1 CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION 2 THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 2010 AT 6:30 PM 3 4 CHAIR YEBER: Good evening. I'm going to start the 5 meeting. Will Sam Borelli come to the podium and lead us 6 in the Pledge of Allegiance, please? 7 SAM BORELLI: (Pledge of Allegiance) 8 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Sam. David, can we have a 9 roll call, please? 10 DAVID GILLIG: Good evening. Commissioner DeLuccio? 11 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Here. 12 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Hamaker? 13 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Here. 14 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Buckner? 15 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Here. 16 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Bernstein? 17 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Here. 18 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul? 19 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Here. 20 DAVID GILLIG: Vice-Chair Guardarrama? 21 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Here. 22 DAVID GILLIG: Chair Yeber? 23 CHAIR YEBER: Here. 24 DAVID GILLIG: And we have a quorum. 25 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Do I have an approval for

1 the agenda? 2 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll move the agenda, but is 3 it possible that we could put public hearing A, Sunset 4 Strip Median, on the consent calendar? Is there anybody 5 here to hear that? 6 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Fine with me. 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Sounds good. 8 **DAVID GILLIG:** Oh, we have one speaker. 9 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: We have a speaker on that? 10 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, so then we can't move 11 it. Okay. I'll move the agenda. 12 COMMISSIONER YEBER: Do I have a second? 13 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Second. 14 COMMISSIONER YEBER: All in favor? 15 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye. 16 COMMISSIONER YEBER: Anybody opposed? It passes. 17 Approval of the minutes. 18 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll make a motion. 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Second. 20 COMMISSIONER YEBER: And second from Commissioner 21 Buckner. Do I have -- all in favor? 22 **COMMISSIONERS:** Aye. 23 COMMISSIONER YEBER: Any opposed? Okay, minutes are 24 approved. Public comment. David? I have one speaker, 25 Sam Borelli.

SAM BORELLI: Good evening. Sam Borelli, member of the City of West Hollywood Public Safety Commission.

Actually, I'm chair right now.

As you know, I come and visit you from time to time and talk about our public safety education campaign, often vehicle burglary prevention and emergency preparedness on the higher on our agenda.

For the summer, we decided to take up two new areas of concern, and the first one is street robbery prevention, and this is, in particular, walking home alone at night or early in the morning by yourself and just being aware of your surroundings, making sure maybe you bring a buddy with you, making sure people know where you're going, staying in well-lit areas.

We just did some outreach to the bars and restaurants, nightclubs, for the folks that are getting off work at two or three or four in the morning that might have their Micky's shirt on and might have their tips in their pocket to just take a little more precautions.

We are a safe city, but there have been instances of assaults and incidents of armed burglaries, so I'm reminding you of this.

The other issue that we took up over the summer is Internet safety and online safety, and there's kind of

two components to this.

One is just protecting yourself from scams that happen. You might get an e-mail saying that your Uncle Bo passed away 22 years ago and there's some money in the family coffer, so please send us all your information. That's probably a scam.

And also with the online sites, the scammers are getting really good at creating a Bank of America logo that looks like your Bank of America logo. So just -- if you bank is asking you to give them all the information, probably not your bank because they have most of your information.

So protect yourself from those online -- you know, Facebook. If you post on Facebook, "I'm going out and I'm heading out for the evening," and somebody knows where you live, you're inviting somebody to potentially burglar your house.

The other thing is people in West Hollywood are often advertising for a roommate situation or there might be selling of furniture or something and they're bringing people to their house that they don't know, strangers. So be aware of strangers.

I'm asking other commissioners to help us remind people in the neighborhood. Unfortunately, there was an incident in the State of Washington where the husband of

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS:

1 a family was murdered over a \$1,000 diamond ring that they advertised on Craigslist. So make sure you have 2 3 somebody with you when you're doing that kind of stuff. 4 And also online dating. If you're online dating, 5 try to meet somebody in public. Again, you might not 6 know this person. Don't bring a stranger into your home 7 right away. Get to know them first in a public location. 8 So I ask you to take these brochures that I left for 9 you and also tell your friends and neighbors and family 10 and just remind you to be safe out there. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Sam. 12 All right, items from Commissioner. Commissioner 13 Buckner? 14 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Thank you. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Bernstein? 16 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: No, thank you. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul? 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I've been told by several 19 members of the community that there is only one copy of 20 the General Plan, the associated EIR, and the Climate 21 Action Plan available for public perusal, and I think that's a little bit short of what there should be. 22 23 don't know if there's anybody here in the room that can 24 do anything about that. John Keho isn't here, and--

Yes, we can make some more

copies available.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Since the general plan process was ballyhooed from day one as being inclusionary and transparent, it would seem to me that it be incumbent upon the city to provide copies to anybody that wants to undertake to read it, which is a huge project, and to allow anybody that has an interest in it the ability to have access to it.

And I understand, also, that this one copy that is available is being passed out for sort of library lending for one or two days at a time, which certainly doesn't make any sense because nobody can get through that in one or two days and have a little sleep.

So I would suggest that somewhere 15 or 20 copies at least to start with be available for those wonderful citizens that want to participate in giving some input into it and trying to digest it.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Okay, perfect.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: I would like to remind everybody that we do have the General Plan Draft and the EIR also available online.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I knew you were going to say that.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct.

1 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The problem with that is for 2 some of us that wear glasses with bifocals and perhaps 3 trifocals, reading hundreds of pages online like this is 4 just not doable, and printing it out is certainly not a reasonable solution, especially when you can burden 5 6 people with all that poundage to carry home and give them 7 the exercise in carrying it upstairs. 8 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: We'll make extra copies 9 available. 10 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 11 Thank you, Commissioner Altschul, for CHAIR YEBER: 12 those comments. 13 Commissioner Hamaker? Commissioner DeLuccio? 14 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: If someone wants to borrow 15 my copy, you have my phone number. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama? 17 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Oh, I just have one comment 18 on what Mr. Borelli said. He said to avoid meeting 19 people online and then having them come to your house, 20 but one of the brochures he passed out says, "At night, 21 avoid public parks, vacant lots, alleys, and areas with 22 excessive trees and brush." So where are you supposed to meet them, Mr. Borelli? 23 24 SAM BORELLI: In a coffee shop.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:

24

25

1 CHAIR YEBER: And I have no further -- I have no 2 comments. We have no items on the consent calendar, so 3 we will move to our first public hearing, which is the 4 placement of offsite district identification signs in the 5 Sunset Plaza, and I believe Antonio Castillo is the 6 planner who will give us the staff report. 7 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Mr. Chair? 8 CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 9 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I'm going to need to recuse 10 myself from this item. 11 CHAIR YEBER: So noted, thank you. 12 ANTONIO CASTILLO: Good evening, Chairperson Yeber 13 and members of the Commission. 14 The item before you this evening is a city-initiated proposal for the placement of offsite district 15 16 identification signs on the medians within the Sunset 17 Plaza district. The placement of the signs is part of 18 the Sunset Plaza median and sidewalk improvements for the 19 Sunset Strip Beautification project. 20 The proposal includes illuminated offsite signs 21 within three separate landscaped medians located at the 22 intersections of Sunset Boulevard and Sunset Plaza Drive.

It is staff's assessment that these signs would be

The image projected identifies three red dots, and those

are the approximate locations of the offsite signs.

consistent with the design of the onsite identification signs already located throughout the Sunset Plaza.

Additionally, the signs, in combination with the new landscape medians, would further promote the goals and objectives of the Sunset-specific plan by enhancing the aesthetic quality of the street.

Pursuant to the zoning code, the Planning Commission may allow offsite signs for identified districts in compliance with the Sunset-specific plan and subject to a maintenance agreement. In this instance, the placement of the signs is consistent with the zoning code provisions for signage, and the goals and objectives of the Sunset-specific plan and a maintenance agreement has been approved between the city and Montgomery Management Company. Therefore, it is staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission allow the placement of the offsite district identification signs by adopting a resolution making a finding to that effect.

And with that, this concludes my presentation, and staff's available for any questions.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Do commissioners have questions?

Okay. Are there -- let's go through disclosures real quick, just a blanket disclosure. Anyone have any disclosures regarding this item?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, we have one speaker, a Joseph 4 Clapsaddle. 5 JOSEPH CLAPSADDLE: Good evening, commissioners, 6 My name is Joseph Clapsaddle. I'm a resident and 7 businessperson in West Hollywood. And while you might 8 think this is redundant because you know I'm a huge fan 9 of signs on Sunset Boulevard, I think that this is an 10 excellent way for us to identify this shopping area in a 11 very tasteful way, and I appreciate the staff's 12 recommendation, of which I am in favor. Thank you. 13 Thank you. All right. CHAIR YEBER: Since there's 14 no other speakers, I'll close the public hearing. 15 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll move the item. 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Second. 17 Okay. Is there any discussion? CHAIR YEBER: 18 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: 19 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, seeing no discussion, all in 20 favor say aye. 21 COMMISSIONERS: Aye. 22 CHAIR YEBER: Anybody opposed? Okay, the motion 23 carries unanimously. 24 Okay, with that, we are going to move on to the next 25 item, which is Monarch mixed-use project at Santa Monica

1 and La Brea Avenue. And I believe --2 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Mr. Chair? 3 CHAIR YEBER: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I need to recuse myself from 5 both of these public hearings. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, thank you. So noted. Okay, on 7 the --8 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Barbara, I texted Sue to 9 let her know to come back in, but if you see her, can 10 you...? 11 We're just going to wait for our other CHAIR YEBER: 12 commissioner. 13 Okay, this project is for 7113-71125 (sic) Santa 14 Monica Boulevard, 112 North Detroit, and 1111 North La 15 Brea Avenue. Francisco, staff report, please? 16 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Sure. Thank you, Chair, and 17 good evening, commissioners. 18 Now, the proposed Monarch at Santa Monica Boulevard 19 and La Brea project involves the redevelopment of 20 approximately 1.4-acre site located at the northwest 21 corner of La Brea Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard. Uр 22 on the screen, you'll see the existing Carl's Jr. 23 restaurant, retail, commercial, and industrial buildings, 24 and associated surface parking lots that would be 25 replaced with a six-story building.

Now, this building will contain 184 residential units, including 37 affordable units and three live/work units facing Detroit Street. These units will help the City meet their local and regional housing needs.

There will also be approximately 13,000 square feet of ground-level retail and restaurant uses, approximately 25,000 square feet of open space, and plentiful streetscape improvements that will really create a high-quality pedestrian environment along Detroit Street and Santa Monica Boulevard.

Now, approval of a tentative map is requested that would permit the subdivision of the commercial tenant spaces on the ground floor and also so that the applicant may retain the possibility to convert the rental units to condos in the future. Now, such a condo conversion would require review and approval by the director and would have to comply with all the condo conversion requirements found in the zoning code.

Now, the project does involve a general plan and zoning map amendment for the northwestern-most parcel, what you see on the screen, so that it conforms with the overall zoning of the project site, which is CA for a commercial arterial.

Now, with the approval of these map amendments, the project will comply with all applicable development

standards for mixed-use projects in the CA zone.

Now, because the project provides 37 affordable dwelling units, the project is eligible for a 25% density or FAR bonus and two concessions.

The project is seeking one concession to modify the rear yard height requirement for the portion of the project which is adjacent to the residential zoning district, currently used as a parking lot for the McDonald's restaurant.

Also, the project is seeking a concession from the private open space requirement for 126 of the proposed rental units. In order to offset the lack of this private open space in these units, the project proposes large, well developed, and high-functioning common open spaces throughout the project in different locations with varied amenities where the residents have the advantage of sharing a space far bigger and more versatile than any private space of their own.

Now, the city did conduct an environmental impact analysis that identified temporary construction noise and traffic and circulation impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant. If the city were to approve the project as proposed, the city would have to make a finding that the benefits of the project outweigh the impacts at the time of approval. This is

known as a statement of overriding considerations.

Now, a statement of overriding considerations is attached to draft resolution PC09938 as attachment B, and that statement finds that the project's benefits outweigh the project's significant impacts to noise and traffic.

Among these benefits, the project will implement many of the existing housing mixed-use and east side revitalization general plan goals of the city, as well as an important goal to establish the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard and La Brea Avenue as a principal activity center and entry to the City of West Hollywood.

Now, at their last meeting, the east side PAC enthusiastically and unanimously endorsed the project.

Also, the Planning Commission Design Review Subcommittee was supportive of the project's urban design and architecture.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project because it will develop a prominent mixed-use building at the eastern edge of the Santa Monica Boulevard corridor that will enhance the major eastern gateway to the city.

Now, the three blocks of La Brea within the City of West Hollywood are a prime location for larger, more urban development that reflects the ready availability of transit at the major bus transfer corner of La Brea of Santa Monica Boulevard, as well as the adjacency to

downtown Hollywood to the northeast. In addition, La
Brea Avenue has larger parcel sizes than in the norm in
West Hollywood, and the ample width of the public rightof-way also makes this an appropriate location for
larger-scale projects.

As designed, the project will become a new urban landmark that is as a contextual and appropriately scaled solution for the site that will really enhance the quality of life in the east side of the city.

Due to these benefits and those outlined in your staff report and resolution, staff recommends that the Commission recommends the City Council certify the final EAR, adopt the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, adopt the statement of overriding considerations, and approve the project.

Now, staff would like to mention that we have indicated some revisions to Resolution PC10939.

On page six of 30, we revised finding number five, just to clarify, some of those specific findings necessary for our implementation of inclusionary units.

Furthermore, the fire department has added some additional conditions to the approval of the tract map, and those revisions are found on page 26 of 30 under heading 15, Fire Department.

So with that, staff concludes our presentation. To

answer any of your questions, we have our environmental consulting team here from Impact Sciences, our traffic consultant from [Fair & Peers], our city's transportation division, as well, and John Chase, our city's urban designer. So they're all available for questions at this time. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, does John Chase want to say something about the project before I ask questions of the commission?

JOHN CHASE: I guess I just wanted to say that this is a project that is a large and important enough use and building with enough attention to detail with the differentiation into different elements so that it's not a monolith but it is designed as a large building at the scale of a large building, so it looks like it should sit at a major metropolitan corner. It has fantastic landscape design.

The provision that there be more common open space and less private open space is really merited because of the quality of the design, the location of the common open space, and it has the all-important double row of trees along Santa Monica Boulevard that I think the east side would be very proud of if this project were approved.

So I just wanted to say those very general words.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, thank you. Commissioners --I'll start with Commissioner Buckner. Do you have 2 3 questions for staff on this report? 4 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: No. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Bernstein? 6 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Disclosures now or do you 7 want to--? 8 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Disclosures? 9 Well, we can. Want to do disclosures? CHAIR YEBER: 10 Disclosures, Commissioner Buckner? 11 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes. I had an opportunity to 12 meet with the applicant's representative, Jeff Seymour, 13 this week and review the video that they have at the 14 little office site that they have available for public, as well, and also discussed with him only those issues 15 16 that were part of the staff report. 17 Thank you. Commissioner Bernstein? CHAIR YEBER: 18 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: No questions at this time, 19 and similar disclosure to Commissioner Buckner. 20 with applicant's representatives and saw the video 21 presentation, as well, and we discussed matters that are 22 contained within the report. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Why don't we just stick 24 with disclosures, and I'll come back and do questions. 25 Commissioner Altschul?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I met just within the last several weeks with the applicants and saw the video and had -- saw the model and had a brief discussion about the projects. And I had also met with the applicants several years ago to have a general overall discussion about the possibility of a project for the city.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner DeLuccio?

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Met with the applicants, I viewed the video, and we had a discussion, but everything is contained in the staff report that we discussed.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: The same as Commissioner DeLuccio.

CHAIR YEBER: And I, too, met with the applicant and its representatives at their marketing center, where I saw the video and the boards that you see before you, as well as the models.

I also took a opportunity to walk the area just to get a better understand from a pedestrian level and understand traffic and some of the mass transit.

So with that, I'm going to go with questions, and I'll start with Commissioner Altschul since those two already stated.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Francisco, you stated, I believe, that this project will have 13,000 square feet

1 of retail? 2 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct, about 13,300 3 or so. 4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That's inclusive of 5 restaurant? That's both, restaurant and retail? 6 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Yes, correct, restaurant and 7 retail. 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: How many square feet of 9 restaurant and retail is this replacing? How many 10 existing square feet exists with respect to the retail 11 component? 12 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Okay, let me take a look at 13 the plans real quick and I'll get that information for 14 you. 15 Do you have other questions? CHAIR YEBER: 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: 17 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Commissioner DeLuccio? 18 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have no questions at this 19 time. 20 Okay, Commissioner Guardarrama? CHAIR YEBER: 21 COMMISSIONER GUARDARRAMA: 22 CHAIR YEBER: I do have a couple of questions, and 23 it could be -- the first question could be either 24 answered either by Francisco or John Chase. 25 to, "The project fits within a vision for the east side."

Maybe, John, you're more appropriate to help me clarify for the public what that vision might be so that we can determine or help determine if this project -- how this project fits in.

key to the vision on the east side along with preservation of some of the great housing stock in the neighborhood like the Poinsettia Green Acre neighborhood is making new housing opportunities that are on the boulevard and making a better boulevard. I think that -- I hope it's okay to say this as a former resident of the east side that those of us who live or have lived on the east side believe that there can be a better Santa Monica Boulevard, that one-story buildings and surface parking lots are not appropriate on a transit corridor.

So this fits into the vision for the east side by putting the greatest housing, the greatest density of housing opportunities at exactly the point where there's the most available transit right now, i.e., the busses, and also at a location where there might one day be other forms of public transportation, like the subway.

It provides more housing units right on Santa Monica
Boulevard that can have people living in them to
patronize more businesses for the people that are already
there, and it's a high-quality level of architecture, and

it is -- has an impressiveness about it in everything from the double row of trees to the large areas of the building. When you look at the corner, that has that little bit of monumental quality because a band of windows is joined together.

So I think it represents the hopes and aspirations where something more, something positive, something urban in a good way but not overwhelming, a very friendly kind of urbanism.

So those are the ways I think it fits with the vision that residents on the east side have had over the years, but this is all -- it's a -- at the same time, while it's an impressive building, it's still a friendly building.

So that's my shot at that.

CHAIR YEBER: So I guess my -- the reason why I asked that question is just I didn't know if there was something more concrete for the east side like we have for the Sunset-specific plan or something like that that gives us design guidelines of what -- how we shape the east side, especially at this particular intersection around these two corridors.

JOHN CHASE: We don't have specific design guidelines in that sense. There is enormous work.

There's the general plan. There's all kinds of documents

1 and workshops back in (inaudible) over the years, but we don't have a separate set of guidelines specifically as 2 3 we would, say, in the Sunset-specific plan. 4 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, thank you very much, John. 5 And, Francisco, just for clarification, this 6 particular item, as opposed to the one that follows, will 7 go to Council because of the zone amendment and the zone 8 map, the Zone [text] amendment and the Zone Map 9 Amendment? 10 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. 11 CHAIR YEBER: So are all our decisions on this one 12 simply a recommendation? 13 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. 14 CHAIR YEBER: Whereas the next one will be -- we 15 approve or [INAUDIBLE TALK OVER] not a project? 16 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, thank you. 18 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: And Commissioner Altschul, I 19 do have an answer for you on what's going to be replaced. 20 There is approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial 21 uses plus an additional 10,000 square feet of storage. 22 So approximately 20 square feet total of replacement. 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: What kind of storage, public 24 storage? 25 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: It's mostly, I think,

forward.

1 industrial storage. It's right there at the corner of Santa Monica and Detroit. 2 3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Does that generate any 4 revenue to the city? 5 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Very little. Just simply 6 storage. 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 8 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, if there are no other questions, 9 we're going to move to the public hearing, and we'll 10 start off with the applicant and the applicant's 11 representatives. I have three -- actually four, but the 12 last one, Mark Steres, will be speaking if necessary in 13 the rebuttal position. I have Jeff Seymour, Rod Stone, 14 and Kevin Newman, and I quess we'll start with Jeff. 15 Collectively, you'll have 10 minutes and then five 16 minutes for rebuttal. 17 **JEFF SEYMOUR:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of 18 the Commission, my name is Jeff Seymour. I'm with 19 Seymour Consulting Group. I reside in West Lake Village. 20 First and foremost, Mr. Chairman, I would like to 21 thank staff for three, almost four years of assistance. 22 Both Mr. Chase and Mr. Contreras have been wonderful in 23 regard to providing us with input as we move this process

25 Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be here representing

the Monarch Group tonight. I have for any number of years come to you with, I believe, rather significant projects that had been based really on the west side and on the middle portion of the City of West Hollywood. And tonight, we have come here to hopefully provide transformational projects for the east side of West Hollywood.

Great things, Mr. Chairman -- great things are happening on the east side of West Hollywood. And tonight, the two Monarch projects that you will consider will do the following.

One, we believe it's going to bring needed rental housing to West Hollywood's east side. We are going to - hopefully with your support -- enhance the pedestrian experience, generating opportunities for the existing restaurants and businesses. We're going to assist in generating new restaurants, new businesses on the east side, something that we're very, very proud of.

And Mr. Chairman, we will be building affordable units that are totally integrated into these projects and that are built to the same building standards as the market rate.

In addition, together, the Monarch Group and the city will activate the Santa Monica and La Brea quarters, we'll upgrade the sidewalks and streetscapes of this

area, and enhance the pedestrian experience and east side gateway.

We believe -- we are absolutely sure that this project, combined with the others that are coming to the east side of the City of West Hollywood, will indeed have transformational opportunities for the entire city and really for the entire region.

I will now introduce Rod Stone, who is a founding partner of the Monarch Group. He would like to provide a few minutes of background on the Monarch Group. We are then going to have Kevin Newman, our architect, speak and show you our animations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ROD STONE: Thank you, Jeff.

My name is Rod Stone. Reside in San Diego, California.

As one of the principals of the Monarch Group, we have over 40 years of experience in building high-end rental projects throughout Southern California. We pride ourselves in the extensive research that we do when it comes to actually finding a site, buying the site, and of course, developing the site and managing it, and we are honored to be part of a family here in the excitement of developing these projects in West Hollywood. We think it will be a continued, sustainable, and cutting edge for

the community and also for us.

We're a hands-on builder. We have built over, say, seven to eight thousand units to date, and we understand the process, and we understand that it's a difficult process, especially in the construction. And you have our word because we understand this process that we'll do everything in our power to diminish the amount of disruption that for sure will take place in the neighborhood. And it's not an empty promise for us because we know what it takes to build a project, our financing is arranged, and if you allow us, we will continue in obtaining our construction plans, getting our permits, and hopefully when we finish with that, then we will have a project finished in the year 2013.

We are especially proud of the support that we have received from the wonderful community of West Hollywood, and I would like to thank the people that are here today plus the support that we've had and thank all of you. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Mr. Stone. And Kevin Newman?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Good evening. First, I'd like to say that we're very proud to be --

CHAIR YEBER: Kevin, can you state your name and city of residence, please?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Kevin Newman, and I reside in Newport Beach, California.

3

1

2

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

KEVIN NEWMAN: I'd like to start by saying briefly that we're very proud to be here this evening in front of you and to be able to showcase two very extraordinary projects that over the last two-and-a-half years we've spent a great deal of time working with staff and the east side PAC community and really taking an opportunity to listen to what their concerns and their needs were and how we were able to integrate that into these two projects that you're going to see this evening.

Again, the opportunity exists to create two phenomenal great gateway developments that will become the gateway into West Hollywood and particularly on the east side, and with that, I'd like to go ahead and begin the presentation.

Our goal and vision has always been to create a truly dynamic, transformational development which will become a significant gateway entrance into what is now West Hollywood.

As we approach the site and the main intersection that interfaces with Gateway Center, let's now begin what is truly the transformation of West Hollywood.

We took this opportunity to create contextually a

building that integrates and interfaces with the intersection, as well as Gateway Center across the street to create a very vibrant pedestrian-oriented development that is conducive for businesses and living residential units.

A wide sidewalk area of 25 feet embraced by a double row of trees due to the specific plan engages Santa

Monica Boulevard as a pedestrian transcends from Detroit towards La Brea.

Integrating outdoor activity areas, i.e. the public space and restaurant area, that creates a dynamic activity center and allows additional businesses to flourish.

As we continue our pedestrian walk around La Brea, you can start to see the integration of the pedestrian edge and how we've expanded it to become much wider to integrate into the sidewalk area and to activate the retail.

Additional uses of materials which are very unique and significant to the overall design of these developments is called Swiss Pearl, and it allows us an opportunity to create a very unique expression of architecture that is also emboldened by color but yet simple forms.

Both of these projects, especially the one we're

1 looking at this evening before you, will create a very 2 unique living experience within the gateway into West 3 Hollywood -- outdoor activity areas, rooftop terraces 4 that engage and embrace the outdoors and transcends into 5 what you see as the jewel box along Santa Monica 6 Boulevard, which will again activate and create a dynamic 7 appearance. 8 And as we pull back, you now start to see how the 9 transformation will begin. 10 And that concludes the presentation. Thank you very 11 much. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Before I move on to the 13 public, does any commissioner have any questions for the 14 three representatives? 15 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I do. Mr. Seymour? 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible - multiple 17 speakers) 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 19 JEFF SEYMOUR: Yes, Commissioner? 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: There is a 7,000-square-foot 21 difference -- differential between the existing 22 commercial footage and the proposed commercial footage, 23 and knowing that commercial footage means a lot to the 24 city in terms of its ongoing revenue, is there any 25 thought being given to perhaps equalizing where the

proposed project, what there is there now?

JEFF SEYMOUR: Well, a part of it also has to do with use. As you probably -- you know better than anyone that I know, we have tried to look and maximize the uses that would be there, but it's -- again, we're three years away from a point where I can tell you the exact uses.

We believe that the mix as we have been reviewing and monitoring will be appropriate for what I think you're getting to, Commissioner, which is the revenue that would be coming into the city.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, when you have 20,000 existing square feet of commercial and you're tearing it all down, it isn't difficult to put 20,000 square feet of commercial and then build your residential, also.

JEFF SEYMOUR: But, again, I think a fair amount -if we're talking dol -- and I'm not trying to be
argumentative because, again, we have been looking at
this. I don't think there's been any discussion in
regard to changing a mix or use.

ROD STONE: If you don't mind, I'd like to really actually defer to Francisco. Francisco, the actual square footage that exists there now in terms of retail, which is Carl's Jr. and I guess you would count Yummy's, which is not there any longer, is significantly less square footage than what we're building, the amount of

structure that's there, which there's lots of structure that's there that is not really retail. It's cabinet makers. So we figured that we're really adding more retail square footage.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, I understand. The potential of that square footage that's not being used for retail now is, in fact, potentially usable for retail. What you're proposing is not, as I understand it.

ROD STONE: Again, the retail -- if we're talking about that the retail that is existing now compared to what we're putting in, we're putting in --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, I'm talking not about the retail that is there now; I'm talking about the retail that is there now plus that square footage that is zoned for retail that may or may not be used for retail at the present time.

ROD STONE: I understand.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But it could be used for retail tomorrow.

ROD STONE: Yes, okay, I understand. All right. So the discussion -- in order to make a rental project work today, there's certain dynamics that we need, which is a formula as far as how much retail you're allowed to put on in order to get the parking, the retail, and also the

2.1

rental units, and it's almost -- as you play with this puzzle, it kind of dictates as to where we end up.

In order to make this project work for us, that's what we had to do. We had to create that specific amount of retail, if that makes sense, also and to make the parking work and also the rental work. That's how we came up with those amounts, and it's very difficult for us to make any changes.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Commission DeLuccio?

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have a question. This has to do with the design of the project, the Swiss Pearl.

Do we have a sample border what the Swiss Pearl looks like over there?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Yes, you do. It's right adjacent to the color material boards to the left. Swiss Pearl is a cementious panel. It's actually conceived in Switzerland. It's been around for about 15 years or so, but only in the last eight years has it been more conducive to our market here in the United States.

We do a lot of work internationally, and we were introduced to Swiss Pearl probably about two years or so ago, and as we started to look at materials that we felt could be a good fit to what we were doing here, we really looked into it, and by far, it's one of the more unique

1 materials that we've come across. It is also one of the 2 most expensive materials we've come across. 3 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, and then --4 KEVIN NEWMAN: And, I'm sorry, I was also going to 5 add it is a color-through panel, so it's baked into it 6 all the way through. 7 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: What about the yellow and 8 blue? Does that have --9 They have custom colors and standard KEVIN NEWMAN: 10 colors, over 175 to choose from, but we can actually give 11 them any paint sample that we would like that's not a 12 part of their standard mix, and they can create any 13 custom color we choose. 14 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Of which is the Swiss Pearl 15 finishing. 16 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Because the yellow/blue, I'm 18 not -- I wasn't too crazy about the yellow/blue coloring, 19 and I think I've actually mentioned that when I did meet 20 with the applicants, but that's just my opinion. 21 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** Duly noted. Thank you. 22 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama, do you have 23 questions for the applicant? 24 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: No, I don't at this time. 25 I just have a few questions for the CHAIR YEBER:

architect, actually.

I wanted to start off with more of a -- kind of a philosophical or strategy that you took with the urban street or pedestrian activity beyond just the normal pedestrian activity that occurs on a sidewalk for people to get from one place to another. I mean what was your vision for this particulate site in terms of that activity?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Well, first thing is obviously to create the activity was important and to be able to expand the width of the sidewalk at the pedestrian level was something that we looked at quite a bit, and I think that has some play into one of the comments that we just made about how can we integrate more retail.

We felt that there was a balance that needed to be taken, and so to widen the sidewalks as much as we possibly could to have that public interaction was critical.

And, also, again, materials play a big role, especially at the pedestrian level. If it's four, five, six stories up, you don't necessarily get as much of an impact from it, but again, with a building like this and the nature of it, we felt it was truly important to integrate a color and to integrate a material that was unique and different, that really conveyed a certain

stylistic approach, and we wanted to do something that was different not only for the sake of creating a very unique blend of architecture and massing and color, but again, it was very important to have that pedestrian level speak differently than what we normally would see.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, but if I hear you correctly, you're saying it's the architectural move and the color and materiality that you're using as a strategy to create that activity, that pedestrian activity?

KEVIN NEWMAN: That's correct. As you look at a lot of the architecture that's being done today, we felt that it was important to branch out and try to really create something that was a little different.

The site itself really allowed us an opportunity, frankly. Unlike the other site at La Brea at Fountain, we had a more formal approach to the design because of the site constraints, and we wanted to take advantage of that. And in thus doing so, it allowed us an opportunity to play with the simplistic forms and the formality of the building not only to reduce the height along Santa Monica, where it interfaces with Gateway, but we felt that it was important to play with the color and create some unique opportunities where typically you may not have those opportunities.

And I'll explain a little bit further as we get to

La Brea and Fountain what those challenges were and how we addressed them so there are two completely different design approaches.

CHAIR YEBER: What were the top three constraints

CHAIR YEBER: What were the top three constraints that you saw on this particular site?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Trying to put all the retail, the residential, the parking to us was probably the most problematic. Again, we have a very small and limited site. We had some assistance, obviously, in height, but frankly speaking, the constraints of the site were somewhat difficult. And, again, to create a more dynamic building with constrained dimensions was a challenge.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Somewhere in your presentation you talked about or you were just mentioning the width of the sidewalk. I was having trouble because of the size of the plans. What is the width of the sidewalk along La Brea?

KEVIN NEWMAN: I believe -- and I don't have the drawings in front of me. Francisco, do you have the -- I don't want to speak out of context. It appears that we would be right about 15 feet along La Brea.

CHAIR YEBER: So you've added approximately about a foot in the current width because the current width is about 14 feet.

KEVIN NEWMAN: We have 15, and then we've also taken

1 the opportunity in certain areas to bring the building 2 back in and thus expanding, and I believe we're probably 3 right about 17 to 20 feet in the middle. 4 CHAIR YEBER: Including what would be private 5 property --6 KEVIN NEWMAN: That's correct. 7 -- in terms of the width? CHAIR YEBER: 8 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** That is correct. 9 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Let me ask you a question about 10 the -- you've separated delivery on Detroit and customers 11 and residential on La Brea. Is there a device that 12 prevents someone from using the delivery entry as a way 13 to get to the parking? 14 Actually, you can -- it's an exit, so KEVIN NEWMAN: 15 one can exit through out onto Detroit as a resident or as 16 a retail. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. And have we looked at that 18 turn? Because it's a full 180-degree turn from the 19 ramps. Does that work? 20 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** Yes, it does. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Is there a specific reason why 22 that was put in that configuration? Was there some sort 23 of constraint that forced you to do it in this kind of --24 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** Are you referring to the actual drive 25 entrance off of Detroit?

2.1

CHAIR YEBER: No, I'm talking mostly about the delivery.

KEVIN NEWMAN: Well, first, in talking with staff and traffic, it was believed that it was imperative that we brought delivery in off of Detroit because it was obviously a less trafficked street, and to engage the delivery and to also get access to the rest of the parking field, we needed to work within the constraints that we had. Obviously, you have service, and then you also want to be able to get traffic through out onto Detroit, as well. So those were challenges for us.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. If you'll indulge me just one more minute. On page 09, it's illustrating on your roof plan, it's illustrating hip roofs, but I thought in your illustrations it was a flat roof. Is this just a incorrect read?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Actually, they are sloped gently to get water off those roofs, but they're -- they are flat.

CHAIR YEBER: So these are just shedding?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Yes.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. And the last question has to do with the water retention planting area. Is this water coming from the building that is being deposited into this retention area that's on the north side of the project?

1 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** Well, that would be yes and also rainwater, storm water. 2 3 Storm water from -- coming from the CHAIR YEBER: 4 north? 5 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** Coming from the north. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. And can you give me a little 7 bit more information about -- is that just permeable 8 surface? 9 KEVIN NEWMAN: Yes, it is. 10 CHAIR YEBER: So basic --11 KEVIN NEWMAN: And I apologize. That is a question 12 that I think gets to be where our landscape architect 13 would be more appropriate to answer, but unfortunately, 14 they're not with us this evening, but we can get you that 15 information. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. All right. Thank you very much 17 for indulging me. 18 **KEVIN NEWMAN:** You're welcome. 19 CHAIR YEBER: What I'm going to do if there's no 20 further questions of the applicant, I'm going to allow 21 the public -- before we go to the public hearing or the 22 public testimony, allow the public to come up and view 23 the models and material boards and the renderings three 24 to five minutes. Also, commissioners, if you want to 25 take a look. I ask the public not interact with the

1 Commission. Don't ask questions or have comments because 2 we're still in an open public testimony. Thank you. 3 (Short break) 4 Okay, if we can resume the meeting. CHAIR YEBER: 5 If I could ask the public to take their seats. 6 Okay, I have quite a few speakers here tonight. 7 going to allow everyone two minutes per speaker. 8 that you come up to the podium, state your name and city 9 of residence clearly into the microphone. We do have 10 some hearing-impaired residents, so we need to make sure 11 everyone speaks into the microphone. 12 There's no carryover of minutes, meaning you can't 13 speak, take someone else's unused minutes. It'll be two 14 minutes per speaker. 15 And with that, I'll start with Ruth Williams, 16 followed by Yola Dore, to be followed by Genevieve 17 Morrill. 18 RUTH WILLIAMS: Good evening. Ruth Williams, PAC 19 member and east side resident since 1949, and when you 20 talk about change, trust me, I have seen it. 21 Since cityhood and the first general plan meetings, 22 the east side was always referred to as the east end or 23 the industrialized end. As some of you, as well as John 24 Chase, may remember, I fought so hard to have us referred

to as the east side to change the perception of the image

of being the downtown area.

Slowly but surely, we're coming into our own, and this project really blows us away. This is the catalyst to ensure it. Monarch has been to the PAC a few times, three that I know of. They've heard our requests. They listened to us. They knew our feelings about open space. They followed through with the changes. They integrated the affordable housing throughout the project and not isolated or cubby-holed people that couldn't pay market rate.

The project will upgrade Santa Monica Boulevard and La Brea with new sidewalks -- we love the double rows of trees; increase the property values on the east side; new shops and restaurants will encourage more pedestrian traffic and support the existing businesses at the Gateway, and I believe that with the existing retail that's there on Santa Monica Boulevard now from La Brea west to Detroit, what Monarch is going to be bringing in is going to give us more retail. There may be retail establishments, but they're either up for sale -- I mean Carl's Jr. is probably the only one that it's really operating openly as a retail business.

I would like to, hopefully, urge you to support both 9B and 9C, and the PAC did unanimously support this.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

2

Yola Dore, followed by Genevieve, to be followed by Joseph Clapsaddle.

3 4

YOLA DORE: Good evening. Yola Dore, West Hollywood, also a member of the PAC.

5

Commissioners, this evening, you have the esteemed opportunity to embrace a European-inspired work of art

8

7

 \mathbb{R} where east meets west.

9

rising through the Silver Pearl. You can enjoy the six-

As you look at this structure, you can see the sun

10 11

story building with 37 inclusionary units dispersed

12

throughout.

13

As we look downstairs, we see an open-air café where maybe one day you and I could meet for coffee. We can

15

14

people watch and enjoy the new gateway to our city.

16

It brings us into another century as people may now park their cars and enjoy the pedestrian walkway with its

18

17

tree-inspired and gorgeous landscape view.

19 20

As we look across the street, we see a gorgeous structure that shows nothing but rainbows as the sun sets

21

and gorgeous different dimensions, a place we can shop,

22

live, enjoy, and be proud of.

2324

We embrace our diversity, our creativity, and our willingness to go one step further. I hope tonight you

25

will remember that and accept this into our new city

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

structure. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Henehan. GENEVIEVE MORRILL: fellow commissioners. Morrill, Los Angeles.

Thank you, Ms. Dore.

Genevieve, followed by Joseph, followed by Joan

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I'm here today -- Genevieve I'm here today representing the Chamber of Commerce and the business community.

This is an incredibly important project to the east This will again help to, as the Gateway did, start to bring in more vitality into the east end and raise the bar in accommodating some great retail and residential and some open space.

This project -- I liked Jeff Seymour's comment on I think that's where we're headed with transformational. the east end, and this project does that. It assists in creating an environment that's more walkable and bikeable, and I'm probably going to repeat a lot of things that people have already said because those are the attributes of this project.

It ties into the general plan in looking at less emissions in the city, getting people out on foot and on bike. It adds open space and landscaping that is aesthetically pleasing but also very important.

I heard a great architect say once, "Open space is

one of the most important parts -- components of an architectural project."

And the landscaping is brilliant, creating almost a promenade, and the enlarged sidewalks, again ensuring the walkability.

This type of project creates an opportunity to thrive, work, play, and live in West Hollywood and will generate more jobs and spending into the economy for our business community.

And the developer has created a project that complements the Gateway and has been cognizant of the city's objectives in its 25-year plan.

It goes without saying that the architect is worldclass, the lighting is world-class, as well, and we hope you will support -- will recommend to support the project.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Joseph Clapsaddle, followed by Joan Henehan, to be followed by Norm Chramoff.

JOSEPH CLAPSADDLE: Good evening, Chair Yeber and fellow commissioners and staff. My name is Joseph Clapsaddle. I'm a resident and a businessperson here in West Hollywood, and I come before you quite often, and tonight I'm not going to repeat what everyone else has said before me. I must say you should be a poet, young

lady, you know.

What I liked especially about this project, Donald, Commissioner DeLuccio, is the color. I love that blue and yellow. I love the dimensions and the juxtaposition between this corner and what is the gateway. I love the double trees, which create a promenade. You know, it's really a promenade, and that's what will bring people to this area.

I think it will also attract a very high-end or higher-end -- and I don't necessarily mean more expensive by that. I mean more unique, which is what we're known for here in West Hollywood -- retail tenants.

Commissioner Altschul, I certainly do understand your sense of responsibility of protecting the revenues coming to the City of West Hollywood, and I think we should explore this as much as we can.

I would say that there could be another answer to this if we maybe give the developer another floor for residents just to make it worth his while. That's one possibility, and I certainly don't pretend to be an expert in this area.

The last thing I want to say is to the residents on the east side. I have just come through the Sunset

Boulevard redo, if you'll call it that, and it was -it's been very trying in a lot of ways, but I'm so proud

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think, on that.

of it now that we've come to the end of that. Yes, there was dust. Yes, there was noise. Yes, there were inconveniences. But I think they did a good job, and I think we just have to embrace that sense of what will happen as we progress. And, gentlemen, I hope you'll approve this, and I thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Ms. Henehan, followed by Norm Chramoff, followed by Rob Bergstein. Good evening, Commissioners and JOAN HENEHAN: Chair. I'm Joan Henehan. I'm a resident of Toluca Lake. I'm here this evening to speak in favor of staff's recommendation of the project in my capacity as the chair of the West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. To put it plainly, this project has the support of the residents of the area, the east side PAC, of our able staff, and a foremost developer. It provides affordable housing and replaces some of the aging housing stock that we have here in West Hollywood that is an ongoing concern. Everyone loves the open space even if they don't love the colors. That's a very emotional, personal thing, and I could go with anything except maybe puce, I

1 But it relieves a lot of the current sort of 2 industrial blight in the area, provides jobs and 3 vibrancy, and supports the street life that we love in 4 West Hollywood and that people who live here embrace and 5 visitors embrace. So with that, folks, I hope that you will support 6 7 Thank you so much. staff recommendation. 8 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 9 Norman, followed by Rob. NORMAN CHRAMOFF: I'm Norman Chramoff, resident of 10 11 West Hollywood. I support this. I don't have a lot to 12 say because Yola stole my speech and she was magnificent. 13 You know, this is really long overdue. It's the 14 right project in the right place, and particularly with the PAC having voted overwhelmingly -- the people on the 15 16 east side live in a way with a lot less than we do, and 17 it's about time we paid some real decent attention to it. 18 Thank you. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 20 Rob, followed by Mr. Wall, Scott, or -- I'm sorry, 21 I'm having trouble reading the first name. 22 ROB BERGSTEIN: Scottman. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Scottman? Scottman Wall? 24

Followed by Scottman Wall to be followed by Orrin Karp.

ROB BERGSTEIN: Good evening, Commissioners.

name is Rob Bergstein. I'm a resident of West Hollywood.

I am a member of the PAC, but I'm speaking for myself and not the entire PAC this evening.

I think it's a beautiful project. They totally listened to our comments in the planning stages. We asked for no stucco. We got a beautiful exterior. The wide sidewalks, the double row of trees. This building, particularly striking at night when it's lit up, the corner of the building.

And the housing -- I was somewhat skeptical of bringing in more upscale housing, but I've since found that the project across the DJA rented out in six months. Those of you know that my home, the property next door, is undergoing renovations, 600 square feet, \$2,500.

They're renting as fast as they can finish building those, so there appears to be a pent-up demand for a little bit nicer housing both from people already living in West Hollywood and those that would like to come to West Hollywood.

So I'm going to say also ditto my comments on the next agenda item so I will not be up here a second time. I hope you approve the project. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Scottman Wall, followed by Joel Mark.

SCOTTMAN WALL: Good evening, esteemed members of

the Planning Commission. Scottman Wall, resident of City of West Hollywood, also the chair of the east side PAC.

Opportunity versus economic obsolescence. The sites before you tonight are economically obsolete. This is the future for the sites. This is the future of the east side.

I think it's an incredible opportunity. They're premier buildings. They fulfill our affordable housing component, which is very important in our future vision for that part of town. It's pedestrian friendly. You have a builder with a track record, a long track record, of performing and delivering quality products. You get an economic base, not only residential but financial from the commercial, which is beneficial to the community. It also puts residents where we need them, which is there, and it feeds the commercial that's already there along that corridor.

And in so doing, I humbly close that I request that you approve these projects. I think they're incredible jewels and they flag the east side and connect us to the west side. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Actually, the next speaker -- Joel, if you'll hold on a minute -- it was Orrin. The reason why we got confused is there's two slips here for you.

1 **ORRIN KARP:** I think there's four, actually. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Did someone else fill them out? 3 Because they're different writings and everything. 4 ORRIN KARP: I'm sorry. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 6 **ORRIN KARP:** Good evening, Commissioners. 7 is Orrin Karp. I'm a resident of Oak Park, California, 8 and I'm a native Californian. I'm here tonight on behalf 9 of Faith Plating, who's next door to the proposed project 10 and hopefully one day will be in this same room proposing 11 a site as amazing as this project. 12 I'd like to say that in addressing the retail 13 concern, I've been in -- I'm a commercial real estate 14 broker, I have my own firm, and I've been in retail many 15 years, and the retail that you're replacing right now is 16 really only Carl's Jr., and the City of West Hollywood is 17 They're not unique because of Carl's Jr. unique. 18 They're unique because of the million-dollar milkshake. 19 I mean that's West Hollywood. So to get rid of Carl's 20 Jr. and put the kind of project here is just going to 21 benefit the city, everyone around it. 22 This project contains all the important features of 23 a project. It has retail housing, low-income housing, 24 open space, and it's amazingly aesthetically pleasing.

So on behalf of Faith Plating, we support both projects

being proposed tonight. Thank you. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 3 So Joel Mark, followed by Steve Levin, followed by 4 Alexander Freedman. 5 JOEL MARK: Good evening. My name is Joel Mark. 6 I'm a resident of the east side of West Hollywood and a 7 member of the PAC. I am speaking for myself tonight. 8 These developers came into the PAC, and they 9 listened to us, but I think it's been said already, but 10 the other thing that has impressed me about this project 11 is -- and we've had several developers come in and 12 propose some very nice projects and the economy has 13 tanked them. These people are self-financed. 14 project will go through. It is quality project, and we don't have to worry about somebody not finding -- or 15 16 their finances falling through at the very last minute. 17 I think that's very important to consider, as well. 18 It is a quality project, both this and the one at 19 Fountain and La Brea, as well. Thank you. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 21 Steve Levin, followed by Alexander Freedman. 22 Steve Levin, resident of West STEVE LEVIN: Thanks. 23 Hollywood. I live on Formosa. I'm also on the PAC. 24 Mr. Chairman, you asked what the vision of the east 25 side was, and I can honestly say, speaking for myself,

that in my wildest dreams, I didn't picture these two projects.

While [Movie Temp Plaza] provides a catalyst for redevelopment, I think what Monarch is proposing -- and I hate to say the word again -- but what Monarch is proposing, it's a city-defining project that will transform the entry, our main entry, into the City of West Hollywood.

When they first came to us, we were not impressed.

We had a lot of concerns. We were not very excited about these projects at all because we thought that these needed to be amazing projects that just shouted West Hollywood.

These developers went back. They did so much work. They listened to everything that we had to say, and this is the sign of a developer with integrity, that they listened to everything we said. I mean a visitor center -- I'm just so amazed by that that they have opened up a place that you can come see these things. The entire neighborhood can come see them, and we're all very excited about it.

They're great. They're going to replace just an awful intersection right now, and we really desperately need it, and we're very fortunate to have this developer come in and do this. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

ALEXANDER FREEDMAN:

2

1

Alexander Freedman, followed by Sofia Gelman.

Yes, I'm Alexander Freedman, a

3

4 resident of Hollywood for almost 20 years. Also, I'm a

5

transit advocate and a bicycle advocate and pedestrian

6

advocate, you name it. And I'm a fan of urban

7

development.

8

So, first of all, I want to salute Monarch Group for

9

suggesting such a beautiful project, and it should be a

10

good message to the Commission about that everybody we're

11

pretty much in support of this project, and I totally

12

embrace it, support it, love it.

13

Right now, the area, probably the entire La Brea

14

Avenue is ugly. You see a lot of homeless people, crime,

15

graffiti every now and then. It's like it's really

16

A couple requests, though, to the Commission.

you can do something about the current safety because

right now you see even lately homeless encampments and

you can see people harassed there on the Carl's Jr.

17

area, and so once again, it's great. I totally 200%

18

support it.

unattractive.

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

it, that would be great.

parking lot. You can see even there's prostitution.

It's like it's really a mess. So if you can do something

This will completely transpose the entire

our bikes.

To the Monarch Group, when you build the sidewalks for this new project, please do not use concrete or cement. Please do something like a brick pavement, like do the sidewalks like they do in city of Portland because it really enhances the pedestrian environment.

Also, please provide bicycle parking if possible, like bike corrals or poles, something where we can park

And, also, another message to West Hollywood

Planning Commission. If you can also do something about

cleaning up -- I don't know if it's a part your area,

south of Santa Monica Boulevard, but La Brea and Romaine,

there's this old vacant building which is an old factory.

That also needs to be torn down and do something about

it.

So anyway, once again, I totally support the project. Thank you, Monarch Group. And please endorse. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Sofia Gelman, followed by Steve Martin.

SOFIA GELMAN: Sofia Gelman, Senior Advisory Board member. I represent the east side of West Hollywood, and we are very, very excited about this project. We love it very much.

The building on La Brea looks very festive,

majestic, and different. It is improving the appearance of our city.

I think that there won't be any obstacles to approve this project, but we have to think about the quality of these buildings.

Now we have big problems with garbage and waste. In regular apartment buildings, we are learned how to separate it, but in big buildings, there is a need for innovative [truths] segregated by class of material for easier recycling. It is very, very important -- excuse me for such my language because I am now interested in this problem -- it is very important for our environment. Good luck to all of you. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Steve Martin, followed by John Berberian.

STEVE MARTIN: Steve Martin, West Hollywood.

Actually, this is what we envisioned when we adopted the redevelopment plan for West Hollywood. This is a severely blighted corner that's being completely transformed into something that's I mean really incredible and something I think we can all be proud of.

What I think is really important is that staff said this could not be done. Every other project comes in and says, "We have to have 10 stories, we have to have luxury condos. We can't do anything that you want," and that's

not what this developer said.

This developer is committed to human scale development. This is only six stories. In the proposed general plan, this site is a nine-story, 90-foot site, which you would get another 10 feet for affordable housing that would put it up to 10 stories. They're only building six. And I think that really shows that these people are really concerned about how we live in this city.

We're getting 37 affordable units which are going to be not segregated but throughout the building, which I think is really, really wonderful. It's built -- it is a big building, but it's built on a major intersection where there is the ability to have most of the traffic and circulation avoid a lot of the residential streets. So you're not going to have the same kind of impacts as you see at Casden.

To address Commissioner Altschul's concerns, I think we need to be -- numbers, when it comes to retail square footage, can sometimes just be numbers. Right now, Carl's is the only thing -- which may be 4,000 square feet -- that's the only thing that's generating any revenue for the city. I think at 13,000 square feet, this is going to generate a lot. I don't think 20's going to make much difference. And the problem that we

have is very often we over-develop retail so we wind up having a lot of empty space, so I think this is a good balance.

When all is said and done, when this is finished, people are going to drive by Casden and say, "Why didn't you make Casden like this?" Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Steve.

John Berberian, followed by Eugene Levin.

JOHN BERBERIAN: Good evening, everybody. My name is John Berberian. My business is in West Hollywood. I think everybody said everything that was supposed to be said. I don't want to repeat the same things, but definitely I will appreciate it if you support these two projects. I'm definitely supportive on both projects. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Eugene Levin, followed by Naum [Turetskiy]. I'm sorry if I mispronounced that name.

EUGENE LEVIN: Eugene Levin, resides in Los Angeles, representing West Hollywood Russian Community Center.

I guess both of this project is very important. It create jobs, new jobs at the time when companies leaving California. It carries additional revenue to the City of West Hollywood, and there is affordable housing issue with the result a certain degree.

1 And regarding colors, yellow and blue, just since I 2 am originally from Kiev, this is a national flag of 3 Ukraine, so somebody did it purposely. 4 Thank you. I hope you support it. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Touché. 6 Naum, followed by MaryAnn. 7 NAUM TURETSKIY: Yes. My name is Naum Turetskiy. 8 I'm resident of City of West Hollywood. I really support 9 this project because it will be --10 CHAIR YEBER: Could you speak into the microphone a 11 little more? 12 NAUM TURETSKIY: -- it will be additional job 13 creation, and as a secondary, it will be additional tax 14 revenue to the city and very important since it's 15 affordable housing for the low income. And I think we 16 all will be proud after this project will be done. 17 you. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 19 MaryAnn, followed by Valerie Sacks. 20 MARYANN SHISKOWSKI: Good evening. My name is 21 I reside in West Hollywood. I am the 22 neighborhood watch captain for Detroit, Lexington, and 23 Formosa. I'm also the PAC member, and I'm a member of 24 the Women's Advisory Board.

Good evening, and I just want to put my support in

for this project. They have listened to us. They've listened to me specifically. Of course, one of the biggest issues for us is parking, and they really listened to my concerns and the concerns that the neighbors had told me that they have in terms of parking. So they listened to me, they listened to us, they have a visitor center, which is really great.

And one really, really great thing about the Gateway is the sense of community that we have now. I walk my

And one really, really great thing about the Gateway is the sense of community that we have now. I walk my dog. I know the people that work in the Gateway, say hello to everybody. I walk with my neighbors that I've gotten to know a lot better because we all walk over there. And I think this is just going to add a greater sense of community for all of us. We shop there. We live where we shop. We get to walk there all the time. I mean I'm there almost every day either getting coffee, of course going to Target, which is a good and bad thing for all of us.

But we really, really do support this project, and I hope that you will, too. So thank you so much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Valerie Sacks, followed by Jeanne Dobrin.

VALERIE SACKS: Hi. My name is Valerie Sacks. I'm here on behalf of HMMY Property Management and Sycamore LLC. They're the -- I'm sorry, I guess I'm taller than

the previous speaker -- they are a family owned and operated company, and they own a variety of apartment buildings, including a 68-unit apartment building directly behind the La Brea Fountain project and about a block-and-a-half up from this one.

They have a variety of concerns. They do recognize that there are a lot of positive aspects of this project, but they do continue to believe that it's severely underparked. There are 116 fewer parking spaces required for just the residential portion of the project than would be required for market rate even though only 20% of the units are affordable, which is the minimum permitted for a project of this size.

It's going to have massive, massive traffic problems, particularly because the two projects together will be built at the same time and they're going to come online at the same time, and we believe La Brea's going to be basically impenetrable.

The noise impacts are going to be very considerable. At the last minute, they changed the way in which they plan to mitigate the noise. We don't have any opinion as to the infeasibility of the other way of mitigating it, as Monarch said, but there's insufficient analysis of how the proposed sound wall is going to mitigate noise, and also, it's not going to come in until after the

1 demolition's been completed. 2 There's also some issues having to do with the way 3 the notification of -- they only want to provide an 4 approximate construction schedule. They only want to 5 muffle the gasoline or diesel engines. They only want to 6 respond to construction complaints if it's required or 7 it's practical. We believe the previous conditions 8 should be put back in place. 9 Finally, the density bonus incentives, they 10 essentially got height, density, parking, and private 11 open space, and -- okay. The private --12 CHAIR YEBER: You'll have to wrap it up. 13 VALERIE SACKS: I'm sorry? 14 CHAIR YEBER: You'll have to wrap it up. 15 VALERIE SACKS: For the private open space, 16 basically they got a 65% reduction in the minimum open 17 space required. It should've been --18 CHAIR YEBER: (Inaudible) Sacks, your two minutes 19 are up. I'm sorry. 20 VALERIE SACKS: Okay. 21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Ms. Sacks, I have a 22 question. 23 VALERIE SACKS: Um-hmm? 24 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: When did you become 25 associated with this project? When did you take on this

1 client? 2 VALERIE SACKS: About a year ago. 3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And your written comments 4 were only forwarded to staff this morning? 5 VALERIE SACKS: No, we replied to the scoping 6 We replied -comments. 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But the letter that you 8 wished us to consider was forwarded this morning? 9 VALERIE SACKS: The --The letter that you wished 10 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: 11 us to consider was forwarded this morning? 12 VALERIE SACKS: Yes, the staff report came out late 13 last week along with a final Environmental Impact Report. 14 So those two documents --15 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But you -- I assume that you 16 were aware of the issues you were going to bring so that 17 -- you could've, couldn't you not, have gotten a letter 18 in so that it would've gone in the packet? 19 My point being, Ms. Sacks, is that it's kind of 20 burdensome when for me, for instance, when I go around 21 all day reading things on a Blackberry because I'm not at 22 my office to try to read 13 pages of small-typed print 23 today. 24 VALERIE SACKS: And if I had another minute -- I'm 25 sorry?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And if you had gotten it in to the packet, wouldn't it have been better for those that you're trying to address and for your client?

VALERIE SACKS: Yes, I was actually --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you very much. You've answered my question.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Jeanne Dobrin, followed by [Abby Hecht].

JEANNE DOBRIN: I'm Jeanne Dobrin, a long-time resident of West Hollywood.

First of all, the Commission asked some very, very good questions tonight, and I appreciate that. And I agree with Mr. Altschul that this lawyer evidently doesn't know that they would get these things sooner. That's the first thing.

The parking here is totally inadequate. A onebedroom unit requires by the zoning law 1.5 parking spaces, but they're only providing one.

Another question is are these parking spaces going to be tandem, or are they going to be standalone? The lawsuit that I won last year was trying to have separate units have parking in tandem. That doesn't go. I'd like to have that question asked about it. Are they also going to be standard size? That's another question.

I also have found out that although they are asking

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

followed by Eric Hecht.

for apartments, they are reserving the right to turn them into condominiums, and I don't think people know that. And the person who would make a decision about that is the community development director. I don't believe if that's so that should go before the Planning Commission. The loss will be -- no loss, of course of Carl's market at all. Now, I want to tell you about water. The State of California has a water program that would serve 18 million people, but right now, it's serving 37 million There is not enough water for this state and especially Los Angeles County. Also, the traffic and circulation is hideous in this city, and there's going to be more. Now, I did want to say this is a beautiful product -- project. I like the architecture very much. another thing I want to know is are they going to have [degreements] if they have to come back every two years if they don't start it, or is this going to be one of the development agreements which I consider a bribe which gives them a long term before they start the project? would like the Commission to address that with the staff. Thank you very much. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Ms. Dobrin. [Abby] Hecht,

ERIC HECHT: Hi. My name is Eric Hecht. Abe Hecht will actually go next.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay.

ERIC HECHT: I actually represent HMMY Property

Management Corporation, and I wanted to just address that

as a developer, I do appreciate this project, but as a

property manager, from the get-go, I've had many concerns

in terms of noise, traffic, in terms of parking.

Then I've had several meetings where I sat with Monarch Group and I said, "Listen, we have a 68-unit building. I need you guys to work with us on this," because clearly as a business owner, I'm going to be losing a lot of money, and clearly my tenants are going to be hit real hard with noise and whatnot, and we have a lot of tenants out there that have been staying with us for the last 20 years with our management company who are enjoying a quiet street, enjoyed not having to deal with a hard parking situation, and now they have to -- a lot of them are going to be forced to move out because they can't deal with the noise during the construction and after the construction because it's going to be a very busy area.

Now, as I've said, I have met with Monarch Group to address my issues many times, and they've kept saying they'll work with me on it, they'll work with me on it,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's what I suggested.

but all I heard during all our entire meetings was that they're pretty much can't say anything until things come out, they have to keep waiting till more information comes, and they wouldn't work with us. And I apologize Valerie Sacks did not get the letter It came out last week, and we had to comment out sooner. on it, and we worked on it really hard, but like I said, we're awaiting a response from them. We never really got worked with anything. And now my concerns are a lot stronger considering they said would work with us on it and they have done nothing really to work with us on it. So I just wanted to put that out there. Thank you very much. CHAIR YEBER: I think there's a question for you from a commissioner. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Mr. Hecht? ERIC HECHT: Please. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Just briefly, in what way did you desire that they work with you that they didn't? ERIC HECHT: In what way? COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. ERIC HECHT: I suggested they either helped financially cover the problems with our tenants because they're going to be covering our walls or anything.

I suggested -- and at a

1 meeting, I suggested to them that I can even come in as a 2 partner, which he actually got very excited about, and 3 then when I proposed it again, they completely denied it. 4 And I felt like if I had an interest in the property, 5 maybe I could help mitigate the problems. 6 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: In other words, what you're 7 saying is that your definition of asking them to work 8 with you is inserting yourself into their financial 9 interests and they didn't do that, correct? 10 ERIC HECHT: That's correct. They didn't do that. 11 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. Thank you. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Bernstein? 13 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Mr. Hecht, I have another 14 question. Just to clarify something, your property is at 15 Fountain and Sycamore? 16 ERIC HECHT: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: So we're considering two 18 items. Right now, we're considering the item at Santa 19 Monica and La Brea, and then we'll be considering a 20 separate item from the applicant nearer to your property. 21 Are you specifically alleging that all these impacts from 22 Santa Monica and La Brea would impact your apartment 23 building at Fountain and Sycamore? 24 ERIC HECHT: Absolutely, considering we're Los 25 Angeles and West Hollywood's on the other side, I mean

West Hollywood's benefiting a lot, but Los Angeles is really being cut off with these benefits. We're actually being hit with a lot of problems in terms of parking and the traffic between the two projects. I mean what we're dealing with already is a complete big problem in terms of traffic and whatnot, and now we're just being hit harder with this project.

And it's a big concern of mine, and I definitely -as a developer I support the project, but I wanted them
to work with me a little bit more on this, which I have
not seen, and it seems to me that they've been getting -everything they've done in terms of density bonus or
housing bonus or parking bonus, they've just done the
minimum required and they haven't really sat and
communicated to me how they'll work with me. So it
doesn't seem to me they'll work with us in the future.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: (Inaudible), may I have a follow-up question? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Other than they're not giving you a piece of the action, did you throw a figure at them as to what you would take?

ERIC HECHT: I threw a figure at them what I'm losing. I said, "Please work with me to help mitigate these problems." I did not throw anything. I threw an

idea to --2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But did you make an offer to 3 them to settle this thing that they didn't accept? 4 **ERIC HECHT:** I didn't make any offers. 5 considerations out there that they can review and work 6 with me on. Nothing was ever offered. 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Nothing was -- nothing was 8 offered? 9 I communicated to them --ERIC HECHT: Nothing. 10 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The fact that nothing was 11 ever offered gives rise to your statement that they 12 didn't work with you? 13 ERIC HECHT: They didn't work with me to mitigate 14 these problems that I've been having in terms of --15 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Because of the fact that 16 nothing was ever offered? 17 ERIC HECHT: I'm sorry? 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I said your statement that 19 they didn't work with you is --20 Nothing came as an offer from them to ERIC HECHT: 21 work with me. That's what I'm saying. 22 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Which leads you to say that 23 they didn't work with you? 24 ERIC HECHT: Yes. 25 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ERIC HECHT: Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Abe Hecht followed by Uzi -- again, I apologize Avnery. Mr. Hecht?

ABE HECHT: Yes, my name is Abe Hecht. I bought this building in 1994 during the earthquake. We invested a lot of money into this building to make it right and to clean it up and to make it very good for the area.

When we talked to them, we told them that, "I worked very hard and I would like you to, when you do your construction, to help us because we're going to lose a lot, we're going to have noise factors, we're going to lose a lot of tenants. What can you propose to help us?" They said they would. They never came up with anything to tell us what they would do to help us. I feel that this will be devastating to my business. I will lose a lot of money during the vacancies that I'll have. the hard times it is right now, we already have a lot of vacancies as it is. This will create more problems to myself and to my family. We hope we don't lose our business because of this.

They promised they'll talk to us and they kept promising and they kept delaying time and time and time until we got to the point where they said they're not going to be able to do anything for us.

And this will definitely hurt me, and I need you to

somehow communicate with them so they can sit down with us and tell us how they can cause us not to lose so much money that I feel we will lose during this time.

Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Mr. Hecht, I have a question. You and Eric Hecht talked about a projected loss of revenue, loss of tenants. Do you know what that projection is, and how did you come to that projection?

ABE HECHT: I have about 20 apartments facing their side. With the project being built and the views taken away, I will lose a lot of tenants. A lot of old tenants that's been there will not tolerate the noise factor that will be created there.

I know from experience having another property in the Kodak area, and I know the devastation that I lost there. I lost a lot of people, residents in that area, and it created a lot of problem for me there, and I'm experienced. This problem is going to happen here, too.

My experience shows that, the construction. Now, the other project -- and Kodak did work with us to help us solve -- not to lose so much, which was nice.

They're proposing absolutely nothing but problems to us and a lot of vacancies, and that's going to hurt my business a lot. Again, I work very hard for this business to keep it going. I work with my tenants very

1 well, and I feel this is going to cause me a lot of lot 2 of losses. 3 But is it your assumption just because CHAIR YEBER: 4 they haven't contacted you about mitigation measures that 5 they're not going to work with you in making sure that --ABE HECHT: Well, they haven't up till now. 6 7 would happen in the future? I don't hear anything from 8 them saying that they'll sit down and really talk -- how 9 they can help me curb my losses. I just don't see that 10 at this point. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 12 And I'm scared. I'm really scared. ABE HECHT: 13 CHAIR YEBER: All right. Commissioner Altschul? 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I --15 And you have to understand that very ABE HECHT: 16 well. I am very scared. 17 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I understand your concern, 18 Mr. Hecht, but is it your assumption that in our city's 19 zoning code or in our laws that there is a provision for 20 vacancy protection for neighbors or view protection for 21 neighbors? 22 ABE HECHT: Am I familiar with this? 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, is that your assumption? 24 Because there isn't. We don't have any --25 But this will create a lot of --ABE HECHT:

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

т,

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: May I finish? We don't have view protection for neighbors, and we don't have vacancy protection for landlords when buildings go up in the general vicinity. I don't think they do in the city of Los Angeles either, where your properties seem to be located.

So I would suspect that as good neighbors, they will be very considerate during construction in trying to make sure that they do everything they can to make sure that your tenants are not inconvenienced.

ABE HECHT: I'm worried they won't be because so far during our negotiations, they haven't said anything what they will do to help us. So what would they go forward? Would they do that? I doubt it, too. We have been trying to negotiate and talk with them, and they have not been in favor of helping us.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Commissioner DeLuccio?

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes, I'm sitting over here.

Sir, I have a question, if you want to come back, please.

You articulated some concerns. Have your tenants articulated those concerns to you, or are you projecting what will happen?

ABE HECHT: Some of my tenants have talked to me about that, and they're worried about it.

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Are they here this evening, any of those tenants? 2 3 ABE HECHT: No, they are not. 4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: They're not here this 5 evening? 6 No, they're not. ABE HECHT: 7 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Have you actually read the 8 documentation that's been presented to us this evening? 9 There is a resolution that is before us with some 10 conditions in it, conditions that would potentially --11 the conditions -- if I was to approve something this 12 evening, there need to be conditions which are in a 13 resolution that would mitigate the impacts that you are 14 describing. Have you read the resolution? 15 I'm afraid I did not, sir. ABE HECHT: 16 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, thank you. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you very much. 18 Victor Omelczenko, followed by Shawn Saeed, who will 19 be our last speaker. Oh, I'm sorry, wait a minute. Ι 20 lost your slip. Do you want to speak after? 2.1 UZI AVNERY: Good evening. My name is Uzi Avnery. 22 I'm a resident of the City of West Hollywood, and I own 23 commercial property very close to this site right here. 24 I couldn't ask for a better neighbor than these. 25 just want them to build this building. It's a beautiful

building, beautiful design. Just love it and love those colors, the yellow and blue. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Victor, sorry about that, and thank you, followed by Shawn Saeed, who will be our last speaker.

VICTOR OMELCZENKO: I'm Victor Omelczenko, a resident of West Hollywood, and here it is, the continuing revitalization of our eastern gateway to the city, and I generally like this project, but I do have some concerns.

You know, folks, as we look into our new general plan, where do we want to be 25 years from now, I look and I know this is an emotional issue with people, but when I look at the architecture, I'm less -- I'm not overwhelmed by it. I'm not overwhelmed by the rectangularness of it, the boxiness of it.

If you look at the building that's sort of towards the up -- down Santa Monica closer to Detroit Street, it looks kind of stark. The corner looks good, but the starkness. Like I wonder, couldn't there be other shapes like Vs or upside down Vs or a porthole or windows on the sides, sort of like the art modern windows?

I'm just wondering whether 25 years from now as people come from the east into the city whether they will find this the kind of stellar exemplary architecture that

we like to approve here, but I haven't really heard those words, that it's stellar and exemplary.

And yet when -- I know things are a compromise, and so when you look at this project, we are getting the affordable units, the 149 new residential apartments, and the 38 affordable units, and there's more open space, it's pedestrian friendly, it is replacing a blighted area now. So, overall, I think this project is a go. I just wish it had a little bit more distinction in its

wish it had a little bit more distinction in its architectural rendering. Will we be wowed by this 25 years from now?

And following up on Mr. Levin's comment, I'm of Ukrainian background. I like the yellow and blue.

(Speaking foreign language). Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Mr. Omelczenko.

Shawn Saeed is our final speaker on this item.

Shawn? Well, seeing none, I guess, Victor, you were our last speaker.

So Mr. Seymour and company, you have five minutes to rebut any discussion points that were brought up tonight and --

JEFF SEYMOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR YEBER: -- and maybe even speak to some of the issues or the questions that the commissioners brought up with some of the speakers.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JEFF SEYMOUR: Mr. Steres, our counsel, will be speaking on rebuttal.

CHAIR YEBER: Great. Thank you.

Good evening. MARK STERES: I'm Mark Steres. Ι reside in Calabasas, and I am the attorney for the I'm going to keep my remarks fairly short and applicant. respond mostly to the comments you've heard tonight from Valerie Sacks, who represents the Hechts, and the Hechts are the HMMY entity that has the building that's behind our project that's at La Brea and Fountain. It's not this project, and I think your questions were well suited of why they have the concerns with this project impacting their tenants, especially the 20 units they were saying that face La Brea. They're not going to see this project. They're not going to hear this project. They're not going to be impacted by this project.

Ms. Sacks made comments both tonight and then submitted letters to you today. She also made on behalf of HMMY extensive comments to the draft EIR. And her comments in the letter today and her comments tonight are essentially a rehash of her previous comments to the draft EIR, and the final EIR provides proper responses to those comments all in compliance with [SEQUA].

Your EIR consultant and your transportation staff are here. They're fully prepared to respond to any

specific claims that were raised by Valerie Sacks if you have any questions in that regard.

But note that the potential traffic impacts, the parking impacts, the noise impacts have been thoroughly and reasonably analyzed and discussed, and the mitigation measures, where appropriate and feasible, have been imposed through this process. The impacts that have been found have been found to short-term construction noise, and there are been some impacts to a few intersections — been identified in the EIR.

This is all well and good and expected in a highly urbanized environment, and there are overriding benefits that are self-evident with this project. You've heard the overwhelming enthusiasm from the east side to the benefits of this project.

In the long term, this project is exactly what the city envisioned and planned for. It will be an asset to the city once it's built.

I did want to just briefly comment on this questioner about retail. If you look at the site plan of this project, all the retail is completely maxed out facing Santa Monica and La Brea, and so I think this project has done a good job in bringing retail where it belongs, which is facing Santa Monica and La Brea.

The existing site has a few buildings that face

1 Santa Monica and has Carl's Jr. The rest of that square 2 footage is accessed through Detroit and would never be 3 utilized as effective retail. It's behind other 4 buildings. 5 We urge you to support this project, and we urge you to adopt the resolutions that have been presented. 6 7 Thank you. 8 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Are there any questions of 9 the applicant, any final questions? 10 Okay, so if there's no opposition, I'm going to 11 close the public hearing and open discussion among the 12 Commission. I'll start with on this side --13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible). 14 CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 15 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I will be happy to go first. 16 CHAIR YEBER: (Inaudible) DeLuccio. 17 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: But I actually love yellow 18 and blue colors. I want to go on the record and say 19 that. I've been won over. 20 Just one thing, actually. The Swiss Pearl 21 materials, is that a condition? I'm stealing your 22 thunder, Joseph. Is that a condition in there about the 23 Swiss Pearl materials? 24 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: There's not a specific 25 condition except that the material sample over the

material will be approved by the director once it comes -

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: If we were to move this to this evening's resolution, I'd like to see that in there, that they are going to be using the Swiss Pearl materials because I think that makes all the difference in the world.

I actually like the balance of the residential versus the commercial. Actually, I think having more residential will generate less traffic trips, if I'm not mistaken. Commercial will bring more traffic.

I also like the needed retail and affordable housing that it's going to be bringing to the city, and I think it's just totally outstanding all the combined open space that will be there. And I know that -- and I like the heights of the building. The height is just right. I wasn't a big supporter of the Casden property because of the height, and I think this is just a great addition to the Gateway project, and this will be your own little east side urban village. So I'm totally in support of this project this evening.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Is there -- Sue Buckner, a discussion? And I'd ask, too, if we could hold off -- allow discussion a little bit before someone wants to throw a motion just because I'd like to hear what

everyone has to say.

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Sure. Okay, thank you.

I sort of had the same reaction to the yellow and blue, but I'm won over, as well, and I'd rather it be yellow and blue than red and yellow since I'm a University of California person.

But I do think that -- first of all, I want to congratulate the applicant for spending as much time listening to the residents of the east side and really bringing forth a project that I think is going to be -- I'm going to use the word stellar because I really do think it's going to make that kind of impact on the east side.

I think that whenever there's any construction in an urban area, we're going to have significant impacts.

It's just what it is. It's temporary, and frankly, I believe that once this project is up, it's going to benefit all of the people around there, the current businesses and so forth, so they'll have to put up with some inconveniences in the short run to get some incredible benefits in the long run, and that's just nature of this kind of a project.

I feel that it's going to make a major impact, and I can't -- I'm really looking forward to seeing what it's going to look like when it's up there, and I hope it

looks like the renderings and the model that we're looking at because I think it's going to be quite an amazing project and certainly a lot better than what's existing in that area right now. It's really an eyesore. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Commissioner Bernstein?

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: My family's from Belarus,
and the flag colors would be red and green, so unless we
wanted a building that looked like a Christmas tree, I
think probably this is a better way to go, and thank you
for the Ukrainian lesson and dialogue.

Frankly, in the time that I've been on the commission, I have never felt so strongly that the public is just dying for us to approve something and, therefore, it is very pleasant to be in accord with the majority of the public.

I would like to say briefly that my business is property management, and I can understand the Hechts' concern about the impacts of the development on their property, although I think really what they were talking about is primarily the Fountain property. But since they are from Los Angeles and since this is an opportunity to vent for just a moment, last year in the City of Los Angeles next to a building that I have a substantial interest in, a six-story building was approved not only

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

without an EIR but without a public hearing, and that is simply what they do in Los Angeles from time to time. And I think while it's important for everyone to have an opportunity to bring their concerns to a public forum, you have to have a public forum in order to bring your concerns. And the West Hollywood process, the PAC meetings, the design review meetings, the EIR, the hearing that we have tonight, the hearing for this that will take place at Council is extraordinarily thorough, and I just feel very strongly that while it's important that everyone have an opportunity to say what they want to say that we should be proud of our process because we really give a great deal of opportunity for everyone to have a voice and not to give away the ending, but when we get to the Fountain project next, because I was part of the design review process, that building was, in fact, in part redesigned based on their input. So while I understand their concerns, I think that

So while I understand their concerns, I think that our process here has produced a very strong application, and I will be pleased to support it.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. John Altschul?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I agree. I think it's a very good project. The blue and the yellow is almost all right. If the yellow could be a little bit more gold, because I'm from UCLA, that would be more to my liking.

1 But, you know, you take it the way you get it. 2 With respect to the commercial, I would hope that 3 some consideration be given by future projects that there 4 be at least an equal trade-off. I don't buy the idea 5 that commercial occupying the entire street level or as 6 much of the street level as previously was zoned for 7 commercial or retail shouldn't be met. Casden cut it 8 down by a third, and I wasn't thrilled with that. 9 project is cutting it down by about a third, and I'm not 10 thrilled with that. 11 And I believe Jeanne said that she thought that they 12 would reserve the right to convert it to tentative tract 13 maps, and my understanding was that only the commercial 14 is reserved for that change. Is that not correct? 15 CHAIR YEBER: It's not correct. 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The whole thing is reserved 17 for tentative tract? 18 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct. It'll have 19 commercial and residential. 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The commercial and 21 residential could be --? 22 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Will be -- the commercial will 23 be subdivided into condominiums and potential for future 24 residential condos, correct. 25

Converted potential for

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:

2.1

future resident -- well, I would suggest that there be a Planning Committee -- Commission review of those conversions rather than a directors' review of those conversions, and I would add that as an amendment to any motion that encompassed the right staff-recommended motion.

Thank you for pointing that out, Jeanne.

I think it's a go. If it's underparked, it's their problem. It's parked to what they're allowed to get it parked under the code and under the bonuses that are allowed them under the various state laws. So if they can't rent it with one parking space per one bedroom, I'm sure they couldn't really sell it very easily with one parking space per one bedroom, so the rents will have to come down so people will be able to get it at a bargain. I still think it's a good project.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I'm generally very supportive of this project. I was on the design review subcommittee when it came before us.

There's one thing about the architecture of this building that sort of still gives me pause, and that is the corner, especially at the first level and going up.

I'm not sure if that's sort of gateway we'd want to have juxtaposed to the Best Buy/Target gateway across the

street.

But I'm very supportive of the affordable housing.

I'm very supportive of rejuvenating this blighted corner and the project in general. So if I were to support this project tonight, I'd want to send it back to design review for just one more go-around and see if there's something we can't do about that one particular section.

And one more thing. Donald was talking about conditioning the material, the Swiss Pearl material. I think that if we do go forward with something like that, we should say, "Swiss Pearl or another equivalent material," because I guess Swiss Pearl is some sort of brand name, and generic might be fine.

And I guess the way we would do that would be by saying that if they do change that particular material for the exterior, that it becomes an automatic major design change and comes back to the full commission because I know what the procedure is, that it goes to design review, and design review decides whether it's a major change or not. And then so we're totally bypassing that and saying that if they change that, it comes back to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have a question, Marc.

CHAIR YEBER: Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: (Inaudible) a question

(inaudible). Sorry.

This evening, we're making a recommendation to counsel, and part of the recommendation is a tentative tract map. So if ultimately the Council approves all this, then the tentative tract map is a given, isn't it? If they decide to convert in the future, there's no review process, right?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. The only review process would be through the section of the code with regards to condominium conversions, so when you take rentals and convert them to condominiums, which is basically a review of the general development standards, which they're meeting since we're approving it or could be approving it tonight, and so there's other certain little findings, but it's really through a review through the director and not through the planning --

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: But we can we put an addition that it would come to the Commission -- if they were going to convert from residential to condominium, that we, that the Commission, has an opportunity to review those standards?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: We can condition that as part of the approval, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes, that's just my -- FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: We could also take out the automatic right to convert and just let them just apply for a tentative tract map when they want to.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can I ask one more question?

Yes, that's a possibility, too.

However, again, if we were to recommend this to

Council and they approve it, they can decide to not even

do residential. They can go then right to condominiums,

and then they wouldn't have to have another review at the

staff level, correct?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: So right now, all of the project description throughout the entire proposal is for rental units, so they would have to basically change their project description to condominiums before they get to the City Council if they wanted to do that.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: But once it went to City

Council and then they're -- then they're getting

approvals more for residential right now?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: I can explain a little bit why they're even going that route. The fire department does have slightly different conditions of approval for apartments than they do for condominiums, so I think they're thinking sort of more long-term if in the future -- who knows how many years down the line -- if they

1 decide to actually convert to condos, they would have to 2 spend a lot of time, a lot of money actually doing some 3 upgrades to the actual facility that they wouldn't have 4 been required to incorporate if they were rentals. So I 5 think that's kind of, I think, their thinking. 6 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** So let me ask this question 7 to understand, and I know Commissioner Altschul has 8 another thought on this. 9 Okay, so if they ultimately get the approvals and 10 the tentative tract map is in there and they decide not 11 to do residential but when they're going for their 12 financing or something and they decide to go condominium 13 instead, it would have to come back to staff for a 14 review? 15 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. It would have 16 to go through -- to the condominium conversion process. 17 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Gotcha, whether it ever --18 before it even got built, if they decided to do 19 condominiums? 20 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Yes, in fact, I think if it 21 ever -- correct -- if it ever got sold as condominiums. 22 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: They don't have to come back 23 for review at your level --24 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Correct. 25 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: -- before they even got the

map?

2.1

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: They would have the map.

Before they can actually sell them as condominiums, they would have to come through the department.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Gotcha. So there would be an opportunity to bring it to the commission again?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: There would be if they were to do commercial condos. I'm sorry --

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Residential condos.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: -- residential condos. So we can have a condition that states, if this project in the future were to convert to condos, it shall first be reviewed by the Planning Commission versus city staff or the director.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Commissioner Altschul?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes, I believe I recall hearing the applicant state at one point or another that they only build rental properties and they don't sell them and they keep them all and they rent them forever.

So I would think that it would certainly be appropriate to take out that automatic right to convert, and if they eventually do want to, this probably would be a first for them because they've never, according to what I've heard, done it before. So I think we should take it

out.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: But on the -- we're talking about taking it on the residential portion but then leave it in under the commercial section?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Leave it on the commercial.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Gotcha. Okay, thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, just a question for staff to clear up the parking issue, Francisco. It was stated by a couple of speakers about parking and the perceived shortage that this is not parked to our standards. Isn't there a mixed-use component or average parking requirement that's applied to this project, as opposed to a strict residential?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: I think the only difference with regards to this project is because of the affordable housing component that's incorporated per our affordable housing ordinance and SB-18, the state senate bill, you can actually reduce the amount of parking for the residential components in order to basically make the project possible or feasible. So it's only a reduction within the residential component, not the mixed-use portion -- not the commercial portion, sorry.

CHAIR YEBER: And that reduction is coming from the affordable housing component only?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct.

1 CHAIR YEBER: No other bonus or incentive? 2 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct, right. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. And then, lastly, I didn't see 4 in the conditions, and I didn't notice in previous 5 conditions, do we condition projects especially of this 6 size that there are public bike racks in the -- I quess 7 it would be the public right-of-way or is it on the 8 private property? 9 No, not private locker -- I mean I saw the private 10 bike lockers. I didn't see ones that were if you're just 11 traveling by bike to the -- like a bike rack. 12 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: There are conditions in there 13 for bike racks for the commercial component so those are 14 distributed sort of like throughout some of the 15 commercial parking spaces and throughout the project, as 16 well. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, great. 18 **FRANCISCO CONTRERAS:** So those are in there. 19 CHAIR YEBER: So my opinion, I, too, feel the 20 project is a pretty good project. I'm glad to see a 21 project of this nature occurring on the east side. 22 good architecturally. I don't find it as strong from an 23 urban design standpoint, and I agree with some of the 24 comments made.

And, actually, my thoughts were totally aligned with

Mr. Omelczenko tonight in terms of it's good but it's not stellar, and specifically, I am concerned about the corner at Santa Monica and La Brea, the one that we're looking at right there. I sort of feel like that does not read to me as a gateway, and it certainly doesn't respond to the move that was made across the street in the Gateway shopping plaza that's adjacent to this project.

And I would like to see more of a move there for several reasons so that it does respond as an actual gateway and does respond to that, and maybe this is something that staff could work on because we obviously have two other corners that have yet to be developed so that that really becomes a de facto entryway and it reads as an entryway, as opposed to this building could be on any block along Santa Monica or on -- in La Brea.

And I don't see the public open space that speaks to a gateway kind of move, and that leads me to the other issues of the two -- this particular corner, as opposed to the other three corners, has two sides that have MTA bus stops. The La Brea currently has two bus stops. It's heavily used. And the Santa Monica one has one, and it will probably have a second, and because it has a rapid bus on that line.

And I sort of feel like there hasn't been any

response or response to that particular condition. I was asking earlier the architect about the top three restraints, and for me, the restraints aren't trying to fit program on a particular site or parking; the restraints are the traffic conditions, the pedestrian conditions, the public transit and responding to that in a very meaningful and effective way. So I would like to see -- I really would like to see -- re-look at that particular corner.

Also, from an urban design standpoint, I sort of feel like this project should be setting the tone for good urban streets in West Hollywood, and I'm not sure it does that just yet. I had posed that question, and the response was about the mix of retail, and retail can only go so far and materiality and color can only go so far, and I think it has to do with other activities, other amenities.

In one of the conditions that speaks to pedestrian furniture and landscaping and so forth, and I see the landscaping, but I don't see anything else. And so I just -- I would like to see almost a mirror of activity and energy that's going on on the Gateway Plaza as we see it on that side for this project.

The other thing is I would like to see -- I agree with Commissioner Guardarrama that I would like to see

this come back to design review to work out these issues.

The other problem I had was the delivery zone on the Detroit side. I'm not sure why it's splitting up the two work/live or three work/live buildings and why it doesn't just push it to the north side and have a straight run. I sort of feel like that's an awkward turn and it's kind of a funny move from a traffic movement standpoint, and I'd like someone -- I'd like to see if that could be relooked at.

And then, finally, a condition that I want to add, and we talked about this in the past, is coordinating, making sure that the applicant and the architect are coordinating with all the public utility agencies and the fire department to appropriately place all the fixtures - we're talking about standpipes, electric utility boxes -- so that they do not interfere with the public right-of-way or public plaza aspect or public amenity.

We've seen a lot of projects come up recently that we've been surprised that big old standpipe is right there, right in the middle of the building, or in the case of the Havenhurst Pocket Park, a utility box was placed right in the middle of the public park, right at the entry of the Pocket Park.

So I'd like to make sure there's some sort of coordination and that they have that addressed upfront

1 and they're not surprised at the back end. 2 So with that, would someone like to make a motion or 3 try to assemble with all the different conditions? 4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I'll try. I'll try. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, it's your soapbox. 6 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Move the staff 7 recommendation resolution #1, resolution of the Planning 8 Commission recommending that the City Council certify the 9 final Environmental Impact Report, adopt a Mitigation, 10 Monitoring and Reporting program, and adopt the Statement 11 of Overriding Considerations for the Santa Monica and La 12 Brea mixed-use project located at 7113-7125 Santa Monica 13 Boulevard and 1122 North Detroit and 1111 North La Brea 14 Avenue, West Hollywood, California, exactly as it's 15 worded. 16 Okay, so this is just --CHAIR YEBER: 17 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That's just regarding the 18 EIR and the Statement of Overriding Considerations. 19 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: And I'll second that. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we voting separately? 21 CHAIR YEBER: Yes. 22 I'll second that. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Shall we vote separately on that? 24 25 CHAIR YEBER: That's great because there's three

1 items within -- three components with that. 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And Donald seconded it. 3 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Do I have any discussion on 4 that? 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. 6 CHAIR YEBER: With that, can I have a roll call? 7 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Altschul? 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. 9 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner DeLuccio? 10 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes. 11 Commissioner Bernstein? DAVID GILLIG: 12 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Aye. 13 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner? 14 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Yes. 15 DAVID GILLIG: Vice-Chair Guardarrama? 16 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yes. 17 DAVID GILLIG: Chair Yeber? 18 CHAIR YEBER: Yes. 19 DAVID GILLIG: Motion carries, unanimous, one 20 recusal. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 22 So now we'll move on to the actual --23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The actual entitlement? 24 CHAIR YEBER: Now, also remember, this is a 25 recommendation because it still has to go to Council

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because of --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That's part of the language.

CHAIR YEBER: Right, okay.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Draft -- resolution number two, a recommendation of the Planning Commission to the City Council approving a General Plan Amendment Number 2009-03, Zone Map Amendment 2009-06, Demolition Permit 2008-23, Demolition Permit 2008-37, taking out the tentative tract map language with the exception of including tentative tract map language for the groundlevel -- for the street-level commercial footage to demolish all commercial structures and associated surface parking lots on four parcels with the construction of a six-story building containing 184 residential rental units, including 37 affordable inclusionary units, 13,350 square feet of ground level retail and restaurant uses, 24,380 square feet of open space, and ground-level and subterranean parking containing 304 parking spaces for the Santa Monica and La Brea mixed use project located at 7113-7125 Santa Monica Boulevard, 1122 North Detroit, and 1111 North La Brea Avenue, West Hollywood, California; further conditioned that the Materials Board has presented at the Commission hearing materials identified as Swiss Pearl or its equivalent be used in this project; further that the project go back to Design Review

Committee for examination and perhaps revision of -- help 2 me -- the --3 The southeast corner of the building CHAIR YEBER: 4 to incorporate a move that would be more in line with or 5 respond to the Gateway project across the street. 6 Actually, Christi, why don't you help me here with the 7 language on that. 8 CHRISTI HOGIN: Are we just sending this to design 9 review to make suggestions for what the architect would 10 voluntarily do? 11 CHAIR YEBER: Yes, why don't we just say -- I mean 12 the motion to say back to Design Review, and then we can 13 discuss looking at X, Y, Z on design review. 14 CHRISTI HOGIN: Okay, so we're going to --15 everything Commissioner Altschul said plus to refer the 16 design back to Design Review Committee for consideration 17 for changes on the southeast corner. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Southeast corner and looking again at 19 the -- if the commissioners agree -- the delivery 20 strategy or the delivery truck strategy that's on 21 Detroit. Do I -- is there any -- is there a consensus on 22 that? 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I think that's fine. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 25 And I would incorporate that COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:

1 as part of the motion, and that is the motion. Is there 2 a second? 3 And then the third thing on the design CHAIR YEBER: 4 review was looking at the urban -- the public right-of-5 way and the urban design aspect or the street aspect of 6 the project. 7 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: With regard to public -- park 8 services and --? 9 CHAIR YEBER: With regard to -- yes, with regard to 10 that plaza, that open space, public open space condition. 11 **FRANCISCO CONTRERAS:** Okay. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Does that -- you guys are kind of 13 scratching your heads. 14 CHRISTI HOGIN: Only because we're only -- with all 15 due respect, we're just hearing it from the Chair, so 16 we're waiting for the wagon heads one direction or 17 another for --18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible). 19 CHRISTI HOGIN: -- a couple of other commissioners 20 to know that --21 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: (Inaudible), I'll second 22 the motion. 23 CHRISTI HOGIN: Okay, that's what our looks are 24 about. 25 CHAIR YEBER: Okay.

1 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I'll second the motion. 2 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Marc, 3 CHAIR YEBER: is that clear? 4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Your utilities are in there? 5 CHAIR YEBER: Well, that will be a condition. That 6 will actually be a condition. It's part of the 7 resolution. 8 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Well, all these are 9 conditions. 10 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 11 It's my opinion that we --COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: 12 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, did we miss anything? Have we 13 missed anything else? 14 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: No, just the utilities. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, so the last thing is we're 16 coordinating with the public utility agencies and the 17 fire department in regards to utility boxes, phone boxes, 18 standpipes to incorporate and place these fixtures so 19 they do not interfere with the aesthetic or public 20 amenity that this building is trying to --21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: As usually stated before -as stated before. 22 23 CHAIR YEBER: Yes, yes, gotcha. All right. Are we 24 Should someone read that -- without reading the clear? 25 first portion or maybe surmise this before we actually do

a roll call?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, if you read the motion, it's extracting the tentative tract map language except for the commercial. It's exactly as it is written with the addition of the instructions or the recommendations, the dicta, as Christi would call it, with regard to the Design Review Committee.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Adding of the material on board?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And the material condition.

CHRISTI HOGIN: And the utility --

CHAIR YEBER: Utility and the design review, right.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Right.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes, that summarizes it.

Did somebody second?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Second.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Does everyone understand what it is?

The motion is to [improve] the project, no residential condominium automatic, commercial condominium stays in, material board unless it comes back to you, the design review is going to look at the southeast corner and the relationship with the property across the street, and we're going to get a plan on the utilities where they'll place the boxes and whatever else they need.

CHAIR YEBER: Right, coordinate, just simple coordination in advance.

1 CHRISTI HOGIN: Right. And we all understand that 2 this is all going in the form of recommendation to the 3 City Council? 4 CHAIR YEBER: Right. 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And that would be a bring-6 back resolution? 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible - microphone 8 inaccessible). 9 CHAIR YEBER: I think we're good. 10 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** We're good? 11 CHAIR YEBER: Yes, um-hmm. 12 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Okay. 13 I didn't hear Marc's things COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: 14 in there, now, Marc, your couple little things that we're 15 missing. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Such as? 17 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: About re-looking the 18 configuration of the parking? 19 CHAIR YEBER: Just that -- you know, it's in there 20 with design review. 21 CHRISTI HOGIN: We use the shorthand of design 22 They'll look at the delivery and the -review. 23 CHAIR YEBER: The public spaces, meaning the 24 sidewalks, the two sidewalks along La Brea and Santa 25 Monica and the corner so that it becomes a better gateway

1 move. 2 So with that, does everyone understand that, the 3 motion that's on the table? Okay, David? 4 DAVID GILLIG: Commission Altschul? 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. 6 DAVID GILLIG: Vice Chair Guardarrama? 7 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yes. 8 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein? 9 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yes. 10 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner? 11 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Yes. 12 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner DeLuccio? 13 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes. 14 DAVID GILLIG: Chair Yeber? 15 CHAIR YEBER: Yes. 16 DAVID GILLIG: Motion carries unanimous, one 17 recusal. 18 CHAIR YEBER: And we'll take a five-minute break. 19 (Short break taken) 20 Again, the staff planner is Francisco. CHAIR YEBER: 21 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good 22 evening again, Commissioners. 23 So the proposed Monarch at Fountain and La Brea 24 project involves the redevelopment of the approximately 25 1.6-acre property located at the southeast corner of La

Brea Avenue and Fountain. The existing John's Marketplace, which you see up on the screen, and furniture retail structures, vacant lot, and surface parking will be replaced with a six-story building.

Now, this building will include 187 residential units, including 38 affordable inclusionary units. A little bit -- approximately 19,600 square feet of ground-level retail and restaurant uses, about 28,000 square feet of open space, as well as a ground-level and subterranean parking containing 364 parking spaces.

Likewise, as in the previous project, the applicant is requesting approval of a tract map that would permit the subdivision of the four commercial tenant spaces on the ground level and so that they may retain the possibility to convert the rental units to condominiums in the future.

Now, because the proposed project provides 38 affordable units on site, it is eligible for a 25% density or FAR bonus and two concessions.

The applicant is seeking two concessions, one of them being an additional story not to exceed 10 feet in project height, and it's also seeking a concession from the private open space requirement for 80 of the proposed rental units.

Similar to the other project, in order to offset the

lack of private open space in these units, the project proposes large, well-developed, high-functioning common open spaces throughout various locations with varied amenities that the residents can take advantage of.

These would be much bigger spaces and more versatile than some of the private spaces within some of these individual units.

Now, we did conduct an Environmental Impact Report.

The Environmental Impact Report identified temporary construction noise impacts, as well as traffic and circulation impacts. The EIR is considering a mitigation to install a traffic signal at the corner where that intersection of Lexington and La Brea and this is to mitigate impacts at that one intersection.

Now, if the Planning Commission were to approve the project as proposed, we would have to make a finding that the benefits of the project outweigh the impacts of the (inaudible) approval. This is known as a statement of overriding considerations.

This is attached to Draft Resolution PC09940 as

Attachment B. Among the benefits considered for this

project, the project will implement many of the existing

housing, mixed use, and east side revitalization general

plan goals for the city, as well as an important goal to

provide for the upgrading, infill, and recycling, and a

new development of use is along La Brea Avenue.

Now, similarly to the last project, at their last meeting, the east side PAC enthusiastically endorsed this project. Also, the Planning Commission Design Review subcommittee was supportive of the project's urban design and architecture.

Staff does recommend approval of the proposed project because it will develop a prominent mixed-use building at a gateway entry point on the eastern boundary of the City of West Hollywood.

The project's mix of uses in architecture and urban design elements will significantly enhance the streetscape and improve pedestrian activity along La Brea and Fountain Avenues.

This project, too, will become a new urban landmark that will enhance the quality of life on the east side of the city. Due to these benefits and those outlined in the staff report and in your resolutions, staff recommends approval of the proposed project.

That concludes my presentation, and our team is still here and still available for any of your questions. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, well, before we do that, John, do you want to add anything on this particular project and maybe speak to how this one might be a little --

slightly different?

JOHN CHASE: Well, the big move about this project is the length of the frontage on La Brea, and that was a design issue, and that was something that came up at Design Review subcommittee, and I think they've really addressed it by having a significant break in the building, by having that public plaza, part of which is open to the sky.

And kind of the main design task of this from the point of view of presentation to the street was acknowledging that this is a big building on a big site but still breaking it down into pieces that were more human scale, and I think they didn't do anything phony about trying to make this look like two different buildings when it's not, but they used a variety of methods in stepping -- and using different kinds of cladding materials, window -- the types of windows to break it up, and they definitely addressed the corner of La Brea and Fountain with the vertical glass tower that's very clearly a corner orientation. So I think they did a good job of that.

And that plaza, breaking up the building also has the advantage of it being the access that takes people back to the parking, so it actually has a use as people going to and fro, and it gives kind of a break in a more

1 occupyable moment in the sidewalk going up La Brea. 2 Okay, thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Yes, Francisco? 3 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Chair, I just wanted to 4 mention that we did make a small little revision to one 5 of the findings in the Resolution 10-941. 6 In section five of the Resolution, [finding five], 7 we just clarified some of the items with regards to the 8 implementation of inclusionary units in the proposal, so 9 we just wanted to point that out to you that there was 10 revision to that resolution. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YEBER: I'm sorry, what page was that on 12 again? 13 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: It's page five of 24. 14 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Can I have disclosures? 15 Commissioner Buckner? Anything different from the 16 previous? 17 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: No, the same disclosure as 18 prior project. Met with the applicant's representative. 19 We discussed only those things that are part of the staff 20 report. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Bernstein? 22 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I do have one additional 23 disclosure. In addition to all the other earlier 24 disclosures, and Commissioner Altschul was nice enough to 25 point out that Congregation Kol Ami sent in the letter of

1 support. I am secretary of the board of trustees of the 2 congregation, and I did not participate in the 3 conversation when they decided to endorse the project. 4 left the room but lest anyone question that, I just want 5 to make it clear I was not part of the process of their 6 approving that letter. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Commission Altschul? 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The same disclosures as 9 before, and I noticed on the letter of Congregation Kol 10 Ami, I'm listed on the letter as a former president, but 11 I was not even apprised that they were having a 12 discussion about it. 13 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner DeLuccio? 14 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have no further disclosures. 15 16 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama? 17 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Same disclosures as for the 18 last item. 19 CHAIR YEBER: And also for me, same disclosure as 20 the previous item. So questions from Commission for 21 staff? 22 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have one question. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner DeLuccio? 24 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes, one question and 25 clarification. This requires if we were to approve it

CHAIR YEBER:

1 this evening a statement of overriding consideration, but 2 it does not have to mean that we would have to do that. 3 It doesn't need to go on to the City Council? 4 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. 5 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: It does not? 6 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: It does not need to go to the 7 City Council, correct. 8 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay, thank you. Unless it's 9 appealed. CHAIR YEBER: 10 Commissioner Bernstein? 11 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Francisco, I had another 12 One of the unmitigatable impacts is question. 13 construction noise, and I was just curious. In a general 14 way, are the mitigations for construction noise that we 15 are proposing as stringent as we would do for any similar 16 project that we've approved in the past in the city? 17 Yes, and if not so, maybe a FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: 18 little bit more because we were very concerned with some 19 of the comments that we received during the draft EIR 20 regarding noise, so we did include some industry-standard 21 noise mitigation, I think maybe a little bit above and 22 beyond what's usually required in most of our required 23 approvals. 24 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Okay, thank you.

Any other questions for staff?

with that, we'll start the public testimony.

Mr. Seymour, the same as the previous item among your -- you and your representatives and the applicant, 10 minutes and then five minutes at the back end to rebut any items, any issues brought up by the testimony.

JEFF SEYMOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Jeff
Seymour, Seymour Consulting Group. I reside in West Lake
Village.

Again, I want to thank staff for the assistance that they've provided us throughout this process.

Mr. Chairman, much of what I had said at the earlier hearing was, as you'll note, included for both of these projects. One of the things I wanted to do, though, is you will note that there are some who had discussed their support at the previous hearing. They're not here, but they have also made comment either on their speaker cards or during the verbal discussion of their support.

Again, one of the things that the staff had mentioned in their staff report was that there are 11 miles of La Brea and three of those -- three blocks of those 11 miles is in the City of West Hollywood.

This project, we believe, is as important as its cousin to the south and does indeed have transformational impacts upon the entire region.

One of the things that I want to do at this point,

though, is to give Rod Stone, again the senior partner at Monarch, an opportunity to respond on some issues that did come up at the initial hearing, which will be germane in relation to this hearing. After that, Kevin Newman will again make a presentation using animation.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, Mr. Stone?

ROD STONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Rod Stone. I reside in San Diego, California, and I'm one of the principals of the Monarch Group.

First, I'd also want to thank staff and all the help that they've given us in getting this far.

We are very excited about this project. We think our architect has done a wonderful job in creating something unique and unusual for West Hollywood and especially on the east side.

A question that was brought up before, why do we request a tract map? Lenders require it, especially today, when financing is almost impossible. We had financing on the first project. Unfortunately, if the tract map is eliminated, our financing just fell apart. We have to have a tract map. It's the only way lenders are really willing to look at a project today.

What they're looking at is the worst-case scenario, worst case meaning they get the property back. If they

Newport Beach.

get the property back, what they want to do is they want to get rid of it in the most -- in the quickest way, and that is options, option being that they keep it as a rental or they sell it out as a condominium. So it's just imperative that we include a tract map. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Mr. Newman?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Thank you. My name is Kevin Newman.

I'm the principal with Newman Garrison Plus Partners

located in Newport Beach, California, and I reside in

Again, what I'd like to do is briefly state that this project also has a opportunity to become a catalyst. It is an extension of the project at Santa Monica and La Brea and also provides an opportunity to create pedestrian-oriented activity and to energize the corridor along La Brea Avenue towards Fountain.

CHAIR YEBER: David, can you stop the watch till they get that set up?

KEVIN NEWMAN: Our vision, along with that of the east side PAC and staff was to create an opportunity to create some dynamic, livable, retail-oriented activity along La Brea Avenue, thus creating contextually a building that fits within the area.

We had a challenge regarding the length of the building, as John had mentioned, and we took advantage of

that opportunity by breaking the building down in varying areas and also providing opportunities along the pedestrian level to enhance and widen for better access.

The building opportunities that we had created was to provide public open space that separated the two portions of the building. And, again, as you see along the pedestrian activity, the width of some of these areas expands up to 27 feet.

As you approach the public plaza, we now engage into the activity in the center of the project. This is the view coming in from the parking garage into the public area and as you transition through the public area into the sidewalk and pedestrian linkage to Fountain.

The use of materials again becomes a integral part of the design. The use of Swiss Pearl and metal column covers continues to enhance the articulation at the pedestrian level.

Again, the use of landscaping in certain areas helps soften the hardscape and becomes more of an inviting adventure.

As we continue to come to the corner, we now are engaged by an iconic statement, which happens to take advantage of the corner element. What you're actually viewing there are units that have full spectacular views of the Hollywood Hills.

And as we transition along the building area and dropping the façade, we now create outdoor open space that overlooks La Brea and continues to activate and energize that area, utilizing an opportunity for passive space and active space commingling and creating a dynamic vision for this particular project along La Brea Avenue.

And as it transcends into evening, we create an opportunity where people can intermix, mingle, and share ideas and thoughts and conversation while at the same time creating a very vibrant, energized area along La Brea Avenue, and thus completes the transformation.

Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Any questions for the applicant or his representatives at this point?

Okay, seeing that, now we'll move on to the public speakers. Again as before, I'll call you up. Please state your name and city of residence. You'll have two minutes.

Starting with Joseph Clapsaddle, followed by Joan Henehan.

JOSEPH CLAPSADDLE: Good evening, Commissioners and staff. My name is Joseph Clapsaddle, and I am a resident and a businessperson here in West Hollywood, and I urge you to support the staff's recommendation.

I'm a little angry right now, so I don't want to

speak further, but this is -- tonight, I'm disappointed.

Let me just say that. Now, this -- the first half of this session went on. I'm just very disappointed. Thank you.

JOAN HENEHAN: Good evening, again; Joan Henehan, resident of Toluca Lake here in the capacity of chair of

Because this project at the corner of La Brea and Fountain is of a part of the entire project, the first portion of which we discussed earlier, I would just like to simply restate my support, our support on behalf of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce.

the West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.

This is a project that has been executed by professionals, vetted by professionals, and is financed. So I would say that I personally wouldn't want to second-guess -- I'm not in a position to second-guess colors or designs. These folks have been very, very forthcoming with everyone, as well as with the neighbors, and I think it looks like a great project for West Hollywood, very much in keeping with the general plans.

So thank you for your consideration.

CHAIR YEBER: Norm Chramoff, followed by Rob Bergstein.

Norm Chramoff: Norm Chramoff, resident of West Hollywood.

This project, like the other one, has something else that's unique. Almost all of us go through hell to get to the subway when we once in a while use it. Both of these projects are quite literally -- unless there's some massive traffic jam -- three to five minutes. You can get on a bus at the corner of either one of them and go to the subway and go to work downtown or go to work at Universal City. And I live near Sunset in the middle of the city. I believe the DASH bus, which I would take sometimes to the subway so I do my once a week on it, has now been discontinued. So most people in West Hollywood don't have access unless you drive up there and you park and then you might as well go downtown.

So my real point is this will probably have a lot of people living in both of these projects that work in the valley, that work downtown, and it is really quite literally three minutes to the subway. Some of us could walk it. So take that into consideration, and I think it's a great project.

Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Rob? Rob's not here. Scottman Wall? Orrin Karp?

Joel Mark?

Steve Levin, followed by Steve Martin.

Steve Levin: Thank you. Steve Levin, City of West

Hollywood.

I guess I think I can safely speak for the six people who you just called who aren't here, but no, again, we're very excited about this project, this one even more so from an architectural standpoint. We're just -- I'm so excited by it. I think it's just -- I mean again going back to -- we never pictured this happening in our neighborhood and especially at this particular intersection. And all of a sudden, slowly, we're starting to knit that, knit that garment between Fountain and Santa Monica, and I'm sure you've all been on that stretch of La Brea. It is not a pleasant place to walk. I mean no one chooses to walk there. It's horrible, and this is going to drastically change that.

And just with my remaining time, I just want to make one comment. It would've been really kind of cool if because this meeting was strictly about east side projects had you had this over at Plummer Park. I know about five or six people who weren't able to make it over here who were supportive of the project who would've definitely been able to do that. So in the future, perhaps think about that, but very much in support of the project and hope you guys pass it.

Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Steve Martin, followed by

John Berberian.

STEVE MARTIN: Steve Martin, West Hollywood.

I actually do use the subway, and very often, I walk home from Hollywood/Highland, and this is a 10 or 12-minute walk from Hollywood/Highland, so that's a real advantage to this project.

The other advantage to this project is the alternative that could happen here. This is a large site. This could be a site for a big-box developer, and we could easily wind up with another 10-story box here, maybe with a couple of stories of affordable housing on it, but something that could really create problems.

You might get a project that could generate a lot of revenue for the city, but it wouldn't be changing in a positive way the ambience of the east side of West Hollywood. It wouldn't be increasing the livability of the east side, which I think that's the goal of redevelopment -- well, redevelopment has a number of goals, but certainly I think for the PAC, and I don't presume to speak for them, but for my friends on the east side, increasing the livability on the east side is really important, and that's what this project does, still keeping within a human scale on a major West Hollywood thoroughfare.

So I would urge you to give it some -- give it the

consideration. It has a lot of open public space and space for the people that will be living there. It's rentals, which are in huge demand right now. People are not attracted to our mixed-use luxury condos because they're, frankly, too big of a commitment for young people who don't know one year to the next whether they're going to be working in the Los Angeles area or Portland or D.C., and they're not going to be tied down to a condo that they might not be able to get out from under and they might not be able to rent to cover the mortgage.

So I just think this has a lot to recommend it, and thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Steve.

John Berberian, followed by Naum Turetskiy.

JOHN BERBERIAN: My name is John Berberian. I reside in Los Angeles, my business in West Hollywood, which is John's Market. Definitely I'm supportive of the project, and I encourage to approve the project.

And just for the record, I'd like to let them know we really care about our customers, and we're going to provide a free shuttle to our -- the other location until we see what we can do in the future. It's about two-and-a-half miles away. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Naum?

Eugene Levin, followed by MaryAnn.

resides in the City of Los Angeles. I'm representing West Hollywood Russian Community Center, east side of West Hollywood mostly area where Russian historically resides.

And I think this project it's really unique. It will help in any way to the whole city in term of revenue, in term of finding jobs, and for apartment for lower-income people.

Talking about concerning related to moving John's Market, as we just hear, it would provide free shuttle service, and (inaudible) nobody mentioned the color of this building because I found out, just be politically correct, it associates with a country which I don't want to name tonight. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

MaryAnn, followed by Valerie Sacks.

MARYANN SHIWKOWSKI: Hi. I'm MaryAnn [Shiskowski]. I'm a resident of the City of West Hollywood. I just want to reiterate what I said last time, though I didn't say that I am a Bruin, too, so I do like the blue and wish it was gold.

But anyway, I do like this building even more than the other building. I'm very much in support of it, and

I do have to say that I know that there are some concerns by the apartment owners over on the LA side; however, they did not come in front of the PAC at all, and we did not know of their concerns at all, and it would've been nice to have heard from them at any time since the Monarch Company came in front of us many times before and they have every opportunity to speak in front of us, also.

So I just want to give my support, and thank you so

So I just want to give my support, and thank you so much. Bye bye.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Valerie Sacks, followed by Victor Omelczenko.

VALERIE SACKS: Hi. Valerie Sacks for HMMY property management. Again, as you know, they are the owner and operator of the 68-unit apartment building directly to the back of this.

I do apologize, as I wanted to say, for getting you the materials quite late, but it was a lot of material that came out a week before the hearing. I did try and confine my remarks in those letters to things that had to do with -- things that came out then. I can't say that 100% of the comments did that. And I did respond extensively to the draft EIR. Some of the responses in the final EIR did, I believe, require additional responses, such as we had hoped that there would be

additional traffic mitigations, but instead, there were not. We really believe there are going to be enormous traffic impacts for this and that they should -- the city should consider requiring additional signals at various locations to help alleviate that.

They did change the way they wanted to deal with the noise impacts. There wasn't enough detail in the FEIR for us to evaluate whether those would be effective. We understand there is going to be noise and that's unavoidable, but we did want to acknowledge that those are severe impacts on the people who live on the other side of the building.

We do believe that the project is severely underparked. I miscalculated -- underestimated how much it was underparked in previous materials. I just sort of noticed that today.

And we believe that the density bonus incentives, the way the private open space is to be done, we do not believe that it's in compliance with code requirements. It seems to be the variance in addition to the concession would be required for that.

I don't know if I said more this -- said less this time or if I just spoke really, really, really fast, but I will confine my comments at that. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you very much.

Victor Omelczenko, followed by Genevieve.

VICTOR OMELCZENKO: I'm Victor Omelczenko, resident of West Hollywood, and in a prior life, I worked for six years for USDA's Food and Nutrition Service, the program that supports food stamps, school lunches, Women Infants & Children program, as well as food programs for the elderly.

And the concern I have about this project is the issue of food security. We've heard this as a topic in the city. I'm really, really concerned about the loss of John's Supermarket eventually.

I did hear the owner say that they were going to try to set up a bus, a shuttle, and they're promising that for us, but for many of the residents, that's kind of like a long schlep, two-and-a-half miles. That's going down La Brea or Fountain but going down La Brea, making a left on Santa Monica, and going all the way, I think, to the John's at Hollywood at Santa Monica and Western. It just seems like a far way to go.

I occasionally make that trek. I now live in the center city. Jeanne Dobrin and I occasionally go shopping together. She lives on the west side. I'll pick her up, and we go the furthest way to the end of our city, and we shop at John's. Jeanne loves the tilapia there. I like the fruits and vegetables there.

2.1

Let me point out, this mango at John's recently was \$0.50. If you want to cross -- go across to Ralphs, it's going to be \$1. So, yes, we're talking about more affordable housing but what about affordable food?

I'm very, very concerned about the loss of this supermarket eventually. I know there is retail space in there. I wish it could be a food market like John's, and what I ask you, as our commissioners, is that until John — when John's ultimately does leave, I do feel that Monarch developers should show the city that they have the money to actually build this project, that they have the money and let John's stay there as long as possible before everybody has to go two-and-a-half miles into East Hollywood.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Victor.

Alexander Freedman, followed by Abe Hecht.

ALEXANDER FREEDMAN: Yes, hello, again. Alexander Freedman, a resident of Hollywood. I live right across John's, but I'll get to it.

Anyway, first of all, I fully supported the project, 200% supportive, as I said last time.

A few comments. The white color, I would make something more interesting. I think white is a little too plain so maybe like, I don't know, use yellow, blue,

whatever, but maybe something other than white.

As far as the traffic impacts, a few people said,

"Oh, it's going to be too much traffic, too much noise."

You guys, this is a city. This is not South Dakota.

This is not Nebraska. This is not Iowa. This is Los

Angeles, the second-highest population city in the nation
after New York, so there will always be traffic.

Every single city around the world has traffic, so we have to live with that, and we just can't say it's going to be too much traffic so to prevent a nice project from happening.

So we're going to have to get used to it, and if you're concerned about traffic, get out of your car. You can take a walk, take a bike ride, take the bus, subway. I personally use public transportation, and yes, LA does have public transportation. So if you're concerned about traffic, get out of your car.

As far as -- oh, as far as property owners expressed concern they're going to lose tenants, my opinion, it's going to do up to, it's going to attract tenants because those projects are going to improve the quality of life.

I'm a tenant right across from John's, and this is reason for me to stay in the neighborhood because once I see we have those restaurants and shops, hey, I'm going to stay for a few more years here. It's going to be nice. So I

think it's going to actually attract more people.

As far as losing John's, yes, I sometimes shop there, but you know what? Sometimes we have to take sacrifices in order for the better projects to develop. There are (inaudible) stores around here by which have similar products. There's Ralphs across the street. There's a farmer's market on Hollywood and Ivar. So there are great opportunities, great alternatives other than John's market.

And just once again, I want to thank the Monarch Group and the commissioners. I urge to approve this project. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Abe Hecht, followed by Eric Hecht.

ABE HECHT: Again, I want to plead with you to understand this will be a big loss to my business. It'll be a big loss to the street. We will have hard problems parking because I know they will not have enough parking for them. They will have to come to our street to park. This will cause us more congestions. I will lose more business, and I repeat, it is a hardship, going to be for me. I need your help. Please help me. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Eric Hecht, followed by Eleanor Barrett.

ERIC HECHT: Hi. My name is Eric Hecht, and I'm here to represent HMMY Property Management Corporation.

I just want to point out half the constituents affected by this property are in Los Angeles, and Los Angeles is a half a building. Everyone in West Hollywood seems to be supporting it. Where's my input?

I just heard about the east side PAC. I was not informed. I've talked to tenants. I've talked to neighbors. I haven't heard one thing about an east side PAC or any involvement for the City of Los Angeles to be involved with that. I don't think that's fair, okay?

I have problems with traffic. I have problems with parking. I have problems with noise. And our building has 68 units, which is the biggest building in the area. I provide 125 parking spaces in my building.

Across the street are single-family housings and duplexes and small buildings. I don't think they're going to appreciate having all their streets covered with your tenants parking their friends there and bringing in all this traffic. And I never said, "Hey, I have a problem with traffic in Los Angeles," because I'm realistic. I live in Los Angeles. I have a problem with the way it was addressed in the EIR. They can throw in a few more stoplights [on] our streets because when I need to make a turn, I'm going to have to go around the world just to get out of there with this traffic.

So they can do a little more input and a little more

with parking, a little more with traffic, a little but with more noise, and I just think that's very important that it's addressed.

But mostly important, Los Angeles didn't get the input it deserved. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Eleanor Barrett, followed by Uzi Avnery.

ELEANOR BARRETT: My name's Eleanor Barrett, and I'm a resident of the east side of West Hollywood. I'm also on the east side PAC, and I'm speaking as an individual in support of the project.

I am a walker. I think that this would be a lovely place to walk. I love the open center area in this. I love this idea of this being developed into a retail space that would draw me to it.

I think the other speakers have mentioned that this would be a good residence for people who would use public transportation. Hopefully, this city will get the Metro coming through it at some time, and that would add to it.

I think that this will revitalize the east side.

Both of these projects add attractive spaces. We desperately need low-income housing here, and this will add to it. I just would like to add that I support this very much. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Uzi, followed by Jeanne Dobrin, who will be our last speaker.

Good evening. My name is Uzi Avnery. UZI AVNERY: I'm a resident of City of West Hollywood. commercial property almost across the street from this site.

Again, this is a stunning building. It is just beautiful the way it's designed. I'm just amazed at it. I think we deserve this building as presented in our community.

I would like to focus one more on the issue -- one more time on the issue of the tentative tract map. would prefer to have the condominiums in there, and if that could help, if at some point the markets would free up and at the end of this construction if this thing would be sold as condos, it is a great alternative to the eight or \$900,000 condos we've seen in the area. are smaller units. They'll probably carry smaller price tags and make it much easier for people to come in.

The home ownership would promote -- the area would probably come just a little bit -- nothing wrong with apartments, but I think that product is missing in the area. Thank you very much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

Jeanne Dobrin, our last speaker.

JEANNE DOBRIN: Jeanne Dobrin, long-time resident of West Hollywood.

This project is different from the one on Santa Monica because under the zoning, you can have a much higher in the zoning ordinance height than the one on Santa Monica.

But they both are involved with this dreaded, dreaded words, "overriding consideration." Technically speaking, that means we can't do anything about it, it's going to cause chaos, but we have to put up with it.

As for instance, they have not really addressed the fact of the circulation issue. The circulation on La Brea is the traffic service level F, and that is A to F means the worst. In fact, our former transportation manager said that it's even worse than that.

I also have not heard as to whether there's going to be any tandem parking here and also are they going to be standard spaces or compact? And, also, are they going —tandem is very important. There's a lot of studio and one-bedroom units there.

At the beginning -- prior to the meeting, I spoke to Francisco, and I asked him who would be the person who would be able to judge as to whether they could turn at their idea to convert to condominium. He said that would be the community development director. But I heard him -

- when he was testifying to the commission, he spoke about that staff would determine that, and then very obliquely, he said that the commission. Is he mixed up here? He told me something different from what he told the commission. I'm a little bit alarmed about that.

I also hope that you will take out the condominium

I also hope that you will take out the condominium conversions there.

And, again, about John's market, that is a very sad thing that we are going to lose that market, as you heard Victor Omelczenko say.

Thank you, gentlemen and ladies.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Jeanne. And with that, we'll close the public -- oh, yes, I'm sorry.

Mr. Steres would like to rebut. Please state your name again and address for the record, and you have five minutes -- up to five minutes.

MARK STERES: Thank you. Mark Steres. I reside in Calabasas, and I am the attorney for the applicant.

Some of my rebuttal will be a repeat of the last item because this is a separate item and there's a separate record, I think it's important that I speak to it. I am going to be basically responding to Valerie Sacks and the Hechts' comments.

One of the things I think is important to note is that the design of this building was very complementary

to and sensitive to the impacts that the Hechts have raised. If you look at the site plan layout, there is a huge carve-out right where their building is, and our apartment complex that stretches east going toward that property line creates a courtyard between the two main buildings going back, and what's in between is their building.

They currently look over John's loading dock.

That's what their current view is. And so I think it will be actually an improved view once the building is complete.

There are numerous construction conditions and mitigation measures that are placed on this project, and as you heard from staff, they even are more stringent than you normally would have. And as you heard from the applicant, they are very sensitive to that and there's supervision and contact numbers, and these are all in the standard conditions of approval. If there are any issues, there is a process and a remedy.

The other thing regarding traffic impacts, I think as you all know, being on the commission for a while, that residential development has the least impact on traffic generation, and this project here could support much more commercial -- could be a commercial project that would actually generate more traffic. The fact that

it's residential actually keeps the traffic generation lower.

Plus, with some of the testimony you heard from the community, we expect people to engage in public transportation at this site just like the other site, and there is other commercial opportunities. The Ralph's across the street, people that are moving into this complex can walk across the street to get their grocery shopping.

So I think that all adds to this project in reducing the impacts.

The comments made by Valerie Sacks and her letters again were essentially a rehash of comments that were made to the draft Environmental Impact Report, and we think that the final impact -- Environmental Impact Report, the response to comments, did an excellent job in responding to those concerns, and it's in compliance with [SEQUA].

Again, you have the environmental consultant here and the transportation staff here if there are specific questions based on what was raised regarding parking or traffic or noise.

I would note that the potential traffic impacts, including the need for signals, was thoroughly analyzed and discussed in the EIR. The parking impacts and

concluding that it is in compliance with the city's codes was analyzed.

And in the response to comments, this issue about the density bonus concession was also discussed in the response to comments and found parking impacts to be less than significant.

As far as noise, again, there's been quite a bit of mitigation to lessen it as much as possible.

The impacts are short-term construction noise and to a few intersections. As I said before, this is a highly urbanized area. We know that and that almost any project is going to have those kind of impacts, the short-term impacts, when there's construction going on.

But there are quite a few overriding benefits, and it's in the staff report. It's listed, a very complete and thorough a discussion of what all the benefits from this project are. I think making that finding is not very difficult. In fact, it's an easy finding, I think, to make. You have sufficient evidence in the record.

The long-term effects of this project are exactly what, again, the City envisioned and planned for, and once it's built, it will be an excellent asset, and again, we would request that you support the project and adopt the resolutions as written. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Any questions for the

applicant or its representatives?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Can we leave the public hearing open for a moment? I have a question for staff and may want to ask a follow-up question to the applicant.

CHAIR YEBER: Sure.

JEFF SEYMOUR: Mr. Chairman, I know I have about 30 seconds left. I just wanted to reiterate one comment. I think it's important that we do.

The Monarch Group for the past 40 years has been known for its development of rental units. That is what they do and they do very well. I wanted to reiterate the issue with regard to -- and I have 13 seconds to do it -- with regard to the issue of the tract map.

We are doing that as a place marker to ensure that our financing, which we have now secured, will be there as we move forward with construction, and that was the reason for our doing that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: May I ask -- I'll start my question with Mr. Seymour. I've been sitting here for 14 years, and I've never seen a residential project or a project coming forward asking for an either/or, either rental units or give us condos. Let us decide when we want to. This is totally new.

And you didn't even ask for either/or. You asked for rental units, then stuck somewhere in the staff report is something about fire department approvals of conditions which may be more beneficial to you now than later, of course, which I've never seen either.

Then you come forward with a project that has tandem parking, and I don't recall any tandem parking that we've addressed in recent years without having some conditions

parking, and I don't recall any tandem parking that we've addressed in recent years without having some conditions on there with respect to guest parking permits. In a condominium -- most condominiums in West Hollywood that have tandem parking are mandated to have valets to park.

JEFF SEYMOUR: But we're not here speaking for a condominium, sir.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But you're wanting a tentative tract map.

JEFF SEYMOUR: We understand that, but in order -COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, I'm just saying I'm
confused. You're asking for apples and oranges, but
you're putting it under the apple box.

JEFF SEYMOUR: No, what we're trying to do, sir, is we're trying to find a way by which we can ensure our funding for --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You know as well as any of us sitting here that we're not -- our concern is the use of the land. Yes, we're sympathetic to the funding

processes, but it wasn't presented to us in terms of funding requirements. It was presented in terms of something about fire department -- read the staff report. It was presented as something in terms of fire department maybe having different requirements than they do now. So I just don't see it.

JEFF SEYMOUR: Well, I can tell you what I know for a fact. In the world that we live in, with the economic process that we're living in at this moment, we are here today requesting approval of 187 rental units. That is what this is all about.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: For years we've had --

JEFF SEYMOUR: And I understand --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: For years we've had rental units that have been approved and not built, approved and built, and people come in and ask for a tentative tract map and they've always been granted.

So this kind of a hybrid where, well, give us rentals, but maybe give us condos, but we don't have present code requirements in our application or in our plans for what condos would require now, and our parking is certainly not sufficient or not valeted properly for what condos would require, I don't know that this is appropriate.

JEFF SEYMOUR: Well, Commissioner, in again, in the

world that we're living, this project is a rental project. Bottom line, that is what we are building, that is what we are funding, and in this situation, in this economy, that is what our funding sources are looking for.

I'm not trying -- and, seriously, I'm not trying to skirt your concerns, but your concern also is are we -- and if I'm wrong, clarify it. It appears that the concern is that at some point after the construction of this building or during the construction --

and I sympathize with your concern. My concern is I don't want to set a precedent for everybody to come in here and in some little sentence coached in fire department language in the middle of the staff report really wants to get part of an entitlement or, in fact, an entitlement that, number one, they're not asking for, number two, the public doesn't have a right to evaluate and comment on, and number three is just sort of snuck in there --

JEFF SEYMOUR: Well --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- for a reason that isn't even stated in the staff report.

JEFF SEYMOUR: We are obviously going forward with the fire department's requirements. In addition to that,

we are more than willing to deal with the conditions if there is a moment in time when this is going to be converted. Unless I'm wrong, I think there's a conversion process that would have to take place. This building is going to be a rental building, bottom line.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Christi, would you -- could you comment on this?

CHRISTI HOGIN: They've applied for a tentative map that would allow a conversion into condominiums, and they become condominiums when they're sold, but your ability to impose conditions is now. It wouldn't be later.

So although there is a process for if you have a full building and you have approved condominium map, in order to convert it, you still need to Ellis the building and go through certain procedures. None of them create opportunities to impose land use conditions. So any conditions that you would want to impose on the condominiums have to be imposed at the time that you approve the tentative map.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And in our draft resolution, we don't have any conditions with respect to the parking, do we, were it to be a condominium. We don't have any conditions with respect to valets. We don't have any conditions -- or do we have conditions with respect to guest parking permits. What other conditions do we

1 | impose on condominiums?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: We have just the standard conditions for just any residential unit regardless of whether they're condos. Not much really is different in the code with regards to what conditions are for condos and apartments.

The valet situation, there really is only a single row, basically like two tandem spaces. You would require valet if you'd have triple tandem, for example, so that's not what's requested in here.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I'm going to buy a condominium in there, and I live in apartment 102, and I have to go up to apartment 404 to ask the guy who's parked behind me to move his car at six o'clock in the morning if I want to go to the airport?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: I think that the way that the architect has -- or the way that they've designed the project is that the one-unit bedrooms will have their single space, and those with two bedrooms will have two spaces in tandem.

JEFF SEYMOUR: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: What about the studios?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: And studios get one bedroom,
as well -- I mean one parking space, as well.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well --

1 CHRISTI HOGIN: Mr. Chair, can I just throw one more 2 thing in? As I was listening to you speak, well, a side 3 remark would be the fire department issue isn't really a 4 concern because --5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: It is not? 6 CHRISTI HOGIN: Not really because --7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, I didn't think so. 8 CHRISTI HOGIN: -- you could -- the fire department 9 gives minimum standards. Those standards have to be 10 complied with, but there's nothing to prevent the 11 developer from going beyond that, and if it's more 12 stringent for condos, they can certainly voluntarily 13 design their project that way. They don't have to be 14 conditioned. 15 But beyond that, let me just say that the conditions 16 that you put on a tentative map, they have to be 17 satisfied in order to file a final map. And it's at the 18 point that they final -- I'm sorry, could you just step 19 away from the microphone? 20 I'm sorry, I'm sorry. JEFF SEYMOUR: 21 I get distracted. Now that the kids CHRISTI HOGIN: 22 are gone from home, I'm used to just quiet conversation. 23 I don't know what's happening to me. 24 It's when they satisfy the conditions and file a

final map that they can convert. The condominium

conversion is complete.

So the commission could certainly impose whatever conditions you want on the tentative map that you feel are necessary for a condominium for the tentative map, and then if, in fact, they never filed a final map, they would never have to satisfy those conditions. So it's not imperative that the development permit conditions and (inaudible) --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But were we given sample of conditions that could, should, may be imposed? Was that option brought forth?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: There is a section in the resolution regarding our standard conditions of approval for a tentative tract map, so those are really the only additional conditions that we would impose on a condominium project versus a non-condominium project.

JEFF SEYMOUR: Commissioner, we would be willing to be conditioned to come back to the Planning Commission if we were going to go forward with any kind of conversion.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Let me ask you a question. Is that possible, Christi? Because I'm getting --

CHRISTI HOGIN: I'm trying to -- I actually like -- with all due respect, if Mr. Steres could answer that question because I don't understand how you could get both a tentative tract map approval tonight and be

2.1

required to come back for a tentative tract map approval later. It doesn't make any sense to me procedurally, so I'm not sure what value the approval has if the applicant is willing to come back and do it again anyway.

MARK STERES: I think what we're suggesting is that the condo conversion process would be a Planning Commission process, and what I'd suggest is that we have the tentative tract map approval. You can final map in phases, and we can file the final map on the commercial condos at any time, but it'd be conditioned that we couldn't file -- one of the conditions of the tentative tract map, we couldn't file the final map on the residential condos until we got Planning Commission approval on the condo conversion.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I've never had a case here, again, in almost 15 years, where we've had any hearings on a final tract map, only on a tentative tract map.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Because legally you can't because a final tract map approval is ministerial.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right.

MARK STERES: And the only thing I could say to that is that the final map is ministerial, and the ministerial action is have they applied with all the conditions of approval. So if one of the conditions of approval of the tract map is that before you can file the final, that you

have to go through this process, that's a condition of approval of the tract map.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right, but neither Ms.

Dobrin or any of these commissioners or any of the public people who have participated in this process or any of the people who submitted comments to the EIR had any inkling whatsoever that conditioning for a condominium tentative or final tract map was in the air or in the offing for tonight.

MARK STERES: The only thing I can comment is that it was part of the application and it was set forth very clearly that there was a tentative tract map on both applications and so is available.

There seems to be a very deep concern by

Commissioner Altschul about this matter. We've explained why it's a very important matter to the applicant, and we've also provided a path to allow an ease of those concerns so that both sides can accomplish what they're trying to accomplish here, which is a built project at the corner of La Brea and Fountain.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I'd like to see the path, but I'm not getting from Ms. Hogan that there is, in fact, a path that's satisfactory.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Well, essentially what the applicant's suggesting is that you make up a procedure

that doesn't currently exist. Currently under our subdivision code, the way it works is you get a tentative map in front of you, you impose conditions, they satisfy the conditions, file the final map, ministerial approval. They're saying --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I think we need the procedure before we need -- we need the cart -- or we need the horse before the cart.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can I ask a question? Can I ask him a question, same subject?

Okay, so you explained that the tentative tract map has standard conditions in it for -- if they could would file that. However, we would be looking at this project differently if it was a condominium than an apartment. The conditions that are in the resolution this evening before us would not necessarily be the same conditions that we would put in a condominium.

For example, the parking situation's different. We would look at the parking different. We would not -- we'd look at a configuration different, for example.

So what is before us this evening is, in my opinion, an apartment building, and that's what the conditions in the resolutions reflect. They do not reflect what would be necessarily for a condominium.

Granted, the tentative tract map, all that is is

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 template language that would be applicable to go along 2 with a condominium project if that was before us this 3 evening, but I really don't feel like we have a 4 resolution in front of us that would match a condominium 5 building. 6 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I have a question for 7 staff, Francisco. My understanding is that the 8 development standards for condominiums are the same as 9 the development standards for apartments.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's correct. We have development standards for multi-family residential projects, and those don't change whether you're a condo or whether you're an apartment. They're exactly the same with regards to the amount of parking required, with regards to open space, private open space, etcetera.

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Is this a permanent parking
district?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: It's a commercial parking district. I'm not very sure about that question. It's probably not because it's commercial versus residential.

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But, of course, those code standards could change over a period of two, three, five, 15, 20 years, and if they came back 15 or 20 years from now and said, "Okay, give us our right to convert," the

standards could've changed completely and we wouldn't have had any control to condition them.

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Unless the modification, for example, if the director would consider that change to the project or the project description, a major change to the project, then --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right, and I don't know who the director's going to be in 20 years, and I don't know -- and this director would be fine if she'll guarantee she'll stay here for 20 years. Monarch would be fine. I think they're totally responsible people. But if we do mangos for papayas in one application for Monarch, we have to do it for somebody else down the street, and I don't know that that's going to be acceptable.

MARK STERES: If I may, could I have just two concluding remarks?

One, on the concern of the life of this, there is a certain life to a tentative tract map, and it is not 20 years. And so the initial one is two years, as City Attorney Hogan is stating, but there is a short life to a tentative tract map, so we're not going out that far.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, just wait. I want to question that.

The life of any entitlement is two years, but if you start to build within the two years these apartments,

1 would the tentative tract map entitlement survive that since you built the apartment? So could that be possibly 2 3 so? 4 MARK STERES: The answer is no. The life of a 5 tentative tract map is until you file a final map for 6 that tract map, and initial is two years. There are some 7 extensions. 8 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So then you would have to 9 come in for an extension every two years of a tentative 10 tract map? 11 MARK STERES: Well, there's a certain life. 12 it's five years, right? 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Oh, so it's five years, not 14 two? MARK STERES: No, it's two years, and then with 15 16 extensions, it goes to year four --17 CHRISTI HOGIN: I think it's 10, but whatever it is. 18 MARK STERES: There is a limitation to the amount of 19 extensions. 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: How is this any guarantee to 21 a lender, which -- don't even answer that. 22 rhetorical question. 23 CHRISTI HOGIN: No, I will just throw one more thing 24 in the mix which is I know you are acutely aware you have 25 very limited authority to prevent conversion from a

apartment to a condominium, and that's why our standards are the same because we do want to make sure that any multi-family structures that are built can accommodate either.

So it's important that you have every -- any condition you think is necessary for a condominium has to be, I think, on at the time that you approve the tentative map.

and we might consider a continuance of this hearing for the purpose of examining a report, a staff report, and proposal for conditions that might, could, should be attached if the tentative tract map were to be granted and would also give the public a chance to come back here and address what conditions they might want. And let's be rid of this fire department charade.

CHRISTI HOGIN: You know, unless you -- that's a possibility. Unless you think there's going to be a conflict, the tract map itself is also severable, so you could approve all the other entitlements tonight and just continue the tract map application, too, if that's an option that the applicant would want.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Would it be acceptable, Mr. Chair, to take five minutes just to see if the applicant would be agreeable to separate the tract map and bring

1 that back and take the entitlement on the rest if, in 2 fact, the Commission votes that way? 3 CHAIR YEBER: Would the rest of the commission be 4 amenable to that? 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's fine. 6 We'll take a five-minute to CHAIR YEBER: Sure. 7 have a discussion. Thank you. 8 [Short break taken] 9 CHRISTI HOGIN: Francisco wants to make some 10 clarifications about what is in front of you, and then 11 I'll talk about what the applicant has told me. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Sure. 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Jeanne --14 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: And just for clarification and 15 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Mr. Chair, could Excuse me. 17 you get her to be quiet? I can't hear. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Ms. Dobrin --19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Ms. Dobrin, thank you. Go ahead, 21 Francisco. 22 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Sure. On page 24 of your 23 resolution PC 10-941 for the entitlements, that section 24 13 with regards to the tentative tract map, those there 25 are the only conditions that would have been imposed on

the condo versus a rental property. No other conditions
-- none of the other conditions would change or be
different from a rental property versus a condominium
except for the tract map conditions that are included in
this resolution.

There might be, for example, as you mentioned, additional conditions that you might want to place on a condominium versus a rental but none that are required by the zoning ordinance or that would be recommended by staff.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right.

CHRISTI HOGIN: Okay, and so this is what I learned. The first was -- I got my curiosity satisfied about why they were applying for it because, as I said, it doesn't make any legal sense if they are trying to build an apartment, and it turns out that's right. It doesn't make any legal sense, but it's a psychological issue.

They have financial partners who are, unlike

Monarch, not necessarily as accustomed to building and
keeping apartment buildings forever, and while Monarch
sees themself in business doing this forever, the
partners want the psychological security of knowing that
this property after it's gone through these years of
entitlements has the most amount of options and
entitlements possible. So it's just -- that's the

24

25

1 psychological reason, and it is what it is. 2 But they would be willing to have you act on all of 3 the other entitlements tonight and just continue to 4 another public hearing date in the future the tentative 5 tract in order to give the public additional opportunity 6 to comment on that application. 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 8 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, does that satisfy the questions 9 for the applicant? 10 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: It satisfies me. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Any other questions for the applicant 12 from the commissioners? Do you still want to leave the 13 public hearing open? 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, with that, I close the -- if 16 there's no opposition, we'll close the public hearing and 17 move to commissioner comments, starting with Commissioner 18 DeLuccio. 19 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I really don't have any 20 further comments on the project itself. This is very 21 similar to the other project, so all the positive 22 comments I have hold for this, as well.

And the only thing I want to add to the condition

However in my opinion, my preference would be not to

would be that the materials with the Swiss Pearl.

building.

1 continue the tentative tract map portion of this hearing. 2 My preference would be to make a decision this evening, 3 and I'm tending to make a decision that's similar to the 4 decision that we made up in the hearing earlier to 5 eliminate [the two], remove the tentative tract map from 6 the residential portion of the project. 7 Okay, Commissioner Buckner? CHAIR YEBER: 8 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I tend to -- I appreciate 9 Commissioner DeLuccio's comments, and I think I'd support 10 that, as well. 11 Okay, Commissioner Bernstein? CHAIR YEBER: 12 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I like the project. I have 13 no problem supporting the project, and I'm not convinced 14 that I wouldn't support the tentative tract map, and 15 since there seems to be such a great amount of unease and 16 unanswered questions, I think my preference would be to 17 approve the project and to continue the conversation 18 about the tract map until everyone can have enough 19 information to feel comfortable making a final decision 20 on that. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul? 22 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I agree with that one. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama? 24 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I love this design of this

I like it a lot better than the one on Santa

25

1 Monica and La Brea. I think the move on the corner really sort of accentuates that this is a beautiful sort 2 3 of corner lot, and the fact that the public plaza breaks 4 up the massing of the building is fantastic in my eyes. 5 That being said, I think I can craft a motion 6 tonight -- I will craft a motion after Commissioner Yeber 7 has a word. But --8 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: What would the motion be? 9 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: -- if I were to craft a 10 motion, it would be to move the staff recommendation and 11 continue the consideration of the tentative tract map 12 until a date certain --13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Uncertain. 14 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: -- uncertain -- to a date 15 certain or uncertain, and yes, to include a similar 16 condition to keep the Swiss Pearl as part of the design 17 of the building. 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I would second that. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, there's a motion on the table. 20 My comments are pretty similar. I actually when I 21 saw these two projects initially, and my first 22 introduction to these projects was through the EIR, I was 23 more worried about this project than I was the one -- the

previous project that was presented to us.

When I got these documents last week, I thought this

particular project was a bit more in sync with what I think makes sense for this particular lot. I think it's a better project.

There's a couple of quirks in it. The triangular plaza, which also seems to be an entry to the lobby, is a circulation to lobby, but then there's a café, there's tables and stuff, and it kind of doesn't make sense that the main -- the front entry circulation would go through the -- would kind of divide the outdoor café with the adjacent restaurant.

I thought the stairs that's in the big kind of move off that plaza was also oddly placed, but I also understand that from a fire safety exiting reasons, it's probably the reason why it's there because there's a maximum length from a corridor situation.

But other than that -- oh, and then, lastly, the entry to the garage, which is at the southwest corner of the building, is adjacent to a fire lane, which is another entry to the building. I'm a little concerned that if it's not properly articulated with the right signage, that that could be confusing in terms of which is the entry to that particular building.

So I'd like staff to just further look at that, work with the applicant, and make sure that that particular entry is clear in terms of where they're supposed to go

1 so it doesn't create problems on La Brea. 2 Other than that, I'm fine with everything else of 3 this project. Like I said, I thought this was a little 4 bit stronger than the project on Santa Monica and La Brea 5 from both architecturally and urban design standpoint. 6 So there's a motion on the table and --7 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: And I have another comment 8 I'd like to make. 9 Don DeLuccio. CHAIR YEBER: 10 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Oh, and I wanted to add a condition if 12 everyone is amenable, and it's the same condition from 13 the previous, having to do with coordination with the 14 public utility agencies and the fire department regarding 15 utility boxes and standpipes that would be in the public 16 right-of-way or adjacent to the public right-of-way. 17 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I'm fine with that. 18 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 20 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'm not going to vote no on 21 the project this evening because I think it's a really 22 good project. 23 I'm not feeling good about the tentative tract map 24 right now, but I am open-minded, and I'll see what you 25 have to say when you come back.

1 Again, I don't really believe that the project is designed to be a condominium having to do, for example, 2 3 with the way the parking is configured. 4 understand there's some other issues going on here that 5 would -- that you guys have articulated this evening, 6 reasons why you'd want to get the tentative tract map. 7 So for that reason, I will go along with the motion 8 on the floor this evening, and then we'll take up the 9 tentative tract map at a later date. 10 CHRISTI HOGAN: This motion on the floor is staff 11 recommendation on both the environmental review and the -12 - right. 13 Oh, should we -- does it make sense to CHAIR YEBER: 14 split it up, or are you comfortable with--? 15 CHRISTI HOGAN: Absolutely fine to do it once. 16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Do it as one? 17 CHRISTI HOGAN: Yes. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, and this one is actual our 19 approval unless appealed to council? 20 CHRISTI HOGAN: That's correct. 21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And that does take out the 22 tentative tract map? 23 CHRISTI HOGAN: Yes. 24 CHAIR YEBER: Is that taking it out or continuing? 25 What was --

1	CHRISTI HOGAN: Taking it out of this
2	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Taking it out.
3	CHRISTI HOGAN: Resolution for the purpose of
4	continuing it to a hearing after we do our general plan
5	trilogy.
6	CHAIR YEBER: Okay. So does everyone understand the
7	motion? Okay, David, take a roll call, please?
8	DAVID GILLIG: Vice-Chair Guardarrama?
9	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yes.
10	DAVID GILLIG: Chair Altschul?
11	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, ex-Chair.
12	DAVID GILLIG: Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Altschul.
13	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes.
14	DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Bernstein?
15	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yes.
16	DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Buckner?
17	COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Yes.
18	DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner DeLuccio?
19	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes.
20	DAVID GILLIG: Chair Yeber?
21	CHAIR YEBER: Yes.
22	DAVID GILLIG: Motion carries, one recusal,
23	unanimous.
24	CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.
25	Shall we try to get finished real quick, or do you

guys need another break?

Okay, new business. Planning Commission

Subcommittees. Francisco, should I just speak real quick
on this?

FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Yes, please.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay, so I did have an opportunity to meet with the planning manager, John Keho, along with Joe Guardarrama to look at the subcommittees. The one subcommittee that we're eliminating at this point is the General Plan Committee since the General Plan is now in a phase that we're ready to review and adopt.

The other committees as they are will stand for the time being. That includes Design Review Subcommittee, the Business Signage Subcommittee, the Long-Range Planning Projects Committee, which could conceivably change or morph into a zoning implementation once the general plan is adopted, the Plummer Park Steering Committee, and the Working Group, which is for the capital improvement projects.

So what I'd like to do is ask my fellow commissioners to please contact me, express an interest if they want to stay on a committee, move to a different committee, and so forth, and I'll try to accommodate everyone's desires as far as that goes, and then we'll announce it at the next -- the committee members at the

1 next meeting. 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Sounds great. 3 Unfinished business, none, excluded. CHAIR YEBER: 4 Consent calendar, none. Items from staff. 5 Francisco, I guess you are interim planning manager 6 tonight. 7 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: Yes. Just a quick look at 8 your upcoming agenda items. For August 19, we have 7914 9 Norton Avenue, basically demolition of 10 units for a 10 construction of an eight-unit apartment building. 11 We have the Karma mixed-use project, which is the 12 project at the -- basically the north end of La Cienega 13 Boulevard at Sunset, Sunset Miller La Cienega right next 14 to [Big Dot]. September 2 meeting is cancelled, and then we begin, 15 16 like Christi said, our trilogy of general plan adoption 17 hearings. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Great, thank you. Is that it? 19 FRANCISCO CONTRERAS: That's it. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Public comments. I have two 21 speakers, starting with Steve Martin, followed by Jeanne 22 Dobrin, and I apologize we weren't able to fit you in 23 earlier. It came in -- your slip came in later, so I 24 apologize. 25 I was late so you have no reason to STEVE MARTIN:

apologize.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay.

STEVE MARTIN: Thank you very much. Steve Martin, West Hollywood.

Yes, the general plan is coming up. Monday is the last day to make comments on the draft Environmental Impact Report, and you can do that through the Internet by e-mailing [Bianca Siegal] at City Hall. You can go to the city's website, look up general plan, and you can both look at the general plan draft EIR and make your comments to the city by Monday.

The general plan, what's being proposed, seems like a real departure from a lot of what was being heard in the community throughout this long three-year process. There was a call for a 20% increase in West Hollywood's population, increase in jobs, an increase in densities and heights that don't seem to be quite in keeping with most of the conversations that were happening throughout the public process.

And I recognize that at least initially only 8% of the city's parcels are going to be increased for size and density, but they're all at very strategic places that are going to create the most adverse impacts on quality of life in West Hollywood.

There's also a lot of statistics that don't really

2.2

add up, particularly about parking circulation. We're going to see at the end of this process that if we have seven intersections that are at F today, we'll have 15 at some point during the life of this general plan.

The infrastructure does not appear to be able to bear the type of development that the city is trying to force onto this small community, and we are 1.9 square miles. We are incredibly densely populated. We have at this point probably more residents than the city of Beverly Hills, which is, I believe, nine square miles. And it just seems like we're trying to do too much in too small an area.

We have a vibrant community. We already have pedestrian orientation, and the plan the way it sits will create such gridlock that a lot of the stores that rely on people -- drive-through traffic are going to go out of business because people aren't going to want to stop and the city's plans to raise parking rates, eliminate parking, and shorten parking meter times is going to make it very unfriendly for people to stop. And it just seems like there's -- the constant drive for constant more growth in this community at complete sacrifice of quality of life and perhaps at the sacrifice of our business vitality doesn't make a lot of sense. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Steve.

Ms. Dobrin?

JEANNE DOBRIN: Jeanne Dobrin, a resident of West Hollywood. I know that all of the commissioners know that I have great respect for them and the fact that in a sense they are volunteers. The \$50 per session that they're paid isn't worth a tinker's [expletive]. But at the same time, I have respect for all of them, including the one who isn't here, Barbara Hamaker, but I think the commission has to have more guts.

For one thing, you've heard of unintended consequences. Unfortunately, many of the actions that are taken by both the commission and other commissions -- not as much as you and the City Council -- have intended consequences.

You've heard it testified by our former traffic manager -- who is gone, and her position is not going to be replaced. You have to figure out why that is -- you've heard her testify that not only do we have traffic service level F in many places; we have worse than that. A to F is all that's in the transportation manager's handbook, and that is going to happen. In fact, it's already happening -- Santa Monica Boulevard.

Now, I want to tell you that the Planning Commission and the City Council really do not have any right to consider whether a developer can make a profit or it can

get a loan or whatever. Now, that sounds sort of -- it's unsensible, but I can prove that to you.

For instance, here we have Casden, who said that he never needed financing, who told that by your people because he had his own financing, he had plenty of money (inaudible). Huh-uh. Two weeks ago, the City Council had to agree that the state will issue \$75 million' worth of bonds for him, so that isn't what was represented.

I'll also remind you that in 9040 Sunset Boulevard, the people demanded that the people be paid -- who worked there be paid union wages and the developer didn't want to do that. He's a nice guy, but he said he wouldn't be able to get his financing.

Well, the City Council said screw that, and not only did they say that he had to have -- pay union wages, but they have now passed a law that says every hotel now that is passed in West Hollywood have to have union wages. By the way, did you know at the last City Council meeting that [Abby] in approving -- it isn't fully approved yet, but discussing the Sunset Times said here we are being presented with all these hotels, and we've approved a tremendous number. I think there's six hotels that have been approved. And they have never built them.

Anyhow, that's why I say this city, including the Commission and the Council, have to have a little more

1 The city is blaming the fact that we have traffic problems on the fact that people are passing from Beverly 2 3 Hills to Hollywood and back and forth. Yes, we do, but 4 that is not the crux of the problem, and we're adding to 5 it every day. 6 So I feel that what is done tonight -- in other 7 words, let these guys get away without taking away with 8 them the right to have the condominium conversion, and 9 part of it, as Francisco could tell you, it's tied up 10 with the fact that the fire department has different 11 rules for condominiums than they do with apartments. 12 don't know if that has been expressed to you tonight --13 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Jeanne. 14 Jeanne Dobrin: -- but you should know it. Thank 15 you. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you very much. Items from 17 Commissioners? Commissioner Buckner? Bernstein? 18 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: No. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Altshul? 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No. 21 CHAIR YEBER: DeLuccio? 22 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Nada. 23 CHAIR YEBER: Guardarrama? 24 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: No. 25 CHAIR YEBER: Okay, and I have nothing. With that,

we are adjourned until our next meeting, which is --COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: August 19. CHAIR YEBER: -- August 19 here in the auditorium. APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS 16TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2010. CHAIRPERSON ATTEST: COMMISSION SECRETARY