for it. And I
2887 would say, of course, and I understand the
2888 residents in the neighborhood that they are afraid
2889 because everything you...every change needs courage.
2890 They don't know what is going to happen and that's
2891 why they're opposed to it. But take my word because
2892 I'm one of those faces. I was homeless. I got an
2893 apartment from the West Hollywood Housing
2894 Corporation, and I'm thriving ever since. It
2895 changed my life. It's like winning the lottery of
2896 life. I'm going to the Los Angeles City College.
2897 I'm studying psychology. I'm volunteering for the
2898 homeless. I'm with the Jewish Family Services
2899 giving out food. I'm turning it around. I paid
2900 forward. It's thanks to you, Planning Commission,
2901 that allowed the Courtyard of La Brea to, to be
2902 erected. And one more thing for the people who are
2903 afraid, which I understand that they are afraid, we
2904 in 10 years never had the police come out to our

2905 building, never. We live in perfect harmony.
2906 Tomorrow we have a community lunch for
2907 Thanksgiving, and we all like each other. We are
2908 there for each other. We support each other. It can
2909 be absolutely beautiful. And yes, it will be too.
2910 And as a man who lived 2023 years ago said, "We not
2911 need to build the walls higher, we need to extend
2912 our table to invite the people. Thank you very
2913 much.

2914 Gillig: Thank you. Andrea to be followed by Steven Roussey.
2915 Did she leave? Steven... to be followed by our last
2916 public speaker here in council chambers, who will
2917 be Cathy Blaiivas. If I've missed anyone, please
2918 come down to see me. I will add you to the list to
2919 give you a moment.

2920 Roussey: Yes, my name is Steven Roussey. I just had a couple
2921 of comments. One is that I would really love I if
2922 somehow people that worked in West Hollywood could
2923 actually end up in this building, assuming it gets
2924 built. As far as I know right now, the likelihood
2925 of that happening is very, very small. Two, on
2926 parkin there's a lot of my neighbors and myself
2927 that are worried about parking on the street. I
2928 think a lot of that could be solved by how the city

2929 issues or does not issue permits for that space or
2930 the residents in that space. And number three, the
2931 parking for the church, which, you know, is sort of
2932 a proponent of probate and the like. Imagine living
2933 in that ci...living in that building and having their
2934 signs there all the time. It really kind of bothers
2935 me. The, the state law that allows them to say that
2936 this is, like, not a choice for the city, I think
2937 you could probably take out a whole floor of
2938 parking and then not have those 20 spots for the
2939 church, and it would probably make the building
2940 cheaper. So, I think that really should reconsider
2941 that. Thank you.

2942 Gillig: Thank you. Cathy Blaivas to be followed by Jesse
2943 Harris.

2944 Blaivas: Good evening, commissioners. Cathy Blaivas, City of
2945 West Hollywood. It's been very interesting sitting
2946 here this whole time listening as you have. In my
2947 opinion, I have not heard one "nimby." I have not
2948 heard one person say they don't want affordable
2949 housing in their neighborhood. I have heard...I have
2950 heard over and over again it is too big for the
2951 neighborhood, it is not taking the neighborhood
2952 into consideration. You know, it...this is probably

2953 the wrong expression, but the focus of affordable
2954 housing is very real. This is like putting 100
2955 pounds of sugar in a 5-pound sack. You can't make
2956 the lot bigger. You can't do that. So, you, you go
2957 up and you make it bigger. Yes, West Hollywood
2958 Housing Corporation has other buildings. Sierra
2959 Bonita on Santa Monica and Sierra Bonita. The
2960 Courtyards on La Brea on La Brea. These are not
2961 neighborhoods. You're not putting a seven-story
2962 building on a corner or on a...on a thoroughfare,
2963 you're putting it in a small neighborhood. I... I
2964 would ask this question, if this was not an
2965 affordable housing building, would you even look
2966 twice at what they're trying to put there? I
2967 understand your limitations...I understand
2968 incentives. But let's be realistic. It's too many
2969 people, too many apartments. Lower...again, I, I
2970 can't speak for the residents. I don't live in that
2971 area. But it seems to me from what I've heard
2972 tonight if West Hollywood Housing Corporation
2973 really listened and listened to the concerns and
2974 reduced the massing, reduced the size, I
2975 don't...again, I'm not speaking for them. I don't
2976 think it would be such an argument. I, I don't

2977 know. I, I certainly don't envy your having to make
2978 this decision tonight and I don't know what you can
2979 actually do. But if you can do anything to, to, you
2980 know, even the scales. To, to really even the
2981 scales because it sounds to me like it's all been
2982 in the developer's hand, and they've had all the
2983 power for lack of a better description. Again, if
2984 this was a regular building, would you have let it
2985 get this far? Thank you and good luck,
2986 commissioners.

2987 Gillig: Jesse Harris to be followed by Josh Harris, and
2988 then we'll go to the Zoom platform.

2989 Harris: Howdy, commissioners. Good evening. Jesse Harris.
2990 I've been a...a resident of West Hollywood for going
2991 on a decade. I actually moved here to West
2992 Hollywood because I got a job at a place that used
2993 to be called the Youth Center on Highland. They...it
2994 was a shelter and drop-in center for homeless youth
2995 that's operated through the LA LGBT Center. And I
2996 got the feeling like a lot of people that I was
2997 just completely overwhelmed by the sheer amount of,
2998 of homeless people, and, and not just homelessness
2999 but the gravity of our...of our housing crisis. And
3000 so, I started thinking, what can be done about

3001 this? And I fell so far down the rabbit hole that I
3002 ended up getting a master's in urban planning and I
3003 now work as an urban planner. And, and I
3004 understand, like many folks do, that we are in a
3005 full-on housing crisis. Actually, the worst that
3006 has been seen in, in recorded history. And I think
3007 by the very nature of the word crisis, what we also
3008 have to understand is that the solutions are, are
3009 not going to be comfortable. We have, you know,
3010 about 2400 units to produce. And as was said
3011 before, this is sort of a drop in, in the bucket. I
3012 love the City of West Hollywood. I'm constantly
3013 bragging about how we are a city that, that values
3014 access, that values transit, that values density,
3015 and values this being a city where, where folks can
3016 live and have a high quality of life. I think this
3017 project is part of that and it's a...it's a great
3018 part of West Hollywood's legacy. The only way that
3019 we can increase the number of housing, and, and we
3020 are absolutely in a housing crisis that mandates
3021 that we increase our housing supply, is to build
3022 differently than we're used to. And that I know is
3023 uncomfortable. I love that this building mixes lots
3024 of different incomes. We oftentimes see buildings

3025 that are only for very low or only luxury. I love
3026 that this provides moderate-income housing. And we
3027 have to acknowledge that the only places to build
3028 new housing in a city in an urban area that's
3029 already built up will require us to build in
3030 existing neighborhoods. This...I think turning a
3031 surface parking lot into, into housing meets...helps
3032 us meet a lot of our regional goals. And to be
3033 cleaner, urban areas that do a good job of
3034 providing adequate housing, they're not easy to
3035 drive a car in. They're not easy to park in. They
3036 have tall buildings next to short buildings next to
3037 medium-sized buildings. They mix the old and the
3038 new. And I don't think that in a crisis we really
3039 have the luxury of prioritizing parking or ease of
3040 single-occupant vehicle movement. And so, I, I
3041 think this is a great project and, and I think that
3042 we need a lot more just like this.

3043 Gillig: Thank you. And our last speaker in chambers will be
3044 Josh Harris. For those of you on the Zoom platform,
3045 if you'd like to speak, your time will be coming
3046 up. Please star nine for me at this time and we'll
3047 give you your opportunity in just a moment. Josh,
3048 go ahead.

3049 Harris: Hi, good..good evening. Joshua Harris. Just a brief
3050 overview, I was a intern for the city about a
3051 decade ago working at the city council and my first
3052 meeting it was about development. And flash forward
3053 a decade on, and I changed the project address, and
3054 it's the same exact rhetoric. Nothing has changed.
3055 Parking, massing, height, it's the same complaints.
3056 Right? And I think as has been mentioned, this is
3057 literally the Housing Crisis Act, right? Housing
3058 Crisis Act. It's in the name. Act. It's right
3059 there, right? We have a game of musical chairs
3060 going on in Los Angeles County. We don't have
3061 enough seats for everyone, right? And what I...people
3062 say people are living on the street. No, people are
3063 dying on the street. They're dying on the street.
3064 And we are all, everyone in here with a pair of eye
3065 balls, has to walk over them, and see these...they
3066 see our fellow humans in the street in these
3067 conditions. And instead of getting more chairs, we
3068 have people talking about, "Hmm, should it be polk-
3069 a-dots? Or maybe we should add..maybe a little
3070 (UNINTELLIGIBLE)." We have a crisis. Please act
3071 accordingly. Thank you.

3072 Gillig: Thanks, Josh. And gentleman, now turn it over to

3073 Joe for our Zoom platform speakers.

3074 Heredia: Hello, Chair and commissioners. We have Alex
3075 Hopkins up. Alex, please state your name and city
3076 of residence and you have three minutes. Thank you.

3077 Hopkins: Hi, my name is Alex Hopkins, and I'm a resident of
3078 West Hollywood. I keep hearing a lot of, "I'm all
3079 for affordable housing, but not this one." And I
3080 think it's important that we recognize there will
3081 always be people in opposition no matter what. So,
3082 my focus is on the people who really deserve this
3083 opportunity. And I'd like to preface this by making
3084 it clear that my opinion is in no way a political
3085 platform, it's a matter of empathy. West Hollywood
3086 is such an amazing, inclusive city. And a lot of
3087 the people who contribute to our city don't have
3088 high-paying jobs so that they can afford housing
3089 here. Some of these people even have to resort to
3090 living in their cars. Their quality of life is far
3091 worse than any of us who can say we sleep in the
3092 same bed each night and wash in the same shower
3093 each day. And that's why affordable housing is so
3094 important to me because it's not just a home, it's
3095 a shower, it's a bed, it's warmth in the winter,
3096 it's cooling in summer, and it's a new start for

3097 those who really need it. For these reasons as well
3098 as those stated tonight, I urge you to approve 9A.

3099 Thank you.

3100 Heredia: All right. And our next speaker on the Zoom
3101 platform will be Roddy. Remember to star six to,
3102 unmute yourself.

3103 Roddy: Hello, my name's Sherelle Roddy and our family owns
3104 a condominium in a complex that borders on Wetherly
3105 Street. I'd like to circle back to the issue of
3106 micro-units. And I've heard discussion tonight, but
3107 it doesn't seem to make any difference that these
3108 are only 250 or 242-square-foot units. But another
3109 government group in the same shoes as your Planning
3110 Commission had this situation presented to them
3111 just this fall, and it was a situation where the
3112 UCLA was proposing to the Board of Regents an
3113 approval for a dorm building specifically aimed to
3114 help low-income students. And the units were going
3115 to be 318 square feet. And I think the Regents
3116 comments about this are informative because it's a
3117 very parallel situation. One of the regents, and
3118 I'm, I'm looking to the LA Times Report, said, "I
3119 don't want to call these jails. But these really
3120 are good dorms." Another Regent noted that the

3121 research has found that micro-units have been
3122 linked to negative mental health issues. And when a
3123 UCLA official said that he was trying to keep costs
3124 down for low-income students, the regent said that
3125 this implication was for poor kids, for low-income
3126 kids, this density is okay. He went onto question
3127 the density. Our Lieu...Lieutenant Governor is a ex-
3128 official member of the Board of Regents and she
3129 com...her remarks were that this trend of smaller and
3130 smaller spaces as campuses cram more students into
3131 rooms to address affordable house...housing is very
3132 worrisome. And she indicated that what it comes
3133 down to is your efforts to use every square foot of
3134 land to produce space for as many students as
3135 possible. But quoting her she said, "But there is a
3136 limit that can get us to the point where students
3137 can really experience negative mental health impact
3138 but by the way they're being asked to live." To the
3139 extent the Commission has power to do so, I ask you
3140 to revisit this issue of micro..micro-units and
3141 really question whether 242 square-feet, 250
3142 square-feet is the type of housing that should be
3143 provided in West Hollywood. I don't support the
3144 plan as it's currently drafted. And to the extent

3145 the Commission can, I ask you to look for revisions
3146 that would make the quality of life for those who
3147 actually live in this development and improved
3148 quality of life. Thank you.

3149 Heredia: We would like to now ask our last speaker to state
3150 their name. Remember to star six to unmute yourself
3151 and it is Yigit Kale.

3152 Kale: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for the
3153 opportunity to speak. I am a resident of 9023
3154 Cynthia Street, which is 10 foot away from the
3155 border...the southern border of the proposed project.
3156 And as someone who will be directly impacted by
3157 this project, I want to underline very clearly to
3158 everyone that I am not opposed to having affordable
3159 housing 10 foot away from our lot line. I am not
3160 opposed to having all these people who need
3161 opportunity in their lives to live in this
3162 building. What we are opposed to as the neighbors
3163 is the design as proposed and the process that we
3164 are all excluded to provide our feedback and pro...to
3165 raise our concerns. I also want to underline that
3166 the report...the Staff Report, and I provided my
3167 concerns in writing with this, is so one-sided and
3168 so biased towards the development. Which I want to

3169 give an example. The report refers to the...to the
3170 standards that the public officials can make
3171 comments about the, the proposed plan while it's
3172 underlying that they cannot be based on subjective
3173 or personal opinions. However, while evaluating the
3174 setback requirements and the concessions that are
3175 at your discretion, the report suggests that...the,
3176 the proposal by the plan applicant for not
3177 providing the setbacks but doing material
3178 modulations or façade movements in lieu of
3179 the...those required setback...setbacks is sufficient.
3180 This is in fact a subjective statement by the staff
3181 and in no way can replace the measurable
3182 requirement of setbacks. So, just to summarize,
3183 this is...thi...this is the right project. This
3184 can't...this is the right opportunity to the
3185 affordable housing, but we are strictly opposing to
3186 the...to the design as proposed, which is not right
3187 for the scale, which is not right for the total
3188 units that will be increasing the amount of the
3189 traffic for our neighborhood. Thank you.

3190 Heredia: Hello, commissioners. We do have one more person
3191 that'll go ahead and raise their hand. And Kali
3192 Rogers, please star six to unmute yourself.

3193 Rogers: Hi, thank you so much. My name is Kali Rogers, and
3194 I'm a current resident of West Hollywood and I'm
3195 calling to voice my support for the project.
3196 California, including West Hollywood, is in a
3197 housing crisis. While this project is bringing some
3198 inconveniences to some, it will be life-changing
3199 for others. We house a dense urban area. And
3200 therefore, big development should be expected if
3201 not welcome. Someone earlier mentioned that if you
3202 have children you need to think about this city's
3203 future. And he is so right. It's something I think
3204 about all the time. I really have no idea how my
3205 daughter will ever afford to live in WeHo at the
3206 rate things are going, unless we get this housing
3207 crisis under control. I'm also very excited at the
3208 notion that people with chronic illness and
3209 transition-age youth will be included in this
3210 project. WeHo thrives off of its diverse population
3211 and this will only add to our vibrant community.
3212 And given the fact that they have a massively long
3213 waitlist, I have a feeling that everyone living in
3214 the building will be grateful and feel incredibly
3215 lucky, regardless if some believe that the
3216 square...square footage is too small. I really

3217 sincerely hope that we welcome our new neighbors at
3218 grocery stores, public park, at our local library,
3219 and other fun events that the city has to offer. I
3220 take issue with the idea that people in affordable
3221 housing can't contribute or belong in this
3222 community. So, thank you so much for listening to
3223 all the comments tonight. And yeah, I hope you
3224 approve this project. Thank you.

3225 Gillig: Chair, that was our last public speaker for this
3226 item. And I will turn it over to you. Next up will
3227 be the applicant's rebuttal.

3228 Carvalheiro: Okay. Thank you. Well, first off, I want to say
3229 thank you for everybody who spoke tonight. Those
3230 are really impactful comments and I'm sure we will
3231 respond to some of them during our deliberation.
3232 The applicant has five minutes to respond. And if
3233 you want, go ahead. We'll take a break shortly
3234 thereafter.

3235 Slansky: Thank you. I want to thank everyone who's come
3236 tonight sincerely and express their concerns about
3237 this project. We strive to be a good neighbor.
3238 We've been here for 35 years. We're not going
3239 anywhere. We're not trying to cram a project on
3240 anyone's throat. The majority of our properties are

3241 on neighborhood residential side streets and most
3242 people have no idea that our housing is affordable
3243 housing. It's, it's scary. Like people said, it's
3244 scary to try something new. But we're in a housing
3245 crisis and we've heard about the need. And it's
3246 incumbent upon us to do everything we can to house
3247 the maximum number of people possible. Yes, the
3248 units are small. I mean, that's the way it is. But
3249 this housing is a choice. No one is forced to live
3250 in this housing. This housing is for people who
3251 choose to sacrifice square footage to live close to
3252 where they work, to live close to their community,
3253 to forego their cars, to forego transit, and just
3254 be in their community that they're otherwise priced
3255 out of. So, we've listened to the neighbors, we've
3256 made some very significant changes, and, and I
3257 just...I want to thank everyone for coming sincerely,
3258 and I want to thank everyone for their comments,
3259 and I want to thank you for your consideration.

3260 Leaderman: Thank you. Ryan Leaderman again. And really do
3261 appreciate the, the turnout tonight and the
3262 heartfelt comments. There might be somewhat of a
3263 misperception about who might live at Wetherly
3264 Palms. Low-income...income is about \$80,000 dollars a

3265 year. And there was some comments tonight that
3266 said, "These people won't shop at Pavilions, they
3267 won't shop in the neighborhood." And that was
3268 Mister Dickstein who said that. So, to me, there's
3269 maybe a little bit of unease about those people who
3270 might live in the neighborhood. But those are
3271 people and they have money and they shop at grocery
3272 stores just like everyone else. I am not only pro
3273 bono council, I'm on the board, and I've been on
3274 the board for a long time. Our buildings are
3275 integrated into the neighborhood. We do not have
3276 issues whatsoever. I understand the legal arguments
3277 very clearly and I think staff does as well as the
3278 Commission. You've been a price of it...of it quite
3279 well. The concerns about parking, this site has a
3280 parking ratio that meets the demand. State law says
3281 zero parking. We are providing parking to meet the
3282 demand that we know in our experience is
3283 appropriate for this site. We're also additionally
3284 accommodating church parking and there's a
3285 condition of approval that goes ahead and addresses
3286 street parking as well to alleviate some of the
3287 concerns of the neighbors. With respect to
3288 construction, there are about 27 conditions staff

3289 is imposing relating to safe conditions and
3290 construction management. And the corporation is
3291 obligated to abide by those conditions. So, I
3292 understand that this is new and scary for some
3293 people, but we have projects in very wealthy areas.
3294 We just had a ground-breaking in Palm Springs right
3295 next to Las Palmas, which is a very exclusive area.
3296 We were just...we're...we have projects all across the
3297 Los Angeles and West Hollywood area and they're
3298 seamless. And, and perhaps some of the residents
3299 could come and visit some of the existing
3300 facilities, some of the existing communities that
3301 are integrated into the fabric of the city. Thank
3302 you.

3303 Carvalheiro: Thank you. So, I'm going to close the public
3304 comment portion of this hearing, and we're going to
3305 take a 10-minute break before we come back and do
3306 deliberation in which the commissioners will have
3307 the opportunity to continue asking questions. Take
3308 their seats, please. Thank you. So, we have now
3309 closed the public portion...the public hearing
3310 portion of this meeting, but we are retaining the
3311 right for commissioners to ask questions of the
3312 applicant and staff. And given all the comments,

3313 and I'm sure the questions that commissioners might
3314 have, I thought it might be a good place to start
3315 deliberation with just...if anybody does have
3316 questions of staff or applicants that maybe we can
3317 ask those questions now before we get into each
3318 deliberation. Does anybody have questions of staff
3319 or...yes? Commissioner Copeland?

3320 Copeland: Thank you, Chair. I guess if you don't mind. The...we
3321 received some correspondence that I...there were some
3322 questions about public information requests that
3323 were not responded to or not in a timely manner. Do
3324 we know if there were requests that were not
3325 addressed or provided?

3326 Rosen: I would say that the Public Records Act component
3327 is separate from the hearing, but I know the city
3328 obviously strives to provide records consistent with
3329 the, the obligations under that state law. But I
3330 would say certainly that the City Staff Team has
3331 been responsive to questions that have come in
3332 responsive to the, the project.

3333 Copeland: Okay. And the, the two units...the moderate-income
3334 units that were set aside for the church. Did...does
3335 city or staff in advance already know what the
3336 income levels of those and that they are...indeed

3337 would, would meet that criteria? Or are we just..

3338 Alkire: Those two units are income-restricted as moderate-
3339 income units. And so, whoever goes into those units
3340 would have to qualify.

3341 Copeland: Okay. So, if they...something happened and they did
3342 not ultimately qualify, that would then go to..

3343 Alkire: There's a...yeah. So, you...are you saying if they're
3344 income-increased or if their income was already too
3345 high to qualify?

3346 Copeland: Right. If we don't have that information now, I
3347 mean, what would happen if those two units did not
3348 qualify that have been set aside?

3349 Alkire: Well, I can't speak to the agreement between the
3350 church and the Housing Corporation. But those units
3351 would be available to people who qualify for
3352 moderate-income units. And so, whether that's
3353 somebody from...that's affiliated with the church per
3354 an agreement or whether that's somebody else, it
3355 would be someone who income-qualifies.

3356 Copeland: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chair. I do have a
3357 question for the applicant when that comes up, but
3358 that's it for staff. Thank you.

3359 Carvalheiro: Do we have any other questions for staff? Vice-
3360 Chair Lombardi?

3361 Lombardi: Just a quick follow-up question to that. So, if the
3362 units are available to anyone who income-qualifies,
3363 what is the process for verifying that?

3364 Alkire: I, I would defer to either the applicant or someone
3365 from...yeah, the applicant I think would be the best
3366 person to respond to that.

3367 Lombardi: Does the...does the...do...does the city receive
3368 documentation or...I understand that, that the
3369 process that leads up to it might be different, but
3370 how does it hit the city? Like, how do you...thank
3371 you.

3372 Bartle: Yeah, this is Alicen Bartle. I'm with the Housing
3373 Department of Public...Property Development
3374 Department of the city. So, there's various income
3375 sources, funding sources on this project. And so,
3376 it's not just the city and not just the applicant
3377 reviewing this project. They're going to win tax
3378 credits, they're going to have county funds, and
3379 these are all of the...you know, lease up is reviewed
3380 by all the folks that are contributing to the
3381 project. So, if you want to talk to the applicant
3382 about how the Lease Up project works funding source
3383 by funding source, you can direct that question
3384 towards them. But, again, this is income-restricted

3385 including the mod-income units.

3386 Lombardi: Who verifies that it's being used as such?

3387 Bartle: The city...the county if they win county funds, the
3388 state if they win state funds, you know, federal
3389 funds if they win LITEC (phonetic) funds. At this
3390 point, the project isn't fully financed. So that's
3391 still to be determined in terms of all the funders
3392 that will be on this agreement.

3393 Lombardi: So, there would be some sort of documentation that
3394 the city would review if...

3395 Bartle: Yes.

3396 Lombardi: ...funding was...what about...only, only for funding
3397 purposes? I, I guess I'm trying to understand the
3398 process because it seems a little bit different
3399 than the typical that we hear here.

3400 Bartle: Well, the city reviews it because of the funding
3401 tied to it. In this case, we put in a \$10 million
3402 dollar commitment, and therefore, you know, we are
3403 tied to various restrictions that are in the
3404 regulatory agreements.

3405 Lombardi: Okay. So, it...one way or another, this is all going
3406 to be checked and routinely checked too...

3407 Bartle: Yes.

3408 Lombardi: ...because it could...like yearly annual basis or

3409 something?

3410 Bartle: Again, it depends on the funding source.

3411 Lombardi: Okay.

3412 Bartle: But annual is typical.

3413 Lombardi: Thank you.

3414 Bartle: Yup.

3415 Lombardi: All right. Thank you. I appreciate it.

3416 Carvalheiro: Any other questions? No? I do have a question for
3417 legal. So, by state law, we're required to make a
3418 decision on this project within 60 days with a 30-
3419 day extension. And I understand that that deadline
3420 is January 1st, correct?

3421 Rosen: I believe the deadline based on when the CEQA
3422 determination was made by the city is in early
3423 January, yes.

3424 Carvalheiro: Okay. If we denied this project, what are...what are
3425 the recourses of a denial?

3426 Rosen: Well, the Planning Commission would have to make
3427 requisite findings to explain sort of why the
3428 project didn't meet the criteria laid out within
3429 the resolution. And so, part of that in terms of
3430 having an Housing Accountability Act Project that's
3431 eligible for density bonus under state law, would
3432 act...would also require findings that are based on

3433 substantial evidence in the record for sort of the
3434 various components of the project to explain for
3435 instance why if you just take, like, the
3436 concessions as an example, which is a density bonus
3437 component of the project. There's, there's
3438 different findings that would have to be made. So,
3439 I'm just using this as an example relevant to the
3440 density bonus component. You know, the city would
3441 have to make the, the findings associated with a
3442 substantial adverse impact based on evidence in the
3443 system. So, practically, you know, you'd have to go
3444 through that process for each of the findings, and
3445 then the project would be denied and the, the
3446 applicant would be able to appeal it. There would
3447 be certainly, I'm sure, action on that...on that end
3448 in terms of whether those findings had been made
3449 based on evidence in the record.

3450 Carvalheiro: Thank you. So, in regards to the 10 percent
3451 modification, if we denied that as...that
3452 modification, the project can still continue and
3453 that modification or that adjustment to the
3454 building happens before the building department
3455 issues any permits? It doesn't come...it does not
3456 come back to the Planning Commission?

3457 Rosen: Because the...so staff's recommendation is to make
3458 the hardship findings to approve the one-foot
3459 setbacks, roughly one-foot setbacks for rear end
3460 side, and make that discretionary decision. If the
3461 Commission was to determine that it could not make
3462 those findings and it could not support the
3463 standard modifications, then that would need to be
3464 stated on the record as part of the motion and the
3465 item would come back on consent because those
3466 findings would need to be incorporated in writing
3467 into the materials, into the resolution, and
3468 additionally, staff would need to go through the,
3469 the findings elsewhere with respect to the standard
3470 modification and the recommendation resolution
3471 that's in front of the Commission this evening.

3472 Carvalheiro: Thank you. That's helpful just so we all have
3473 context to start a discussion and deliberation on.
3474 Does anybody want to take a first try? Commissioner
3475 Gregoire? Oh, sorry. Here, can we hold...do we have
3476 any questions for the applicant? Commissioner
3477 Copeland? I'm sorry.

3478 Copeland: Sorry. Thank you, Chair. I was just listening to
3479 the presentation earlier talking about the other
3480 projects throughout the city and I just wondered

3481 about the lot and unit size comparison, like, in
3482 the residential areas. Are any of these other
3483 projects also exceeding what the local zoning would
3484 require? Like, this one is, is seven stories rather
3485 than its four I understand. Normally is this...is
3486 this something that's, that's new and has not been
3487 done elsewhere in this city? In other words, in a
3488 residential area?

3489 Slansky: The question you're asking is have we taken
3490 advantage of density bonus law previously?

3491 Copeland: Like, in, in a res...on a residential street such as
3492 this by comparison as opposed to not like Sierra
3493 Bonita or something that's on the...

3494 Slansky: Yes.

3495 Copeland: Like Hayworth House for instances on Hayworth.
3496 That's a, a two-story building.

3497 Slansky: Yes.

3498 Copeland: But as far as this lot and this density and, and
3499 this type of residential area. Is this...this is, is
3500 new or do we have another example of...

3501 Slansky: Our last project in the City of West Hollywood,
3502 Blue Hibiscus had a hundred percent density bonus,
3503 which was the standard for 100 percent affordable
3504 housing prior to this new state legislation. And

3505 that's typical for us to take advantage of the
3506 density bonus like that. That...

3507 Copeland: Okay. So, this, this lot size and unit size would
3508 not be something new or unheard of?

3509 Slansky: In...it is not new or unheard of in our portfolio.

3510 Copeland: In West Hollywood I mean.

3511 Slansky: In West Hollywood, like I said, we have taken
3512 advantage. We've always taken the maximum advantage
3513 of State Density Bonus Law...

3514 Copeland: Right.

3515 Slansky: ...available at the time. This is the first time that
3516 we are able to take advantage of this here in West
3517 Hollywood.

3518 Copeland: So, this would be a first in, in some ways?

3519 Slansky: It would be the...yes.

3520 Copeland: Okay. Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

3521 Slansky: Sure. And just if I may, your question in regard to
3522 the two church units, we do have the income
3523 information for the pastor and the groundskeeper,
3524 and they both qualified far below the income
3525 limits.

3526 Copeland: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Chair. That's it for
3527 me.

3528 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Any other questions for, for the

3529 applicant? No? All right. Commissioner Gregoire,
3530 sorry. Go ahead.

3531 Gregoire: I do support staff's recommendation to approve this
3532 project. I do appreciate all of the community that
3533 came out to express their concerns about it.
3534 However, you know, state law in recent years has
3535 been amended to really tie our hands. When I joined
3536 this commission two years ago, I thought this
3537 commission had a lot of discretion. We don't really
3538 have that much discretion anymore. State law has
3539 taken that away from us. I do believe the project
3540 meets all the requirements of the Housing
3541 Accountability Act and State Density Bonus Law. We
3542 don't really have a basis to deny this project
3543 tonight. I know there are two small, minor
3544 modifications that we do have discretion over. But
3545 I feel like those modifications are de minimis.
3546 They'll have a de minimis impact on the community.
3547 And I think it would hurt the project to, to deny
3548 those modification requests. I, I...you know, there
3549 are aspects of the project that I have concerns of
3550 too, you know? I'm, I'm not a fan of the concept of
3551 the micro-unit. Open-minded about it, experiment
3552 with it. I have concerns about that. If I were in

3553 the state legislature, I, I don't think I would
3554 have taken local control away from...with respect to
3555 parking. State law says that we cannot consider the
3556 parking at all. This...we cannot require even one
3557 parking space in this project. And, you know,
3558 that's not the ba...while I appreciate the concern
3559 that there will be a parking impact in the
3560 neighborhood, we can't legally consider that in
3561 making our decision tonight. I do appreciate, you
3562 know, the residents have come forward, expressed
3563 concern about their views being blocked, their
3564 sunlight being blocked. Those, too, are not proper
3565 legal basis to deny this project this evening. So,
3566 I, I, I generally support affordable housing. I'm,
3567 I'm thrilled that this project will be in...adding
3568 89...88 or 89 affordable units to our city. I think
3569 that's a...that's a terrific thing. I, I...but my sense
3570 is that once this project is built, I think...I think
3571 the neighborhood is going to realize that the
3572 negative impacts that they feared are not going to
3573 come to pass. I hope that's not the case. So,
3574 that's all I have to say, and I will be voting yes
3575 on an eventual motion to approve this project.

3576 **Carvalheiro:** Thank you, Commissioner Gregoire. Commissioner

3577 Matos?

3578 Matos: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate that. First of all,
3579 I want to thank every single member of the public
3580 that came out to spend your evening with us and to
3581 take the time to make a public comment. I, I want
3582 you to know that I listen to every single public
3583 comment intensively, and that I've read every
3584 single public comment that has come in even in the
3585 11th hour. Your voices are heard, and I want you to
3586 know that. That being said, I do want to address
3587 some of the realities that we're facing with
3588 specificity and information. To Commissioner
3589 Gregoire's point, there has been several amendments
3590 to what's called the Housing Accountability Act.
3591 This has removed local control from jurisdictions.
3592 It's also given affordable housing developments the
3593 right to certain concessions and waivers that local
3594 jurisdictions are unable to consider and unable to
3595 remove or to make a determination in a different
3596 direction. This isn't by way of a decision; this is
3597 by way of the...here. This is by way of a decision
3598 that is occurring in Sacramento in response to a
3599 very real housing crisis. And it has effectively
3600 changed how we look at projects. What are we doing

3601 here then? What we're here to do is to look at this
3602 project within the confines of the Housing
3603 Accountability Act. It is a very narrow set of
3604 criteria that we're allowed to look at per state
3605 law and actually consider whether or not this
3606 project meets those requirements. And when...you
3607 know, while I definitely appreciate everyone's
3608 voice and I understand the concerns and I hear
3609 them. My job here is to look at this project in the
3610 confines of state law. That is the role. You know,
3611 my mom and my dad used to say, "You follow the
3612 law." And I'm going to continue to do that. That's
3613 what we're doing here. You know, when you look at
3614 the parking issue, specifically Assembly Bill 2097
3615 passed in 2022 and went into enactment in January
3616 1, 2023. What does AB 2097 do? It eliminates
3617 parking requirements for local jurisdictions. That
3618 means that a local jurisdiction can no longer say
3619 that you need to have one space per unit or two
3620 spaces per unit. It's just a reality. And I think
3621 to the point of the city attorney, and I'll try to
3622 make this in a short...this short measure is that if
3623 this project were challenged and taken to the
3624 state, it would...it would stand because it's meeting

3625 the state law requirements. I...you know, I, I
3626 promise you I take the time to review every single
3627 project. I take this role so seriously because I
3628 love this city so much. I review every single line
3629 in this condition. I can cite them...some of them off
3630 of memory. And when I review this project, they
3631 all...it meets the state law requirements. There's
3632 also just a lot of people were bringing up CEQA,
3633 the California Environmental Quality Act. There is
3634 a section with CEQA, specifically section 15194
3635 that grants exemptions for affordable housing
3636 projects like this. So, when you're looking at this
3637 from a legal perspective, from a purely policy
3638 perspective, and what we're here to do, it is
3639 meeting the requirements and that is the reality.
3640 It...you can't put in your personal feelings with it.
3641 It's just black and white. It's state law. So, I
3642 just wanted to provide that information and I also
3643 wanted to just mention that this body earlier in
3644 2023 requested that the city attorney do a briefing
3645 on changes to state law that were enacted on
3646 January 1, 2023. That meeting was on April 6th,
3647 2023. It's available on WeHO TV on YouTube. You can
3648 watch that meeting and there's a very robust

3649 outline of state law changes of what policies have
3650 changed and what the outlook looks like at the
3651 state level. So, I, I encourage you to review that.
3652 The other thing, you know, I just want to address,
3653 you know, the fire department did review, it's in
3654 the Staff Report. There's been a lot of review on
3655 this project. I understand that people have
3656 concerns. But those concerns are out of our hands
3657 this evening and that's just the reality. I do want
3658 to give a little bit of personal touch to this.
3659 This is an affordable housing project and it's
3660 going to provide a really meaningful opportunity
3661 for people to come to this city and afford to live
3662 and work here. I'm just a kid from the central
3663 valley, grew up with a single mom, and I got here
3664 looking for affordable housing. So, for whatever
3665 it's worth, I'd see this as an opportunity to
3666 provide needed affordable options in our community
3667 so that people can come be part of our society in a
3668 meaningful way, be part of our city in a meaningful
3669 way, and I think that that's something that should
3670 be looked at positively. I know...understand that
3671 people have concerns. I acknowledge those concerns.
3672 I have heard them. I promise you. But just looking

3673 at the silver lining here, that is a good thing
3674 that we're creating an opportunity for young people
3675 or people who are struggling or people who are
3676 working in our restaurants, in our bars, to be able
3677 to come here and live here. I think that that is a
3678 very real opportunity and that...and for that reason
3679 and for those whole scopes of reasons, I'm going to
3680 be supporting this tonight. So, thank you for that.

3681 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Commissioner Edwards?

3682 Edwards: I, I li...I'm just going to put my, my...I love this
3683 city. I'm in this city for a very specific reason.
3684 It's because I'm a kid from Cleveland Heights who's
3685 self-identified as a mixed-race Black man and
3686 Jewish. And so, I operate in a luminal space. And
3687 that luminality doesn't always offer safety. So, I
3688 got lucky that my parents were able to move into a
3689 community in northeastern Ohio that was open to
3690 integration and that there was real intention in
3691 that by all the...most of the folks in the city. And
3692 the reason for that was because there was an
3693 intentional effort to organize and have these
3694 conversations about what does it take for us to
3695 healthily integrate. And so, what I love about the
3696 City of West Hollywood is there's that same

3697 intention of being a creative city. To have the
3698 morale imagination to say, "What can we do
3699 differently to ensure that we are inclusive?"
3700 Because we all came from somewhere...for most of us,
3701 to, to this city because it offered a sanctuary.
3702 And thirdly, I want to add that the dually elected
3703 officials in Sacramento were elected. And they were
3704 elected and they are feeling the pressure to
3705 address a crisis. So, they have their moral
3706 obligation to do something about it. And I
3707 understand that the City of West Hollywood, we see
3708 ourselves as an exception to the rule, but we're 88
3709 cities and there's tons of cities throughout the
3710 state of California that have not done their fair
3711 share. And so, you can't just do carve outs and
3712 say, "Well, City of West Hollywood is not obligated
3713 to follow the same rules and regulations that
3714 everybody else is when we have a housing crisis."
3715 So, there's that mandate. And then when it comes to
3716 parking, I just hope you understand that when they
3717 passed these legislation up in the state, it was
3718 based on really good solid science. We know what
3719 the parking needs are for particular type of uses.
3720 It's been consistent and it kind of give you

3721 the...you know, here's the, the quick backstory about
3722 parking and regulations and how we came up with
3723 these rules. There is...I think is the International
3724 Transportation EE something. I can't remember
3725 exactly it's...what it is. But what they did was they
3726 did studies in other states under other conditions
3727 that does not relate to us. In fact, I'll tell you
3728 quickly that in the City of LA when Council Member
3729 Wendy Greuel chaired the Transportation Committee,
3730 she thought for sure that we would need more
3731 parking. So, she asked the city
3732 valet...Transportation Department to look into it.
3733 They looked into it and it quietly went away
3734 because they realized we actually need much less
3735 parking. So, this to, you know, parking spots or
3736 one is not based on any real science that's
3737 partic...you know, that's particular to us. So, I
3738 just want to help everybody understand that
3739 that...this is not just something that was mandated
3740 in, in...without...you know, without thinking about the
3741 consequences of trying to be smart about it. And
3742 so, I, I agree with Commissioners Matos and
3743 Gregoire. I'm obviously going to support this
3744 project. I think...I understand that there's been

3745 some legal arguments made around the, the part
3746 about, you know, that was more...you know, that we
3747 can make. But it doesn't...if we were to try to stop
3748 it based on those three items, it still goes
3749 against the intent of the Housing Accountability
3750 Act. And so, we would not be acting in good faith.
3751 And so, for all the reasons I listed and what was
3752 addressed in the Staff Report, and plus, you know,
3753 the Police, if Fire, if they all make an opinion
3754 about this or...actually not make an opinion based on
3755 their professional, you know, what they're
3756 responsible for doing. Public safety is their
3757 mandate that if they state something is safe, then
3758 I'm going to rely on that finding by our public
3759 safety officials and all the other professionals
3760 who are involved in this process. And so, I will
3761 close by saying this, I really, really appreciate
3762 everybody coming here. This is a unique gift in the
3763 world to come to a space to share your thoughts and
3764 for us to listen and try to offer solutions when we
3765 have that opportunity. And just thank you to
3766 everybody and we heard you. Like, you know,
3767 Commissioner Matos, I have a ton of notes about
3768 everything that everybody said. It's fascinating

3769 and thank you.

3770 Carvalheiro: Thank you, Commissioner Edwards. Commissioner
3771 Copeland?

3772 Copeland: Thank you, Chair. I of course read all the
3773 information in, in the packet and, and listened to
3774 all the public comment. And I'm very torn about
3775 this. This is very difficult because absolutely I
3776 have been asking for and encouraging 100 percent
3777 affordable buildings. But I have issues with what I
3778 feel are insufficient information in, in a couple
3779 of various...Historic Preservation Commission
3780 expressed that they did not receive sufficient
3781 information to even make a finding or
3782 recommendations to us. And there's no denying that
3783 this is next to a cultural resource that...and it
3784 will be affected by it in some way. The question is
3785 to what extent. I think it would have been
3786 important to have more input. It would have been
3787 important to have the original resolution with a
3788 designation in it that talked about defining
3789 features. I know the windows were, were some of
3790 them and those will be...will be blocked. The, the
3791 UDAS Agreement, which we were told is not in our,
3792 our per view. But in the Staff Report, it did list

3793 item after item that was recommended, suggested,
3794 and those were not implemented, and it's supposed
3795 to be a cooperation of partnership. We don't know
3796 to what degree. I'm, I'm uncomfortable with, you
3797 know, if, if they were to remove this, this...the top
3798 floor and there were no modifications which
3799 exacerbates the massing. There's no denying that if
3800 we had a CEQA or a study in EIR, I mean, that would
3801 be different. I think it would have sufficient
3802 information to just be over the line. "Okay, I'm
3803 confident with this. I'm comfortable with it."
3804 Right now, because I'm not confident that I have
3805 the information to make that kind of a, a decision,
3806 and I'm aware of what we are required by law to do
3807 as well on the other hand. But I think not only are
3808 we rendered impotent in some things by state, but
3809 that we do need sufficient information, and I don't
3810 feel that we've received that. So, my thought right
3811 now is that I'm going to need to abstain from this
3812 because of these concerns. Staff is...legal
3813 is...there's no issue with that? Is that correct?
3814 Rosen: Correct. I would say we have a quorum and, and
3815 yeah.
3816 Copeland: Okay. Thank you.

3817 Carvalheiro: Vice-Chair Lombardi?

3818 Lombardi: Thank you. Well, first of all, I do want to say it
3819 was really refreshing to see so many people in the
3820 audience and, and especially, some of you that have
3821 held out here to this point, and we have more items
3822 after this. But I, I do really appreciate it. It's
3823 nice to hear from everyone. I, I think this project
3824 certainly is challenging and perhaps even shocking
3825 to some of the community in terms of its mass and
3826 scale and perhaps especially to, you know, the
3827 immediately adjacent community members. But we
3828 discussed this at length during Design Review. We
3829 did make suggestions. Some of those have been
3830 implemented. And at, at the end of the day, to me,
3831 it appears we don't really have discretion over the
3832 height or the density of the project. You know,
3833 with regards to the modifications, it seems like we
3834 do have some discretion there. But when I look at
3835 the arguments toward those modifications, they
3836 actually seem sensible to me. You know, the
3837 setbacks I understand that that pushes the building
3838 a little bit closer to the adjacent
3839 property..properties. But also, we have some
3840 constraints at the front yard. So, there is a lot

3841 of logic to all of that. So, it's hard for me to
3842 really get on board with there being an issue or
3843 concern there in terms of our review. With regards
3844 to the, the project being a hundred percent
3845 affordable, I have to appreciate and believe that,
3846 that staff and legal's opinion on this is correct.
3847 It's a 100 percent affordable project. And I just
3848 want to point out that, you know, I, I really truly
3849 believe that a successful city is a diverse city
3850 and that can mean so many things. In...income, race,
3851 race or ethnicity, gender identity. You know, a
3852 city that's all poor or all rich is a city that's
3853 destined for failure. We need to have a city that
3854 can, can work for everyone and we need that
3855 diversity. And the cost of housing is so high in
3856 California, so high in West Hollywood, and that's
3857 just the reality. And, and state law has, you know,
3858 pushed us in this direction where we're looking at
3859 a very narrow window of items that we can decide on
3860 and review today for those reasons. So, you know, I
3861 guess what I'd like to say is at the end of the
3862 day, I...I'm 100 percent on board with this project.
3863 And I do ask that the applicant will do anything
3864 possible to ensure the project lives up to the

3865 standards of the City of West Hollywood, really
3866 makes it exemplary. I, I know that there's a lot of
3867 challenges on a project like this. So, if you can
3868 be accountable, I know we were hard on...hard on
3869 everyone during Design Review, and, and maybe even
3870 now. We're coming from a, a space of wanting to
3871 make the project a success. I, I would suggest that
3872 you look at doing anything that is possible to
3873 increase the size of the units. Maybe implement
3874 more Juliet balconies that are open to air but
3875 don't have outdoor patios per se. I, I trust that
3876 there is some opportunity for continued refinement.
3877 We've already seen some of it since this went to
3878 Design Review. Laundry...disbursement of laundry
3879 facilities, not consolidating them all to, to one
3880 area. I still believe that that would be very
3881 helpful given the residents that would be in the
3882 building. But, but ultimately, we have challenges.
3883 Population, environment, all the housing issues
3884 that have been stated. So, I really appreciate all
3885 of the, the feedback that we've heard today from,
3886 from everyone that's been out here. I'm, in
3887 principle, on board with the project and I think
3888 it's, it's...you know, it...it's going to be an

3889 adjustment for people. But it's, it's what we need.
3890 I do have one, one minor note. I am a little bit
3891 concerned about safety factor with the parking and
3892 the unusual condition that we have people that are
3893 not residents using it. So, I guess one suggestion
3894 I have is if we include some sort of condition such
3895 as...what did I write here? Representative of the
3896 church needs to monitor the parking during the
3897 times in which parking is made accessible for
3898 persons utilizing the church and related church
3899 services. I just want to make sure we're covered
3900 there because it is a little bit unusual. And I
3901 think there's multiple ways that could be handled.
3902 So, I don't want us to overly, you know, prescribe
3903 what that is. But I think that would be a welcome
3904 adjustment that I would...I would really push for.
3905 Otherwise, I, I am in support of the project within
3906 all of the considerations that we've had. I realize
3907 it's a dense project, but it is exciting to have a
3908 100 percent affordable project. I, I, I think that
3909 the city needs it and it...you know, it's large but
3910 I, I...again, we need to make housing. So here we
3911 are.

3912 **Carvalheiro:** Thank you Vice-Chair Lombardi. These have all been

3913 very thoughtful deliberations and comments. So, I
3914 won't repeat what's already been said. As you all
3915 know, I'm a proponent of micro-units. I believe
3916 that, you know, the...making our carbon footprint
3917 smaller is something that we should all esteem to
3918 do. And it's important in regards to our immediate
3919 environment and our global environment. So, I don't
3920 have an issue with these smaller units. And like
3921 several of the public comments mentioned, you know,
3922 it would...it's preferable than not having a home,
3923 and it gives people a launching pad to move
3924 forward. And I think that's commendable. From a
3925 design perspective, which I know we're not
3926 discussing but since it came up so often in public
3927 comment, just everybody should know that the
3928 applicant has no reason to ob...take in any of our
3929 design comments if they don't want to. And they did
3930 and they crafted quite a beautiful building. And
3931 they did respond to some of the comments, not all
3932 of them. But regardless, it's still a well-crafted
3933 building. And like one of the other public comments
3934 that was made was like, "We're looking at the city
3935 now." Or, "We're...some of us are considering the
3936 city the way it looks now as opposed to maybe in

3937 10, 20 years from now when a generation has moved
3938 through and the city has fundamentally changed and
3939 this building could be setting a precedence for the
3940 future of our city." And from that point of view,
3941 the well-crafted, well-designed project is
3942 something that would be good in our environment
3943 because it sets a high bar for future projects. I
3944 also want to address...because there were...there was a
3945 letter that implied that they wished the new
3946 building reflected the language of the church...the
3947 design language of the church. And, you know, from
3948 my perspective and from my experience having...doing
3949 lot's of projects in the City of LA where they
3950 often...they always ask that when you're near a
3951 historic resource, you juxtapose oppose that
3952 project as much as possible. You don't try to mimic
3953 what's next door or what you're adding onto because
3954 it muddles what's historic and what's new. And I
3955 think in this regard, this project clearly makes a
3956 statement that, "I'm new and the church is historic
3957 and the two are not muddled." And in that regards,
3958 I don't feel like this is going to overshadow the
3959 church. The church has such a prominent position on
3960 that corner. And it has a very distinctive language

3961 that is really born out of the last turn of the
3962 century when the state determined that Spanish
3963 colonial architecture was going to be the language
3964 for government and most buildings in, in southern
3965 California. It's a totally different point of view
3966 now. So, in regards to that, I'm in support of the
3967 project. And I'm happy to hear that the
3968 modification is not in question in any of the
3969 deliberations because I understand that the fault
3970 line takes away 200 square...285 square feet, and the
3971 modification adds 164 square feet. I'm not sure if
3972 that's per floor or in total. I'm assuming that's
3973 per floor. But either way, the fault line does
3974 create an adverse effect on the project and would
3975 decrease the number of units and the number of
3976 units that we would have on this site. So, in that
3977 regards and with all the other comments that I
3978 agree with, and thank you everybody for all the
3979 comments that you've made and the letters that
3980 you've written, I'm in support of the project also.
3981 So, any...yes, Commissioner Matos?

3982 Matos: I'd like to make a motion.

3983 Carvalheiro: Okay. I was going to ask. Go ahead.

3984 Matos: I'd like to mo...move that we move this project

3985 forward with the staff recommendation.

3986 Carvalheiro: Do we have a second?

3987 Edwards: Second.

3988 Carvalheiro: Commissioner Edwards.

3989 Lombardi: I'm just curious if there was any thought on the
3990 recommended additional note.

3991 Carvalheiro: Are we okay with the motion? Does anybody have any
3992 questions?

3993 Lombardi: I...I'm curious if it would be open, I guess
3994 Commissioner Matos, to the note about monitoring
3995 the parking during the times of which the parking's
3996 made accessible to the church.

3997 Gregoire: I would prefer not to have that, that requirement
3998 imposed on the West Hollywood Community Housing
3999 Corporation.

4000 Carvalheiro: What was...what? Sorry.

4001 Lombardi: I...my question or concern was just that there's
4002 parking that's off-site effectively, right? There's
4003 parking that's not for the residents. And we now
4004 know that there's a gate at the door, which I
4005 didn't see in the plan. So that's good. But is,
4006 is...just the idea that it's open or people could be
4007 coming and going it...within a residential building
4008 is a little unusual. And as you've seen in

4009 commercial, mixed-use residential we've usually had
4010 a...had a separation of parking. It doesn't make
4011 sense to do that here. So I guess I'm just asking
4012 that there's effectively someone that's making sure
4013 when it's opened for the church that people aren't
4014 just able to come and go.

4015 Carvalheiro: Well, that seems to go back to an operational
4016 question...

4017 Lombardi: Yes. Yeah.

4018 Carvalheiro: ...that we...so do we want to ask the applicant or...

4019 Lombardi: I mean, yeah, I guess that might be a question for
4020 the applicant, but there's a motion on the floor.
4021 So, I don't know.

4022 Rosen: Well...yeah, I would say we have a first and a
4023 second. And I believe we have some language that
4024 maybe we can suggest to address Commissioner
4025 Lombardi's concern and then it would be up to the
4026 motion maker and the second whether or not they're
4027 amendable to that with the live motion on the
4028 floor.

4029 Matos: I'm, I'm fine with hearing it.

4030 Rath: Hi, so the con...condition reads, "The building
4031 operator shall ensure that the parking spaces
4032 available to the church are monitored to ensure

4033 that the spaces are used exclusively by authorized
4034 patrons at all times that the church has access to
4035 the parking.

4036 Matos: I will...I will...

4037 Carvalhoeiro: Commissioner Matos, are you okay with that?

4038 Matos: I'm okay with it, but I would also ask my
4039 colleague...

4040 Carvalhoeiro: Commissioner Edwards? Yes?

4041 Matos: ...and my other colleagues where they're at with
4042 that.

4043 Carvalhoeiro: That's fine.

4044 Matos: Chair? Commissioner Copeland? Anyone?

4045 Carvalhoeiro:: She's abstained.

4046 Matos: Okay.

4047 Carvalhoeiro: Okay.

4048 Matos: Cool.

4049 Lombardi: I appreciate that. Thank you.

4050 Matos: Yeah.

4051 Carvalhoeiro: So, we have a motion, we have a second.

4052 Lombardi: I think it...

4053 Rosen: Yup, and just to note on the record, so the motion
4054 as approved by...or as modified by the motion maker
4055 and the second has the condition that was just read
4056 into the record regarding parking authorization.

4057 And so that is the current motion to approve the
4058 project as recommended with that one additional
4059 condition of approval.

4060 Matos: Yes.

4061 Rosen: And the second? Yes. Thank you.

4062 Edwards: Yes.

4063 Gillig: And the motion passes. Five ayes, one abstention,
4064 one with absence. The Planning Commission just
4065 approved Resolution PC231534. Memorializes the
4066 Commission's final action on this matter. This
4067 action is subject to appeal to the city council.
4068 Appeals must be submitted within 10 calendar days
4069 from this date to the city clerk's office. Appeals
4070 must be in writing and accompanied by the required
4071 fees. The City Clerk's Office can provide appeal
4072 forms and information about waiver of fees.

4073 Carvalheiro: Thank you. All right. So, we're going to move onto
4074 Item 10 Section 2: Other, other items that require
4075 a public hearing. Zone Text Amendment free emission
4076 Vehicle Showrooms. Planning Commission has been
4077 asked to have a public hearing to consider
4078 recommendation to the city council to permit and
4079 regular Zero Emission Showrooms in all commercial
4080 and public facility zones in West Hollywood,

4081 California. And excuse me. Thank you. And we have a
4082 Staff Report.

4083 Hittleman: Yes. Thank you, Chair and commissioners. We don't
4084 have the PowerPoint up yet.

4085 Gillig: We're waiting for the connection to the Zoom
4086 platform.

4087 Carvalheiro: Okay. David, do you need to read the appeal
4088 language for the other item?

4089 Gillig: I'm sorry?

4090 Carvalheiro: Did you need to repeat the...re...reread the (talking
4091 over)?

4092 Gillig: No, no, we're...no, we're good to go now.

4093 Carvalheiro: Okay. Okay, great. Thank you.

4094 Hittleman: You ready Francisco?

4095 Contreras: Yeah.

4096 Hittleman: Yeah, thank you Chair and commissioners. I'm Jerry
4097 Hittleman, a contract planner with the city. And as
4098 stated, the item before you tonight is a Zone Text
4099 Amendment to allow zero emission vehicle showrooms
4100 in all commercial zones. Let's see. We'll start
4101 with some background, then what the current
4102 regulations are, proposed amendments, and then our
4103 recommendation to you. So, here's the background.
4104 As you can see, there's a lot of policies and

4105 trends that have recently been enacted for zero
4106 emission vehicles. We have the Biden-Harris
4107 Electric Vehicle Charging Action Plan, and that
4108 requires that half of all new vehicles sold in the
4109 US by 2030 be electric vehicles. California has the
4110 Zero Emission Vehicle Action Plan. And I won't go
4111 into all of the details, but that...they're, they're
4112 basically saying that all new vehicle sales to be
4113 EVs by 2035. And, and you can see that on the graph
4114 on the right-hand side, electric vehicle sales are
4115 going up tremendously in LA County currently. Right
4116 now, there is only one car dealership in the city
4117 that's the Specialty Car Collection and it's up on
4118 Sunset Boulevard, 8929 Sunset Boulevard in the
4119 Sunset Specific zone...Specific Plan zone. So, the
4120 current regulations only allowed vehicle sales in
4121 the CC, the Community Commercial Sunset Specific
4122 Plan and Commercial Arturial zones currently. So,
4123 it's pretty limited to the major roadway. Santa
4124 Monica Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard, and so forth.
4125 Recent...we've...the city has received a number of
4126 recent requirements for ZEV showrooms. And these,
4127 you know, are typically showrooms that are a little
4128 different than your typical car dealership.

4129 They're...I won't go into it, but they're smaller and
4130 they have an interior gallery and maybe a little
4131 bit of a community space in there as well. So, it's
4132 a little bit different. So here are some of the
4133 differences. Sometimes you can order the vehicle
4134 online. Although you can order other vehicles
4135 online. I realized now as well. There's no
4136 typically on-site inventory, only the display
4137 models. You can do test drivers either by
4138 appointment or you can show up in some of these
4139 dealerships as well. There's typically, again, no
4140 on-site repair shop. It's a reduced footprint
4141 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) smaller. And they call themselves
4142 concierge instead of salespeople. So here is some
4143 pictures. You've probably seen them around town.
4144 Tesla, Lucid, Polestar, and then Rivian also. So,
4145 one example, you know, down on the 3rd Street Mall
4146 in Santa Monica, they had...Tesla's been there for a
4147 while. So maybe you've seen that one. And then the
4148 proposed amendments are, we're looking at new
4149 definitions. So, we're looking at a Zero Emission
4150 Vehicle definition, which...let me see. I'll read
4151 that off to you. I have it in the Staff Report
4152 right here. So that is a vehicle that does not emit

4153 exhaust gas or other pollutants from the on-port
4154 source...source of power under any and all possible
4155 operational modes and conditions. And that includes
4156 plug-in electric vehicles, and it also includes
4157 fuel cell electric vehicles that are coming on
4158 board now as well. Then the other definition we're
4159 looking at adding is Z...Zero Emission Vehicle
4160 Showroom. And that's the retail establishment
4161 focusing on zero emission vehicle sales, display,
4162 and costumer...consumer education. That does not
4163 include as we stated vehicle repair, vehicle part
4164 sales, or vehicle rentals, delivery from the site
4165 or exterior vehicle storage, except up to a maximum
4166 of five test vehicles. So, we are proposing a new
4167 section in this zoning code, which would be that
4168 the ZEV showrooms are a maximum of 10,000 square
4169 feet, they have a circulation plan approved for
4170 circulation, and egress and ingress to the site and
4171 how they would do their test drives also, display
4172 in screening requirements for onsite vehicles only,
4173 and no ZEV shall be parked in the public right of
4174 way, maximum of five vehicles in the show room, and
4175 maximum of five ZEVs for test drives on site. So,
4176 it'll be a smaller operation. This came from the

4177 Long Rang Planning Sub-committee. They recommended
4178 that there be only one space per one thousand
4179 square feet of showroom or the retail space. And
4180 that would be for parking on-site. And then
4181 here's...with the zones that...where these EV showrooms
4182 would be allowed. So, it would be the personal
4183 neighborhood on the left, the Sunset Specific Plan,
4184 commercial Arterial, commercial Regional, the
4185 Pacific Design Center, and also the public facility
4186 zone. And I highlighted the two that where vehicle
4187 sales are currently allowed, which are in the
4188 middle. So, with that, staff recommends that the
4189 Planning Commission adopt the resolution
4190 recommending that the city council approve an
4191 ordinance allowing ZEV showrooms, all commercial
4192 and public facility, zoning districts, and finding
4193 that the action is categorically exempt from CEQA.
4194 Thank you and we're available for any questions or
4195 feedback at this point.

4196 Carvalheiro: Thank you, Jerry. Do we have any questions for
4197 staff? No? Vice-Chair Lombardi?

4198 Lombardi: Am I really the only one? Oh, people are hiding I
4199 see. Oh, okay. Well, since I'm talking, the,
4200 the...there's a couple of questions that I have. I

4201 mean, this all makes sense to me. I'll save some
4202 comments for deliberation. But I know parking is
4203 something that has been flagged and I'm concerned
4204 about too, so, you know, are they going to put curb
4205 cuts or other things in to get vehicles into and
4206 out of the showroom? And then related to that, I
4207 understand that it's five vehicles in the showroom
4208 up to and five vehicles for testing purposes. So,
4209 I'm also wondering when one is scheduling a car for
4210 a test drive, are they then going to ask for some
4211 sort of a loading zone for lack of a better word to
4212 pull that car up too? Because I know that sometimes
4213 when we see, like, a bar or a restaurant or other
4214 larger development mixed-use projects, there may be
4215 a, a loading zone that's, that's requested and
4216 sometimes welcome to maybe encourage fewer people
4217 to drive and park and take more parking. In this
4218 case, it kind of is a different purpose because
4219 it's for the, the service of that business. So, I'm
4220 wondering if those concerns need to be addressed.
4221 The, the curb cut and the idea of a loading zone.
4222 And I realize that, that could be done at director
4223 level, but it may...there may be some confusion
4224 in...intent and maybe that's a part of deliberation

4225 too. But I'd like to hear staff's thoughts on that.

4226 Contreras: Sure. I can add that as a policy. Our Engineering
4227 Team and our Public Works Team do not support curb
4228 cuts for, you know, commercial enterprise for
4229 retail development. We did mention this to the team
4230 and they said they would not allow that. With
4231 regards to the loading zone, they did mention that
4232 they would treat this as, you know, any other
4233 request for a loading zone. Typic...like, the
4234 restaurant case that Vice-Chair Lombardi just
4235 mentioned. It would be on a case-by-case basis. So,
4236 if they...it did...a request came in, they would have
4237 to study, you know, where, where, where is it
4238 located, are there any other impacts, would parking
4239 meters have to be removed, and therefore some of
4240 that revenue has to be recouped. So, it's sort of
4241 a, like, case-by-case basis. I would venture to say
4242 if, if the Commission wanted to prohibit both of
4243 those things, we could add some additional language
4244 into the, the Zone Text so that we just exp...you
4245 know, explicitly prohibit that. But at least with
4246 the, the loading zones, it sounds like our
4247 engineering team would just look on it on a case-
4248 by-case basis and they wouldn't permit it where it

4249 wouldn't make any sense.

4250 Lombardi: Okay. And then maybe for some additional context, a
4251 restaurant, I mean, there, there is sometimes a, a
4252 need for a valet or something so things can change
4253 over time. But they wouldn't be asking for a curb
4254 cut, but they might be asking for a loading area,
4255 right? That would be the difference between a
4256 restaurant case for example and, and something like
4257 a ZEV showroom?

4258 Contreras: ZE...right, right. Yeah, and potentially the, the
4259 showroom could have on-site parking as well. Like
4260 some retail establishments have parking already on
4261 the lot. So, there would be no need for, you know,
4262 a, a loading area, you know, or a drop-off or pick-
4263 up in front of the, the venue. So, again, that's
4264 why it kind of depends on the case-by-case basis.

4265 Lombardi: Okay. Thank you. That's the only question or two
4266 questions that I had.

4267 Carvalho: Commissioner Copeland?

4268 Copeland: Hi. Thank you. I noticed in the Long Rang Planning
4269 Staff Report that traditionally they do not have
4270 vehicles on-site available for test drive. It is
4271 something that people arrange to do elsewhere. But
4272 the one on Sunset, do they have vehicles available

4273 for, for a test drive or is this going to be
4274 something new that's just been applied for here?
4275 Contreras: I be...I believe they do have test drives, but
4276 probably very limited. Those are very, very
4277 expensive cars.
4278 Copeland: Right.
4279 Contreras: So, it's not like you can just go in there and test
4280 drive. So, I'm assuming similar to some of the ZEV
4281 showrooms, it's by appointment only.
4282 Copeland: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).
4283 Contreras: So, it's just not anybody, you know, off the street
4284 could, could come in and, and do a test drive. The
4285 business models also are very different from one...
4286 Copeland: Manufacturer...
4287 Contreras: ...vendor to another, right?
4288 Copeland: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).
4289 Contreras: So, some of the operators may have a Test Drive
4290 Center where instead of actually performing test
4291 drives on-site, they actually have you, the driver,
4292 go to a particular location...
4293 Copeland: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).
4294 Contreras: ...be it in Santa Monica or somewhere where they have
4295 a larger facility to do your test drive there. So,
4296 it's just various models. We were just trying to

4297 accommodate as many, you know, potential options as
4298 possible.

4299 Copeland: Right. And , and you're talking about five for test
4300 drives and five just for in the showroom just to
4301 display?

4302 Contreras: Right.

4303 Copeland: So, it would be 10 total but only 5 of those would
4304 be actually driven test drive, is that correct?

4305 Contreras: Right. That's correct, yeah. And we've sort of
4306 chosen number five because right now I believe
4307 Tesla's probably the one company that has the most
4308 number of vehicles. And as of now, they have five
4309 vehicles. So, if we had a Tesla showroom that
4310 wanted to showcase all of the different (talking
4311 over).

4312 Copeland: That's where the numbers came from then?

4313 Contreras: It would be five because as of now, you know,
4314 they're the largest manufacturer.

4315 Copeland: Thank you. That's it for me. Chair, thank you.

4316 Carvalheiro: Any other questions? No? I will open the public
4317 speaker portion of the public hearing. Do we have
4318 any public speakers on this item?

4319 Gillig: Chair, we are all clear.

4320 Carvalheiro: Okay. So, then I'll close the public speaker

4321 portion of the public hearing. And we'll move onto
4322 commissioner deliberation. Commissioner Gregoire,
4323 thank you.

4324 Gregoire: We, we looked at this at Long Range Planning, and
4325 we didn't see any concerns. So, I will support it
4326 again this evening.

4327 Carvalho: Great. Thank you. Commissioner Edwards?

4328 Edwards: Second. If that's a motion, I'll second it.

4329 Carvalho: Is that a motion?

4330 Gregoire: (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

4331 Carvalho: Okay, so we have a second. But we'll finish off the
4332 comments.

4333 Edwards: Oh, okay.

4334 Carvalho: Commissioner Copeland? Nothing? Commissioner Matos?
4335 No? Vice-Chair Lombardi?

4336 Lombardi: My only comment/maybe question for deliberation is
4337 after hearing staff's explanation, I'm not as
4338 really concerned about request for a loading zone
4339 or area that came up. You know, who knows what the
4340 scenarios are, right? I do wonder if the curb cut
4341 is like something that might want to be put into
4342 the code just so we don't wind up with curb cuts or
4343 completely lost parking all the time to make it
4344 really clear to the applicant before they come in

4345 with a request. So then this...the city needs to
4346 explain their, their standpoint. I don't know.
4347 I'm...again, I'm curious what everyone else thinks.
4348 But then beyond that, my opinion is, I mean, I, I
4349 like that this...that we're looking at this Zone
4350 Text, and I feel like retail has been a challenge
4351 and all cities struggle with, you know, how retail
4352 is utilized and encouraging it versus, you know,
4353 vacant space. And so, this allows some additional
4354 opportunity, and it does seem like the way that
4355 these stores operate is quite different than a
4356 typical car sales, you know, location which would
4357 potentially have a lot of other negative impacts.
4358 More, more cars coming and going, more people
4359 coming and going, parking and, and then also lots
4360 of test driving, all that. So, I'm generally in
4361 support of it. I'm kind of curious about the curb
4362 cut. But otherwise, it...this is already a motion and
4363 a second. So, I wanted to give my opinion before
4364 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) and see if anyone has any thoughts
4365 on that.

4366 Carvalheiro: Any further comments on that? No? Okay. (Talking
4367 over).

4368 Rosen: And just for the record, so the, the motion from

4369 Commissioner Gregoire with the second from
4370 Commissioner Edwards was to approve staff's
4371 recommendation to recommend the Zone Text Amendment
4372 to the City Council.

4373 Carvalheiro: Yeah.

4374 Gillig: And the motion passes. Six ayes, noting
4375 Commissioner Jones absent on this vote. The
4376 resolution number PC23-1535, there is no appeal
4377 process. It is a recommendation to City Council.

4378 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Item 11, new business: discuss upcoming
4379 Planning Commission meetings and subcommittee
4380 calendar for 2024.

4381 Contreras: Yes, for 2024 because there's not anything on the
4382 docket for 2021. So, December 7th a meeting has
4383 been canceled. I think December 21st a meeting has
4384 been canceled or will be cancelled tonight.

4385 Gillig: Are you...are you giving the update?

4386 Contreras: What is that?

4387 Gillig: Are you giving the update?

4388 Contreras: Yes.

4389 Gillig: Oh, because is for the approving of the, the
4390 calendar for next year.

4391 Contreras: Oh, sorry. I was already one agenda item ahead. So,
4392 I, I will...I will retract all of my statements.

4393 Gillig: I'll just jump...I'll jump in real qui...real quick.
4394 Staff just basically has two dates that you'd like
4395 to...we'd like you to consider. I believe it's April
4396 20...or December 19th, which is the optional last
4397 meeting of the year that we have historically
4398 always cancelled. You can leave it open in case we
4399 do need it or you can cancel it. So that would be
4400 your prerogative. And then we'd also like to
4401 question you on April 25th. That's a Passover. It
4402 doesn't actually fall on Passover Day, but it is
4403 part of the Passover holiday. So that would be an
4404 optional date if you want to cancel or keep it open
4405 for a date...for a meeting date. So those are really
4406 the only two dates. The other dates are pretty
4407 standard for cancellations.

4408 Carvalheiro: Okay. Sorry now I'm lost. Where are we on the
4409 agenda? Oh, the calendar. Oh, I see. Okay. So, do
4410 we have comments on that? Anybody have any
4411 opposition to that idea? I think everybody..

4412 Lombardi: Like what...the question is if we're okay with
4413 keeping the dates open for April?

4414 Edwards: For, for clarification, so this is for 2024. So,
4415 December 19th would...it traditionally would be..

4416 Gillig: Would be cancelled, yeah.

4417 Edwards: And then you're saying April 25th is...

4418 Gillig: Is it...it's in the Passover holiday.

4419 Edwards: Yeah, but it's not (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

4420 Gillig: But it's...right. Correct.

4421 Edwards: Okay.

4422 Lombardi: I have a question if I may. So, I have a question

4423 maybe for David because I, I think we have a

4424 potential meeting that may be cancelled this year.

4425 But can we...would there be the option if we

4426 find...like, let's say there's a housing project or

4427 something else that we could reenable a date as it

4428 gets closer if we found that we knew that something

4429 was coming our way and it was time sensitive?

4430 Gillig: Yes, that is...that is possible.

4431 Lombardi: I mean, I know that's not ideal for planning. But...

4432 Gillig: Yeah.

4433 Lombardi: It's not irreversible?

4434 Gillig: It's not...it's not...we can...we can...we can do that.

4435 Lombardi: I don't know if that helps or hurts, but...

4436 Carvalheiro: We don't need to do an official vote on this?

4437 Gillig: No, it would just be by consensus. We just want to

4438 get your thoughts on, you know, if you actually

4439 want to cancel the meetings or just leave them open

4440 optional.

4441 Gregoire: I, I would just leave them open in case we need
4442 them.
4443 Carvalheiro: I, I agree.
4444 Gregoire: Leave them open.
4445 Gillig: Okay. We'll leave those two dates open then.
4446 Carvalheiro: Yup.
4447 Gillig: And then the...we'll just go ahead and, and create
4448 the rest of the calendar as presented.
4449 Carvalheiro: Great.
4450 Gillig: Okay. Thank you.
4451 Carvalheiro: So, the December 21 meeting has been cancelled? The
4452 upcoming?
4453 Gillig: Yes, it will be cancelled.
4454 Carvalheiro: It has been cancelled, okay.
4455 Gillig: Yeah.
4456 Carvalheiro: Okay. So that finish...finishes Item 11. Item 12,
4457 unfinished business. We have none. Item 13,
4458 excluded consent calendar. We have none. Fourteen,
4459 items from the staff, the planning manager's update
4460 subcommittee management. Okay, thank you.
4461 Contreras: Fantastic. So, we just heard about the cancellation
4462 of the December 21st Planning Commission Meeting.
4463 So, I think the next time we will see each other in
4464 these chambers is January 18th. So, we will see you

4465 in the new year. Wow, that seems like it's
4466 tomorrow. Wow. Trans...let's see. We have no meetings
4467 for Design Review Subcommittee this year. So, I
4468 think the next meeting that we have on the books is
4469 for January 11th, and that's to review 1006 through
4470 1011 North Edinburgh Avenue. And that's a four-
4471 story eleven-unit residential project. For the
4472 Sunset Arts and Advertising Subcommittee, there is
4473 an item scheduled for January 25th, and that's for
4474 the review of 9039 Sunset Boulevard. There are no
4475 items currently scheduled for Long Range Planning
4476 Project Subcommittee. So nothing on the calendar
4477 now. And yeah, it's a fairly light schedule due to
4478 the holidays. So, I think those are my only
4479 updates.

4480 Carvalheiro: Okay. Thank you.

4481 Contreras: Uh-huh (AFFIRMATIVE).

4482 Carvalheiro: Any questions? No? Oh, Vice-Chair Lombardi?

4483 Lombardi: I know this is way out there. But I feel it's
4484 better to let you know now in case we're able to
4485 steer direct anything. I try to navigate around
4486 Planning Commission. But February 22nd, if that
4487 were to be a SASSC or Design Review date, I don't
4488 think I would be able to be present. Obviously, if

4489 I can make myself present, I will. I don't know
4490 what's planned or will be planned. But if there's a
4491 way to navigate around that date if it's
4492 oscillating or something, I thought better to let
4493 you know now.

4494 Contreras: That's all right. Thank you. We'll, we'll consider
4495 that. Thank you.

4496 Carvalheiro: Great. Thank you. So, Item 15. David, do we have
4497 any public comments?

4498 Gillig: We are all clear.

4499 Carvalheiro: Thank you. So, Item 16, items from the
4500 commissioners. Do we have any comments,
4501 Commissioner Matos?

4502 Matos: I'll just keep this brief. I want to express
4503 gratitude for everyone on staff and for all of my
4504 colleagues for taking the time to devote
4505 themselves. It's a true act of passion and heart
4506 and service to be here for long hours and put in
4507 the work. So, I want to thank everyone on the city
4508 staff, and I want to thank all of my colleagues for
4509 doing this. It's, it's very meaningful. So, thank
4510 you.

4511 Carvalheiro: Any other comments? Commissioner Copeland?

4512 Copeland: Yes, I just wanted to wish everyone a very safe and

4513 happy holidays, whatever you celebrate. And
4514 hopefully staff will enjoy a couple of months off
4515 from us. And we'll see you...see you in the new year.
4516 But thank you very much for everything that you do.
4517 We appreciate you. That's it. Thank you.

4518 Carvalheiro: Thank you. Vice-Chair Lombardi?

4519 Lombardi: I, I can't believe this is a year-end closeout
4520 already. But, I mean, yeah, thank you for all of
4521 your hard work this year and, and the commission as
4522 well. You all are lovely people and it's so nice
4523 to, to be a part of this, and especially thanks for
4524 today's meeting. I know it was a lot and
4525 challenging. So, I guess we won't be seeing you
4526 until 2024.

4527 Carvalheiro: Yeah, I just want to reiterate. First, tonight was
4528 an amazing night. All the public speakers that came
4529 out, that was impactful and insightful and really
4530 appreciated. Obviously, it impacted how we felt and
4531 some of the things that we said. I want to thank
4532 staff for all their support around this meeting.
4533 It's...we prepared...the Staff Report was fantastic,
4534 and there was a lot of preparation going into the
4535 meeting, and it went well. I want to thank my
4536 commissioners for the very thoughtful deliberations

4537 tonight. I thought they were totally on point, very
4538 respectful, and really understood the situation
4539 that we're in and how we need to proceed. I think
4540 it sets a good precedence. And I want to wish
4541 everybody a happy holiday and I look forward to
4542 seeing everybody in 2024. So, we will adjourn this
4543 meeting till January 18, 2024. Happy New Year.

4544

4545

4546



Written Communications, Inc.

worldwide transcription services

CERTIFICATION BY TRANSCRIBER

I, Gabriel Salinas, hereby declare as follows:

I am located at 5837B E. Los Angeles Avenue, Somis, California 93066. I am the person who transcribed the foregoing Planning Commission Meeting.

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

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

EXECUTED this 10th day of December 2023, at Somis, California.

Gabriel Salinas

Gabriel Salinas

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION, INC.