approve the agenda tonight?

1 CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION 2 THURSDAY, AUGUST 19, 2010 AT 6:30 PM 3 4 CHAIR YEBER: All right. We're going to start the 5 meeting tonight, August 19, 2010, and I'd like Richard 6 Maggio to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. 7 RICHARD MAGGIO: (Pledge of Allegiance) 8 CHAIR YEBER: David, can I have a roll call? 9 DAVID GILLIG: Good evening. Commissioner DeLuccio? 10 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Here. 11 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker? 12 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Here. 13 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner? 14 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Here. 15 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Bernstein? 16 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Here. 17 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Altschul? 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Here. 19 **DAVID GILLIG:** Vice-Chair Guardarrama? 20 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Here. 21 **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber? 22 CHAIR YEBER: Here. 23 DAVID GILLIG: And we have a quorum. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Do I have a motion to

1 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll make a motion. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: 2 Second. 3 **COMMISSIONER YEBER:** All in favor, say aye. 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER YEBER: Any opposed? Seeing none, the 6 agenda is approved. We have no minutes. 7 We'll move on to public comment. I have two 8 speakers, starting with Steve Martin, followed by Jeanne 9 Dobrin. 10 STEVE MARTIN: Fortunately I don't have to follow 11 Jeanne Dobrin. Steve Martin, West Hollywood. 12 A lot of people have probably noticed that there's a 13 number of petition gatherers out soliciting signatures 14 for a petition to create a billboard tax in West Hollywood, which of course, sounds great because it's 15 16 being pitched as something that's going to open up a lot 17 of revenue for the City for law enforcement, social 18 services, and a chicken in every pot. 19 What isn't being made clear is this initiative will 20 allow tall walls to be put all over the city. Currently, 21 those tall walls are restricted to Sunset Strip, which 22 there seems to be a community consensus that that's 23 appropriate. 24 What this will do is will create a whole lot of 25 pressures to put seven and 10-story buildings on Santa

Monica Boulevard because of the huge amount of revenue these tall walls generate, and it's really -- I think we're trading something that probably is not going to be worth it in the long run.

I also have concerns that the tax is not even legal.

I had proposed a tax for the City of West Hollywood

approximately 15 years ago, and I was told by the city

attorney that the City could not tax the billboards

because that had been preempted by the State of

California so only the State could do that, so we were

restricted in that way.

So what I'm really concerned about this is that this initiative [will] get on the ballot, it will pass, the courts will rule that we don't get the tax because it's not legal, but we will be stuck with the only thing that we probably don't want, which is going to be the tall walls on Santa Monica and Beverly and Melrose.

So I urge people to read it. You know, there's no free lunch, and people should be careful about what they sign. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Steve.

Jeanne Dobrin, and happy belated birthday.

JEANNE DOBRIN: Thank you. Oh, it isn't belated. It isn't till Monday.

CHAIR YEBER: Oh, okay. Well, happy birthday in

advance.

JEANNE DOBRIN: But the City Council has said that Monday, August 23 is Jeanne Dobrin Day, and I have a big thing to prove it.

CHAIR YEBER: Congratulations.

**JEANNE DOBRIN:** And it's framed, too.

Anyhow, Jeanne Dobrin, a resident in West Hollywood.

I believe that on tonight's agenda, and I'm not going to talk about the project, is probably the first major project that has come before the Planning Commission for which there is no draft EIR to be discussed among the planning commissioners or to take comments from the public.

The reason given by the staff, I believe, is that it's not mandated by CEQA. That's a big joke as far as I'm concerned because the City of West Hollywood prides itself on the fact that they take initiative and they do things that are not mandated and they make the world a better place.

If the draft EIR cannot be discussed among the commissioners listening to each other's responses to it, that's a shame, and it also is almost tragic that the public is not allowed to comment on the draft EIR. The worst thing is that the Planning Commission tonight is being asked to certify the draft EIR.

Now, I don't know how many minutes is going to be given to the speakers tonight. Usually the Planning Commission two minutes -- three minutes for the speakers and at the chair's and the Commission's purview, they can lengthen that time or shorten it, but when many, many, many, many people show up, they have the right to shorten it to two minutes.

I contend that any discussion by the public and amongst the commissioners themselves lacking the fact that they have never discussed the EIR and it has to be certified tonight, as I said, is a tragedy, and I believe that this should be overcome. I think there's nobody in this room can challenge me and say that the City of West Hollywood is not a person -- an entity that is the forerunner in doing good government, and that's what we should pride ourselves on. I would like that to be overturned.

If the reason the staff doesn't want to do that is they don't have enough planners, then we should hire some more planners, and if that's too expensive in this economic crisis, although our city is in very, very good financial condition, then they should bill the applicants for the added cost. I hope that most of the people -- in fact, all of the people in this room -- agree with me.

Don't forget; you have to certify the EIR tonight,

and you will not have heard practically anything or discussed it amongst yourselves. Thank you very much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Jeanne.

We move to items from commissioners. So if commissioners would like to speak on any item, including memorances of our dear friend John Chase, I invite you all to do that. So who would like to go first?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I will.

CHAIR YEBER: John?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I'm going to make a few comments about John Chase, whom I was very, very fortunate to consider and to be called his friend.

About 14 or 15 years ago, when I first became involved in the process of planning in West Hollywood, John Chase arrived on the scene at about the same time. And there was a class that was given -- I don't remember whether it was [SEQUA] or Planning 1A -- but it was given at a hotel in La Mirada, and it was suggested by the then-director Ray Reynolds that John Chase and I drive together for economy of gas. So we did, and we got to know each other because traffic was slow.

And when we got to La Mirada, we discovered that the hotel was directly across the street from the La Mirada Performing Arts Center, which neither of us had seen, and the exterior looked very inviting, and we thought, "Let's

try."

So at the lunch break, we talked our way into it and we walked all around it, and we walked all the way through the inside, and I had about an hour's worth of delight listening to the description of what he saw and appreciating the architecture and the look of that building through his eyes and his mouth, and it was an experience that I -- 14, 15 years ago, that I will never forget.

There are a lot of things I will never forget, but along with some of the most wonderful and delightful were the five or so years that I spent on the Design Review Committee -- Subcommittee and John Chase, of course, went to all of those meetings, and not only listening to him in his own special language at those meetings describing projects that were wonderful and describing projects that really weren't in a way so as not to be offensive to the people that brought them forward was a delight.

And then after every single one of those meetings, we would go to dinner at Pomadoro. We had three Johns and a Joe, and I'll never forget those, and I'll always cherish them. Thank you very much, John.

His books -- his bibliography is huge, and I would hope that the City would do something to honor his memory by taking his big bibliography and doing something with

it for the benefit of the City and the entire public in general, perhaps something with respect to the new library. Maybe a subcommittee or some kind of a group could be formed in order to help that direction along.

Thanks so much, John.

CHAIR YEBER: Sue?

commissioner buckner: Thank you. I've been serving on the Design Review Committee, and John took me under his wing and gave me a few lessons getting me prepared to actually be on that committee, and he was so delightful and so caring and patient. His patience was amazing.

And he -- extremely knowledgeable. His language is -- was so beautiful. The way he would describe things, it was almost -- you could visualize exactly what he was saying when he described a building or particular area of building. It was so helpful to have him participate.

And I do remember last Thursday when -- well, the last meeting, which was already two weeks ago, that he looked so wonderful. His eyes were so bright. I was totally shocked to hear what had happened, and he will be missed in so many ways personally and professionally, and I do hope that people will come to the memorial service that's going to be next Tuesday. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Alan?

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Marc, and thank

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you, John and Sue. Everything you said is just right, and I sat next to John in Design Review for the last two years, and I just find myself -- and I pride myself on being pragmatic and realistic, and I find myself unwilling to accept this loss, and I sense I'm not the only person in the community who simply finds this unacceptable and just so sad, and my heart breaks for Jonathan, his husband, and for his family. And if it's worth anything to anyone out there, I have been cross with myself because he, John, was just so extraordinarily wise and perceptive, and I sat next to him, and now I feel like I should have been greedier. I should've asked him more questions. I should've listened more voraciously because we have all lost just an extraordinary talent and perspective, and it is devastating, and we will all miss him greatly.

CHAIR YEBER: Donald?

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yeah, I was devastated to hear about the passing of John. I remember two weeks ago he was sitting over there, and this evening, we will be - our hearing will be his last project, I guess, that he worked on, his last major project. And I've been on this commission since 1997, if you can believe that, and in the beginning, he was a mentor. I was on his Design Review Subcommittee for like five years right in the

beginning, and the committee was a lot more intimate back then than it is now, and we used to meet on a Thursday morning, and I learned so much from him.

And besides that, he is -- he was such a wonderful person, both as a professional and on a personal level.

And just reading the staff reports for the major projects and the way he describes the projects, it's just -- and then some of those projects actually have gotten built.

So even though John is not with us anymore, some of the projects that actually got built are that we go and we visit in the city, then we should be thinking of John. I know I will, and he's actually left the city in a better position today for all that he's given us in terms of architect and also -- and we'll also remember him for what a wonderful person he is.

CHAIR YEBER: Barbara?

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Well, I wasn't going to say anything because I thought I would cry, but I'm going to try and stay happy.

I really loved John, and since his passing, I realize everybody else did, too, everybody. I also always thought he was about 12 years old, so when you look at that photograph, it's hard to imagine that he has passed because he was so young and he was so in his prime.

He was everything everybody said. He was perfect.

He had a fantastic sense of humor. He loved to gossip.

He could be incredibly brilliant and professional. He

had a vocabulary that was unbelievable. He knew the city

backwards and forwards. Everyone I have talked to since

his passing knows him as he has touched their lives, each

of us, in our own individual way.

So he's -- I think we should have a chair over there for him in case he wants to drop by at the meetings, but he could leave any time because I know he got bored really fast. So I know he's here. I just know here's here, and thank you, John. Love you.

## CHAIR YEBER: Joe?

COMMISSIONER GUARDARRAMA: I first met John Chase when I came on the Commission in 2003, and he was really fantastic because I knew a lot about law and I knew a lot about government and process, but I didn't know anything about architecture. And he taught me how to look at a building, and he let me have my own opinions, which I thought was pretty fantastic, and he authored some fantastic books.

And I brought some of them today if any members of the public want to come look at them at a break. This one's called *LA 2000+: New Architecture in Los Angeles*. It's a pretty recent book. But my favorite book of John

Chase's was -- or is Exterior Decoration, and it's all about this area, in particular, and the Hollywood Regency style of architecture, but particularly, it's about the interior designers and the set designers that lived in this area and decided to just refurbish the street façade of their homes. And so you have mansard roofs and Pullman doors on the front and you have a clapboard style house on the back.

And these designers really changed the way West

Hollywood looked and the way -- basically the way that

Los Angelinos, in general, thought about what their homes

should look like, and he really documented that.

And I hope that that part of our history isn't forgotten, and I really think that John Chase is going to be a big part of making sure that that's remembered, and I really thank him for that.

CHAIR YEBER: So my experience with John with the city started when I was on Historic Preservation nearly eight years ago, but it also happened on a professional level. He and I were both part of AIA, and so we participated in different events through AIA and through the LA Forum, and I grew to have an enormous respect for him.

I had a lot of thoughts -- there's so much to say about John that I had to write a few of them down so that

I wouldn't forget tonight.

Not only was West Hollywood fortunate to have one of the few insightful and experienced urban designers in Southern California, but we had the advantage of having the most talented and eloquent advocate for design that consisted of clarity in language and in energy and function.

His insight in the city's urban design and compatibility issues were largely due to the fact that he understood the city inside and out. This is where he lived. This is where he worked. This is where he played. This was John's community on various levels.

Whatever side you stand on on the issue of development, when the design is successful, it becomes an engine that keeps our city culturally significant and socially relevant.

Development's not always perfect, but West Hollywood mostly got it right, and it was largely due to the efforts of John Chase, our urban designer. He not only demonstrated an undeniable enthusiasm for prodigious and unconventional design but took great pleasure in staunchly advocating for everyday and simple construction.

I'm saddened that this voice for compelling architecture and unifying urban design throughout

1 Southern California has been silenced. His wisdom, his wit, his debonair style will be enormously missed. 2 3 with that, I would like to adjourn in his memory. 4 Any other items from staff -- I mean from -- go 5 ahead. 6 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I don't know if my children 7 are still watching or not, but if they are, I just want 8 to say hello to [Isaac] and [Natalie] and [Naomi], who 9 are often watching, and wish them a good night, and I'd 10 like to welcome one of our newer members of the West 11 Hollywood community, our new au pair, [Svenya], who 12 arrived from Germany this week and will be here for the 13 year. 14 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Any other items? 15 have one consent item. Do we have a motion to --16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I move the consent item. 17 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Second. 18 CHAIR YEBER: It's been moved and seconded. All in 19 favor, say aye. 20 ALL COMMISSIONERS: Aye. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Anybody opposed? Seeing none, the 22 consent calendar has been approved. 23 Public hearings. Item A, I understand, has been 24 withdrawn? 25 ANNE MCINTOSH: The item was withdrawn.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. This is 8600 Sunset Boulevard. 2 It was withdrawn by the applicant? 3 ANNE MCINTOSH: It was just the tract map ... 4 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 5 ANNE MCINTOSH: ... at the site. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Item B is demolition permit and 7 development permit, and I see here that it's being 8 continued. 9 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: To a date certain. 10 CHAIR YEBER: To a date certain. 11 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** What is that date? November 12 14, November 4? 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I think it's November 4. 14 ANNE MCINTOSH: Yes, you're right, November 4. 15 We're recommending that you continue the item to November 16 4. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Without objection, we will continue it 18 to November 4, you said? 19 ANNE MCINTOSH: Yes. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, 2010. 21 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: What is the address of that 22 project in case somebody's watching this? 23 CHAIR YEBER: That address is 7914 Norton Avenue. 24 Thank you, Donald. 25 Item C. This is 8497 through 8499 Sunset Boulevard.

Francisco, do you have a staff report?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Um-hmm.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Thank you, Chair, and good evening, commissioners. The proposal before you this evening is a request to demolish an existing 31-unit apartment complex for the construction of a mixed-use project.

Now, the project consists of 34 residential dwelling units, including 24 condominiums and 10 onsite affordable housing dwelling units and approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space divided between two tenant spaces. For now, they're envisioned as a restaurant and a retail tenant space.

As permitted by the Sunset Specific Plan, a new integrated billboard, standard billboard, is proposed in conjunction with the new development, as you can see there on the screen.

The project does provide 10 inclusionary housing units. This is actually double the amount of what's required for this project. This contribution to affordable housing makes the project eligible for a 35% FAR or density bonus. So although they do propose to utilize this 35% density bonus, they really don't seek any of the available concessions.

Also, this project is proposed to be a green project, and it will exceed the City's current 60-point green building requirement. It's actually a 90-point building. They will be requesting a green incentive,

which is an additional 0.1 FAR.

Now, this proposal does require certification of the final Environmental Impact Report, along with adoption of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. I would like to note that there is no Statement of Overriding Considerations for this project since all impacts have been mitigated to a level that is less than significant, and we will review some of those issues in a second.

Now, here is a snapshot, an aerial photograph, of the site area. It is located on the north side of Sunset Boulevard immediately west of Sunset Boulevard's intersection with North La Cienega Boulevard.

The northern hillside portion of the site lies within the City of LA, and the southern portion lies within the City of West Hollywood.

Now, if approved, the project will be conditioned to require that the applicant obtain any required planning and construction permits from the City of Los Angeles to the satisfaction of the community development director before this project can move forward.

Currently on the site, there's a three-story multi-

family residential dwelling unit. You can see it has some tuck-under parking. This will be demolished in order to construct the new -- the proposed project.

Now, there were four major concerns from nearby residents with regard to the proposed project. These were highlighted in the Environmental Impact Report and in some of the correspondence that we submitted to you today.

The four major concerns were both the size and the height of the proposed project; the location of the proposed driveway on Miller Drive versus somewhere farther east along the site; emergency vehicle access to Miller Drive during construction and operation; and just the overall impact of this project on the Sunset and La Cienega/Miller intersection.

So as I mentioned, these issues have been formally addressed in the EIR and our response to comments, as well, but I wanted just to highlight some of these for the Commission this evening.

So with regards to the height and size of the building, the project does meet all development standards for the site, including height and FAR. In fact, the 40-foot height of the building is less than what is permitted in the Sunset Specific Plan, which calls for a range of heights anywhere between 45 feet to up to 80

feet. The project is only 40 feet.

Because the building has been designed to conform to the contours of the hillside, it does break up the massing and the size of the building, and also, the building has been designed so as not to impair any of the site lines from the homes situated above on top of the hill, and I think this sort of cross section that's up on the screen kind of indicates that.

Now, Bob Cheung, the acting transportation manager, is here today, who will provide you with a summary of the transportation analysis that addresses those other three factors -- the location of the driveway and the overall improved operations at that intersection that will improve access for all vehicles, including emergency vehicles.

Bob?

BOB CHEUNG: Good evening, commissioners.

A traffic impact study was conducted as part of the EIR which identified one potential significant traffic impact at the intersection of Sunset, La Cienega, and Miller. The project's impact can be fully mitigated with the proposed improvement to re-stripe the northbound approach on La Cienega.

The proposed improvement would improve traffic operations at the intersection to a level better than

pre-project conditions.

What the technical analysis doesn't reflect is the improvement that would result from removal of the dozen or so carports that are currently -- that have access directly off of Sunset. Cars from the existing apartment are often backing out of their driveways and creating a hazardous condition on Sunset.

Staff is aware that there have been concerns regarding the location of the proposed project driveway located on the western edge of this site. At the start of the project, staff evaluated the feasibility of having a driveway on the eastern side near Pink Dot.

After careful consideration, staff determined that an eastern driveway would not be desirable for two reasons. First, the driveway would essentially add another approach to the intersection, making an awkward five-legged intersection. This would not only add more confusion to an already busy intersection but would require adding another phase to the traffic signal, which would take away green time from the other approaches and result in more delay to all vehicles, including motorists, on Miller Drive.

Second, the City does not promote signalization of private driveways.

As proposed, the project's western driveway is

located approximately 50 feet north of Sunset on Miller Drive, and the project's traffic is not expected to intrude into the residential neighborhood.

The project is providing more parking than what is required by code, so all project parking should be accommodated on site.

During the PM peak hour, which is typically the most congested period, the project is estimated to generate about one vehicle per minute, so concerns regarding traffic from the project backing up onto Miller Drive should not be an issue.

Staff is also aware that there are concerns regarding emergency access during and after construction. As mentioned earlier, the proposed project mitigation measure would actually improve traffic operations at the intersection to levels better than pre-project conditions. As such, the project would not adversely impact emergency access at the intersection.

Additionally, prior to construction, City would require the project to submit a construction management plan, where we would require full access to Miller Drive to be maintained at all times.

Tonight we have our EIR traffic consultant here along with staff to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Thank you, Bob.

So in order to continue, the Planning Commission

Design Review Subcommittee did review the proposed

project and was overwhelmingly supportive of the design.

The subcommittee commended the project on various aspects of its spectacular design, including that the project will be an iconic building, basically a landmark building, for this area of Sunset Boulevard. That was one of the more articulated projects seen by the subcommittee in a long time in that it would really fill in a gap in the pedestrian rim on this stretch of Sunset Boulevard.

A little bit more on the urban design analysis. I'm sort of, in the words of John Chase, the mixed use complex here -- note, I'm reading his words. This was written in the report. "The mixed use complex proposed here at 8497-8499 Sunset Boulevard is an extraordinary accomplished work of architecture and urban design, even within the context of the best buildings constructed to date in the 25 years of cityhood. It not only achieves key urban design goals of the Sunset Specific Plan in providing an active streetscape and landmark architecture, but it exemplifies these goals."

And there's further urban design analysis in your packet, and I won't go over all of those.

the draft EIR.

I would like to mention that the City of LA -- the Los Angeles Department of City Planning has provided the City with an authorization letter to process the entirety of the zoning entitlements, subsequent building permits, and associated code-related actions for the proposed project. This authorization letter is included as Exhibit E in your staff report, as well as Appendix B in

But just prior to tonight's hearing, we did receive a subsequent letter from the City of LA basically believing that they might want to retract that authorization letter so that they can provide further review of the project and its impacts on its -- on the neighbors in the City of LA. So that is in your packet.

So with that, I would like to end my presentation and allow Planning Commission to ask us any questions at this time. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, before we do that, let's have quick disclosures. Sue?

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Yes. I did meet with the applicant and applicant's representative early this week to go over again the design and over some issues that were raised in the report, the staff report.

I also discussed with them some of the objections that were raised in the letters that were attached to the

1 report and particularly with regard to safety and traffic 2 concerns. Basically, that's it. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Alan? 4 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Oh, excuse me. I'm also on 5 the Design Review Committee, so I had an opportunity to 6 review the design at that meeting. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Sue. Alan? 8 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I chatted with Mr. Seymour, 9 who's the applicant's representative, and we discussed 10 matters that are solely contained within the staff 11 report. 12 And you also are on the Design Review. CHAIR YEBER: 13 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yes. 14 CHAIR YEBER: John? 15 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: My disclosure is the same as 16 Alan's except I'm not on the Design Review. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Barbara? 18 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Yes, I met with the 19 applicant's representative at the site and walked the 20 site, specifically the tuck-under. I parked in the tuck-21 under parking and walked up and down not to the top of 22 Miller Drive but the area around it, and everything that 23 we discussed is contained in the staff report. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Donald? 25 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: My disclosure's the same as

24

25

1 Barbara's disclosure. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Joe? 3 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I met with the applicant 4 and the applicant's representative at the project site, and we walked it, looked at the models, and discussed 5 6 items that are in the staff report. 7 CHAIR YEBER: And I briefly had just a brief 8 discussion with the applicant's representative. I 9 actually walked the site on my own, drove up Miller Drive 10 just to understand the context in which the building 11 sits, and I also sit on Design Review. 12 So with that, we'll go to questions of staff, and 13 we'll start with Barbara. Do you have questions? 14 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Not at the moment. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Donald? 16 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Not at the moment. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Sue? 18 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Yes, I have a question with 19 regard to the traffic study. 20 Was there any consideration given to changing the --21 or making a left-turn lane coming off of Miller going 22 east onto Sunset similar so that there were two lanes and

then traffic coming to -- coming down La Cienega going

lanes coming off there that I think might facilitate -- I

south and the right lanes so there were actually two

1 don't know if there's enough room there at that 2 intersection. 3 Exactly, there's not enough room to... BOB CHEUNG: 4 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: There isn't enough room. 5 BOB CHEUNG: ... to widen this. It's 24 foot wide at 6 present, enough for two lanes. 7 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Not enough. 8 BOB CHEUNG: Not enough for extra lane. 9 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Okay. Thank you. 10 CHAIR YEBER: Alan? 11 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Sure. Francisco, two 12 questions. 13 I just want to confirm my understanding. An EIR was 14 prepared and we are not being asked tonight to adapt a 15 Statement of Overriding Consideration? 16 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct. All impacts have 17 been mitigated to a less-than-significant impact, to a 18 level of less than significance. 19 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: And the plan as designed is 20 in -- is within conformance with the Sunset Specific Plan 21 that was adapted 14, 15 years ago? 22 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. 23 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Okay. And can you just 24 clarify something? Council member Koretz's letter states 25 that the majority of the site is located in the City of

Los Angeles. Is that correct?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: We were looking at that just before the hearing, and I think we would probably argue that if at all, maybe half or perhaps maybe even the majority of it is actually in the City of West Hollywood.

I'll just show you a -- well, it's hard to read in this drawing, but this little line here is basically the line that marks off the City of LA's portion from the City of West Hollywood. And so because it's also sort of in a very steep hillside, it's a little bit hard to tell just visually.

We'd actually have to probably go into the assessor parcel information to figure out the exact measurements. We can take a look in our plans to see if we have that information available, and I can get back to you.

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: It's actually on the tract map. If you look at the tract map that we all have, it will show the boundaries.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Okay, excellent.

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: And then, Christi, either now or whenever you think it's appropriate, can you give us a little bit of clarity on the significance of the letter that the City of Los Angeles gave and what, if any, meaning it has that they're consider revoking it,

but if I understand it correctly, they've not taken action yet.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Commission.

I'm going to do a classic lawyer move. I'm just going to answer the question I wish you'd asked instead of the one you just asked because the legalities or internal issues in terms of how LA is going to handle its side of the equation is really outside of our concern.

Here's our issue. We have full land use authority over all of the property that's in the City of West Hollywood, and if the property owner has a parcel, and it's unusual, that straddles both cities, then the property owner's going to have to figure out how it gets all of the approvals that it needs to build.

So anything that you do tonight, Los Angeles still has whatever land use control Los Angeles has, and the property owner will ultimately have to deal with that.

So if you go ahead and approve this project, obviously it would be conditioned on the property owner also getting permission from LA, and I think that's, from my point of view, easier than trying to figure out what it means to cede your jurisdiction or to give it back or whatever.

**COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I think you answered the question I meant to ask, so thank you very much.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I just have one question. 2 Why would we have to condition it on the applicant 3 getting approval from LA? Isn't that up to LA to do 4 that? If we approve it, they've given us the authority 5 to approve it, to do the EIR, everything that was done in

the City of West Hollywood, why do we have to condition 6

7 our approval based on that?

CHRISTI HOGIN: This is like the advanced land use That's a good question, and in the highest class. theoretical sense, we wouldn't because it is what it is, the law is what it is, but another very important part of land use law is to give notice to everybody who's involved.

And so it's important for, I think, the City to notify the property owner that we understand that part of this parcel does sit in the City of Los Angeles and that we don't intend to step on Los Angeles's toes either in this process and that we are keeping our exercise of jurisdiction within our city limits.

So I mean you're being presented with a project that in fact is only partially in the city. You can't really just look at part of the project; you're going to have to look at the whole. So we're going to look at all the impacts, everything that it does to our -- the area, which includes actually outside the city, the traffic,

2.1

all of that, and then we'll communicate to the property owner this is either okay with us or it's not, but if it is, you still need to -- we want you to know that you still need to go to LA.

It's not going to change their obligation, but the notice, I think, is important. We have a lot of conditions that sort of restate what's already the law.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, John?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Francisco, there have been a couple of communications today from members of the public, last-minute communications, which I think the people that sent them have been involved in the process for quite a long time, and I think it's rather burdensome, but I've said this before, of people to come in at the last minute and expect their opinions to be evaluated, responded to, and taken into consideration.

But has there been anything submitted either today or in the last couple of days, at the 11th hour, that you feel has not been adequately addressed or responded to in the staff report?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: I believe that most, if not all, of those items in the last-minute correspondence submitted are issues that have already been addressed either in the draft EIR or in our responses to comments in the final EIR or addressed in the staff report.

1 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: At some point, could you 2 kind of make a list of those things that you feel have 3 not been analyzed and you have not had time to address or 4 analyze in the staff report so that we can figure out 5 whether or not we would -- what we would want to do with 6 those? 7 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Also, I thought that I saw 9 Jeff Skorneck here. Is he? 10 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Yeah. 11 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Perhaps, Francisco, might we 12 have a report from him as part of the staff report as to 13 the situation with the tenants in the current structure? 14 JEFF SKORNECK: Yes, the tenants in the current 15 structure --16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Name, rank, and serial 17 number. 18 JEFF SKORNECK: Oh, Jeff Skorneck. I'm the housing 19 manager for the City of West Hollywood. 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 21 JEFF SKORNECK: The tenants in the existing 22 structure would need to be relocated under the Ellis Act 23 and as the building is taken out of service. 24 I'm not sure whether that process has started or

not, but I believe it has not yet started. So all the

25

tenants would have four months minimum, and any tenants in certain special categories would get the opportunity 2 3 to extend their time in the building for another eight 4 months, making it a year. 5 Typically, building owners find it to their advantage if they have any tenants staying a year to let 6 7 all of them stay a year. 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: To your knowledge, is the 9 building fully occupied, or is it partially occupied? 10 JEFF SKORNECK: I don't know the extent to which 11 it's occupied, but I believe it is not fully occupied. 12 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Perhaps then the applicant 13 can address those questions that are pending regarding 14 the tenants. Thanks, Jeff. 15 JEFF SKORNECK: One thing I might add, though, is 16 that any low or moderate-income tenants who are displaced 17 from this project get a first priority for any 18 inclusionary units that become available in the city. 19 They also have the first right of refusal to go back to 20 this project and occupy one of the affordable units upon project completion. 21 22 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Good. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Jeff, there's a couple more questions. 24 Joe?

I was hoping that you

Yes.

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:

2.1

could address the issue of the inclusionary housing. It seems to me that the applicant has proposed more than they were supposed to have under the code, and it seems they've also gathered them together. And if you could address those two issues.

JEFF SKORNECK: Yes. The zoning ordinance is a little bit ambiguous as to how many units need to be provided. This developer has elected not to make the affordable units different from the market rate units so they're providing units that are 650 square feet minimum. However, they are providing more than the minimum number of units, and so in consideration of that and on balance with other factors, we believe that the -- we're better off having 10 smaller units than five large units that would really not fit the needs of the people on our waiting list.

CHAIR YEBER: Donald?

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have a couple of questions. So isn't it determined in the zoning ordinance that they would need five units?

JEFF SKORNECK: They'd need five units if they were of equal quality and size in all respects to the market rate units.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, and they're proposing 10, and these would be apartments or condo units?

1 **JEFF SKORNECK:** I believe they're designated as 2 apartments, and I think that's generally the preference 3 of the City. 4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, thank you. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Jeff, I have a quick question. 6 I'm assuming, but I may be incorrect, that the 7 portion of units that are in LA don't necessarily fall 8 under our requirements for displacement, or actually, 9 it's a state requirement, right, that when you displace 10 someone from an existing project? Does City of West 11 Hollywood and Los Angeles fall under the same guidelines, 12 or are ours even more stricter? And then how do they ... 13 JEFF SKORNECK: I'm going to need to defer to Ms. 14 Hogin on that. 15 ANNE MCINTOSH: We don't know. 16 **CHAIR YEBER:** You don't know? 17 ANNE MCINTOSH: The laws of LA. 18 CHAIR YEBER: All right. Any other questions for 19 Jeff's? All right. Any other questions for Francisco? 20 Do you have a question for Francisco, Joe? 21 I just have a quick question, Francisco. We briefly 22 talked about this earlier on the 15 -- the minimum 10-23 foot sidewalk versus the 15-foot setback. 24 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Right. 25 CHAIR YEBER: (Inaudible) clarification on that.

particular item in the Sunset Specific Plan, so there is a requirement for 10-foot-wide sidewalks, and the setback referred to in the SSP is actually 15 feet from the curb, so not from the property line but from the curb.

So that's what they're proposing in this project; it's a 15-foot setback from the curb as required by the Sunset Specific Plan.

CHAIR YEBER: So they're not going beyond the Sunset Specific Plan on the setback? They're meeting the minimum requirement for the SSP?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: They're meeting the minimum requirement sort of like in a portion of the project but exceeded in that portion whether opening up to create this kind of public open plaza.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you.

So with that, we'll open the public hearing. We will start with the applicants. I have four representatives from the applicant. One will speak on the back end for the rebuttal, and so that means I have three at the front end, 10 minutes total. Jeff, you can divide it up any way you choose.

Followed by the public. I have 32 speakers. We'll give two minutes per speaker. I ask that you hold your applause and be respectful of people who are speaking

even if you don't agree with their view.

Thank you.

JEFF SEYMOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jeff Seymour with Seymour Consulting Group. I reside in Westlake Village.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would thank the staff, and Francisco especially, but I would also want to thank John Chase, who was not just a great public service but a good friend and also a mentor to hundreds of people, hundreds of young people that I know, one being my daughter.

So I did want to have an opportunity to say that.

I'm going to be blessedly brief. We have three others
who will be speaking in presentation.

Mr. Chairman, three years ago, we met with City staff, and we were given a mandate, and that mandate was to design a landmark project of extraordinary significance, to create a project that would overwhelmingly improve the existing site which currently encompasses a 31-unit residential apartment building, and to ensure improved ingress and egress along Sunset and Miller Drive.

Mr. Frank Damavandi, who is Karma Development, responded to each and every concern expressed by city residents, representatives, business representatives, and

property owners. He's retained an internationally known architect in his firm to design what John Chase has said in his report "to be a landmark building of high architectural quality at an important location on Sunset Boulevard that not only meets but far exceeds the urban design goals and guidelines for the Sunset Specific Plan."

Mr. Chairman, this project is currently in phase with the existing zoning standards in the Sunset Specific Plan and in the zoning code. It requests no variance. We request no extension of time. We require no Statements of Overriding Consideration, and we have, we believe, mitigated those issues which have been of concerns to our neighbors.

For the record, Karma will at some point consider contemplating or filing a signed permit and potentially a development agreement in regard to the standard billboard. We are not really ready to do that at this point. We really want to see what the standards that the City will be creating for billboards really throughout the city.

And, also, I wanted to mention for the record that

Karma has stated that it would include in its appropriate

documents between its tenants and its condo owners a

reference to the fact that living on the Sunset Strip

will include noise impacts not found in other residential areas of the city. That was a request made by members of the public, and we are more than willing to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to introduce to you Mr.

Craig Hodgetts of Hodgetts/Fung. He has come back from

Venice, Italy tonight to be here. He is leaving again, I

believe, tomorrow night, and he will then introduce Ann

Gray, who is also a consultant with Karma Development.

We will then answer any questions you may have, and Mr.

Steres will do rebuttal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Craig?

CRAIG HODGETTS: Thank you, Jeff, and good evening, commissioners. My name is Craig Hodgetts. I live in Los Angeles. We are the architects of this project, and my wife and I worked very, very hard on this project.

My heart's really torn because of John's death. He was a student of mine at UCLA, and I remember one of the signature projects, which we discussed at length, was a project in Switzerland for terrace housing called the [Siglin Highland].

And the inspirational part of that project was that by terracing housing backwards and stepping it into a hill, you really greatly enhanced the amenities which were available to the residents because they don't simply have a little balcony stuck onto a slab, and secondly,

that you avoid that kind of canyon-like driving experience which you find if you have vertical buildings on either side of the street.

And this has been a longtime ideal of mine in terms of the way that the Los Angeles hillsides might be developed in the future years as population density increases.

We also thought it was really important that that prototype for something that was green, that was verdant as you looked down from the hill kind of melts into the hill, was a very important precedent to set, and I think that's the thing that John and I had in common.

I'd like to just very quickly, if whoever's manning the slide projector can show these slides, we can go right past that one.

The building, as you can see, terraces back, and we've taken into consideration many, many solar considerations with louvers which open and close and protect the residents from the sun.

If you go to the next slide, where you see that highlighted area, these are the inclusionary units which front onto Sunset Boulevard. Next?

The next highlighted slide will show you the market rate housing. Next slide?

And you can see that those louvers will open and

close when you leave your house and close -- shut off the lights. That will close down and save energy. Next?

And at the top are units which are, as you can see, next slide, sort of chopped into smaller segments so that in the view both up the hill and down the hill you don't have a great mass of building at the top but you've got rather a crenellated kind of profile. Next?

And then over in the area behind the billboard, we've decided to make a kind of topiary garden which will -- go to the next slide, please -- have this quality for the inclusionary residents who are going to be overlooking the dining terrace. Next?

This is a view of the dining terrace.

And with that, we'll discuss the streetscape just a bit. We've widened the sidewalk, as Francisco said, and -- next slide, please -- and provided a place where residents can and passersby can sit and enjoy the landscape.

Thank you very much. I'd like to introduce Ann Gray. Ann has been a constant presence here and a tremendous facilitator and creative helper as we've developed this project.

ANN GRAY: And John Chase and I were both students of Craig's.

So Craig and Jeff have given you some more general

1 information about the project. I have some kind of specific technical facts that, anticipating some of your 2 3 question. 4 The market rate units are all two and three 5 bedrooms, mostly two bedrooms, both flats and townhouses, 6 ranging from 1,200 to 3,300 square feet. 7 The rental -- the inclusionary units, the 10 units, 8 are all rental. They range from 650 to 780 square feet. 9 There are seven one bedrooms, three studios, and 10 they're all built to building standard. 11 Every unit in the project has a patio ranging from 12 1,200 to 1,400 -- I'm sorry, 120 to 1,400 square feet, 13 with the exception of the four "fat cribs," as we call 14 them, on top of the project that have about 2,600 square 15 feet. 16 In the private open space, our requirement is about 17 4,100, and we're at about 20,000 in terms of private open 18 space required. 19 Two thousand square feet of common area is required. 20 We're providing 2,200 that is accessible by all tenants 21 and the public. 22 Parking is to code with additional non-required 23 guest parking spaces. 24 There are 10 bicycle parking spaces.

We are voluntarily providing a full-time parking

attendant, providing valet service, and taking care of any other parking issues that may arise.

There's no required tandem parking in the project, and interior to the project, there's space for seven to 10 vehicles to stack interior before they start backing onto Sunset Boulevard, so we anticipate no snarl-ups that way.

Recapping the public benefits, we have an architectural landmark, 10 new inclusionary units at building standard, an active pedestrian experience. The current sidewalk is five feet, and it's actually just a driveway. Our new landscaped area is 15 to 20 feet wide with furniture, planters, and water features. The traffic at the intersection during AM peak goes from an F to a D. We think that's pretty cool. And we're increasing safety at the intersection with the curbs, new crosswalk, ingress and egress away from the intersection, with elimination of the tuck-under parking.

The design is energy efficient with biofiltration, xeriscaping, green roofs, many other features.

And from a noise perspective, the new project, all deliveries and trash hauling will be interior. Thanks.

**CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Are there any questions for the applicant?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes.

25

1 CHAIR YEBER: John? 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Ms. Gray, one question. You 3 said there is no required tandem parking. 4 understand that. Do you mean none of the required 5 parking is, in fact, tandem? That's correct, right. 6 ANN GRAY: There's some 7 shown on the plans, and just in case there was some 8 confusion that people may have seen it, it's there, but 9 it's an additional parking, not required. 10 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So all of the residential 11 parking, the required residential parking is not tandem? 12 It is not tandem, and the commercial ANN GRAY: 13 parking is not tandem. 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you very much. 15 And one question for Mr. Seymour. Would you address 16 the issue of the tenants, the existing tenants? How many 17 -- how many apartments are vacant, and then what is the 18 situation with the tenants that are remaining? 19 JEFF SEYMOUR: I can, Mr. Chairman, if I can find my 20 notes. Do you have it? Well, if you have it, then go 21 for it. 22 ANN GRAY: Yeah, hi. There are 31 units. Nine are 23 currently vacant. As tenants have moved out voluntarily,

The current rents in the building are market rate.

they just haven't been re-rented.

1 There are three that are very low that have been there since '92, '94 that are in the 300 range, but as a 2 3 general rule, the average rent in the building's about 4 \$1,100 a month. 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And the current -- the demographic of the building, one-bedroom apartments, two-6 7 bedroom apartments? 8 ANN GRAY: Yeah, there are five two-bedrooms, seven 9 studios, and the balance are one bedroom. 10 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And the two-bedroom 11 apartments are getting \$1,100? 12 ANN GRAY: No, the two-bedroom apartments are 13 ranging from about \$1,400 to \$1,800 a month. 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So that's actually below 15 market? 16 **ANN GRAY:** Well, yeah. I mean they're what they're 17 allowed to charge now, but they're not -- they're rent 18 controlled but not inclusionary, yeah. 19 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right. But they're not 20 exactly what you would call market rate for today's 21 market, correct? 22 ANN GRAY: You know, I don't know how you'd know 23 that. 24 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Okay. 25 ANN GRAY: I mean the most recent unit rented for

1 \$1,700 a month, and they're not terrific, so I'm figuring 2 that's pretty fair. 3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Okay, thanks. 4 CHAIR YEBER: Barbara? 5 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I have a question for either Ann or Jeff. 6 7 Can you tell us who will manage the retail portion after the -- if the project is built? I realize in 8 9 mixed-use projects you don't always know if actually a 10 restaurant is going in there, but who will be in charge 11 of the retail? 12 JEFF SEYMOUR: Well, it, Commissioner, hasn't really 13 been determined as yet. We're really talking about 4,000 14 -- they're not large areas -- 4,000 square feet of 15 restaurant area, about 3,000 square feet of retail, plus 16 an additional 2,000 for the outdoor dining and the like. 17 But we're very early on in this process, and I 18 really don't have any information for you in relation to 19 who would manage. 20 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Thank you. 21 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have a quick question. 22 Donald? CHAIR YEBER: 23 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I think Ann made the 24 statement, and I have a question for you if you'd come 25 up, please.

1 ANN GRAY: Sure. 2 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: You commented on the common 3 open space, and you said it would be about 2,200 square 4 feet. And then you made the comment it'd be for the 5 tenants and the public. Can you elaborate on that? 6 ANN GRAY: Right. The public plaza along Sunset 7 that's behind the property line is considered a common 8 amenity, and it's by code required to be accessible to 9 inclusionary and market rate tenants alike. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: But that's not the public. 10 11 You made a comment that it'd be --12 ANN GRAY: And it is accessible by the public just 13 by merit of its location, yeah. 14 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, thank you. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Sue? Alan? Okay, so we'll move on to 16 our speakers. 17 Again, please come forward. I'm going to list two 18 to three names at a time. Come forward, state your name, 19 city of residence. 20 We'll start with -- I think this is [Vivine Court]. 21 If I mispronounce your name, I apologize. Please use 22 your opportunity to correct me. Is there a Vivine? 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, Warren. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Is that Warren? Okay, Warren Kourt, 25 followed by Trish Swords.

1 ANNE MCINTOSH: Chair Yeber, did you say two 2 minutes? 3 CHAIR YEBER: Two minutes. Yeah, in fact, we were 4 just looking at the new bylaws, and it says two minutes, yes. 5 6 Thank you, commissioners. WARREN KOURT: While we 7 commend the developer for designing a project that's a 8 vast improvement... 9 CHAIR YEBER: Can you state your name and the city of residence? 10 11 Oh, I'm sorry. Warren Kourt, Miller WARREN KOURT: 12 Drive, Los Angeles. 13 Anyway, we commend them for designing a project 14 that's a vast improvement aesthetically over the existing 15 buildings. 16 However, the scope of the building, especially the 17 restaurant and retail space, gives us grave concern. 18 There's no question that traffic on our very narrow 19 and quiet street, Miller Drive, will increase, and there 20 exists a significant possibility that fire, police, ambulances, and other emergency vehicles will be 21 prevented from reaching any of the residences in our 22 23 neighborhood in a timely manner. 24 We residents may also be prevented from leaving our 25 neighborhood in a timely manner in an emergency.

2.1

I've written numerous letters to your office expressing our concerns, which are included in your project files.

I know that the EIRs and the staff recommendations are voluminous, but I trust in your duties as commissioners you've read all the materials. I certainly have.

Our biggest concern, which is in your power to alleviate, is the egress and ingress from the new project. It's been proposed to locate the entrance at the west end of the project off Miller Drive. Cars will turn right in and proceed to valet station. There's room for approximately seven cars.

There was originally a turnout lane at curbside, which would take traffic off of very narrow Miller Drive, but this has been eliminated. Egress is from a lane parallel to the ingress lane, and vehicles will exit back out onto Miller Drive, mostly to the left, we presume. If too many cars want to enter, it will likely result in a long line down to the Sunset/La Cienega intersection.

With respect to egress, if the signal at Sunset/La Cienega is red, there could be a traffic jam of vehicles going down to the intersection.

The developer and architect told me at an open house on this site Tuesday that they have designed the driveway

with a gate that would allow cars to exit if traffic is clear on Miller Drive. I'm unsure of the technology, but it's an interesting idea, and it was something that I would hope that you would consider.

Is that -- I guess that's my time. You have my letter in your file. Thank you very much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Trish Swords, followed by Shawn Bayliss.

TRISH SWORDS: Hi. I'm Trish Swords, a resident of Glendale, but I'm here on behalf of Greg Gorman, a resident at 1351 Miller Drive, Los Angeles. I'm going to read a statement from Mr. Gorman.

"After living 28 years on Miller Drive, a really beautiful intimate street above the Sunset Strip, I find it difficult to understand what the relationship between the cities of West Hollywood and Los Angeles is about, not to mention what they were thinking when approving the location of an entrance to a commercial structure on a narrow residential street.

"Over the past several months, trying to realize the time I need to get to business appointments has been an issue. Since the onset of the construction that has been going on to widen Sunset Boulevard, I have missed countless appointments no matter how much time I've allotted due to the extreme inconvenience this project

caused the residents of Miller Drive and the lack of traffic management provided by the city.

"Reviewing what is not only an overly ambitious but totally ridiculous project proposed at 8497-99 Sunset Boulevard, I don't see how anyone honestly taking the time to look at the location for the entrance to this structure could possibly feel that this will not permanently impede all traffic flow for the residents of Miller Drive. Not only will this be insurmountable during construction but also will be a permanent issue for those residing here.

"Anyone taking the time to see the width of Miller Drive as it opens onto Sunset Boulevard will totally understand that there is absolutely no way to have an entrance to what purports to be a rather large commercial structure on our street.

"I would strongly urge a reevaluation for the appropriate location of this entrance not only for the needs of the Miller Drive residents but also for the cities of West Hollywood and Los Angeles.

"I'm sorry I cannot convey this in person. I have previously committed to teach a workshop in Aspen, Colorado this week. Thank you."

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Shawn Bayliss, followed by Joseph Clapsaddle.

SHAWN BAYLISS: Hello. My name is Shawn Bayliss from council member Paul Koretz's office, the councilman who drafted the letter that was received this afternoon to Francisco, having drafted that letter in response to the 2008 letter that was previously written from the council member Jack Weiss in support of the alleviation of the City of Los Angeles's jurisdiction over the back portion of this property that is located within the City of Los Angeles.

The project aesthetically is a great project, and our office has no desire to try to kill a project. Our concerns surround the intersections of Miller and Sunset. This project admittedly will add approximately 930 car trips a day, I believe, if I'm getting that right.

While the project is adding that many car trips, not all those car trips are going to be coming from the east on Sunset or from the south on La Cienega or from the west on Sunset, but all of those car trips will enter Miller Drive, which is a hillside residential street, and therein lies our main concern because the residences who live above that are in the City of Los Angeles.

There was discussion this evening from the city attorney with regards to this jurisdictional issue, and it actually sounds like the councilman Koretz's request may be a moot issue if the City of West Hollywood is also

requiring the applicant to get permits from the City of
Los Angeles for both construction and entitlement and
planning aspects.

I would like to reference condition 1.11, where I
was pointed to look at as the condition that requires

was pointed to look at as the condition that requires that that condition only points to the construction permits. That's how I would read it. So I would ask that there be a clarification on that condition if what has been brought up by Francisco and then confirmed by the city attorney is actually what is being suggested here this evening.

And I would also like to just make one last thing that should the -- that the 2008 letter from Michael LeGrande from the zoning administrator's office not be used as a reason for the director of development here in the City of West Hollywood be used as a proof for the completion of that condition. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: There's a question for you.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Mr. Bayliss?

SHAWN BAYLISS: Yes, sir?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I read the letter from Mr. LeGrande dated 2008, which is two years and several months ago...

SHAWN BAYLISS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: ... which in my

interpretation, in effect, cedes or gives the zoning jurisdiction to West Hollywood on behalf of the City of Los Angeles.

I think that that gives a substantial reason to act in reliance upon the word of the City of Los Angeles, and I don't understand any attempt to modify that or to even -- to take that away.

I do understand council member Koretz and the citizens of Los Angeles taking apart and looking with a microscopic look at the traffic, the circulation, and every other aspect of this entitlement, but to say or even intimate that you were going to withdraw that or wanted to withdraw that, is that not a little bit disingenuous, not even to address the legal aspects?

were concerned that what you just stated may be the fact, meaning we had ceded all jurisdiction and therefore the City of Los Angeles would not have an opportunity to look at the traffic and would not have an opportunity to look at those things. So it was in that concern and that effort to try to bring that back in. Now, if this...

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But you're here ...

SHAWN BAYLISS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: ... and you're giving your opinions, as are the citizens of Los Angeles who are

1 testifying here. 2 SHAWN BAYLISS: Yes, sir. 3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That is a big input. 4 SHAWN BAYLISS: Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That, I think, is perfectly 6 in the spirit of things, but I think if you're trying to 7 re-grab some kind of administrative control, I don't 8 believe that is in the spirit of things, do you? 9 SHAWN BAYLISS: Well, I think the concern is that 10 the portion that is in the city of Los Angeles is the 11 very portion that's allowing the development to be the 12 size that it is, which is thereby causing the concerns 13 for those who live in the city of Los Angeles. 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I'm talking about the right 15 to ultimately make the decision based, of course, on all 16 the evidence and all the testimony. 17 SHAWN BAYLISS: Sure. 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But isn't that right 19 previously ceded to our jurisdiction? 20 SHAWN BAYLISS: Well, the city attorney's office is 21 actually reviewing that, and they couldn't give me an 22 answer because it is -- it's a quandary. I completely 23 understand where you're going where... 24 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I don't think it's a 25 quandary.

1 ||

SHAWN BAYLISS: Sure, okay.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And so is the other lawyer, one of the other two lawyers sitting here. Thank you, Mr. Bayliss.

SHAWN BAYLISS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I had a question for you.

SHAWN BAYLISS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: There is a draft

Environmental Impact Report and a final report. How come there was no correspondence from council member Koretz addressing any of those issues that could've been commented on in the final or the draft Environmental Impact Report, and why did council member Koretz get involved so late in the process?

SHAWN BAYLISS: Sure. Well, this project started approximately three years ago. The previous council member did that. When he left the office, along with most of the staff, there went the knowledge that this even actually existed. It wasn't until a few months ago that I even learned that the jurisdiction had been ceded, and there started our end of the process.

I apologize for not giving a response to the draft EIR or the EIR. Perhaps we should have done that. We were in direct communication with the applicant and the community both, and so our concern lied in what is our

responsibility as the City of Los Angeles.

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Mr. Chair, may I? It would seem to me that Mr. Koretz's office, Councilman Koretz's office, should have imputed knowledge. He's inherited -- I mean he was the second councilman. This project's been going on for years. Thus, the City of Los Angeles and all the residents have had ample opportunity to address all these issues that are raised.

And the fact that all of a sudden you became aware of it, it would seem that knowledge of this project should be imputed to the City of Los Angeles and that if there were going to be objections, it should've been made long before now, in my view.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I totally agree with Ms. Buckner, but I would want to ask you, Mr. Bayliss ...

SHAWN BAYLISS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: ... on behalf of Mr. Koretz, when Mr. Koretz has termed out of this office, would you think it would be reasonable for the subsequent council member to take his commitments and try to rescind them? Would the constituents and would the general public be well served by that?

SHAWN BAYLISS: Well, actually, I think that's a practice that probably happens quite often. With any elected official [who] leaves office, the incoming

her and I respect her.

1 elected official has their own thoughts and personality 2 and commitments to that office, and if something by the 3 previous elected official differed in that thinking, 4 then, yeah, it would be the responsibility to address it. 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I think you're making a 6 pretty good record for a lawsuit. 7 SHAWN BAYLISS: I understand. 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 9 SHAWN BAYLISS: Thank you. 10 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Joseph Clapsaddle, followed by 11 Phillip Carter. 12 JOSEPH CLAPSADDLE: Good evening, Commissioners, 13 Chair Yeber. My name is Joseph Clapsaddle. 14 resident of West Hollywood and a businessman here in our 15 community, and I have -- my comments tonight may be a 16 little disjointed because I really have three points. 17 The first one is that I find council member Koretz's 18 letter and his intentions crassly political and do not 19 have any root in representing what I would call political 20 honesty in a situation like this. 21 The second one is I would like to take this 22 opportunity, because I never really do this, to wish my 23 friend Jeanne Dobrin a happy birthday. Jeanne and I are 24 hardly ever on the same side of the fence, but I admire

What I'd like to say about this project is what a wonderful project it is to recognize John Chase with. I mean the beauty of the project, the integrity of the project. I was really thinking during all of your comments about John what I think about John, and I always think about him as a gentleman with tremendous sartorial splendor. I just loved the way he -- his whole persona proceeded through our lives and our community, and I'm so grateful to have had an opportunity to meet him.

But back to the project. This is a very well thought out, very well planned project which meets a number of needs, both in terms of its location, but I think it is a signature project because of the location as people come up La Cienega Boulevard to Sunset.

So I want to just express my great respect for what's been done and to urge you to adopt the staff report. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Phillip Carter, followed by Curtis Bushey.

PHILLIP CARTER: I'm Phillip Carter. I own the building at 1320 Miller Drive, which is that little piece over there next to that big piece over there, and I've owned it for 33 years.

Obviously, I'm concerned about the impact in the whole area in terms of traffic, noise, and all of that,

but other concerns I've had that I haven't heard 1 2 addressed because nobody's talked to me -- they said 3 they've talked to the community. I'm part of that 4 community -- the hills behind there have been slipping. 5 Last -- about three months ago, a tree fell off that hill behind this project. I've had to build a retaining wall. 6 7 I understand they're going to go building two stories 8 below all that soil/dirt. What's going to happen next to 9 me? I don't know. Nobody's talked about mitigation on 10 the people I have living there many years, 16 units 11 there. 12 The project is an overkill. Retail sales, that 13 means traffic all day long in and out on La Cienega and 14 Sunset. I don't need to, once again, talk about the traffic there. It's overwhelming now. 15 16 Residential -- I can understand. This is a 17 residential area, residential all the way up the street. 18 The buildings have been there for years. 19 Retail I don't understand. That's an overkill. 20 think that should be really reconsidered by everybody in 21 this whole project. 22 The project is lovely, but it's overkill, and that's 23 my feeling it should be downsized. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 25 JEANNE DOBRIN: Mr. Chair, I have noticed that

1 almost every speaker never states their name or the city 2 of residence. 3 Thank you, Ms. Dobrin. I will remind CHAIR YEBER: 4 everyone to please state your name and city of residence. 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible - microphone 6 inaccessible) 7 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Curtis Bushy, followed by 8 Benjamin Primo. 9 CURTIS BUSHEY: Good evening, Council. My name is 10 Curtis Bushey. I'm a Sunset resident. I've been living 11 there for 18 years, and Frank has been really good to all 12 of us. I mean my kid was raised there. She's sitting in 13 the back. 14 This project is phenomenal, and I think it should go 15 through. I mean it's just going to really help the area. 16 It's going to help the economy of that area, and that 17 intersection was a mess way before we got to it. I'm 18 sure they'll figure it out. 19 You have a wonderful day. Thank you for listening. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 21 Benjamin Primo, followed by Andy Bilanzich. 22 about Benjamin Primo? Okay, Andy? 23 ANDY BILANZICH: Good evening. Andy Bilanzich, West 24 I'm here on behalf of Mikeal Maglieri and the Hollywood. 25 Maglieri family, owners of the Whiskey A Go Go.

2.2

They really wanted to stress that they are very much in support of this project. They love the idea of bringing some new vibrancy to the area, and that's all I wanted to -- they wanted to really state that they were very much behind this project.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Barbara Marko, followed by Steve Martin. Barbara Marco? Okay, Steve Martin, followed by [Isabelle Sheukel].

STEVE MARTIN: Steve Martin, West Hollywood. Yeah, it's a beautiful building with lots of great open space for individuals, but it's just in the wrong location, and it just can't work on Miller Drive.

I would be very concerned if I was one of the low-income seniors in one of these affordable units because by the time an ambulance responded to me, to my call, I'd be in advanced stages of rigor mortis.

This project is -- once again, it's another West
Hollywood classic where it's really -- the building is
really simply a super structure for [landishly] outsized
billboard, which will be a digital Jumbotron, which will
be a blight on the whole area south of -- down La
Cienega.

I know there's a lot of people who are real excited about 10 affordable units, and this is one place where

affordable housing just isn't going to work. As we all know, seniors aren't walking up and down La Cienega. You can't. I have a hard time doing it, and I'm in good shape. It's not walkable to a drugstore. It's not walkable to a grocery store. It's just there.

So unless the City puts in workforce housing, rather than making this housing for seniors and people with disabilities, that's the only way that this would work would be for workforce housing.

But I really think we'd be giving the housing corporation a better deal if we simply gave them a piece of the revenue from the Jumbotron. They probably could buy a lot more affordable housing that way.

Once again, West Hollywood declares war on existing renters because this building, basically when you look at it, it's got units -- three or four units at \$300 a month. The average is 1,100 or \$1200, which is very affordable for people living who work in the area.

It's going to replaced basically by luxury condos, and there's incentives to build this project, which basically is going to displace a lot of working West Hollywood people. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Steve.

Isabelle, followed by Richard Maggio.

ISABELLE SHEUKEL: Isabelle Sheukel, resident of Los

Angeles.

I have been living on Miller Drive for 15 years, and although I love architecture, I -- I think in concept, this looks really, really nice. I would agree with my predecessor, this is just the wrong location for this project. It's just too big.

The entrance being on Miller Drive, and I don't know -- you mentioned previously that some of you had been on the site -- there are currently 24 feet where the entrance of this big building is, and I drive up and down Miller a lot, and it's basically 1.5-line -- lane. And there's constant, constant bottlenecks. We wait sometimes two or three lights to get through the intersection, and this is only the residents on Miller right now.

So if you're adding this complex that includes a restaurant and retail stores -- and I understand that there are pretty serious plans to have a restaurant -- I just don't see how the current setting will just allow the cars to go back and forth in and out without creating not only huge bottlenecks on Miller, which will obviously affect the residents, but also this intersection, there will be bottlenecks and traffic jams on each side of the building.

So I would really like you to reconsider the size of

1 the project, the fact that there will be a --2 restaurants, there will be retail spaces, and just 3 basically scale it back to something that looks like this 4 but is just smaller. 5 That's all I have to say. The traffic will be a 6 It is already very difficult, and this will nightmare. 7 just create a huge problem for the entire intersection. 8 Thank you very much. 9 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Richard Maggio, followed 10 by Jenifer... 11 (Inaudible - microphone UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 12 inaccessible). 13 Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: 14 I'm Richard Maggio, West Hollywood. RICHARD MAGGIO: 15 I support the project. I think it's a very exciting 16 project, a project of the future, and West Hollywood has 17 to continue to look to the future. 18 I'm excited about the 10 one-bedroom and studio low-19 income units, which will be priced at 40% of the market 20 rate. 2.1 I think also for your general information, you 22 should know that anyone who's presently in the existing 23 apartments, if they're 62 years or older, they're 24 entitled -- it's required you give them one-year notice

and the maximum of \$17,000 to move out.

If they're under 62, they get \$7,500 and a three-month notice to move out.

I would hope that everyone would be given a one-year notice since there are people that are over 62. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Jenifer, followed by Genevieve.

JENIFER YEUROUKIS: Hello. I'm Jenifer Yeuroukis.

I live in Los Angeles. I live in a single-family house on Miller Drive.

CHAIR YEBER: Can you pull the mic to you?

JENIFER YEUROUKIS: Sorry. Jenifer Yeuroukis, Los

Angeles. I live in a house on Miller Drive. I have a

job and a family life that requires that I drive up and
down Miller drive a minimum of eight times a day.

Because I travel that much up and down Miller drive, I

think it makes me a perfect person to observe how

construction of an R3-type multi-use building with 9,000

square feet of restaurant and retail space is being

constructed on a property that has 50% of it, which I

believe LA County originally zoned for R1, how that would

affect the traffic on Miller Drive.

I took photos over a two-month period from my car with my BlackBerry so that you could see what it's like for me as a driver up and down Miller Drive north, south,

east, west, La Cienega, Sunset, so that you can see that there is clearly an overflow of traffic and that population and traffic flow issues already exist on Miller Drive where the new building's entrance and exit is being proposed.

I took about 30 photos. I'm only giving you seven.

Photos one, five, and six speak to what it's like to wait at a light at the various intersections going in different directions at different times of the day on different days of the week.

Photos two, three, and four speak to the fact that Miller Drive really is only one-and-a-half lanes. More often than not when you have two cars going in opposite directions, one car must pull over to let the other car pass safely. There simply isn't the room to have an entrance and exit for a retail and a restaurant space, including additional multi-residential space.

Photograph seven speaks to how West Hollywood has currently dealt with this traffic issue. There was a temporary sign that says "Do not block intersection" placed on Sunset facing east. That sign spent most of its time in the middle of Sunset being run over by cars, and I propped it up against the building, where it currently is.

I hope you will really reconsider the entrance and

1 exit on Miller. Thank you. 2 There's a question for you from a CHAIR YEBER: 3 commissioner. 4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** I have a question for you. 5 JENIFER YEUROUKIS: Sure. 6 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Did you say you took these 7 photographs in the last few months? 8 JENIFER YEUROUKIS: Over a two-month period, I've 9 been taking them. 10 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Because this was all during 11 the Santa Monica Boulevard construction. 12 CHAIR YEBER: You mean Sunset. 13 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I mean Sunset. 14 JENIFER YEUROUKIS: I realize that, but there was no 15 construction at that exact corner. The construction was 16 in different places, and I think this speaks to how an 17 excessive flow of traffic will impact this area in the 18 future. 19 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Well, I happen to work part-20 time for a business at Sweetzer and Sunset, so for the 21 past year, I've been going back up and down and up and 22 down, and because of that construction, this Sunset 23 Boulevard traffic jam was continuous. No matter where 24 the construction was, it was a nightmare.

But once that is finished, I do not believe that

1 will be the case because I had traveled up and down prior 2 to that, and it was never a problem. 3 Where is this a question? You...? CHAIR YEBER: 4 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'm sort of wanting to 5 understand the context that she's saying ... 6 JENIFER YEUROUKIS: Sure. 7 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: ... that this is life as usual, 8 and I'm saying... 9 JENIFER YEUROUKIS: But it is life as usual. 10 because I took the photographs during time that was 11 construction, I was encouraged to ... 12 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Thank you. 13 JENIFER YEUROUKIS: ... because I knew this meeting 14 was coming up. Thank you for your consideration. I 15 appreciate it. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Genavieve, followed by 17 John Welch. 18 GENAVIEVE MORRILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and 19 Commissioners. Genevieve Morrill, City of Los Angeles, 20 and here as CEO/President of the West Hollywood Chamber 21 of Commerce on behalf of the business community. 22 I want to applaud the efforts -- tireless efforts of 23 staff and this developer and this amazing architect, 24 Craiq Hodge (sic). 25 This is just an amazing project. It's beautiful,

and I'm surprised that Koretz doesn't want to grab it just for bragging rights, actually.

This is really extraordinary, and the way that -- I applaud everything about it -- the green design, the intelligent contour into the configuration of the landscape.

They've been extremely accommodating to the needs of the community, affordable housing allowances that haven't been taken to give us additional housing, height under the allowed, improving traffic -- and I also want to note that a lot of this traffic issue is existing and that the EIR and what was stated -- I'm not a traffic expert, but I did listen to a traffic expert, and it seems to me that this project will improve traffic in this area. They might just find that this would be the case.

This will strengthen the local economy. It gives us a pedestrian friendly, more parking than is needed, additional retail, mixed use, and on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce and the business community, we hope that you support the staff recommendation for this project. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. John Welch, followed by Evan Grayson.

JOHN WELCH: John Welch, West Hollywood. I live in the building adjacent at 1320 Miller Drive. I've been

there for 13 years.

I think the impact on the traffic going up and down Miller Drive is going to be a nightmare, as others have stated, and I don't know how you're going to get around it because you only have one or two car lengths before the cars come out, and already we have three and four cars backed up, so there's no place for those cars to go at certain times of the day.

The other impact you've talked about, people's views not being obstructed, but noone's talked about the views in the building I live in. All we're going to see is a wall looking out our windows.

And those are my issues. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Evan Grayson, followed by David Freeman. David Freeman? Is there an Evan Grayson here? David Freeman, followed by Judy Gingold.

DAVID FREEMAN: Hello. I'm David Freeman. I live on Miller Drive in Los Angeles and have for 30 years. I think I've been listening to a science fiction novel. All anyone needs to do is drive up and down Miller Drive. You pick a time of day -- maybe not two in the morning -- it's jammed.

Everyone knows that the intersection of La Cienega, Miller, and Sunset is a thorn in the side of our city.

It's terrible. I don't see how anyone could disagree

CHAIR YEBER:

1 with that or see it differently outside of their own 2 commercial interests. Pushing it farther than it now is 3 is going to make life even harder for those of us who 4 live there. 5 I agree with everyone who has commended the beauty 6 and forward-looking nature of this venture. 7 architect is a friend of mine. I respect him. 8 This time out, it's too big and in the wrong place, 9 and you are harming the lives of the citizens. 10 you take that into account when you make your decisions. 11 Thank you. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Judy -- no clapping, 13 please -- Judy Gingold, followed by Frank Geraci. 14 JUDY GINGOLD: I guess I'd like to second what David 15 just said. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Your name and... 17 JUDY GINGOLD: Oh, sorry. Judy Gingold. I'm a 18 resident of Miller Drive, Los Angeles. 19 I would just like to say that I have a mini Cooper, 20 and driving up and down Miller Drive as it now is, I very 21 often have to stop if there's a car in another direction, 22 and that's with a very tiny car. And I suffer to think 23 what will happen if there's more and more traffic coming 24 out onto that tiny little street.

Thank you.

Thank you. Frank, followed by John

2.1

Ferraro. I think it's Ferraro.

JOHN FERRARO: Hi. I'm John Ferraro. I live on Miller Place. I've been there for about 16 years, and I've seen the traffic grow in that intersection year by year, and it's not going to get better, contrary to what some people are saying tonight that this project will improve the traffic.

By the way, I do admire the project in some ways. I do like the design of it. It's too big.

I don't understand the mitigation efforts for the traffic. Creating an additional right-turn lane on the northbound of La Cienega, I'm not sure how that's going to actually mitigate the traffic in the intersection and on Miller Drive and the eastbound traffic on Sunset. All that will do is help the northbound traffic on La Cienega turn right.

Just today I was coming up La Cienega and there were 10 cars in front of me and I couldn't make it through the light. I'm not sure how adding more traffic that will be able to turn right into that lane will make it better.

So I think you need to reconsider your mitigation efforts. I also think you need to reconsider where the ingress and egress for this building is going to be.

There's already an entrance, a driveway entrance for this building on the eastbound side of the building, so I'm

not really sure why that can't be modified to accommodate this new building. It seemed to have worked for all these years.

There's 12 carports in front of the building.

That's not the entire parking for the building. I know in your EIR that it said that those carports will be gone so that will help with the safety and the traffic. Well, it seems to me that that would be moot anyway if they're not going to exist in terms of the safety.

And that's about all I have. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Sol Yamini, followed by Keith Biele.

SOL YAMINI: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Sol Yamini. I'm the owner of the Pink Dot business east of the proposed building that's being built.

I don't know the logistics of the traffic, if it's going to bring more traffic or bring less traffic, but what I do know is that it's going to be great for our economy. It's a beautiful looking building. I don't know if the size is too big or too little. I don't know anything about that.

But I've owned the business for a long time, and the building right now is an eyesore, and it's just torn -- it's just old, it's torn down -- it should be torn down and should be built looking something like that, and

1 hopefully the traffic issues won't be a problem and if it 2 helps traffic, then that's great because that street does 3 have traffic, and I think it will be great for the 4 economy. Thank you. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Keith Biele, followed by Paran Johar. 6 7 KEITH BIELE: Hi. My name is Keith Biele, and I 8 live on Miller Place. 9 After listening to everything here tonight, I can't 10 even believe we're considering doing this building this 11 It's ridiculous. I mean seriously. bia. 12 JEANNE DOBRIN: Could he talk in the microphone, Mr. 13 Chair? 14 CHAIR YEBER: Can you talk into the microphone? 15 KEITH BIELE: I said I can't even believe we're 16 considering making this building this big. Are you 17 talking to me? 18 JEANNE DOBRIN: (Inaudible - microphone 19 inaccessible) 20 Yeah, just speak into the microphone CHAIR YEBER: 21 so she can hear. Sorry. 22 KEITH BIELE: Okay, sorry. I have two newborn 23 babies, and one of the reasons why we got the house on 24 Miller Place is because ... 25 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Marc, I can't hear him.

25

Excuse me. Can you ask him to lift the mic up? You can 2 lift the mic. That would be easier for you. Thank you. 3 KEITH BIELE: I don't mind being uncomfortable 4 trying to get this worked out. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Go ahead. I'm sorry. 6 I have two -- if I'd have known this KEITH BIELE: 7 was going to happen, I wouldn't have got the house on 8 this street. If there's ever a problem with these kids 9 and I'm trying to get down and there's a traffic problem, 10 I can't even begin to explain to you what that's going to 11 do to me. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Paran? 13 Paran Johar, Miller Place PARAN JOHAR: Thank you. 14 resident, Los Angeles. 15 I'll be very brief because a lot of the comments 16 have already been said. 17 Though I commend the architect for the beautiful 18 architecture, I have some great concerns on the size of 19 the project. If anyone who's gone up and down Miller 20 Drive, you can measure and they can barely take one-and-21 a-half cars. Two cars cannot simultaneously go up and 22 down Miller Drive at any given point given there's 23 parking on Miller Drive. 24 The second concern is there is already constant

traffic in terms of ingress and egress, and I have no

idea how adding 900 cars is going to make the traffic problem better. I think for the size of the project, they have to reconsider that.

My final concern, which I've vocalized, is from a view perspective for that, we've all paid a lot of money for our houses on Miller Place and Miller Drive, and given the size of the project, I have a concern regarding the view. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Elyse Eisenberg, followed by Tom Fanning.

**ELYSE EISENBERG:** Elyse Eisenberg, City of West Hollywood.

I'd first like to acknowledge the passing of John
Chase and the enormous legacy he left for the City of
West Hollywood. What an incredible loss this will be. I
don't want to use up my time with that, but it's a tragic
loss.

I would also like to commend the architect for probably the most beautiful residential and mixed-use project that I've ever seen come before the City in the limited time I've been participating in the public process. I hope he continues to work in West Hollywood and we get a lot more buildings from this architectural firm. It's outstanding.

That being said, a couple of things that were -- one

of the questions that was brought up by one of the commissioners earlier this evening about how much of the project is in Los Angeles versus West Hollywood, I may not have the exact figures in front of me, but I seem to recall that the project is about 25,000 square feet, of which a little over 15,000 square feet is in the City of Los Angeles and 10,000 square feet is in the City of West Hollywood.

I would also like to point out that from my reading of the Sunset Specific Plan, it does not meet the goals or objectives. This is a site for (a) of the Sunset Specific Plan and in there several times in that section on page 189 through 196, this site is mentioned on at least occasions that the maximum height is 35 feet and that the only way it would be -- qualify for an 85-foot height was if it incorporated the Pink Dot site and created a public park on the land that's in Los Angeles.

From my reading of the Sunset Specific Plan, there was never any intention to build on the LA portion of the property. The goal of that was always to be public land, public park for the benefit of the citizens.

As you probably know from reading the general plan,
West Hollywood only has a quarter of an acre of public
park for the city, and to eliminate something even more - I have more comments in the letter today. It's just so

1 short. The sloping is manipulated, too. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Elyse, there's a question for 3 you. 4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Ms. Eisenberg, you said that 5 the height is 80-some-odd feet. 6 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** They're calling it --7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The professionals measure it 8 at 40 feet. 9 ELYSE EISENBERG: That's because they're taking 10 advantage of the sloping code. The site is graded. 11 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But that's what (inaudible). 12 ELYSE EISENBERG: The site is ... 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: They are allowed to measure 14 it according to the rules for the type of topography that it is. 15 16 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** I believe that in my 17 interpretation of the Sunset Specific Plan that was 18 already factored in. It's mentioned several times that 19 the maximum height of the property is 85 feet. 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Okay, that's what I wanted 21 to hear, that it is your interpretation. 22 ELYSE EISENBERG: I think it's clear. 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You do understand that that 24 is not what the professionals say about the height? 25 ELYSE EISENBERG: I do understand but...

1 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. Thank you. 2 **ELYSE EISENBERG:** Okay, thank you. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Tom Fanning, followed by Stuart 4 Leviton. 5 TOM FANNING: Hi there. My name's Tom Fanning. Ι 6 live on Sunset Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. 7 I just wanted to come down and show support for the 8 project. I think that what's currently there is a pretty 9 terrible eyesore, and I think that the Sunset Strip is a 10 pretty vibrant place, and I think that this would be a 11 major improvement for the Sunset Strip. 12 Thank you. Stuart Leviton, followed CHAIR YEBER: 13 by Erik Marino. 14 STUART LEVITON: Stuart Leviton, City of West 15 Hollywood. 16 First, it seems to me that this is a great project. 17 I'm supporting it. I urge you to support it and adopt 18 the staff recommendation. 19 I also urge you, as you're sitting here as a 20 commission, to take a step back, look at the totality of 21 the project. From what I have heard this evening, this 22 project meets or exceeds nearly every goal this city puts 23 out. It is either compliant or exceeds all legal 24 requirements for this kind of project. It seems to me 25 this is exactly what we want to do.

I am mindful of and respectful of the individual concerns that have been expressed today. I am certain that they are heartfelt and sincere, but most of them, if not all of them, have been addressed.

As Commissioner Altschul was pointing out, the professionals have analyzed this through the staff. They have concluded that this is a terrific project, and I simply urge you, look at the totality of this, be mindful and respectful of the individual concerns, but on balance, a great project. I hope it gets approved, and I hope you adopt the staff recommendation.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Erik Marino, followed by Boris.

ERIK MARINO: Good evening. My name is Erik Marino, and I'm a resident of West Hollywood and Los Angeles because I'm one of the residents of 8497 West Sunset Boulevard.

I am one of the residents of the eyesore of that location. Yes, I am. But it is the last apartment building on the Sunset Strip. I take a certain pride in saying that I live on the Sunset Strip, and I also park on the east side in the gated parking. And as such, I would just -- I do every morning -- I have to come out of the gated side. I think -- I know that I can't stop progress.

I live in an eyesore, and that's a very pretty building, but I would ask before it moving forward the Commission all look towards the availability of rental and commercial space up and down the Strip because it is actually at an epic high, and I don't know. I'm all for if you build it they will come, but I'm not convinced that retail space will flock to this landmark, and then it's a landmark of a different sort.

I guess as I park and go in and out of a building,
I'd say that since this fits so well with the Sunset
Specific Plan, we shouldn't shoulder Sunset's problems on
another street, Miller, which is that I think that we
should take a look at reconfiguring the light so it
really is sort of a straight drive up and down into
Sunset and leave Miller alone.

I'm sorry to be a dissenting voice, but I'd like to stay living at the eyesore as long as possible because it is affordable housing, rent-controlled housing on the Sunset Strip for me right now, and I appreciate your time. Goodnight.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Boris, followed by Raisa.

BORIS SHPUNT: Good evening, Boris Shpunt,

(inaudible).

I like this project. I think this nice new building will make our district more attractive. I'm going to

2 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Raisa, followed by Eugene 3 Levin. 4 RAISA SOKOLOVSKY: Hi. My name Raisa Sokolovsky. I 5 live in West Hollywood. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Can you speak into the mic, please? 7 Thank you. 8 RAISA SOKOLOVSKY: My name Raisa Sokolovsky. I live 9 in West Hollywood. I am here to support this project. 10 This is create job for people and the housing for low 11 income, and this is good for city. Please help for this. 12 Thank you. 13 Thank you. Eugene Levin, followed by CHAIR YEBER: 14 Jeanne Dobrin. 15 EUGENE LEVIN: Good evening. Eugene Levin, City of 16 Los Angeles. 17 This place have a special part in my heart since I 18 got the traffic tickets from this place. It was long 19 time ago. It's already not on my record. 20 Anyway, this is a great project, and I support it, and it creates [really] job. It good for the city 21 22 revenue, and there is always the wrong time and the wrong 23 place for the progress. Please support this project. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Jeanne Dobrin, followed by 25 Norm Chramoff, who's our last speaker. Jeanne? Norman,

vote for this project. Thank you.

1 do you want to come up and speak? Thanks. 2 NORMAN CHRAMOFF: Norman Chramoff, resident of West 3 Hollywood. 4 I support the project. What I'm particularly 5 impressed by is the inclusionary units are about 30% 6 bigger than my market rate apartments, so I think that's 7 really special. 8 And, also, I just wanted to call to your attention 9 again that the people in the \$300 units, I understand, 10 are going to be first on the list for the inclusionary, 11 so I think that's a good thing. 12 Anyway, it's a great project. Support it. Thanks. 13 Thank you, Norman. CHAIR YEBER: 14 JEANNE DOBRIN: Jeanne Dobrin, a long-time resident 15 of West Hollywood. I'm going to bring up a subject that 16 I heard one of the -- is this on? 17 CHAIR YEBER: Yes, it's on. 18 JEANNE DOBRIN: Okay -- that I heard one of the 19 commissioners bring up, and that commissioner happens to 20 be -- an old English expression I've heard -- best friend 21 and severest critic of me. 22 I don't know if Jack Weiss was termed out, but his 23 record in the area as a LA councilman was worse than 24 He showed not even a little regard for his dubious. 25 constituents versus developers, and I was one of the

persons that criticized him. I complained about something in West Hollywood -- in Los Angeles, excuse me, paid no attention.

Mr. Koretz is well known as a community-oriented person, and I feel that he is doing the right thing by asking that it be rescinded, that Mr. Weiss and Mr. Michael LeGrande were giving away rights of the City of West Hollywood -- of the City of Los Angeles and its residents of the City of West Hollywood, although, of course, I love our city.

And Michael LeGrande, for your information, was just appointed the planning director of the City of Los Angeles and by [Vir Ragosa], and immediately, an article appeared in the *LA Times* about how unqualified he is for the job. And I agree -- I think he was something like Mr. Weiss.

We desperately don't need another restaurant which will become a bar, a de facto bar after 11 o'clock on this already stressed out location of three streets coming together.

Mr. Fong (sic) claims that re-striping La Cienega will make this a better transportation and circulation issue. I don't believe him. I don't know where he's coming from. May be a very nice guy, but I wish that Terri Slimmer was still here. And this ...

1 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Jeanne, wrap it up. 2 JEANNE DOBRIN: This traffic has given -- as told 3 you by the people who live on Miller is a scary, scary 4 thing. Beautiful project, but turn it down. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Jeanne. Okay. We will do rebuttal, and it looks like Mark 6 7 Steres will give us that. 8 MARK STERES: Thank you. Mark Steres. I reside in 9 Calabasas. I am the attorney for the applicant, Karma 10 Development. 11 Project driveway location -- that seems to be one of 12 the -- the major issue. The driveway is located where 13 the city experts told us to place it. Let me say that 14 again. The driveway is located where the city experts 15 told us to place it. 16 The city has heard the concerns of the Miller Avenue 17 residents, and they thoroughly studied and analyzed the 18 issues, and it was in their expert opinion that they 19 found that the location is the safest and most efficient 20 location. 2.1 Based upon this review and the findings, we request 22 that the Planning Commission follow the staff 23 recommendation and approve the project as submitted. 24 City of Los Angeles -- Needless to say, we are

extremely disappointed by Councilman Koretz's current

position and by the letter that was submitted just this evening by the council member.

The history of this is many years ago the applicant sought to redevelop this site and went to the City of LA with this project and met with Council Member Weiss, and he was the one who did approve having West Hollywood authorized as processing the entitlement.

Some of the factors that went into that is that this is a single lot with City of West Hollywood area upfront facing Sunset Boulevard and the City of LA's area is completely landlocked behind this site.

The current use of the site has multi-family apartment, residential, and parking that exists on both the West Hollywood and the City of LA side.

The proposed mixed use project that's in front of you and is planned has commercial on the bottom floor and then parking and residential -- multi-family residential above that.

The commercial segment of this project is essentially almost entirely within the West Hollywood area. The part that is in the City of Los Angeles is made of parking and multi-family residential, the same that exists today.

Thousands of dollars have been spent by the applicant in reliance of the City of LA's authorization,

and of the significance that was brought up by the Commissioners in questioning Mr. Bayliss, the draft EIR was out for comment just this past February through April, 45-day comment period.

The City of LA did not comment on the draft EIR.

The issues that the City of LA says they have, which is traffic and curb cuts, is solely within the jurisdiction of West Hollywood. The appropriate place for them to put in their input is in comments of the draft EIR and comments to West Hollywood, and that's what the Commission invited and the Commission questioned, and they chose not to do so.

Now, Council Member Koretz comes in at the last minute and talks about reasserting their authority.

We urge West Hollywood tonight to take action. That statement does not derail or stall anything that you have in front of you. You are the lead agency for the EIR, and you should take action on the EIR, and we request you do that tonight.

You are the lead agency on the project applications that are in front of you, and we would ask you to take action on the City of West Hollywood applications.

You know, with all this testimony, it's worthwhile to step back and really think about what's currently on this site. What's currently on this site does not meet

1 at all what the City of West Hollywood adopted when they 2 adopted their Sunset Specific Plan and their vision. 3 It's got carports, it's got driveway cuts, it has no 4 pedestrian activity, and it has no streetscape. 5 Now, picture what is proposed in this application. 6 This is exactly what you asked for. This is exactly what 7 the Sunset Specific Plan envisioned, and it was adopted 8 by this city and the City directed that this type of 9 development be built. 10 It directed a landmark building, commercial 11 activity, pedestrian activity, vibrant streetscape. Ιt 12 even called out a billboard at this location. 13 application delivers what the Sunset Specific Plan wanted 14 with no variances and no Statement of Overriding 15 Consideration. 16 So we would ask you to please consider the 17 application and adopt it as submitted. Thank you. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Any questions for the 19 applicant? 20 Okay, seeing none, there's been a request to take a 21 five to seven-minute break to give people a chance to go 22 to the bathroom. 23 Please, the public, do not ask questions or talk to 24 the Commission since the item is still on the table and

the public hearing is still open. Thank you.

| [Short break]

CHAIR YEBER: Hello again. So questions -- since traffic and related impacts seem to be the central concern here, a couple things, just some clarification.

The staff report and the presentation talked about how this project would improve the traffic condition even though we'll have more cars at this intersection. So could you explain it in simplest terms so that we can understand how you've come to this assessment that the project actually will improve the intersection?

BOB CHEUNG: Sure. The project is proposing as a mitigation measure to re-stripe the northbound approach on La Cienega. Right now, currently, we have a left turn and a right turn. Because of the heavy -- extremely heavy right-turn movement, particularly during the PM and nighttime, re-striping for an additional right turn would help the intersection overall operations, and because of more green time allotted for other movements, it helps every movement through the intersection.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. What about on the Miller side?

BOB CHEUNG: Also Miller side. So it's an indirect mitigation because it's not on Miller, but it does benefit Miller to a certain degree.

CHAIR YEBER: So but what changes are you making to Miller or what changes are already in place that help

1 mitigate potential impacts from this project? 2 **BOB CHEUNG:** On Miller specifically? 3 On Miller specifically. CHAIR YEBER: 4 BOB CHEUNG: Because of the constraint of the slope 5 and also the existing structures, there isn't a whole lot 6 we can do to widen or re-stripe. It's 24-foot wide right 7 now, and it's only wide enough for two lanes of traffic. 8 CHAIR YEBER: But there's no on-street parking. 9 BOB CHEUNG: That's correct. There's no on-street 10 parking in the -- maybe one or two in the West Hollywood 11 boundary or side, but there is no on-street parking 12 fronting the project site. 13 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 14 BOB CHEUNG: And we wouldn't allow any [private] 15 parking. 16 CHAIR YEBER: And no onsite parking on the opposite 17 side of the street in front of the project... 18 BOB CHEUNG: That's correct. 19 CHAIR YEBER: ... on Miller. 20 So that speaks to the other issue that kept being 21 brought up was this notion that Miller was approximately 22 a lane and a half and that people have to pull over to 23 allow a car to pass through. I'm assuming they're 24 referring to further up as you get up into Miller Drive 25 that that's the case, that it's not at the intersection?

1 BOB CHEUNG: That's correct. 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible - microphone 3 inaccessible) 4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Excuse me. Order, please. 5 you clarify that for us in terms of the width? Because 6 on the plans, I see 26.2 feet at the project site. 7 don't know what the width is further up Miller. 8 BOB CHEUNG: I think the 26 foot is an error and 9 it's actually 24. We measured it. 10 CHAIR YEBER: That's what it's currently or what's 11 being proposed? 12 BOB CHEUNG: Currently. 13 CHAIR YEBER: 24 currently. 14 BOB CHEUNG: Currently. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 16 BOB CHEUNG: So, yes, you're correct that the 17 parking further north on Miller restricts the flow of 18 traffic to one lane or one-and-a-half lane, but at --19 where the project site is located without -- again, we 20 don't have any on-street parking there. It's two lanes 21 full. 22 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. And then explain the car 23 staging for exiting or egress because right now as it was 24 pointed out by one of the speakers that a car pulls out 25 of the project site, there's only room for two cars on

Miller, but then you have seven to 10 car staging on the project site.

So let's say you're backed up. Let's say there's already five cars already on Miller. Is the light synchronization going to allow the cars from the project site to get through quickly? I mean how is that going to work?

BOB CHEUNG: The thought is that any backup will be onsite due to the project's traffic, so it wouldn't affect any traffic on Miller.

As far as synchronization, that's a tough question.

I'm not sure how synced in -- how that would affect

traffic coming out of the project site, but I would

assume that if on the worst condition there is backup, it

would be all onsite and would not affect Miller.

CHAIR YEBER: I guess what I was trying to get with synchronization is the timing for the traffic lights would be set in such a way to allow more than two or three cars to get through a light cycle.

BOB CHEUNG: Yeah, that would be correct.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Are there any other questions for staff? John? Oh, go ahead, Sue.

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: So the plan is to resynchronize the light there so that there is more time? They're going to change the light, the amount of time

that -- for the people coming south down Miller to either make their turn onto Sunset either east or west and then -- or proceed down to La Cienega. It's not just going to be one or two cars that are getting through like they are now, right?

BOB CHEUNG: Well, La Cienega and Sunset is part of the synchronization plan along entire Sunset, so whatever we do at that intersection, we need to take into account upstream and downstream along the whole corridor.

The synchronization gets adjusted as demand changes and as needed, so that would be looked at on a case-by-case level and could be adjusted as needed.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. John, did you have a question?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But not of Mr. Cheung, of

Francisco.

In going through -- and I know you've got a lot to do tonight -- in going through the comments that were submitted quite late, did you find any issues that had any credibility that you think needed responding to or analyzing at the 11th hour?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: No, I don't think there were any new issues. I think most of the comments in the letters were actually stated by the speakers that were here tonight and which were things that were already addressed in the staff report or the draft EIR.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you.

2

CHAIR YEBER: Is there any other questions for

3

staff?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Barbara?

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'm not exactly -- I'm -back to Mr. Cheung again -- concerned about the traffic that has come down Miller Drive and is sitting there waiting for the light to change so that those people can go left, right, or down La Cienega. And it looks to me in the site plan of the new project this addition of this extra -- what is it? -- 15 feet or so being added to this little outcrop of the retail space is giving more of a definition to where the cars are supposed to stay.

I'm asking this because I was there today and I parked in one of the tuck-under parking and I had to back out and I -- it was a nightmare trying to just figure out whether I should -- which way I should back out facing, and then I didn't know where to wait for the light even.

So there is a -- I realize if this project is built, the entire curb area and frontage will be defined where it isn't now. It's a mess.

BOB CHEUNG: That is correct, and actually, the curb will be pulled back somewhat to allow for cars entering the site to move to the right a little bit so that -- to avoid any backup onto Sunset.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Okay, so there will be a

1 better ingress into the projects... 2 BOB CHEUNG: Yes. 3 ... because of that? COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: 4 BOB CHEUNG: Correct. 5 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Now, are you -- is the City -6 - it's the City's job when a project is finished -- this 7 is a question -- to re-stripe? You said you're going to 8 do some re-striping on La Cienega. 9 Are you -- and I don't think I saw it this morning -10 - are you going to do any sort of re-striping on -- from 11 Miller Drive when people who have never been to this 12 project before come out of that parking structure and are 13 sitting there, and basically what they're doing is facing 14 oncoming traffic on La Cienega going west. 15 So are you going to do any sort of dotted lines or 16 any sort of re -- some sort of notification on the actual 17 pavement that gives a driver who doesn't know where he is 18 -- which of course, nobody is like that -- which lane to 19 go in to go east on Sunset? Is that a possibility? 20 Let me make sure I understand. BOB CHEUNG: 21 you're asking about re-striping on Miller onto Sunset? 22 Well, not -- yeah, from COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: driving -- from Miller onto Sunset. 23 I think I'm not 24 asking, I quess, maybe specifics as much as how much is 25 this in play once the project gets three-quarters of the

25

1 way through and you guys come and start to see how you can better facilitate a functional intersection? 2 3 BOB CHEUNG: Yeah, actually, we have looked at re-4 striping and improving Miller, including adding a, if you 5 will, a slip ramp because -- but because of the grade 6 differential, that became problematic. 7 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Yes. 8 BOB CHEUNG: Although we did have the pedestrian 9 crosswalk adjusted so that it is a little bit more 10 aligned, and with that, it should align the cars a little 11 bit better than what we have today. 12 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Yes, there isn't really --13 that huge diagonal thing today. 14 BOB CHEUNG: Correct, correct, correct. 15 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: So the crosswalk itself is 16 meant to organize things better, order (inaudible). 17 BOB CHEUNG: Yes, that's the intent. The crosswalk 18 would be more of a traditional crosswalk instead of a 19 diagonal, where it causes confusion, so that would be 20 part of the project. 2.1 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Exactly. And that would also 22 facilitate -- this is a question, but I'm assuming 23 anybody walking from, let's say, Sunset Plaza up the

street on the north side of the street, they could then

cross and go into that retail, whether it's restaurant...

1 BOB CHEUNG: Correct. 2 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: ... or clothing store, or 3 whatever it is? 4 BOB CHEUNG: This would improve pedestrian safety 5 tremendously, yes. 6 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Because there isn't any 7 sidewalk or anything there now at all. I mean I didn't 8 see any. 9 BOB CHEUNG: Yeah, no, not much to say that there's 10 a crosswalk or sidewalk, yes. 11 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: May I? 13 CHAIR YEBER: Go ahead, Sue. 14 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Also, I thought that perhaps 15 what you ought to make sure is that there's going to be 16 some kind of "No U-turn" there because I noticed that the 17 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible - microphone 19 inaccessible) 20 CHAIR YEBER: Please. 21 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** -- the taxicabs are coming 22 west on Sunset. They go and make a U-turn and then turn 23 around to go pick up passengers over at the hotels right 24 down the road. And so I think that the City must 25 consider putting that kind of signage up there and have

1 our sheriffs enforce that for a while until people really 2 get the idea. 3 BOB CHEUNG: Thank you, noted. 4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible - microphone inaccessible) 5 6 CHAIR YEBER: Excuse me, there's no comments from 7 the audience at this stage. 8 I just have one last question regarding the 9 construction process and traffic, and how is it 10 envisioned that the staging would occur during 11 construction so that all the residents that live up 12 Miller Drive are not impacted in any way at any point 13 during the construction? 14 Have they submitted a construction plan at this point, or do we know how that's going to be handled so 15 16 that all trucks are off Miller Road? 17 BOB CHEUNG: We haven't received any construction 18 management plan. That usually follows at a later stage. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 20 BOB CHEUNG: But we do have very specific conditions 21 to maintain full access to Miller and to minimize any 22 disruption to traffic. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Are they just our usual conditions, or 24 are they ramped up because the conditions are a little 25 bit more extraordinary on this particular site?

1 BOB CHEUNG: We can certainly look at ramping up 2 conditions for this particular project. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, great. 4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Mr. Chair? 5 CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 6 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'd like to make a comment 7 about that. I understood from the applicant this morning 8 that all of the construction vehicles will be staged 9 behind the Pink Dot. Can Mr. Seymour speak to that or 10 Anne? 11 Commissioner, we -- I think what I JEFF SEYMOUR: 12 had said was that there was discussions and negotiations 13 at this point, but we -- it's very early on in this 14 process. 15 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Okay. All right. Thank you. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. With that, I'm going to -- if 17 there's no objection, I'm going to close the public 18 hearing, move on to discussion on this item. 19 So who wants to take the lead on this? 20 ahead. 21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, there's certainly no 22 doubt and no controversy over the quality of the 23 architecture and the design. 24 I was a member of the Sunset Specific Plan task 25 force back in the last century, and it's true that this

particular site calls for in the Sunset Specific Plan pretty much exactly what has been brought forth here, and it's an amazing opportunity.

I live above Sunset, as do two other commissioners sitting here, and I live on top of a narrow street. It's pretty much the same type situation except Miller is a little bit longer, in fact, quite a bit longer than my street. There's many more houses.

But all of us really have to face the reality that when we chose to move above Sunset Boulevard -- and I've lived above Sunset Boulevard for the last 40 or 45 years -- it was busy then and it's constantly remained busy.

We choose to live there, and we choose to live there for a reason. Whatever our own individual reasons are, we chose it then and we still -- we still choose it. We can move, although in today's economy, it's a little harder to extract ourselves.

But Miller is narrow, Miller has problems, but I don't believe that this is going to compound Miller's problems. I think there are a couple of things that need to be sort of looked into to make the problems a little less, and I don't -- I wouldn't make them a condition of approval if, in fact, this does get approved, but I think the concept of ensuring that seven cars get off the street to ensure that there is no congestion is not

enough.

I think when you're dealing with raw land and the concept of a carriage lane, which could get more than seven cars off the street -- in other words, you could get seven cars in the project and a carriage lane might get another seven or eight cars off the street -- is certainly something to consider and I think in the applicant's best interest because if you do have 9,000 square feet of commercial, which is not a lot of commercial at all, you want it to be successful commercial, and if you don't have a situation where cars can get off the street and where people can't get in and out easily, your commercial is going to be worthless because you're not going to have customers. So I would urge that the applicant do consider something like that.

I would also think that the billboard is sort of conceptual at this particular time. Yes, the Sunset Specific Plan does allow a billboard here, but I don't know that we should approve the permit for the billboard at this particular time because it's just too conceptual. I think they can certainly live without that until they have something a little bit more refined.

So I would move that -- move to approve the application, adopt resolution #PC10-924 certifying the final EIR and adopting the mitigation monitoring and

1 reporting program, adopt resolution PC-925, conditionally 2 approving the demolition permit, development permit, 3 extract the billboard permit from the entitlement, and 4 approve the tentative tract map as indicated on the staff 5 report for the properties located at 8497-8499 Sunset, 6 West Hollywood, California. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Do we have a second on that 8 motion? 9 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'll second that. 10 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 11 I have a question. ANNE MCINTOSH: 12 CHAIR YEBER: Go ahead, Anne. 13 ANNE MCINTOSH: The word "extract," would that be 14 meaning that you just aren't taking action so it's on 15 hold? 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right, on hold. Thank you, 17 Anne. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Can you, Christi, maybe give us some 19 clarification because I understand we went through 20 something similar our last meeting regarding removing a 21 certain component. We didn't take any action on it, so 22 do we need to take action on the billboard as a separate 23 meeting, continue it? 24 CHRISTI HOGIN: What you did last time was a little 25 different because then on that one you actually intended

1 to take action in the future. You wanted to continue it 2 because you wanted to give the public a chance. 3 appropriate action you took in that case was to continue 4 that tentative tract map to another night. 5 CHAIR YEBER: But on the first one, we didn't. 6 CHRISTI HOGIN: Tonight -- right, well, you actually 7 denied that because you were done with it. You were 8 rejecting it. 9 In this -- on this one tonight, though, I think that 10 probably the best thing to do would be to deny the 11 billboard permit without prejudice so they can bring it 12 back at any time when they're ready. 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right. And I think that's a 14 good idea. 15 Also, I don't recall, but is there a finite number 16 of billboards under the SSP that can be added to the 17 current inventory so that since these people aren't 18 ready, it frees it up for whoever comes first? Is that, 19 in fact, a true statement? 20 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: No, there's no restriction on the number of standard billboards. I think there's a 21 22 restriction on Jumbotrons, which this --23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That's four, right? 24 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct, correct, correct. 25 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Marc?

25

the motion.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:

1 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, yes? 2 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I was going to clarify. 3 Their intent in the future, I think, was to come back 4 with a DA anyway, so I guess at that time they can bring 5 the billboard forward to us. 6 And, also, as far as the billboard itself goes, 7 that's a billboard intended for this site because it 8 allows for a billboard to be incorporated into a building 9 so that wouldn't count toward the -- it'd be on an 10 inventory list perhaps, but it wouldn't count toward a 11 limit on the number of billboards, correct? 12 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct. 13 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, so since we have a slight change 14 to staff's recommendation, is there discussion on the 15 billboard component in itself before we move forward? 16 mean or maybe there's a (inaudible) -- is there any 17 objection to the billboard component part? 18 Okay, the motion on the table is the staff... 19 COMMISSIONER HANAKER: Chair Yeber? 20 CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 21 COMMISSIONER HANAKER: I'm sorry. I do have a 22 clarification on the motion that was made about the 23 carriage lane and how specific that has to be or not in

That was -- I did -- that

was not included in the motion.

**COMMISSIONER HANAKER:** Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That was a suggestion.

**COMMISSIONER HANAKER:** Okay, thanks.

CHAIR YEBER: But did you want to make a condition?

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: If it was included in his motion, I wanted to understand what the specifics were, but as long as it wasn't, it's fine. We'll discuss it afterwards.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Joe?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yeah, I support the billboard. I think it's very clear from the plans where it's going to be, how large it's going to be. The only question that the applicant might bring before us later is a development agreement to change it into a digital billboard. But the placement, size, style of the billboard is very clear, and it's contemplating it in the Sunset Specific Plan. So I'm sort of hesitant to remove it now because it might injure the viability of this project.

And I know we're not supposed to think o the economics of this, but the fact of the matter is that projects do depend on billboards, and I don't want to kill this project just because we are waiting for a

23

24

25

1 development agreement later. 2 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can I say something, Marc, 3 too? I also tend to agree with Joseph because I actually 4 think it's well incorporated into the architect of the 5 building. So for that reason, I don't really have a 6 problem with that, with the billboard, so... 7 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Mr. Chair? 9 CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 10 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I also feel at this time that 11 it is incorporated and it's part of the building. 12 an important part. However, I do want to specify tonight 13 that if we approve it with the billboard component that 14 it be a standard billboard and that they'd have to bring 15 it back for any modifications. 16 Which is, I think, is already part of CHAIR YEBER: 17 the resolution as it stands, correct, Francisco? 18 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Okav. Alan, do you want to chime in 20 on the billboard issue? 21 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I don't have a problem with the standard billboard as envisioned in the specific plan and as laid out in the model, and I think I'm just duplicating what some other commissioners have said already.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, so ... 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, then there's clearly 3 four people in support of a standard billboard, so I'll 4 revise the motion to include the staff report's 5 suggestion or recommendation with respect to the 6 billboard as part of the motion. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. And --8 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: It's not a recommendation, 9 though, right? This is a final action on our part? Yeah. 10 CHAIR YEBER: 11 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yeah. 12 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I believe that one of our 13 fellow commissioners approved the original motion. 14 needs to withdraw her second, and then we need a new 15 second on the new motion. 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, the new --17 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: She is not fond of 18 billboards, but she also doesn't want to fall on her 19 sword on this issue, so it's fine. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, so you're withdrawing the second 21 22 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: No, no, I'm (inaudible) --23 CHAIR YEBER: On the first? 24 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Yeah, yeah. I'll second it 25 with the billboard. It's okay.

1 CHAIR YEBER: You're amending your second? 2 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Amending my second. 3 CHAIR YEBER: And you're amending the (inaudible)? 4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** You know I'm not a legalese 5 person. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Is this clear? Okay. 7 CHRISTI HOGIN: There's a motion and a second for 8 staff recommendation. 9 Okay. And I would just like to add a CHAIR YEBER: 10 condition similar to the Monarch project concerning 11 coordination with outside agencies, such as public 12 utilities and the fire department, shall be conducted in 13 advance of construction document submittal so as to best 14 determine the best location of necessary fixtures and screening strategies to minimize the impact on the 15 16 aesthetic amenities as they relate to the public realm. 17 Does that make sense? 18 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Perfect sense. And if I can 19 just -- if I can just amend condition 1-11, we wanted to 20 just include some additional language in order to clarify 21 that condition. We want to state that the applicant 22 shall obtain any required zoning entitlements and 23 construction permits from the City of Los Angeles for the 24 portion of the project which lies within the City of LA

to the satisfaction of the community development

director. We just wanted to just clarify that particular condition.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That's acceptable.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Are both the change and the added condition acceptable to the maker and the seconder?

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Yeah, except may I just ask,
I also wanted to have a bit of discussion before the vote
if that's possible. I had a few things I wanted to say.

CHAIR YEBER: That's fine.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Should I do it now or do you want to...

CHAIR YEBER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Okay. I just wanted to thank the people from Los Angeles for coming out. This is -- we have always had issues with our neighbors on the north side of Sunset in the Hills. I years ago used to live in the Hollywood Hills. I totally understand the issues with the windy streets, and I'm very envious that you live up there because it is absolutely gorgeous.

I wanted to specifically say to the young father who was distressed about his babies, we have often had these issues with our emergency vehicles going to be able to get up and down, and I would say that this particular project is not going to make or break that from happening. It will depend on what is going on on the

Sunset Strip.

But I would hope that that young man doesn't dwell on this and make his life a misery. I felt very badly for him because he was very obviously upset about it.

All of us have these problems. I live near La Brea where the Target was built, and 12 years ago when we were discussing that, I was convinced that my street, Formosa, was going to be destroyed, and I was as angry as all of you people are, and nothing happened. The traffic mitigations were wonderful. I have less traffic on my street than I did before.

And everyone who come -- most people who come to these Planning Commission meetings have the same reaction you do -- in fact, I wrote down what someone said, "The traffic will be a nightmare." We should have that engraved on this table because that's our life.

I was thinking 100 years ago Miller Drive, if it existed, was a dirt road and people were arguing over the horse (expletive) that was being left on the road. I mean everything having to do with cars has cropped up since the '50s, post-war, and we're now dealing mainly with this problem of these vehicles.

So I just -- I hope that you don't think we're unfeeling. I'm thrilled with this project. I'm absolutely stunned at how beautiful it is. We have

25

1 entitled so many projects on Sunset and they've never 2 been built. If this one gets built, we're just going to 3 have a huge party because it's really beautiful. 4 you. 5 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Mr. Chair? 6 CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 7 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: One last thing. Francisco, I 8 don't -- I'm not sure I understood what the condition was 9 that you were saying because I'm -- would you explain it 10 again? 11 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Sure. It's condition 1-11, 12 page 9 of 28 of Resolution PC 10-925. 13 The way that the condition is phrased now, it may 14 give the -- it may be interpreted to mean that only 15 construction permits shall be required or approval of the 16 construction permits from City of LA. 17 We wanted to just clarify that the applicant shall 18 obtain any required zoning entitlements, as well as 19 construction permits, from the City of LA. 20 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Okay, well, I have -- I'm 21 having a little bit of a question on that because the 22 letter that was provided to our city and the entitlements 23 that were given to our city with regard to the

supervision of this project, the City of Los Angeles gave

us exclusive use of it, basically exclusive.

24

25

1 CHRISTI HOGIN: I don't think we're in a position to 2 adjudicate that, and it's not really legally clear what 3 happened. 4 I really would advise you to just focus on West Hollywood and our Sunset Specific Plan and our general 5 plan and our rules and not worry -- let them worry about 6 7 that. 8 If it turns out that the effect of that letter was 9 to do as you say and that the subsequent attempt to take 10 it back was invalid, then the net effect will be they 11 won't have to get any permissions, but it's not really 12 this body's problem. 13 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Okay. 14 CHAIR YEBER: Well, not only that, it does say if 15 any, so it's just basically saying... Okay, any other 16 discussion on this? 17 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I just want to make one 18 little comment. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Yes, go ahead. 20 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Just because I don't know 21 when we'll have Mr. Hodgetts back in front of us. 22 I just need to say what a pleasure it was,

particularly Design Review, to hear his description of

John Chase but we lost Stephen Kanner.

the project, especially in a year where we not only lost

It's just so

exciting to have an architect who is clearly in love with his building explaining his love of the building. That was a really nice experience, and I just wanted to thank you for that.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. I just have a few comments and then we'll move to a vote on this.

I just want to say I, too, want to thank the public for coming out and addressing their concerns, especially the traffic. I get it. We all get it up here. We understand that traffic is a problem, and we try to take every step possible to mitigate it and make it as livable a condition as possible, and you have to commend our staff for constantly looking at new ways to restructure such intersections. So I do appreciate spending the time, especially at this late hour.

The project effectively addresses some very significant site constraints and one that we probably won't see again any time soon, the SSP and the Sunset Strip, the topography, the massing, circulation, obviously as mentioned, and then obviously the transition in urban form.

If you look at the urban form that's below Sunset and above, it's quite different, and I think this particular project really handled every one of those constraints in a fantastic way.

1 I also wanted to commend the architect not only for 2 design but also the clarity and the drawing set. 3 very easily understood, and I appreciate that. 4 The project's contextually sensitive. It's a strong 5 design solution that fully realizes the position as 6 anchor on Santa Monica -- at the end of La Cienega and 7 its place on Sunset Boulevard, so I really see this as 8 one of the strongest projects that I've had the pleasure 9 of reviewing. 10 And so with that, David, will you take a roll call 11 vote. 12 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Altschul? 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. 14 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker? 15 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Aye. 16 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Bernstein? 17 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Aye. 18 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner? 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: 20 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner DeLuccio? 21 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes. 22 DAVID GILLIG: Vice-Chair Guardarrama? 23 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yes. 24 **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber? 25 CHAIR YEBER: Yes.

1 DAVID GILLIG: Motion carries, unanimous. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Can you read the appeal 3 process? 4 DAVID GILLIG: The resolution the Planning Commission just approved memorializes the Commission's 5 6 final action on this matter. This action is subject to 7 appeal to the City Council. 8 Appeals must be submitted within 10 calendar days 9 from the state to the city clerk's office. Appeals must 10 be in writing and accompanied by the required fees. The 11 City Clerk's office can provide appeal forms and 12 information about waiver of fees. 13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible - microphone 14 inaccessible) 15 Okay, so we're going to move on to --CHAIR YEBER: 16 do we have new business? There's -- new business. 17 have none. Unfinished business. Planning Commission 18 subcommittees. Okay. Are you ready, David? 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Could you ask the public to 20 take their conversations outside the auditorium? 21 CHAIR YEBER: Can you all take -- excuse me, those 22 that are leaving the meeting, can you take your 23 discussion outside so we can continue and wrap up here? 24 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Jeanne? 25 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Ms. Dobrin? Jeanne?

1 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Now. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Ms. Eisenberg? 3 Okay. All right. Design Review Subcommittee will 4 stand as it currently is. That is myself, Marc Yeber, 5 Alan Bernstein, and Sue Buckner. 6 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Thank you. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Long-Range Planning Project 8 Subcommittee, which will also handle zoning issues once 9 the general plan is adopted, will be Joseph Guardarrama, 10 Barbara Hamaker, Donald DeLuccio. 11 Business Signage Committee will be Joe Guardarrama, 12 John Altschul, and Sue Buckner. 13 Plummer Park Steering Committee is Barbara Hamaker. 14 The Working Group Committee is Barbara Hamaker and 15 John Altschul. 16 And I have it if you want it in written form. 17 Okay, great. 18 Excluded consent calendar, none. Items from staff, 19 planning manager with our lovely community development 20 director. 21 ANNE MCINTOSH: The stand-in. The stand-in for John who's -- the understudy, and that's actually true. He's 22 23 always got this stuff together. He knows where the memo 24 is about the item continued and all of that. 25 So, of course, we hope you'll join us on Tuesday at

Plummer Park at four o'clock to honor John Chase and enjoy good memories of his time with us. So four to seven, service and refreshments and good fellowship.

I think you -- maybe do you have one more meeting before you're going to review of the general plan? No So your next meeting.

So we've been studiously looking at what you have to cover, the issues you have to cover, the comments that we've received from the community and put together or are putting together some very specific agendas about what you can cover at each of those meetings.

I'll talk to [Bianca] because I think it would be helpful for you all to sort see how we have it all laid out further in advance than the 16th or the date that you get the packet.

So as soon as we know the order in which we're going to ask you to consider things or take the public testimony, we'll try to bring that forward to you so you can be prepared for those very intensive meetings.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay.

ANNE MCINTOSH: The Sunset Time project was continued to September 7, the appeal at the Council, and at this point, it looks as if it will go that night. And I'm not sure there's any other outstanding issues of your items to report on unless you have questions.

1 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Sunset Time, an appeal or 2 (inaudible)? 3 It was not an appeal, it was ... ANNE MCINTOSH: 4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: A recommendation? 5 ANNE MCINTOSH: Yes, your recommendation to Council 6 because it has legislative items. 7 CHAIR YEBER: If I could chime in, I did have a 8 chance to speak to John on Wednesday regarding the 9 sequencing of the three meetings. 10 ANNE MCINTOSH: Good. 11 CHAIR YEBER: I could share that with the 12 Commission. 13 I don't think you need to tonight. ANNE MCINTOSH: 14 We'll just take whatever conversations you had, and we'll 15 roll them into that when we bring it forward. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, no, it was just he was talking 17 about he envisioned it would happen, so... 18 ANNE MCINTOSH: Yeah, and I -- because we don't have 19 that all finished yet, let's wait until it's put down in 20 writing, and then we'll get it out to you. 21 CHAIR YEBER: So one of the other things that I'd 22 asked about was sort of a -- kind of a cheat sheet in 23 terms of how to -- since we're dealing with some pretty 24 meaty issues and a lot of documentation, how you would 25 advise us as commissioners to best organize our review,

an organization of thought so that it's a coherent and helpful feedback during that process and...

ANNE MCINTOSH: So just...

CHAIR YEBER: Again, John had some thoughts so maybe...

ANNE MCINTOSH: Right, but tonight, I can just tell you between now and the time that you embark on the hearings that our focus will be from all of the feedback that we've heard from the community already, we'll be certain to make you aware of the issues that have been raised by people in the community over the summer.

You may have some issues yourselves that you noticed as you were reading through the documents, and certainly you could bring those with you.

We are taking the approach that on many, many aspects of the general plan document that are non-controversial or that continue policies that we already have, there's really no need for intense discussion.

You'd be reading the document and saying, "Well, of course this is what we've always done and this is what we're going to continue to do," and there's no need to go over it page by page, in our minds.

And so what we'll try to focus your attention on are the things that have been raised as concerns or where there's maybe two points of view.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

And so I would just suggest that when you get the staff report and you see what those are, that you spend time looking at those sections of the documents. CHAIR YEBER: And will we be getting that earlier than we normally get our staff report? ANNE MCINTOSH: That's what I was saying. We'll try to get you something as soon as we have it ready. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. ANNE MCINTOSH: But certainly we'll pace it so that you're not having to think of all of it in one night. That's where we're spreading it out. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. I want to thank you, Anne, COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: for doing that because it will certainly help us and move us in the right direction in terms of our discussions. Thank you. ANNE MCINTOSH: Um-hmm. CHAIR YEBER: Now, there was also one other item, but we'll wait till John gets back, that commissioners have asked me about is the restructuring of Design Review, but we'll wait till he gets back unless you want 22 to add -- chime in. ANNE MCINTOSH: No, no, we're talking about that

just in terms of how you operate your meetings and maybe

some new ideas for how you can operate the meetings more

effectively, so we'll bring that back at some point, too, as a guideline, and you can certainly have discussion about it.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, great. Thank you.

JEANNE DOBRIN: Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute to speak about John Chase?

CHAIR YEBER: Submit -- when we get to comments.

Public comment, I have Bruce Robertson, and then if the Commission would so incline be -- indulge Ms. Dobrin, we'll allow her her minute to speak about John Chase.

**COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay.

BRUCE ROBERTSON: Good evening. My name is Bruce Robertson. I'm speaking as a resident of the City of West Hollywood and one who attends these meetings fairly regularly, and although I don't go to City Council, I can assure you that I watch them vigilantly.

I'm really happy to hear that Commissioner Hamaker was troubled by the speaker with the two little children who was so -- you could tell that he hadn't been to public meetings and he was speaking and then we're asking him to -- you know, "I can't hear. Can you move the mic up." And this poor man was trying to talk about his poor little children that he was so worried about, and this is my concern. We have members of the public who make outbursts on a regular basis. It's inappropriate and

it's disrespectful.

It's disrespectful, first of all, to the public speaker. This poor man was -- I mean you all saw him. He said, "I don't mind feeling uncomfortable," because he was speaking about his children.

But these outbursts are a regular occurrence and they're inappropriate, and I would hope that the Commission would stop them.

For those who are hearing impaired, we have the closed captioning.

I usually am not embarrassed by outbursts, but tonight I was generally embarrassed for this poor man, and I just wanted to bring that to your attention. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Jeanne, one minute, on John Chase only.

JEANNE DOBRIN: Thank you. When that man was speaking, there was no closed captioning. Closed captioning has been turned off sometimes 10 minutes at a time.

Anyhow, let me get to John Chase. John Chase, when I used to go to the Design Review Committee meetings, they didn't have either a television monitor with closed captioning and they didn't have the Sennheiser devices, which the City put in this room at my request about 15

years ago under ADA qualifications. And John Chase went way out of his -- out of his work and whatever, and he arranged for all that to happen.

And as you know, last year due to a nomination that was made for me by one of the Commission members to become honored by the Disability Board, that was part of it, that I always wanted to have the Sennheiser device, and he carried it out. And that was so kind and dear of him, and I always appreciate it, as the rest of West Hollywood should. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Jeanne.

Okay, items from commissioners? Anybody? Okay, John?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, first of all, it was pointed out that where John Chase and I went to that class and saw the performing arts center was the Cerritos Performing Arts Center, not La Mirada. I didn't drive. I know what I saw, but I didn't know where I was.

And, secondly, I want to point out that we were given tonight revised bylaws for the Planning Commission, and the -- one of the changes in it is that the public comments are now reverting back to two minutes rather than three minutes according to the new revised bylaws that are dated today.

So I think the public should be aware that from now

1 on there is a two-minute public comment period and not a 2 three-minute public comment period. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Donald? 4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Oh, I just wanted to wish 5 Jeanne Dobrin a happy 90th birthday. Is your birthday on 6 Sunday, Jeanne? 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Monday. 8 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Monday? She can't even hear 9 Happy birthday, and I know you got a plaque at the me. 10 City Council meeting on Monday. Well deserved. 11 And I also want to wish you a post-happy birthday, 12 Chair Yeber, and I actually have it written down in my 13 calendar right here that your birthday was on Tuesday. 14 CHAIR YEBER: It was. 15 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. 16 CHAIR YEBER: A spry 28. 17 JEANNE DOBRIN: And Mr. Altschul's birthday is 18 Tuesday. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Oh, well, and I think Barbara's was a 20 couple weeks prior to that, so we have three Leos up 21 here. 22 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: A lot of good Leos. CHAIR YEBER: Any other --23 24 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I'm a Virgo. 25 CHAIR YEBER: Oh, you are. Okay, any other

1	1 comments? No?		
2	With that, we adjourn to our next m	neeting, wh	ich
3	would be September 16. Thank you.		
4	[Meeting adjourned.]		
5	-000-		
6			
7	APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING C $16^{\text{TH}}$ DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2010.	COMMISSION	ON THIS
8	8		
9	9		
10	0 CHAIRPERSO	N	
11	1 ATTEST:		
12	2		
13	3		
14	4 COMMISSION SECRETARY		
15	5		
16	6		
17	7		
18	8		
19	9		
20	0		
21	1		
22	2		
23	3		
24	4		
25	5		

comments? No? With that, we adjourn to our next meeting, which would be September 16. Thank you. [Meeting adjourned.] -000-APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS  $16^{\text{TH}}$  DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2010. CHAIRPER ATTEST: COMMISSION SECRETARY