

1 **CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION**

2 **THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2010 AT 6:30 PM**

3

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Good evening. We're going to start
5 the meeting, which is a continuation of our previous
6 meeting held on Thursday, September 16.

7 And if I could ask [Mrs. Banta] to please lead us in
8 the Pledge of Allegiance, we would be rather honored.

9 **[MRS. BANTA]:** *(Pledge of Allegiance)*

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** I don't think I took the agenda from
11 you.

12 Okay, John, why don't we make sure all the
13 Commissioners have one because I can't approve the agenda
14 without them having... Sorry for the mishap. This is a
15 little different than we usually do it since this is a
16 continuation of last week's meeting.

17 Okay, has everyone had a chance to read it real
18 quickly?

19 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'll make a motion to move
20 the agenda.

21 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Second.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All in favor, say aye.

23 **ALL COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any opposed? Seeing none, the agenda
25 is approved. We have no minutes. We'll move on to

1 public comment. This is comment not pertaining to General
2 Plan discussion. That will be at the tail end after
3 Commissioner deliberation on the various topics
4 highlighted at the last meeting.

5 So with that, I will start with Steve Afriat,
6 followed by Steve Martin. Please state your name and
7 city of residence.

8 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Steven Afriat, Los Angeles. And,
9 Commissioners, I'm going to apologize in advance. I'm
10 actually taking a little personal privilege today. I'm
11 here on this item only representing Supervisor Zev
12 Yaroslavsky, and he was out of town in late August and
13 missed the City Council meeting honoring a regular here,
14 Jeanne Dobrin, and he asked me to come to another public
15 setting and say how much the County appreciates the
16 leadership and community involvement of Jeanne Dobrin,
17 and he asked me on behalf of the County -- I have a
18 certificate, and Jeanne, if you want to come up here, I
19 can give this to you. On the occasion of your 90th
20 birthday with sincere congratulations and best wishes,
21 the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles
22 does hereby join in your celebration August 23, 2010,
23 which was Jeanne's 90th birthday, from Supervisor Zev
24 Yaroslavsky. Congratulations, Jeanne.

25

1 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I wanted to say that was very nice
2 things you just said about somebody, but that person
3 sounds a little bit like a bit of a nuisance. Thank you,
4 and thank the supervisor, whom I wholeheartedly support.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Congratulations, Ms. Dobrin.

6 Steve, if you could hold on just a minute.

7 David, because of the little confusion at the
8 beginning, we forgot to take roll call, so if you could
9 do that real quick.

10 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Here.

12 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker?

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Here.

14 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner?

15 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Here.

16 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein?

17 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Here.

18 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul?

19 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Here.

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

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

22 **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber?

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Here.

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

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

1 I apologize for that, Steve. It's your soapbox.

2 **STEVE MARTIN:** No problem. Good evening. Steve
3 Martin, West Hollywood.

4 It's been difficult to drive around the city of West
5 Hollywood without seeing giant posters along our bus
6 benches touting the city's core values, which talk about
7 idealism, creativity, protecting the residential quality
8 of life, protecting the environment, and of course,
9 having respect for people. Sometimes I'm driving down
10 Santa Monica Boulevard and I think I'm in Cuba with all
11 the propaganda posters.

12 This was on the cover of the Parks and Rec Services
13 that was mailed out, and it reiterates basically what the
14 city's core values are, and those core values do include
15 respect for the public, respect for people.

16 At the last meeting, one of the Commissioners,
17 Barbara Hamaker, made a rather snide comment about some
18 of the people in the public, well, "Everyone in the
19 public spoke in a very sincere manner except for one,"
20 and then when I came up to speak at public comment, she
21 rudely stood up and walked out on my comment while I was
22 going to speak.

23 And I wasn't going to particularly address her, but
24 given that the city's core values call for respect for
25 the public and you are supposedly representatives of the

1 city, I would think that we wouldn't have to put up with
2 that sort of immaturity and arrogance. If you cannot
3 abide by the city core values, then maybe you should
4 reconsider your continued participation.

5 These are public hearings. This is not high school.
6 What goes on here can have major legal significance,
7 could wind up in a report, in a document that goes to
8 court, could wind up in a published opinion in the court
9 of appeals. So I think having a certain sense of
10 dignity, decorum, and respect for the public coming from
11 the members of this body would be appropriate.

12 Normally, I would just perhaps make some comment
13 about a generalized complaint, but I didn't think that
14 was fair to the rest of you because, quite frankly, I've
15 spoken many times before this body and we haven't always
16 agreed, but every one of you has treated me with respect,
17 and I have to say I do appreciate that, and I think it's
18 just a sad reflection, but hopefully we can move on in a
19 constructive way.

20 We really -- this process with the General Plan has
21 been an emotional one for a lot of people, but it's also
22 been a difficult one. It's dragged on for almost three
23 years. But I really think that our core values as a city
24 should not be something that we celebrate in a light way.
25 They should be something that we try to live. Thank you.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Mr. Martin.

2 **DAVID GILLIG:** You have one more, Jeanne Dobrin.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Ms. Dobrin?

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

6 I spoke at the City Council meeting two meetings ago
7 and said I was stunned because the new bylaws of the
8 Planning Commission said people only had two minutes to
9 speak, and I said that was quite different from the fact
10 that the City Council in this city wants to reach out to
11 the community and have the community part of the
12 participation that goes on.

13 And Abbe Land said, "Oh." She was kind of
14 surprised. "I'll have to look into that two minutes,"
15 which was formerly three. Corri Planck came up to me and
16 told me it was a typo. Harriet Segal sent an e-mail to
17 Abby and said that this was -- she felt -- she said it
18 very well and subjected to it, and then we looked on the
19 bylaws and there was another reference to the two minutes
20 again. And one of the Planning Commissioners said to me,
21 "That was absolutely right. We only have two minutes to
22 speak." But now it's three minutes again. We sort of
23 feel that that wasn't a typo, that that was some kind of
24 an attempt to shut down on public comment.

25

1 I also wanted to ask why when this time meter here
2 says two minutes -- three minutes, excuse me, and it
3 immediately changes to 2:57, why is that? When it's
4 three minutes, why does it suddenly show 2 minutes and 57
5 seconds left? Can we have an answer to that, please? Is
6 that another attempt to cut down on the time that the
7 public will speak?

8 And I do not believe that the Planning Commission
9 should be averse to hearing from the citizens because
10 those seven members of the Commission, who are very
11 bright, and the Staff, also, might not know of some
12 things that are happening in West Hollywood, small little
13 things which will be made known to them by the residents
14 who live here and might influence the decision or the
15 recommendations that the Planning Commission makes.

16 So we're very unhappy about that. And please give
17 me an answer why it shows three minutes and suddenly
18 jumps to 2.57. Thank you.

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

20 John, you probably can't answer the latter, but what
21 about the former, clarification of the -- because we did
22 get something, an e-mail that said two minutes, and then
23 later, it was a correction that said, no, it's three
24 minutes.

25

1 **JOHN KEHO:** That was just a typo. That was a typo
2 in the bylaws.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** It was a typo? Just a simple typo.

4 **JOHN KEHO:** I believe that the amount of the time
5 that most of the other boards and commissions are two
6 minutes, and we allow for three.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, thank you.

8 Also, I wanted to let everyone know who is parked in
9 the lot that is adjacent to the basketball courts, they
10 will not be enforcing the eight o'clock tow-away. They
11 will enforce it upon the conclusion of this meeting. So
12 anybody who's parked there, if this meeting goes beyond
13 eight o'clock, don't worry, the car is not going
14 anywhere. Okay?

15 Items from Commissioner? Ms. Hamaker?

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** No.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

18 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Not at this time.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner.

20 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** No, thank you.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

22 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** My children, I believe, are
23 watching. I just want to say hello to Isaac, Natalie,
24 and Naomi and wish them a good night.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

1 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I, too, was a little
2 surprised and perhaps shocked last meeting when one of
3 the Commissioners questioned the sincerity of one of the
4 speakers.

5 I have always believed that people that have come
6 here to talk are sincere, and my definition of sincerity
7 is you believe what you're saying and you're saying it
8 with heartfelt conviction, and sincerity doesn't have to
9 mean or doesn't have to -- in any way have to mean that
10 you agree with me.

11 So I apologize to Mr. Martin because this should not
12 happen here.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

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

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** And I have no comment, so with that,
16 we will move on.

17 We have no consent items, so we'll move on to the
18 continuation of our public hearing for the General Plan,
19 and what we're going to do is we're going to start with
20 the topic -- and I'm sorry I don't have the chapter
21 number, and you can give it to us -- but the topic of
22 infrastructure, resources, and conservation. We'll move
23 on to land use and urban form, which is number -- chapter
24 number two, and then mobility, which will be the last,
25 which I believe is nine?

1 **JOHN KEHO:** Chapter six.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Chapter six? Okay. Infrastructure is
3 nine and mobility's chapter six.

4 And before each of those, we are going to start with
5 a brief presentation from Staff, who will present
6 basically the issues that are of concern for each of
7 those topic areas.

8 So with that, John, do you want to...?

9 **JOHN KEHO:** Just real quick before Bianca begins her
10 presentation, I just want to introduce a couple of
11 consultants that are here tonight.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Great.

13 **JOHN KEHO:** Matt Raimi, you may have already seen at
14 some of the previous meetings, and then Jeremy Nelson is
15 back there on transportation and mobility issues.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Bianca?

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Good evening.

18 So as you mentioned, we'll be following up tonight
19 on the key policy issues that were identified during last
20 week's meeting. And, actually, before we get to
21 infrastructure, I just wanted to follow up on a few other
22 items of business just before we get into the main
23 topics.

24 One very quick one. There was some discussion last
25 week about whether there was a clear definition of

1 affordable housing, sort of the official affordable
2 housing definition, and I just wanted to point out that
3 there actually is an official definition of affordable
4 housing included in the glossary to the General Plan, so
5 hopefully, that will help to provide some clarification
6 for those people that are looking for it.

7 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Bianca, excuse me, is there a
8 definition for workforce housing, as well?

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** There's not a definition for
10 workforce housing included right now, but we could
11 consider that.

12 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, thanks, yeah.

13 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yeah?

14 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Could you please read the
15 definition of affordable housing?

16 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Sure.

17 **JOHN KEHO:** Since I have it right here, I'll read
18 it.

19 Affordable housing -- any residential unit for
20 moderate income persons or family or for low-income
21 persons or family which, as defined in the Health &
22 Safety Code Section 500719.5, shall be affordable at rent
23 that does not exceed 30% of 60% of area median income.
24 Those units targeted for very low-income households, as
25 defined in Health & Safety Code Section 50105, shall be

1 affordable at a rent that does not exceed 30% of 50% of
2 the area median income.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So if -- may I ask one more
4 question?

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

6 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So to summarize, is it a
7 correct statement to say that that definition may, in
8 fact, include, as far as the arithmetic is concerned,
9 rent controlled units but it does not include rent-
10 controlled units in its actual definition?

11 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct, because it's addressing the
12 people in the rent-controlled units.

13 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Thank you.

14 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** And may I follow-up? Since
15 it makes reference to moderate income, why could it not
16 also then serve as a definition or at least a starting
17 point for a definition for workforce housing?

18 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Workforce housing would need to be a
19 separate definition because the affordable housing
20 relates to state housing law and other things, and it
21 needs to follow that standard, but we can certainly look
22 at including a separate definition for workforce.

23 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Thank you.

24 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Okay, so a couple of just other
25 clarification items. Another issue that was brought up

1 last week by the public and the Commission was the
2 difference between the growth projections that were
3 included in the Metro EIR, draft EIR regarding the
4 westside subway extension versus the growth projections
5 that are included in the EIR for our General Plan.

6 We looked into that a little bit. The reason for
7 the difference is that, as EIRs do, there are many
8 methods for selecting growth projection methodology, and
9 the Metro EIR chose to follow SCAG growth projections for
10 2035, whereas our EIR took a more conservative and more
11 tailored approach of looking at a parcel-by-parcel
12 consideration of development and growth potential, and so
13 it's just a -- they're both equally valid; it's just a
14 different set of numbers to work from.

15 I also wanted to just clarify what I said last week
16 with respect to how SCAG develops their regional growth
17 projections.

18 They take data from local cities, as I had
19 mentioned, but it's not as simple as just compiling that
20 data on a regional scale. They take that city data as
21 one of the inputs and balance it with other data sources
22 and analysis to develop a sort of broader regional
23 picture.

24 So our updated growth projections will be used by
25 SCAG and will influence their regional numbers, but it's

1 not a one-to-one relationship, as I may have indicated
2 last week.

3 And, finally, just one other word about growth
4 projections. We had discussed the original City's
5 General Plan, 1988 General Plan growth projections, and
6 we just wanted to point out this chart. It's maybe a
7 little easier to understand in graphic form.

8 So the original 1988 General Plan EIR looked at or
9 evaluated the impacts of growth of nearly 11,000
10 residents over a 25-year timeframe, and that compares,
11 you can see, to actual growth during that time of less
12 than 1,000 residents. And then the orange bar on the far
13 right on this chart is showing our growth projection
14 analysis of about 6,800 residents over the next 25 years.

15 And as we discussed, EIRs assume a higher-than-
16 likely amount of growth than is expected to occur in
17 reality, just to allow for analysis of the maximum
18 potential environmental impacts.

19 So that said, let's move on to infrastructure.

20 The infrastructure chapter addresses a broad range
21 of policy issues which are listed on the screen here.
22 The two that were identified for discussion this evening
23 based on last week's meeting are street maintenance,
24 roadways, circulation infrastructure, and water. So
25 we'll start with the street issue.

1 Community input throughout the General Plan process
2 identified street maintenance as an issue of some concern
3 to residents. The telephone survey that was done about a
4 year-and-a-half ago, respondents to that survey ranked
5 street quality as number 10 on a list of changes that
6 could improve the city in the future. And so to that
7 end, this first goal in the infrastructure resources and
8 conservation chapter addresses ongoing maintenance of our
9 roadway system.

10 Street conditions are monitored on a continual basis
11 by City Staff in the Public Works department, and the
12 policies in the General Plan are really directed at
13 continuing those programs. The City's funding sources
14 require ongoing maintenance -- City's funding sources for
15 roadways, that is, require ongoing maintenance programs,
16 which Public Works then tailors to specific needs of
17 individual streets based on surfacing material and
18 traffic levels and types of use and other factors.

19 And so the policies in the Draft General Plan
20 include continuing to monitor and prioritize maintenance
21 of the public right-of-way, including streets and
22 sidewalks, requiring any utilities or service providers
23 that do work in the public right-of-way to return those
24 work sites to standard or better conditions, and also

25

1 continuing programs to underground utility lines as
2 funding allows.

3 Water was the other major infrastructure topic
4 identified for discussion, and it's largely addressed
5 under the goal number three in related policies in the
6 infrastructure resources and conservation chapter.

7 Water service to the city is provided by the City of
8 Beverly Hills and by DWP. DWP provides roughly three-
9 quarters of the city with water service, and Beverly
10 Hills covers the rest on the west side.

11 The General Plan really promotes conservation as the
12 basis of long-term water supply management and also
13 addresses the fact that water supply and management have
14 to be considered in a regional context.

15 Population growth is occurring in the region and has
16 to go somewhere. As a dense urban community, West
17 Hollywood can accommodate growth or limited growth in a
18 more sustainable manner than, say, less dense or suburban
19 areas can. Infill development uses less water per capita
20 than other development types, and in fact, that's borne
21 out in DWP's Urban Water Management Plan, which
22 specifically identifies multi-family infill development
23 as a significant factor in creating lower water demands
24 for the future. Multi-family households on average use

25

1 about two-thirds of the water of a single family
2 household.

3 The approach in the General Plan and the Climate
4 Action Plan is to take an aggressive stance with respect
5 to water conservation in existing buildings, municipal
6 operations, and in new construction.

7 The General Plan contains a series of policies, some
8 of which are listed here, related to water use. The most
9 significant of these may be policy 3.1, which states that
10 the City will not allow for the construction of new
11 development unless the water service provider can
12 demonstrate sufficient water to supply that development.

13 The General Plan and Climate Action Plan also
14 contain a series of policies and measures intended to
15 help Beverly Hills and DWP to achieve their state-
16 mandated water use reduction targets over the next 10 and
17 25-year timelines.

18 During development of the Draft General Plan and
19 EIR, the City met with representatives of the West Basin
20 Municipal Water District, which is essentially a water
21 wholesaler and of which we are a member. The City
22 received assurances from West Basin, as well as the
23 Metropolitan Water District, which is in the hierarchy of
24 water above West Basin, that they would continue to
25 supply water to the city in the future through existing

1 DWP and Beverly Hills pipelines, and there's a letter
2 stating that that's included in the response to comments,
3 which is Appendix H of the final EIR.

4 As our EIR consultant, Yara Fisher, discussed last
5 week, the EIR still takes a conservative approach of
6 finding long-term water availability to be a significant
7 impact despite the assurances that I just mentioned and
8 the policies in the General Plan simply due to long-term
9 water uncertainty at a regional scale and beyond the
10 control of the City.

11 The Commission had also asked that we address storm
12 water capture and harvesting at tonight's meeting, and
13 policies related to efforts to minimize and wherever
14 possible reduce stormwater levels are contained in the
15 infrastructure and resources chapter, [goal 9], and
16 related policies.

17 Those generally include doing what we can do within
18 our city boundaries as the high water table and other
19 conditions allow us to do so, as well as collaborating
20 with regional efforts to clean, minimize, and re-use run-
21 off.

22 These are a pretty broad set of policies that are
23 really intended to help the City to pursue and implement
24 new solutions as they are available and as they're
25 feasible.

1 And, finally, there was a question about sub-
2 metering for existing residential buildings. The Climate
3 Action Plan includes a measure that would amend the green
4 building ordinance to require all new development and all
5 condominium conversions of existing buildings to install
6 sub-metering for electricity, gas, and water meters. I
7 just wanted to point out that that's there.

8 That's the conclusion of the Staff presentation as
9 far as infrastructure is concerned, so if there are
10 questions or other discussions for the Commission, we can
11 pause for that now.

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

13 So why don't we start some discussion on these
14 specific topics under this particular chapter, and I'd
15 like to start with Commissioner Hamaker if you have..

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I don't have any comments at
17 this time.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner DeLuccio?

19 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I want (inaudible) before I
20 possibly make any comments.

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

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** In the area of street
23 maintenance, Santa Monica Boulevard was totally redone
24 several years ago. My recollection is it resulted in a
25 rather significant lawsuit because of apparently some

1 breach of contract with respect to the ultimate result of
2 the work. If it's possible to talk about where that
3 stands and if it's concluded what the result was, if it's
4 not concluded, just where in the process is it, and what
5 effect, if any, it might have on this particular goal of
6 the General Plan.

7 **JOHN KEHO:** I don't think the legal action on the
8 reconstruction of Santa Monica Boulevard would have an
9 impact on the goals that we have in the General Plan. I
10 don't happen to know the status of it. I believe it was
11 concluded some time ago. I can provide that update at
12 the next meeting unless the city attorney knows.

13 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** It is resolved, and it was a dispute
14 over whether or not the street was actually built
15 pursuant to the correct specs. So it's a very fact-
16 specific lawsuit, but it's resolved now.

17 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So did that resolution
18 result in any funds for the maintenance, for the future
19 maintenance of that street? Because there was, I
20 believe, a specific life or length of life that was
21 attributed to the street when it was done. Is that life
22 conceived to be shortened, and if so, does this make
23 provision for that?

24 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** I'm going to get back to you on it
25 because I can't remember what was talked about and what

1 was ultimately concluded, but I'll get the information
2 and get back to you.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Thank you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

5 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Sure. Bianca, thank you
6 for the report.

7 I was the one who raised the question about sub-
8 metering for water of older apartment buildings, and I
9 appreciate your clarification, although I have to say it
10 actually raises more questions for me than answers.

11 It sounds like what we've got covered in the current
12 proposed draft of the General Plan would be sub-metering
13 of new buildings, which clearly doesn't affect older
14 buildings, and sub-metering of condo conversions for
15 which actually it kind of opens up a bigger issue, which
16 is I don't think we have any remotely effective condo
17 conversion policy in place, and I don't believe the
18 General Plan calls for any change in that right now.

19 And even if we had a discussion and we talked about
20 a condo conversion plan as one mechanism for potentially
21 helping to preserve some of our older buildings, it still
22 leaves us with the fact that something like 16,000 of our
23 units are by law master-metered for water usage, which
24 would appear to me to not be conducive to our efforts to
25 find constructive solutions for lowering water use, which

1 is not -- it was a statement, not a question, but
2 certainly if you have a response, and it looks like you
3 do, I'd be really happy to hear it.

4 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Sure. Not being an expert in
5 electricity or water use necessarily, I think one of the
6 factors for existing buildings and why there wasn't a
7 policy saying to convert existing buildings to sub-
8 metering is that it's not as simple as simply installing
9 the sub-meters on the main electrical panel and that it
10 would require larger systems upgrades that would be
11 difficult to require of some buildings, but it's
12 certainly something we can look into if that's of
13 interest.

14 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** And I guess from my
15 perspective, and first of all, if people are -- I want to
16 be clear where I'm going. I'm not suggesting that we
17 simply dump an expense on tenants that they are not
18 paying. I want to be absolutely clear. I don't think
19 anyone here would be proposing that. I'm sure Council
20 wouldn't either. I'm talking about solutions for new
21 tenancies. I'm talking about other programs that could
22 be done to give people incentives to help reduce their
23 water usage. I'm not talking about in any way proposing
24 passing on an expense to existing tenants that they're

25

1 not paying now. That would not fly and it should not
2 fly.

3 But I would just add to what you said. I would at
4 least be interested in exploring not only could we
5 mandate that buildings be converted, but is there a way
6 for this city to get involved in helping to green
7 buildings? Are there funds at some point that we could
8 identify to give assistance to our older buildings to
9 help them become more green, to become less hogs of
10 things like electricity and water?

11 **JOHN KEHO:** If the Commission wants, we could
12 certainly create a policy that says something like
13 explore sub-metering in existing residential buildings,
14 rental buildings. So if that's the consensus of the
15 Commission, we can look into that.

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, the implication --
17 that has implications with respect to the costs of the
18 metering and who bears the cost of the metering and does
19 it cross the threshold of whether or not it gets passed
20 through to the tenants, and I think that raises a lot
21 more than just the policy issue of whether or not it
22 would save water.

23 So I think before we go into that, you might want to
24 check with the other departments and see whether or not
25 this is a viable thing to discuss.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** I just want to -- I want to chime in
2 on this because I thought about this when Commissioner
3 Bernstein brought it up. And though I appreciate the
4 concern, I'm just not sure how that would be feasible in
5 the older buildings, and I think you touched on it,
6 Bianca, and that was that in some of the old buildings,
7 first of all, you would have a central hot water kind of
8 scenario. And so it's coming from -- it's not coming
9 from -- it couldn't come from a meter, and you've got a
10 circulating situation where you've got some pipes that
11 are going up and above through the roof and down below
12 through the basement. And then you've got pipes that
13 ultimately go through other apartments before they get to
14 the apartments above.

15 So I could not conceive unless someone re-pipes an
16 entire building how that would be implemented, especially
17 in the older buildings. So I appreciate trying to
18 explore this. I just don't know how far we would get
19 with implementing such a policy or suggesting such a
20 policy. It seems like pie-in-the-sky kind of stuff.

21 Does anybody else have a comment regarding the sub-
22 metering issue?

23 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I agree with the Chair. My
24 building was built in 1974, and it was built precisely as
25 the chair indicated. We do have a central boiler and

1 recirculating hot water, and the pipes do go through
2 several units before they end up where they're ultimately
3 used. So I think without a technological advancement,
4 that doesn't exist today, I think it would be difficult
5 to implement. But it doesn't mean that we can't have it
6 as a goal sometime in the future. I mean this is a
7 general plan for 25 years.

8 **BIANCA SIEGL:** If I might suggest, one possibility
9 would be to include an action that suggests that we study
10 the feasibility of a system like that so it allows to
11 explore it without necessarily requiring it be enacted.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Great.

13 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Commissioner Bernstein is
14 right. The best way to get people to conserve water is to
15 tell them exactly how much they're consuming, and if they
16 have no way of knowing that, it's hard for them.

17 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** And I'm supportive of your
18 suggestion. I certainly am not imposing the infeasible.
19 I just think -- first of all, I'm not -- even though it
20 is my bread and butter, paying attention to pipes, I'm
21 not enough of an expert to know how to initiate it, but I
22 do think that when you have 16,000 units that are master-
23 metered, it's a good place to begin to look to try to
24 identify some of the water reductions that we're aiming
25 to enact over the life of the General Plan.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Great.

2 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Can I make a...

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

4 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Can I make another
5 infrastructure comment and I'll be done? I just want to
6 say that I am so proud of the streets of the City of West
7 Hollywood. As I drive down Melrose every day, I
8 literally see a diagonal line of asphalt that's darker in
9 West Hollywood and well maintained and lighter and older,
10 filled with potholes, in the City of Los Angeles. And
11 for some reason, the fact that we have little to no
12 potholes in this city gives me a tremendous amount of
13 pride.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner?

15 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I only have one comment and
16 that is with regard to the -- obviously, the goals are
17 clearly something that we would all strive for. I think
18 that one of the things is that it makes it very difficult
19 -- all of the goals are mighty. I think that the actual
20 implementation is not necessarily as easy as we think.

21 I remember I think it was -- getting mixed up a
22 little bit, but I think it was Planning Commission
23 meeting where some people from the city of Beverly Hills
24 came, and they were very upset with our city on some
25 other issues. And I think that they have a lot of

1 resentment towards our city for our using their water,
2 and they're going to have to be compliant with some of
3 the state-mandated reductions and are going to be looking
4 to us to really do something to be able to help them
5 along because they're going to be -- so I think that
6 providing some kind of incentives, I like that idea, and
7 even if it's a building -- like I'm in a very old
8 building, but I think that there are ways to reduce it by
9 providing incentives if people use less water than they
10 did the year before, the month before, whatever. I think
11 that is something that we should include in our
12 implementation, rebates or some kind of incentive
13 program.

14 Also, I think that in some of the older buildings,
15 you could reduce the water consumption by putting
16 circulating pumps on rather than metering because most of
17 the people are running water in order to get the hot
18 water, and it's going to three or four different
19 apartments before it gets there. You're using a lot of
20 water before you actually use the water.

21 So it's just a thought that maybe there's incentives
22 to putting those circulating pumps on, giving a rebate or
23 something if they install them.

24
25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Commissioner DeLuccio, you
2 wanted to wait to hear other Commissioners' comments. Do
3 you want to chime in?

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** No, I'm fine on this topic,
5 and I just wanted to find out how do we hear from the
6 public on these items. Since we've pulled the different
7 topics, are we going to wait until the end here for...

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Till we're through with the three
9 general areas. Then they can chime in again because
10 essentially they've already spoken. We never closed the
11 public testimony, so this is just an extended version of
12 a public hearing.

13 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, because I --

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** We're giving them another chance to
15 speak at the end of deliberations.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, because I'd like to
17 hear what the public has to say on this subject. I have
18 nothing else to add. I didn't pull the item the last
19 time. I think it was Alan pulled it, but I do agree with
20 your comment, and I think Bianca has softened it and
21 turned into more of a thing we would explore rather than
22 -- so it sounded like we were just going to go do it. So
23 I'm fine. Thank you.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, and I also mentioned the
25 stormwater capturing and harvesting, and I do see that

1 it's highlighted or outlined in 9.8 of that. And the
2 reason why I'm glad to see it in here is a meeting that I
3 had probably about a year ago indicated that the City
4 wasn't exploring that because either the County or LA
5 City, whoever's in charge of storm drainage, kind of made
6 it not possible, and I would just like to see the City
7 explore as best possible to capture as much of the
8 stormwater runoff for uses such as greening, parkways,
9 and for city uses. And I was talking about gray water,
10 obviously.

11 So if I -- with that, it sounds like we've had the
12 discussion on this topic. The only change or addition is
13 you'll explore -- you'll have a feasibility study on sub-
14 metering. Commissioner Buckner mentioned incentives and
15 rebates for those who are practicing water conservation.
16 And, John, your question was answered regarding
17 maintenance or construction on streets?

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Did you have any -- did I cover
20 everyone else?

21 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** It's all very good. I just
22 -- since this is also about energy conservation, I'm just
23 wondering if there's any reason to limit Sue's
24 suggestions to simply water conservation. It would seem
25 that exploring opportunities and incentives for

1 conserving all forms of energy, gas and electric and
2 water, in buildings is advisable.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right. So we have
4 consensus on this at this point, and it will come back to
5 us at our next meeting next Thursday.

6 So with that, we'll move to land use and urban form,
7 chapter three.

8 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Okay. So as we begin the discussion
9 about land use policy and those issues that were
10 identified last time, I'd like to start with a little
11 background information. After this slide, we'll be
12 looking at some of the maps that Commissioner Hamaker
13 suggested that we look at, and those, just as a reminder,
14 are included in Exhibit K of the Staff Report.

15 First, just the two charts that are on the screen
16 now, the blue chart at the top shows by decade the number
17 of housing units that have been built since 1939 or
18 earlier, actually, and what essentially that chart is
19 showing is that the vast majority of our existing
20 residential units were built between 1950 and 1970.

21 That presents some challenges as we consider how to
22 provide housing for all segments of the community and
23 addressing an aging housing stock. It also shows that
24 the rate of new housing construction slowed pretty
25 dramatically after the city was founded.

1 The chart on the bottom shows the age of existing
2 buildings along Santa Monica Boulevard, again by decade,
3 with pre-1930 on the left, moving to 2010 on the right,
4 and similarly illustrates that even in the boom times of
5 the 1990s, that development again has been slower in the
6 years since the city was founded than in previous decades
7 when it was under county control.

8 This map is essentially the same information as was
9 in that chart on the previous page, just highlighting --
10 the colors indicate the different decades of the
11 buildings along Santa Monica Boulevard.

12 It's interesting to note that there's not really a
13 single concentration in one area of buildings of a
14 particular age, but development has been more or less
15 consistent along the length of Santa Monica within the
16 city.

17 This map is showing multi-family housing citywide,
18 so the areas that are highlighted in blue, those parcels
19 have four or more residential units on them, and then the
20 red and pink parcels are highlighting those properties
21 that have been developed or are currently under
22 construction in the past 10 years with buildings that
23 have four or more residential units, as well.

24 You can see it's not actually -- and I should point
25 out this does not include -- the map doesn't include

1 entitled projects. These are just projects that are
2 built or are being built now. So it's not an enormous
3 number of projects, but they are pretty evenly dispersed
4 throughout the multi-family neighborhoods in the city,
5 and as a result, most multi-family neighborhoods have
6 experienced some new construction, so there are a lot of
7 people that are aware of construction, but at the same
8 time, no single neighborhood has been sort of overrun
9 with new buildings.

10 This now is the proposed land use map for the Draft
11 General Plan, and there are a few copies printed on
12 poster board around the room that may be easier for
13 people to see. This is also included, of course, in the
14 agenda packet and the Draft General Plan.

15 So as we move into the details of the land use
16 discussion, just first, a few words about some of the
17 community input that we heard throughout the process
18 related to land use and urban design.

19 There was a lot of support for focusing limited
20 growth in commercial areas and maintaining existing
21 residential neighborhoods, allowing for some sensitive
22 infill of residential neighborhoods, a lot of
23 appreciation for the unique character of our different
24 districts, both residential and commercial, and an

25

1 appreciation for the mix of commercial business types
2 throughout the city.

3 There's a desire for new construction to be
4 sensitive to its surroundings. There's not a general
5 consensus about the appropriate height of buildings. Some
6 participants in community outreach efforts like taller
7 buildings, and others like things more as they are
8 currently.

9 The land use chapter and the map attempt to balance
10 that input with professional expertise and also
11 consideration of other policy issues, like historic
12 preservation, economic development, and mobility that are
13 addressed in the General Plan.

14 And before we get into discussing the map in detail,
15 I just wanted to address briefly the issue of bonuses
16 that was brought up last week and the affordable housing
17 bonus, SB1818.

18 Policies in the General Plan relating to the
19 application of bonuses are contained under land use goal
20 number two. There are no changes proposed to how bonuses
21 are applied in the city. That is, cumulative bonuses
22 would still be allowed. One change, as we mentioned last
23 week, is that in residential areas, we would eliminate
24 all height and density-related bonuses except for the
25 State-required affordable housing SB1818 bonus.

1 Other bonuses that relate to open space or setbacks
2 or parking would still be, of course, allowed in
3 residential areas, but limiting the height and density-
4 related bonuses can help to provide some greater
5 certainty about the size of new development in those
6 areas.

7 Also with SB1818, the City addressed some of the
8 impacts of that potential additional height last year
9 with the interim zoning ordinance replacement and related
10 down-zoning of some of the multi-family neighborhoods.

11 Moving back then to the Draft General Plan land use
12 changes, the changes that are proposed in terms of land
13 use designations are quite limited. I do want to note
14 that the nomenclature of land use designations is
15 proposed to change citywide. Right now, the General Plan
16 land use map has its own language for describing the
17 different districts' names, and the new General Plan map
18 would make those descriptions and names match with the
19 zoning map, which just makes it much easier for people to
20 understand what we're talking about when we refer to land
21 use designations, and so that should provide some
22 additional clarity.

23 While the names will change on properties citywide,
24 the actual development standards are proposed to change
25 for only about 8% of the parcels.

1 This map highlights only those properties that are
2 proposed to have some change to height in terms of the
3 land use designations. Again, you can see those are very
4 limited areas. There are the two clusters of darker
5 green parcels indicating height reductions along West
6 Knoll and Doheny, and those are reductions that were
7 directly in response to requests from the neighborhood.

8 The yellowish tone that applies to most of the
9 parcels on this map indicates a height increase of just
10 10 feet, or approximately one story. The greatest height
11 increases are proposed at the intersection of La Brea and
12 Santa Monica Boulevard.

13 This map highlights only those parcels that would
14 see some change to density under the proposed General
15 Plan land use map. Fewer parcels then would be affected
16 by height changes. And, generally, the green color here
17 indicates a change of 0.5 FAR, which would be an increase
18 of 0.5 FAR, which would be the case, as you can see, with
19 most of the parcels that would have a density change.
20 And, again, those are focused around three main nodes at
21 La Brea and Santa Monica, Fairfax and Santa Monica, La
22 Cienega/Melrose and then also -- sorry, four nodes --
23 Melrose Triangle and Beverly Boulevard.

24 The Commissioners last week raised some questions
25 about how the General Plan addresses change in

1 residential neighborhoods, as well as architecture and
2 design compatibility.

3 The housing element includes some programs and
4 policies to address ongoing maintenance of the city's
5 aging housing stock. The land use chapter contains a
6 section of goals and policies that are specifically for
7 residential neighborhoods, again, which support ongoing
8 maintenance of those neighborhoods, as well as
9 compatibility of scale and character in new residential
10 development, maximizing density and diversity of unit
11 types, and you can see here that those are actually --
12 the goals are divided into single and multi-family
13 neighborhoods and the map, although it's a little bit
14 hard to read, is showing how those neighborhoods are
15 divided across the city.

16 Also, as we discussed last week in response to
17 community suggestions regarding strengthening the
18 neighborhood conservation overlay zones, there is a new
19 suggested policy that is included on the list of proposed
20 changes to the Draft General Plan and stating that we
21 would wish to strengthen those conservation overlays, and
22 that would be a new policy that would fall under goal LU-
23 10, which is on page 67.

24 The Commission also requested some discussion of
25 signage policies. Signage is addressed in the last three

1 goals and policies of the land use chapter. Those are
2 goals 16, 17, and 18.

3 These policies are focused mostly on maximizing the
4 urban design value, as well as the economic value for
5 offsite and creative signage. There are policies in that
6 section that would allow the City to consider new offsite
7 signage outside the Sunset Strip as long as it's located
8 in strategic locations, carefully integrated or designed
9 to integrate with the building, and to minimize impacts
10 on adjacent properties, and also would remove equivalent
11 amounts of existing signage elsewhere in the city.

12 Another request from last week was to address
13 pedestrian orientation and some of those policies that
14 are in the existing General Plan. So the existing
15 General Plan, the 1988 General Plan, actually addressed
16 that issue in some detail. There was a goal in the 1988
17 General Plan to establish the city as unique in the
18 region in part because it was a place where there was a
19 high level of pedestrian interaction and that residents
20 were located in close proximity to services, jobs, and
21 cultural activities. So even in 1988, walkability was a
22 priority.

23 Also in the original General Plan, each of the major
24 -- the discussion of the major commercial areas included
25 a policy requiring that all uses and buildings enhance

1 pedestrian activity along commercial boulevards. There
2 were policies specifically for Santa Monica Boulevard
3 encouraging architectural details and visual interest in
4 building design, use of landscaping, and pedestrian
5 amenities, like benches.

6 Those have since been detailed and implemented
7 mostly through the zoning ordinance, which includes
8 standards for façade design, including transparent
9 frontages and recessed entries, as well as encouraging
10 features like sidewalk dining.

11 The General Plan continues that emphasis on
12 pedestrian activity with land use policies like those on
13 the screen, as well as some related policies that are in
14 the mobility chapter.

15 Both the existing and the Draft General Plan include
16 policies encouraging pedestrian pass-throughs and mid-
17 block connections in the larger Melrose Triangle area.
18 The Draft General Plan also encourages consideration of
19 the public right-of-way as a shared space for
20 pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and vehicles. It seeks
21 to increase green space wherever possible, including
22 bump-outs and medians, where those can be built.

23 And there's also an implementation action in the
24 land use section that specifically discusses creating

25

1 temporary special street closures occasionally for
2 pedestrian use.

3 **JOHN KEHO:** I would just like to interject that so
4 how's that been accomplished over the last 20, 25 years?
5 You'll notice that we haven't had any fast food
6 restaurants or drive-through facilities being built in
7 this city or banks that have drive-through lanes being
8 built in the city because that was not considered
9 pedestrian oriented.

10 If you look at some of the newer construction over
11 the period, like Kookooroo was brought to the corner with
12 outdoor dining, and the parking was at the back or the
13 side rather than putting the parking in front of the
14 building.

15 As you walk along the boulevard, you'll notice that
16 there are windows in buildings, that instead of having
17 mirrored glass that might've been predominant in the
18 1980s, we now have buildings where you can see in and see
19 out.

20 So there's been a lot of activity over the last
21 period of time that has made the boulevard better for
22 pedestrians.

23 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So height along Melrose Boulevard in
24 what's called sub-area one in the Draft General Plan is a

25

1 policy issue for Planning Commission consideration this
2 evening.

3 A little background on that issue. We heard some
4 from public comment last week. There's been some
5 construction along Melrose in the last few years under
6 our existing land use regulations. During development of
7 the Draft General Plan, there was some desire expressed
8 by property owners to better accommodate design
9 showrooms, which generally require greater floor-to-floor
10 heights than can be achieved under current zoning, as
11 well as to create opportunities for creative office space
12 along Melrose.

13 I'm actually going to flip to the land use map here
14 so we can see just a close-up of this area.

15 On the proposed land use map, there are two land use
16 designations, which would both be changes proposed for
17 Melrose Avenue. The new designation along the length of
18 Melrose, which is CN2, would allow for a 10-foot height
19 increase over what's currently allowed but no change in
20 density.

21 Also, in the CN2 zone, a creative office bonus of
22 0.5 FAR would replace the existing mixed-use bonus that
23 currently can be applied to any commercial zone in the
24 city, so mixed use would be allowed in the CN2 zone, but
25 there wouldn't be a bonus provided for it.

1 As is the case in any commercial designation,
2 bonuses for affordable housing and green building would
3 still be possible here.

4 The second land use change along Melrose itself is
5 on the north side of the street in the block immediately
6 adjacent to West Hollywood Park and the new library.
7 That would be a change to the CC1 zone, which has the
8 same 35-foot height or would have the same 35-foot height
9 as the rest of Melrose but would have a density increase
10 of 0.5 FAR over what's currently allowed.

11 The General Plan Advisory Committee discussed the
12 height issue along Melrose Boulevard at some of their
13 meetings that were focused on land use and indicated
14 general support for height increases there. There was a
15 vote of, I think, 17 to 7 in support of that idea.

16 But, also, as you've read in the comment letters and
17 heard from public speakers, there are concerns from
18 residents in adjacent neighborhoods about those height
19 increases.

20 This is ultimately a policy decision, should the
21 area continue to evolve as much as it has over the past
22 25 years or should it evolve into a destination that may
23 be more focused on design showrooms and creative office
24 uses along with shops and restaurants with heights of 35
25 feet.

1 There's a separate discussion that also applies to
2 this area with respect to the larger Melrose Triangle.
3 That would be between Doheny and the park.

4 The Melrose Triangle property, which is the smaller
5 block closer to Doheny, the height increase and density
6 increase that's proposed there -- let me just flip to the
7 -- this is the density and height increase maps -- that
8 change, proposed change is in response to a specific
9 development proposal on that site, which is requesting a
10 General Plan amendment, and this would essentially take
11 care of that.

12 There are also height and density increases proposed
13 for the rest of the Melrose Triangle area moving over
14 towards the park.

15 The General Plan section that talks about sub area
16 one, which is all under land use goal 11 and related
17 policies, includes a policy and implementation action
18 that would develop a detailed planning study for the
19 Melrose Triangle area. That would allow for more
20 specific examination of some of the urban design and land
21 use issues there in the near future.

22 I also wanted to note that this section of the
23 General Plan contains policies directed at supporting a
24 concentration of arts and design-related uses and
25 enhancing those that already exist, supporting a

1 pedestrian-oriented character of the neighborhood with
2 active storefronts, improving sidewalks in the
3 streetscape, creating better pedestrian connections
4 through the blocks, encouraging high-quality and varied
5 architecture, and showcasing international design talent.

6 The last issue that was identified under land use
7 for discussion this evening is the Transit Overlays.
8 This map shows existing transit routes in the city, so
9 Metro bus, Rapid bus, DASH, and the CityLine shuttle
10 routes.

11 The DASH circles show existing locations that are
12 major transfer points between those different services or
13 between different bus lines.

14 The idea with the Transit Overlay, which is
15 described under policy -- Land Use Policy 2.4 in the
16 General Plan is ultimately to encourage transit
17 supportive development along commercial boulevards that
18 are already served by high levels of existing and
19 potentially future transit.

20 And the Transit Overlay policy has two parts. The
21 first part describes an incentive that would apply to
22 those areas that are highlighted in blue here -- those
23 are the Transit Overlay areas -- and would allow for
24 modifications to development standards, excluding height
25 and density for new development projects that go above

1 and beyond the required transportation demand management
2 strategies required in the General Plan or the municipal
3 code, by providing things such as contributions to city
4 transit programs, outstanding pedestrian improvements,
5 on-site shuttle programs, or accommodating taxi stands or
6 bus stops on site.

7 The second part of the Transit Overlay policy
8 addresses future regional transit service improvements,
9 and it states that the City may revisit the areas
10 indicated in blue on this map and consider modifications
11 to permitted density and height or other standards for
12 new development when measurable milestones are achieved
13 in the creation of bringing a regional rail transit
14 service to the city, and those milestones are completion
15 of CEQA analysis for rail service and inclusion of rail
16 service in Metro's long-range transit plan.

17 The Transit Overlay is an important part of the
18 City's overall efforts to increase options for mobility
19 and to reduce reliance on the private automobile, and
20 it's also particularly important to efforts to advocate
21 for future rail transit service.

22 As we've already discussed, Metro has recently
23 released the draft EIR that studies the west-side subway
24 extension, including an alternative alignment along Santa
25 Monica Boulevard. There was a Metro subway comment

1 hearing last night in West Hollywood at Plummer Park that
2 was attended by a number of community members, as well as
3 Mayor Heilman and Councilman Berland.

4 And so the policy in the General Plan, while
5 especially that second part would have a very long-term
6 impact over the lifetime, in 25-year lifetime of the
7 General Plan, it is ultimately important for the long-
8 term mobility planning for the city.

9 If the Commission has specific questions related to
10 how the traffic may be improved as a result of these
11 policies, our transportation consultant can help address
12 those during the discussion, but that's the conclusion of
13 the Staff presentation on the land use issues identified.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Bianca, I just want to
16 clarify something. Being that -- I don't know, I can't
17 recognize all these colors here, so help me here.

18 The plus 30, that has to do with La Brea and Santa
19 Monica Boulevard, correct, the 30 additional feet?

20 **BIANCA SIEGL:** On the height map?

21 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yeah. Is that what it is?

22 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes.

23 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And then 55 was the Casden
24 project, the MovieLand, correct? Little tip for...

25

1 **JOHN KEHO:** Actually, no, that's just on the south
2 side of it. It makes it match the Casden project. That's
3 not actually the Casden project itself. Casden property,
4 I think, is the purple.

5 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, I know it's been
6 approved already, but I'm looking at the color-coding on
7 here and...

8 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. So the red part is not the
9 Casden property. It's just to the south.

10 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** La Brea and Fountain is
11 going -- and Santa Monica Boulevard could go 30 feet high
12 -- would be 30 feet higher than today. The height would
13 go up 30 feet additional height potentially?

14 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Did you mean the Monarch development?

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'm just talking in general.
16 I'm looking at a map here.

17 First of all, I guess let me back up. Suddenly I'm
18 a little bit annoyed about something, actually.

19 When I look at this map, to me, going into this
20 whole process, I actually read all the letters over the
21 last week, and most of the letters, actually I would say
22 maybe half of the letters, had an issue -- actually, a
23 lot of them with Melrose -- the height on Melrose.

24 However, what I'm seeing here is the way this all
25 was formulated, even when we were going through the whole

1 process, the way this map was changed around was based on
2 projects, in my opinion, that were in the pipeline.

3 For example, if you go back over to the Melrose
4 Triangle project, you're adding 25 feet to that because
5 that's -- there's an application that you have that would
6 go 60 feet high and is it a 2.5 FAR.

7 Then when I read the General Plan that you put
8 together, on page 70, it talks about having a study
9 session to do with that project, with the Melrose
10 Triangle project. Is that correct? You reference on
11 page 70 LL.8, I think it is. It says, "The City shall
12 develop a planning study for the..." Is that for the whole
13 Triangle or just for that particular project?

14 **JOHN KEHO:** I believe it's for (inaudible) Melrose.

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** For the greater project,
16 okay.

17 **JOHN KEHO:** (Inaudible) all the way over to
18 Robertson.

19 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay. But maybe you can
20 answer my question. I feel like this map was developed
21 based on what was in the pipeline so we don't have to go
22 back and do General Plan amendments?

23 **JOHN KEHO:** That's not how specifically it was
24 addressed. We're looking at transit areas. There are

25

1 some places where projects are there, but there are no
2 projects in the works at Fairfax and Santa Monica.

3 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, there is a project in
4 the works on the Melrose Triangle on...

5 **JOHN KEHO:** There is a project in the works there.

6 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, and that right now
7 currently is 25 feet lower than you're proposing. Is
8 that because there's a project in the pipeline?

9 **JOHN KEHO:** There is a project there, so we did take
10 that into consideration.

11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, you did take that into
12 consideration.

13 **JOHN KEHO:** Into consideration, but that's not how
14 we arrived at the whole height and density issues. We
15 took comments from the public, professional expertise,
16 projects in the works, and we took a whole bunch of
17 things into consideration.

18 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, the projects in works
19 is one of the criteria that you did use?

20 **JOHN KEHO:** Those are in part the consideration,
21 yes.

22 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, so you answered that
23 question.

24 So I mean I can go on and on, but I feel that -- I
25 definitely feel the height on Melrose, when I'm looking

1 at the way you built the height on Melrose, when you
2 start with the -- obviously on the north side of the
3 street, when you start with the PDC, for example, that's
4 obviously the PDC and it's very tall, and I like -- I do
5 kind of like the way it goes into the public facility and
6 then the height sort of steps down a little bit to -- I
7 think it steps down to like 35 feet and then it steps
8 back up to 45 feet and then up to 60 on the corner there.
9 So that sort of makes some sense to me. And it is on the
10 north side of the street.

11 However, I know that some of the residents have an
12 issue with that corner at 60 feet and 2.5 FAR. So that's
13 why I just want to go on the record and say that.

14 And then on Robinson Boulevard, you didn't leave it
15 at a 25 and a 1 FAR, all of Robinson Boulevard. I don't
16 understand why Melrose -- I understand why -- you
17 explained why Melrose was going to be increased from a 25
18 to a 35 and a 1 point FAR and that was because of some
19 businesses expressed -- allowing them so they can develop
20 showroom space, for example.

21 But I really think that, yes, that's adjacent --
22 behind there is all residential, and to step it from --
23 and Robinson also abuts all residential. I think for
24 consistency's sake that that should also remain what it
25 is today at 25 feet. I can't see increasing it,

1 especially when the other side of the street north of it
2 will be increased in height. I just feel like there's
3 potential for too much density on Melrose Avenue, so I
4 really do have a problem with going from 25 to 35 feet on
5 Melrose.

6 I want to throw that out for some -- I just want to
7 throw that out for some discussion in this body this
8 evening.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

10 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I agree with Donald
11 wholeheartedly. Melrose is very narrow. Melrose is
12 mostly abutted by residential, at least as far west as
13 the PDC on the north and all the way from La Cienega to
14 the border on the south.

15 Perhaps if we just step back a little bit and look
16 at Melrose and divide it into three segments, take it
17 from La Cienega to San Vicente and from San Vicente to
18 Robertson and then from Robertson to the point or the
19 border, and make three little sub districts out of it or
20 three substantial sub districts out of it, have some
21 experts reexamine the height and the density and see what
22 works so Melrose, number one, is not cavernous and,
23 number two, does not totally overwhelm the residents of
24 that area, figure out a height and density maximum for
25 each one of those three segments and how many parcels or

1 what percentage the parcels can get to the maximum height
2 and density and make it on a first-come, first-served
3 basis like parts of the Sunset-specific plan, maybe we
4 can satisfy the goals and satisfy the residents and make
5 significant improvements to it now, could give us
6 something that looks like Madison Avenue at its worst.

7 That's what I would suggest, and hopefully, we're
8 not constrained by the rush to get this thing done. If
9 there are a few areas where we can just sort of take the
10 time to do what's necessary to get it right, I strongly
11 think this is one of them.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** It seems like the discussion's focused
13 on the Melrose Triangle area, so I'd like to see if
14 there's any other comments regarding that particular
15 topic within this chapter. Commissioner Buckner?

16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Only I agree with our two
17 Commissioners who just spoke on this issue. I think
18 there's been considerable input from the neighborhood,
19 and I think that there's general consensus on most of the
20 plan. Everybody seems to like it. But we're hearing a
21 lot of energy coming in opposition to that height and
22 density along Melrose. So I think we better take another
23 look at that. That's all.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

25

1 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I'm in agreement with my
2 colleagues. I like John's idea of sort of subdividing
3 the area and reexamining it more, and I also just -- I'm
4 generally pleased with the idea of disallowing cumulative
5 bonuses in residential areas, and this is an area where
6 particularly the area is low enough to the ground already
7 that I've become concerned that cumulative bonuses, which
8 I believe would still be in effect, are going to have
9 unintended significant consequences.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

11 If we could hold their applause, hold the applause
12 so that we can get through this. Commissioner Hamaker?

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I just -- I actually have a
14 lot of comments about everything else but that, but I
15 would like to remind everybody that this is a 25-year
16 plan. It's not like there are going to be high-rises
17 built tomorrow on that street.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

19 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I agree with Commissioner
20 Altschul's subdivision of Melrose. I think it's logical.
21 I think we should be very careful with FAR, but as far as
22 ceiling heights go, a lot of those showrooms do require
23 higher ceilings. Whether we limit the stories and then
24 allow higher ceilings, that's something completely
25 different.

1 But places like Mansour Modern, the place that sells
2 the carpets, that needs high ceilings, and a lot of other
3 high-end furniture showrooms need high ceilings, and this
4 area depends a lot on those types of businesses.

5 And so the more we can do to keep those types of
6 businesses here, the better. And then if we could not
7 ruin the neighborhood in the process, that would be
8 perfect.

9 One thing, though. I want to voice my support for
10 the FAR and the height at the very tip of Melrose, the
11 Melrose Triangle. That is something that has been in the
12 works for a very, very long time since -- really since I
13 got on the Commission seven years ago. I can remember
14 going to an EIR scoping meeting that was lead by CJ. We
15 all remember CJ.

16 Anyway, so I would like to support that and then
17 reexamine the strip along Melrose all the way to La
18 Cienega.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And then I actually want to --
20 my comments or sentiments are the same as Commissioner
21 Guardarrama, both with the Triangle per se, I'm fine with
22 that, but I'm concerned about the rest of the Melrose
23 area, Beverly, Robertson.

24 I especially am concerned that instead of achieving
25 the goal of, let's say, extra height in the showrooms

1 because it's not specific to stories, it's specific to
2 heights, I could see someone jamming in two floors of --
3 doing a commercial floor at 10 feet and then two
4 additional floors of residential at 10 feet each and then
5 getting that extra floor from SB1818, and I'm certain
6 that that is not what the goal of the City is in that
7 particular area.

8 So I think we really need to re-look at that area.
9 I'm not sure that some of these areas warrant an increase
10 knowing that SB1818 is in place, so we just need to look
11 at that a little bit more carefully.

12 I do want to touch on something else that
13 Commissioner DeLuccio touched on regarding the overall
14 map, and he was talking about the piece of parcel that is
15 at the southeast corner of the Movietown Plaza, and
16 you've got an increase of 55 feet on that little piece of
17 parcel.

18 What's the likelihood that you could even get
19 anything beyond two or three stories on that? What's the
20 purpose of zoning that particular piece of parcel to
21 match the Casden project?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** It is just to match the heights in that
23 area, and it is adjacent. There's a public park across
24 the street in the city of Los Angeles. So it's a
25 relatively small site, but it's not that small, so it's

1 possible that that site could be redeveloped at the
2 future.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** To 65, 75 feet?

4 **JOHN KEHO:** It's possible. People can come up with
5 different designs if they so choose.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, I'm just not -- I'm uncertain
7 about...

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** That makes no sense to me.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** It doesn't make any sense.

10 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I don't see the logic of
11 that.

12 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** It's adjacent to the parking
13 structure that The Lot has...

14 **JOHN KEHO:** And that's 70 feet tall, I think.

15 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah. Didn't the city buy
16 one of those lots?

17 **JOHN KEHO:** I think we bought the one to the west.

18 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** To the west, not to the east?

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** The blue one. The one that's marked
20 in blue.

21 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Does anyone have any comments
23 overall on that particular map, the change in allowable
24 heights?

25

1 **JOHN KEHO:** I'd like to go back and make sure I
2 think I -- to make sure I, hopefully, summarize what I
3 heard on the Melrose Avenue area.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

5 **JOHN KEHO:** So I'm hearing that you would like to
6 have the heights to stay as they are, not increase the
7 heights, but then have a policy that would divide -- have
8 us look at Melrose in the future, dividing it into the
9 three segments for what might be the appropriate heights
10 and FAR in the future but keep the heights as they are
11 today.

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Which heights are you
13 referring to today?

14 **COMMISSIONER ALTSHCUL:** Present heights, present
15 allowable heights?

16 **JOHN KEHO:** The present allowable heights. That's
17 what I thought I heard you...

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay, thank you.

19 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Is that the consensus of the
21 Commission?

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Barbara, you're shaking your head.

24 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** No, I'm not going to say
25 anything.

1 **JOHN KEHO:** And were you wanting the heights on the
2 -- the one section I wanted more clarification was just
3 south of the library. Were you okay with the heights
4 going up in that area now, or did you want that to..

5 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** What are you talking about?

6 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I think that should be in
7 the study.

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I didn't hear you, John.
9 What did you say?

10 **JOHN KEHO:** The parcels on the north side of
11 Robinson south of the library.

12 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** The north side of Melrose.

13 **JOHN KEHO:** North side of Melrose, right.

14 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Oh, I didn't -- I personally
15 didn't have any problem with that, but I mean that -- I
16 wasn't as concerned about that because that was actually
17 not in residential neighborhood. It was already north of
18 Melrose. So, John, I personally had no problem with
19 that.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Of course, the higher it is,
21 it will cover the library garage.

22 **JOHN KEHO:** So we're okay with the increased height
23 for that one block as proposed?

24 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

25

1 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** And this is not talking
2 about the Melrose Triangle proposed project, right? This
3 is...

4 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

5 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Okay.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Wait, how is it -- I'm confused now.
7 So we're going to keep the height as being proposed on
8 that one particular lot next to the library just south of
9 La Brea?

10 **JOHN KEHO:** The block from Robertson to San Vicente..

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** OH, that whole south side?

12 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so that would stay -- there's
14 not a problem with the Commission as far as what's being
15 proposed?

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** On the north side only.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** On the north side only.

18 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. On the south side all along
20 Melrose Avenue, the consensus is that we want to leave it
21 where it's at?

22 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yup.

23 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And that one segment from
24 San Vicente to Robertson.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I thought the consensus says
2 we were going to have a study on it.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Right.

4 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** And if we're going to have a
5 study -- I don't understand. If we're going to adopt the
6 plan and the plan says these are the heights, what's the
7 study going to do? At that point, we're...

8 **JOHN KEHO:** No, there's several places, and there's
9 a lot of implementation, a lot of looking at future
10 things.

11 One, as earlier noted, was maybe we need to look at
12 a better plan for the greater Melrose Triangle. This
13 suggestion was let's keep the heights where they are but
14 maybe Melrose Avenue might be better looked at in
15 individual segments in three spots.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I was talking about the
17 whole -- I was referring to the whole Melrose on the
18 south side all the way from almost La Cienega to Doheny
19 except for the portion on the corner of La Cienega, which
20 I think is proposed for a CC or something, a CC-1. That
21 I didn't have a problem with, but I was referring to all
22 the CN2 from that all the way over to Doheny.

23 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I think that's what
24 John proposed, with the exception of the one parcel south
25 of the library...

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right, exactly.

2 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** ... to maintain the height
3 that was proposed in the new General Plan. Otherwise,
4 leave the rest of the heights as they are now and study
5 in three segments, dividing Melrose and seeing what is
6 more appropriate.

7 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right. The bottom line is
8 I'm okay with everything on the north side of Melrose and
9 that you will study everything on the south side. I'm
10 just on Melrose on the south side. That's what I'm
11 referring to.

12 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, that's not what was
13 proposed. What was proposed is studying everything on
14 Melrose on the north and the south, with the exception of
15 this one area south of the library.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, that would -- no,
17 because we're not looking to study the Melrose Triangle
18 at this point. We're saying we're okay with that and
19 we're okay with the -- I think we're okay with everything
20 on that side of Melrose, on the north side, from the
21 library over to Doheny. Is that what you were getting,
22 John?

23 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I'm not sure that
24 everybody is okay with the Melrose Triangle. At 65 feet,
25 if in fact the overall cumulative effect of what's going

1 on in the entire three segments is going to make it look
2 cavernous, that may have to be adjusted. I think a study
3 should necessarily include that.

4 **JOHN KEHO:** Now, you could still leave Melrose
5 Triangle as proposed and study the south side, but it
6 would obviously have to take into context what's on the
7 other side of the street.

8 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, perhaps then the
9 experts should determine whether or not that should be
10 maintained as it was proposed or not. So I don't see any
11 harm in including it in the study.

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay.

13 **JOHN KEHO:** I think we have direction. We'll bring
14 back what we thought we heard, and obviously you can take
15 a look at what we're going to bring back next week.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, can you...

17 **JOHN KEHO:** What I'm hearing...

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah, let me hear what you're hearing
19 so just everyone knows we're on the same page.

20 **JOHN KEHO:** ... that everything on the south side of
21 Melrose would stay the same height as currently allowed.
22 On the north side of Melrose, the Melrose Triangle would
23 be as proposed -- north side of Melrose would be as
24 proposed all the way over to San Vicente. So on the
25 north side of Melrose, everything would be as proposed.

1 And then the area east of San Vicente on the north side
2 of Melrose, that would remain current heights.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And I think when you're
4 saying current heights, we should also include FAR.

5 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. The FAR's not changing, though,
6 but you're correct.

7 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I can agree with that.

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I can agree with that, too.

9 **JOHN KEHO:** And then, also, evaluate Melrose Avenue
10 in three segments as they might potentially have three
11 different characteristics.

12 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I can agree with that.

13 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yes, I'm okay with that.
14 You mean current heights as of today on the north side
15 from San Vicente over to La Cienega. You mean current as
16 they stand today?

17 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

18 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I can agree with that.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Does everyone -- do I have a consensus
20 on that?

21 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

22 **JOHN KEHO:** And that's not including the commercial
23 at the -- that's in white on that map at La Cienega and
24 Melrose? Right, okay.

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So the second thing that we
2 already touched on is the rest of the map in terms of
3 proposed changes in height. Are there comments beyond
4 the comments already made by myself and Commissioner
5 DeLuccio? Commissioner Hamaker?

6 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, I'm curious about
7 whether we're going to actually discuss land use 1.1
8 through at all or we're only going to discuss the things
9 that we talked about last week that we were going to
10 discuss this week.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Basically, anything's on the table,
12 but we were prepared to cover the topics that were raised
13 last week, and then we'll have to leave it up to Staff in
14 terms of other issues.

15 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, because I have some
16 notes in general throughout the land use chapter that are
17 not related to what we've been discussing so far.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so let's do this. Let us go
19 through these areas that were discussed, and then I have
20 room to...

21 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** To go back and do that?
22 Okay.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** ... go back and cover other issues that
24 weren't raised last week. So we're talking about...

25

1 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** So we're going to leave land
2 use entirely you mean and (inaudible)?

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** No, no, no, we're still on land use.

4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, got it, got it.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** We're going to be on here for a while.
6 Get comfortable.

7 Okay, so we're focusing on the proposed height
8 changes that are illustrated on this map. Unfortunately,
9 it just says proposed land use designation changes,
10 height. Okay, are there any other discussion or issues
11 regarding this map? Commissioner Bernstein?

12 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** When do you want to talk
13 about the Transit Overlay zone, as part of this or ...?

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** We'll get to that. Yeah, let's focus
15 on this matter because it was brought up. I just want to
16 close this item, and then we'll move on to the next item.

17 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I guess the plus 55 feet we
18 question but -- I'm not sure I understand the logic, but
19 I'm not -- I was more questioning that, John. If that's
20 what it is, that's what it is if you're going to
21 recommend. I'm going to pick my battles.

22 **JOHN KEHO:** Right, and that's to match with the
23 whole area going further east. We're not showing any
24 increase in heights because the lot already has heights
25 of that height or greater actually.

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Otherwise, I'm -- as far as
2 this whole map goes, I think we discussed this map a lot,
3 and I'm -- now I understand everything on the map now,
4 and except for what I brought up, I'm fine now with this
5 map pretty much, and I want to thank Staff for
6 acknowledging some areas in West Hollywood West, which
7 you actually -- that finally are going to get down-zoned.
8 They've been advocating that for a long time. Otherwise,
9 I think this looks really good.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any other comments regarding
11 the map?

12 Okay, so we're going to move on from the map. Let's
13 start with -- we'll go back to the beginning of the list.

14 Well, we talked about the land use -- well, the
15 overall land use map. I guess the first map, is this the
16 General Plan designation map? Okay, any
17 discussion/issues with this particular map? This is the
18 first map of your packet. And for the audience, it's the
19 map to my right, and I think it's back there, also,
20 towards the rear. Any issues with the changes here?

21 Okay, so we're going to move on. The bonus --
22 cumulative bonus issue that was discussed by Bianca.

23 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Is there a map?

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** We don't have a map for the...
25

1 **JOHN KEHO:** There's not a map, but there is -- on
2 page 53, there's a chart that indicates the various
3 zoning districts and which bonuses are applicable to the
4 zoning districts. It's on page 53.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Does someone want to start discussion
6 on this, or does anyone have any questions?

7 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Maybe we can get
8 clarification again from Bianca what we mean by the
9 bonuses and -- can you do that?

10 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Sure. Actually, on page 54, if you
11 just turn the page, there's a quick summary of each of
12 those four bonuses that's provided. Did you want me to
13 review what the bonuses allowed for?

14 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** No, thank you. I can --
15 unless you want to read it for the public again or
16 something because I know there's a lot of letters that
17 are making reference to the bonuses, and I just want to
18 make sure everybody understands it because it's not
19 necessarily just adding height to height. There's other
20 things you get with the bonuses.

21 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Sure. I'd be happy to review these.

22 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay.

23 **BIANCA SIEGL:** The green building bonus is for
24 projects that achieve a minimum of 90 points. That's an
25 exemplary status beyond the minimum required for the West

1 Hollywood green building system or the green building
2 point system table, and they can select from a series of
3 incentives.

4 The one that affects density is a 0.1 FAR bonus that
5 would apply to commercial or mixed-use projects.

6 The affordable housing bonus, the SB1818, that's the
7 state required bonus, is up to a 35% bonus per state law
8 on top of base project FAR or density.

9 The mixed-use bonus is an additional 0.5 FAR and 10
10 feet in height for residential mixed-use projects.

11 And then the creative office bonus would be an
12 increase of 0.5 FAR for projects that include office
13 spaces for fashion, arts design, or similar uses.

14 And just to clarify, the mixed-use bonus applies to
15 any commercial area other than CN2, which is where the
16 creative office bonus applies. Those two bonuses don't
17 overlap.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Which is sub-area...

19 **BIANCA SIEGL:** For the most part.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And, Bianca, these do not
21 refer to residential. There's no bonuses for the
22 residential areas?

23 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Right. The only height and density
24 bonus that applies to residential is the SB1818 bonus.

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

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein, you had a
2 question or you wanted -- had a comment?

3 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I wanted to talk about R1B.
4 Is this the right time to do it?

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** In regards to bonuses?

6 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** No.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** So this is about -- we're focusing on
8 the bonus issue, and then we'll get to that at some
9 point.

10 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I will wait.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Just put that on the back burner. So
12 we're focusing on the bonuses, (inaudible) bonuses. Any
13 issues? Do we need further discussion on this particular
14 topic?

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I don't think so.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner?

17 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Not particularly on this
18 topic, but I'm thinking about what's going to happen when
19 projects come to Planning Commission down the road.

20 And with regard to bonuses, are we mandated to give
21 them if they meet these qualifications, or is it a may or
22 a should or will?

23 I noticed that throughout the whole thing I'm like
24 looking at, I think, well, what happens if it comes to us
25 and we've got this language here in the General Plan?

1 And I see words like *should, will, may, encourages,*
2 *seeks, will promote, allow, supports.* How is that
3 translated in terms of how we're supposed to evaluate a
4 project when it comes before the Commission?

5 **BIANCA SIEGL:** In terms of...?

6 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Especially in terms of
7 bonuses.

8 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Right. In terms of bonuses, projects
9 that meet the requirements for those bonuses, as detailed
10 in the zoning ordinance, have the ability to apply those
11 bonuses to their projects.

12 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** So it's mandated? We don't
13 have any discretion?

14 **JOHN KEHO:** All the projects that come to the
15 Commission are discretionary projects, and so the
16 Planning Commission has to make findings for the overall
17 project and that it would include whatever the bonus is
18 for the overall project, so you'd look at it in that
19 context.

20 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Well, maybe it's
21 inappropriate right now, but I just wanted to understand
22 more about why you selected certain language and choice
23 of words when you were talking about different goals and
24 so forth in here. And the shoulds and have-tos and wills

25

1 and shall mean something to me than maybe it does to
2 other people. I don't know.

3 **JOHN KEHO:** We're definitely going to -- there's
4 some clean-up that we were going to talk about towards
5 the end of the evening which actually addresses some of
6 those language issues.

7 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Thank you.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any other ...

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Suggestion. Can we go --
10 can you go around again and just -- are there different
11 topics we need to talk about at land use, or is it just
12 pretty general that people have comments?

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** No. We are following as Bianca
14 presented the material under land use.

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, got you.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** We're following each topic area and
17 just get a consensus. We're not making any decision at
18 this point. Just get a consensus, see where the hot
19 buttons or hot issues are that need further flushing out.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, I got you.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** So we're focusing on cumulative
22 bonuses.

23 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Got you.

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

1 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Mr. Chair, may I ask if
2 anyone knows how to turn the air conditioning off to
3 please do so? It's about below zero in here. Please,
4 our camerawoman has icicles hanging off of her.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Your comment is noted. I'm
6 seeing that there's no further issues on bonuses.

7 So the next topic, if I can find my sheet here,
8 residential neighborhoods and design. So this was more
9 of an urban design issue, if I understand my notes
10 correctly.

11 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. Some of the issues were adding
12 the policy about conservation overlay for certain
13 neighborhoods, so that's been added back, those issues.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. I also have like kind of
15 overall goals of neighborhoods as one -- something I
16 wrote from last week.

17 So discussion on this particular area under this
18 chapter. Do you want to start, Commissioner Hamaker?

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I just do not -- I can't
20 follow how this is happening. I have a book here that
21 starts on page 57 with goals and policies and it goes
22 numerically through the thing, and I can't follow what's
23 being presented. So I don't know what to say because my
24 notes are not prepared the way you're asking me the
25 questions.

1 **JOHN KEHO:** Chair?

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes?

3 **JOHN KEHO:** If you want to stray from how we've made
4 the presentation, that's fine. We can try to keep track
5 of ...

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so where -- just direct me to
7 the goal so to help Commissioner Hamaker, the goal or
8 what page.

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** The goals that relate to residential
10 neighborhoods start on page 66, and it's goals, land use
11 8, 9 and 10.

12 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Commissioner Bernstein, do you
14 want to chime in?

15 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Yes. One thing that
16 concerns me greatly falls under LU8, and that's LU8.7,
17 which would appear to be an intent to allow bigger
18 buildings that exist in residential neighborhoods to be
19 taken down and rebuilt with the same number of units, and
20 this is where I want to talk about R1B for a moment.

21 I live in R1B. I may be the only one of us who
22 does, and that's an area that's designed for duplexes,
23 but because of construction prior to incorporation of the
24 city, we have much larger apartment buildings on our
25 block. And in most cases or many cases, the streets

1 actually already have an average of more than two units
2 per lot even though what's what they're zoned up for, and
3 I just have to express, I don't want to see 12-unit
4 buildings taken down on a block like mine and replaced
5 with a 12-unit building. Maybe there's a proportional
6 fractional thing to be considered, but I also think that
7 this is an opportunity to also weigh in that it would be
8 great to give some consideration to granny flats. It's
9 just something we've talked about from time to time, and
10 I know it's slowly moving forward. But if there's a way
11 to keep existing homes by allowing granny flats, homes
12 and duplexes, and over time diminish the size of the
13 bigger buildings on streets like mine, I think that would
14 be a better policy.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, and the accessory units is?

16 **JOHN KEHO:** There is a goal for that.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** On the accessory unit that is...

18 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yeah, there's a program in the
19 housing element that addresses the granny flat accessory
20 unit issue, yes.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

22 **JOHN KEHO:** I'll just tell where that policy 8.7
23 came from kind of is what Commissioner Bernstein is
24 talking about is those buildings are getting older. All
25 the time, they're getting older and older, and so the

1 issue is if those buildings actually did come down and we
2 built back to current regulations, ultimately the city
3 would lose units, and so there would be fewer units being
4 rebuilt than are there. And so the thought was allow a
5 building to be replaced with the same number of units so
6 we don't increase the number of units, we don't decrease,
7 we just maintain the status quo, and we'd have a new
8 building that would be able to function for the next 25,
9 30, 40 years, whereas the buildings now are getting to be
10 close to 50 years old.

11 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Marc?

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I also -- when I read
14 that, I had to try and figure out what the rationale was,
15 and I'm assuming that nonconforming residential buildings
16 obviously were built before cityhood but many of them
17 way, way before that. And so I figured out what you just
18 stated that must be the case.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

20 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** And I would just make
21 another approach. I appreciate that one of our sort of
22 underlying themes is we want to be gentle on the
23 residential neighborhoods, but that being said, if you
24 live on a building -- if you live on a block that's all
25 single-family homes and duplexes, if it's zoned to be

1 that way, if it's R1B, then the 12-story apartment
2 building on one lot is not really characteristic of that
3 and it just exists because it came in prior, and if we
4 need to maintain those number of units, better to look at
5 something like grandmother flat or accessory units,
6 whatever we're calling them, as a way of increasing some
7 density on the blocks and over time, hopefully, getting
8 rid of eight and 10 and 12-story buildings on lots,
9 single lots in a single-family and duplex street.

10 Or if the characteristic of the street is so
11 entirely different, then I guess the conversation to have
12 is R1B appropriate zoning? But if R1B is the zoning,
13 then the characteristic should be towards single-family
14 homes and duplexes, I believe.

15 **JOHN KEHO:** So perhaps that policy could be amended
16 to say in multi-family areas, to exclude the R1. Could
17 be an R2, an R4 or something like that to exclude the
18 single-family areas.

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

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Except if those R1B areas
21 have a significant number of multi-family units,
22 apartment buildings now, if they fall down and you
23 replace them with duplexes or smaller, then you've lost a
24 significant number of rental units and your rental stock

25

1 diminishes, and I don't think that satisfies the overall
2 goals.

3 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Then that's not an R1B
4 block. Then we're calling it an R1B block, but if our
5 goal is to maintain eight and 10 and 12-unit buildings on
6 the individual lots, it's really not an R1B block
7 anymore.

8 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I think there's
9 certain provisions that we have I know in the commercial
10 districts that if, say, a building is destroyed by fire,
11 that you can replace it using the standards that were in
12 place at the time that the building existed rather than
13 under the new standards. Maybe something might be
14 considered for this situation, too.

15 **JOHN KEHO:** Sure, I can...

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Do we have other discussion on this
17 particular item? All right.

18 So, John, what did you get out of that?

19 **JOHN KEHO:** Well, I think a way to kind of satisfy
20 both that I think would be acceptable is from a Staff
21 point of view would be just to move that section to the
22 multi-family area because I think that's where we were
23 really thinking about it. We weren't really thinking
24 about the R1 areas that were overbuilt. So we were
25 thinking more about the multi-family areas to begin with.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** So you're saying moving that
2 particular policy...

3 **JOHN KEHO:** Policy to the multi-family section.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** ... to the multi-family section and not
5 the... okay.

6 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

7 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Which would be under "Goal, LU9," on
8 the following page.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** Which -- is that correct? -- would
10 fall under LU9? Do I have consensus on that?

11 **ALL COMMISSIONERS:** Yes.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

13 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Alan thought to exclude it.
14 Do you feel good now, Alan?

15 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** Yeah, makes me happy.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** There's a request to take a five-
17 minute break to let everyone stretch real quick, and then
18 we'll resume.

19 *(Short break taken)*

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Bianca, will you hold up that sheet
21 that you e-mailed us that references all the topics to
22 the chapters?

23 **JOHN KEHO:** I guess we didn't bring one for
24 ourselves.

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Who has one? Do you have one? Chris,
2 do you have one? I have mine here, but I'm so
3 overwhelmed with these documents. It's one of the
4 attachments that was sent yesterday referencing all the
5 areas, topic areas against the chapter and page numbers.

6 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Yes, I have that.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** It's called the Policy Matrix. Did
8 everyone bring this?

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Bianca, was that what you
10 gave us yesterday?

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Do you have any extra
13 copies?

14 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Apparently we don't.

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Oh, no.

16 **BIANCA SIEGL:** I apologize for that.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. So I will guide you. Okay,
18 the next section is signage, and that one is land use
19 goal 16 on page 77.

20 Commissioner Bernstein, Altschul, when you get a
21 chance?

22 Any further discussion on this particular topic on
23 signage? Commissioner Hamaker?

24 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, I've never been a fan
25 of billboards or offsite signage, so I'm not crazy about

1 this entire section. I was not, however, a part of the
2 General Plan Committee. I can't remember the initials
3 for it.

4 But 16.4 says, "The city may consider new offsite
5 signage in strategic locations and where there is
6 economic and urban design value." What does that mean,
7 economic value and urban design value, because I can't
8 see any urban design value in any billboard anywhere
9 myself.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Bianca, can you ...

11 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Sorry to put you on the spot,
12 Bianca.

13 **BIANCA SIEGL:** No, no, that's fine. So that --
14 let's see, let me write that down. The urban design
15 value -- well, let's start with the strategic locations.
16 What the policy is suggesting is not just allowing
17 signage anywhere in the city that anybody wants to have
18 it but that we might identify particular, I don't know,
19 intersections or areas where signage might be okay.
20 That's one possibility.

21 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** But it's obviously a
22 departure. It's not talking about the Sunset Strip.
23 It's talking about the entire city.

24 **BIANCA SIEGL:** This is potentially outside the
25 Sunset Strip, yes.

1 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** And currently do we have a
2 ban on billboards, new billboards in the city?

3 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Outside Sunset Strip.

4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, so this is a new --
5 this is a departure completely?

6 **BIANCA SIEGL:** It would be, yes.

7 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, so I am -- I would like
8 to go on record as saying I completely oppose this.

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And 16.5 is a continuation
10 of that.

11 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** 16.4.

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And also 16.5 is a
13 continuation of the same thing, correct?

14 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes. 16.5 addresses new signage
15 outside the Sunset Strip and outside the redevelopment
16 area, which would -- this is what I sometimes called the
17 "no net new signage." It would require removal of
18 equivalent amounts of existing signage if a new sign were
19 allowed somewhere.

20 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Right. But the term
21 "economic value," I'm assuming would mean that, let's
22 say, for the developer, he would only develop if he could
23 get a \$1 million billboard attached to his development or
24 in the development agreement, the city might extrapolate
25 some funds as part of a supposed public value?

1 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Um-hmm.

2 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner?

4 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'm opposed to these two
5 items, as well, that -- giving offsite signage. I think
6 we've been very clear not wanting it except up on Sunset,
7 and to encourage people to use -- to do that, I think, is
8 just going to clutter up our city and make it not so
9 pretty. So that's it.

10 I know that I've been assigned to be on the signage
11 subcommittee, so I'm very interested in this section
12 here. We haven't met yet, but I would like to know what
13 direction we're going to go on in terms of this item.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Bernstein, do you
15 have anything on this item?

16 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** While I don't agree with
17 Commissioner Hamaker that there is no urban design value
18 to signage, I'm comfortable with our current policy of
19 discouraging signs outside of the Sunset Boulevard, and
20 I'm not comfortable with sort of the tone of this
21 language that seems very open to exploring signs all over
22 the city.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** So this is LU16.5?

24 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** 16.4 and 5.

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** 16.4 and 5. Okay, Commissioner
2 Altschul?

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I think the current
4 policies are fairly good. I think Sunset, of course,
5 being unique has its own separate rules, and by the way,
6 when Joe was saying that we should congratulate ourselves
7 for not having potholes, we should also congratulate
8 ourselves -- not ourselves, but we should thank the sign
9 companies for religiously trimming the trees on Sunset,
10 whether we ask for it or not.

11 I think that the total amortization of all signs
12 that aren't on Sunset might be a little restricted, and
13 perhaps again in looking at this, maybe a further study
14 might be undertaken to see what areas it is logical and
15 beneficial to allow offsite advertising in the next 25
16 years on a limited basis rather than when a sign falls
17 down have them use every bit of Scotch tape and glue to
18 prevent it.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Anybody else want to chime in?
20 Commissioner Guardarrama?

21 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I agree with Commissioner
22 Altschul. So, in general, what I'm hearing from you,
23 John, is that you agree with the chapter as written but
24 it should be applied very carefully?

25 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

1 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Okay. Yeah, I agree with
2 him.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any other? Commissioner DeLuccio?

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** This chapter as written is
5 so open-ended the way it's written that, I don't know, it
6 could mean anything. I realize that this is the General
7 Plan and the execution will be in how it ends up in the
8 zoning ordinance. Is that true, Bianca?

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes.

10 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** See, this is just really
11 broad-stroked information. So taking that into
12 consideration, I tend to agree with Joseph and with John
13 Altschul, and as we move forward and start amending the
14 General Plan -- I mean the zoning ordinance, that will be
15 an opportunity to flush this out further.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Bernstein?

17 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** While I think we all
18 dislike buildings that basically stand off Sunset in
19 order to give life to signs, I just have to express my
20 concern that however well intended a replacement
21 guideline is, it's going to have the effect of
22 encouraging signs off of Sunset, and certainly 16.5 seems
23 to have room in the fleshing out for working, but 16.4 to
24 me reads clearly as not about replacement but simply as

25

1 about new signage off of Sunset, and I find 16.4 harder
2 to embrace than 16.5.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. I'm on the fence on this, also,
4 so why don't we -- it seems like the consensus is we need
5 to look at this just a little bit, maybe focusing on
6 16.4, 16.5, but the consensus seems to be -- or half the
7 consensus is generally it's okay, not great. Does that
8 help you?

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** It does if I can clarify. In 16.4,
10 the language right now describes strategic locations, and
11 if we could maybe find a way to make that more specific
12 somehow in the policy language, would that address some
13 of the Commission's concerns, or is it more having that
14 policy at all?

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Anybody want to chime in?

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I do. Just from our
17 experience with the Sunset-specific plan, for instance,
18 not speaking about signage in particular but target
19 sites, it seems in my experience on the Planning
20 Commission we can't too much anticipate where a developer
21 is going to want to do something. They tend to want to
22 do it where we don't expect them to do it. And I think
23 that unless we can be really specific in -- and I don't
24 know how we could do that. I mean are we going to name

25

1 streets or nodes or something like that? -- how we would
2 narrow this down, I don't know.

3 And I also -- and this is a broader question, I
4 guess, is how are the remarks that the Planning
5 Commission or the things that the Planning Commission
6 decides on going to be folded into what is sent on to the
7 City Council for discussion?

8 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So let me answer ...

9 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I mean in other words,
10 obviously you're not going to rewrite these chapters for
11 us.

12 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Right. So what moves forward to City
13 Council, and there's already a list attached to the draft
14 resolution. There's a list of suggested changes to the
15 Draft General Plan, which includes things like that,
16 maybe conservation policy..

17 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Exhibit G.

18 **BIANCA SIEGL:** ... Exhibit G, thank you.

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

20 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Any additional changes that the
21 Commission would like to recommend for Council
22 consideration would be added to that list, and so where
23 there are specific policy language revisions, we'll just
24 include those. Where there are items that the Commission
25 would like to suggest for additional study, we'll include

1 a suggestion that the Council direct additional study on
2 those items and then move forward.

3 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** So I would gather 16.4 would
4 be the further study, and I know 16.4 show a "may
5 consider," so it is a passive word. An example of a 16.4
6 actually would be the gateway project because there is an
7 outdoor element, I believe, in that project, the screen,
8 right?

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** But there's no offsite advertising on
10 it.

11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** There's what?

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** There's no offsite advertising.

13 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** It's all PSAs or...?

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah, it's all city-oriented PSAs.

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay.

16 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I don't see what the big
17 deal is about 16.4. It's permissive language.
18 Obviously, there has to be a whole zoning code, probably
19 several sections devoted to this, a whole new lawmaking
20 process just to accommodate this. So I feel like this is
21 just permissive and it will be studied at length, and I'm
22 sure there will be some sort of litmus test to decide
23 when a sign is permissible and things like that. So I
24 don't know why we're stuck on this.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And I agree, Joseph. Yeah,
2 I think we should move on, but I think we should just
3 maybe make -- that you should just -- this would be a
4 point of when it goes to Council that we did bring up
5 16.4 and we were kind of cautious about it and perhaps
6 wanted further study.

7 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I would say we were divided
8 about it.

9 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Should we take a straw poll
10 so it gets recorded?

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Those who have concerns with
12 16.4 and 16.5, just say yes or no when I call your name.
13 Commissioner Buckner?

14 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Somewhat, although I'm
15 starting to lean the other way now.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

17 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Yes, I do.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

19 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No, I don't.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

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

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

23 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, the way you're
24 phrasing it, I don't. I just think it needs to be
25 flagged that we had a discussion about it and to proceed

1 cautiously on 16.4. I totally understand 16.5, and
2 that's close-ended. So I can't give you a yes or no,
3 just that I really have a concern.

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

5 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I have concerns about the
6 entire signage chapter here and the intent statement at
7 the top.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** And I'm going to say I don't have
9 necessarily the concerns on 16.4 as I do with 16.5.

10 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** And we're opposites, okay.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah. Okay? All right, does that
12 help? All right.

13 With that, we're going to move on to pedestrian
14 orientation, but I noticed that it's hooked up to the
15 mobility, so should we leave that to the mobility? Even
16 though we have it listed under land use and you probably
17 raised it or covered it, it's connected to chapters that
18 are on our mobility chapters.

19 **BIANCA SIEGL:** There are also pedestrian orientation
20 policies in mobility, but if we can address the ones that
21 are contained in land use, that would be helpful.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Can you tell me what goal and what
23 the...

24 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes, so that's goal LU4 and the page
25 number is 62.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** I'm sorry, what page?

2 **BIANCA SIEGL:** 62.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** 62. Okay, discussion on that? If
4 there's non-discussion, we'll move on to the next topic.
5 Barbara?

6 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Not in this particular
7 section. It seems to me in a lot of the sections there
8 are called out shops and services of a kind, like beauty
9 shops and dry cleaners and things like that, and for
10 instance, in 4.1, "The City encourages walking as a
11 desirable mode of transportation by implementing land use
12 patterns that create a wide range of useful destinations
13 within a short walk of every West Hollywood resident."

14 There isn't a bank in the redevelopment area except
15 for a two-window bank at Ralph's. So there are thousands
16 and thousands and thousands of people in the
17 redevelopment area who can't walk to a bank, and there
18 are lots of seniors without cars.

19 So I didn't go back through -- when I got to this, I
20 had wrote down bank, but I didn't go back through. But I
21 would really appreciate it if -- I've said this so many
22 times. We've talked about it at the PAC that the fact
23 that there are no -- the closest bank is actually at the
24 Crescent Heights place up at the corner, right where the
25 Strip starts. And I know the City can't call up a bank

1 and say, "Would you please build a building here?" but it
2 needs to be put in with the beauty shops and with the
3 services. It's a service that we need in the city, and
4 there are lots of banks on the west side, there's lots of
5 banks on Santa Monica Boulevard, but not over on the east
6 side. So that's my peace.

7 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** You might be glad to know that we're
8 actually talking with a bank for a location on the east
9 side. I can't tell you where it is but...

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Wonderful. Well, I've spoken
11 with the manager at Ralph's many times, and he's been
12 begging Ralph's to let him expand, and they won't do it.

13 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Which Ralph's?

14 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** The Ralph's at La Brea.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any other comments regarding
16 this particular topic? All right, so we're going to move
17 on to -- we're going to skip -- since we already covered
18 -- I'm assuming we've covered heights, sub area one, and
19 also parcels adjacent to the library.

20 Okay, the Transit Overlays. Can you direct me to
21 the chapter and the policy?

22 **BIANCA SIEGL:** The policy number is 2.4 on page 59,
23 and I'll flip the map, as well.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioners had raised some issues
25 on this particular. Commissioner Altschul?

1 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** This is another area where I
2 think we ought to take a further look and a little bit
3 more in-depth look. The MTA is holding hearings with
4 respect to how the subway is going to proceed westward
5 and whether or not there's going to be a line through
6 here or how we're going to be served, if at all.

7 I think that rather than put down in this document
8 forever policies that may not even be possible because
9 the MTA may make an adverse decision against our
10 interest, we should perhaps wait until they do, number
11 one, make a decision, and number two, when they do make a
12 decision, it's more than likely that they'll want an
13 Environmental Impact Report, and I think that would
14 certainly be very helpful in determining our destiny with
15 respect to the advent of the subway or not.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** John, can you give us kind of an
17 overview again on overlay -- Transit Overlay one and two
18 and how the City - or Bianca -- how the City envisioned
19 these particular zones?

20 **JOHN KEHO:** Sure. Again, we're talking about a two-
21 phased Transit Overlay, and excuse me for my voice. I've
22 been having some issues. Sorry about that.

23 But it's a two-phase Transit Overlay. What happened
24 immediately would be if a project goes above and beyond
25 our normal traffic demand management programs, then we

1 give them incentives to try to help encourage that type
2 of development.

3 Incentives might be eliminating the private open
4 space requirements or the common open space requirements
5 or maybe some setback issues but not additional height
6 and not additional square footage, so trying to help
7 accommodate buildings next to the transit areas that are
8 already high-transit areas. There's a lot of bus traffic
9 already there, so that's trying to help the existing
10 transit network that we already have.

11 The second phase, as Bianca mentioned earlier, when
12 the environmental review's all done and it's in the
13 program, then we'd be able to look at additional height
14 and FAR at that time when that happens, and that might be
15 in the future, that's correct, but we want to make sure
16 that those policies are in our General Plan now because,
17 just as you said, Commissioner Altschul, is that MTA is
18 looking at that now, and so we want to make sure that MTA
19 knows that the City does really want transit through West
20 Hollywood, including subway, and so I think it's really
21 important from a policy standpoint that we have these in
22 the plan now to try to help encourage Metro to provide
23 the line through West Hollywood.

24 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** And, in fact, on Monday night at the
25 City Council meeting, Commissioner Steven Greene, who was

1 not speaking as a transportation commissioner on behalf
2 of the Commissioner but as a resident who's following the
3 subway, urged the community and the City Council to
4 continue to participate in these discussions, showed
5 everybody exactly where in their options the West
6 Hollywood options occur, and we feel strongly that the
7 MTA will only consider -- they're only going to consider
8 putting a subway through the city if we show some sort of
9 plan to accommodate additional transit-oriented
10 development in the future.

11 So we feel like this is a great opportunity to both
12 identify where this might go but not yet have to
13 implement it. And being a 25-year plan, it's possible
14 that sometime during this period, that project would move
15 forward. So we feel like it's a bit of the best of both
16 worlds by including it in this fashion.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** If I could chime in, I actually was at
18 the meeting last night, and just for clarification -- a
19 lot of people talk about funding the West Hollywood spur.
20 The West Hollywood spur is part of two -- is included on
21 five alternatives, and that's alternative four and five
22 if you go to the Metro website. And the problem is the
23 spurs beyond the funding that's covered by measure R,
24 which was passed last year, that does not take into
25 account other funding that is or could be available

1 within the next 25 years. It just focuses on measure R.
2 And so one of the things we should remember is that a
3 year or two years ago, people weren't even talking about
4 Crenshaw, wasn't even on people's minds, and all of a
5 sudden, it's already being studied and evaluated, and I
6 believe they're in an EIR process for Crenshaw.

7 So I guess my comment is if we have it in place and
8 all of a sudden funding becomes available, funding that
9 we don't know of today, then at least we're in a good
10 position to make sure we get that spur that's part of the
11 westside extension.

12 Commissioner Altschul?

13 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I don't have any problem
14 with having it in place to make it look to the MTA and
15 the rest of the world that number when we need it, which
16 we do, and number two, we want it, which we do, but I
17 think that to program the General Plan to anticipate
18 development based on having it is not appropriate.

19 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Can I say something?

20 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can I ask...

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

22 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yeah, if I can just jump in,
23 we're talking about Transit Overlay district here and
24 certain things that trigger modifications to the
25 development standards, is that correct? And would that

1 go beyond the train? It could be other forms of transit
2 as well, right?

3 **BIANCA SIEGL:** The way the policy's written, it
4 describes rail transit, some kind of fixed rail transit,
5 so it's possible that that wouldn't be a subway. It
6 could be light rail or it could be, I don't know, three-
7 car, but rail transit -- regional rail transit is the
8 issue.

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay. And if that was or
10 something was to occur and there were modifications, it
11 would exclude height and density, correct? Would those
12 be certain? Would those...?

13 **BIANCA SIEGL:** No. For the second part that relates
14 to regional rail transit, considerations would include
15 modifications to height and density.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** They would, because I'm
17 looking at LU24, and it says, "Individual development
18 projects and Transit Overlays may be allowed
19 modifications to development standards, excluding height
20 and density, for providing one or more of the following."

21 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So that's for part A, and then part B
22 under LU2.4 addresses the density, height, or other
23 considerations pursuant to measurable progress with rail
24 transit.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, but there's other
2 opportunities to get modifications besides rail transit?

3 **JOHN KEHO:** But the way -- the first part, A, letter
4 A, would be immediately.

5 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Exactly. That's what I'm
6 getting at. So we're talking about immediately and we're
7 talking about potentially long-term, so I think we're a
8 forward-thinking city, and I don't see any problem. If
9 we want to put it in there, we need to be realistic. It
10 could or could not happen.

11 But I'm thinking of this Transit Overlay district as
12 more, as just being a subway coming. This is much
13 broader, other ways to get modifications that when -- so
14 we have this Transit Overlay along Santa Monica Boulevard
15 in place and there's other ways to trigger it...

16 **JOHN KEHO:** Right, because we believe it.

17 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** ... and get people out of
18 their cars.

19 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay, so why, when it talks
21 about rail, what other ways are there to trigger it? We
22 don't have canals, gondolas.

23 **JOHN KEHO:** I think the idea is...

24 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** We'll get you a bicycle,
25 John.

1 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I have one. I don't ride
2 it.

3 **JOHN KEHO:** ... the one that's talking about
4 immediately, letter A, is talking about if individual
5 developers come up with new ideas or different ideas that
6 they can put into their project, car share programs,
7 other things that they put in above and beyond our normal
8 requirements, then that's what triggers those extra
9 changes to development standards because they're trying
10 to do something to help encourage people to get out of
11 their cars.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** And if I'm not mistaken, this is
13 simply framework, and Transit Overlay One could
14 potentially be implemented sooner, but we're not even
15 going to look at Transit Overlay Two until there's a
16 clear indication that that spur is coming through West
17 Hollywood.

18 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** So this is framework and nothing more.
20 Nothing changes in terms of development standards,
21 zoning, and so forth?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct. The height and FAR is
23 definitely off into the future.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right.
25

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** That is my concern. I just
2 don't want to have like a Transit Overlay zone and
3 somebody says, "Okay, we're going to put bikes into the
4 project. Okay, now we can get added height and density."

5 I think A is a small little -- there's
6 modifications, and it could be in a small way. It's just
7 sort of incentives to get some people out of cars and
8 other ways, other modes of transportation.

9 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

11 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I do wish that we would
12 consider starting with -- if we're going to move forward
13 with this, which it sounds like we're leaning toward that
14 with a smaller area, it seems to me that the district
15 basically runs most of the boulevard, and I'm not sure
16 why it needs to be so broad initially. It would seem to
17 me that it would achieve all of the goals if it covered a
18 smaller area, and if the program were successful and
19 actually brought us desirable development, there would be
20 an opportunity to expand it. But once we've pretty much
21 laid it on the entire boulevard, I think we live with
22 that.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Just remember, though, that there are
24 stops beyond the circles in terms of rapid transit
25 currently. So this considers the current conditions with

1 bus, with the local busses, with the rapid busses, so in
2 addition, the circles would be locations, target
3 locations potentially, of where the subway stations would
4 be, not right on the intersection but in the proximity.

5 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** I just think the Transit
6 Overlay's intriguing and may prove to be really
7 effective, but I'm just concerned. It also feels that as
8 an initial overlay, it's very broad and it could -- in
9 the way that it is programmed in stages, one stage for
10 basic transportation and a second stage if the Metro
11 moves toward identifying us, it also could be in stages
12 in terms of how broadly it applies to the entire
13 boulevard.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any other comments?
15 Commissioner Buckner?

16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** No. I mean I understand it
17 better now that we sort of talked about it so that how it
18 might be implemented over a period of years. I was
19 concerned since it seems like there's such -- we're not
20 likely to get that line in here in the next 10 years or
21 so that we're building out and up with the idea that we
22 might get something in terms of this subway. So that's
23 all. I feel better about it now.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, I want to just take a --
25 Commissioner Hamaker?

1 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I just have a quick question.
2 The fact that we already have three very large
3 developments entitled at La Brea, does that not impact on
4 any kind of decision that's going to be made in our
5 favor? I mean it's not like we're doing...

6 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** I think it helps, yeah.

7 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yes.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, I'm going to take a quick
9 consensus here on this topic just to find if people are
10 generally fine with this chapter.

11 Commissioner Hamaker?

12 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I am. I do have a
13 wording suggestion for 2.2, but if you want to leave that
14 until later, that's fine.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** I'm -- Bianca, do you want to take
16 that now or...?

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Let's -- if we can just focus on the
18 Transit Overlay issue and then we can go through the rest
19 of that chapter, [that'd be] helpful.

20 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I'm okay with the
21 Transit Overlay.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Yes, Commissioner DeLuccio?

23 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'm fine with it.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

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

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

2 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No, I think we ought to take
3 a look at it a little bit more refined and try to see
4 what they're going to do with respect to an EIR.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

6 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I share some of John's
7 concerns.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner?

9 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'm willing to look at it
10 some more, but I'm okay with it.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah, I, too, am okay with it. So I
12 mean it wouldn't hurt to do a little further study, but
13 generally I'm okay with it. Does that give you enough
14 information on that?

15 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Now we're going to move into
17 the areas that might not have been covered tonight that -
18 - in our land use, and I'm going to start with Barbara.

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Do you want to go back to the
20 beginning, or do you want me to go back to...?

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Whatever you want to do.

22 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, as long as we're on
23 this page, if Bianca, if that helps you, 2.2, as it's
24 worded, "Infill development within residential areas
25 should consider the existing neighborhood character."

1 Suggested change would be, "Infill development within
2 residential areas should improve the character of the
3 existing neighborhood and enhance livability," because as
4 it's written, it doesn't really mean anything.

5 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So there's -- in the list of
6 recommended policy changes, there was -- we had suggested
7 rephrasing that policy to clarify it.

8 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** You did? Okay, was that...

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Although the word, I think, improve
10 was the word that you used, which wasn't part of that.
11 What's included in the proposed changed list was to
12 rephrase it to, "Consider the scale and character of
13 existing neighborhoods when approving new infill
14 development projects."

15 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I don't think what you
16 just read gets to the issue of the sentence that says,
17 "Improve the character of the existing neighborhood and
18 enhance livability." The only problem with that is not
19 everybody likes the architecture, including me, that's
20 supposed to improve the neighborhood, but that's another
21 issue.

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I think the intent of that
23 is wonderful and admirable, but I think it's a little too
24 subjective.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** The intent of the current
2 language or the intent of Barbara's...?

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No, the intent of Barbara's
4 suggestion that the word improve is...

5 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, it's all subjective.

6 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** ... is very subjective and not
7 quantifiable.

8 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** But you could look at it from
9 saying, "You should consider the existing neighborhood
10 character," and build something just like what's there.

11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes, well, I think Bianca's,
12 in fact, said that.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, will you re-look at that again?
14 See if it can satisfy both?

15 **JOHN KEHO:** So I wanted -- if you could just take a
16 straw poll on whether or not you want to add that
17 particular word?

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** So are we focusing on the word
19 "improve"?

20 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Buckner?

22 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I don't have a comment either
23 way, frankly.

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

1 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I think it's asking too
2 much for infill to improve. I think if it matches the
3 character, it's sufficient.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

5 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

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

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Out of courtesy, yes.

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** And the other phrase was
11 "enhance livability," so I mean that has some meaning,
12 aside from being subjective, I suppose, maybe not.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah, I kind of tend to agree. It
14 can't hurt to say improve. That's sort of kind of an
15 unspoken rules for designers and architects who approach
16 infill project is to leave a particular site better than
17 what they were handed, but it wouldn't hurt to improve,
18 and I do like the improve -- enhance the livability
19 because that's what we're talking about.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I wouldn't spend a lot of
21 time on it, though.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Barbara, you had some other...

23 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, okay. On LU1.6, I'm
24 just -- I am familiar with the term "adaptive reuse," and
25 I'm not technically familiar with it, but I was wondering

1 if that is what is meant by that sentence and why you
2 didn't use that term, "retention of existing buildings
3 for new uses."

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** This is LU...?

5 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** This is LU1.6 on page 58, the
6 first sentence.

7 **JOHN KEHO:** Frequently, when we use the term
8 "adaptive re-use," that's more often in terms of historic
9 preservation.

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Oh, okay.

11 **JOHN KEHO:** And so this is just generally across the
12 board.

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, okay. Got it.

14 LU1.15, we had talked about the drive-ins before at
15 the very beginning, but I just wanted to ask, since this
16 was suggested by a letter, "The City prohibits new drive-
17 through land uses." Is that referring only to commercial
18 uses? -- because this letter said something about a
19 residential drive-through use, and I was never familiar
20 with the residential drive-through.

21 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Right. And, actually, in response to
22 that, that letter, there's a policy suggestion, a
23 rephrasing suggestion included on the list of suggestions
24 that would rephrase that to "specified drive-through
25

1 commercial land uses just to avoid a confusion of that
2 kind.

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, great. On LU1.19, "The
4 City's CEQA threshold should reflect the community's
5 vision for its future." Who determines the CEQA
6 thresholds?

7 **JOHN KEHO:** That would have to go through a public
8 review process.

9 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. So that's future
10 oriented.

11 There's a typo at the bottom -- toward the bottom of
12 page 59 on 2.4B, third sentence, overlay AFTER CEQA
13 analysis, I believe.

14 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Thank you, yes.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Barbara, can I ask ... because we made
16 this comment at the prior meeting, for typos and
17 grammatical changes, you could e-mail Bianca or call her
18 directly and go through those issues?

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. It was the only one I
20 found.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** I'm only worried about language or
22 issues that -- interpretation of some of these goals or
23 policies.

24 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, got it. That was the
25 only one I found.

1 I found LU2.9, "The city will consider modifications
2 to development standards for all of those issues, A
3 through K." What rang out to me was childcare
4 facilities. I don't know that we want to go through this
5 tonight, but it just seems to me that I'd like more
6 clarification on this. But at this late hour, I don't
7 know whether my brain is up to asking you to do that.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Can you be more specific on the
9 childcare facility issue?

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, it says, "City will
11 consider modifications to development standards, not
12 including height, density, or FAR for development
13 projects to provide one or more of the following kind of
14 public benefits."

15 So if a development provides a childcare facility,
16 which as we all know is a huge hot-button issue in this
17 city, what would be a modification to development
18 standards? John, you probably know this.

19 **JOHN KEHO:** So, yeah, we don't have anything in the
20 codes currently, but it could be reduced parking, could
21 be changes to setback requirements or landscaping
22 requirements.

23 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

24 **JOHN KEHO:** I do want to just say that this whole
25 item is actually in our current General Plan, so we took

1 that language and put it in here because that was
2 language that we already had.

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. All right. Thank you.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** And we talked about the green building
5 to make it exemplary green building or is it just green
6 building because..

7 **JOHN KEHO:** Yeah, exemplary green buildings because
8 obviously every building, new building has to comply with
9 the green standards.

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

11 On LU3.2, on page 61, I'm not quite sure what this
12 implies. "The city should efficiently utilize all city-
13 owned lands, encourage the use of air rights above
14 parking lots, consolidation of multiple public functions
15 into single buildings, joint use of public space by
16 multiple agencies." What does this imply?

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Well, in general, or was there a
18 particular part of that that was of concern?

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, I don't understand what
20 use of air rights above parking lots could there possibly
21 be.

22 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Billboards.

23 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** A building.

24 **JOHN KEHO:** It could be a building, could be a sign.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Billboards like the one we
2 have up on Sunset.

3 **JOHN KEHO:** Could be a park.

4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** And is there anything -- is
5 this different from anything that's in our General Plan
6 now?

7 **JOHN KEHO:** I don't know about that one, no.

8 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Because the City has exempted
9 itself from any rules, so it does anything it wants to do
10 with its own land, right?

11 **JOHN KEHO:** We are exempt from the zoning ordinance
12 regulations but not the General Plan. We have to comply
13 with the General Plan.

14 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. Okay, on page 64, when
15 I read this section, I -- because I live on the east side
16 close to Fountain Avenue, Fountain Avenue has always
17 called out for attention, and nobody's ever quite known
18 what to do with it, and I first thought that LU6.5, since
19 these streets were called out, I thought maybe Fountain
20 Avenue could be added to it, "The streetscape of
21 commercial corridors, including Sunset Boulevard, Santa
22 Monica Boulevard, etcetera, will be designed to balance
23 regional traffic flow with pedestrian," -- and I added
24 the word safety -- "with pedestrian safety and movement
25 and the unique physical environment of the area."

1 And then I spoke with someone about this, and they
2 suggested that there might be a place to have a
3 completely new goal which would be -- see if I can read
4 this -- add another policy, prioritize pedestrian
5 improvements that abut major traffic corridors, including
6 Fountain Avenue.

7 And I'd like to embellish on that by saying I did
8 attend the aging conference a couple of months ago.
9 There are so many seniors between -- not to mention going
10 all the way to Doheny but on -- or I mean, sorry, to La
11 Cienega but between Fairfax and La Brea who live close to
12 Fountain, who walk to Plummer, who walk to Fairfax, or
13 who walk to La Brea, and we only have the south side of
14 Fountain, but that sidewalk is so narrow, and in some
15 places you cannot get a cart between the fence of a
16 resident and a light post. At Formosa and Fountain, you
17 have to go into the street to get your cart that you've
18 taken with food in it from Ralph's.

19 So there are so many -- in the next 25 years, so
20 many people living in rent-controlled homes between La
21 Brea and Fairfax -- and I know, Marc, you live on
22 Fountain, too, so you must have issues there -- I would
23 love for Fountain to have the potential to be looked at
24 in the next 25 years. So that was why it was suggested
25 that it might warrant another item.

1 **JOHN KEHO:** There are a few actually in the mobility
2 section that kind of hit some of this.

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** The what, John?

4 **JOHN KEHO:** The mobility section.

5 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** The mobility section, okay.

6 **JOHN KEHO:** On page 124, N-3.5 says, "The City's
7 planning processes, such as street improvements or area
8 plans, should identify areas where pedestrian
9 improvements can be made, such as new pedestrian
10 connections, increased sidewalk widths, improved
11 crosswalks, pedestrian countdown signals, improved land
12 lighting, and new street furniture."

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

14 **JOHN KEHO:** And then there's another one, M-3.11,
15 "The city should enhance pedestrian accessibility
16 providing (inaudible) where appropriate in order to
17 minimize pedestrian crossing."

18 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. Usually that happens
19 in the north/south corridors. I mean I really would like
20 Fountain -- the words "Fountain Avenue" inserted
21 somewhere in here. I really would like the City to at
22 least have an excuse to study this issue.

23 **JOHN KEHO:** So if we could have a straw poll and see
24 if we want to add -- straw poll on that item to make sure
25 we want to get the Commission...

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Well, I'd like to chime in on --
2 obviously, I agree with Commissioner Hamaker, and I know
3 there's been some very peripheral discussion about
4 Fountain Avenue, at least for the last 10 years. So I
5 agree that we should identify -- if we've identified
6 these other streets, we should identify Fountain Avenue.

7 My only concern is this says commercial corridor and
8 Fountain Avenue is a residential corridor, so I don't ...

9 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, it's a major transit
10 corridor.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** You'd have to reconcile that. I would
12 like to see it in here so that -- because we're talking
13 about public spaces and streetscape, whereas in the
14 mobility section, they're talking about efficiency from
15 more of an engineering standpoint.

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, and I didn't know where
17 to put it, and I think it's all -- I think, frankly, what
18 I was saying was really a public safety issue for
19 seniors. It's really serious.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** And the condition she spelled out
21 actually exists all the way through along Fountain Avenue
22 all the way to La Cienega basically, and if I understand,
23 too, even though this north side beyond Fairfax is in Los
24 Angeles, West Hollywood has, I think, zoning control or

25

1 how I understand it, we ultimately have control of the
2 entire street?

3 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** We own the street and the sidewalk
4 up to the...

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** The property lines.

6 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** ... the property lines on the north
7 side.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

9 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** So, again, I think if you just ...

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Do a straw?

11 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** ... question the Commission as to
12 whether or not they want to specifically make a
13 recommendation to add Fountain as a street that would
14 also have this kind of study or enhancement?

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Buckner?

16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I think that is a good idea.
17 Thank you for raising it.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

19 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I'm fine with it.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

21 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I think in concept it's a
22 wonderful idea. However, as Marc pointed out, it is not
23 a commercial corridor, it's a residential corridor, so if
24 we're going to add it, it would have to be added in
25 another section.

1 And if, in fact, you're going to increase its width
2 for pedestrians, you're going to have to take the land
3 either from the street or from the properties adjacent.

4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I wasn't suggesting that.

5 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I don't know that either one
6 of those are acceptable.

7 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I wasn't suggesting that. I
8 was just suggesting that the study [does a way to make
9 it].

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right, this is just a framework to
11 look at it. We don't have the specifics. So that's all
12 ...

13 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** But the thing is, is it
14 possible to make it anything other than what it is?

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** It is.

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** It is?

17 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** One wouldn't know unless one
18 studied it.

19 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Then let's study it.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Commissioner Guardarrama?

21 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I don't mind studying it,
22 but I think it needs to be put in the appropriate section
23 for it.

24 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I agree.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I agree with Joseph.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** And then Commissioner Hamaker,
3 obviously?

4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, yeah.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Barbara?

6 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. On the next page on
7 65, LU7.4, "The City allows and encourages the planting
8 and maintenance of private landscaping in parkways." Is
9 this basically the section that talks about parkways at
10 all? Am I...?

11 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yeah, for the most part, this is
12 where (inaudible), yes.

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** For the most part, okay,
14 because I don't want to be redundant, but...

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** And this is an existing -- this came
16 from our existing General Plan, right?

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** That's right.

18 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. Because we have a lot
19 of problem on the east side with neglected parkways and
20 there have been a lot of code enforcement citations that
21 have gotten my neighborhood, in particular, really angry,
22 I'm just wondering if there is any way to be a little
23 more specific about parkway policies or goals? For
24 instance, people have been -- one woman beautifully, I
25 guess, bricked in her parkway and the code enforcement

1 made her tear it all up. So there's nothing in here that
2 says you can't have hardscape in the parkways. I mean is
3 that something that is too detailed for a goal?

4 **JOHN KEHO:** I believe so because that has been a
5 very contentious issue of what exactly goes in the
6 parkway.

7 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** That's the problem, yeah.

8 **JOHN KEHO:** And so I know the folks involved in that
9 have been studying exactly how to handle that.

10 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, so you want to keep it
11 pretty general at the moment?

12 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

13 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay. My only other
14 suggestion would be to -- if you want to encourage
15 plantings to consider the height because when you back
16 out of the driveway if it's too tall, you can't see the
17 cars coming.

18 **JOHN KEHO:** That's exactly the issues, the type of
19 plantings, the type of hard surfaces.

20 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** It's a big deal. Okay.

21 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I think you have to give the
22 public (inaudible) about that because we also had to tear
23 our public parkway -- our parkway area because the City
24 came around and said it should be something different
25 than what we plant -- planted. So I think that that

1 needs to be clearly specified so people are put on notice
2 of what they can and can't do.

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** On page 67, LU9.3, "The City
4 requires maximizing the number of residential units and
5 redevelopment of parcels in high-density zones." This
6 came from another letter from a constituent that -- by
7 virtue of maximizing the number of residential units, you
8 -- every developer is going to want to maximize the
9 number of units. So by requiring it, I think it
10 eliminates the creative aspect.

11 I understand the reason behind it. We have a lot of
12 developments come forward with three bedrooms and a
13 dining room, and we're sort of having condo units in
14 apartment buildings -- you know, these three-story houses
15 and apartment buildings, so I understand wanting to
16 maximize the density, but at the same time, I think that
17 this requirement rules out a level of creativity that
18 could happen. So I'm questioning that term.

19 **BIANCA SIEGL:** This is an existing requirement that
20 was established as part of the interim zoning ordinance
21 replacement and the (inaudible) to that.

22 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Right, and I don't think it
23 works. So are you -- you're just leaving it?

24 **JOHN KEHO:** That's how the proposal is. That's how
25 it's written.

1 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, but would you make a
2 note of the fact that I'm saying it's wrong?

3 **JOHN KEHO:** We'd like to know if there's a consensus
4 of the Commission. I mean either we wouldn't -- we would
5 just make a note of it but we wouldn't change it..

6 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah.

7 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

8 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** You know, somehow I just
9 think this is -- here we've been here for four hours. Is
10 this a waste of time, John? I mean is this just like --
11 this feels like busy work. Why are we even doing this?

12 **JOHN KEHO:** Well, the idea is we have looked at
13 these -- we've gone over these previously. We haven't
14 gone over them in detail like this. This is an
15 opportunity if you find significant issues that you think
16 impact the future policy direction of the city..

17 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well..

18 **JOHN KEHO:** ... and so someone -- it really depends on
19 how nitty gritty you want to get.

20 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I know, and this is the
21 problem. I agree.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** So do we need a consensus on this
23 particular topic?

24 **JOHN KEHO:** Don't --

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

1 **JOHN KEHO:** If we don't get a consensus saying to
2 change it, then it stays the same and it's just in the
3 minutes that a Commissioner voiced something, but
4 resolutions would go with it saying exactly the same.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Can we do a quick poll? Commissioner
6 Buckner?

7 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I don't have an opinion on
8 it.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

10 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** LU-93?

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** So basically this is a goal that I
12 guess not codifies but just frames current zoning that we
13 have in place that was as a result ...

14 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I feel the Council is very
15 clear that this is what they want and I'm not interested
16 in revisiting it.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** It should stay as is.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

20 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** As is.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

22 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'm glad Commissioner
23 Hamaker brought it up, but I think it should stay the way
24 it is.

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And, Commissioner Hamaker, you
2 have...

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** No, I think it's wrong.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And I feel like this would be a
5 hard-fought battle, and I'm not willing to take on this
6 battle for this because this particular topic has been
7 studied to quite extent. We may not agree with it, but I
8 can live with it. All right, Barbara?

9 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Since you're going through
10 the book, Barbara, I had a comment on Item 10.2.

11 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** What page?

13 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** "Views of carports and
14 garages from the street will be minimized..."

15 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** 67.

16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes, excuse me, it's on page
17 67, just below where you were. I don't know exactly what
18 it means to be minimized, but I'd sure like to eliminate
19 views of carports and garages from the street as much as
20 possible. [I was going to] say minimize. I don't even
21 know what that means.

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** It means eliminate as much
23 as possible.

24 **JOHN KEHO:** Right, as much as possible.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Okay, then I'm in agreement
2 with that then if that's what that means.

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I have something on 68. Can
5 I just jump in?

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah, go ahead.

7 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Mine has to do with -- just
8 have one thing. It's LU11.1C. When we talk about allow,
9 this is Beverly Boulevard. It says, "Allow limited
10 housing on Beverly Boulevard." I know that -- and then
11 it says, "These opportunities should be focused on
12 artists' live/work housing." How can -- I know on that
13 Beverly Boulevard, we're changing the zoning. It's going
14 to a different zoning, but how can you allow limited
15 housing on Beverly Boulevard? I don't understand how
16 that could possibly be executed.

17 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Second story?

18 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Yeah, but I mean, see, I
19 understand -- do you mean it that way to allow within a -
20 - you're looking for mixed use?

21 **JOHN KEHO:** Right, so someone couldn't come in and
22 build an entire building that's just housing. It would
23 be accessory to other commercial uses, and it's mixed
24 use, and it's trying to encourage that type of housing.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I understand. So it's not -
2 - so that you may allow limited housing, meaning within a
3 project, you're looking for mixed-use project.

4 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

5 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Is there any -- then these
6 opportunities should be focused on art/lives/work
7 housing, but it doesn't have to only be art.

8 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** That's right.

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Can this be maybe clarified
10 a little, what you mean by it, by mixed use or something?
11 Because otherwise it means to me you're trying to allow
12 limited housing, but it's like..

13 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** This is one of those policies that
14 would then allow us to put some zoning language in place
15 that would be the enabling language.

16 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** To push it out in general?

17 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** Yes. This is a general statement
18 that would then allow us to specify more detailed
19 requirements in the zoning code.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay, we're stretching it,
21 but I accept that.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Barb, you...

23 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I'm done.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** You're done.

25

1 Okay, other areas that were not covered by the
2 previous topics we discussed? Commissioner Buckner?
3 Commissioner Bernstein?

4 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Okay for now.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

6 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I'm fine.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Let's move on.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

10 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I'm ready to move on to the
11 next chapter.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. I just wanted to make one
13 comment. I don't know if you raised it, but we did bring
14 it up last Thursday and that was live/work/commercial,
15 not live/work/residential. Live/work on commercial
16 corridors, especially that could be easily accommodated
17 along Santa Monica Boulevard, where the lots are small
18 and shallow and individually owned. We're more likely to
19 get that kind of development than we are a bigger mixed-
20 use project.

21 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So to that point, there are no
22 policies that would prevent that kind of development that
23 are included here, and in fact, it's possible that some
24 of the parking policies, which we'll discuss when we get
25

1 to that section in a moment, could help to encourage the
2 smaller developments.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Well, I was struck because you do
4 mention, and I don't know if this -- this is the only
5 place, page 68 is the only place you mention live/work,
6 but you don't mention it and it's associated with Beverly
7 Boulevard, but it's not associated with any other
8 commercial corridor?

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Actually, that recommendation here
10 with the artist live/work/housing was a recommendation
11 that came out of discussions with the General Plan
12 Advisory Committee.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

14 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** That was a vision for
15 Beverly Boulevard, that community.

16 **JOHN KEHO:** Right, and I think it's the idea that
17 that area thinks of themselves as artist-oriented, as
18 opposed to the other commercial boulevards that don't
19 think of themselves so specifically focused.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** But live/work can be more than just
21 artists. You could have a bakery downstairs and someone
22 lives above or a small...

23 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes, you can.

24

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** So why are we precluding such
2 discussion to be included in the framework here for the
3 other commercial...

4 **JOHN KEHO:** We're not precluding it. We're just
5 saying that this was -- the advisory committee
6 specifically wanted it for Beverly.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Does anybody else have an
8 opinion about that along commercial -- I mean along Santa
9 Monica Boulevard?

10 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** It's not -- doesn't say it
11 can't happen. It's just silent, but it could.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Is there a reason it doesn't happen
13 now?

14 **JOHN KEHO:** We don't get that much live/work,
15 period, so I don't know if it's the market or -- I don't
16 know why it's not happening.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right, so if there's no
18 other topic or discussion in this particular chapter,
19 we'll move on to the last one, which is mobility, which
20 is chapter six?

21 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes. Okay, so we're going to hear
22 from some Staff and consultants other than us for a
23 moment, but just to introduce the topic, I wanted to
24 address the community input that we had heard regarding
25 mobility and the development of that section.

1 As we're all aware, traffic and parking were
2 consistently listed as major concerns by the community
3 throughout the process. Other community input included
4 support for expanded regional and local transit,
5 appreciation for our already walkable community and a
6 desire to increase the ease of walking and biking and
7 transit around the community.

8 The Commission questions from last time related
9 specifically to unbundling parking, offsite parking, and
10 park once districts. The policies in the Draft General
11 Plan that are related to parking management can be found
12 under goal M8.

13 The fact that parking was consistently identified as
14 a top concern by the community would seem to indicate
15 that the strategies that the City has been trying so far
16 may not be addressing the challenges of parking
17 regulation to the satisfaction of community members, and
18 so maybe it's time to try some new or enhanced
19 strategies, some of which are already being implemented,
20 as we'll hear.

21 The General Plan takes the approach that parking is
22 a scarce and a valuable resource and should be treated as
23 such, and that means seeking new solutions to balance
24 parking demand and supply using new techniques and also

25

1 that both public and private parking should be used as
2 effectively and efficiently as possible.

3 So I actually -- I'm going to ask Jackie, our
4 parking manager, to address some of the current -- over
5 here. She's over there -- some of the current efforts.

6 **JACKIE ROCCO:** Good evening. Well, one of the areas
7 that we have been working on I think you're familiar from
8 a presentation that "Mott" Smith from Civic Enterprise
9 made some time ago to you was a study that we conducted
10 of the Sunset area, as well as Melrose and Santa Monica,
11 the Triangle area, to identify our existing supply of
12 both public and parking in those areas as a way to more
13 efficiently manage the existing parking in both of these
14 study areas and begin to identify policy recommendations
15 that could better utilize the way -- the access to
16 parking.

17 As you know, there's widespread perception that
18 there isn't a lot of parking availability throughout this
19 city but there are areas, especially along Sunset and
20 Santa Monica where there's a good supply of privately
21 owned parking that if we had the ability to maximize that
22 parking and make it available to the public, that we
23 could then allow some changes in land use.

24 For example, when there are buildings that are used
25 during the day as office buildings but in the evening

1 those facilities remain vacant, then those could be
2 utilized to provide parking, off-street parking for
3 businesses.

4 But as a policy recommendation of something that
5 we're refining, that we're still working on, this would
6 be addressed as a district-by-district basis because, as
7 you know, the characteristics of both parking, business,
8 and residential mix in each of these study areas is a
9 little different, so it would have to be addressed
10 specifically or tailored for each area.

11 And in some areas, like I said, it would entail
12 using private operators of existing parking, and in other
13 areas, like in the Santa Monica area, it would be to
14 utilize like city-owned or operated parking facilities,
15 especially as we finalize construction of the parking
16 structure next door here.

17 But essentially, the one thing that I do want to
18 stress is that any strategies that come out as we
19 continue to refine this policy recommendation is that
20 they would be presented to the Planning Commission for
21 consideration, and the goal is overall to maximize the
22 existing supply of parking, where parking is available,
23 but also to prioritize where parking would be built in
24 areas where there isn't a good supply of parking.

25 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Thank you, Jackie.

1 So Jeremy Nelson, Transportation Consultant,
2 Nelson/Nygaard is here and can perhaps address some of
3 the questions that were raised last week with regard to
4 unbundling parking and some of those other programs.

5 **JEREMY NELSON:** So good evening, Commissioners.

6 I understand that last week there were some
7 questions about unbundled parking, shared parking,
8 offsite parking. What I'd like to do is just give a
9 general quick overview of those concepts.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Can you speak into the mic? I can't
11 hear you.

12 **JEREMY NELSON:** Sorry. I'll speak a little bit
13 louder in the mic there. And then if there are other
14 questions, I can answer those more specific questions.

15 But, essentially, unbundling parking is a concept
16 that is very common in multi-family housing, whether
17 formally or informally. It occurs very frequently, and
18 essentially, the General Plan policies that we helped
19 Staff develop on this topic were that the City would
20 simply encourage this policy for certain types of
21 development, which Staff can give you more of the details
22 on.

23 I want to be very clear that unbundling does not
24 change the supply of parking that's provided. It simply
25 itemizes the cost of the parking separately from the cost

1 of the housing. Whereas in most cases, the cost of
2 parking is bundled with your lease or rent or mortgage,
3 unbundling parking simply itemizes those costs.

4 And the key benefits of unbundling parking are
5 threefold:

6 One, the research strongly suggests, where this has
7 been studied, that it helps to reduce vehicle ownership,
8 so once people have the information of what the parking
9 is costing them on a monthly basis, they begin to think
10 through whether they need that second car potentially or
11 whether they need a car at all, depending on where they
12 live.

13 The second benefit is that it increases housing
14 affordability because standard parking requirements
15 dictate that every family -- every household should have
16 a certain number of parking spaces and some families are
17 paying for parking that they don't need, and so that's a
18 second benefit.

19 A third benefit is in terms of demographic
20 diversity. Because of the housing affordability impacts
21 of unbundling parking, you can expect to see a little bit
22 more demographic diversity in terms of household incomes.
23 There are people who are currently residents, would have
24 a better chance of affording housing in West Hollywood.

25

1 Lower-income residents or moderate-income residents would
2 have a better chance of being able to move here.

3 So the studies that have been done in the San
4 Francisco Bay area suggest that a great number of people
5 can afford housing that they might not otherwise be able
6 to afford.

7 So I think those are the three main benefits of
8 unbundling, and one thing that I would strongly caution
9 you or draw to your attention that we emphasized in the
10 General Plan policies we helped Staff develop was that
11 unbundling parking should be implemented in conjunction
12 with residential parking management or permit districts
13 to manage spillover parking effects. You don't want all
14 the cars to not be parked off street and simply be parked
15 on street, so you don't want to solve the unbundling
16 problem and then create an on-street parking problem. So
17 because West Hollywood has a very robust parking permit
18 program for their residential street parking, we feel
19 comfortable that unbundling [wouldn't] make sense here.

20 That's just a quick overview of unbundling. Shared
21 parking, I think we've talked a little bit about that
22 already this evening, a fairly familiar concept. Jackie
23 highlighted it, as well. Many land uses have different
24 peak demand periods. I mean West Hollywood knows that
25 better than any community. There are daytime parking

1 peaks and there are nighttime parking peaks here. The
2 bank doesn't have the same parking demand as the
3 nightclub. So shared parking simply takes advantage of
4 that. It's a very common practice. There are industry-
5 standard methodologies to estimate parking demand. Most
6 savvy infill developers are aware of shared parking and
7 how to measure that.

8 Offsite parking is a very similar concept. In any
9 urban environment, people are accustomed to parking some
10 distance from the front door of their final destination.
11 So the policy language we helped the city develop was to
12 emphasize that.

13 As Jackie mentioned, from the parking analysis we
14 did and from the parking analysis Civic Enterprise did,
15 some uses have different parking demands. Some districts
16 have available parking in the vicinity of where other
17 land uses are maxed out on parking. So offsite and
18 shared parking takes advantage of that, allows you to
19 park the same number of cars using your existing parking
20 supply more efficiently.

21 And that's, I think, a brief overview of those two
22 concepts. I'm happy to answer questions.

23 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Could you talk about the
24 "park once" districts that were mentioned?

25

1 **JEREMY NELSON:** So "park once" districts, in
2 general, the concept simply implies that rather than
3 drive, park your car, do one errand, drive three or four
4 or five blocks, do another errand, "park once" districts
5 help create an environment in which you are able to park
6 your car and either walk or take transit to accomplish
7 several errands within the same trip essentially so that
8 you're not using multiple parking spaces at every land
9 use destination. You're using one parking space.

10 That's the general concept, and did you have
11 specific questions for the...?

12 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** How are they implemented in
13 general?

14 **JACKIE ROCCO:** (Inaudible) that I can add is that
15 the way we envision that in some of the areas of the city
16 would be, for example, we have a public valet system or
17 program here in this side of the city, but for example,
18 on Sunset Boulevard, it would be utilizing that same
19 concept, having one destination where you drop off your
20 vehicle at a valet station, and there would be valet
21 stations along the Sunset Strip, for example. And if you
22 walked from, let's say, San Vicente to Sunset Plaza, you
23 could -- to have dinner at Sunset Plaza, you could pick
24 up your car at that location rather than having to walk
25 back to the original location where you dropped off your

1 vehicle. So there would be communication among all these
2 stations, so wherever you end up as your final
3 destination, there will be someone there to return your
4 vehicle, so you could retrieve it at multiple sites, so
5 you could conceivably park in one location, go to one
6 venue for dinner, one venue for entertainment, but you
7 would still have the ability to have your vehicle
8 returned at your final destination.

9 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** That's like my dream come
10 true.

11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Has this been experimented
12 with elsewhere?

13 **JACKIE ROCCO:** There are other areas, and even some
14 areas of Los Angeles are experimenting with this, as
15 well, and piloting these types of programs where you have
16 the ability to have that sort of centralized location
17 where you initially drop off your vehicle, and then you
18 have multiple satellite locations where this valet
19 company then has other stands where you could pick up
20 your vehicle.

21 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Well, one of my objections to
22 this valet issue is that it seems like places where they
23 have valet, they're taking up four or five parking spaces
24 so that the valet could put up a sign and they say, "This
25 is only for valet," and then all the parking is -- and

1 the valets charge quite a bit. So it creates a problem
2 for...

3 **JACKIE ROCCO:** But I think that's a little bit
4 different than -- a dedicated valet for one business as
5 opposed to a public shared valet, like the valet program
6 that we run, where we have -- there is a stand. I mean
7 if you are taking vehicles on the street, you do have to
8 dedicate a couple of meters to pick up and drop off the
9 cars. But by having multiple locations that they're not
10 just used by one business to sort of take up an area,
11 you're maximizing the use and allowing multiple
12 businesses to benefit from the availability of these
13 satellite locations, as well.

14 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** And what about the traffic of
15 the valets running up and down Sunset Boulevard or Santa
16 Monica Boulevard to pick up the vehicle and transport it
17 to where the customer (inaudible)?

18 **JACKIE ROCCO:** Well, this -- again, this is
19 something that is not the perfect solution for every part
20 of the city. I mean there are areas of the city where
21 this lends itself to be used depending on the
22 availability of parking, off-street parking, where the
23 vehicles will be parked, and traffic patterns. But it's
24 something that, again, we sort of already have part of
25 that in place. The only thing that we're missing is your

1 ability to pick it up in a different location. But now
2 with the construction of our parking structure here,
3 we're going to have more freedom to experiment and expand
4 these programs to make it more available.

5 **JOHN KEHO:** Also, I think one of the locations in
6 Los Angeles where they're starting to do this, the study
7 about it showed that there was less circulating around
8 the neighborhood by patrons searching for a parking spot,
9 so they weren't going into the residential neighborhoods
10 looking for places because they go straight to the valet.

11 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Could I ask a question about
12 the unbundling? Is that going to be a voluntary thing or
13 mandatory, the unbundling? Is it going to be for rental
14 properties or condominiums, or how does that work? I'm
15 not sure. I know they do something like that in New
16 York. You have to pay for your parking.

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So on page 129, policy 8.11...

18 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Okay.

19 **BIANCA SIEGL:** ... is written to require new multi-
20 family residential and commercial development along
21 commercial corridors and NTOD zones to unbundle parking.
22 And then the next policy, 8.12, suggests that we consider
23 unbundling parking requirements for other residential
24 uses.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Okay, so this is going to be
2 required of new construction, not necessarily...

3 **BIANCA SIEGL:** That's right.

4 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Okay.

5 **JEREMY NELSON:** One thing I would add is from some
6 of the workshops we participated in and our experience in
7 other communities is that there's likely already -- with
8 existing development, there's likely informally some
9 unbundling that already occurs.

10 I personally unbundled our parking space in our home
11 and we rent it to a neighbor, and I'm sure that's common
12 from what we heard in West Hollywood, as well.

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

14 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I have a question. So this
15 would be both for rental and condominium, you're
16 suggesting?

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes, it would be for multi-family
18 development in those areas specified.

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** So if someone goes to rent a
20 house and the rent is \$1,300 a month, but if you want a
21 car, it's \$1,700 a month. So what happens if I rent it
22 at \$1,300 a month and six months later I want a car?
23 What have you done with the parking space that went along
24 with my car for the first six months? Who's parking in
25 my ex-space?

1 **JEREMY NELSON:** There's sort of infinite iterations
2 of how this can work, right? And in some ways, I think
3 that's wise to include the language in the General Plan
4 to evaluate how this would be implemented for the West
5 Hollywood context.

6 But to your specific question, for ownership units,
7 often the parking supply, say, for an eight-condominium
8 building, there may be six to 10 parking spaces, for
9 example, depending on where you're at.

10 The parking spaces are held in ownership by the HOA,
11 and then at your time of purchase, you're eligible to
12 purchase a parking space separately. If you forego that
13 option at the time and then later your household needs
14 change and you end up with -- or your job changes and you
15 end up purchasing a vehicle, then on a fairly regular
16 basis, your people are offered the chance to sell their
17 parking space back to the HOA for whatever someone else
18 might be offering to pay. So it..

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** But what you were saying
20 earlier was that what we don't want to do is create a
21 surplus of that person buying the extra car and then
22 parking on the street with it because there's no space
23 available, yeah.

24
25

1 **JEREMY NELSON:** Correct. So you need to implement
2 this policy, and the General Plan, I think, recognizes
3 that, and Bianca can discuss the details.

4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah. I'm sorry, John.

5 **JOHN KEHO:** I was just going to say the condo that I
6 live in, it's not unbundled, but individual homeowners
7 get one parking space. There's other parking spaces that
8 you can then rent if you want more than one space or not.
9 And so every so often my condo association sends out
10 notices saying there's extra parking spaces, do you want
11 to rent them.

12 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Got it, got it. But your
13 research has shown that somehow this may work in West
14 Hollywood?

15 **JEREMY NELSON:** Yeah, absolutely, and as I said, I
16 think it's already occurring informally, and this just
17 sort of helps establish the policy for new development to
18 regularize it and to monitor it.

19 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I have to just say what has
20 occurred to me during this conversation is the absurdity
21 of how much time human beings spend dealing with these
22 cars that we've been driving for 50 years. It's just
23 unbelievable.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Bianca, is there more of your
25 presentation?

1 **BIANCA SIEGL:** Yes, so Bob was going to share some
2 other...

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

4 **BOB CHEUNG:** Okay, good evening, Commissioners. So
5 if you recall from last week's presentation, Staff stated
6 that there are 26 intersections that have been identified
7 as significantly impacted and avoidable impacts with the
8 implementation of the proposed General Plan, and we know
9 that that figure sounds a little scary, so we wanted to
10 note that the threshold that we used to measure
11 significant impact is the same threshold that we used for
12 individual -- to measure impacts for individual
13 development projects and that the 26 significantly
14 impacted intersections reflect the build-out of the city,
15 so it reflects all development buildup by 2035. So
16 that's a very -- it reflects a worst-case scenario in the
17 city in terms of traffic.

18 And to further put the traffic impacts into
19 perspective, we wanted to direct you to some of these
20 statistics or slides that compares the proposed General
21 Plan impacts to the existing General Plan.

22 As mentioned, there are 22 impacted intersections in
23 the AM and 26 in the PM under the proposed General Plan,
24 as compared to the existing General Plan, which has 24

25

1 and 29. So it's slightly better than what the existing
2 General Plan is forecasted.

3 Another fact to bring up is that of the total
4 intersections that are operating at level service F, and
5 these are intersections that are severely congested,
6 under the proposed General Plan, we estimate seven
7 significant impacts in the AM, 12 in the PM, as opposed
8 to existing General Plan, which has 15 in the AM and 16
9 in the PM. So in short, the proposed General Plan would
10 have less congestion at major intersections in the city.

11 Another method that we used to measure impacts,
12 city-wide traffic impacts is vehicle miles traveled, or
13 VMT, and as the name suggests, vehicle miles traveled are
14 the total amount of miles traveled of all trips on a
15 daily basis with either origin or destination within the
16 city.

17 Under existing condition, we estimate there are
18 about 1.5 million miles per travel total. Under
19 existing General Plan, we estimate about 1.723 million
20 miles traveled, and with the proposed General Plan, it'll
21 be slightly better at 1.712 million miles traveled.

22 And similarly, the eco miles traveled per capital
23 under existing condition is estimated at 24.6 miles.
24 Under existing General Plan, there's 23.9, and under the

25

1 proposed General Plan, there's 23.5, so it's actually
2 slightly better than existing General Plan.

3 **BIANCA SIEGL:** So that was the Staff and consultant
4 presentation for mobility. We could move through some of
5 the discussion topics now.

6 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Can I ask you a question in
7 regard to those graphs?

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** You said existing General
10 Plan. Why does it say 2035 on existing?

11 **BOB CHEUNG:** If we take the existing General Plan
12 policies and carry that through to 2035...

13 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Got you. Okay, compare..
14 thank you.

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

16 Okay, so let's focus on the parking first, the "park
17 once" districts. Anyone have any issues, discussion,
18 comments?

19 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I'm in favor of them.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any other issues?

21 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** In favor of Joe.

22 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** If they're in favor, I'm in
23 favor.

24 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Thanks, you guys.

25

1 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I think that people have been
2 studying this and these are suggestions and concepts that
3 they believe are going to help the congestion in our
4 city, and so I'm in favor of at least experimenting with
5 them in certain areas to see how they work.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any other comments? Okay, so that I
7 think we can -- that one can go to bed for now.

8 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I'll just add one comment,
9 please. I think they're very innovative, and just as the
10 last General Plan didn't accomplish all of its goals,
11 this one may not either. But if it accomplishes these, I
12 think it's wonderful.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. On an issue of unbundling and
14 shared parking, comments, remarks? Barbara?

15 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I just think that -- this
16 just may be a personal -- prejudice isn't the right word.
17 I think of San Francisco. You cited that as have working
18 in San Francisco. I think of San Franciscans who have
19 the streetcar as it being an easier concept to buy.

20 Los Angeles is so spread out and people are so
21 wedded to their cars that I -- and we are more of an
22 affluent city -- not more in comparison to San Francisco,
23 but I think that a lot of people here will pay more to
24 have their car downstairs than opt not to buy a second
25 car.

1 So I have no way of measuring that. It's just an
2 opinion that I think it might be a harder sell for West
3 Hollywood, but I think it's a valiant effort.

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Marc? I agree with Barbara
5 as far as keeping this in the General Plan. I think it's
6 good direction. And, again, it's going to go back to
7 when we actually do the zoning rewrite how these things
8 will flesh out because they are going to have
9 implications on the number of parking spaces that will be
10 required not only for residential but also for
11 commercial. If you're going to have shared parking, for
12 example, that could change the parking ratio for a
13 particular business.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Anybody else?

15 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I think the unbundling is an
16 excellent idea. I think if somebody rents an apartment
17 and the rent is 875 with a garage and 800 without a
18 garage, you have the choice of saving \$75 and taking the
19 bus or having a relative drive you around or having a
20 car. It's a wonderful choice.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so consensus, I think, sounds
22 like they're happy -- we're happy with the -- what's
23 being proposed for unbundling and shared parking.

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

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** There were a couple other areas that I
2 don't know if you covered formally that were mentioned
3 last week.

4 Someone raised a concern about transit
5 implementation. I forgot -- I think that was actually
6 Sue. You had brought that up. And someone mentioned
7 transit-oriented development in general. I think that
8 was you, John. Transit-oriented development? Nothing
9 comes to mind?

10 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes, we covered it already.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** With the transit? Okay, good.

12 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I just raised the issue
13 because I think if we're going to do some of these
14 parking plans, that we're going to have to provide trams
15 or shuttles or something for the public, which is going
16 to put more vehicles of different nature, different kinds
17 on the streets. But I do think that we have to consider
18 that when we're considering these other concepts, little
19 trams, people can get on and get off and stop off and
20 whatever along the way.

21 **BIANCA SIEGL:** I would also just draw your attention
22 in the back of the General Plan and the implementation
23 chapter, there are a number of specific implementation
24 actions that would help us to carry out some of these

25

1 programs, and we can discuss those if there are
2 particular concerns.

3 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I specifically thought of a
4 few times when I was reading about some of these plans is
5 that we're encouraging walking, but there's a lot of
6 people that aren't able to walk, and so we're needing to
7 provide some kind of a transportation vehicle for them so
8 that they can get to places where they need to go, our
9 seniors or disabled and so forth.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. I'll tell you about my list
11 here.

12 Parking overlay -- I don't know who brought that up
13 in the last meeting, and I don't know how that pertains
14 to something beyond what's already been discussed.

15 Doesn't? Okay.

16 Are there any other issues that haven't covered
17 under mobility?

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

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Parking overlay, are we
21 talking about the PK district or--?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes. I don't think we're proposing any
23 changes to what we currently have for the parking
24 overlay.

25 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Thank you.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Barbara, was there anything
2 that you wanted to add regarding mobility?

3 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** No.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Joe?

5 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAM:** I'm sort of comforted by the
6 fact that the Transportation Commission looked at this
7 particular chapter and signed off on it already, and
8 because I'm not a mobility expert, I sort of weighted
9 their input pretty heavily.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Any other comments?

11 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** I like the idea of exploring
12 existing parking for other uses, and I hope that we have
13 success with it. I just am cautious about how much we
14 can get private owners to contribute parking to a General
15 Plan policy. I hope it works out.

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

17 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right.

19 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Thanks, Alan.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. So I think that ends the
21 discussion for mobility. So with that, I would like to
22 invite the public to once again add comments to what was
23 already added at the last meeting.

24 **JOHN KEHO:** There were a couple items that we wanted
25 to keep till the next time, and I just didn't know if you

1 wanted to try to address any other items tonight or just
2 wait until the next time.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioners?

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I prefer to wait until next
5 time. Are there a lot of items or just a couple?

6 **JOHN KEHO:** There's just, I think, a few. I think
7 there was -- Parks and Rec was one that some people
8 wanted to talk about.

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** We can do it tonight, I
10 guess.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yeah. Sure, if...

12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I'm okay with that.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right. So a few more
14 minutes. All right, so you want to move to Parks and
15 Recreation?

16 **UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:** We'll be here all
17 night.

18 **JOHN KEHO:** I'm going to flip back to my notes from
19 the last time to just raise the issue.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Could we hear from the
21 public first and then come back to that, Marc? I mean
22 the public has been here a long time, and I actually
23 wanted to hear from the public earlier, and I held off
24 and...

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** I know, but remember, this was just a
2 continuation of the last meeting, and this is a second
3 opportunity for them to speak tonight.

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I realize that. However,
5 we've lost most of the people that were here this evening
6 and...

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. I'm fine with that if the rest
8 of the Commission is fine with that.

9 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I think it's your call,
10 Marc. I think you should determine the order of the
11 meeting.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Why don't we go ahead -- since we hit
13 on the more contentious topics or chapters, why don't we
14 hear from the public, and that will give us a chance to
15 rest our jaws.

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Mr. Chair?

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

18 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** So that we don't offend
19 anyone, may we take a five-minute bathroom break?

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. Let's take -- can we make
21 it a three-minute? Three-minute bathroom break? Okay.

22 *(Short break taken)*

23 *[Commissioner Buckner left the meeting at 9:30 P.M.]*

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** I have quite a few speaker slips here,
25 but I don't think everyone's here. So Steve Afriat I

1 don't think is here. Kevin Burton? Sven Toorvald? Oh,
2 Kevin you're here? Oh, Kevin, you're the first speaker,
3 followed by Sven.

4 Three minutes. Please state your name, city of
5 residence, and you can speak on any items that we
6 discussed tonight or any of the other areas that we
7 didn't discuss.

8 **KEVIN BURTON:** Okay, my name's Kevin Burton. I'm a
9 resident of West Hollywood. And I wanted to...

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Could you speak into the microphone?

11 **KEVIN BURTON:** Kevin Burton. I'm a resident of West
12 Hollywood, and I wanted to offer my support for policies
13 and actions in the General Plan that encourage bicycling
14 in West Hollywood, so this is the mobility chapter,
15 chapter six.

16 There are several advantages of the provisions
17 concerning bicycling.

18 For bicyclists, they increase safety and security of
19 the bicycles.

20 For pedestrians, more bicyclists will use the street
21 if they feel they can safely do so, and fewer will
22 actually use the sidewalks, which the City recently
23 considered.

24

25

1 For motorists, every person on the car, they're not
2 driving, and that means less traffic congestion and fewer
3 parking spaces taken up.

4 And for the community as a whole, there's less air
5 pollution and noise pollution.

6 I think it's worth noting that more people are
7 bicycling as time goes by in West Hollywood. I don't
8 know if you pay attention to this. I certainly do. And
9 there are more and more people on the roads all the time
10 bicycling, and whether or not there are facilities
11 available for it.

12 And I believe that further increase in use of
13 bicycles is inevitable in West Hollywood for several
14 reasons.

15 One, because of the heavy automobile traffic and the
16 problems with parking. We know that West Hollywood is
17 the densest area in Los Angeles County, and with the
18 planned developments, these problems will probably
19 increase so that for those residents who can feel safe
20 bicycling on the streets in West Hollywood, many will
21 chose that option to avoid the headaches of traffic.

22 Secondly, West Hollywood has many advantages for
23 bicycling. One, obviously, there's good weather. That's
24 true of the Los Angeles Basin, in general. Two, it's a
25 mixed community. Many residences are within easy

1 bicycling distance of shopping areas, and that's really
2 true of the whole of the city from the east side to the
3 west side. And, three, much of the city is flat and can
4 be easily cycled. There are, I recognize, important
5 exceptions to that in the hilly west side and especially
6 the West Hollywood Heights, north of Sunset Boulevard,
7 where bicycling is difficult.

8 And, three, surrounding communities are implementing
9 bicycle plans, and it would be useful for there to be
10 proper connectivity through West Hollywood. That
11 includes Los Angeles, who's just completing its city-wide
12 bicycle plan and is implementing several facilities. And
13 just this week, the past Tuesday, our neighbor to the
14 west, the Beverly Hills City Council took up adding
15 bicycle names to Santa Monica Boulevard within its
16 borders. And so we want to be able to take advantage of
17 these events and our neighbors.

18 And, finally, there is a requirement. The
19 California Complete Street Acts (sic) of 2008 mandates
20 consideration of bicycling and pedestrians on streets,
21 and the City was reminded of this in a letter from
22 Caltrans on the draft EIR. Thank you.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Sven, followed by Steve
24 Martin.

25

1 **SVEN TOORVALD:** Hi. Sven Toorvald, West Hollywood.
2 I'd like to talk about two of the subjects that came up
3 tonight.

4 First, scale, I want to talk about in more detail.
5 Currently at -- the broad statement is protection of
6 scale. Currently in the General Plan, we have a lot of
7 language that actually protects scale in terms of
8 expressing and basing the decision on surrounding
9 structures like all the objectives say protection of
10 existing neighborhood by ensuring compatibility, language
11 like that.

12 In the R3 zone where I live, the actual language
13 states -- land use policy states you could build up to a
14 certain height depending on the predominant existing
15 height. So there's kind of a mechanism in there. We
16 used to have a height average, and we don't anymore, but
17 there's like a mechanism that lets us know that we're
18 looking out for the scale, that it just doesn't jump up
19 too big.

20 Now as I read the General Plan, I may have missed
21 it, but in 1.2, it just says, we'll consider the urban
22 context, which seems very broad and very general. The
23 urban context could be the house next door, the building
24 two blocks away.

25

1 In terms of the public, we don't really have an idea
2 that you're looking out for what's right there. I would
3 like to see it be as specific at the very least as what
4 we now in the General Plan.

5 I understand having vague language gives you more
6 flexibility to go higher. I'd like to see more of that
7 control put back in in the language here because in the
8 zoning ordinance, it's just by the numbers. This has
9 heights and stuff like that. There's no real protection
10 on scale.

11 The other subject is about the bonuses, combining
12 bonuses, and underpinning this is how we define a unit.
13 Right now, a unit is just -- a unit can be a studio, a
14 one-bedroom, a two-bedroom, a three-bedroom. So you
15 could have -- like in my area, eight units is the maximum
16 density that you can have. That could be eight studios
17 or it could be eight three-bedroom apartments.

18 Okay, so the actual density can vary greatly, and I
19 think that's part of the problem when we talk about these
20 bonuses because what was brought up is like the green
21 building bonus. It doesn't specify whether that bonus is
22 supposed to be allowed to go above maximum density or
23 not, if it can add to the height or not, and that was a
24 subject you guys brought up is can it go to height. It's
25 not specified anywhere. Especially in the courtyard

1 housing section, you can add, in the case of a recent
2 project, eight parking spots, which is eight bedrooms,
3 which really increases the density. It's allowed. It's
4 allowed under the current housing section, but it does
5 really impact the overall density of a project.

6 My time is up. Thank you.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Steve Martin, followed by
8 [Alex Vance].

9 **STEVE MARTIN:** Steve Martin, West Hollywood. Thanks
10 for calling the public.

11 I've got concerns about the Transit Overlay, and I
12 know that it's going to give incentive to developers that
13 will not be height or density, but that kind of leaves
14 the obvious incentive, which is parking, and if you go
15 through the CC2 zone where you've got 45-foot heights
16 that are being proposed and then you have an SBS --
17 SB1818 bonus, which will give you another 10 feet, then
18 you add a Transit Overlay incentive, which cuts down on
19 your parking, you're going to have a mess on Santa Monica
20 Boulevard, and I really think that you need to look at
21 some of these cumulative incentives that you're giving,
22 and that doesn't even count any green bonuses somebody
23 might get.

24 You may also want to look at limiting the number of
25 mixed-use either areas or units. Maybe you put a cap on

1 it because I know there's been a lot of discussion by
2 several Commissioners and particularly by Staff that by
3 granting mixed-use where you could get additional heights
4 and densities, you're somehow pulling residential
5 development out of the residential areas and somehow
6 preserving our rent-controlled housing, and I've been
7 very skeptical of that concept.

8 So I contacted a local realtor, Susana Miller, who
9 does residential real estate right here in West
10 Hollywood. Her office is in West Hollywood, and she
11 lives in the Norma Triangle. And I asked her about this
12 concept, and she laughed and laughed because it doesn't
13 make any sense. It's a nonsensical proposition.

14 The first thing she pointed out is that the reason
15 people want to live in residential areas is because
16 they're residential. And certainly the Hancock project
17 is a great example of mixed use that is not marketable.

18 The other thing that she pointed out is that if you
19 own a residential building, you're not going to sell it
20 to develop a more expensive parcel on Santa Monica;
21 you're going to develop the property that you own.

22 And just because somebody on Staff says that Adam
23 Smith doesn't live here, that we can repeal logic in the
24 laws of economics, that doesn't make it so.

25

1 I've heard several Staff people, particularly Allyne
2 Winderman, talk about this concept, and I don't know
3 whether she went to the Ronald Reagan School of Economics
4 or voodoo economics, but this just doesn't make a lot of
5 sense. So I think you really need to look the concepts
6 behind what's being proposed because if we're going to
7 protect livability, we need to do that. If we're going
8 to protect rent-control housing, we better think up some
9 different strategies. Thank you.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. [Alex Vance], Lauren
11 Meister -- I don't see her here, [Allegra] -- Elyse.

12 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** Elyse Eisenberg, West Hollywood.
13 I first want to say how disappointed I am in this process
14 tonight and the fact that last week we got four minutes
15 and now we only have a handful of people here and we're
16 only given three and we had about 30 people here who
17 wanted to speak on various subjects. It is extremely
18 disappointing.

19 I want to thank you, Commissioner DeLuccio, for
20 pointing out on the Melrose map that it was basically
21 developed according to pending projects. I would have to
22 say that's the entire General Plan.

23 Excuse me, I'm channeling a little of Steve's
24 passion from last week. I'm just so upset about this
25 whole process.

1 I want to address some of the things that were
2 talked about last week. I'm glad that we had a
3 definition of affordable housing here tonight so you can
4 hear how easily that would be misconstrued by the average
5 person.

6 I still heard nothing that said that the people who
7 get affordable housing are on lists and they win it by
8 lottery, and if they have moderate, low income, or very
9 low incomes, what does that peg to?

10 I think a lot of the people would say, "Well, my
11 income is moderate. If my income is moderate, I should
12 be getting one of these low rents," but that doesn't mean
13 that at all, and it is absolutely not clear.

14 Last week, Commissioner Altschul asked whether we
15 had specific numbers on how people responded. Well, I
16 have here in my hand right now a few pages from the
17 telephone survey that was done in September of 2008.
18 Four hundred people were telephoned in the city of West
19 Hollywood. This is -- I downloaded from our city's
20 website. This -- at the beginning of the conclusions, it
21 said, "This survey is 95% accurate on the views of the
22 city." And I want to point out that if you look closely
23 at the first pages of this, the primary issues in this
24 city, the number-one issue is we need more parking. That
25 is what the public has come back and said.

1 Everything that is being talked about here tonight
2 is saying how can we reduce parking requirements? How
3 can we unbundle parking requirements from where people
4 live so they have to gouge the middle class to buy
5 parking? Do you think anyone is actually going to buy a
6 condo in a city like this with no parking and not have a
7 parking space? That's insanity. It's just another way
8 to gouge everybody.

9 This plan absolutely was done for the developer's
10 benefit. It's like playing pop-up mole. You hit a mole
11 and another one pops up. You were talking about lowering
12 the heights along the streets here. Well, can we raise it
13 on this property? Can we raise it on this property? No,
14 push it down. Oh, what about this property? Where can
15 we raise it?

16 The second-most major issue that the public has come
17 back is we don't want more development. We don't want
18 more height. We don't want more density. But the City
19 is pushing this through. This plan was -- if you look at
20 the proposals, which are online, which were presented to
21 the General Plan Committee, this is what you're seeing
22 today. It does not reflect the feedback from the city,
23 and I advise you to look at the telephone surveys, which
24 was 400 people, which is supposed to be accurate. The
25 community response fair, which has another 200 responses.

1 There was the 1,400 responses. You can count what people
2 had to say.

3 I went and I reviewed this stuff again today, and I
4 looked through it, and there are hundreds of people
5 talking about these three primary issues, which every
6 single decision made here tonight is how can we reduce
7 this and destroy our quality -- continue to destroy our
8 quality of life.

9 Everything you're doing to unbundle and make things
10 easier for developers is not what this public wants, the
11 majority of this public wants, and I highly advise you to
12 look at the numbers for those of you who are numerically
13 challenged. Thank you.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Victor Omelczenko, followed by Jeanne
15 Dobrin.

16 **VICTOR OMELCZENKO:** Victor Omelczenko, West
17 Hollywood. Thank you for all your hard work. We've been
18 here a long time.

19 Last week, Rae Miller (sic), who worked -- Rae
20 Mitchell, the lady who had worked on the General Plan,
21 talked about infrastructure and her concerns, and I just
22 wanted to say that I really -- I understood what she was
23 talking about. We don't want to happen here what
24 happened up north in San Bruno, a community that was
25 devastated, a whole neighborhood wiped out, homes

1 destroyed, citizens killed because of a gas transmission
2 pipe exploding.

3 Just like our plans look at not developing near
4 earthquake faults, I really think that we should look
5 under the infrastructure chapter and look at how -- about
6 where the gas lines are but also as we look at the land
7 use and form, as you look at that, you want to look at
8 finding what kind of an impact will these land use
9 changes have on the underground infrastructure as we go
10 and build.

11 And I suggest that in the implementation action plan
12 that we add one more thing, IRC-A.29, safe underground
13 gas infrastructure program and outreach.

14 The implementation plan for that section has a lot
15 of stuff about plastic bags and polystyrene and that, but
16 there seems to be short shrift given to this whole
17 problem of a potential devastating gas leak, gas pipe
18 exploding.

19 Let's not build any more any closer. Just like we
20 don't build near earthquake faults, let's not build any
21 more than we have to where there are these underground
22 gas pipes. Let's be very careful about that.

23 And I really urge you to make a policy decision that
24 -- make a policy decision regarding keeping the
25 commercial neighborhood zone at 25 feet and the

1 commercial community zone at 35 feet, not bifurcate them
2 into commercial neighborhood, 25 feet, and then another
3 commercial neighborhood at 35 feet, and then a commercial
4 community at 35 feet, and now this commercial community
5 at 45 feet.

6 That will impact my neighborhood. I live on Laurel
7 Avenue in the Fairfax/Santa Monica area, and you want to
8 increase it to 45 feet. Already, it's at 35 feet. We'll
9 have up to six stories once the bonuses and the SB1818
10 come in and everything. We'll get up to six stories
11 along Fairfax, but do we want more? Do we really want to
12 let it go up to 45 feet as a base? And who knows? There
13 might come from Sacramento another SB1818 that says, "Oh,
14 to be green cities, you should give new bonuses," and
15 then you go higher and higher and you "canyonize" the
16 city, and we don't want that.

17 A lot of citizens do not want that. Please listen
18 to us, and thank you for your hard work.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Jeanne Dobrin, followed by
20 [Eric Daarbola], [Park Leman], [Mark Cheesa].

21 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Jeanne Dobrin and a longtime
22 resident of West Hollywood. I was going to speak today
23 about water and give you some facts and figures, but I am
24 going to put that aside for the moment, although I did
25 see that developers have to prove there's plenty of

1 water. I haven't seen that happen anywhere. I'm saving
2 that for next week.

3 But I have to address the cockamamie things I heard
4 tonight. I make it my plan not to criticize the Staff
5 when it's not called for. Even when I don't agree with
6 them, I go along and I say they're doing the best they
7 can. But this guy who came from somewhere and tells us
8 all about unbundling, I guarantee you 95% the people who
9 listen to this here and on television don't know what
10 unbundling means.

11 Plus, try my condominium. I live in a security
12 building. Joseph Guardarrama lives in a security
13 building very closely allied to mine. There's one other
14 person on the Commission that lives in a condominium.
15 The rest of you live in houses or apartments.

16 Do you think -- it so happens I am not using my two
17 tandem spaces now because I don't have a car, but if I
18 had a tandem space, do you think because I only have one
19 car I'm going to let somebody who lives on San Vicente
20 come into my security building and park in my tandem
21 space and I'm going to have to call them up when I want
22 them to move their car? It ain't gonna happen.

23 What if there is going to be two side-by-side
24 parking spaces? Are we going to have somebody who lives
25 on Robertson Boulevard come and park there into our

1 security building? It ain't gonna happen. This is pie
2 in the sky.

3 I realize that we're looking for solutions. When I
4 used to work with the county 34 years ago, the biggest
5 problem that we had is parking, and here tonight I hear
6 about unbundling. If people don't want to -- let's just
7 say unbundling goes into place and people don't want to
8 purchase a parking space, where are they going to park
9 that (expletive) car? They're going to park it on the
10 street! This is something that we don't need.

11 I think that to take up the Commission's time and
12 the Staff's time with somebody telling us about this kind
13 of (expletive) is really kind of disgusting. It ain't
14 gonna happen. Maybe it'll happen in some apartment
15 building.

16 Don't forget, by the way, that there is no rent
17 control on anything that is built in West Hollywood since
18 1979, so when we talk about this affordable housing, who
19 is going to manage all of that, too?

20 And as for the idea that you know before you several
21 buildings have come for you for entitlements that have
22 all tandem parking, how are you going to under-bundle
23 those things, condominiums or even apartment buildings?

24 I am really disgusted. I think that there's an
25 insult to the Commission and the public to have this kind

1 of stuff brought before us. Talk about things that are
2 important and can be carried out. Thank you.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** I don't think anyone else here. [Lynn
4 Hoopengartner], [Carlton Cronin] --

5 **UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:** He's gone.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** [Patty] --

7 **UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE SPEAKER:** I think this is
8 (inaudible) speaker, right?

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

10 **JASON ILLOVIAN:** I'm not Patty but...

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Anybody else who I haven't
12 called, just come on up. State your name and city of
13 residence, please.

14 **JASON ILLOVIAN:** My name is Jason Illovian, and I'm
15 a resident here in the city of West Hollywood. I'm also
16 on the Eastside PAC, and I'm a board member of the
17 Avenues of Art and Design.

18 I wanted to touch upon some of you guys' comments on
19 Melrose.

20 My father has been in business here in West
21 Hollywood for 35 years, and he currently has a showroom
22 on Melrose directly in front of the library garage.

23 I think the library, the park, and the library
24 garage are going to be dynamic additions to Melrose, but

25

1 I also think the General Plan has to accommodate the
2 surrounding area for future growth.

3 And differentiating between the north and south side
4 of Melrose, the library garage is approximately between
5 60 and 75 feet high and spans almost that entire block on
6 Melrose. You guys are -- the General Plan is proposing
7 to go 35 feet high there. Even at 35 feet, it's still
8 only at the halfway mark of the library where it is right
9 there.

10 A second important is neighbors. On the north side
11 of Melrose when you take San Vicente all the way up to
12 the Melrose Triangle, there are no neighbors behind any
13 of the projects. Along the entire south side of Melrose,
14 there are neighbors, and I think that the plan should be
15 sensitive to that.

16 So just to reiterate, I do think there's a material
17 difference between west of San Vicente all the way to
18 Melrose Triangle and east of San Vicente, where it gets a
19 lot narrower on Melrose.

20 The current economy -- as a member of the Board of
21 Avenues of Art & Design, I see it firsthand -- has made
22 it really difficult for the Avenues to remain competitive
23 and dynamic, and a lot of our businesses here are
24 struggling.

25

1 I think the General Plan can encourage new
2 development to attract more businesses and residents into
3 our main corridors, and allowing that increased height
4 will enable us to develop buildings that can attract more
5 kinds of tenants. Having creative office space on top is
6 something that would add a lot of energy to the entire
7 neighborhood.

8 Whether it's the south side or the north side, it's
9 up to you guys. I don't know what the exact height
10 should be all along Melrose. I just know what I believe
11 is that the north side should be higher than the south
12 side, and going west of San Vicente is definitely
13 different than east of San Vicente. Thank you.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. And I think that is our
15 last speaker. So -- and I'm assuming we're still keeping
16 the public testimony open until the third meeting. Okay.

17 So with that, does Staff need to make any
18 clarifications or on something that may have been
19 mentioned?

20 **JOHN KEHO:** No. We were just going to say that if
21 the Commission wanted to come up with -- bring any other
22 comments to us so we can get them tonight and get the
23 resolutions prepared as best we can for next time if
24 there's anything else that hasn't been mentioned.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** If you could guide us because...

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Could I ask you a quick
2 question first?

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, go ahead.

4 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** On the green building -- for
5 the bonuses for the green building, you know, the FA, you
6 can get a 0.1 FAR. What is it? It's a 0.1 FAR. With
7 that 0.1 FAR, that's only for FAR area ratio. It
8 wouldn't be height related, would it? It could be?

9 **BIANCA SIEGL:** It's just a density bonus, just the
10 0.1 FAR now (inaudible).

11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And that would not have to
12 do with height; it'd be more for...

13 **BIANCA SIEGL:** It's for density, right, and only in
14 commercial that would no longer...

15 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** But could it equate into
16 enough to make -- add another height to a building?

17 **BIANCA SIEGL:** No, it would -- just the green
18 building bonus itself only relates to density and would
19 need to be accommodated within the existing height.

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

21 **JOHN KEHO:** And that is a change from -- currently,
22 that's eligible in the residential areas, and the General
23 Plan proposes to remove that from residential.

24 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Right, thank you. Sorry,
25 I'm okay.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so we started to talk about
2 Parks and Recreation and...

3 **JOHN KEHO:** I think -- we kind of discussed and we
4 think we got enough comments from you last time that we
5 can craft language to bring back to you next time on the
6 Parks and Rec about investigating dog parks.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, what are some of the other topic
8 areas?

9 **JOHN KEHO:** Well, that's what we wanted to know. We
10 don't have anything else, but we just wanted to make sure
11 that if you guys have any burning issues that you already
12 know about tonight, that if you want to spend some more
13 time tonight so that way we can craft a response for next
14 time.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Commissioner Hamaker, do you
16 have anything else you wanted to add?

17 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, it's 10 o'clock, and my
18 brain is fried, so I don't think you'd want any -- I
19 couldn't be coherent about any other issues, I'm sorry.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Is it also possible for us to, if
21 there's something that comes up between now and the
22 beginning of next week, that we could just e-mail you
23 or...?

24 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

25

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And then, of course, with any
2 grammatical changes or word awkwardness, they can just
3 get in contact with Bianca.

4 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Commissioner Altschul?

6 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Elyse? Perhaps if you and
7 Jean stayed, you might have answers to some of your
8 premises and suppositions that were somewhat faulty.

9 If you listen -- if she listens -- if she listens
10 rather than talks all the time, she can get some
11 clarification on some of the things she raised rather
12 than continuing to operate under a false impression. So
13 it would be beneficial, I think, if you sat down and
14 waited till the end of the meeting.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, thank you. Commissioner
16 Bernstein, do you have any -- were there any other issues
17 that you thought needed to be brought up tonight?

18 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Just one. I think there's
19 good language in the Plan right now about the
20 preservation of existing housing, affordable housing,
21 historic buildings. I don't see much about a better
22 condo conversion policy, and I think as a goal, to
23 paraphrase Sue, a may or could, but something that we
24 might want to explore is opportunities for tenants to
25 either be protected in their current tenancies or

1 participate in a viable condo conversion plan because
2 right now, we don't have one.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Is this under housing, the housing,
4 that you noticed that?

5 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I don't think it -- I think
6 it falls more under land use or one of the areas where
7 there's language about how we can extend the life of
8 existing buildings that we want to extend, and I think
9 that could be a mechanism for extending the life, along
10 with other good language that I already see there.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** So just to clarify, there is a
12 condominium conversion ordinance in the housing provision
13 on page 220. I actually had an issue with this because
14 it sounds -- it doesn't sound like the title. If you
15 read it further, it sounds like trying to minimize
16 conversions and trying to manage that, and I'm not sure -
17 - you sound like you're going in a different direction
18 with that.

19 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Since our current
20 condominium conversion policy mandates that you bring old
21 buildings up to current codes in some regards and is
22 basically impossible to do, it's sort of a non-starter,
23 and I think it could be a viable option if the condo
24 conversion policy were crafted differently for
25 maintaining and preserving older buildings.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Are we talking about all older
2 buildings or historic buildings?

3 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Especially historic
4 buildings.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so that was an issue that we
6 brought up under historic preservation as a -- well, not
7 conversion but tools that would allow for substantial
8 rehabilitation to a building's infrastructure.

9 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** I appreciate what Joe said
10 last week about the fact that the housing element has
11 already been shipped off and it's sort of a done deal.
12 He's right. I just think this is an opportunity to
13 acknowledge that condo conversion, especially in a post-
14 [gassas hawkins] world, may be our best option in some
15 cases for preserving things that we want to preserve, and
16 we should at least have it on the table to explore how to
17 better use it.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Do you want to chime in, John?

19 **JOHN KEHO:** (Inaudible) do want to address at least
20 as far as the historic -- officially the historic
21 designated buildings. The current condominium language
22 if you want to convert an existing building, you're
23 supposed to bring it up to code where feasible, and so
24 that provides the out if you have a historic building
25 that has character-defining features. That means you

1 can't add balconies or you can't add parking, that type
2 of thing. It provides the ability for the Commission and
3 decision makers to say it's not feasible for this
4 particular building because it's a historic building and
5 you can't do it.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** It's not feasible to bring it up to
7 code?

8 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. No one's applied for that, gone
9 through that process, but it's there.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Does that answer your...

11 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I don't --

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Or do you want to see something, some
13 language in this document?

14 **COMMISSIONER BERSTEIN:** You seem to have thought
15 about it, too. Do you have anything you would add to
16 that?

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** I have, and I've had various
18 discussions with different people about it. I would hope
19 that there's something more defined about that, maybe an
20 historic preservation issue, not specifically condo
21 conversion, but tools such as a condo conversion could be
22 explored to really allow buildings to re-pipe, re-wire,
23 reinforce structure so that these buildings stand --
24 remain standing for another 50, 75 years. That was --
25 so...

1 Anybody else want to chime in on this particular
2 issue? No?

3 Do I need a consensus on this? Okay, can I get a
4 consensus, thumbs up, thumbs down on such a thing under
5 historic preservation?

6 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Thumbs up?

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

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner DeLuccio?

9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** It's okay.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Hamaker, okay. So consensus.

11 All right. Any other topic? Nothing? Yes?

12 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I just want to state for
13 the record that the parking discussion that we were
14 having never envisioned forcing people that live in
15 security buildings to allow people who don't to use their
16 parking spaces. This has to do with sharing within the
17 building, and that's precisely what Mr. Keho was saying
18 was occurring in his building.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

20 And, also, I kept hearing tonight that it's a
21 developer's tool or whatever, and if I'm not mistaken,
22 John, and you can correct me, from the meetings that I've
23 been at, especially like the green -- when we were
24 deciding on the green building ordinance, developers
25 don't like parking reductions or they want the parking in

1 place because they think that's more marketable. So this
2 is not a developer's kind of incentive. They prefer to
3 have the parking they need to market their -- or to sell
4 their condominiums, if I'm...

5 **JOHN KEHO:** That's typically the case that the
6 developer wants to be able to market their buildings with
7 parking.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

9 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** But who said anything about
10 parking reductions other than some of the speakers? This
11 doesn't envision parking reductions. It doesn't. It
12 envisions better parking management of the existing
13 spaces, but we're not reducing the standards, are we?

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** No, no, but they were -- I just -- I
15 heard these conceptual statements about reducing parking
16 is coming from the developers. In actuality, that's not
17 one of their preferences.

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** That's what the speakers are
19 saying.

20 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** No, no, if I can jump in, I
21 actually said that, too, because we haven't gotten to the
22 zoning rewrite yet. This is directional, this General
23 Plan, and when we start doing the zoning rewrite, that's
24 when we'll be talking about the parking -- number of
25 parking spaces, if they're going to stay the same or

1 they're going to need more or they're going to decrease.

2 Is that true, John?

3 **JOHN KEHO:** That's correct because it talks about
4 the adequate number of parking spaces, and so adequate
5 number is always up for debate.

6 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** However, we need to be
7 careful what's in the General Plan because directionally
8 that will dictate -- I'm reading from this by unbundling
9 parking spaces, potentially there could be a case trying
10 to be made at that point when we do the zoning rewrite to
11 reduce their parking requirement, but I'm jumping ahead.

12 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I'm not reading -- I'm not
13 understanding that at all, and I agree with Jeanne. I
14 didn't understand what unbundling was when I started this
15 process, but now I do because I listened. And I would
16 suggest that the people that don't understand it do
17 listen or that we offer a special little hour's worth of
18 discussion informally for anybody that wants to
19 understand any concept that isn't thoroughly
20 understandable by them.

21 And unbundling does not mean the developers get
22 something they don't have now. Unbundling does not mean
23 we have reduced our parking standards. Unbundling means
24 hopefully we have a tool to better manage our parking,
25 and when the public says, "We want more parking," this is

1 true. We need as much parking as we can get, but if we
2 can also figure out how to better manage the parking that
3 we have and that we will get, this is also a wonderful
4 thing.

5 Is it doable for sure? No. Is it possible? Yes.
6 So let's explore the possible and not decry and say that
7 nothing is possible.

8 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Well, that's why it's in the
9 General Plan because we are a forward-thinking city. It
10 is definitely an approach. It should be in the General
11 Plan. However, I totally understand what the concept is.
12 You and I perhaps have a differing opinion of the
13 execution when we get to the General Plan. Maybe it is
14 part of management, but it also could -- somebody could
15 make a case that you need less parking.

16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** If I could just chime in, I
17 think it's obvious that the ultimate goal is to reduce
18 the number of cars, and any ideas or any creative ways of
19 trying to do that, I think, are laudable. No matter
20 whether we think it may or may not work, it's certainly
21 is doable, and I think moving into this next century and
22 the next 100 years -- I mean 100 years ago, who would've
23 thought we'd be having these discussions? You know, we
24 had horses in the barn. So this is -- who knows what's

25

1 going to be going on 100 years from now. Maybe we'll
2 talk about skyway parking lots. I don't know.

3 Another thing that is clear to me, being of the
4 older generation, is that the younger generation, meaning
5 anybody between, I would say, 50 and 20 and younger, is
6 much more concerned about all kinds of recycling, all
7 kinds of less car use, all kinds of use of mass transit.

8 So there are generations coming up now who have a
9 different approach to the world and approach to living
10 that my generation and older generations have about our
11 attachment to cars, and I think it's really exciting to
12 see.

13 So as much as I would -- I would not probably
14 participate in these things -- I certainly am not going
15 to ride a bicycle -- I think it's great what's in the
16 General Plan, and I want us to continue to look forward
17 and be able to make this city viable for everybody.

18 And I also really want to say -- I know this isn't
19 really wrap-up, but thank you guys so much. I'm looking
20 at Bianca and John thinking how in the (expletive) do you
21 guys concentrate the way you do. It's amazing. And the
22 rest of the Staff that's here, I really appreciate the
23 work that you're doing. It's just amazing. Thank you.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, with that, so it sounds like
25 we've sort of wrapped up the discussion for the time

1 being on these topics, and I think you guys have the
2 information you need to put the materials together for
3 our next meeting.

4 So with that, I'll move to the next agenda item.

5 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So will the next meeting
6 just be a consent calendar?

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** No.

8 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** It's a valid question.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** John, before we move on, do you want
10 to give us sort of how you at this point envision how the
11 next meeting is going to take place?

12 **JOHN KEHO:** Well, I guess just right off the top, I
13 guess I'm thinking we'll be preparing a set of
14 resolutions that are going to have all the amendments
15 that we've heard and the language, and so the goal would
16 be for everyone to -- for us to go through that
17 resolution with the amendments and make sure we agree on
18 all those amendments that we're going to be forwarding on
19 to Council.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** And considering this is Thursday and I
21 believe City Hall's closed tomorrow, when would we
22 possibly get these that we all have enough...

23 **JOHN KEHO:** We'll get them to you as soon as we can.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** ... time to review these documents?
25

1 **JOHN KEHO:** Hopefully, we can get it to you -- we're
2 going to aim for Tuesday.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein is saying stay
4 late tonight, and let's plow through the work.

5 **JOHN KEHO:** Going to aim for Tuesday evening.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So you'll be bringing these
7 resolutions, and we'll go through -- I'm assuming they're
8 going to be in parts by chapters, or are you looking for
9 one big..

10 **JOHN KEHO:** If you want to move it to the consent
11 agenda, that would be fine. Probably you'll want to talk
12 about it.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right.

14 **JOHN KEHO:** As assistant city attorney is saying, we
15 haven't closed the public hearing yet.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. Great.

17 Okay, so we have no new business, no unfinished
18 business, no excluded consent calendars. Items from
19 Staff?

20 **JOHN KEHO:** I just wanted to let everyone know that
21 there is an upcoming state APA conference at the
22 beginning of November, so if you're interested, let me
23 know, and we can sign you up for that state conference.

24 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Where is it being held?
25

1 **JOHN KEHO:** Anne, do you know where the -- where is
2 the state conference?

3 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** It's in La Costa near San Diego in
4 November 1st through 4th. It's a Monday through Thursday
5 this time because Sunday is Halloween, so they're
6 starting on a Monday.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right. Anything else,
8 John?

9 **JOHN KEHO:** That's it.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. I have public comment.
11 These are items not pertaining to the General Plan. And
12 I'll start with Victor Omelczenko, followed by Elyse.

13 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** He's gone.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Victor's right there.

15 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** Oh, I'm sorry. I thought that you
16 left. Sorry, Victor.

17 **VICTOR OMELCHENKO:** That's okay. Victor Omelczenko,
18 City of West Hollywood.

19 I remember going to a City Council meeting when they
20 were deliberating a project that you had approved. It
21 was the 9040 Sunset Boulevard project at the corner of
22 Sunset Boulevard and Doheny, designed by a famous
23 architect. I think his name was Moss, and it was going
24 to be a hotel and some condos, and there were concerns
25 there. And the City Council continued that meeting to

1 its next regular meeting. And I had spoken and so had
2 the public.

3 If I remember correctly, the Staff presented, and
4 then the public comments came, and then there were
5 deliberations, and the City Council continued the meeting
6 to their next meeting.

7 And at that next meeting, Staff presented some new
8 information and then public comment period opened, and
9 then the City Council deliberated.

10 So I'm a little -- I'm concerned about the process
11 as it was held here today. I know that there's the usual
12 suspects that come and speak, like me, but there were a
13 lot of other people who submitted those orange slips to
14 talk and probably to inform the discussion.

15 You may have heard from them things that you hadn't
16 thought about before, and I think that probably would've
17 helped you in your deliberations.

18 So I would just like suggest that maybe at the next
19 meeting -- like today, it would've been wonderful after
20 Bianca's fine presentation on those three topics to let
21 the public, who was here early, to make their comments,
22 and then afterwards, you would've had that input and you
23 would've had more information from us.

24 So maybe that could be the process that's used at
25 the next meeting that's coming forward.

1 So thanks for listening, and thanks for being here,
2 and I wish that you could've heard from all of those
3 other members of the public who did submit slips but just
4 got wearied and tired out. Thank you.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Elyse?

6 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** Elyse Eisenberg, West Hollywood,
7 and I'm calm now. Sorry for my outburst before.

8 I do want to just comment on something you said,
9 Commissioner Yeber. I do think developers are looking
10 [way] to reduce parking requirements. We had a project
11 in our neighborhood that we appealed, as Commissioner
12 Altschul knows, and the policies where they're saying
13 they're going to take the pressure off of the
14 neighborhood, we had our neighborhood change so that we
15 had a three-story 35-foot height thinking that we had
16 accomplished what we had set out to do, but in fact, the
17 developer came in and used SB1818, which we hadn't
18 considered, or unfortunately, everyone kind of learns
19 after it's too late, and by doing that, the developer was
20 also able to eliminate two guest parking spaces. He
21 actually put in the building, which was about 20 -- or
22 40,000 square feet less than the previous designed
23 building and had -- or, excuse me, greater than the
24 previously designed building but actually had five spaces
25 less in the building and eliminated a level of parking.

1 And, in fact, last week at the meeting, Commissioner
2 Hamaker commented that a lot of developers are
3 discouraged by building in a lot of areas because of the
4 cost of parking, which is the most expensive component of
5 any development.

6 So we also have an issue in this city with compact
7 and tandem spots, both tandem certainly in many of the
8 residential. Like Jeanne, I also have a tandem spot in
9 my building, and I would certainly not rent out my second
10 space, but even in commercial properties, we have a
11 tremendous problem with compact spots.

12 I've brought up in the past the Millennium building
13 as an example. SUVs don't seem to care where they park.
14 They will park anywhere, and I've taken many, many
15 photos, which I have not yet put into a little montage
16 for the city, which someday I will do, of SUVs parked
17 over the lines and in compact spots and all of the empty
18 spots in between.

19 So in thinking about parking, not only is the public
20 absolutely requesting parking garages scattered
21 throughout the city -- whether or not they would like to
22 pay a competitive rate for it is another issue, but they
23 are asking for more parking spaces, not ways to share
24 parking for like two or three businesses and things like
25 that. The public doesn't want that. They're a little

1 more realistic about the needs for physical spaces. We
2 need to find ways to create it through, I would suggest,
3 municipal garages.

4 And one last thing I would like to point out in
5 terms of park -- you talked about that tonight -- the
6 Quimby Act of the State of California recommends three
7 acres of green space per 1,000 residences. We only have
8 a quarter of an acre per our 1,000 residences, and it
9 would be nice if we mandated or had a serious attempt to
10 get up to a half an acre or approach an acre for our
11 citizens. Thank you.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

13 Okay, comments from Commissioners? Commissioner
14 Hamaker?

15 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah, I would just like to
16 comment again on the readability of this General Plan
17 document. Who -- I'm looking at the acknowledgements
18 page. Who is responsible for the design of this
19 document? It's probably used in other General Plans, but
20 Bianca, did you -- are you responsible? John, are you
21 responsible?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** It's a collaboration of us.

23 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** It's really lovely. It's a
24 pleasure to look at. The maps are gorgeous. It's

25

1 really, really, really nice, and I really appreciate it.
2 Thank you.

3 **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** It's actually unique. We
4 don't use it -- it was designed for this city.

5 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, I wondered if there was
6 sort of like a boilerplate for every -- okay, it's really
7 a pleasure. Thank you.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

9 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Yeah, I just -- for years
10 when I was younger, I worked as a TV writer, and I can
11 remember going before the network and just how not fun it
12 was to hear why your baby was not attractive. And so I
13 just want to thank Bianca and everyone from Staff who's
14 involved in crafting the plan.

15 Clearly, what we did tonight was look at an
16 aspirational document and tried to see what our
17 aspirations were, but it would make me feel remiss if we
18 didn't -- I didn't acknowledge how much good stuff there
19 is in here, how much hard work went in, and I don't
20 imagine it's fun to have it picked apart for four hours,
21 and I want to end on an upbeat note, so thank you very
22 much.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

24 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I just want to point out
25 that there are obviously concepts in this General Plan

1 that are new, that are innovative, that are progressive,
2 that are forward that we haven't heard before, and the
3 general tendency that a lot of us have is if we don't
4 know what it is, say no. And many of us tend to be the
5 chairman of the No on Yes committees, and we need to get
6 over that. This is a wonderful opportunity to expand our
7 vistas and to learn new concepts.

8 If I were to have been chosen to choose the name for
9 unbundled parking, I might not have chosen unbundled. I
10 don't know what I would've chosen, but when you un-
11 anything, you seem like you're getting less. But that
12 isn't what it is. It's better management.

13 So let's try to comprehend what it is that's being
14 proposed here. Let's try to use the tools that are being
15 presented to us by these wonderful young people who have
16 studied, who have taken courses, who have gotten an
17 education, who by their experience and by their exposure
18 to other venues and other jurisdictions brought forward
19 something to us that we can make something out of that's
20 potentially fantastic and enjoy it and appreciate it and
21 not stomp our feet and raise our voices and just say no.
22 Let us at least just say maybe.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, John. Commissioner
24 DeLuccio?

25

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I think they're all just
2 placeholders in the General Plan and we should be open,
3 and I think we have some wonderful concepts that we've
4 introduced and we've put in there, and so I think John
5 Altschul and I are on the same page. We just take it
6 from different angles.

7 I am a little bit disappointed this evening that we
8 did not get to hear from the 30-odd speakers that came
9 out. I think we had more speakers this evening than last
10 week, and what we used to do was if topics were
11 introduced, we would give the option to the public if
12 they wanted to comment at that time or they wanted to
13 wait until the end. You couldn't comment twice, but you
14 would have an opportunity to comment early on or to wait.
15 So I just wanted to throw that out as a suggestion for
16 the future.

17 Maybe next week those folks will return and
18 hopefully we will have an opportunity to hear them early
19 on because until we do, until we hear from everybody, I
20 just cannot go forward and make my recommendation to City
21 Council. I just wanted to put that out there.

22 And one other thing. Acknowledgements in the
23 General Plan, when we do finalize it, let's acknowledge
24 Paul Arevalo, our City Manager. His name's not in it.

25 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** We'll have to convince him of that.

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I know he's shy. I
2 understand he's totally shy about that, but he
3 definitely, definitely should...

4 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** We'll make a note.

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

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

7 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I think we have heard from
8 the public. I think we've heard from the public during a
9 telephone survey, during numerous meetings, during GPAC
10 meetings, during this whole process, and I think that we
11 had approximately the same number of speaker slips as the
12 first go-around.

13 So those people left because it got late, but
14 really, our meeting started at six and we've only been
15 going for about four-and-a-half hours, which is not a
16 marathon meeting by our standards.

17 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I know, but still I feel bad
18 they didn't have an opportunity to speak.

19 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Well, anyway, I would just
20 also like to thank my husband, who's watching at home.
21 [Aaron], thank you for putting up with our meeting, and
22 I'll be home in five to 10 minutes, and if I could have a
23 turkey sandwich, that'd be great.

24 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** And my husband went to
25 sleep.

1 **CHAIR YEBER:** Can I place an order, also?

2 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** Chair Yeber? Could I -- I know that
3 Staff already had our chance to speak, but I wasn't at
4 the table.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Please.

6 **ANNE MCINTOSH:** I just would like to let you know
7 that what we were considering tonight in terms of the
8 format, we really wanted to give the Commission an
9 opportunity for you to have your chance. This really is
10 your big role as a planning commission as it is with any
11 planning commission in the state.

12 This is your document to review and recommend, and
13 our feeling was that if you spent the first part of your
14 meeting on another 30 speakers from the public that you
15 wouldn't have had the energy then to have the discussion
16 you had tonight. So we did decide of your three meetings
17 for this one to have the public speak at the end so that
18 you would have that time as Commissioners because we do
19 value your input and we want it to come while you're
20 fresh and you have clarity.

21 So that was done intentionally, and we agree that
22 next week there should be some final documents. People
23 can make some additional comments, and you'll have
24 another chance to sort of finalize any of your input.

25 But I wanted you to know that we did this because we

1 do value you as a commission and as our representatives
2 on planning issues.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. I appreciate that.

4 And I just wanted to make some clarifications.
5 There were quite a few people in the audience. I only
6 got 16 -- 15, 16 speaker slips, and of that, seven spoke.
7 So it wasn't a big difference. We certainly -- and we
8 only had 15 or 16 speak on the first night.

9 And I know someone made some comparison between us
10 and an item that came before Council, and the difference
11 between what occurred last week and this week is we
12 actually didn't get to deliberate until tonight. What we
13 did is we did some organizational things on the first
14 meeting and then knew that tonight we needed to
15 deliberate.

16 So in actuality, like Ms. McIntosh had mentioned, we
17 needed an opportunity to go and work through these issues
18 that we knew would be contentious and then hear
19 additional comments from the public. And I wish we were
20 able to hear more comments and I hope more people will
21 come back to the third meeting, which obviously will be a
22 different format, and if you want to know how that will
23 be handled in terms of the agenda, please contact
24 Planning Staff.

25

1 I also want to thank once again Planning Staff for
2 handling those issues and helping us work through them in
3 a kind of hopefully cohesive, understandable way so that
4 now we have a document that I think we all feel
5 comfortable about when we look at for -- hopefully
6 recommendation to the Council. So, again, thank you very
7 much. And with that, if there's no other comments?

8 So the next...

9 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Marc, if I could just say one
10 thing. John got me to thinking about another name for
11 unbundled parking -- liberated parking, separated
12 parking, or divorced parking. That's as much as my brain
13 could do.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Do that with what you will.

15 All right. So with that, the hearing remains open,
16 and we will continue this to our next meeting, which will
17 be next Thursday, September 30 at six o'clock in this
18 auditorium.

19 I look forward to seeing you all and everybody else
20 who's watching, if you're still watching. Good night.
21 Thank you.

22 [Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.]

23 -o0o-

24

25

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

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25


CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:


COMMISSION SECRETARY