

1 CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

2 THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2010 AT 6:30 PM

3

4 CHAIR YEBER: All right. We're going to get  
5 started, and apparently Vice-Chair would like [Albert  
6 Hughes] to come lead us in the *Pledge of Allegiance*. So  
7 if you'll step up to the mic. You can talk to him after  
8 the meeting.

9 ALBERT HUGHES: Do I do it? (*Pledge of Allegiance*)

10 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. David, can we have a roll  
11 call?

12 DAVID GILLIG: Good evening. Commissioner DeLuccio?

13 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Here.

14 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Hamaker?

15 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Here.

16 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Buckner?

17 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Here.

18 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Bernstein?

19 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Here.

20 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Altschul?

21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Here.

22 DAVID GILLIG: Vice-Chair Guardarrama?

23 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Here.

24 DAVID GILLIG: Chair Yeber?

25 CHAIR YEBER: Here.

1           **DAVID GILLIG:** And we have a quorum.

2           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Do we have a motion to  
3 approve the agenda?

4           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'll make a motion.

5           **CHAIR YEBER:** Do I have a second?

6           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Second, second.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** All in favor?

8           **ALL COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

9           **CHAIR YEBER:** Any opposed? Seeing none, motion  
10 carries. We have no minutes.

11           Public comment -- we have Steve Martin as our only  
12 public speaker at this time, and this is for items not  
13 pertaining to the General Plan.

14           **STEVE MARTIN:** Good evening, Commissioners. Steve  
15 Martin, West Hollywood.

16           As you all know, West Hollywood is a very small  
17 town. Sometimes people say we're a little incestuous,  
18 and you probably all read in the paper about the  
19 unfortunate situation at 1302 Sweetzer, the El Mirador.  
20 That's a culturally sensitive building where the  
21 landlord, Jerome Nash, is busy Ellis-ing out and evicting  
22 all the tenants.

23           What is unfortunate is that one of our local  
24 luminaries who's representing him, somebody who's been  
25 before you, who's been, I believe, chair of the East Side

1 PAC (inaudible) business license, Todd Elliott is  
2 representing the landlord who's evicting those people.  
3 And I hadn't seen Todd's name in a while, and I thought,  
4 you know, I had seen it somewhere recently, and I  
5 remembered I had just seen Todd's name on as a sponsor  
6 for Abbe Land's kickoff for her fundraising event.

7 So it just sort of seems like a very, very small  
8 world that -- whereas I know we're all very concerned  
9 about what's going on with the Ellis Act and with tenants  
10 being evicted to make way for whether it's luxury condos  
11 or whatever, but sometimes I think we had to be very  
12 careful who we're sleeping with. Thank you.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, Steve.

14 All right, with that, Items from Commissioners.  
15 Commissioner Buckner?

16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Not anything. Thank you,  
17 Chair.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

19 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I wanted to say hi to my  
20 children, who are watching. Hi, Isaac, Natalie, and  
21 Naomi. Have a good night.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

23 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No, thank you.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?  
25

1           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I'd like to say good evening  
2 to my new cat, whose name is [Smithy]. Don't jump out  
3 the window.

4           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

5           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Not at this time. Thank  
6 you, Chair.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

8           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** No.

9           **CHAIR YEBER:** And I have nothing.

10           We have nothing on the consent calendar, so we will  
11 resume our public hearing on the comprehensive General  
12 Plan update, and John, would you like to start us off?

13           **JOHN KEHO:** Sure. Thank you, Chair and  
14 Commissioners.

15           So here we are at our third meeting on the General  
16 Plan. Last time, we heard a lot of discussion by the  
17 Planning Commission and received direction, so tonight,  
18 we're bringing back to you resolutions reflecting what we  
19 heard from the Commission, so we'd like the Commission to  
20 take a look at those -- the resolutions.

21           Bianca will walk you through that and give an  
22 update, and we're hoping to have a recommendation by the  
23 Commission that we can present to the City Council.

24           So with that, I'd like to turn it over to Bianca.  
25

1           **BIANCA SIEGL:** Thanks. Good evening, Chair and  
2 Commissioners.

3           So based on the Commission discussion at our last  
4 meeting, we've amended Resolution 10-943, which is the  
5 resolution pertaining to the General Plan, particularly  
6 Amendment A, which has the list of recommended changes to  
7 the Draft General Plan, and you can find those on also on  
8 pages 19 and 20 of that first resolution that's in  
9 tonight's packet for your reference.

10           So, first, I just wanted to review. There were  
11 several changes that you'll see there related to the  
12 discussion of land use and height along Melrose Avenue.  
13 We've provided the updated land use map and height change  
14 map in your packet. That's Exhibit D.

15           Based on Commission direction at the last meeting,  
16 the revisions would remove the proposed CN2 zoning along  
17 the south side of Melrose, and I'll actually just move to  
18 the more detailed map.

19           This is what was proposed in the Draft General Plan  
20 with the height and density changes, and the revision  
21 would be what's shown here, so the revision would be  
22 changing back to the existing zone, which is CN1, all  
23 along the south side of Melrose between Doheny and West  
24 Knoll and along the north side of Melrose between the  
25 Pacific Design Center and West Knoll.

1           The policy language that relates to that change,  
2 which I think is at the bottom of page 19 in the  
3 resolution, you'll see two changes.

4           One change is to amend the existing policy regarding  
5 the planning study for the Greater Melrose Triangle area,  
6 and that would be amended to include study of Melrose  
7 Avenue in three segments between Doheny and West Knoll.

8           The other change is adding a bullet point to the  
9 implementation action that's related to that study, which  
10 again just identifies those three segments of Melrose  
11 Avenue to be studied in greater detail.

12           And just to reiterate, so this would be -- what's on  
13 the screen now is the revised proposed land use map that  
14 would change the land use -- the height map so that there  
15 are no increases to height proposed for the south side of  
16 Melrose or for the north side between the PDC and West  
17 Knoll Drive.

18           The density map is as was proposed before because  
19 there were no density changes proposed as part of the  
20 Draft General Plan along those specific areas.

21           The other changes that you see on this matrix, based  
22 on Planning Commission direction over our last two  
23 meetings, in the land use category are to revise policy  
24 land use 2.2 that would now include language about new  
25 development improving and enhancing neighborhoods, as

1 well as considering the scale and character of those  
2 neighborhoods. Also, adding the term exemplary to  
3 clarify the green building bonus that's discussed in  
4 policy 2.9. Adding Fountain Avenue to the list of  
5 corridors and streetscape improvements in policy 6.5.  
6 Moving the policy regarding reconstruction and  
7 replacement of existing non-conforming residential  
8 buildings to fall under goal land use 9, which means it  
9 would only apply to multi-family neighborhoods. And  
10 adding an implementation action to create informational  
11 materials describing standards for planting and  
12 maintenance of private landscaping in parkways.

13 Changes to the Parks and Recreation section would be  
14 to add dog parks to the list of types of park spaces that  
15 are listed as examples in Policy PR1.2. Also to add  
16 rooftop gardens or open space as an example in Policy  
17 PR1.9.

18 And then in the infrastructure section, to add a new  
19 implementation action to study the feasibility of and  
20 also funding sources for sub-metering and other energy-  
21 saving features for existing multi-family buildings.

22 There's one additional policy change that I  
23 apologize was not included in the resolution in your  
24 packet but we do have ready for you this evening and it's  
25 on the screen here. This would be added to the historic

1 preservation implementation sections, and it would modify  
2 historic preservation implementation action 16 to add the  
3 examples of adaptive reuse or additional funding sources  
4 in order to help maintain and operate cultural resources.

5 That covers the changes that are included in the  
6 resolution. There's some additional discussion that the  
7 Commission had that I just wanted to point out that we  
8 will be informing Council of those issues as part of the  
9 Staff report and the minutes that they'll see from these  
10 meetings. Those issues include signage. We will let  
11 Council know that the Commission expressed some concerns  
12 about the signage, not the language, relating to signage  
13 outside the Sunset Strip and perhaps considering  
14 limitations on signage locations.

15 Also, for historic preservation, there was some  
16 desire to address the issue of condo conversion as a  
17 possible tool for retaining historic buildings.

18 One other item that was brought up last week is  
19 incentives for water reduction, particularly from an  
20 incentive standpoint, and I just wanted to point out  
21 those are actually already included in the Climate Action  
22 Plan under Measure 1.1.

23 One other change which is not new since our last  
24 meeting but I just wanted to point out is included in the  
25 list of recommended changes as part of the General Plan



1 resolution has to do with the grammatical structure of  
2 the General Plan policies, which was raised as a question  
3 last week.

4         Right now, the Draft General Plan uses the terms  
5 *will, should* or *may* in certain policies, and there's a  
6 matrix included here that illustrates a global change to  
7 just the structure of how those sentences are written to  
8 clarify those terms. It won't change the meaning or the  
9 content of the policies but just how they're phrased to  
10 make it easier to read and understand.

11         And that is the extent of the -- oh, wait, I'm  
12 sorry. And there was just another issue of clarification  
13 about the way that affordable housing is described in the  
14 housing element. It refers to the city in the housing  
15 element, and we just want to clarify that that's not  
16 meant to imply that the city actually owns the affordable  
17 housing; it's just the way that that language was  
18 structured. So I'll point that out, as well.

19         **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, Bianca.

20         Are there any questions for Bianca or John?  
21 Commissioner Hamaker?

22         **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Bianca, I'd just like to  
23 thank you for remembering all of that. I'm amazed. And  
24 thank you for remembering the comments about the signage.

25

1 I hadn't seen it in here, and I appreciate that, so thank  
2 you very much.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any other questions?

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** We'll have more time later  
5 to -- I have a couple of things, but...

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** We can do it now or we can do it after  
7 public hearing.

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Maybe I'll wait to hear from  
9 the public, and I do have a couple of comments.

10 And about the signage, thank you. I don't think the  
11 recommendation is worded as strongly as we discussed it.  
12 I think maybe there were a couple of things in there that  
13 we really had issue with.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. So we can talk about that  
15 after.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. So if there are no other  
18 questions for Staff, we'll move on to the public hearing.  
19 This is the third opportunity for the public to speak on  
20 the General Plan during this process. I only have five  
21 speaker slips. I see a lot more people in the audience.  
22 So if you are planning to speak, please turn in your  
23 public comment slips as soon as you can.

24 We're going to allow four minutes since we have so  
25 few, four minutes, and please come to the microphone,

1 state your name and city of residence, starting with  
2 Lauren Meister, followed by Alberto Borrelli.

3       **LAUREN MEISTER:** Good evening. Lauren Meister,  
4 resident of West Hollywood and President of West  
5 Hollywood West Residents' Association.

6       We ask that you not adopt the resolution  
7 recommending that Council approve the General Plan  
8 Amendment or the Climate Action Plan and especially not  
9 the FEIR. And for this supposedly environmentally  
10 conscious city to adopt a statement of overriding  
11 consideration, shame, shame, shame.

12       According to our planning and traffic consultants,  
13 the City's response to comments while adding hundreds of  
14 new pages of material to the EIR document still did not  
15 adequately address many of the issues that were raised in  
16 response to the DEIR. We respectfully request that you  
17 not certify the FDEIR but instead send it back to  
18 Planning to be revised and recirculated as a draft EIR.

19       I trust you received our consultant's letters  
20 regarding the City's response to comments in your packet.  
21 The materials on the public record for this project fail  
22 to support findings of no significant impact for the  
23 numerous areas where it is claimed no impact would occur  
24 or where full mitigation is claimed. The examples cited  
25 are just a small portion of the numerous flaws in the

1 documentation for the proposed project. It's important  
2 that all environmental issues for this critical project  
3 be fully investigated and mitigated to the fullest extent  
4 possible, including approval of an alternate reduced  
5 project. Thank you.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Alberto Borrelli,  
7 followed by Allegra Allison.

8 **ALBERTO BORRELLI:** Good evening. My name is Alberto  
9 Borrelli, and along with Steve Lococo, we would like to  
10 thank you for the opportunity to speak to the Commission  
11 regarding the proposed General Plan specifically as it  
12 relates to the use of 652 North Doheny Drive.

13 We are the owners of the subject property. We  
14 purchased the parcel in 2009 with the understanding of  
15 its approved commercial use. This property has been  
16 occupied as a CPA office for the past 30 years. And in  
17 researching the current zoning and allowable land usage,  
18 we discovered that the West Hollywood plan has designated  
19 this parcel as a residential lot. There are no records  
20 indicating why West Hollywood changed the zoning back to  
21 residential in the last General Plan update.

22 In researching our title and past history of the  
23 property, we discovered that the County of Los Angeles  
24 approved the zone change in 1979 to allow commercial use.  
25 A background sketch of the respective area of Doheny

1 Drive proceeding north from Nemo Street to Harland Avenue  
2 will clarify four parcels with the following addresses:  
3 646 N. Doheny, on the corner of Doheny and Nemo, zoned  
4 commercial housing B2V, a hair salon business owned and  
5 operated by myself and Steve Lococo; the next building,  
6 646 -- or, rather, 648 North Doheny Drive, zoned  
7 commercial, houses also B2V salon, both business and  
8 parcel owned by myself and Steve Lococo; 652 North Doheny  
9 Drive, the subject property of this presentation, the  
10 parcel is owned by myself and Steve Lococo. The above  
11 three addresses are contiguous pieces of property  
12 bordering on the north with 9000 Harland Avenue, a parcel  
13 which accesses on Harland Avenue.

14 We've been involved in the city since before its  
15 incorporation, owning and operating the Borrelli Salon on  
16 Santa Monica Boulevard for well over 20 years prior to our  
17 move to the Doheny location 10 years ago. We've always  
18 valued our relationship with the City and have endeavored  
19 to continuously provide and maintain a highly  
20 professional warm and welcoming environment for our  
21 clients and the neighborhood.

22 We respectfully ask the Commission to recommend to  
23 the City Council the restoration of the commercial zoning  
24 designation to a CC zone. This zone change will merely  
25 add to the string of commercial parcels already in place

1 along Doheny and better reflect the type of use in effect  
2 for the past 30 years, and we thank you very much for  
3 your time.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Can you give us the actual  
5 address again of the property that's in question?

6 **ALBERTO BORRELLI:** 652 North Doheny.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** 652 North Doheny.

8 **ALBERTO BORRELLI:** Yes.

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Chair, can we discuss that  
10 later when -- among ourselves because I really want to --  
11 I'm questioning that because I'm looking at the zoning  
12 map, and it looks like all those three addresses is zoned  
13 residential right now.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** We can certainly discuss it. Do you  
15 have any questions for the speaker?

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Not at this time, but I have  
17 a concern about it.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Questions, Commissioner Buckner?

19 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I wanted to ask a similar  
20 question, so we'll wait till later.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Afterwards?

22 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Thank you.

24 Allegra Allison, followed by Victor Martin.

25

1           And for anybody who walked in, if you're planning to  
2 speak, please get your speaker slips in as soon as  
3 possible. Thank you.

4           **ALLEGRA ALLISON:** Allegra Allison, West Hollywood.  
5 There's so much to talk about with this General Plan, and  
6 there's so much to read, and there's no way that I would  
7 think that anybody would be -- with the new information  
8 and with the old information that anybody would be  
9 recommend a statement of overriding considerations.

10           And what Steve Martin was talking about with Todd  
11 Elliott, just to bring it up, is he's also the guy who's  
12 Ellis-ing the El Mirador, is also on the board of the  
13 West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation, which is  
14 also sort of interesting.

15           But back to the General Plan. I passed out Lauren  
16 Meister's article that was in *WEHO News* this week, and it  
17 was about the community development director and deputy  
18 city manager, who basically wrote an e-mail over a year  
19 ago stating that our -- talking about our vision for  
20 Melrose. And there were traffic studies hidden on and  
21 on.

22           But at that point, the General Plan Committee wasn't  
23 even formed yet. The process was halfway through. And  
24 so once you read this and you see the results of the city  
25 studies, one wonders really whose vision is this. It

1 certainly isn't the residents'. The residents asked for  
2 -- the top three things were -- their concerns were  
3 traffic, parking, and smaller development.

4 Urban village -- where do nine-story buildings fit  
5 into the vision of urban village?

6 Last week, Bianca said that there were no -- there  
7 was no consensus on what heights residents wanted across  
8 the city, but when I opened up one of the general plan  
9 studies today, the first page I opened it up to said that  
10 the group was recommending that there were three-story  
11 building -- wanted to keep three-story developments along  
12 Santa Monica Boulevard.

13 And my comments in the General Plan were either  
14 answered "as noted" and dismissed, obviously, and/or that  
15 this was a project EIR and that we couldn't look into the  
16 future. And because everything will be built and  
17 approved on a project-by-project basis, those questions  
18 couldn't be answered.

19 So what are we doing here looking at the future if  
20 we can't answer those questions? And it just seems like  
21 it's a little bit crazy, particularly with the  
22 transportation corridors, which now could go up to  
23 reasonable heights. Now there's a three-story limit  
24 which could go up another three stories with bonuses, and  
25 that along Santa Monica Boulevard is reasonable.



1           And the transportation corridor's John Keho talked  
2 about the fixed-rail system possibly coming through in 15  
3 years, that we're looking at that. Does that mean that  
4 we're going to tear up Santa Monica Boulevard again?  
5 What does that mean? None of this stuff is really  
6 addressed or looked into.

7           And the traffic study, so much. Where is Terri  
8 Slimmer? Why did she disappear in the middle of the  
9 General Plan process?

10           The other night I came home when it was really hot  
11 and there was a transformer blowing on Fairfax and sparks  
12 were flying in the air, the streets were blocked off, the  
13 fire department, the sheriffs were there, and I went up  
14 to a deputy and I asked him what was going on. He had no  
15 idea I had anything to do with the city, and he started  
16 to talk about how the city puts money into -- not into  
17 what's important, not into the infrastructure, and he  
18 said they keep inviting more people in, they keep  
19 building, and the city's going to blow. And then he  
20 said, "Look, it's blowing right now." And it's putting  
21 people into danger, and this shouldn't be approved at  
22 this stage. Thank you.

23           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, Allegra.

24           Victor Martin, followed by Mihai Peteu. I'm sorry  
25 if I mispronounced your name. Victor?

1           **VICTOR MARTIN:** Yes, Victor Martin, Director of Land  
2 Use at the Afriat Consulting Group, resident, City of  
3 Glendale.

4           Good evening, members of the Commission. We are  
5 very supportive of Staff's land use proposal for the  
6 General Plan. We represent major projects throughout the  
7 city. Currently, we are representing the project at 8568  
8 Melrose Avenue between San Vicente and La Cienega.

9           Melrose Avenue is one of the few commercial  
10 corridors in the city. As of yet, there are too many  
11 vacancies on the street. To encourage a rebirth of  
12 Melrose, larger floor heights and floor plates need to  
13 exist to encourage showroom space. Unique design  
14 considerations that could impact height have to be taken  
15 into account to encourage creative office uses. There  
16 needs to be flexibility for setbacks in height to allow  
17 architectural articulation that could include sidewalk  
18 dining or the creative use of landscaping and green space  
19 to allow for additional public benefits such as open  
20 space.

21           All of these proposals can be evaluated, considered,  
22 and accepted or rejected by the Planning Commission and  
23 City Council through the entitlement and permit process.

24           I would encourage you to keep the plan as proposed  
25 by Staff. Foremost, the proposed land use designations

1 were the result of years of collaboration with the  
2 community.

3       Specifically, we would urge you to keep the higher  
4 height on the south side of Melrose of a maximum of 35  
5 feet possible, which would allow for a higher proposed  
6 FAR of 1.5 if the height were granted.

7       The General Plan should house a framework whereby  
8 creative expression in landmark architecture and a built  
9 environment can foster. With such strict requirements  
10 for even the smallest requests or project, the General  
11 Plan constricts many of the potential opportunities for  
12 appropriate projects that bring with them the very  
13 aesthetic and creativity that the creative city and the  
14 Avenues of Art and Design would benefit from.

15       When conducted correctly and responsibly with  
16 sensitivity in mind for residents, additional FAR and  
17 height can successfully coexist when adequate measures  
18 are taken to preserve the quality of life for residents.

19       More freedom to provide a larger building envelope  
20 will inevitably attract the very one-of-a-kind businesses  
21 that make West Hollywood the destination that it is.

22 Thank you.

23       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Can I ask a question?

24       **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

25

1           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I have a quick -- are you  
2 referring to 8564 you represent or 8568?

3           **VICTOR MARTIN:** It's a range.

4           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, because that's --

5           **VICTOR MARTIN:** There's several...

6           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** That's something on our  
7 agenda on October 21, that project, tentatively.

8           **VICTOR MARTIN:** Yes.

9           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, thank you.

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Pronounce that?

11          **MIHAI PETEU:** Hello, My name's Mihai. I'll keep it  
12 short.

13          **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, and then followed by Steve  
14 Martin.

15          **MIHAI PETEU:** I'm an East Hollywood resident, and I  
16 commute through West Hollywood on a daily basis on the  
17 way to my job at UCLA, and a stretch of Santa Monica  
18 Boulevard between [Kings] and Doheny has a bike lane on  
19 it, and it's honestly the most pleasant part of my  
20 commute. I actually feel like I belong there. I don't  
21 feel like a second-class citizen, which is kind of what  
22 happens when it dead-ends at Doheny on Beverly Hills'  
23 doorstep.

24                 So when I saw the mobility section of your new  
25 General Plan, I was surprised to see such positive

1 language supporting walking, cycling, and just in general  
2 more livable city, and I really hope that such strong  
3 words turn into actual infrastructure because I'm  
4 concerned about things like traffic, as well, but more  
5 importantly, my self-preservation, so I look forward to  
6 providing all the input I have to Chris and everyone else  
7 that's on the Planning Commission.

8 Thank you very much for having such strong visionary  
9 language.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Steve Martin, followed by  
11 Isaac Soleman.

12 **STEVE MARTIN:** Steve Martin, West Hollywood.

13 I know that we come here, a lot of us, with a lot of  
14 concerns, criticisms, and sometimes a lot of anger, but I  
15 have to say the last two meetings, we do appreciate the  
16 fact that the Commission's been very reflective on a lot  
17 of issues, particularly the Melrose issue, and a lot of  
18 good ideas have come up. I don't think that anybody  
19 who's speaking here, no matter how critical, is  
20 particularly critical of the Commission because I think  
21 you have done a lot. You have tried to listen.

22 One of the things that does concern me is the idea  
23 that we've allowed enough zoning for, particularly with  
24 mixed use, for a 20% increase in the population here in

25

1 West Hollywood, and Staff has indicated they don't really  
2 think that's going to get built out.

3 Well, I think it might be reassuring that if we  
4 reach that 50% level -- because a 10% increase would be  
5 what SCAG has predicted -- that maybe we do a time-out  
6 and a reflection and maybe an EIR or just put a cap on it  
7 just because that way people would be assured that  
8 there's just not going to be -- we're not going to be  
9 trying to cram 20% more people into the most crowded city  
10 certainly in West Los Angeles and one of the most crowded  
11 areas in the United States.

12 The other thing that I find a little troubling is  
13 comparing the last 25 years with the next 25 years. For  
14 one thing, I know we've only had like 871 net gain in  
15 population in West Hollywood since 1984, but the fact of  
16 the matter is we took out hundreds of units. We took out  
17 probably four or five hundred units to put in the  
18 Ashkenazy hotels. When Pavilions expanded, that took out  
19 20 units. You've got [Clean] that's taken out another  
20 20, 25 units, San Vicente Inn. It may not seem like a  
21 lot, but when you look at the number of vacant units  
22 here, buildings that have been either Ellis-ed or just  
23 sitting vacant, the 871 number is really misleading.

24 Also, it took a long time for us as a city to get  
25 our act together. The *LA Times* didn't even consider us

1 part of the west side for our first seven years. The  
2 first 12 years of cityhood, prostitution was rampant on  
3 Sunset and Santa Monica. We were not a great place to  
4 live.

5       Until 12, 13 years ago, Santa Monica Boulevard was a  
6 joke. I mean there was this strange median strip running  
7 through with a bunch of scraggly trees and funky  
8 flagpoles going off in angles.

9       Our parks the first seven years, eight years were --  
10 there were no repairs done. They were mostly homeless  
11 encampments.

12       And our pool for the first 12, 15 years of cityhood  
13 was only open up two months out of the year.

14       Now, obviously, we've made huge progress in the last  
15 10 or 15 years, but it meant that for a long time, West  
16 Hollywood was not a desirable area to develop.

17       I think a better model was when we looked back three  
18 to four years when the City had to put a moratorium on  
19 the demolition of rent-controlled housing because the  
20 West Hollywood market was so hot. Unfortunately, the  
21 City didn't follow up with any sort of real restrictions  
22 for future growth or disincentives for future  
23 demolitions, but that's something that can be addressed  
24 through this process.

25

1           And I really think if we look at the last decade and  
2 what West Hollywood is going to be subjected to, because  
3 even now, in a bad economic times, we're seeing people  
4 who are being evicted for development, including the  
5 Sunset Times area up on Olive.

6           And I think we really need to be concerned that if  
7 we've got people -- if developers are looking at West  
8 Hollywood during the middle of a recession, we need to be  
9 very careful what we're going to allow, so thank you for  
10 your time.

11           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, Mr. Martin. Isaac Soleman,  
12 followed by Armen Ovsepien.

13           **ISAAC SOLEMAN:** Thank you, Commission. Good  
14 evening. My name is Isaac Soleman from West Hollywood.

15           I'm calling about the neighborhoods called Sherman  
16 District between La Cienega and San Vicente north of  
17 [Murrows], south of Santa Monica Boulevard, specifically  
18 north of Sherwood.

19           If you look at this map in this area, it shows that  
20 most of the properties are multi-units, which used to be  
21 called R4 in LA County zoning.

22           When the city was established, for some reason, the  
23 City of West Hollywood down-zoned most of the properties  
24 in this neighborhood.

25



1 In the last General Plan, we requested to up-zone at  
2 least close to the existing of what it was before.

3 Apparently, it was forgotten to put in the General Plan.

4 Same thing is happening right now. For some reason,  
5 with all due respect to the General Plan people and  
6 Planning Commission, this area has a few pockets of  
7 properties which should be considered to be up-zoned to  
8 multi-units between -- most of the properties that I'm  
9 talking about are between major properties, which are  
10 high-density properties.

11 I ask the Commission to investigate and put it on  
12 the General Plan to up-zone these few properties, which  
13 would be compatible with the neighborhood. Thank you.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Armen, followed by Elyse  
15 Eisenberg.

16 **ARMEN OVSEPIAN:** Good evening, Commissioners. My  
17 name is Armen Ovsepien. I'm a resident for four years  
18 now, but I have also worked here in West Hollywood for  
19 the past almost nine, 10 years. And I have a newborn  
20 child. He's 10 months, and several of the residents in  
21 my neighborhood have children within the age of newborn  
22 to maybe two or three years old. And I'm thinking for  
23 the future of these kids, and I think we need some  
24 growth, we need some room within our city.

25

1 I walk to work every day. I've been doing that for  
2 the past four years, and I think bringing more creative  
3 shops within -- I work in a design industry, so to bring  
4 in more creative showrooms within our city, I think this  
5 can help us a lot, especially for the residents who live  
6 here.

7 We need some new jobs. There's so many showrooms  
8 closing up. We need some smaller, nice showrooms to  
9 bring in some work and bring in nice restaurants and for  
10 us to be able to walk -- our children walk on the streets  
11 and enjoy the beauty of our buildings.

12 We're very creative. West Hollywood's a very  
13 creative city, and I think we can do a lot with the help  
14 of this General Plan if we approve it. We can bring in  
15 more creative residents into our city, young, and just go  
16 with the time.

17 This is a plan for 25 years for now, from here --  
18 for the next 25 years, and I think we do need new  
19 improvements, we do need to be a little more creative.

20 Thank you, and I hope you will all support the  
21 General Plan.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Elyse, followed by Ali  
23 Karimpour.

24 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** Elyse Eisenberg, West Hollywood.  
25 I want to first thank you for putting the public comment

1 at the beginning of the meeting, early in the meeting  
2 tonight. Thank you for that.

3 I would also like to talk about -- I would also like  
4 to recommend that you postpone making a decision on the  
5 General Plan this evening. A lot of the subjects that  
6 you discussed last week you ran through very quickly, and  
7 a lot of them, like building heights, districts, parking  
8 are all subjects that could have stood for their own  
9 meeting all on their own with public comment coming in.

10 I know specifically in the area of parking, I have  
11 many, many concerns because I don't think the public is  
12 aware that so much of commercial parking these days is  
13 tandem and compact spots, which reduces the overall  
14 availability of people to park.

15 SUVs don't really pay attention to whether it's a  
16 compact spot, and if they see two spots open, they'll  
17 just move in. And a mini doesn't look just for a compact  
18 spot to park. So it's really not an equitable situation,  
19 and it's another way for developers to squeeze in extra  
20 spots and make things more difficult for people to park,  
21 and it hurts the quality of life in this city when it's  
22 probably the number-one issue that people are talking  
23 about.

24 A couple of times in recent weeks, the Staff has  
25 brought up how there really hasn't been that much

1 development going on around the city even though people  
2 are complaining about it. They were saying, "There's  
3 only been less than 1,000 units out of our 24,000  
4 buildings around the city."

5 Well, maybe 1,000 units out of 24,000 doesn't sound  
6 very much, but when you're talking 1,000 units in 1.5  
7 square -- 1.9 square miles, that's quite a lot of  
8 construction going on. There isn't a neighborhood that  
9 isn't affected, and it is why people are pushing back.

10 And I would like to second everything that Allegra  
11 said earlier about that this document does not reflect  
12 the will of the people. We're right now before the  
13 national elections, November, and we're looking at  
14 polling that is done around the country, and they're  
15 saying that these polls have like a 3% plus or minus  
16 accuracy rate, and they're only interviewing  
17 approximately 1,500 people for these polls if you look at  
18 the data.

19 Well, our poll, our telephone survey, the first one  
20 that was done by the consultant, was 400 people, which is  
21 only a third of what the entire country considered  
22 accurate -- considered for accuracy. This poll is  
23 considered 95% accurate, and 95% of the people who  
24 responded to this poll want to see two and three-story

25

1 buildings throughout the city, both commercial and  
2 residential.

3       So the push on all of the commercial corridors to go  
4 higher, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11  
5 stories, throughout the city is simply not supported by  
6 the feedback that has come back.

7       When these citizens were asked -- these residents  
8 were asked, "Do you support going higher than three  
9 stories?" the support level dropped off 15 to 20%. When  
10 they asked if they supported five stories, it dropped  
11 down another 15 to 20%. By the time it got to six  
12 stories, only half of the poll was supportive. And many  
13 of these projects are seven to 10 stories.

14       And as Allegra was saying before, we already are not  
15 reaching what is allowed on the corridors. None of the  
16 projects along Santa Monica Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard  
17 are built up to current code levels that they can, and  
18 that's not even counting SB18 and the other bonus  
19 incentives that can go on top of it. So there is plenty  
20 of room for growth without increasing what is already  
21 instituted in the plan.

22       So I would request, respectfully, to please put this  
23 off, especially until after the Metro decision is done on  
24 October 28 because so much of this plan is based on a

25

1 presumption of public transport that's not going to  
2 exist. Thank you.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Ali, followed by Jeanne  
4 Dobrin.

5 **ALI KARIMPOUR:** Good evening. My name is Ali  
6 Karimpour, and I'm a business owner here in West  
7 Hollywood on 8574 Melrose.

8 I moved here a year-and-a-half ago, and for previous  
9 five years, my store was in Beverly Hills, and I moved  
10 here mainly because of the uniqueness of West Hollywood.

11 I believe that these zones would give business  
12 owners like me a better chance of survival because,  
13 frankly, business is not really that good, and I hope  
14 that these proposals would bring more people and more  
15 creative businesses in the area to help us stay here. I  
16 would like to stay in West Hollywood. Thank you.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Jeanne Dobrin, followed by  
18 Jim Magni. How about Jim Magni?

19 **JIM MAGNI:** Hello. My name is Jim Magni. I'm a  
20 resident of West Hollywood. I'm an architect and  
21 interior designer, and I've lived in this area for 20  
22 years. My offices are in the Pacific Design Center for  
23 our firm, Magni Design, and I own the duplex next to  
24 Earth Café at 611 Westmount. I live and obviously work a  
25 couple blocks away from one another.

1 I'm very much in favor of this General Plan. I  
2 travel all over the world to do projects, whether it's  
3 Tokyo or Moscow.

4 New York is a great example for us to learn from in  
5 terms of creating a creative environment. We've taken --  
6 from New York, we've taken the art scene along La Cienega  
7 south of Venice, where all the galleries from SoHo have  
8 moved to that space, and on a given night, Friday night  
9 when the galleries are opening, you'll see hundreds of  
10 hundreds -- I would exaggerate maybe to say 1,000 but  
11 nearly 1,000 people walking up and down that street going  
12 from gallery to gallery where all those creative spaces  
13 are.

14 I would hope that we could recreate a similar kind  
15 of situation here. I moved to West Hollywood because I  
16 believe the tagline said 20 years ago something to the  
17 effect of West Hollywood is where all your dreams could  
18 be made, and for me that did happen. I achieved  
19 everything I wanted to achieve because the creativity was  
20 here. This is the heartbeat of creativity.

21 I believe Melrose, if we are in favor of this  
22 General Plan, allows us some mixed use spaces with added  
23 creativity. We've got some wonderful architects, graphic  
24 designers, some very creative landscape people, so I

25

1 think that it's a very good idea and a mixed-use scenario  
2 along there would be advantageous to us all. Thank you.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Jeanne Dobrin, followed by  
4 Ed Levin.

5 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Jeanne Dobrin, a resident of West  
6 Hollywood.

7 I think that it is absolutely criminal what is  
8 happening in this city. I have owned and lived in my  
9 condominium for 34 years, so I don't need affordable  
10 housing, but all over this city, we have affordable  
11 housing, and those people are being constantly evicted  
12 for huge buildings which were not in the blueprint for  
13 West Hollywood as it was envisioned about 25 years ago or  
14 so.

15 And the fact that SB1818 has come to our city, it  
16 comes to cities which are like rural cities, too, and it  
17 is not applicable for our city. We are already densely  
18 populated, and to have less parking and more density and  
19 taller buildings, more space is not appropriate that much  
20 for West Hollywood.

21 And I feel sorry for all these people who are being  
22 evicted, and then we have buildings that are being built  
23 which are standing empty. As a realtor, I know that.

24 I wanted to speak about Melrose. Melrose is a very  
25 narrow street. These people who keep coming here,



1 including Mr. Martin, want all kinds of things to happen  
2 on Melrose. It so happens as a realtor there was a man  
3 named [Solomoni], who was a broker with me when I worked  
4 for [George Elkin], and he called me up and asked me how  
5 did I know how they could build three stories instead of  
6 two stories where that great big carpet store is now  
7 owned by the [Solomonis]. The Solomonis own a lot of  
8 Melrose Avenue, and they are very upset about it.

9         Now, Mr. Martin is a sincere person, but he is a  
10 lobbyist, and he works for my dear friend, whom I respect  
11 tremendously, Afriat. But I do not respect what these  
12 people are trying to do to Melrose, especially when they  
13 back up to residences.

14         I appreciate the way the Commission spoke last week.  
15 It was a horrible meeting as far as time and effort was  
16 concerned, but they recognized that there are residences  
17 in back of the south side of Melrose, and that should not  
18 call for monster buildings.

19         As a statement of overriding consideration, here  
20 we're going forward with a new General Plan that's been  
21 in the vision since 2008, and we're all working overtime.  
22 Tremendous amount of work is being done, and yet the City  
23 wants to still stick to the idea that it's -- number four  
24 -- it will cause terrible chaos and havoc, but we want to  
25 issue a statement of overriding consideration.

1 I have begged, implored, and pleaded that the City  
2 take this out of their vocabulary. They are immune to  
3 what I say about this. This is wrong. It says -- they  
4 are saying, yes, it's going to create havoc, but you guys  
5 are going to have to put up with it.

6 I agreed totally with what Allegra, Lauren Meister,  
7 Steve Martin, and Elyse have said. They have addressed  
8 this thing even better than I can.

9 I'm going to ask you not to certify the draft EIR.  
10 I feel that with all the work that has been done, both by  
11 the Commission and Bianca and Keho and the other  
12 planners, all that work has come to -- what did they say?  
13 -- they labored mightily and brought forth a mouse.

14 Anyhow, I feel we're not ready for that. I do  
15 appreciate what you've done, but I cannot see the right  
16 in most of what is going on. You have tried to change  
17 it, and they came back with some changes, but they simply  
18 are not enough.

19 And as for Santa Monica Boulevard, the height there  
20 is 35 feet and three stories, and they are now  
21 envisioning 10, 11, 12 stories of building. That is a  
22 shame. We don't want that, and the citizens have made it  
23 clear in community meetings. Thank you.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, Ms. Dobrin.

25 Ed Levin, followed by Nicole Dijkstra Araghi.

1           **EDWARD LEVIN:** Thank you, Chair. Edward Levin,  
2 resident of West Hollywood and Chair of Historic  
3 Preservation Commission, though I want to emphasize that  
4 I'm appearing not for the Commission tonight but only in  
5 my own capacity as a private individual.

6           But I do want to speak to a couple issues that bear  
7 on preservation. We've had a chance to take a look at  
8 our element, as most of the Commissions have taken a look  
9 at the elements that affect them, but this is really the  
10 first opportunity that any commission's had to look more  
11 globally and to address some structural issues in the  
12 code and in the General Plan.

13           For example, the recent events at something like El  
14 Mirador focused on the fact that it's possible for one  
15 city agency, the city with its left hand, the code  
16 enforcement, to say you must replace windows and historic  
17 preservation to say, on the other hand, you may not  
18 replace them or you may not replace them in this manner.

19           Currently -- and there are a number of conflicts  
20 like that that occur. Right now, we've got some language  
21 in the General Plan that says after a disaster we should  
22 give special scrutiny or a different level of scrutiny to  
23 historic buildings in terms of whether they're red-  
24 tagged, at what point do we say that they need to be  
25 abandoned. We treat them slightly differently.

1           But right now when it comes to housing issues and  
2 preservation issues and many of our cultural resources  
3 are multi-family residential buildings, when those  
4 conflicts arise, when one part of the city says you must  
5 do A and the other says you may not do A, there's  
6 currently absolutely no mechanism for resolving those  
7 conflicts. There is no way outside the political  
8 process.

9           And it seems to me that the General Plan is the  
10 perfect opportunity to at least address those, to talk  
11 about how they might get resolved, what mechanisms might  
12 be created for them to be resolved when there are  
13 conflicts.

14           And this is the first opportunity. We've had a  
15 chance to take a look at our elements. Other commissions  
16 have looked at theirs. But this is the first time that  
17 someone -- that you guys are going to be sitting here and  
18 looking at where those things intersect and how they  
19 intersect, and I think there ought to be some serious  
20 consideration to some of those aspects.

21           The only other thing is I know you've been given  
22 some additional language on incentives for preservation.  
23 One thing that I do want to emphasize, and the General  
24 Plan doesn't make it very clear, it talks about the Mills  
25 Act. The Mills Act is a very, very powerful device.

1 However, the biggest problem, one of the biggest problems  
2 that we have with multi-family residential structures is  
3 that many of them that have cultural resource status were  
4 built 70 years ago, 60 years ago, 80 years ago. They  
5 still have many of the original systems -- original  
6 electrical systems, original plumbing systems, some  
7 original mechanical systems. But failures in electrical  
8 system have the capacity to take a building down. These  
9 buildings can burn down. Most of them have old switch  
10 gear, they have old wiring, and these things need to be  
11 upgraded at some point or we'll lose these buildings.  
12 Same is true with plumbing issues.

13 Right now, that's an extraordinarily expensive  
14 process. The Mills Act is not available for those  
15 remedies. You cannot use Mills Act money to repair your  
16 electrical system. You cannot use Mills Act money to  
17 repair your plumbing. It is only for your historical  
18 elements.

19 And so we're putting a great deal of emphasis on  
20 that in the General Plan, and it appears to take the  
21 emphasis off other incentives that the City might come up  
22 with, and it's really preventing us from understanding  
23 how important those other incentives are.

24 So, again, I'd like just some thought to be given to  
25 what the limitations of those things that we're touting

1 in here are and what else we might want to do or improve  
2 in order to make sure that we're covering those bases.

3 Thank you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

5 Nicole, followed by Ric Abramson.

6 **NICOLE DIJKSTRA ARAGHI:** Hi. My name is Nicole  
7 Dijkstra Araghi. I'm the owner of a store of 8568  
8 Melrose. I have a gallery. I'm an artist, and I came to  
9 Melrose because I'm an artist. This is our street of the  
10 artists, and we don't have that much traffic in our  
11 street. And if there was more business in our street and  
12 more artists are coming because it's Melrose, you know --  
13 I'm so sorry, but if there was more people coming over  
14 and more business in our area, we could actually sell  
15 more, and I am surviving.

16 I have a house on 2539 Roscomare Road, and there's a  
17 school, and every day from seven o'clock to nine o'clock,  
18 we cannot move because there's traffic, this  
19 inconvenience, but it's for kids, and for that, I will  
20 stay in line every day an hour to get to my work.

21 And for me as an artist and there's so many young  
22 people who are looking for jobs and to open these places  
23 like me, and we should have a change. Change is good,  
24 and there's no traffic, and we wish there was. Thank  
25 you.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

2           Ric Abramson, followed by Ted Stafford.

3           **RIC ABRAMSON:** Good evening, Commissioner. Ric  
4 Abramson, resident of West Hollywood.

5           I thought I would just make a few more broader  
6 comments about the General Plan and its process, having  
7 served in multiple ways on the city through the Public  
8 Facilities Commission, Environmental Task force, Green  
9 Building program as a practicing architect in town, and  
10 as a member of GPAC. So I think I'm going to speak a  
11 little bit more broadly as opposed to a specific  
12 constituency.

13           And I also want to thank Staff, as well, because I  
14 think there's been a tremendous effort and hard work led  
15 by Anne and John and their Staff, and kudos to Bianca and  
16 Chris, specifically, who spent countless hours trying to  
17 bring this forward.

18           So a few general comments. In terms of  
19 infrastructure, I think that, broadly speaking, the  
20 infrastructure section could be a little bit more  
21 ambitious. It seems to be very focused on maintaining  
22 sort of existing systems with upgrades as needed. I  
23 think in 2010, given where a lot of other communities  
24 are, I think we should have a greater effort to be more  
25 forward thinking not only in the use of our public ways -

1 - how to share streets, how the streets start to become  
2 public spaces, how energy consumption moves towards net  
3 zero as opposed to, say, a policy goal to just replace  
4 lighting with energy-efficient lighting -- I think we  
5 should move way beyond there.

6 I think there's been a lot of discussion about water  
7 usage and management, and I think that it could use a  
8 great deal of strengthening on stormwater capture and, in  
9 particular, using the alleys more effectively.

10 In terms of open space and green space, one thing  
11 that concerns me, and it's sort of been a silent element  
12 of the city, is that our canopy trees through development  
13 in the last 10 years have really been significantly  
14 impacted, and I was hoping through the General Plan  
15 process that there would be some aggressive language  
16 about canopy tree replacement and making sure that a lot  
17 of the green space that creates the air quality in the  
18 city is insured to continue to expand and grow going  
19 forward and not diminish.

20 I didn't see it in the General Plan. It might be in  
21 the Climate Action Plan. Sometimes that document covers  
22 things that are not in the General Plan.

23 In terms of urban space, and again public space, I  
24 think what city more benefits from a place to gather and  
25 have a public voice than West Hollywood, and yet when we



1 talk about an urban village, there really is no square  
2 plaza space to gather.

3 I think that it would be worth at least in the  
4 framework start to open that discussion about how can  
5 West Hollywood start to create that space for gathering,  
6 a public urban space, not so much park space and  
7 recreational space but a gathering space. And I think  
8 there's some sensible places to start having that  
9 discussion in the city.

10 In the arena of housing, I think (inaudible -  
11 technical difficulty), frankly, are moving much closer  
12 towards a variety and diversity in housing types and  
13 housing choices. I'd like to see some language where we  
14 start to open up opportunities for more diverse income,  
15 types of developments where we mix income, for example,  
16 as opposed to mix use, where we look at cluster housing,  
17 cottage housing, detached townhouse-type of housing, more  
18 small lot subdivisions, ways to achieve economic  
19 diversity, and more importantly, start thinking about  
20 aging-in-place discussions, how we move forward with  
21 aging-in-place programs in the city.

22 I have many more comments, but I will leave it at  
23 that. Thank you.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

25 Ted Stafford, followed by Marne Carmean.

1           **TED STAFFORD:** Good evening. My name is Ted  
2 Stafford, and I've been practicing commercial real estate  
3 here in West Hollywood for over 30 years.

4           **UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT:** Speak into the  
5 mic, please.

6           **TED STAFFORD:** You want it more directly, do you?  
7 All right.

8           I've been practicing real estate here in West  
9 Hollywood for over 30 years. I began my career with  
10 Ronald Kates and Company before opening my own company.

11           Over that period of time, I have seen the steady  
12 growth of the commercial business district in West  
13 Hollywood transform itself into a cosmopolitan mixture of  
14 local, national, and international businesses basically  
15 from all over the world.

16           The City of West Hollywood realizes that in order to  
17 maintain its advantage over some of the neighboring  
18 cities, that certain changes have to be made to its  
19 current zoning ordinances, and this is reflected in the  
20 new General Plan to encourage some new commercial  
21 developments to accommodate the future growth of the  
22 city.

23           The idea of creating additional commercial space  
24 will only ensure that the city of West Hollywood remains  
25 competitive for many years to come, and the General Plan,

1 in my opinion, is good in its present form. I don't  
2 think that it requires any modifications, and I would  
3 like to see it passed. Thank you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

5 Marne, followed by Ric Rickles.

6 **MARNE CARMEAN:** Yes, I'm Marne Carmean. I am a  
7 resident of West Hollywood. I live at 1354 North  
8 Havenhurst.

9 And there are visions and visionaries abounding, and  
10 I want to contribute tonight -- I'm going to play the age  
11 card a bit. I've been a resident of Los Angeles County  
12 for over 50 years, and I've lived in West Hollywood for  
13 33, and prior to that in Laurel Canyon.

14 And I remember so well something which I think could  
15 be an object lesson or a cautionary tale or potentially a  
16 model, meaning a negative model, but I remember well the  
17 transformation, if it can be dignified by that word, of  
18 Westwood Village.

19 And I think that many of you probably -- I don't  
20 know. I cannot presume who remembers Westwood Village or  
21 cared about Westwood Village or remember the issue it was  
22 at the time, but I've never ceased wondering what in  
23 God's name happened in that process because it went from  
24 being genuinely picturesque, and it was a beautiful  
25 adjunct to the campus, to UCLA. And I think to myself if

1 they had only been able to preserve that -- and I'm not  
2 even here to bemoan what it is today. What it is today,  
3 it's been that way now for decades.

4 But I will say -- I think to myself I wonder if they  
5 had really been able to preserve at least, I don't know,  
6 a dozen square blocks of what it was, what a wonderful  
7 attraction it would be.

8 And if you don't know what I'm talking about, if you  
9 don't remember Westwood Village or you don't remember  
10 what the process or [in]-process was in transforming it  
11 to really a pretty citified -- citified -- I mean very  
12 gray and very trafficky, I would urge you to take a look  
13 because there is a potential, I think, in it being an  
14 object lesson.

15 And the other thing is -- and the gentlemen who  
16 spoke before me intoned this -- speaking of what I'm  
17 going to bring my -- again, or negative judgment, it's  
18 the growth. I hate the place. I mean it is so  
19 artificial. It is so contrived. And yet when I do go  
20 there, which I do -- I see movies there or I'm at  
21 farmer's market. I don't know. I have obviously gone  
22 and will continue to go to the Grove. Even with my  
23 criticism of it or my own -- how distasteful it is to me,  
24 I am really impressed by the clear yearning that people  
25 have to gather, and I think that it's like they don't

1 care, as I do maybe, about the place being so artificial.  
2 It's just a great place to go.

3 And that's another thing that I think that West  
4 Hollywood -- if the visionaries and the visions --  
5 visionaries, rather, would look at these visions that  
6 have already been realized.

7 And anyway, I do appreciate the opportunity to  
8 contribute this, my viewpoint, and thank you. Good  
9 evening.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

11 Ric Rickles, followed by our last speaker, which is  
12 Atlantic Tires.

13 **RIC RICKLES:** Good evening. I'm Ric Rickles. I am  
14 a resident of West Hollywood, and I served on the  
15 committee for the plan which turned out to be not a very  
16 positive experience for me.

17 Somehow or other, we started with about 40 people  
18 that were gung-ho and excited about being a participant  
19 in this. By the last meeting, there were nine of us  
20 around the table, including Staff.

21 Somehow nobody seemed to think there was something  
22 wrong with it, that with each meeting, there were less  
23 people attending. Somehow or rather, these 40 gung-ho  
24 people were finding that there were other things that  
25 were taking precedent in their lives.

1 I heard some suggestions tonight, some  
2 contributions, some from people who also served at that  
3 time who didn't have the opportunity to discuss the  
4 things that they're contributing today.

5 The one public meeting on Saturday where the public  
6 was supposed to speak was completely agendized with  
7 lectures. There really wasn't an opportunity for  
8 discussion of the criticisms that came after the meeting.  
9 These people who didn't agree with what was going on got  
10 two minutes to speak. They aren't all nuts. There were  
11 some interesting ideas that were presented in those two  
12 minutes, but we never got to discuss them or throw them  
13 out, accept them, somehow find some kind of meeting of  
14 the minds where most of us can be satisfied.

15 So I may be Johnny-come-lately at this point because  
16 I don't like to make waves, but at the end of this, I was  
17 just feeling like my contribution could've well have not  
18 been there. Thank you.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Our last speaker is [Ed  
20 Zantik] (sic).

21 **MICHAEL JINNER:** Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.  
22 My name is [Michael Jinner].

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Can you speak into the microphone,  
24 please?

25

1           **MICHAEL JINNER:** My name is Mike Jinner, in the 1010  
2 North Fairfax. We've been there for 26 years. We almost  
3 serve more than half a million people and we want to sell  
4 more millions, but if you're going to widen the street  
5 and if something happened to my store, what are we going  
6 to do after 26 years?

7           Been there for 26 years. We sold more than half a  
8 million people. We're still serving. We got tire shop  
9 at 1010 North Fairfax between Santa Monica and Romaine.

10           If you're going to widen the street, we already  
11 don't have parking. What's going to happen to us? Where  
12 are you going to move? When you've got 32 to 35 people  
13 working over there -- not working over there but  
14 supporting those many people. If you're going to widen  
15 the street, if you're going to make this, that, what are  
16 you going to do, where are you going to go? It's not  
17 nice.

18           Last time you did the road over there, we did  
19 business maybe 50% down. From [Willoughby] to Santa  
20 Monica, you made the road over there. It's very bad.

21           If you widen the street, what's going to happen?  
22 Nobody from West Hollywood goes over there. Everybody  
23 comes from other side of town want to pick up (inaudible)  
24 Hollywood to go to freeway.

25

1 I think it's a good street. I don't think you have  
2 to do anything on Fairfax really. We don't need it.  
3 That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

5 Okay, that was our last speaker. So, John, does  
6 that mean we finally close the public hearing on this, or  
7 should we keep it open?

8 **JOHN KEHO:** You could certainly consider closing the  
9 public testimony section.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Altschul?

11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I had a question on that  
12 point. If per chance when the thing goes to the City  
13 Council and they refer parts or some of it back here,  
14 should we then -- I mean should we close the public  
15 hearing now or potentially leave it open?

16 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** You would -- it would be okay to  
17 close it because if it comes back to you on remand,  
18 you're going to want to re-notice it anyways, and that's  
19 really the distinction.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Got it. Thank you, Christi.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so if there's no objection,  
22 we're going to close the public testimony and open the  
23 floor to comments, questions, and deliberation from the  
24 Commission.

25



1           And so who would like to start? Commissioner  
2 Guardarrama?

3           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I have two specific  
4 questions. The first one concerns the properties that  
5 were brought up on Doheny in the 600 block. I was  
6 wondering if you could address them.

7           **JOHN KEHO:** I'm going to see if I can use this  
8 pointer. Okay, so there's Nemo Street. Unfortunately, I  
9 think the street names are all slipped up one block.

10           So I believe the property that's in question is that  
11 first brown lot right there above this commercial strip,  
12 and I was in conversation with those folks earlier, and  
13 it is true that it looks like during the county days,  
14 there was a rezoning to actually bring the commercial  
15 boundary up one lot so it wouldn't be a flat line all the  
16 way across the block. There's also a county approval for  
17 a CUP for a use -- office use on that block.

18           I looked back at the old EIRs to see if I could see  
19 anything that happened when we did our environmental  
20 review, and all the documents I could find just showed it  
21 straight across. So whether or not it was an intentional  
22 decision at that time by the City to move -- to keep the  
23 line straight or not, I can't tell, but at least there  
24 was some intention prior to cityhood to have that one lot  
25 zoned commercial.

1           But when we did it in the late '80s, the line -- the  
2 boundary just went straight across all the way through  
3 the middle and left that one lot to the north as  
4 residential, which means it's nonconforming commercial,  
5 so they can continue to use it as office use right now as  
6 long as they comply with how it was used when the  
7 ordinance changed.

8           They couldn't change it to, let's say, a beauty  
9 salon or a hair salon because that's a change of use from  
10 what it currently is, but it could continue to stay  
11 office use as it currently is and has been for the last  
12 25 (inaudible).

13           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** But, John, isn't it being  
14 used as a salon right now? It's not used as a ...

15           **JOHN KEHO:** My understanding -- my conversations was  
16 it was used as an office and they wanted to expand their  
17 salon into it.

18           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Really?

19           **JOHN KEHO:** That's my conversations...

20           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Could I ask a question on  
21 that?

22           **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead, Commissioner DeLuccio.

23           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I just want to understand.  
24 Are we talking about the block on Nemo, these four lots,

25

1 two are commercial right now? Is that what you're  
2 speaking of?

3 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct. There's the two right --  
4 again, unfortunately, Nemo, that's -- Nemo's actually  
5 here, so it's the two lots that are currently commercial,  
6 then there are two more lots that are residential, and  
7 we're talking about one of the lots.

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** We're not talking about the  
9 street between Nemo and Harland, are we?

10 **JOHN KEHO:** We're talking about Doheny.

11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right. I understand we're  
12 talking about but we're not talking about -- I see -- I'm  
13 looking at Doheny and I see two lots that are commercial  
14 between this right before Nemo...

15 **JOHN KEHO:** Right at Nemo.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** ... and two are residential.

17 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

18 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And so...

19 **JOHN KEHO:** So it's the first brown lot above the  
20 red commercial.

21 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** So there's only -- so the  
22 two on -- one right now is an apartment building on the  
23 corner, correct, on the Nemo corner?

24 **JOHN KEHO:** I guess I don't...

25

1           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, and I actually went  
2 over there actually, and what I -- if we're talking about  
3 the right -- same street, there's four lots, two are  
4 commercial right now. The third lot is the [ofted] CPA  
5 office..

6           **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

7           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** ... and the fourth one is the  
8 apartment building.

9           **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

10          **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** So, I don't know, my  
11 recommendation would be to -- that for consistency to  
12 recommend to Council to make that third one commercial if  
13 they own all three lots. This is my input.

14          **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

15          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I agree with Donald.

16          **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So do I.

17          **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, me, too.

18          **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'll weigh in the same way.

19          **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah. It seems to make..

20          **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Seems appropriate and it  
21 seems more consistent.

22          **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. So we have a consensus  
23 here. Commissioner Bernstein? Okay, so it seems like we  
24 have a consistency that we're okay with recommending a  
25

1 change of zoning to, I guess, the third lot but we're  
2 leaving the fourth one alone?

3       **JOHN KEHO:** I think it's 642.

4       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right.

5       **CHAIR YEBER:** 642 or 652?

6       **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** 652 is what we were told.

7       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** 652 Doheny because the other  
8 one is a 9000 (inaudible) and that's already an apartment  
9 building, so I think it should stay residential.

10       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** John, since we don't  
11 actually know the numbers, could we just clarify it's the  
12 third lot that we're talking about?

13       **JOHN KEHO:** Correct, the third lot, yes.

14       **CHAIR YEBER:** Going north.

15       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Exactly.

16       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. You had a couple of other  
17 things...

18       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I have a couple of ...

19       **CHAIR YEBER:** Wait. Commissioner Guardarrama had a  
20 few other things.

21       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** With regard to our last  
22 speaker, he was saying something about Fairfax being  
23 widened. Is he just talking about wider sidewalks or...?

24       **JOHN KEHO:** Yeah, he might be confused about the  
25 transit overlay, thinking that the transit overlay means

1 city's planning to widen the streets, and that's -- we're  
2 not planning to widen the streets.

3 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** That was my one question.  
4 And then I have another comment, but I'll wait for the  
5 other commissioners.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Commissioner DeLuccio?

7 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I just have two things. I  
8 had three, one we addressed. The other one was on the  
9 signage, I know you made reference to the signage.  
10 You're going to go to Council and recommend our -- our  
11 concern.

12 Basically, our thought our concerns had to do with  
13 LU16.4 and LU16.5. Will those be called out to Council?

14 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes.

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay. And the last one was  
16 I know I was a big advocate at the last meeting for the  
17 Melrose Avenue to go back to the existing zoning and the  
18 recommendation of the 25 feet and the 1 FAR on the south  
19 side.

20 However, I just want to throw something out here  
21 maybe. I know that I'm hearing that eventually some  
22 showrooms could go in there, and that was what I was  
23 hearing as a possibility for the height, meaning higher  
24 height for showrooms.

25

1           So I'm really still an advocate of recommending the  
2 recommendation we made. However, going forward, is there  
3 a way to study perhaps -- and I know this is like a dirty  
4 word here -- but to give some kind of incentive if  
5 somebody was going to build a showroom, actually build a  
6 showroom to allow some incentive to do so and then, in  
7 turn, allow for a higher height? But I wouldn't want to  
8 open it up just to blanket make a height 35 and a 1 FAR.  
9 I'd rather have something in place where if somebody  
10 indeed sincerely was going to do that, there would be an  
11 incentive to do so.

12           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I think at our last  
13 meeting, Commissioner Altschul brought up something that  
14 was interesting and we didn't really talk about it. He  
15 said that he would like to consider allowing some  
16 buildings on Melrose to go up to 35 feet but that there  
17 be a cap done on a first-come, first-served basis like we  
18 do in the Sunset Specific Plan. And I don't know what  
19 that cap is. Possibly that cap could be arrived at from  
20 the study that we're asking take place. But that we  
21 carefully consider it but we don't close the door on it  
22 either.

23           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And as part of that study, I  
24 would make a suggestion, the cap, and maybe look at  
25 incentives, also, the showroom.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

2           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I think showrooms are a very  
3 good idea, but once you allow additional height and you  
4 call it a showroom, then what's to prevent the person who  
5 owns it from selling it to some third party who doesn't  
6 want to have a showroom, take the additional height,  
7 divide it, and put in another story of whatever.

8           So I think we need to be a little bit careful in how  
9 we do this.

10          **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I agree. I was thinking the  
11 same thing that perhaps we could allow some additional  
12 height for a showroom and maybe some design restrictions  
13 so that there be a step back so that we don't have like a  
14 canyon effect on Melrose.

15          I don't know exactly how to structure that into the  
16 plan, but I think that for exemplary design and there  
17 also could be some conditional use restrictions on the  
18 buildings so that if they sell it to another owner, that  
19 they would have to apply for a change of use and then  
20 we'd have an opportunity to consider that if it's  
21 appropriate.

22          **CHAIR YEBER:** I just wanted to chime in regarding --  
23 Commissioner Altschul made a good point, but at the same  
24 time, I don't think a showroom is going to ask for 20  
25 feet, and I don't think the city's going to allow a 20-



1 foot-high showroom, and that would be the minimum that  
2 someone could come in later on and insert a floor in  
3 between.

4 So let's say the city establishes some sort of  
5 criteria where showroom height is between 12 and 14 feet.  
6 There's -- I mean that pretty much locks in that space.  
7 You're not going to be able to add that additional floor  
8 or even a loft space within that. So I mean there are  
9 ways that we could do that.

10 Do you have more comments regarding that particular  
11 issue?

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** No, I think I just wanted to  
13 throw that out there to show that I am open to look at  
14 ways of doing it and at the same time controlling --  
15 overall controlling the height the way it is existing on  
16 Melrose.

17 And right now, I don't have any other comments.  
18 Maybe if I do, I'll let you know. Thank you.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so on that issue, it sounds like  
20 there's a consensus from the Commission regarding maybe  
21 re-looking at Melrose not as sort of a one-size-fits-all  
22 but we determine through a study what would be  
23 appropriate and where and that it's not across the board.

24 **JOHN KEHO:** So if you'd look at page 19 of 20 on the  
25 resolution and then look at the last box, that's the

1 implementation, the direction of dividing that area up  
2 into three areas -- development standards --  
3 specifically, the study should examine development  
4 standards, particularly height and density for buildings  
5 in the following three segments of Melrose Avenue, and  
6 then it divides it up.

7       So just wanting to find out if that adequately  
8 covers all those items that you were talking about.

9       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I would like to see  
10 something to do with showrooms in there. That's what I'm  
11 trying to get at because that's what I'm hearing. Folks  
12 that came out this evening, businesses along Melrose, I  
13 heard that they were concerned because they would  
14 potentially want to develop a business with a showroom,  
15 and with the existing height, they cannot do that, so if  
16 we're going to study it, that would be something I'd  
17 actually like to call out in there.

18       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** How about something where  
19 we say it's consistent with the avenues of art, design,  
20 fashion, what we're trying to make this area?

21       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Um-hmm.

22       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** It's called The Avenues of  
23 Arts, Design and Fashion now, right?

24       **JOHN KEHO:** I think it's called The Avenues now.

25       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Yeah, okay.

1           **JOHN KEHO:** But how it's written, it says, "A plan  
2 should create a unified design and land use vision for  
3 the area to enhance its role as a center of arts and  
4 design. Specifically, the study should examine... and then  
5 talked about some of...

6           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** You know what? It would  
7 have to come back to us if something -- if we were to --  
8 this is to evolve into something. It would come back to  
9 this body anyway for us to flush out, is that correct?

10          **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

11          **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** So for that reason, I think  
12 I'd be okay with that.

13          **JOHN KEHO:** Yeah.

14          **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein, you wanted to  
15 chime in?

16          **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I think we've come around  
17 to my perspective, which is that John's idea to study  
18 this seems like a good idea, and it seems like it's in  
19 what Staff has brought to us already.

20          **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So is that the consensus on  
21 this particular item from the Commission?

22          **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

23          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

24          **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Does that give you direction?

25          **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

1           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** John, could you repeat what  
2 you just -- the change to the resolution?

3           **JOHN KEHO:** Actually, it wasn't a change. I was  
4 just reading directly from what we have in the documents.  
5 It says, "The plan should create a unified design and  
6 land use vision for the area to enhance its role as a  
7 center of arts and design. Specifically, the study  
8 should examine development standards, particularly height  
9 and density, for buildings in the following three  
10 segments of Melrose Avenue," and then it divides it into  
11 three areas.

12           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So theoretically if your  
13 study comes back and says that the proposed 25-foot  
14 height on a certain segment of Melrose is too short for  
15 specific types of showrooms, then possibly the plan would  
16 be changed?

17           **JOHN KEHO:** Correct, because it's just a study,  
18 particularly heights and density.

19           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** My worry is that the plan  
20 is going to have some period where it can't be changed  
21 for, I guess, a couple of years.

22           **JOHN KEHO:** Or until we get to it. I mean that's  
23 one of the things we'll have to look at is prioritizing  
24 which things come first, right?

25           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Question.

1           **JOHN KEHO:** Could be a time period.

2           **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

3           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** First of all, may we have  
4 Ms. Dobrin take her conversation outside and stop  
5 disturbing the meeting or sit down? Second -- may we  
6 have Ms. Dobrin take her conversations outside or stop  
7 disturbing the meeting?

8           And, secondly, I don't know what the institutional  
9 memory is, but was Kitson originally supposed to be a  
10 showroom?

11           **JOHN KEHO:** I believe that's how they originally  
12 applied, yes.

13           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And what is it now?

14           **JOHN KEHO:** They went through a permit process to  
15 convert to retail.

16           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Point made.

17           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Other commissioners have  
18 questions, comments, discussion?

19           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Not on that.

20           **CHAIR YEBER:** Can be on whatever you want it to be.  
21 It's your soapbox.

22           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I was interested in the  
23 speaker who talked about the historic preservation and  
24 the conflict that might be created between the cultural  
25 resource issue and the code compliance issue and that

1 there doesn't seem to be a mechanism to address that  
2 possible conflict. Is that something that should be in  
3 the plan?

4       **JOHN KEHO:** I don't -- occasionally there's going to  
5 be conflicts between certain goals, and that's always a  
6 prioritization of when the City's working on things.

7       I don't believe it's necessarily the case that it's  
8 a conflict that says you have to correct a problem with  
9 windows and then you go to Historic Preservation and  
10 Historic Preservation says no because there's always a  
11 way that somebody can remedy it. Sometimes the question  
12 is how someone wants to remedy it, not that they can't  
13 actually.

14       With Historic Preservation, you can renovate and  
15 modify things. It's sometimes a choice of how someone  
16 wants to do it. They may not be able to -- they may not  
17 want to do it a certain way.

18       **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** So the city already has  
19 mechanisms in place to resolve those issues?

20       **JOHN KEHO:** Yeah, when we have problems like that,  
21 we do actually meet across departments and we try to  
22 strategize about how best we can address and move forward  
23 things that are both an issue with code compliance and  
24 historic preservation or code compliance and parking

25

1 issues. We do already meet together to work on those  
2 issues.

3 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** What about some incentives or  
4 rebates or something to give to the owners of those  
5 buildings to upgrade the plumbing and electrical so we  
6 don't have a catastrophe in these buildings?

7 **JOHN KEHO:** We -- actually, the City actually  
8 requires as part of a [MILSAC] contract that they  
9 actually analyze their building for the fire and  
10 plumbing, those type of things, so we can make sure that  
11 those issues are actually addressed as part of the  
12 [MILSAC] contract.

13 We do have policy language that actually talks about  
14 trying to discover or find other ways to come up with  
15 incentives, both financial and otherwise, to try to help  
16 property owners. It's always a struggle because trying  
17 to find where money -- trying to find money to allow some  
18 -- to give to property owners, that's always a difficult  
19 thing.

20 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can you reference where  
21 that language is so we can look at it quickly?

22 **BIANCA SIEGL:** There are two programs in the housing  
23 element that address that to some degree on page 214 and  
24 215. There's policies relating to -- or programs  
25 relating to doing a survey of conditions with multi-

1 family housing, as well as a program to look at programs  
2 to rehabilitate multi-family housing.

3           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** That's programs that discover  
4 buildings that need to have these modifications in order  
5 to be maybe more compliant and updated, but what  
6 incentive is there -- it's very expensive. We just did  
7 it in our building. We have an old building, and it's  
8 condominiums, so it's a different situation, but a lot of  
9 the landlords that have buildings that have rentals,  
10 especially where they have rent-controlled units, what's  
11 the incentive for them to upgrade before there's a  
12 catastrophe?

13           **BIANCA SIEGL:** Part of program #3 in the housing  
14 element discusses exploring funding availability from  
15 state and federal sources for rehabilitation.

16           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Thank you.

17           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** May I? But not city, so  
18 we'd be looking for state and federal funding but not  
19 looking into how we could fund it ourselves if we could  
20 find opportunities?

21           **BIANCA SIEGL:** So one of the changes that will be  
22 included in the resolution, should Council choose to  
23 approve it, is this additional language that I mentioned  
24 earlier about looking into adaptive re-use for additional  
25 funding sources, and this would be part of the historic



1 preservation implementation actions. And so that could  
2 certainly include city funding.

3         **JOHN KEHO:** I think one idea that had been floated  
4 is that the city already has an affordable housing fee  
5 that new building owners have to pay. There's park fees  
6 that buildings have to pay. There's childcare fees that  
7 new commercial buildings have to pay.

8         So one concept some people have raised is well maybe  
9 there might be a fee that people would pay that could  
10 then be used for historic preservation, and maybe that  
11 would start to create a fund that could then be used.  
12 And so then that policy direction allows us to look into  
13 that.

14         **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can we talk about this a  
15 little bit further?

16         **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah, sure. Go ahead. Actually, if I  
17 could make just a quick comment, I was reading this and I  
18 was happy with what was added, but I'm always plagued by  
19 the term *maintenance* because we're really talking about  
20 something beyond maintenance here. We're talking about  
21 upgrade, building system upgrades.

22         And I just sort of feel like maintenance talks about  
23 day-to-day things that the city requires of all apartment  
24 buildings or all housing in general, and we're really  
25 talking about something much more significant or serious

1 here, and I just sort of feel like the language there is  
2 a bit weak and ambiguous.

3       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I agree with you, and I --  
4 with respect to Ric's challenge to be somewhat bolder, I  
5 just think this is not only historical preservation;  
6 these are effectively workforce units that we don't want  
7 to lose to fires and flooding and that we should be  
8 trying to be aggressive about preserving these units  
9 through what you are correctly identifying as capital  
10 improvements, not maintenance.

11       And I think this is a good start, but I think this  
12 language is weaker and less bold than it needs to be.

13       **JOHN KEHO:** So we could add such -- change  
14 maintenance -- we could leave maintenance and upgrade --  
15 maintenance upgrade and operation of cultural resources  
16 or capital improvements. I think one of you said capital  
17 improvements -- maintenance capital improvements and  
18 operation.

19       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Does someone else -- would  
20 other Commissioners want to chime in on this topic? Go  
21 ahead.

22       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I'm just glad it was brought  
23 up because I thought it was very important. Thank you.

24       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Just a question because it  
25 has concerned me and I'm not clear that we're addressing

1 this in the General Plan. It seems to me that one of our  
2 challenges, because Ed mentioned also, the risk of  
3 catastrophe happening, it seems that there are loopholes  
4 right now, as I understand it, in what happens after a  
5 catastrophe and how buildings that are historical are  
6 identified for red-tagging, and I just would want us to  
7 be as absolutely cautious as we can be, especially in a  
8 time of crisis, that we don't lose historical resources  
9 because our language or who makes the determination on  
10 the viability of the building is not as tight as it could  
11 be. That's sort of my understanding.

12 **JOHN KEHO:** We do have a policy, policy HP3.5, "The  
13 City will develop post-disaster response policies and  
14 plans for designated cultural resources," and as a matter  
15 of fact, we had a volunteer over the last maybe three  
16 months actually doing a lot of research with the city of  
17 Santa Cruz, Berkeley, and other places on how they  
18 address their cultural resources, and so we've actually  
19 made some progress on at least identifying how we can try  
20 to add that to our post-disaster recovery plans.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any other comments on this?

22 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Have we reached an  
23 agreement to make that change in language?

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, are we at a consensus to make  
25 this have a little bit more teeth or a little bit more --

1 stronger and ambitious? Is there a consensus?

2 Commissioner Buckner?

3 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I think I'm in favor of that,  
4 yes.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right, so, John, I think we  
6 have consensus on that particular item.

7 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Could I just --

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** You can have as many things as you  
9 want. This is an important document, so there's no rush.

10 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I like the idea of somehow  
11 putting into our General Plan some way of coming up with  
12 urban public space where we can gather. I don't know  
13 where we've got so little space in our city, but I think  
14 our speaker had some ideas of places where we might  
15 consider creating that kind of space.

16 And then, of course, the speaker about the grove,  
17 where it seems like people do like to come and spend time  
18 and chat, and so I would like to -- I see you turning  
19 pages. Do we already have something? Okay.

20 **JOHN KEHO:** We do have one on page 62 under Urban  
21 Design, LU4.6, "Commercial development projects will  
22 provide for enhanced pedestrian activities in commercial  
23 areas through the following techniques," and letter D is,  
24 "Allow for the development of outdoor plazas and dining  
25 areas," so that would be on private property.

1           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** But that's on private  
2 property. What I'm talking about is creating some kind  
3 of public open space besides parks, where it's just a  
4 place for people to...

5           **JOHN KEHO:** Right. There are other ones -- we'll  
6 have to find where they are -- but we do have the  
7 permissions for utilizing, enhancing pedestrian ways  
8 along streets, and so that can include plaza areas. I  
9 mean as you pointed out very clearly, we don't have a lot  
10 of public space so we have to use street right-of-way...

11           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Okay.

12           **JOHN KEHO:** ... and so it's really about pedestrian  
13 orientation. There's a couple of other things and Bianca  
14 has...

15           **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yeah. It's actually one of the  
16 changes that's listed on page 20 of the resolution for  
17 policy -- Parks & Recreation PR1.2 that says that the  
18 city should seek to maintain a diversity of park spaces  
19 throughout the city, including recreation areas,  
20 hardscaped plazas, and then there are other examples.

21           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** So those hardscaped plazas  
22 might be those spaces.

23           **JOHN KEHO:** And I haven't found it, but I believe  
24 there's one policy in here that also talks about where

25

1 parking spaces aren't needed that we might be able to  
2 convert those spaces to a plaza of some sort.

3 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Thank you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Hamaker?

5 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I'll just sort of  
6 piggyback on a little bit of what Sue said.

7 I believe one of the spaces that we've talked about  
8 over the years is the Veteran's Memorial, which is near  
9 to City Hall and a fairly central location. The problem  
10 is that, of course, it's private property going west from  
11 the memorial itself, but it is a good public gathering  
12 space.

13 And usually it's been my experience when something  
14 big happens, the gathering place is the corner of Santa  
15 Monica Boulevard and San Vicente, and they just close off  
16 the streets, and thousands of people come out of their  
17 houses and there they are in the middle of the street.  
18 And, of course, I'm on the other side of town, so I don't  
19 ever go over there, but it is possible.

20 I wanted to make the comment about what the speaker  
21 said about the Grove. I think -- because I have given it  
22 some thought in the past -- I think one of the reasons  
23 the Grove is so successful is that it is insular and  
24 secure and a Disneyland-like environment where the  
25 potential for outsiders to come into that safe space is

1 excluded. The neighborhood is completely excluded. You  
2 have to come in there specifically through gates, and  
3 people feel very safe there with their baby carriages,  
4 and it's a very sanitized, very nice, very pleasant  
5 environment.

6 And one of the things when I first came on the  
7 Planning Commission that John Chase and I talked about  
8 and he explained to me was that we want our doors to be  
9 open to the street. We like to include people in what we  
10 do, not to exclude them.

11 Now, that's a very broad statement, but I gave it a  
12 lot of thought when the Grove first opened, and I went  
13 there, and I couldn't figure out why I felt so  
14 uncomfortable there, and it was because I felt like I'm  
15 an artist and I sort of don't belong in that environment  
16 with all of these really neatly dressed people with  
17 their, you know...

18 So I sort of like the ad hoc environment of the City  
19 of West Hollywood, and I don't know that we would have an  
20 area that could or even would want to be contained, as  
21 opposed to be an open cradle. So that was my thought  
22 about the Grove.

23 I also believe that there were some murders and some  
24 gang activity in Westwood, which is what caused the rapid  
25 decline for a number of years, and other than that, I

1 don't know a lot about it, but I know it was a very  
2 tragic event because I -- in the '60s, that's where  
3 everybody went to have a good time.

4       Okay, thank you.

5       **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner...

6       **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** One more thing.

7       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

8       **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Several of the speakers were  
9 asking the Commission to delay the recommendation to  
10 Council, and I was wondering if any Commissioners had any  
11 reaction or thoughts about that at this point or whether  
12 that's appropriate to talk about it right now.

13       **CHAIR YEBER:** No, it is. Actually, that's funny  
14 because I was going to ask Staff what are the  
15 implications.

16       So before you answer that, I think Commissioner  
17 Bernstein had a question, also, regarding that.

18       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I think the question is  
19 broader than Sue raised than just my question, but since  
20 at least one or two speakers did bring up the validity of  
21 the final EIR based on circulation questions and my  
22 recollection is that either Christi or whoever was  
23 filling in for her answered that. But since probably not  
24 everyone who's here or watching tonight was at that  
25 meeting, if you could -- we got a good response to that



1 question, but I think it would be worth repeating because  
2 it would help to clarify the circulation question.

3 **YARA FISHER:** Good evening, Chair and Commissioners.  
4 So your question is the validity of the FEIR and whether  
5 recirculation is necessary?

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Well, specific to the, again, the  
7 amount of documents that were added to the FEIR, that  
8 seems to be a matter of contention with the public and  
9 its validity.

10 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** And, quite bluntly, I'm not  
11 looking for a new answer. The question was answered, but  
12 it was answered at a different meeting, and I'm not sure  
13 that everyone who's watching or here remembers that, so  
14 it would be great to hear that again.

15 **YARA FISHER:** Okay, I will restate that. There are  
16 a couple of triggers to recirculation of an EIR, and that  
17 is when substantial changes are made to the draft  
18 document and also when changes are made to the  
19 significance impact conclusion of a document or when new  
20 mitigation alternatives are added that weren't previously  
21 considered that you choose to reject.

22 And none of those situations have occurred in this  
23 instance. We have added significant number of pages at  
24 the request of the commenter for additional information

25

1 regarding the traffic model. That information was  
2 provided.

3 And the information, about 20 pages of it, was added  
4 to the actual text of the final EIR describing and  
5 strikeout/outlined where the changes to the document were  
6 made. So the changes were pointed out to the commenter  
7 and to the public at large where the changes were made in  
8 the document.

9 And we determined even with the addition of the  
10 additional information there was no change in our  
11 analysis, our methodology, the conclusions about any of  
12 the impact statements that would require recirculation of  
13 the draft EIR.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Great. And since you're up here, I  
15 have a question that was brought up tonight but also I  
16 read in some of the letters.

17 Is sort of the protocol about responding to comments  
18 and questions where you'll actually point to a particular  
19 policy statement or a municipal code or you'll say  
20 "noted," what is the protocol when you're faced with  
21 dozens of letters that you have to try to point by point  
22 try to address each of their questions or comments?

23 **YARA FISHER:** I think in the latest letter, one of  
24 the comments was that we grouped comments together, and  
25 yes, we did that when they were related comments. We did

1 group comments, but we tried to assure that within one  
2 response we addressed each of the grouped comments.

3       There were several questions regarding very specific  
4 issues or assumptions or other validations within  
5 documents that we relied upon, such as other agencies,  
6 urban water management plans, for example, or detail  
7 within your municipal code about what a project might  
8 allow in a certain location for street lights, so that  
9 level of detail that is beyond the specificity of the  
10 program EIR that you're looking at now.

11       So in some instances, when the answer was not a  
12 simple yes or no or would've been speculative because no  
13 specific project is proposed, we often did refer back to  
14 existing regulation or the existing reference document  
15 that we were using to come to the conclusions.

16       **CHAIR YEBER:** But that's the -- and that is the  
17 protocol for all EIRs, not just this specific one. I  
18 mean this is how it's usually handled, and it seemed to  
19 me on this particular EIR, actually it was more detailed  
20 than I've seen past EIRs in terms of trying to respond to  
21 as many points as possible that could be identified in a  
22 commenter's letter.

23       **YARA FISHER:** Yes, we actually received that comment  
24 from others that we did spend a lot of attention and  
25 detail to responding to the comments, and it is protocol.

1 The way that we've done this is, I'd say, pretty  
2 comprehensive.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Great. Is there any other questions  
4 for our EIR consultant? Thank you very much.

5 And then there's a request to take a five-minute  
6 break to allow Commissioners to get a drink or go to the  
7 restrooms, so please refrain from speaking to the  
8 Commissioners at this point because we're still in an  
9 open hearing. So with that, five minutes.

10 *(Short break taken)*

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. We're going to re-start.  
12 All right, so we're still discussing any items that any  
13 of the Commissioners wanted to talk about regarding this.  
14 Commissioner Hamaker?

15 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I just would like to say I  
16 really appreciated the business people that came out  
17 tonight. We really so seldom hear from businesses.  
18 There were small businesses here, people I had never seen  
19 or heard of before, and a lot of them I really don't know  
20 what they did, but it's really nice to hear from them.  
21 It's really tough to own a business and run it, and I  
22 think that those of us who have tenant issues all the  
23 time really forget how difficult it is to own a business,  
24 especially a retail business. So I just really would  
25 like to thank them for coming out, and I wish we had

1 dozens and dozens more of you who were involved to give  
2 us input and feedback, and we can learn from you. Thank  
3 you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

5 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Yes. I'm concerned that if  
6 we go forward with the Melrose Avenue language as it is,  
7 just by studying the heights, it's not actually  
8 permitting the expanded heights that Donald and I were  
9 talking about earlier. So I was wondering if we could  
10 consider possibly either not making a recommendation to  
11 City Council with that one strip as far as height until  
12 the studies come out or something else because if we  
13 propose the 25-foot height and then -- for it to be  
14 studied, well, then that 25-foot height is in the General  
15 Plan, and the only way someone could get above the 25-  
16 foot height would be to do an amendment, which no one  
17 will want to do for a couple of years at least. So I  
18 don't know where we are on that.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Well, one of the questions that we  
20 started to talk about or ask is what are the implications  
21 of continuing, as it has been suggested, continuing this  
22 discussion for further study and analysis.

23 So, John, can you give us what the implications are  
24 and what Staff would recommend?

25

1           **JOHN KEHO:** Sure. So talking about the General  
2 Plan, the Planning Commission is a recommendation body to  
3 the City Council, so anything that you do is a  
4 recommendation to the Council. The Council will take the  
5 final action on any of the issues that you're talking  
6 about.

7           The City Council's identified two specific meeting  
8 dates where they've identified where they plan to talk  
9 about the General Plan, including a special session  
10 that's already been picked for a Council date.

11           So from a Staff perspective, this is something that  
12 we feel that we need to bring a recommendation to the  
13 Planning Commission, and that recommendation can  
14 certainly include -- to City Council -- a recommendation  
15 to City Council saying that, "Here are some areas that  
16 need further study." And then the City Council will take  
17 that into consideration and might say, "Okay, let's send  
18 it back to the Planning Commission for that additional  
19 study."

20           With that, it allows the Council to address those  
21 issues at the time that they have identified that they  
22 wanted to talk about.

23           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** What date is it going to  
24 council?

25

1           **BIANCA SIEGL:** It's the meeting of October 18, which  
2 is a regular council meeting, and then the following  
3 Monday, October 25, which is the special meeting.

4           **CHAIR YEBER:** And are these two meetings also  
5 devoted to just the General Plan, or do they have other  
6 business?

7           **JOHN KEHO:** The first meeting is going to be a  
8 regular meeting, and the second one was special meeting  
9 for General Plan.

10           **CHAIR YEBER:** Just the General Plan. So essentially  
11 you're saying, basically, if there are areas such as the  
12 one that Commissioner Guardarrama brought up, we could in  
13 the recommendation move it forward that we would like to  
14 see further study and then Council would remand it back  
15 to us in some fashion, either before or after the study,  
16 once we have more information?

17           **JOHN KEHO:** Sure. They can make a decision whether  
18 to take that recommendation or to reject it to or to  
19 modify it slightly.

20           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** They could make a decision.  
21 We're making recommendations to them. It doesn't mean  
22 they're going to send it back to us. They can say where  
23 -- at our last meeting, we made a recommendation to leave  
24 it at 25 and a one. They can -- when they're studying  
25 it, they can say, "Okay, we'll take that into

1 consideration, but we want it to be what Staff originally  
2 recommended, the 35 and a 1.5."

3         **JOHN KEHO:** Yes, they could certainly do that, as  
4 well.

5         **CHAIR YEBER:** But you could also have in that  
6 recommendation that we had made a suggestion or further  
7 recommendation that it be studied to maybe not have a  
8 one-size-fits-all and that we do -- as Commissioner  
9 Guardarrama proposed, that maybe certain sites be  
10 identified to be a little taller and..

11         **JOHN KEHO:** Yeah, we can certainly identify that  
12 there's a mix of opinions about how specifically to  
13 address that area and the concerns about that.

14         **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Does that answer your question?

15         **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I feel like I can craft a  
16 motion then. I'd like to move that we recommend to the  
17 City Council the Staff's recommendation with regard to  
18 the General Plan, the EIR, and the Statement of  
19 Overriding Considerations, with the exception of the  
20 south side of Melrose between La Cienega and Doheny,  
21 where we recommend to Council that that area be studied  
22 but do not recommend a height limit, either the one  
23 proposed by Staff or the 25-foot limit, and move forward,  
24 also, the Climate Action Plan.

25



1           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, I would -- if we're  
2 not going to -- so right now we'd leave it open to be  
3 determined the -- what the height would be.

4           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** My concern was that if we  
5 set a height limit and then study it, then the study  
6 would have to undo something rather than suggest  
7 something.

8           **CHAIR YEBER:** So let me back up just for  
9 clarification before because I think there's some  
10 discussion that's going to be needed here.

11           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Could we --

12           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah?

13           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Do we have to have an actual  
14 zoning in there, or could it be that it's left open for  
15 an individual?

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** Well, first of all, we have a motion  
17 on the floor --

18           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Right.

19           **CHAIR YEBER:** -- that needs a second...

20           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Or not.

21           **CHAIR YEBER:** ... or not. And then we can ask  
22 questions or...

23           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'll second it...

24           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

25           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** ... so that we can discuss it.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, okay.

2           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** You know, I just want to  
3 start off by saying I think the motion is simply  
4 premature. We weren't done discussing elements. It's  
5 just going to be more complicated now, but we've got a  
6 motion to discuss.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, wait. Hold on, hold on.

8           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Wait, wait, wait.

9           **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead, Commissioner Altschul.

10          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** There is no such thing as a  
11 premature motion. Motion does not cut off discussion.  
12 Motion, in many instances, as in this instance, will  
13 begin discussion. So there is no such thing as a  
14 premature motion.

15          **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yeah, I agree. Can I say  
16 something, Marc?

17          **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, Commissioner.

18          **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Because I feel kind of  
19 passionate about this, the Melrose. I feel like -- and I  
20 came in this evening wanting to study it some more, and I  
21 wanted to recognize that there are some uses that could  
22 require a higher height.

23                 And so, John, if I can ask you and Bianca, by this  
24 motion that's on the floor this evening, if it did pass,  
25 how would you foresee taking that to Council, you know,

1 being with the map, the zoning map because it almost says  
2 right now it's at 25 feet. We want to study it to see if  
3 it's going to...

4       **JOHN KEHO:** Right. We would have to say that  
5 there's actually no recommendation by the Planning  
6 Commission on the heights in that specific location and  
7 that additional study is required, and so then the City  
8 Council would have to make a decision either to send it  
9 back for the Planning Commission to analyze it, or they  
10 could choose to make a decision. But we would say that  
11 there's no recommendation for height in that location.

12       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And they could just make a  
13 determination themselves?

14       **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

15       **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I just want to be clear that  
16 I do want to look at it. I'm open to certain different  
17 height -- looking at different heights, generally  
18 speaking, but I don't want to give the impression that I  
19 -- I want to give the impression that I am concerned  
20 about what Staff proposed. I want to make sure that's  
21 articulated.

22       **CHAIR YEBER:** I was going to make this because -- I  
23 want to make this as simple as possible. In the packet,  
24 there are two actual resolutions, and maybe it might be  
25 easier if we focus on, first, PC 10-944, which has to do

1 with the certification of the EIR, the mitigation  
2 program, statement of overriding considerations, and then  
3 let's move to a separate discussion with the General Plan  
4 and the Climate Action.

5 So if there's consensus and if the maker would  
6 withdraw -- consider withdrawing that to make this  
7 simpler ...

8 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Sure.

9 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'll withdraw my second so  
10 that the maker can ...

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So, Joe, would you like to re--  
12 let's...

13 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Sure. I'd like to move the  
14 Environmental Impact Report and the Statement of  
15 Overriding Consideration...

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** And...

17 **JOHN KEHO:** And, also, would you want to read in the  
18 CAP, resolution #2, the Climate Action Plan?

19 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** ... and the Climate Action  
20 Plan.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Are we talking about 944?

22 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** And 945.

23 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** 945.

24 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** 944 and (inaudible).

25

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right. I'm asking are we focusing on  
2 the EIR, the Overriding ...

3           **JOHN KEHO:** Statement of Overriding Considerations,  
4 and I was suggesting -- I haven't heard anyone talk about  
5 the CAP.

6           **CHAIR YEBER:** So go ahead and bring the CAP into one  
7 of these resolutions.

8           **JOHN KEHO:** A single motion for those two  
9 resolutions.

10           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'll second the motion to  
11 move the recommendation as Staff is proposing for PC 10-  
12 944 and PC 10-945. So I'm going to second that motion.

13           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Is that acceptable to the  
14 maker?

15           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Yes.

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any discussion on that  
17 particular motion?

18           All right, David, will you do a roll call vote,  
19 please?

20           **DAVID GILLIG:** Vice-Chair Guardarrama?

21           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Yes.

22           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

23           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes.

24           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul?

25           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

1           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein?

2           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Yes.

3           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner?

4           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

5           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker?

6           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Aye.

7           **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber?

8           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

9           **DAVID GILLIG:** Motion carries, unanimous.

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so if I understand now all  
11 that's left on the table is the actual General Plan  
12 update itself?

13          **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

14          **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So does someone -- it sounded  
15 like there was some more discussion before someone  
16 brought a motion to the table or if someone wants to  
17 bring a motion, the floor is open, so it seemed like,  
18 Commissioner Bernstein, you had some concerns.

19          **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Some minor things we just  
20 haven't addressed yet, and then just a curiosity. We've  
21 been taking sort of consensuses on how we wanted to  
22 modify 943, and with respect -- and obviously John is  
23 technically correct. There's no such thing as a  
24 premature motion -- the motion that Vice-Chair  
25 Guardarrama made was not in line with what the consensus

1 is that we had taken. And I thought the system was going  
2 to be that we were going to take a bunch of consensuses  
3 and then sort of move our ultimate consensus. So I was a  
4 little discomfoted by having a motion that took one of  
5 our consensuses and went off in a different direction in  
6 my impression.

7 But to get back to my thought, one question that I  
8 had, it's just on page 19 of 20, and it was something  
9 that I had requested where the ability to replace units  
10 in R1B would not be automatic, but it was -- the language  
11 said "may allow" before, and now it appears -- this is  
12 that it will allow for the construction or replacement.  
13 And I just would feel more comfortable if it said "may  
14 allow" rather than "allow."

15 **BIANCA SIEGL:** The change in language actually has  
16 to do with what I mentioned earlier, which is the  
17 grammatical structuring of the policy language to remove  
18 the should, will, and may categories. So the term  
19 "allow" still is -- it's not mandatory. It just says  
20 that it is a possibility that the City would allow for  
21 us.

22 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Okay. Thank you for  
23 clarifying that.

24 And then I just was curious. For something like  
25 conservation overlay districts -- because while we're

1 talking about the General Plan, you have also brought to  
2 us also a series of recommended changes, and I'm just  
3 curious how do we weigh -- for instance, I think the  
4 conservation overlay language being strengthened is a  
5 good idea, and I'm just wondering how we do or don't in  
6 any way comment on things where you've already suggested  
7 the changes. How do we endorse those things?

8         **JOHN KEHO:** Well, that's where you would take a look  
9 at this, and if you don't feel like it's strong enough,  
10 either add language or ... but just for the conservation  
11 overlay, the conservation overlay allows the creation of  
12 zoning regulations. So it's the zoning regulations that  
13 are going to be the ones that have the strength or not  
14 the strength, and that's going to depend on an individual  
15 overlay-by-overlay basis.

16         **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Thank you.

17         **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I think there's a motion.

18         **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

19         **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** You want to make a motion,  
20 Joseph?

21         **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Sure. I'd like to make a  
22 motion that we recommend to the City Council Resolution  
23 943 recommending adoption of the General Plan with the  
24 exception of the 25-foot height limit on Melrose, with  
25 the inclusion of the study of that height limit, but also



1 with the inclusion of the original proposed plan by Staff  
2 with the 35-foot limit, this plan that has the existing  
3 25-foot limit, and have the City Council decide whether -  
4 - which parcels should be which after study or..

5 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** To blend them together.

6 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** ... without study or in their  
7 divine wisdom, however they want.

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And I'll -- I can second  
9 that. Sort of blended together. The Council can blend  
10 the heights together.

11 **JOHN KEHO:** Okay, and Commissioner Guardarrama, say  
12 that again so that I can make sure I'm clear.

13 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So, basically, we're  
14 recommending a study of Melrose on the south side, but  
15 present to the Council what the Staff originally thought  
16 was appropriate and then what the Planning Commission  
17 thought may be appropriate, and then somehow -- because  
18 it's both extremes, right? One is 35 foot and the other  
19 one is existing.

20 **JOHN KEHO:** So it's presenting both..

21 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Both options.

22 **JOHN KEHO:** What original proposal was plus what  
23 Commission discussed at the last meeting.

24 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** And with the idea that a  
25 happy medium might be somewhere in between.

1           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yeah.

2           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Or maybe we could talk about  
3 a diversity of height.

4           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Right. Yeah, that's what  
5 I...

6           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right, a blending or diversity of  
7 heights.

8           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes.

9           **CHAIR YEBER:** Not that we would come in between the  
10 two.

11           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** That it would be individual  
12 as each project came before the Commission...

13           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

14           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** ... or before the Staff.

15           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, I don't know if it's  
16 individual. I think they're going to have to come up  
17 with a...

18           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Case by case.

19           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I think -- but I actually  
20 think it's more that Council should come up with -- being  
21 that it's part of a General Plan, I think they should  
22 come up with a blend -- hopefully, the Council will come  
23 up with -- when they finalize a General Plan with what  
24 that blend will be or what that diversity will be and  
25 what the parcel heights and FARs will be at that time

1 because I guess what we're struggling with, and I came in  
2 this evening with, last week I was very set on the 25  
3 feet, but when our -- again, we're here to listen to what  
4 everybody has to say. We're here to hear what the  
5 residents have to say, what the businesses have to say,  
6 and I did hear some valid reasons for it not all being 25  
7 feet. There is some businesses like showrooms, for  
8 example, that could require a different height.

9 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** So then why not -- it just  
10 seems like a bell that's going to be hard to unring. Why  
11 not leave it at 25 feet with a recommendation that they  
12 study it, identify the ways and the opportunities to  
13 increase it rather than shifting everything higher and  
14 then asking Council to bring some things back down?

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I don't think we asked them  
16 to shift it higher. We're asking them to -- we're  
17 presenting both...

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Look at the two, look at what was  
19 originally proposed versus our suggestions, and then try  
20 to find something in the middle.

21 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'm hearing our Commissioners  
22 talk about not it being necessarily recommending it be 25  
23 feet but that there be a diversity so that it's a more  
24 interesting streetscape.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, yes, that's exactly right.

1           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** (Inaudible) but also taking  
2 into account that some buildings, because of that  
3 specific kind of use, is going to require higher  
4 ceilings.

5           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Exactly.

6           **CHAIR YEBER:** Does that make sense? Commissioner  
7 Bernstein?

8           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yeah, but I'd like to hear  
9 from Staff how they're going to -- what the language  
10 they're going to use in this.

11           **JOHN KEHO:** We're going to have to figure out the  
12 language to describe it. We may have to re-listen to  
13 this meeting, but there might be some ideas that we can  
14 come up with that might allow individual buildings, too.  
15 I'm just throwing it out there. We haven't thought about  
16 this much further, but Commissioner Buckner had talked  
17 about a CUP.

18           Maybe we could come up with something where if you  
19 want to go above the height, you have to get a CUP, and  
20 so that's an individual building by building, not all  
21 across the board, but I haven't thought about it more  
22 than about 10 minutes.

23           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And I keep throwing out the  
24 word incentive, incentives, too.

25

1           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I like the idea of diversity  
2 of heights of some sort.

3           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, it's my understanding,  
4 not being a developer, but once something is in the code,  
5 when somebody wants to buy a building, they go and they  
6 look and see what the zoning is, and if they see the word  
7 diversity, they're going to say, "What the heck does that  
8 mean?" I mean there can't be that much ambiguousness. I  
9 think the idea of a CUP or something is a good idea, but  
10 I don't think we just say, "Oh, well, let's -- we'll see  
11 what happens." It has to be summarily specific.

12           **JOHN KEHO:** When I'm hearing the Planning Commission  
13 on diversity, I was hearing it in terms of height, a  
14 diversity of 25-foot buildings, 35-foot buildings, not  
15 diversity of architectural styles.

16           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I'm fine with 35 feet.

17           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** What I'm hearing, I'm  
18 hearing showroom incentives. It doesn't seem like we're  
19 really asking... I'm hearing -- and I may be hearing  
20 incorrectly, I'm hearing comfort with 25 feet and  
21 showroom incentives that would allow people to go higher.

22           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right.

23           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I just don't want to get  
24 into a situation where an applicant has to apply for a  
25 text amendment.

1           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right.

2           **JOHN KEHO:** Right. I think they were talking about  
3 incentives might be a way to do it if it's specifically  
4 to assure (inaudible).

5           **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** See, I'm reluctantly going  
6 along with this, but I'm being sympathetic to the  
7 businesses, so we need to find a mechanism, and we don't  
8 want it to be a thing where we have a General Plan in  
9 place and then we're going to start doing amendments.

10          **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Right.

11          **BIANCA SIEGL:** If I might recommend, one option  
12 would be to have a policy that says something like the  
13 following -- allow height limits of up to 35 feet for  
14 ground-floor design showrooms on the south side of  
15 Melrose between Doheny and La Cienega on no more than 50%  
16 of the parcels.

17          **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** That's perfect. I'm great  
18 with that.

19          **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And I'm fine with that, too.  
20 I'll second that.

21          **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein, does that make  
22 it a little bit clearer for you?

23          **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** It makes it clear. I would  
24 respectfully say I don't think it's perfect, but I think  
25

1 we have a lot of elements in a General Plan and I don't  
2 have to find every element perfect.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Well, and not only that,  
4 remember, this is just the recommendation. Council could  
5 certainly come in behind us and adjust that up or down  
6 depending on what they think makes sense.

7 All right, so is there further discussion on the  
8 motion on the table?

9 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yes, yes.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

11 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I just want to make sure that  
12 I understand that the motion takes into account, because  
13 as Alan had said, there were lots of things that various  
14 ones of us disagreed on or agreed on, but those are  
15 enumerated in the additional changes Bianca recommended,  
16 so that even though I would vote for the motion but I was  
17 against some of the things in it, those are...

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Noted.

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** ... those are noted.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes.

21 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** So that's what -- I just want  
22 to understand that. Correct, John?

23 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. So the motion was to recommend  
24 approval of the changes that were listed in the documents  
25 that we sent out -- I believe it was Tuesday night -- so

1 those are the recommended changes, plus a couple of  
2 things that we read into the record tonight, including  
3 historic preservation item, the property on Doheny,  
4 capital improvements for historic preservation. So those  
5 things that we read into the record..

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Will also be part of the resolution.

7 **JOHN KEHO:** That would be part of the resolution.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** So all the changes and..

9 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** But also, too, as you mentioned are..

11 **JOHN KEHO:** We'll also note that...

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** ... our concern -- yeah, our noted  
13 concerns about offsite signage beyond Sunset...

14 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** ... and anything else that's...

16 **JOHN KEHO:** ... if there are any other areas that we  
17 need to note.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

19 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Are we going to have an  
20 opportunity to review the resolution before it's actually  
21 sent up to Council?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** Well, we believe that the ...

23 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** The language?

24 **JOHN KEHO:** ... the language here is all very clear  
25 and the things that we've added are very minor, and so



1 we've actually read those into the record, so we believe  
2 that it's okay.

3       **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** It'll be what we --  
4 recommending.

5       **JOHN KEHO:** Right. Because [Matt] wrote that great  
6 save there on the Melrose Avenue area for us.

7       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any other discussion, debate?

8       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** The only thing that I didn't  
9 see in here and it was probably because I didn't know how  
10 to articulate it but I did bring it up was the -- my  
11 desire for a something to be put into the General Plan  
12 about the natural recurring -- occurring retirement  
13 community that we are and the issues that will arise in  
14 the next 25 years with specifically seniors on the east  
15 side, Fountain Avenue, and the narrow sidewalks. I have  
16 no idea what solutions would be, and John, I don't know  
17 if there is any place to put that..

18       **CHAIR YEBER:** I thought we added Fountain Avenue.  
19 There was a new..

20       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** It's folded in here, but it's  
21 lumped with Sunset and Santa Monica and San Vicente, and  
22 it's the last street, and it doesn't say anything about  
23 seniors or the difficulties that I mentioned.

24

25

1           And so it seems to me that it's logical for there to  
2 be something in the General Plan for the next 25 years,  
3 but maybe not. I don't know.

4           Bianca, you're the General Plan expert. Because we  
5 aren't specifically addressing populations, are we?  
6 We're not specifically calling out seniors or...

7           **JOHN KEHO:** Excuse me, we do have on page 124 -- I  
8 think it's in the mobility section in 3.3 -- "The city  
9 will implement improvements identified in the bicycle and  
10 pedestrian mobility plan and ADA transition plan as  
11 funding becomes available." So those are some...

12           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I don't have that to refer ...

13           **JOHN KEHO:** It's on page 124.

14           **CHAIR YEBER:** So but ADA does not cover all seniors.  
15 It only covers those with disabilities.

16           **JOHN KEHO:** With mobility disabilities, correct, and  
17 so that -- but this is going to help.

18           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** You know, it's the  
19 combination of mobility issues that will crop up, and  
20 it's not something that the City's going to ignore. It  
21 just seems to me it would be good to see it called out.

22           **BIANCA SIEGL:** Sure. I just also wanted to point  
23 out in the human services chapter, seniors are called out  
24 -- on page 135, policy 1.4 -- seniors are one of the  
25

1 city's target populations for measuring social services  
2 needs.

3 And then throughout the mobility section, there are  
4 quite a few policies that relate to widening sidewalks,  
5 improving crosswalks with bump-outs, and one more on the  
6 senior issue. If you refer back to the original Staff  
7 report from our first meeting, there was an attachment  
8 that was the result of the agent-friendly community  
9 symposium that was held a few months ago.

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Oh, good. Okay, that's what  
11 I'm -- yes.

12 **BIANCA SIEGL:** And there is some discussion in the  
13 written Staff report about where the recommendations from  
14 the summary from the agent, from the community symposium  
15 can be found throughout the General Plan.

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, good. I'm happy.  
17 Thank you.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Other comments, questions? Are we  
19 ready to do a vote?

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Wow, drum roll, please.

22 **DAVID GILLIG:** Vice-Chair Guardarrama?

23 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Yes.

24 **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair -- Commissioner DeLuccio?

25 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes.

1           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul?

2           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

3           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein?

4           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Aye.

5           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner?

6           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Aye.

7           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker?

8           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Aye.

9           **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber?

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** Aye.

11          **DAVID GILLIG:** Motion carries, unanimous.

12          **CHAIR YEBER:** First step.

13          **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, that was easy, right?

14          What's the big deal?

15                **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, let's see if we can get out of  
16 here in the next couple minutes because it's hot.

17                So with that, we have no new business, no unfinished  
18 business, no excluded consent calendar.

19                Items from Staff. John, do you have a manager's  
20 report?

21                **JOHN KEHO:** Just to remind you that I believe you  
22 should've received an e-mail regarding the 7th Annual  
23 Congress Commissions and Boards on Monday, November 29 at  
24 6:30 PM, so make sure you put that on your calendars.

25                **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

1           **ANNE MCINTOSH:** And I would just like to say I think  
2 you did a fabulous job with what you were given and you  
3 were very organized and you did discuss some difficult  
4 issues, and you gave us some great direction. So I  
5 appreciate the work that this commission has put in, and  
6 I think some of these issues will come back to you and  
7 you're going to be discussing them more, and in fact, I  
8 hope as we implement the General Plan, we do some  
9 specific studies on some of the things that you've called  
10 out as being important in this community.

11           So I don't think this is sort of the end of this  
12 process for you. I think it really is, as one of you  
13 said -- was it Commissioner Altschul? -- who said this is  
14 really just the beginning of the studies that you're  
15 going to be doing because of it. So thanks so much.

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** That's why I said step one. We're  
17 done with step one. Thank you.

18           Do we have any public comments? Okay, no public  
19 comments.

20           Comments from -- Items from Commissioners?  
21 Commissioner Buckner?

22           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I just wanted to thank Staff.  
23 All of you have done an amazing job. I haven't weighed  
24 in on that. A lot of commissioners have thanked you, and  
25 I just wanted to thank you, as well. Good job, and

1 you've just really taken a lot of information and put it  
2 together and helped us be able to deliberate in a much  
3 more organized way, and appreciate it.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

5 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I want to thank Staff. I  
6 want to thank the community. I want to say I'm going to  
7 miss our workout of carrying all these books. And I also  
8 -- I mean my children are asleep, but I think about my  
9 children often when we make these decisions, as I have no  
10 doubt Barbara thinks about her cat, and...

11 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Just as important.

12 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** ... and I think that this is  
13 something that my children can live with, and I feel good  
14 about that.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Commissioner Altschul?

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Oh, you have to say something.

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Goodnight.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

20 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yes. I wanted to thank Ric  
21 Rickles for what he had to say. Ric sometimes has a way  
22 of really coming to the point on things. When he talked  
23 about the GPAC, I know two or three professional people  
24 who were on the GPAC whose lives by virtue of the fact  
25 that who they are and what they do is so -- their lives

1 and their workplace are so intense that for them to go  
2 from that into a GPAC meeting, having to cover a lot of  
3 territory was very, very difficult for them. And having  
4 been on the Planning Commission as long as I've been, I  
5 understand how overwhelmed -- it's overwhelming to try  
6 and -- because you want to go through each sentence, and  
7 I think that that is probably why people gave up toward  
8 the end because they just felt as though they couldn't  
9 deal with it specifically, and dealing with it broadly  
10 felt too frustrating and inadequate.

11 So I appreciated the way Ric articulated it, and I  
12 don't think it was an intent -- I'm speaking for people I  
13 don't even know, but I think it was unintentional on  
14 their parts. It was just too overwhelming for them to  
15 deal with.

16 Look at what you guys have been through for the past  
17 four years. It's huge. So I appreciate everything you  
18 did.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yeah, I want to thank Staff.  
21 Staff actually did a really good job in directing us. We  
22 got all these volumes of books, and I really didn't know  
23 what to do with them until I actually got Staff reports  
24 and really pointed to -- you can't read all this  
25 material. They pointed to areas that we should be

1 focusing on, and then when we had our discussions here,  
2 we were able to further focus.

3         And I also want to thank my fellow Commissioners for  
4 the deliberation and the jobs we've done here, and I  
5 think this is ready to go on to Council. I know  
6 everybody doesn't agree with everything in these  
7 documents, but I really think that we did do enough  
8 deliberation and they're ready to move on.

9         And I want to thank Chair Yeber for leading us in  
10 this initiative.

11         **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Commissioner Guardarrama?

12         **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I just want to thank the  
13 Staff for a remarkable job distilling a lot of  
14 information into some very understandable, salient  
15 points, and also Chair Yeber for chairing some very, very  
16 difficult meetings that hopefully none of us will ever  
17 have to repeat.

18         **CHAIR YEBER:** You guys, it wasn't that difficult.  
19 You guys made it really easy, so I appreciate the kudos,  
20 but you guys -- all of us, basically, we wanted to make  
21 this clear a process as possible, and I think each one of  
22 you stepped up to the plate and wanted to focus on  
23 specific issues and not let the process get too muddled,  
24 so you made my job extraordinarily easy. So there was no  
25 superman effort on my part.



1 I do want to thank also Staff. Many years of work,  
2 I know this is not the end, this is just the beginning.  
3 Even once it goes beyond Council, now you've got to  
4 actually figure out, well, what does this mean  
5 policywise, so we're talking about the next 10, 15, 20  
6 years of implementing policy based on changes. So hats  
7 off to you. Should go out and have a drink or two.

8 I also want to thank the public. I may not have  
9 agreed with all the comments made, but nonetheless, I did  
10 want to hear the comments. I appreciate the diversity in  
11 opinion and thought. I missed Victor's comments today.  
12 I was looking forward to it, so next time... but I do  
13 appreciate all the community's participation and  
14 comments, and keep coming to these hearings. We've got  
15 two more coming up. If you want to make further comments  
16 to Staff, you know the numbers.

17 And with that, we'll adjourn to our next meeting,  
18 which is October 21 -- there's no meeting on the 7th --  
19 at 6:30, our regular time. Have a good evening. Thank  
20 you.

21 [Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.]

22 -o0o-

23

24

25

1 APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON  
2 THIS 4<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2010.

3

4

5

6

  
CHAIRPERSON

7

ATTEST:

8

9

  
COMMISSION SECRETARY

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25