

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION**

**THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2010**

**CHAIR YEBER:** Good evening. We're going to start the meeting tonight.

Mr. Golightly, will you lead us in the *Pledge of Allegiance*?

**STEVEN GOLIGHTLY:** Put your right hand over your heart, please. (*Pledge of Allegiance*)

**CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. David, can I have a roll call?

**DAVID GILLIG:** Good evening. Commissioner DeLuccio is absent from tonight's meeting, so all roll call votes will reflect that except for Item 9A, which we'll show him as being recused.

Commissioner Hamaker?

**COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Here.

**DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner?

**COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Here.

**DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein?

**COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Here.

**DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul?

**COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Here.

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

**VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Here.

1           **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber?

2           **CHAIR YEBER:** Here.

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

4           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Do I have a motion to  
5 approve the agenda?

6           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Motion.

7           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Second.

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

9           **ALL COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** Any objections? Seeing none, the  
11 agenda is approved. How about a motion to approve the  
12 minutes? No, I'm sorry. Oh, yes, minutes of November  
13 18.

14          **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** So moved.

15          **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Second.

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

17          **ALL COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

18          **CHAIR YEBER:** Any objections? Seeing none, the  
19 minutes are approved. We have two public speakers for  
20 general comments not related to the items on our agenda.  
21 The first is Lauren Meister, followed by Steve Martin.  
22 You have two minutes, and state your name and city of  
23 residence.

24               **LAUREN MEISTER:** Lauren Meister, city of West  
25 Hollywood.

1 I just want to talk about this two minutes. I  
2 thought we were allowed to have three minutes. And  
3 especially with the Planning Commission, to only have two  
4 minutes to discuss complicated issues, the only way even  
5 -- I talk fast. I mean you won't be able to even  
6 understand what I have to say tonight. I think we need  
7 three minutes when it comes to issues that are  
8 complicated -- I think they should always be three  
9 minutes. I think you'd have a lot less appeals of your  
10 decisions if we actually had time to speak. I just think  
11 the City is going in the wrong direction, cutting the  
12 amount of time that we're allowed to speak. Thank you.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Steve Martin?

14 **STEVE MARTIN:** Steve Martin, West Hollywood. And I  
15 certainly would second what Ms. Meister had to say.

16 I was rather amused looking at the interview in the  
17 *WeHo News* with Councilmember Horvath and [Ryan Jerack]  
18 about Ms. Horvath's use of the City logo on her campaign  
19 website.

20 Now, using the City log on the campaign website is  
21 not legal, but it's probably not a major error. I mean  
22 we all make mistakes, and it is being corrected as  
23 directed by the City Clerk. But what was most amusing  
24 and most revealing during the interview was the fact that  
25 Ms. Horvath didn't want to talk about it being a mistake.

1 She was quick to push responsibility off onto other  
2 people, anybody by her, and when asked to answer simple  
3 questions, simply avoided them.

4 At one point, the interviewer asked her,  
5 "Councilmember Horvath, this question requires a yes or  
6 no answer," and her response was, "I'm not going to  
7 answer that." Similarly, other questions, "Well, I've  
8 already answered that. I'm not going to answer that."

9 It's kind of sad that after 18 months in office  
10 she's already sounding like a politician, like I mean it  
11 sort of runs up there with, "I'm not a crook." What do  
12 you mean, "What is sex?"

13 Really, this is a small town and people just want  
14 straight answers, and it really doesn't speak well for  
15 someone starting off in the political process when they  
16 can't even speak on a simple issue, where clearly, we all  
17 make mistakes, and it's, from my perspective, a very  
18 minor issue.

19 But the real issue is now becoming this person's  
20 ability to be a straight-shooter with the people that she  
21 wants to represent, and I think she's starting off on a  
22 bad foot, and I think it's real sad. Thank you.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. We'll move on to...

24 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Chair, I keep trying to tell you  
25 that there is no television monitor. The screen is

1 blank. By ADA, that's supposed to be operating. Can  
2 something --

3 **DAVID GILLIG:** Staff's looking into that.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you very much, David. They're  
5 looking into it, Ms. Dobrin.

6 Items from Commissioners? Commissioner Buckner?

7 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Nothing at this moment.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

9 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I'd like to say hi to my  
10 children. Hello, Naomi. Hello, Natalie. Hello, Isaac.  
11 I hope you're having a good night, and I will see you in  
12 the morning.

13 And I also just -- I believe that the Chair asked  
14 for clarification on the bylaws, which was brought up  
15 during public comments, so I hope we will be getting that  
16 because we asked for it.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

18 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

20 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** No.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

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

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, we did bring this up at one of  
24 our previous meetings. Do you have anything to add or  
25 maybe--

1           **JOHN KEHO:** Yes, actually, the bylaws, I think there  
2 was a section where there's just some typo where it still  
3 referred to two minutes, and it's not supposed to. The  
4 City Clerk's office is aware of that and will be changing  
5 that and make that correction in the bylaws. So it's  
6 three minutes, and that's what we typically give people.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so it's three minutes?

8           **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

9           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And at what point is it  
10 discretionary during the public hearing? Is it always a  
11 minimum of three minutes?

12           **JOHN KEHO:** No, let me read that to you. Let me  
13 pull it up --

14           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

15           **JOHN KEHO:** So it says, "Members of the public shall  
16 be permitted to speak on each item of business on the  
17 agenda when the item is taken up and before action is  
18 taken on the item by the Commission. Each speaker shall  
19 have three-minute period to speak. Time cannot be ceded  
20 to another speaker. In order to facilitate the conduct of  
21 the meeting, the Chair or Commission may lengthen or  
22 shorten the" -- it's now going to read -- "three-minute  
23 period for all speakers on a particular agenda item based  
24 on the number of persons in attendance wishing to speak  
25 or the complexity of the matter under consideration. The

1 public comment items shall be limited to the items on the  
2 consent calendar and not pulled there from and matters  
3 not on the agenda but within the subject matter  
4 jurisdiction of the Commission. Any individual may speak  
5 only once during public comments, either at the first or  
6 second public comment period."

7 So that's what the bylaws say on public comments.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so that's three minutes during a  
9 public hearing --

10 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** -- but also in general comments?

12 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

14 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Isn't it still that the  
15 Chair or the Commission can shorten?

16 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

17 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes, it is, so depending on  
18 the number of speakers that have -- for any reason  
19 whatsoever, the Chair, the Commission can shorten or  
20 lengthen --

21 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- (inaudible) the time of  
23 speaking.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

25 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Let me just ask one question

1 for clarification. Public can take a speaker slip either  
2 before at public's comment or after but not both?

3 **JOHN KEHO:** It says, "An individual may speak only  
4 once during public comments either at the first or second  
5 public comment period."

6 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So they either speak at the  
7 front end or the tail end, not both?

8 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

9 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** That is how it's always done it, no  
10 [changes] here.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. All right. And it's three  
12 minutes unless at the discretion of the commission it  
13 needs to be shortened for the length of a particular  
14 meeting or lengthened because of the complexity of an  
15 issue?

16 **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So I hope that answers  
18 everyone's questions on that issue. With that, we have  
19 consent item A, the appeal of Cabo Cantina.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Move the consent calendar.

21 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Second.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, all in -- yes?

23 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Sorry. Did you want to speak to the  
24 consent calendar?

25 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Can I speak on the consent calendar,



1 as well as the other item on the agenda?

2           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** No, you need to speak during public  
3 -- I'm sorry. Ms. Dobrin wants to speak during -- on the  
4 consent calendar. Ordinarily, to speak on a consent  
5 calendar item, you'd take that up during public comment  
6 period.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

8           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** She was apparently confused. Do you  
9 want to just give her the --

10           **CHAIR YEBER:** So does that mean we have to pull it  
11 off of consent?

12           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Well, no, you've already got a  
13 motion and second on the floor. You just need to give  
14 her the floor for a couple minutes and let her say her  
15 peace.

16           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Two minutes, I would  
17 suggest.

18           **JEANNE DOBRIN:** As well as the other item on the  
19 agenda.

20           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Yes.

21           **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Okay. Thank you.

22           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Right now, she's just speaking to  
23 the consent calendar. This is about Cabo Cantina, right?

24           **CHAIR YEBER:** Only.

25           **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I can't hear.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Only Cabo Cantina, Ms. Dobrin.

2           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Just speaking about Cabo Cantina,  
3 right? Right now, you just want to speak about Cabo  
4 Cantina, right?

5           **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I could speak on both of the items?

6           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Yes, one after -- right.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** But she's only going to speak on Cabo  
8 right now.

9           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Right.

10          **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Yes.

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

12          **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I wanted to say that I am urging --

13          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Would she state her name,  
14 please?

15          **CHAIR YEBER:** Jeanne, start with your name.

16          **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I'm Jeanne Dobrin, a resident of  
17 West Hollywood.

18          **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

19          **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I wanted to say that I am urging the  
20 appellant to consider to file an appeal against the  
21 Planning Commission decision on Cabo Cantina. I don't  
22 think -- the Commission meant well, but they really don't  
23 know what the situation is there and how the noise  
24 travels and disturbs people.

25                 Another thing that is very sad about it, this

1 building is not a proper building. It is just a terrible  
2 little shack that was built many, many years ago, and the  
3 sound of the so-called roof, which is a piece of fabric  
4 which doesn't totally cover up the roof, is not really  
5 sufficient.

6 So I know that you're going to go ahead and say that  
7 you're affirming your decision of the last meeting, but I  
8 am trying to -- I'm talking to the appellant. He's very,  
9 very discouraged and very sad about it because it's a  
10 thing that's been bothering the neighborhood for a long  
11 time, and the sheriff knows about this.

12 Some remarks were made at the former hearing that  
13 the sheriff has no problems with it at all. That isn't  
14 true at all. Thank you very much.

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

16 Okay, so there's a motion on the table to move the  
17 consent calendar. I believe there was a second. Is that  
18 correct? All in favor, say aye.

19 **ALL COMMISSIONERS:** Aye.

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Anybody opposed? Seeing none, the  
21 consent calendar is moved.

22 We're moving to Public Hearing A, which is  
23 demolition/development permit/lot merger for 8564 through  
24 8590 Melrose Avenue, and [Adrian], you have a staff  
25 report for us.

1           **ADRIAN GALLO:** Thank you, Chair Yeber, and good  
2 evening, Commissioners. Unlike typical Staff reports,  
3 this Staff report does not include a recommendation on  
4 the project. In this case, Staff is seeking a  
5 determination on the request and interpretation and  
6 depending upon the action above -- depend on the action,  
7 direct Staff to bring back resolutions either approving  
8 or denying the project or continue the hearing to a date  
9 certain to allow the applicant to modify the project.

10           First before you is an official interpretation of  
11 the zoning ordinance as to whether affordable housing  
12 density bonus can be applied to the commercial portion of  
13 a mixed-use project.

14           According to density bonus calculation in the  
15 affordable housing section of the zoning ordinance, for  
16 the purpose of calculating the permitted housing bonus in  
17 commercial zones, density shall refer to the maximum  
18 floor area ratio permitted in the zone in which the  
19 project is located, inclusive of all applicable and  
20 mixed-use bonuses.

21           Staff interprets the affordable housing density  
22 bonus permitted in a commercial zone to allow up to 35%  
23 additional residential floor area beyond that allowed by  
24 the maximum floor area ratio in commercial zones; hence,  
25 the density bonus must be applied to the residential

1 portion of the mixed-use project.

2       The applicant believes that the density bonus can be  
3 applied to the entire project, i.e. both commercial and  
4 residential, because the zoning ordinance does not  
5 explicitly restrict the floor area bonuses to residential  
6 floor area.

7       Once you are done with the interpretation, it's  
8 inclined to allow the bonus square footage for commercial  
9 purposes. The Commission shall consider the concurrent  
10 proposal to demolish the existing commercial structures  
11 at 8564 through 8568 Melrose Avenue for the construction  
12 of a three-story 28,000 approximately square-foot mixed-  
13 use building with one level of subterranean parking.

14       The proposed mixed-use project includes  
15 approximately 24,000 square feet of commercial space,  
16 retail and wholesale showroom. Five residential units,  
17 four market-rate unit apartments, and one onsite  
18 affordable unit are proposed in 3,400 square feet of  
19 residential space.

20       The project will combine all three lots on the 8464  
21 to 8490 block of Melrose Avenue into one lot with a  
22 proposed lot merger, but new construction will take place  
23 on the two easternmost parcels nearest to Westmount  
24 Drive. The westernmost building, housing Waterworks and  
25 Kitson, would remain.

1           The project has a Mediterranean architectural theme  
2 and its Melrose Avenue elevation massing is somewhat  
3 broken into two halves. To disguise the project's  
4 length, the eastern portion's two stories fully occupy  
5 the property line. The western portion's first floor  
6 sits at the property line and steps back at the second  
7 floor. Also, a walled-entry courtyard bisects this  
8 portion's elevation, at the back of which sits a two-  
9 story gabled interest piece, punctuated by round top  
10 arches.

11           Per the zoning ordinance, the project requires 102  
12 parking spaces for the combined uses. Vehicular access  
13 for all onsite parking spaces would be taken from  
14 Westmount Drive at the southwestern corner of the  
15 proposed building. The proposed project, as I said,  
16 provides five dwelling units onsite for market-rate  
17 apartments and one affordable rental unit. The total  
18 contribution to affordable housing makes the project  
19 eligible for up to 35% density bonus and two concessions  
20 under affordable housing section of the zoning code and  
21 California Senate Bill SB-1818.

22           The proposed project requests a 30% density bonus  
23 and only one available concession -- one of the available  
24 concessions. The applicant is requesting an additional  
25 building height of 10 feet. Pursuant to CEQA, Staff

1 prepared an initial study and a negative declaration for  
2 this proposal identifying less-than-significant  
3 environmental impacts associated with the proposed  
4 project.

5 In summary, the Commission should first deal with an  
6 interpretation regarding the applicability of affordable  
7 housing density bonus to the commercial component of  
8 mixed-use projects and then move on to the project.  
9 Staff is available for any questions.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** It's been contended that the  
12 posting on the site did not contain the proper addresses.  
13 Has there been any investigation into that contention?

14 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes, we discussed the issue with the  
15 City Attorney's office, and we believe that notice is  
16 adequate for this. The site was posted -- physically  
17 posted in front of the buildings that were going to be  
18 demolished, bringing attention to those buildings that  
19 would be demolished. Notice was mailed to all residents  
20 and property owners within 500 feet that showed all of  
21 the properties involved in the site so everyone could  
22 physically see the map that showed the entire project  
23 site.

24 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay, so the City Attorney  
25 is satisfied that the posting is adequate? Thank you.

1 With respect -- one more, please.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** You stated that you are  
4 recommending a negative declaration. With respect to the  
5 analysis that lead to your recommendation of the negative  
6 declaration, did you take into account or study or  
7 analyze the traffic study that was done for this project?

8 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes, in the negative declaration,  
9 there's -- a traffic analysis was part of this for this  
10 project that's before you tonight.

11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** But was there not a traffic  
12 study that was done for an application that preceded  
13 this?

14 **JOHN KEHO:** For a different version of this project,  
15 not the project that's before you.

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Did that project have any of  
17 the same components that this project does?

18 **JOHN KEHO:** It had some same components, and the  
19 project [was] redesigned.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So --

21 **JOHN KEHO:** So that traffic study --

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- since the project had  
23 some components, was that traffic study analyzed or  
24 comments to that traffic study responded to in the course  
25 of your consideration for preparing a recommendation for



1 a negative declaration?

2           **JOHN KEHO:** No, since the project was redesigned, we  
3 were using that design and did a traffic analysis on that  
4 project.

5           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So, in other words, there  
6 was no consideration whatsoever given to the traffic  
7 study that was initially prepared and filed?

8           **JOHN KEHO:** Consideration was given in the terms of  
9 it showed some potential impacts so the project was  
10 designed -- redesigned to avoid impacts, and so that  
11 resulted in the new project that has the traffic --

12           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** But that new project had  
13 some of the same similar components, albeit it had some  
14 new components --

15           **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

16           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- of the project that the  
17 traffic study, in fact, addressed? Is that right? Not  
18 true?

19           **JOHN KEHO:** There were some similar components, but  
20 it's a different project.

21           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay. But was that traffic  
22 study then ever released to the public?

23           **JOHN KEHO:** I believe it was -- the public received  
24 it yesterday, I believe.

25           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Did the public have a chance

1 to submit comments on it for the Staff to evaluate and  
2 analyze and respond to?

3       **JOHN KEHO:** I believe it got comments yesterday or  
4 today.

5       **ADRIAN GALLO:** Last night.

6       **JOHN KEHO:** Last night.

7       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And have you responded to  
8 them or--?

9       **JOHN KEHO:** No, we have not.

10       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Is it your intention or  
11 would it have been your intention to respond to them if  
12 there had been proper time to do so?

13       **JOHN KEHO:** No, because that was addressing a  
14 traffic study for a project that's not before you.

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

16       **CHAIR YEBER:** I'm actually glad you asked that,  
17 Commissioner Altschul.

18       Just for my own clarification and potential other  
19 people's clarification, traffic study was done on the  
20 previous version of this project and that is what's part  
21 of the application. And did you say there's an amended  
22 version of that traffic study based on this new --

23       **JOHN KEHO:** No, there's not an amended version.

24       **CHAIR YEBER:** Oh, there's not?

25       **JOHN KEHO:** There's a traffic study that was done on

1 --

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** On the previous version.

3 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes, the project was revised, and we did  
4 a new traffic study on the project that's before you, and  
5 that's in the negative declaration before you.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Go ahead, Commissioner  
7 Altschul?

8 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Who did the traffic on the  
9 project as revised?

10 **JOHN KEHO:** Staff.

11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So it was not the same  
12 person or entity that did the traffic study originally?

13 **JOHN KEHO:** No.

14 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Was that person or entity  
15 asked to comment on or address or look at the changes to  
16 the project and to amend their traffic study if they so  
17 felt that they should?

18 **JOHN KEHO:** I don't believe so.

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

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner, do you have  
21 questions? Commissioner Bernstein?

22 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Perhaps later.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker, Guardarrama?

24 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I do have a question. With  
25 regard to the interpretation that you'd like us to make,

1 it's my understanding that this situation that the  
2 applicant is presenting us with can't occur in the  
3 future.

4         **JOHN KEHO:** That's correct because Staff brought  
5 forward to the Planning Commission a change to the zoning  
6 ordinance that would make it very clear that you could  
7 not apply the density bonus to commercial square footage.  
8 So projects in the future would not be able to -- if you  
9 were inclined to approve this interpretation, that would  
10 not be applicable to any future projects as long as the  
11 Council adopts a zoning ordinance change.

12         **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** All right. That was my  
13 other question. Thank you.

14         **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?

15         **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** In addition to the fact that  
16 there is a change proposed in the zoning ordinance that  
17 has not yet been approved by the Council with respect to  
18 the application of the zoning ordinance, there is also  
19 the fact that both the Commission and the Council have  
20 requested that the General Plan be further studied  
21 specifically as to Melrose.

22         And as I recall, the Commission and, I think, the  
23 Council divided Melrose into three sections -- the  
24 eastern section, the middle section, and the western  
25 section -- starting at La Cienega and going west, ending

1 at Doheny -- for further complete study and analysis.

2 What effect, if anything, that this is in flux would  
3 this have on this particular -- application of this  
4 particular project?

5 **JOHN KEHO:** This project is ahead of all -- any of  
6 those changes, so this project would not be impacted by  
7 any of those potential zoning changes.

8 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I'm not talking zoning  
9 changes. I'm talking about the General Plan.

10 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. This project is --

11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** The evaluation has been  
12 directed and ordered with respect to the General Plan.

13 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. And so that's for projects that  
14 are going forward, not the ones that are already deemed  
15 completed in the process.

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay, and this project is  
17 deemed complete?

18 **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

19 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So, therefore, it is totally  
20 subject to the constrictions or the possibilities of the  
21 old General Plan?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** And the zoning ordinance current at this  
23 time.

24 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So any things that they  
25 desire, that comes under the new General Plan, that is

1 not under the old General Plan, then theoretically would  
2 not be allowed?

3       **JOHN KEHO:** They could avail themselves of that.  
4 They can come back and request a change to their project  
5 in the future.

6       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** But currently, anything that  
7 --

8       **JOHN KEHO:** They can't take advantage of anything  
9 that's in the draft General Plan.

10       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** In the draft General Plan.  
11 Thank you.

12       **CHAIR YEBER:** So I just have a question regarding  
13 the interpretation. We've never -- to your knowledge,  
14 we've never used bonus density in terms of commercial  
15 space.

16       **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

17       **CHAIR YEBER:** We've always done like for like. If  
18 you add an affordable unit, you get an extra unit, and I  
19 thought that -- but there's no language in there that's  
20 saying specifically a dwelling unit. There's nothing --

21       **JOHN KEHO:** Correct. There's not -- there's a  
22 section in the code that talks about limitations on the  
23 use of the bonus, and it doesn't say cannot be used for  
24 commercial square footage, so that's where the conflict  
25 is because it talks about housing bonus, but then the

1 code doesn't go on to say you cannot use it for  
2 commercial.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** It does not state that?

4 **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** But we've always applied --

6 **JOHN KEHO:** That's how all the projects that  
7 (inaudible) have been. They've usually been the small  
8 amount of commercial and a large amount of residential.

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** And when the Commission and the  
10 Council approved such language in terms of these  
11 incentives and they came on the heels -- they came on the  
12 heel of SB-1818, was there ever any discussion about  
13 applying the incentives in a commercial -- under a  
14 commercial strategy?

15 **JOHN KEHO:** I don't think that was -- I don't  
16 believe we had thought about it until this project came  
17 along.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right. I'm just -- I guess what I'm  
19 trying to get at is since you were there when we -- when  
20 the ordinance was adopted, can you -- are you able to  
21 speak to the intent?

22 **JOHN KEHO:** I don't -- I think the intent was we  
23 were getting additional housing.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

25 **JOHN KEHO:** I don't remember us thinking we were

1 getting additional affordable housing and additional  
2 commercial square footage.

3       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. That's what I was trying to get  
4 at. All right. If there are no other questions, I'm  
5 going to do quick -- go ahead, Commissioner Bernstein.

6       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Just a quick follow-up  
7 question just so I'm clear. So it's never been applied  
8 to commercial, but it's also never been requested and  
9 rejected? It's simply an unvisited issue at this point?

10       **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

11       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Okay. Thank you.

12       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Any other questions?

13 Disclosures? Commissioner Buckner?

14       **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes, I spoke briefly today  
15 with the applicants represented, Mr. Afriat, on the phone  
16 on -- only in matters that are clearly contained in the  
17 Staff report.

18       **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

19       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I have had conversations  
20 with Steve Afriat, the applicant's representative. I  
21 also had conversations with West Hollywood West President  
22 Lauren Meister regarding this application. In both  
23 cases, we've discussed matters solely contained within  
24 the Staff report.

25       **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Altschul?



1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I met with West Hollywood  
2 West residents' organization president Lauren Meister on  
3 this matter and also met with Mr. Afriat and Mr.  
4 [Davidoff], who are representatives of the applicant, and  
5 discussed matters contained in the Staff report.

6           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

7           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yes, I met with the  
8 applicant's representative, Victor Martin, and I also  
9 spoke with John Keho and Adrian Gallo over the phone.

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

11          **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I met with the applicant's  
12 representative, Mr. Afriat, and we discussed matters that  
13 are contained in the Staff report.

14          **CHAIR YEBER:** I did also have a conversation with  
15 the applicant's representative, a brief conversation, as  
16 well as Staff. I visited the site and the items  
17 discussed are contained in the Staff report.

18           So with that, we have several speakers who want to  
19 speak on this item. We're going to start with the  
20 applicant or the applicant's representative, who will  
21 have 10 minutes upfront, followed by the public, who will  
22 have four minutes since we only have this one item and  
23 it's a complex issue, and then we'll finish off with five  
24 minutes from the applicant at the tail end.

25           So with that, Mr. Afriat, it's your soapbox.

1           **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Thank you, Mr. President,  
2 Commissioners. Steven Afriat, representing BMB  
3 Investments, the applicant for 8564 to 8590 Melrose  
4 Avenue.

5           I appreciate the opportunity to present this to you  
6 today, and I'm very proud of this project, not only this  
7 current design that's before you, which is really a  
8 spectacular Mediterranean design that is keeping with the  
9 spirit and character of Melrose and The Avenues, but also  
10 the fact that it's attracting a flagship store for  
11 Restoration Hardship (sic) as they re-invent this  
12 company.

13           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Restoration --

14           **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Restoration Hard -- I'm on my second  
15 page now -- Restoration Hardware as they reinvent their  
16 concepts and go into a wholesale and showroom genre, and  
17 it's a green boon to West Hollywood to attract this kind  
18 of user to Melrose Avenue.

19           This is a mixed-use project. The total project area  
20 is a little over 28,000 square feet with an FAR of 1:1.  
21 We have a retail square footage of 9,000 square feet and  
22 a wholesale square footage of 15,000 square feet and five  
23 one-bedroom residential units.

24           The project is park to code. Actually, we have four  
25 more spaces than -- we have 65 spaces for the project

1 with the requirement of 61 spaces.

2       What's before you, we think, is a project of  
3 exceptional quality, design, scale, and appropriateness.  
4 It is not excessive or out of place with other buildings  
5 along Melrose Avenue.

6       My client, Mr. [Solomon], has developed other  
7 projects on Melrose that have been very successful and in  
8 keeping with the spirit of Melrose, including Waterworks,  
9 Mansour, and Kitson, which are flagship stores here in  
10 West Hollywood.

11       I appreciate Commissioner Bernstein's question about  
12 SB-1818, and we take some issue not with the fact that  
13 the Commission doesn't have a decision to make tonight  
14 because clearly you do, but you've never had to make this  
15 decision before on how 1818 would be applied because no  
16 one's ever asked for you to do it before.

17       I also take exception, quite frankly, with a Staff  
18 report that characterizes the legislative intent of the  
19 California legislature. I don't think anyone here,  
20 including myself, knows what that intent was, but  
21 clearly, I think we can agree that the intent of the  
22 legislature was to incentivize people to provide low-  
23 income housing in neighborhoods.

24       We believe that the bonus is not a bonus where you  
25 get to build more housing but the bonus is a bonus where

1 you get incentives to provide low-income housing. And it  
2 would not be a big surprise that in commercial corridors  
3 where people are building primarily commercial projects  
4 with a residential component, that's a way to get the  
5 bonus. To be able to get a critical mass of financial  
6 opportunity to provide the low-income housing would be by  
7 doing additional commercial development.

8 Most of your SB-1818 projects in West Hollywood have  
9 been in residential corridors or mixed-use projects that  
10 have been primarily, as Jeff pointed out to you, top-  
11 heavy with residential components.

12 This is a different kind of a project. If you want  
13 the incentives, if you want the opportunity to provide  
14 this housing in this setting and for people -- and rental  
15 housing, I might add. As you know, people are primarily  
16 building condos in West Hollywood. This is an  
17 opportunity to provide rental housing and a low-income  
18 unit along Melrose Avenue, which is a great opportunity  
19 for people who might even live and work, live nearby,  
20 architectural students, or people that want to be a part  
21 of this community.

22 I sat in a meeting at City Hall last October where  
23 we talked about the project components, and this issue  
24 was not raised as an issue, and I understand this issue  
25 has not been an issue with Staff before, and so I'm

1 concerned about the characterization that there's some  
2 enormous interpretation you need to make when, in fact,  
3 we just asked for the concessions that anyone would be  
4 entitled to.

5       The City Council is considering changing the code.  
6 They may or may not make that decision. I can't predict  
7 what they would do, but it would be totally appropriate  
8 for the Commission if you like the project and think this  
9 project has benefits to agree. The code does not  
10 preclude you from allowing us to [imply] and get the  
11 concessions based on SB-1818, which is why the  
12 application is deemed complete and before you today.

13       I do appreciate this is a new decision and I'm  
14 respectful of that, and I'm respectful that the  
15 Commission has a desire to support low-income housing,  
16 and I've been authorized by my client today to offer an  
17 additional concession for this application that if the  
18 Commission desires, we would be willing to have two units  
19 instead of one unit of housing dedicated as low-income  
20 housing at this project.

21       With regard to the environmental issues, I just want  
22 to point out that there were some questions about a  
23 traffic study. I also got the traffic study for the  
24 first time yesterday. When I saw how many pages it was,  
25 it's still sitting on my desk because it's not relevant

1 to this project. It's interesting information, but let's  
2 talk about how sausages are made, which we don't really  
3 usually like to talk about in public hearings.

4 I do a lot of projects. I do a lot more in Los  
5 Angeles. We study impacts on proposed projects. We find  
6 out that maybe one -- and this is not the case here --  
7 maybe one intersection's going to go from C to D or maybe  
8 there's going to be a shadow issue because the building's  
9 10 stories tall and it's on the north side of the street  
10 or whatever it might be. We then ask ourselves the  
11 question, could we make changes to reduce those impacts,  
12 to keep those intersections at C? And we make those  
13 changes all the time, and that's a common part of the  
14 process.

15 So it's an informational tool designed as a  
16 guideline to help applicants decide whether or not they  
17 want to come to you for additional concessions, trigger a  
18 comprehensive environmental study, or reduce the impacts.  
19 That's the purpose of a study like that. That study does  
20 not apply to this project.

21 This project has been substantially reduced. This  
22 project was originally submitted as a retail project, and  
23 now it's primarily a wholesale project. It's a very  
24 different project.

25 So Staff made a good determination, and let me share

1 with you the determination Staff made. They said that we  
2 should do a categorical exemption, and I actually agree  
3 with that interpretation, but we had some concerns when  
4 we spoke with the Planning Manager that maybe a slightly  
5 more onerous process where Staff would look a little  
6 deeper into impacts made more sense.

7         We voluntarily took this off calendar, asked for  
8 additional time, as an applicant's representative,  
9 exposed my client to, I believe, a 20-day public comment  
10 period on the environmental document to have an  
11 opportunity to have a cleaner and better project because  
12 the fact of the matter is that this new reduced project  
13 and these change in uses are de minimis in terms of any  
14 impacts and a negative declaration is appropriate, and  
15 Staff, I believe, made a good decision.

16         Other significant changes --

17         The community had some concerns about the design.  
18 We thought that they were well-founded concerns, as did  
19 the Design Review Subcommittee. We came up with a much  
20 more stylistic Mediterranean project that really looks  
21 like a two-story project. There were some concerns, and  
22 I had the opportunity, and I want to thank Lauren Meister  
23 for taking the time out to walk the site with me, and she  
24 pointed out that very cool courtyard that existed at the  
25 center of the project, and this current design restores

1 much of that courtyard concept. It breaks up the design  
2 and the massing of the building and allows to have that  
3 open-space gathering that, I think Lauren was right, was  
4 an important part of this project.

5 We had concerns about the immediate neighbor to the  
6 south. There's one person who has a single-family home  
7 at the rear of the project, and we thought we needed to  
8 be more sensitive. Our client had us meet with them.  
9 We've had several meetings with them, and we wanted to  
10 address their concerns.

11 So we have a six-foot masonry wall that's along the  
12 perimeter of the project, so it will help reduce the  
13 noise of any vehicles that are entering the project, and  
14 we'll be landscaping that wall.

15 Because the second and third floors are tiered away  
16 from the single-family neighbor, we're going to have  
17 landscape screens so that people who are on the second  
18 floor of the commercial part of the project can't look  
19 out onto and violate the privacy of that individual. The  
20 third floor will have additional screens. That will be  
21 where the residential components will be so that, again,  
22 people can't look into people's back yards and will have  
23 more privacy protection.

24 Plus, again, you have a scaled-back component. You  
25 don't have a 37-foot wall along the rear of the property.



1 As you see, you don't have it throughout the entire front  
2 of the property, as well.

3 We've met with a lot of neighbors. Members of my  
4 staff, Victor Martin, whom you know, and one other walked  
5 all the blocks in the neighborhood and reached out to as  
6 many neighbors as we could. And we're actually  
7 encouraged by the fact that other than the letter from  
8 the West Hollywood West Residents' Association, and I  
9 don't diminish the importance of that association, there  
10 are no other letters in the file, no other comments on  
11 the environmental documents, and no other opposition to  
12 the project. I'm sure you may hear from some people this  
13 evening, but this has not been a magnet of neighborhood  
14 concern.

15 We think this is an amazing opportunity for Melrose  
16 Avenue. The [Solomonis] have a 17-year history of being  
17 active and involved members of this community and  
18 committed to the rededication of The Avenues. Too many  
19 boarded up buildings. Too many "for rent" signs. This  
20 is an opportunity to say that The Avenues are coming  
21 back. We appreciate your support. Thank you.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. There's a question for  
23 you.

24 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Mr. Afriat, in your  
25 presentation, which was quite commendable and quite on

1 point --

2 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Thank you.

3 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- I think I heard you say  
4 that you don't know that -- you don't have any evidence  
5 to show that there was legislative intent not to include  
6 commercial in the allowing of one or more affordable  
7 units on the residential part. But you don't have any  
8 knowledge or any facts to you to show that the  
9 legislative intent was to include the commercial?

10 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** It's in my opinion, and all we have  
11 here are opinions, is that the legislative intent was to  
12 encourage economics incentives to provide low-income  
13 housing. When the code is silent, especially on land  
14 use, the code doesn't say what color the building can be.

15 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No, we're not talking code  
16 now; we're talking legislative intent. So you don't have  
17 any indication about the legislative intent one way or  
18 the other?

19 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** No, I do not.

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Thank you.

21 **CHAIR YEBER:** Are there other questions for Mr.  
22 Afriat?

23 I actually have a question for the architect. I  
24 know he didn't present, but I do --

25 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** He's here today and happy to answer

1 your questions.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

3 **HAMID GABBAY:** Good evening. Hamid Gabbay. I'm the  
4 architect of the project.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** I have a -- well, my first question is  
6 this project went through a major redesign in the last  
7 six weeks. When it first came before design review, it  
8 was a modern version of this, and we were concerned about  
9 what was presented to us then.

10 I'll ask you the same thing that I asked the  
11 architect that presented that project at the time, which  
12 I believe works in your office.

13 **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes, Commissioner.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** What factors or cues from the  
15 neighborhood led you to this particular strategy or  
16 design?

17 **HAMID GABBAY:** To change the design to way it is  
18 now?

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, I mean what language is helping  
20 you determine that that's the best fit or the most  
21 compatible for this particular neighborhood? There was a  
22 reference earlier (by) Mr. Afriat that the Mediterranean  
23 style fit on Melrose, and so I'm trying to figure out how  
24 you came to that conclusion.

25 **HAMID GABBAY:** I understand. First of all, we

1 wanted to be very sensitive to the desire and opinions of  
2 the neighborhood and the neighbors, and unfortunately, I  
3 was not in that meeting to explain the project clearly,  
4 and there were some issues with the presentation. The  
5 renderings, etcetera, were not correct.

6 But anyway, we were very concerned about pleasing  
7 the neighborhood, and we decided to change it. One  
8 project that came along Melrose was Ms. Rose Tarlow's  
9 showroom lately, and it has had a lot of success. And  
10 also we had a new tenant for this project, Restoration  
11 Hardware, that they also gave us some input as far as the  
12 design goes, and therefore, we decided to change it to  
13 what you see and come up with a more pedestrian-friendly  
14 and more classical design, let's say.

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** So the design was based largely on a  
16 prospective tenant?

17 **HAMID GABBAY:** A good portion of it, the right side  
18 of it is because of the tenant. They wanted to have a  
19 courtyard and set back the building, so that was with  
20 their desire, and we wanted something like that. We knew  
21 that it makes a lot of sense with the neighborhood to  
22 break the building, and to the right one -- excuse me, to  
23 the left side, which is not assigned yet, we decided to  
24 go with this façade, that it's classic and pedestrian-  
25 friendly. It's very close to the Rose Tarlow's building.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. I appreciate that -- the answer  
2 there.

3           **HAMID GABBAY:** You're welcome.

4           **CHAIR YEBER:** I'm looking at the parking scheme  
5 here.

6           **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes.

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** Can you tell me -- a lot of your  
8 spaces are labeled as XL/S.

9           **HAMID GABBAY:** Well, those are either a standard or  
10 -- let me take a look at it, and I will explain.

11           **CHAIR YEBER:** This is page A2.5 for fellow  
12 commissioners.

13           **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes. They are standard or larger  
14 than usual.

15           **CHAIR YEBER:** What do you mean standard or larger  
16 than usual?

17           **HAMID GABBAY:** S is --

18           **CHAIR YEBER:** S is for standard.

19           **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes.

20           **CHAIR YEBER:** What's the XL?

21           **HAMID GABBAY:** We consider that they could be a  
22 little bit larger than what is the code requirement.

23           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So according to your legend  
24 here, you have -- the standard is 8 feet 6 inches by 18 -  
25 - it's cut off, but I'm assuming it's 18 because --

1           **HAMID GABBAY:** 18.

2           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

3           **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes, Commissioner.

4           **CHAIR YEBER:** But if I look at wherever you're  
5 labeled XLS, I see eight feet, and I see quite a bit of  
6 that.

7           **HAMID GABBAY:** If I'm not wrong, they're nine.

8           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, they're nine feet?

9           **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes.

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** Listed here?

11          **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And then I noticed that you  
12 have a -- well, that doesn't matter.

13           The second question had to do with the residential -  
14 - the third-floor residential. There was a public open  
15 space that I thought was unusually large facing Melrose.

16          **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes.

17          **CHAIR YEBER:** Hold on. I'll get to that page.

18          **HAMID GABBAY:** It's A2.4.

19          **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, unit three. 1,900 square feet of  
20 open space dedicated to a particular -- one particular  
21 unit.

22          **HAMID GABBAY:** It's not only for one, that unit.

23 It's a common space for all units.

24          **CHAIR YEBER:** It says "private outdoor."

25          **HAMID GABBAY:** I think it's a typing error. It is

1 private for the units -- for these five units. It's not  
2 just for one unit, although each one of them, they have  
3 their own private unit in front of them, but most of that  
4 area goes to a public for that -- I mean for those five  
5 units.

6           **CHAIR YEBER:** For these five units. But you have  
7 public common outdoor on -- bookended on each side, so  
8 you're going to have basically 1,100 square feet plus,  
9 and that's denoted in green and has landscape on it  
10 versus this other space. That's something totally  
11 different.

12           **HAMID GABBAY:** No, the portion that has landscaping  
13 in it, and if you could show that A2.4, to the upper left  
14 corner, that is the lower level that belongs to hardware  
15 store, the Restoration Hardware.

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** I'm actually looking at the one that's  
17 on the right, upper right.

18           **HAMID GABBAY:** The right is the common space for the  
19 five units.

20           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. It really is confusing because  
21 you have common spaces -- you have common outdoor spaces  
22 already identified and then you've got this one space.

23           **HAMID GABBAY:** No, what we have is two type of open  
24 space. One is that is in front of each unit, okay? And  
25 you see on the south end unit and you see in two of the

1 northern unit to the west side. And then there is that  
2 larger space in front of the unit number three. A  
3 portion of that would be private. The rest of it would  
4 be public.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

6 **HAMID GABBAY:** Again, public for the five units.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Along with the ones on the east side  
8 and the west side?

9 **HAMID GABBAY:** Yes.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Are also common?

11 **HAMID GABBAY:** Exactly.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. That's the only questions.

13 Thank you very much.

14 **HAMID GABBAY:** I think --

15 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, someone else had a question for  
16 the architect?

17 Thank you. We're going to move on to the public.

18 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Thank you, Commissioners.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Starting with Ruth -- I believe that's  
20 -- Cislowski, followed by Lauren Meister.

21 And if you could actually queue as I call your  
22 names, that would be helpful to expedite.

23 State your name and city of residence, please.

24 **RUTH CISLOWSKI:** Hello. I'm Ruth Cislowski, a  
25 resident of West Hollywood, and I'm speaking about Item



1 9-A.

2 As a resident of West Hollywood for over 14 years  
3 and living on Westmount Drive, my family's always enjoyed  
4 living in this residential neighborhood, and I have great  
5 concerns about the density, traffic impacts, noise, air  
6 quality, as well as the safety of my children for this  
7 development. I actually live right across the street  
8 from it. So the parking -- the entrance and exit on  
9 Westmount Drive will actually go right to my house, where  
10 my kids like to go in the front yard. I like to know  
11 that they're safe in the front yard. As it is now, I  
12 can't even make a left turn onto Melrose anymore. I  
13 usually just go straight down the street. I'm expecting  
14 that that's the way most of the traffic will go from that  
15 parking lot is straight down Westmount, impacting all the  
16 neighbors on Westmount Drive, not just myself.

17 I really feel that the City has not done their due  
18 diligence as far as the EIR and the traffic mitigation.  
19 I also would like to make a couple points to things I  
20 heard tonight.

21 For instance, the exemption for the density, I  
22 realize that zoning language wasn't specific in the past,  
23 but you obviously made it more specific with a purpose  
24 and intent of making sure that affordable housing units  
25 equate to extra housing space, residential space, rather

1 than commercial. I don't see a reason to allow them to  
2 slip through just because they happened to get through  
3 before you made the change.

4 I also wanted to talk about the comment that was  
5 made about speaking to the neighbors. I do live right  
6 across the street. I'm not always home, but nobody ever  
7 tried to talk to us ever or leave a note. So the feeling  
8 -- I just want to let you know that I certainly don't  
9 have the impression that the neighborhood was  
10 communicated with or supported, from my perspective.

11 And as far as the only one letter, I am a member and  
12 have been for a long time of the West Hollywood West  
13 Resident Association. It's my fault if I did not make my  
14 own personal letter, but I want you to know that that  
15 letter is one that I supported and endorsed. So I  
16 believe many other names are part of the Resident  
17 Association that feel the same way.

18 Again, my understanding is that you, as the Planning  
19 Commission, have been entrusted to ensure that our  
20 community has balanced and appropriate development and  
21 growth, and I certainly like this design better than the  
22 previous one, but I don't believe that smart growth is  
23 occurring here in our neighborhood and for our residents,  
24 and I'd urge you to protect the needs to the community.  
25 Thank you.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Lauren Meister, followed  
2 by Scott Schimdt.

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

6           We respectfully request that, one, you do not adopt  
7 the negative declaration; two, you deny the density  
8 bonuses proposed; and, three, send the project back to  
9 Planning with the requirement that it be revised. If the  
10 project is not downsized substantially, all evidence  
11 suggests that an Environmental Impact Report must be  
12 required.

13           According to our expert planning consultant, [Sandra  
14 Janus], adoption of a negative declaration is  
15 inappropriate in this case inasmuch as the clear  
16 potential for significant adverse impacts in the  
17 environment exist. These include but are not limited to  
18 impacts on aesthetics, air quality, land use, noise,  
19 traffic, soil stability, and hydrology.

20           Our traffic consultant, [Tom Brohard], found  
21 multiple flaws in the City's initial study, and the  
22 traffic study that was MIA until yesterday showed  
23 significant impacts during mid-day at three  
24 intersections, including La Cienega, Melrose,  
25 Melrose/Westmount, and Melrose/West Knoll.

1           To answer Commissioner Altschul's question, the  
2 traffic study was finalized on July 20, 2009. What they  
3 called phase one in the traffic study was the development  
4 of seven apartments and 25,000 square feet of retail at  
5 8564 and 8568 Melrose, and the parking lot remained as is  
6 at 8551 Melrose.

7           What they're proposing today is 28,700 square feet  
8 of retail, wholesale, and residential and 8851 -- excuse  
9 me, 8551 as a surface parking lot. So it's not that much  
10 different. The fact that they have retail wholesale --  
11 and who knows what percentage is retail and what  
12 percentage is wholesale, and Kitson was supposed to be  
13 wholesale, that was a wholesale place, also. Do you see  
14 a wholesale showroom at Kitson?

15           The traffic study found that the maximum development  
16 that could occur without creating significant traffic  
17 impacts is 17,000 square feet of specialty retail. The  
18 proposed project now includes 24,000, as I mentioned, of  
19 retail and five apartments, so it will create significant  
20 traffic impacts.

21           The traffic study also expresses concern about the  
22 access to the subterranean garage and proposes there  
23 should be mitigation measures. Of course, there are no  
24 mitigation measures in a negative declaration.

25           Regarding the applicant's use or misuse of SB-1818

1 to get more commercial density -- and it isn't 1:1; it's  
2 1.35:1 with a 35% density bonus -- that was not the  
3 intention of SB-1818.

4 SB-1818 was enacted to encourage builders to include  
5 affordable units in their housing developments. 8564  
6 Melrose is not a housing development. It is a commercial  
7 project with a few apartments included, making it at best  
8 a mixed-use project, not a housing project. Please refer  
9 to the *Legislative Counsel's Digest* on SB-1818,  
10 Hollingsworth, density bonuses, which starts with, "The  
11 planning and zoning law requires when a development of  
12 housing proposes a housing development," dot dot dot.

13 Let me also share with the applicant that SB-1818  
14 does not establish an exemption from CEQA requirements.  
15 CEQA operates independently of SB-1818 and is not limited  
16 by that statute.

17 Again, please do not adopt the negative declaration,  
18 please deny the density bonus as proposed, and please  
19 send the project back to Planning. Potential impacts  
20 must be studied, discussed, and mitigated. What will  
21 happen with this project will set a precedent for all of  
22 Melrose. Thank you.

23 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Scott Schmidt, followed by  
24 Mark Boone.

25 **SCOTT SCHMIDT:** Good evening, Commission. I'm Scott

1 Schmidt. I'm a resident of West Hollywood. I actually  
2 live closer to Cabo Cantina than this project, but when I  
3 looked at the agenda and I saw it, I had to take a look  
4 because it reminded me of the discussion that's going on  
5 at City Council about the future of Melrose, and I  
6 immediately had some concerns.

7       The first concern was does a project like this fit  
8 with the neighborhood. The neighborhood around Melrose  
9 is unique. It's mostly single-family homes. It's not  
10 something that we see in other parts of West Hollywood  
11 bordering Santa Monica and Sunset.

12       So the first question is let's look at the proposed  
13 tenant, Restoration Hardware. Are they an example of  
14 what -- art and design? It's a national chain. That  
15 seems to go against the flow of what Melrose has been all  
16 about, which is the independent and design boutique  
17 shops.

18       Secondly, the scale. Going to three stories and  
19 almost 40 feet really is out of line with that few blocks  
20 of Melrose. It would make sense perhaps along La Cienega  
21 or Santa Monica or Sunset, but it doesn't really seem to  
22 mesh with Urth Caffé and the other places around there.

23       The second issue that came up was what you're being  
24 asked to do with the density bonuses. It seems like a  
25 bastardization of the concept of density bonuses.

1           Density bonuses are there to promote an objective.  
2 They're there so that we can create more affordable  
3 housing or encourage people to do green building, and the  
4 density bonus is that incentive to allow them to build  
5 more so that they can provide more affordable housing or  
6 to provide a green building.

7           So if you do go forward that way, I would suggest  
8 that all of the floor space gained by the density bonus  
9 should go towards affordable housing, not just a part of  
10 it.

11           Furthermore, I'm on the Transportation Commission,  
12 and we get complaints about this neighborhood quite a  
13 bit. People complain about parking, especially the  
14 employees along Melrose who will purchase residential  
15 passes and abuse them and go park in the neighborhood.

16           We haven't been able to verify whether that's  
17 happening, but anecdotally, it's something that we hear  
18 about on a very regular basis. We also hear about people  
19 cutting through the traffic and causing issues as far  
20 away as San Vicente, where they came to our last meeting  
21 and asked for a stoplight to be put in because of people  
22 trying to cross the street and there's so much traffic  
23 cutting through the neighborhood.

24           So I really think that a more serious look should be  
25 taken at those transportation-related issues. Can we

1 provide enough parking for this in an area that's already  
2 under-parked, and can we get West Hollywood moving again  
3 if we keep adding more card trips to the streets? Thank  
4 you.

5           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. If we could hold our  
6 applause, we'll get through this.

7           Mark Boone, followed by Bill Crowley.

8           **MARK BOONE:** Thank you for allowing me to speak.  
9 I'm Mark Boone. I'm a resident of Los Angeles. I'm also  
10 the owner and president of Mimi London, a well-known  
11 showroom in the Pacific Design Center, as well as  
12 president of London Boone, which is an Architectural  
13 Digest 8100 renowned firm. We've done significant and  
14 published projects all around the country, and we've been  
15 a part of the design community and specifically this  
16 neighborhood for over 35 years.

17           As I work around in different cities, be it in New  
18 York, Chicago, or London, I'm always especially proud of  
19 the design village that's unique to West Hollywood. When  
20 my clients come to LA for presentations or shopping, we  
21 always accomplish so much more because there's so much  
22 close by the PDC in this immediate area, much of it  
23 remarkably on foot, especially given LA's car culture, by  
24 patronizing their local sources, be it Melrose Avenue,  
25 Melrose Place, and La Cienega, and of course, the PDC,



1 which I love.

2 I'm very familiar with Restoration Hardware and  
3 believe they're really offering great product that even a  
4 high-end designer like London Boone can use and mix into  
5 a higher-end thing, which is especially important in  
6 today's economy. I respect their aesthetic and the high  
7 quality they're bringing to retail.

8 Separately, I've always admired the former villa-  
9 like Ed Hardy Showroom in San Francisco, which if you're  
10 familiar with San Francisco and Ed Hardy's building this  
11 architecture is based on, it's very beautiful and very  
12 classical and very timeless.

13 The adjoining structure design is elegant and  
14 timeless as well, and it'll be a great improvement to the  
15 neighborhood. Adding to the pedestrian village feeling,  
16 it extends design choices further down the block for me  
17 and adds even more incentive to visit and buy from  
18 neighbors like Rose Tarlow and Michael Smith, a new  
19 showroom there on Melrose, and vice versa, bringing those  
20 designers back up Melrose to bring us business with the  
21 PDC.

22 So I'm strongly in favor of the approval of this  
23 project. Thank you for your time.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Bill Crowley, followed by  
25 Alex Vance.

1           **BILL CROWLEY:** Good evening. Bill Crowley, a West  
2 Hollywood resident. And I just want to express that my  
3 wife and I moved here to raise a family because of the  
4 uniqueness of the Melrose area, and we just feel that it  
5 sets a bad precedent for things to come because once --  
6 if this plan does go through, then we can see it  
7 obviously dominoeing further in the neighborhood, and it  
8 just doesn't seem like it's compatible with the Melrose  
9 area, the place where we moved to to raise a family.

10           I also take exception to Mr. Afriat's comment that  
11 this, I think he said, is not a magnet issue for the  
12 neighbors. Well, I don't know who he's spoken to, but I  
13 never spoke to him, and I think it's a bit arrogant to  
14 speak for all of the neighbors, so just want to mark that  
15 for the record.

16           And, also, I guess I was just a little dis-- well,  
17 no, I was very disappointed that the [Ineres] traffic  
18 study, which I believe Lauren Meister had requested in  
19 July or August of last year, was just made available to  
20 us yesterday.

21           I think that's poor due diligence on those who are  
22 responsible for getting that out to us so that we could  
23 come to this meeting fully informed, as Mr. Altschul had  
24 brought up earlier, that there are components that are  
25 the same to the previous study.

1           Therefore, we should've been made available -- that  
2 report made available to us much, much earlier than  
3 yesterday.

4           Thank you very much for your time.

5           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Alex Vance, followed by  
6 Dan Weiser.

7           **ALEX VANCE:** Alex Vance, resident of West Hollywood.  
8 I'd like to express my objection about the location of  
9 the subterranean parking on Westmount.

10           It is unprecedented in the R-1 zone areas south of  
11 Melrose to have a subterranean parking with no buffer  
12 zone adjacent to a residential unit. I happen to own the  
13 house just next to this project, and obviously, I'm  
14 impacted the most, but it's not just about me. It's  
15 about the traffic for the entire street, specifically  
16 Westmount and then, secondarily, the adjacent streets.

17           Right now, there are only four parking meters  
18 between the entrance to this parking structure and  
19 Melrose, so you can imagine that 120 cars or 120 parking  
20 spaces that are being proposed, all these cars trying to  
21 exit or enter this parking structure, when they want to  
22 go out to Melrose, after the fourth car, the fifth car  
23 would be stuck in the middle of Westmount right in front  
24 of my house and blocking the street or they would be on  
25 the upper end with their engine running.

1           It will significantly deteriorate the quality of air  
2 to me and the neighborhood but mostly to me because I'm  
3 right next door, and the cars will be forced to make a  
4 right turn south of Melrose, and it just wreaks havoc on  
5 the quality of life, quality of air, our living  
6 standards, and this is basically my major issue with this  
7 project is just the number of the parking units that are  
8 being proposed.

9           And they're claiming that this project is downsized,  
10 but based on the number of units that they're proposing  
11 for parking, there's nothing small about this project  
12 because if the 120 parking spaces are not needed, then  
13 why build them? Obviously, they're going to be utilized.

14           The other point that I wanted to mention, in  
15 closing, is in contrast to Mr. Afriat's assertion that  
16 they had several meetings with me. I've never met with  
17 the developers. In fairness, they had contacted me a few  
18 days ago and wanted to set up a meeting for yesterday,  
19 which I couldn't make, but we have never had the  
20 opportunity to discuss the details of this. I've met  
21 them during these meetings, briefly said hello, but we  
22 have never sat down to mitigate the issues related to  
23 this parking structure being located on Westmount.

24           Again, I'd like to emphasize that it is  
25 unprecedented. There's no other project in the area, in

1 the [Arbonne] zone areas with subterranean parking on a  
2 residential street adjacent to a house. They all have  
3 either an alley in between, there's a buffer zone, and  
4 something.

5 So I'd like to respectfully ask you to reject the  
6 negative declaration and send it back to Planning for  
7 further studies. Thank you very much.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Dan Weiser, followed by  
9 Armen Ovsepian.

10 **DAN WEISER:** Good evening. I'm Dan Weiser. I am a  
11 primarily residential brokerage representative from  
12 Coldwell Banker in Beverly Hills. I'm also a former West  
13 Hollywood resident.

14 I had a chance to review the design here, and part  
15 of my professional title is estates director and  
16 architectural specialist. Within Coldwell Banker, I'm  
17 one of less than 150 architectural specialists out of  
18 147,000 agents worldwide.

19 And in having a chance to review the plans, I  
20 actually think that they've done an incredible job in  
21 keeping with some of the more recent development within  
22 the neighborhood while still retaining a classic design  
23 that is very well suited to the area.

24 In terms of traffic, I have not seen the report. I  
25 cannot speak to that. But what I do know, which is a

1 major concern of both someone like myself who goes to  
2 Urth Caffé for coffee, who's bought fixture at  
3 Waterworks, who shops at Restoration Hardware, the one  
4 concern that I have for the area is parking. And  
5 although the gentleman before me said that it is  
6 unprecedented, I think that that can also be taken in a  
7 positive way.

8         And then in the city, that parking is such a major  
9 issue wherever you go, that I know cars circle the block  
10 to try and find parking at one of the six meters that's  
11 currently in front of that proposed site, I think 102  
12 parking spaces could certainly be a good thing.

13         Also, somebody who sells residential and multi-  
14 family properties in the neighborhood, including just  
15 blocks away from this on Rugby Drive earlier this year  
16 and representing clients of a multi-family project on  
17 Westmount, knowing that this neighborhood is considered  
18 from a real estate perspective A+, 10 out of 10, for  
19 sure. Part of that reason is because of the proximity to  
20 things like the Pacific Design Center and what is on  
21 Melrose in this particular small portion between San  
22 Vicente and La Cienega.

23         I think this just raises the bar. I think that the  
24 changes that have been made to the project in terms of  
25 the separation of the buildings, in terms of the bringing

1 in a design that incorporates both the residential as  
2 somewhat of a mixed use really kind of incorporates the  
3 progression of the city in general.

4       What's happened both in West Hollywood and  
5 throughout the city, as we've seen in other locations, I  
6 think that the melding of it as a place for people to  
7 work and to live is definitely progressive and definitely  
8 in the spirit of the city of West Hollywood. And just  
9 knowing that things like this are coming here helps  
10 neighborhood residents in terms of value because this  
11 only raises the bar and raises the profile of the  
12 neighborhood and what surrounds it immediately.

13       So I think that the -- really the design and the  
14 intent and the way that it fits into the neighborhood is  
15 certainly a positive thing going forward, and I think the  
16 owners and the developers of this project have certainly  
17 shown a commitment to the neighborhood which has been  
18 well documented both from what they own. It's even been  
19 published in the *LA Times* magazine that they're really  
20 intent on making this a wonderful place for people to  
21 come and shop and even with a store like Restoration  
22 Hardware that makes great design accessible to most of  
23 the people. So I thank you very much for your time.

24       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Question.

25       **CHAIR YEBER:** A question for you.

1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Sir, a question. You  
2 indicated -- I think you said you shop at Restoration  
3 Hardware?

4           **DAN WEISER:** Yes.

5           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And where do you shop at  
6 Restoration Hardware?

7           **DAN WEISER:** Currently, I shop at the one closest to  
8 me, which is the Beverly Center.

9           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** There is one in the Beverly  
10 Center?

11          **DAN WEISER:** Yes.

12          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And that's basically a  
13 retail store, right?

14          **DAN WEISER:** Yes.

15          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay. Do you know of any  
16 Restoration Hardware in our region?

17          **DAN WEISER:** There used to be one in Century City  
18 that was closed, a retail location --

19          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** All retail?

20          **DAN WEISER:** All retail.

21          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Any others that you know of  
22 in our area?

23          **DAN WEISER:** Off the top of my head, that is the  
24 closest location to this area.

25          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Thank you. Thank you.



1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

2           Armen, followed by Ted Stafford.

3           **ARMEN OVSEPIAN:** Good evening, Commission. My name  
4 is Armen Ovsepian, and I'm a resident of West Hollywood,  
5 and I also work here.

6           My wife and I moved out here to West Hollywood to  
7 have a wonderful family, to walk our child outside on  
8 Melrose. We live just across the street from the Pacific  
9 Design Center, and I don't feel that there's that much  
10 traffic that we should be worried about.

11           I'm outside walking during the daytime. My wife, we  
12 work -- we change our shifts so I'm home part of the  
13 time, and honestly, I don't feel that there's any problem  
14 with the traffic flow that we have.

15           Now, when I walk around, I tend to be on the west  
16 side near LA Pen. We don't go too far towards the east  
17 side towards where Michael Smith is opening up. I think  
18 this new project is going to bring some more flow. We  
19 will start to walk and enjoy the area because the  
20 property, the current building that's in this space,  
21 honestly, I think it's ugly and it's outdated, and we  
22 need to revise this building.

23           And when I work -- I work in the city with a lot of  
24 interior designers and architects. When they come into  
25 the city, our clients, we walk them outside. We go to a

1 lot of the showrooms like Rose Tarlow, for example.  
2 They're great clients of mine, and I think this  
3 Restoration Hardware store that opens up will actually  
4 give us an advantage to bring in more affordable high-end  
5 merchandise and furniture.

6 In regards to the building, I think it's a very  
7 pleasing building. It does work with the flow of West  
8 Hollywood. It looks very similar or comparable to what  
9 Rose Tarlow's building looks like. It also looks very  
10 similar to the Mansour Showroom. That's a little bit  
11 towards the west. It also works with the new building  
12 that's being built on the -- slightly west of -- it's  
13 almost across the street from the Pacific Design Center.  
14 There's a new building that's been renovated, and that's  
15 very Mediterranean.

16 So as a resident, I am for this project, and I think  
17 this project will be very successful in our neighborhood.  
18 Thank you.

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

20 Ted Stafford, followed by -- we'll figure it out in  
21 a second. Ted Stafford?

22 **TED STAFFORD:** Good evening. Ted Stafford, resident  
23 of Los Angeles, and I am the owner of Stafford Commercial  
24 Real Estate here in the city of West Hollywood, where for  
25 the last 30 years I have devoted my attention to the

1 healthy growth of the commercial district by leasing  
2 space to businesses and individuals and by selling  
3 commercial properties to investors, developers, and  
4 owner-users.

5 Over this period of time, our city has experienced  
6 an exceptional growth pattern where we have enjoyed  
7 seeing a diverse mix of local, national, and  
8 international businesses that have discovered the  
9 advantages of doing business here in West Hollywood.

10 I firmly believe that if we are to maintain this  
11 position and continue this momentum that we have seen  
12 over the past few years, that we must start planning now  
13 for what we want this city to look like 10 or even 20  
14 years from now.

15 With the possibility of adding some new developments  
16 in the city, we can provide for the future needs in our  
17 commercial districts and continue to attract top new  
18 businesses and individuals to West Hollywood. I believe  
19 this is an important goal for the city to achieve as we  
20 strive to keep the West Hollywood area in the forefront  
21 of people's minds when they choose to locate their  
22 businesses here in the Greater Los Angeles area.

23 The new General Plan proposed by the City is a  
24 product of numerous taskforce meetings with the general  
25 public, which provide certain development guidelines

1 which will enable the healthy growth of our commercial  
2 districts to occur in a controlled manner to protect the  
3 interests of the entire community at large.

4       Such is the case with the development BMB has  
5 proposed for the property located at 8564 through 8590  
6 Melrose, which will remove some old buildings that were  
7 built in the time period between 1936 and 1953 and  
8 reenergize the Melrose corridor with a new development,  
9 providing some much needed commercial space together with  
10 a residential component carefully integrated into the  
11 project.

12       In summary, I support this development that is  
13 proposed by BMB, and I encourage your approval of it in  
14 its current form because I believe that it is good for  
15 the future growth of the city. Thank you.

16       **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Francoise Brun-Cottan,  
17 followed by Leana Bartlett.

18       **FRANCOISE BRUN-COTTAN:** Hi. My name is Francoise  
19 Brun-Cottan. I'm a resident of West Hollywood, and I  
20 have the -- I feel that there are enough variables that I  
21 don't understand in terms of traffic density and in terms  
22 of water compaction, in terms of the precedents that are  
23 being set. I don't understand why we wouldn't want to  
24 have an EIR to get a more holistic sense of all of the  
25 impacts that this is going to have on our neighborhood.

1 It's not about whether it's the right building or  
2 beautiful or my sense of style, but I just feel that I've  
3 got things going this way and that way and I don't have  
4 really a whole sense. That's it.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Leana Bartlett, followed  
6 by [Nadine Blumer].

7 **LEANA BARTLETT:** Hello. Good evening. My name is  
8 Leana Bartlett, and I am a resident and also work --

9 **CHAIR YEBER:** If you could speak right into the  
10 microphone? Great.

11 **LEANA BARTLETT:** Hello. My name is Leana Bartlett,  
12 and I am a resident of West Hollywood. I also work in  
13 West Hollywood on La Cienega. I am in favor of this  
14 project.

15 I actually work in one of the top interior design  
16 firms in this country and work and walk this area  
17 frequently, and I'm very excited at what I'm seeing not  
18 only on the west side of Melrose but even on the east  
19 side of Melrose and all the way up La Cienega.

20 We actually have a running joke because now we kind  
21 of hop in a car, pay the meter, go to one place, hop in  
22 the car, pay the meter, go to another place, and we keep  
23 going and going and going this way, and it's very  
24 problemsome for us to do that. And I think that having  
25 these all linked where you can walk this area is hugely

1 beneficial to have this environment and community  
2 atmosphere.

3 I also just want to say for the record that as an  
4 interior designer, we have purchased at Restoration  
5 Hardware for our clients.

6 Part of the issue that I have tonight is getting  
7 caught up into the context and the quagmire of all these  
8 details. I think they're very important. I commend  
9 people for looking at the details, for making sure that  
10 they understand the details and all the questions and  
11 concerns that have been raised, and I think the architect  
12 has done an amazing job in trying to incorporate the  
13 feedback and the comments that he's received for this  
14 project.

15 I have to say as a designer I'm a little fearful of  
16 how much feedback can sometimes be incorporated into  
17 these projects. As a former resident of Manhattan, I  
18 understand that these architects are sometimes  
19 visionaries and can help build and shape our  
20 neighborhoods and communities in ways that we never  
21 expected, and I would hope that we would respect them for  
22 their vision and to not try and bind them down with some  
23 of the details.

24 Is this going to increase traffic? Probably. It's  
25 going to increase noise. It's probably going to increase

1 some of the site pollution or air pollution, but it's  
2 also going to increase a lot of other things. It's going  
3 to increase the sense of community. It's going to  
4 increase the business, the amount of money that's  
5 flourishing on these streets. Everybody's going to be  
6 impacted in a very positive way. I've seen that [Café  
7 Ving] is out of business now. The PDC has a lot of empty  
8 buildings and partly because it's too hard. You need to  
9 have a destination to go where you can see multiple  
10 places at once. You need to have that cohesive  
11 community, and I feel that adding the residential units  
12 is hugely beneficial for artists, designers who may have  
13 loft spaces that they want to work in just for personal  
14 creative work so that they can live in these areas.

15 I think living and working in these environments  
16 also helps reduce traffic. I think that's something in  
17 LA we have avoided. We try to keep our residential areas  
18 purely residential, and then you have to drive your 30  
19 minutes to the areas where we've marked as commercial  
20 spaces. I think that's absolutely wrong. I don't see  
21 any problem with commercial and residential living  
22 together in one area. I think they can be respectful of  
23 each other.

24 So I would encourage this. I think that it is part  
25 of the responsibility of us as residents to give back to

1 our commercial areas. This is improving our quality of  
2 life. It's giving us places to shop, to mingle, to meet,  
3 to eat, to have coffee, and I think that that's our  
4 responsibility is to help make these businesses happen  
5 and to flourish, and I would want to give that back to my  
6 community as a resident. Thank you.

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

8 Nadine, followed by [Irad Kayran].

9 **NADINE BLUMER:** My name is Nadine Blumer, and I live  
10 on Westbourne Drive with my husband and our two-year-old  
11 son.

12 I've prepared for a two-minute speech, so I would  
13 like to ask the Commission to ask the architect if we  
14 could get a little bit of an explanation why these  
15 pictures don't actually show the third story. To me, it  
16 is quite confusing just to see these because the third  
17 story is actually what I would like to come back to.

18 I moved here from Hamburg, Germany, and I'm,  
19 therefore, a bit of an expert on lack of sun exposure and  
20 the effects during different seasons.

21 Walking our beautiful neighborhood is the best way  
22 to find out about the serious impacts the proposed  
23 structures and the future ones like it will have on not  
24 only our neighborhood but the foot traffic and,  
25 therefore, the businesses along Melrose Avenue and the



1 City's revenues.

2       On the stretch between Huntley and La Cienega, my  
3 concerns are the most observable. One thing would be to  
4 raise the building height on the north side, as right  
5 now, coincidentally, the residential area on the north  
6 side of Melrose is composed of mostly two or even more  
7 story buildings, whereas the south side streets are  
8 mostly single-family single-story homes.

9       Higher buildings on the south side would not only  
10 disrupt this side's building height harmony with the  
11 residential part, but more importantly, the sun will no  
12 longer reach the south and north sidewalks.

13       The few very successful cafes on the north side will  
14 be in the shade. Customers average duration of stay will  
15 be reduced, consumption will go down, along with the foot  
16 traffic, and eventually, newly established luxury brands,  
17 smaller boutiques, and retail stores like these will lose  
18 the customers they came for in the first place.

19       Two examples to prove my point. The former [Replay]  
20 store café, now the [Panqua Dijia], had quite a struggle  
21 to attract patio customers until they trimmed their ficus  
22 trees and more sunlight flooded their terraces.

23       The existing Kitson store, one story lower than the  
24 proposed, already brings shade all the way to the curb of  
25 the north sidewalk.

1           Secondly, many brand stores opened on Melrose east  
2 of La Cienega, but without the traffic-pulling cafés,  
3 most of them were gone as fast as they moved in. So much  
4 for their loyalty.

5           The unique culture that has been created over the  
6 last 10 years that makes this part of West Hollywood so  
7 desirable will be destroyed with the first shades hitting  
8 the patios of our Melrose cafés.

9           I am inviting all of you to test it yourself. At  
10 this time of the year, you can sit for lunch on the north  
11 side in a t-shirt, and once you walk back to your car to  
12 the south side, you better put on your ski jacket. And  
13 that is how you will soon be sitting in that same café if  
14 it is still open after you approve this permit. Thank  
15 you very much for listening.

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Irad, followed by Dan  
17 Siegel.

18           **IRAD KAYRAN:** Good evening. My name is [Irad  
19 Kayran], and I have a showroom in Melrose.

20           I'm looking at this project, and I think it's  
21 absolutely out of -- I mean it's a beautiful, beautiful  
22 project. I have no doubt that this kind of project is  
23 going to help the neighborhood and I think going to help  
24 the businesses, as well. I don't think it's fair to sit  
25 down and say, "Well, because we are resident of West

1 Hollywood, then we don't want any (inaudible) project, we  
2 don't want any development. Let's stay this area as it  
3 is forever."

4 I have seen -- I have to congratulate you guys,  
5 honestly, because you have done a wonderful job. When I  
6 look at the development of Melrose from east to west,  
7 it's absolutely becoming a beautiful street, becoming  
8 very, very desirable place to live and to shop. So I  
9 don't see beautiful building like this it's going to hurt  
10 anybody.

11 I think that this is very neighborhood friendly, and  
12 I have no doubt that it's going to help every person who  
13 lives here and somebody like me, who has a business here.  
14 So I'm hugely pro of this development, and I simply  
15 cannot wait to see it done and completed.

16 That's -- thank you very much.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Dan Siegel, followed by  
18 Ali Karimpour.

19 **DAN SIEGEL:** Hi. My name is Dan Siegel. I'm a  
20 resident of West Hollywood, and I really wasn't all that  
21 familiar with this. I've been away, and I started to pay  
22 attention to what -- it seemed interesting to me. It  
23 doesn't directly impact the property I have other than  
24 the fact that it's going to impact the whole area the  
25 more that's being built on Melrose, especially traffic.

1 But I see that this one project, they're asking for  
2 a density bonus for affordable one unit. Whether they  
3 give it -- make it two, it doesn't feel legitimate to me.

4 The developer's representative said that they spoke  
5 to the neighbors, and then the neighbors are coming up  
6 here and saying, "No one ever spoke to me." So did they  
7 speak to the neighbors or they didn't speak to the  
8 neighbors?

9 So there's an entrance and exit on Westbourne Drive,  
10 which is -- this is devastating to that street. That  
11 street goes into a traffic circle, and everyone's going  
12 to turn right because there's absolutely no way to turn  
13 left out of that and get onto -- even if they put a left-  
14 turn-only sign, people will ignore it.

15 There was a traffic study done in July. It was a  
16 former project which is not that much different on the  
17 same property, and we didn't get -- anyone in the city  
18 got to see it till yesterday?

19 I mean this is amazing that all this happens in one  
20 project, and now they're going to tie the block together,  
21 two existing buildings, because they own those buildings.  
22 Now, they're going to take the FAR that they didn't use  
23 from those buildings, which were supposedly built as  
24 showrooms and didn't have any onsite parking, and then  
25 they turned them into retail, or at least Kitson's, and

1 they want to tie it together and use what they didn't get  
2 before. So they're going to get bonus over bonus over  
3 bonus over bonus, and then they come to us and they say,  
4 "Because Lauren Meister said she liked the courtyard that  
5 was there, we put a courtyard in for her."

6 But then the architect says, "Well, we put a  
7 courtyard because that's what the tenant wanted, and we  
8 changed not for the neighborhood's concerns, we changed  
9 the building style because that's what the tenant wanted,  
10 even though they told us that that's what the  
11 neighborhood wanted."

12 So it's a scam. It's a lot of double-talk, and  
13 we're hearing it over and over again, and I don't know if  
14 I have -- I hope I have time to make this point.

15 I read it in the papers all the time. We have greed  
16 on Wall Street and there's no one protecting the little  
17 guy, the middle class. It's the wealthy and the greed,  
18 and it's destroyed our economy.

19 And then we have bullies. We read about bullies all  
20 the time. You know, kids are not protected, especially  
21 young gay people who try to come up -- come out in high  
22 school, they're being bullied. Well, I feel that we're  
23 dealing with a situation where we're being bullied, the  
24 city, the residents are being bullied. There's greed  
25 involved. They want more and more bonuses over bonuses

1 over bonuses, and just like they didn't protect us on  
2 Wall Street, the principals and the teachers don't  
3 protect these kids, we're not being protected by the  
4 people who are supposed to protect us. That's the  
5 Planning Commission -- I mean the Planning Department and  
6 the director of the Planning Department, who puts out an  
7 e-mail to her staff, "Let's take care of these people.  
8 They own a lot of property on Melrose. We've got to take  
9 care of them. Let's not make them have to go through a  
10 lot of process here and deal with parking requirements.  
11 We're going to give them special treatment." Come on.

12 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Ali, followed by Richard  
13 Giesbrot.

14 **ALI KARIMPOUR:** Good evening. My name is Ali  
15 Karimpour. My opinion regarding this project is based  
16 from perspective of a business owner here. I've been in  
17 West Hollywood on a retail level -- I have a retail shop  
18 -- for one-and-a-half years. Prior to that, I was in  
19 Beverly Hills for four years, and we have several shops  
20 in Italy.

21 My move to West Hollywood from Beverly Hills was  
22 largely based on the uniqueness of West Hollywood, and  
23 since I custom-make shoes, it kind of makes sense for me  
24 to be here in the creative neighborhood, if you may.

25 I believe the west side of Melrose -- and my shop is

1 in 8574 Melrose -- so the west side of Melrose, I believe  
2 it is in need of a little makeover, and I definitely  
3 think that it needs more unique, small businesses,  
4 innovative businesses in that area to help all of us  
5 survive and more interaction with people.

6 I support this project because I believe this  
7 project is a step in the right direction as far as  
8 bringing in more small businesses, more innovative  
9 businesses in the neighborhood. Thank you.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Richard, followed by  
11 [Christine Whittle].

12 **RICHARD GIESBROT:** Richard Giesbrot, residency, West  
13 Hollywood. I feel this project should be put on hold.  
14 Perhaps a lot of work was done. However, the proposed  
15 development is clearly not understood. The technical  
16 issues have not been adequately covered. The long-term  
17 city planning considerations are lacking. The department  
18 has not been forthcoming about information. This is  
19 shameful.

20 There are basics to be addressed, as others have  
21 mentioned this evening. The building height overwhelms  
22 the neighborhood. The car noise on the garage ramp will  
23 be a continuing disturbance for 15 -- 50 years. A six-  
24 foot wall and landscaping is acoustically insignificant.  
25 Daily traffic to the building will impact the side

1 streets, the street parking, and further slow traffic on  
2 Melrose. Essentially, it can't be mitigated. Residents  
3 will lose privacy because office windows may overlook  
4 their back yards. The landscaping notwithstanding, look  
5 at the maintenance of the garage landscaping on the PDC.  
6 Noise from mechanical equipment will be ever present,  
7 especially at night. There may be light trespass from  
8 the office windows in the building as there are in other  
9 buildings in the city of West Hollywood, and the  
10 Department doesn't seem to control this, nor do  
11 inspectors. Then there's the building shading of the  
12 neighborhood, the sidewalks, and the loss of views.

13         Although the aesthetics of the buildings have been  
14 addressed, we've been talking to these people for perhaps  
15 over two years, and suddenly in the last six months,  
16 they're listening, and their outreach has been, in my  
17 opinion, inadequate.

18         The Design Review hearing that I attended earlier  
19 this year was insufficient in depth and breadth to  
20 adequately cover all the subjects to be discussed. The  
21 designer at that event did not receive clear direction  
22 and was confused.

23         Developments like this will remain in place for  
24 decades, transforming our pedestrian-friendly small-scale  
25 streets into congested, dark canyons.



1           From a broader perspective, this development prompts  
2 substantial concerns about the proposed General Plan as  
3 it relates to the Melrose and Robertson area. There's no  
4 reason to plunge blindly into commercial development like  
5 this without further consideration of the facts and the  
6 neighborhood quality of life, which is to say, for  
7 starters, an EIR. Thank you.

8           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. [Christine Whittle]?  
9 Steve Martin, followed by Jeanne Dobrin.

10           **STEVE MARTIN:** Steve Martin, West Hollywood. I  
11 would want to just build on what Richard Giesbrot just  
12 testified about, about this project being prejudicial to  
13 the General Plan's vision for Melrose. I mean,  
14 essentially, this is the equivalent of a West Bank  
15 settlement. This is going to try to create facts on the  
16 ground before we've had a real discussion about what the  
17 future of Melrose should be.

18           I'm very concerned about a lot of assumptions that  
19 don't really make a lot of sense in this case. They're  
20 telling us that we really want Restoration Hardware in  
21 West Hollywood. It's a business that's already at  
22 Beverly Center. It's in Chapter 11. I can't tell you  
23 how many corporations that are in Chapter 11 go into  
24 Chapter 7, so we're asked to be approving a very large  
25 out-of-size building for a business that's probably never

1 going to be here.

2       The logic that the answer to boarded up buildings is  
3 more development, well, it takes a lot of chutzpah to put  
4 that sort of asinine position out there, but it really  
5 makes no sense, and it insults, I would hope, your  
6 intelligence.

7       I work on the west side. I live just to the north  
8 of Melrose on Huntley. Today I was coming home and it  
9 was gridlocked going eastbound on San Vicente. Some of  
10 you are very familiar with this, and it was just slightly  
11 after five o'clock. Like most people in my neighborhood,  
12 I get to San Vicente because it's gridlocked. Sometimes  
13 the street's even blocked -- even San Vicente's even  
14 blocked. We turn right on San Vicente, left on Rosewood,  
15 and come up Huntley, which shaves five, seven minutes off  
16 our commute. And that's real unfortunate for the people  
17 who live on Huntley south of Melrose, but that's the way  
18 the city has the shortcut set up. And all this is going  
19 to do is push more traffic onto the side streets.

20       And I would also point out that we've approved the  
21 Red Building and we keep on approving more and more  
22 development on the west side without any thought as to  
23 what the Red Building at the PDC is going to bring to  
24 this neighborhood and my neighborhood. City Council has  
25 said that Red Building is going to generate 3,500 new

1 jobs. That's huge.

2 So here we go willy-nilly turning the current  
3 General Plan on its head for a project that doesn't bring  
4 us a whole lot other than possibly one or two affordable  
5 units. Does not make a lot of sense.

6 Another thing that is rather -- stretches  
7 credibility, I suppose, is the idea that the housing  
8 bonus under Senate Bill SB-1818 includes a bonus for  
9 commercial development. It clearly does not. What part  
10 of housing applies to commercial?

11 SB-1818 has been kicking around for, what, over a  
12 decade? And after all these years in a state with 30  
13 million people, all of a sudden somebody wakes up one day  
14 in little West Hollywood and says, "You know what? SB-  
15 1818 gives bonuses to commercial developments. No one's  
16 doing that."

17 Now, of course, if you want to attract a lot of  
18 development to West Hollywood, you can make that  
19 interpretation, but I think it's a farce and it invites  
20 litigation, litigation that the City will lose, not that  
21 -- I don't think the Staff's recommending that, and I'm  
22 very proud of the Staff for taking a very principled  
23 stance on this.

24 So I would just ask that when you look at this, this  
25 doesn't look like a two-story building. This looks like

1 a 40-foot-high building, and please don't approve it.

2 Thank you.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Jeanne Dobrin, followed by  
4 Laurence Chambers (sic).

5 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Is this on?

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, it is.

7 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I'm Jeanne Dobrin, a resident of  
8 West Hollywood. I really felt for Ruth Cislowski when  
9 she told how her place is right across from where the  
10 exit and entrance is and how she's having such a terrible  
11 time now and how bad this would make it.

12 West Hollywood West Residents' area is the strongest  
13 organization over the community of its kind, of the whole  
14 community, and they are a unique place, a wonderful,  
15 almost totally single family residential area. I have  
16 sold property there, and everybody who has bought there  
17 loves it.

18 There are some good things that I heard today. One  
19 of them is I must say that the building design is  
20 gorgeous, and it is very much similar to the Mansour  
21 building now, which I've talked to you about before. I'm  
22 in real estate. [Abe Solomoni], relative of the  
23 developer here, [Ben Solomoni], was a broker like me, and  
24 he asked me if I could pull some strings to get the  
25 Mansour building higher than was allowed under the zoning

1 code. We didn't have SB-1818 at that time. Of course,  
2 the answer was no. Besides, I can't pull strings. All I  
3 can do is talk and be listened to, I hope.

4 Another thing that bothers me quite a bit is that  
5 the brilliant transportation manager that we had before,  
6 [Terry Slimmer], is no longer here, and so she probably  
7 had nothing to do at all with how they're going to regard  
8 the traffic thing. I believe there are some issues here  
9 which the city -- most of the people in this city don't  
10 know about, and this is related to the Community  
11 Development Director Anne McIntosh, who on -- in August  
12 of 2009 wrote to her staff, some of whom are here  
13 tonight.

14 She says, "Here's the deal. The [Solomonis] own a  
15 lot of property on Melrose. They've invested a lot of  
16 capital in their developments and retail stores, and" --  
17 this is in upper case -- "intend to invest more capital  
18 on this street. They're trying to help us realize the  
19 vision for Melrose that we've outlined in our General  
20 Plan." Gee, I'm surprised that she knew a year ago what  
21 the General Plan was going to be. "I visited their  
22 buildings and proposed development sites on Melrose  
23 today. We need to have a new strategy about how we  
24 approach these projects. They're within code. They're  
25 overparked" -- really? -- "and they do not have the

1 traffic impacts we're reading about in the studies that  
2 are coming back."

3        Ridiculous. Melrose is a bumper-to-bumper-to-bumper  
4 street with people running around looking for parking.  
5 The businesses that are busy on Melrose are the two  
6 restaurants, the ones that we are grandfathering because  
7 they're funky and cool and we like them.

8        "Now, I am going to ask [Brendan]," who's her  
9 assistant, "to schedule a time for us to meet on this.  
10 I'm willing to take" -- this is important -- "I'm willing  
11 to take any bows and arrows flung our way by the  
12 neighbors, the Planning Commission, or the City Council,  
13 but we are over-processing these projects and need to  
14 figure out how to work better with this property owner."

15        The same day she wrote to the developer, "Hi, Ben.  
16 Thank you for giving me a tour of your properties," and  
17 I'll move ahead to the Planning Commission. "Send me an  
18 e-mail indicating you'd like to invite the Planning  
19 Commission to your site to take a tour like you gave me  
20 today." By the way, that is illegal unless it is done  
21 for the whole public. "Our procedure is we invite them  
22 and you call to arrange, and I can help to make sure that  
23 they get there. You will engage a parking consultant to  
24 do a parking thing."

25        I believe that the set-up for this property was

1 developed in the brain of Anne McIntosh, who thinks that  
2 we're overprocessing properties, and I disagree. I agree  
3 with the people from West Hollywood West who spoke to you  
4 today, and they will be severely impacted.

5 By the way, I think the presentation from Mr. Afriat  
6 was beautiful. This is a man that I trust, but I don't  
7 trust what is happening here. Thank you.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you, Ms. Dobrin. Laurence  
9 Chambers (sic), followed by Kim Winick.

10 **LAURENCE CHAMBLER:** May I use the tall guy podium?

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

12 **LAURENCE CHAMBLER:** Thank you. It's Laurence  
13 Chamblar.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Chamblar, okay.

15 **LAURENCE CHAMBLER:** I live in the first block of  
16 Huntley Drive south of Melrose in West Hollywood. No one  
17 consulted me about this project, so when the developers  
18 say that they talked with the neighbors, unfortunately, I  
19 was not among those.

20 There's a lot of talk about how beautiful these  
21 drawings are, how beautiful this project is, how  
22 harmonious.

23 I think many dogs are beautiful, but dogs produce an  
24 environmental impact. Sometimes they produce this impact  
25 on my lawn. The question isn't whether this is

1 beautiful; the question is whether they should be given a  
2 pass on the consideration of potential environmental  
3 impacts. The test under the law is really clear. It's  
4 if there's any fair argument that there is or could be an  
5 environmental impact, an environmental impact report is  
6 required. They don't get a pass by a negative  
7 declaration, and that's the decision that you're being  
8 called upon to make tonight or when you make your  
9 decision. That would not be a fair decision in light of  
10 the evidence that the Planning Commission has before it.

11 I know that CEQA is inconvenient for developers, and  
12 we just heard that they'd really like to streamline the  
13 process to eliminate all this burdensome consideration of  
14 the impacts on the environment, including the impacts on  
15 me and my neighbors.

16 I can't believe that any court would find that by  
17 the legal test, whether there's any fair argument, that  
18 there's any environmental impact, that a negative  
19 declaration would be approved by any court here.

20 Secondly -- oh, I heard an interior designer say,  
21 "You know, probably this project is going to cause more  
22 traffic, more pollution, and more noise." Seems to me  
23 that that constitutes a fair argument that there would be  
24 an environmental impact here.

25 Secondly, this application is calling for an



1 unprecedented interpretation of SB-1818, the application  
2 of bonuses for commercial floor space based on  
3 residential units. There is a clear legislative history,  
4 which the West Hollywood West letter has presented to  
5 you, that it is intended to apply to residents,  
6 residential units. And as Steve Martin just pointed out,  
7 nobody anywhere in California has ever set this proposal  
8 forth to any public body to decide. So you're being  
9 asked to make an unprecedented decision in this case, an  
10 unprecedented decision that will say environmental impact  
11 isn't worth talking about in this case, doesn't need to  
12 be considered, forget about it, the developer gets a  
13 pass.

14 I don't think my neighborhood should be the guinea  
15 pig for this kind of a proposition. Personally, I think  
16 it's an outrageous attempt at an interpretation of the  
17 law, and no court would support that at all. It's a  
18 specious argument.

19 Third, and finally, is timing. This is not the time  
20 to make that kind of a decision. It's not the time to  
21 make the decision that environmental impact doesn't need  
22 to be considered. The City Council has sent the General  
23 Plan back to the Planning Commission, particularly for  
24 reconsideration of the provisions of this precise section  
25 of Melrose Avenue. The proposed changes to the zoning

1 ordinance would, as everybody knows here, prohibit this  
2 development in the future, and as a person pointed out,  
3 this is going to last into the future.

4       It's not the time for this. There's no reason to  
5 rush to judgment on this specious proposition. Thank  
6 you.

7       **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Kim Winick, followed by  
8 Katie Maine.

9       **KIM WINICK:** Short person adjustment here. I'm  
10 Kimberly Winick. I am a member of West Hollywood West.  
11 I've owned a house on Huntley Drive, half a block south  
12 of Melrose since 1989. I agree that the area needs to be  
13 developed, but I believe that it's really, really  
14 important to develop it intelligently.

15       I appeared at the Planning Commission meeting where  
16 this project was discussed. This is really different,  
17 and I know they're trying to make some adaptation, but  
18 given that they've just got a new redesign win in the  
19 last six weeks, I'm extremely disturbed to hear Staff say  
20 that this project is deemed complete and they're ready to  
21 go. It's obvious that they're trying to race this  
22 project through in advance of the General Plan, which has  
23 been under discussion for about four years now and has  
24 finally come around to a level that people are having an  
25 intelligent discussion and being prepared to adopt the

1 General Plan. Obviously, there's a panic to try to get  
2 this approved before the General Plan comes in.

3 I've made comments on the General Plan. I intend to  
4 be at the meeting on December 6, which is to discuss the  
5 Melrose-specific issues, which are exactly what this is  
6 trying to confound, and I'll be at the meeting on  
7 December 20. And I think that at the meeting, the last  
8 meeting on the General Plan, I believe it was [Jeffery  
9 Prang] made kind of a comment about how West Hollywood  
10 West was kind of annoying because so many of us showed  
11 up. We do show up. We care very much. We treasure this  
12 area. We've moved into this area. We've taken care of  
13 this area. We've nurtured this area. And we want to  
14 nurture businesses like Urth Caffé.

15 If you go up three stories -- read the letter that  
16 Lauren Meister gave you -- if you go up three stories,  
17 Urth Caffé will be in shade for a chunk of every day.  
18 You'll kill that business and you'll kill that section of  
19 the street. That is the goose that laid the golden egg.  
20 You should take really good care of that property. The  
21 same thing with [Banco Ddiem]. You should take care of  
22 these properties. They're so important to the street  
23 traffic.

24 And if you want to support businesses, support RTH,  
25 a guy who just opened a cute little boutique on La

1 Cienega. It's a little teeny shop. It's the kind of  
2 shop that we should be having in this neighborhood. It's  
3 an artisan who is working on the street and selling his  
4 goods right there on the street. It's not Restoration  
5 Hardware that is part of a chain that's in Chapter 11  
6 that's trying to reorganize itself. That's not where we  
7 should be hitching our star. We should be hitching our  
8 star to the real artisans in our community.

9 Finally, traffic. It's preposterous to consider  
10 that there's not going to be an environmental impact that  
11 has to be considered here. Huntley Drive is nearly  
12 impassable as it is. The street is narrow. It's not  
13 four cars wide. We get traffic zooming by. People's  
14 mirrors get hit all the time. We've lost a couple of  
15 mirrors on one of our cars, and that's with the existing  
16 traffic.

17 I try to leave my house in the morning to go to work  
18 and I'll take a right on Huntley to head down to  
19 Rosewood, and then it doesn't matter whether I go right  
20 or left. There are always at least five or six cars that  
21 are trying to shortcut through the neighborhood, and  
22 that's before the development that's just been approved  
23 by the City to go on to La Cienega that's going to put  
24 124 residential units. That also got a density bonus.  
25 That's before the Red Building is completed. That's

1 before -- there's another project, I think, on West Knoll  
2 that was just approved. And what we've got is a  
3 piecemeal killing us by layering on project on project on  
4 project without considering the aggregate impact, and an  
5 EIR is necessary to consider the aggregate impact, but  
6 most important, nothing should be done until there is a  
7 comprehensive review of the entire neighborhood and the  
8 effects of all the proposed and pending projects instead  
9 of allowing them one by one to clobber us. Thank you.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

11 Katie Maine, followed by Mary Ann Collins.

12 **KATIE MAINE:** Hi. I'm Katie Maine. I'm a small  
13 business owner with my husband in West Hollywood, and  
14 we're big supporters of this plan because, like the  
15 previous woman said, we are small artisans that have a  
16 teeny office on Melrose, and we rely on these larger  
17 companies. We're an interior design firm, and we rely on  
18 the Pacific Design Center and companies like Restoration  
19 Hardware to make this street a destination so we can take  
20 our clients out and we can sustain as a small business.

21 And also about this business is there's a lot of  
22 retail space on Melrose, but there's not a lot of like  
23 creative office space, and so we could never afford a  
24 retail space to stay in the neighborhood, so to have more  
25 office spaces, it would really help enable us to keep an

1 office in the neighborhood.

2 And on top of that, I think the architecture is  
3 really nice in this building, and I think the underground  
4 parking is a huge help because maybe not only for this  
5 building but other times on Melrose when people are  
6 circling, looking for spots, it will give people a place  
7 to park whether they're visiting Restoration or whether  
8 they're visiting Urth Caffé.

9 And additionally, I know everyone's talking about  
10 the congested street, but I drive -- we would love to  
11 live in the area, but I drive back to our apartment every  
12 day in Hancock Park, and no matter what street I take,  
13 every street in LA is congested. And I know it's really  
14 important for the neighborhood to try to keep it less  
15 congested, but I mean drive through LA. You can't get  
16 from one side of the city, whether you're on Adams or  
17 Sunset, I mean, and those are two polar-opposite sides of  
18 the city. Everywhere is congested.

19 And on top of it, my husband and I the other day  
20 looked at houses in the neighborhood because we would  
21 love to live in West Hollywood, and we can't afford a \$1  
22 million house. So the fact that there's residential  
23 spaces is really beneficial to us in a building like this  
24 because they're small and they're affordable, and it  
25 would enable us to live close to work.

1           But on top of it, when we did look in the  
2 neighborhood because we're interior designers, so we  
3 understand looking at an old property and reinventing it,  
4 but a lot of these houses have taken advantage of the  
5 laws in the neighborhood by building basically on their  
6 entire lot. And I mean these houses, they're not the  
7 little bungalows that were once here. I mean there's  
8 Mediterranean and modern ones that people have completely  
9 renovated, and it's basically the same concept that  
10 they're doing. They're taking an old building and  
11 renovating it and trying to bring it back to life just  
12 like these residents are doing with their houses.

13           So we're very much for this project, and it would  
14 really help us keep our business afloat. So thanks for  
15 your time.

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

17           Mary Ann Collins, followed by Steven Golightly.

18           **MARY ANN COLLINS:** Hi. My name's Mary Ann Collins.  
19 I'm an over-20-year resident of West Hollywood, and I  
20 have a few comments about the things that people have  
21 said tonight.

22           Number one, the traffic is what it is until we have  
23 a freeway that goes through Melrose, which I hope doesn't  
24 happen any time soon.

25           Restoration Hardware, from what I understand, this

1 is a concept store, and it will -- they're closing all  
2 the stores in the mall, and this is going to be a really  
3 high-end kind of design store, which I think will only  
4 enhance the neighborhood and go along the lines of the  
5 design shops that are currently on Melrose.

6 I think that this change is good. It's progress,  
7 and we need progress, and moving forward with the General  
8 Plan and everything that this city's trying to achieve  
9 for the future, I think that this is a really good start  
10 and will help the area with high-end stores and foot  
11 traffic.

12 I live behind [Price] Furniture, so I've dealt with  
13 the -- every week, they have a sidewalk sale. I  
14 understand what that's like. I understand what that --  
15 dealing with is all about. I also live -- on the other  
16 side of me is a three-story condo that they look down  
17 into my apartment, so I understand what that's like, and  
18 it's just something that you adjust to.

19 I don't think that -- from what I saw about these  
20 designs, I don't see where that would really have an  
21 impact to the residents because the developers seem to be  
22 conscientious about looking into the neighbors' back  
23 yards and everything like that.

24 The other thing that I wanted to say is that I think  
25 that the parking will only enhance the neighborhood.



1 Besides what they're building at the library, I think we  
2 need more parking for the events. So thank you. And I  
3 do support this plan.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

5 Steven Golightly, followed by our last speaker,  
6 Garry Anthony.

7 **STEVEN GOLIGHTLY:** Good evening. Dr. Steven  
8 Golightly, proud resident of the city of West Hollywood  
9 and a career civil servant.

10 My doctorate is in public administration and public  
11 policy, and I have to tell you some of the discussion  
12 this evening to me, from my professional prospective, is  
13 really bad public policymaking. In fact, there's been so  
14 much doublespeak this evening that my head is starting to  
15 spin and I ran out of paper taking notes.

16 The traffic study that has been alluded to several  
17 times by Staff and also other speakers, I'm still  
18 confused. There was an old traffic study on the old  
19 design, and then there's a new design, but the old  
20 traffic study, which is the only traffic study kind of  
21 sort of applies to the new design, and on top of all of  
22 that, it was released yesterday for public dissemination.

23 Come on, folks. Good public policy dictates public  
24 input and comment on development of public policy. How  
25 can we comment intelligently on a traffic study that, in

1 fact, kind of sort of relates to this and was released in  
2 the last 24 hours?

3 On the design issue, I heard from the applicant that  
4 it was based upon neighborhood input, but then I also  
5 heard that it was based upon tenant design request.  
6 Which was it? Was it those of us in the neighborhood, or  
7 was it the Restoration Hardware design request? I don't  
8 know. I'm confused about that.

9 I find it particularly intriguing that all of the  
10 individuals speaking this evening from the city of Los  
11 Angeles are very concerned about the quality of life in  
12 my neighborhood. I live five houses behind this  
13 development on Westmount. I can tell you that neither my  
14 partner nor I have ever been contacted by telephone, by  
15 knock on the door, or by mail to ask for our input on  
16 this, and someone is always at our home.

17 I find it appalling that there was a statement made  
18 by the applicant that communication was made with [Sherry  
19 and Alex], who own the house immediately behind this  
20 development, and Alex and Sherry have told me that that  
21 did not, in fact, occur. Someone is misrepresenting the  
22 facts here.

23 I would point out on another note that the letter  
24 from West Hollywood West, from Lauren specifically as our  
25 president, is intended to represent the viewpoints of

1 those of us who live in West Hollywood West. You need to  
2 send this back to Planning.

3 And on one final note, it wasn't Council Member  
4 Prang who made the comment about the million-dollar  
5 homes. It was Council Member Duran. Thank you.

6 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can I ask a question?

7 **STEVEN GOLIGHTLY:** Of, of course.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

9 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Just a point of  
10 clarification. The letter on the West Hollywood West  
11 stationery that's signed by Lauren, because it isn't  
12 clear to me, are you saying that it was a joint letter  
13 agreed to by the entire association or that Lauren wrote  
14 it on behalf of the association?

15 **STEVEN GOLIGHTLY:** Lauren has authorization on  
16 behalf of the authorization -- on behalf of the  
17 association to represent our viewpoints in formal  
18 communication. It's in our bylaws, and it's also in our  
19 meeting minutes.

20 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Okay, thank you.

21 **STEVEN GOLIGHTLY:** Thank you.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Garry Anthony, who will be  
23 our last speaker.

24 **GARRY ANTHONY:** Hi. Good evening. So I've been in  
25 the neighborhood probably like five years, and --

1           **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Name and city of residence --

2           **GARRY ANTHONY:** I'm Garry Anthony. I live on  
3 Huntley, West Hollywood.

4           I've been in residence for about five years, and  
5 when I first got into the neighborhood with my partner,  
6 we did very little walking. But since I've looked at  
7 Melrose and we've had [Chicccone], we've had Kitson, we've  
8 had other things that has appeared, walking has been  
9 enjoyable. Walking my dog has been enjoyable.

10           And as far as the lady saying that the building is  
11 going to cover Urth Caffé, I mean Kitson doesn't cover  
12 the other side of the street, nor will this building. I  
13 think this building is going to be beautiful. It's going  
14 to be a beautiful place to walk. It's going to be more  
15 parking to alleviate all the parking that's been going  
16 on. The parking is going to help. The building is going  
17 to beautify.

18           I don't know about you, but Melrose has become  
19 beautiful. It's been a place for people to enjoy and  
20 walk. This is not your old neighborhood where it's like  
21 picket fence. This is a brand new. We're bringing like  
22 jobs to the area. I mean, come on, people, really? I  
23 mean we need some beauty. I mean for someone to come  
24 into the neighborhood and want to spend money and want to  
25 beautify our beautiful West Hollywood, I'm all for it.

1 Thank you.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

3 So with that, Mr. Afriat, if you would like, you  
4 have five minutes for rebuttal of anything that was  
5 commented on or something you didn't a chance to say in  
6 your opening presentation.

7 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Thank you. Members of the  
8 Commission, I'm going to be sharing my rebuttal time with  
9 Claire Bernowski, our land use counsel, so I'm going to  
10 make a couple of very brief comments.

11 I can't address everything I heard here tonight. I  
12 did want to say that my comments about encouraging new  
13 and innovative development to deal with issues of closed  
14 stores and boarded-up windows was taken out of Steve  
15 Martin's press release when he announced his support for  
16 the Sunset Millennium project.

17 But, seriously, I think the city should encourage  
18 new development fitting for the vision of how  
19 neighborhoods are changing, and it's about driving the  
20 market and what's coming to the Avenues of Arts and  
21 Design.

22 I haven't looked at the traffic study. What I do  
23 know is that when the project was originally filed, it  
24 was almost 8,700 square feet larger and an entire retail  
25 project, and it's not as large as that now. It's 8,700

1 square feet less, and it's primarily a wholesale project.  
2 There's five units instead of seven units of housing.

3 I also know that you get credit for what's there.  
4 Right now, there's a 14,000-square-foot building that can  
5 be used for medical office, and that was a previous use.  
6 That has very traffic-intensive uses. Currently, that  
7 alley behind the project is access for parking for the  
8 other two retail uses that currently exist there, and 65  
9 parking spaces are accessing that without a landscape  
10 buffer, without screening, and without some of the other  
11 things we're talking about.

12 You all have a letter that was given to you from  
13 Restoration Hardware. Restoration Hardware is  
14 reinventing itself. It's closing its retail stores in  
15 the malls, and it's going into the design business. That  
16 is the core business of this Restoration Hardware and the  
17 future of this company.

18 We believe that CEQA was right. We believe that the  
19 EIR decision was correct. And, frankly, while I think  
20 the Staff is correct in requiring a negative declaration,  
21 it's our risk. We indemnify the city. My client is  
22 prepared to take that risk if, in fact, that judgment is  
23 not correct. And while I believe that you as planning  
24 commissioners have to make a decision to certify  
25 environmental documents and have confidence the decision

1 is correct, the risk is not yours. The risk is my  
2 client, who's working very hard to bring this new vision  
3 to Melrose, and I would encourage you to support your  
4 Staff decision, support our decision to do a more onerous  
5 environmental review, and allow us to go forward with  
6 this project.

7 I want to invite [Claire Bernowski], our land use  
8 counselor, to complete our rebuttal period. Thank you.

9 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** May I ask, Mr. Chair, a  
10 question before Ms. Bernowski and not to be taken from  
11 their time?

12 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** Thank you.

13 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Was there any neighborhood  
14 meetings?

15 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** There were mandatory neighborhood  
16 meetings that happened at the early part of this  
17 application. I did not want to get into, but I want to  
18 answer your question, a give-and-take about who said what  
19 or who did what. I know --

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I just want to know if there  
21 were any neighborhood meetings.

22 **STEVEN AFRIAT:** There were neighborhood meetings,  
23 and Victor Martin in my office did walk these two or  
24 three streets. It's unfortunate if people weren't home,  
25 but we did knock on those doors and reach out to people.

1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Did you leave any notes?  
2 Did you leave any door hangers? Did you leave any phone  
3 numbers? Did you leave any encouragement to get in touch  
4 with you?

5           **STEVEN AFRIAT:** No, we didn't, but the --

6           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** When were the neighborhood  
7 meetings, please?

8           **STEVEN AFRIAT:** I was not involved in --

9           **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** (Inaudible).

10          **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Steve --

11          **STEVEN AFRIAT:** [Adrian], do you have those dates?  
12 I'm sorry.

13          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** When did you get involved?

14          **STEVEN AFRIAT:** I got involved in September.

15          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** So there were no new  
16 neighborhood meetings since September?

17          **STEVEN AFRIAT:** No, sir.

18          **ADRIAN GALLO:** Sorry. The neighborhood meeting was  
19 August 14, 2008.

20          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** One neighborhood meeting?  
21 One neighborhood meeting several designs ago?

22          **ADRIAN GALLO:** Correct.

23          **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Thank you. And several  
24 years ago?

25          **ADRIAN GALLO:** Correct.



1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Thank you.

2           **STEVEN AFRIAT:** [Claire]?

3           **CLAIRE BERNOWSKI:** Good evening. Claire Bernowski.  
4 I'm land use counsel for the applicant, and I know I have  
5 a very short amount of time. I want to say that we've  
6 been working very closely with the City on this project  
7 for several years, and I also work with these clients on  
8 other projects in other cities, and they really have  
9 integrity and a vision for the site, and they do not take  
10 lightly what they're trying to bring here.

11           I want to just speak quickly on the legal issues,  
12 first on terms of the interpretation that you're being  
13 asked to make.

14           We went through this issue with the City Attorney  
15 and Staff at the end of last year. The Staff asked us,  
16 and we, in writing, asked for a second concession under  
17 SB-1818 for the commercial density, and we didn't -- we  
18 were very much surprised when the Staff report came out  
19 at five o'clock Thanksgiving Eve that we were now looking  
20 at an interpretation as a threshold decision.

21           So even if you read your staff report carefully, you  
22 will see you have two choices. You can approve this  
23 project either as a concession or as an interpretation,  
24 and I will leave that for you to discuss with your staff.

25           In terms of the CEQA, I can assure you that this has

1 had very thorough review for the size of project. It is  
2 virtually less, in the realm of 10,000 square feet, when  
3 you take into account the net new construction and the  
4 actual usable retail and wholesale areas, so it's a minor  
5 project in a very busy area.

6 We think it's -- the new accurate traffic study that  
7 is for the current project has received staff approval.  
8 It's been through the negative [dec] public process.  
9 (Inaudible) a total red herring to pull out a report that  
10 was a draft for a prior application, and so there's a lot  
11 of misinformation that we hope your staff will be able to  
12 address and we are here to help, also. Thank you.

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

15 I have a -- if Mr. Gabbay could actually come to the  
16 mic, I actually have a couple more quick questions.

17 I'm just curious about the decision, the size of the  
18 units, why it was decided that 680-square-foot studio  
19 apartments as opposed to slightly larger one-bedroom  
20 apartments were placed on top of this structure.

21 **HAMID GABBAY:** When we started, there was a study  
22 done, and it was discovered, or we thought, that this is  
23 the most desirable size of unit for a couple or a single  
24 person living in the neighborhood.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** A studio, as opposed to a one-bedroom?

1           **HAMID GABBAY:** As opposed to one bedroom. And,  
2 also, we wanted in a way to limit the size of what is  
3 called now a third floor, which is not, the size of it.  
4 So we have adequate landscaping and setback on the roof  
5 that the units are located.

6           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And then the materials that are  
7 presented here before us, we don't really have a material  
8 board. There's one reference to the material you're  
9 using, which is smooth [tiled] stucco, but there's no  
10 other reference to colors, materials, in fact, almost  
11 less than what was presented at the initial design  
12 review, which was a totally different scheme.

13           So there's a lot of questions I have because I'm not  
14 sure the renderings, obviously, are hand-drawn, as  
15 opposed to using some other computer modeling program.  
16 So I'm having trouble distinguishing what materials are  
17 being proposed here.

18           And then the other thing is it shows a landscaped  
19 parapet across the top, and I'm not really clear on what  
20 that is or how that would occur. So if you could explain  
21 that.

22           Also, the gabled roof, if I understand you  
23 correctly, would be the potential Restoration Hardware  
24 side. It looks like it's standing [seam] metal, but  
25 again, I can't really tell from these renderings.

1           **Hamid Gabbay:** Okay, first of all, the materials  
2 that we are using, as mentioned, it's stucco, and the  
3 molding are made out of pre-cast concrete. Is very  
4 similar and close to what is Mansour right now, so that's  
5 the direction of the design.

6           The doors and windows are either frameless or they  
7 are aluminum. The glass is clear glass.

8           On the third floor, we have these hedges next to the  
9 parapet. That separates the parapet from the back of the  
10 hedges, and they go around the building. Therefore, from  
11 the third floor, you won't be able to see really the  
12 other side, especially into the southern neighbor.

13           Furthermore, I would like to make also one thing  
14 clear, that the height of these -- this building is 27  
15 feet high to the top of the parapet on the roof and,  
16 therefore, it's just about two feet higher than Mansour,  
17 or if I'm not wrong, at Kitson. And, again, the units  
18 are approximately 15, 20 feet back and, therefore, there  
19 is absolutely no shade and shadows on any business across  
20 the street that it was mentioned several times.

21           The reason the building is in reality two-story  
22 building, it's two story and a mezzanine. I wanted to  
23 make that clear, as well.

24           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Thank you very much.

25           **HAMID GABBAY:** You're welcome.

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. There's been a request to take  
2 a five-minute break, so we're going to do so. Please do  
3 not talk to the Commissioners about this item since we  
4 are still in session regarding that. Thank you very  
5 much.

6           *(Short break)*

7           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so with no objection, we're  
8 going to close the public testimony and -- can I get some  
9 direction from Christi in terms of closing the public  
10 testimony, especially since this is a unique kind of  
11 application in front of us in terms of there's not --  
12 it's going to have to come before us regardless, back  
13 before us, because there's no resolution. Is that  
14 correct?

15           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** I'm not sure what you're asking.

16           **CHAIR YEBER:** Closing the public testimony. Do we  
17 leave it open or closed?

18           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** You can do either way. If you think  
19 you want to ask some more questions, leave it open.

20           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Why don't we -- we'll leave it  
21 open for the time being, the public testimony without --  
22 if there's no objection.

23           So with that, I open the floor to my fellow  
24 commissioners, starting with Commissioner Guardarrama.

25           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I have a question for the

1 City Attorney. I was hoping you could explain for  
2 everyone that is not familiar with CEQA what a negative  
3 declaration is and the --

4 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Would you speak into the  
5 microphone?

6 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** -- what a negative  
7 declaration is because there's this sense that no  
8 environmental review took place.

9 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Every project that comes before the  
10 City is required to undergo environmental review. The  
11 initial review determines whether or not it's a project  
12 that's subject to CEQA. There are categories of projects  
13 that typically don't have special adverse impacts. Those  
14 are regarded as exempt, in-fill and some basic  
15 redevelopment where you're not increasing the density,  
16 those kinds of things.

17 If a category -- if a project falls into a category  
18 that's exempt, the City is not required to go any further  
19 because it's simply not exempt. Sometimes the City does  
20 anyways go through an initial study, and the initial  
21 study's actually in the packet that you have before you.  
22 It's a lengthy checklist that identifies all of the  
23 potential impacts and areas of impacts that a project  
24 might have and the planner is required to look at all of  
25 the evidence that's in front of the City and determine

1 whether there's any substantial evidence that might  
2 indicate that an impact may occur, and when that whole  
3 initial study is completed, if no evidence has been found  
4 that there's likely to be any adverse environmental  
5 impact, then the City declares that there is no impact.

6 Otherwise, it's a negative impact, it's a negative  
7 declaration, and then circulates that along with the  
8 initial study and gives the public an opportunity to look  
9 at it.

10 If instead, as this process goes on, some  
11 substantial evidence is presented that does suggest a  
12 fair argument, there may be a environmental impact. Then  
13 the City must prepare an Environmental Impact Report.

14 What happened in this case was the project appeared  
15 to meet the standards for an exemption. The City Staff  
16 nonetheless prepared the initial study, which is in your  
17 packet, and as you -- you can go through every checklist  
18 and see what they did.

19 But in the end, they determined that there was no  
20 evidence of a significant impact, and they issued the  
21 negative declaration.

22 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Thanks.

23 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** That's what you wanted?

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

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, Commissioner Altschul?

1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I find it a little  
2 amazing that in two-and-a-half years there has not been a  
3 neighborhood meeting, and I don't fault certainly Mr.  
4 Afriat because you've only been here for two-and-a-half  
5 months, not two-and-a-half years, been on this project.  
6 Your presence has been here for decades. We know that.

7           So I think it should go back to square if not one,  
8 square two or three for quite a few reasons.

9           Reasons number one through 10, there should be at  
10 least two and perhaps three neighborhood meetings, and  
11 none of them should be held on December 23, as has been  
12 happening in the past. When neighborhood meetings have  
13 been mandated this late in the game, they somehow seem to  
14 have them two days before Christmas when nobody can come.  
15 So I think they should be scheduled at dates -- if we're  
16 going to have them, they should be scheduled at dates  
17 where the community and the neighbors are reasonably  
18 expected to be able to attend.

19           Secondly, an issue that probably is not usually  
20 discussed in land use but the applicant relies very  
21 heavily on, the Restoration Hardware presence as a  
22 tenant. And Restoration Hardware being in bankruptcy, I  
23 think it would behoove us to check with the trustee in  
24 bankruptcy or to check with some reasonable bankrupt  
25 authority to see whether or not the trustees' signature



1 or the trustees' assent might be required for even this  
2 letter of intent, which, as I read it, isn't really a  
3 letter of intent; it's just a letter of praise for a  
4 project here.

5       And getting into the more specific issues at hand,  
6 Melrose is a two-lane street. It's absolutely beautiful.  
7 It's gotten beautiful over the course of the years, and I  
8 drive down there -- no, I don't drive down there. I  
9 crawl down there because you can't drive down there at  
10 any speed to get from one place to the other. But on the  
11 times when I don't have enough sense to get off of  
12 Melrose, I marvel at what it looks like. But it being  
13 such a small street, and we intentionally cut it down  
14 years ago to one lane in either direction, with whatever  
15 parking there is on the diagonal to attempt to make it  
16 what it has become, but I think even at least in just  
17 this one area, there's a fair argument to say that a --  
18 at least a focused EIR on traffic is absolutely  
19 essential. Given the anecdotal experience that we all  
20 have in trying to negotiate Melrose and given the fact  
21 that on a prior project there was apparently a traffic  
22 study that had some serious concerns, although I haven't  
23 read it, and this is another observation that I think  
24 that -- well, first of all, I have a -- I would bet  
25 anybody that this is going to end up at a court one way

1 or the other, and one of the arguments in the court is  
2 going to be why was this traffic study not released. Was  
3 it a draft? Probably not. And whose choice or whose  
4 decision is it as to whether or not the public or the  
5 decision makers get to see it?

6 And in my opinion, it is always best to err on the  
7 side of let it see the light of day, let it see the air,  
8 let everybody in the public that wants to bother to read  
9 it, and let all of the decision makers who have to read  
10 it, at least in its summary, see it whether it applies to  
11 100% on point to the project that is then or now being  
12 presented or not.

13 It's a little baffling that one would try to shove  
14 it under the carpet rather than expose it and limit  
15 anybody's opportunity to criticize for non-exposure.

16 So I would suggest, number one, do a study of that  
17 traffic report and have it updated if it needs to be  
18 updated. Have a hearing so that there can be a comment  
19 period on it, so that staff can not only respond to the  
20 report but respond to the comments and address the  
21 comments, and then see where that leads with respect to  
22 whether or not a full EIR should be required.

23 Now, getting to the issue that's actually agendized,  
24 which is the use of one unit, Mr. Afriat argues that  
25 there is no legislative intent to limit 1818 to

1 residential, and it can, in fact, spill over to  
2 commercial, and Ms. Meister, in fact, brings language  
3 from the legislative documents showing, or at least  
4 indicating quite strongly, that the legislative intent is  
5 to apply to residential only.

6         So my theory, my leaning is to not approve the  
7 extension of the SB-18 benefits from residential to  
8 commercial.

9         It sort of reminds me of the story of a guy who's  
10 driving across the country and comes to a little small  
11 diner in the Midwest, and he's hungry and he goes in and  
12 he looks at the menu and he sees on the menu an elephant  
13 sandwich for \$9.95. He said, "I've never had an elephant  
14 sandwich before." So he says to the proprietor, "I think  
15 I'll have the elephant sandwich," and the proprietor  
16 says, "No, you can't have it." He says, "What do you  
17 mean? It's here on the menu." He says, "Well, you can't  
18 have it." He says, "Why in the heck can't I have it?"  
19 He says, "You think I'm going to kill the elephant for  
20 one sandwich?"

21         And this is what this -- give me a break. We'll  
22 offer you up one, even two affordable units, but let us  
23 build a commercial structure that pushes the envelope.  
24 Doesn't make sense. So my intention would be in -- about  
25 toward this policy direction would be to say no to that,

1 but this is a good project. This has all the earmarks of  
2 a good project.

3 Come back with a traffic report that passes the  
4 smell test. Come back if necessary with an EIR because  
5 in listening to some 40 people here today, I heard quite  
6 a few what I would consider fair arguments for an EIR,  
7 but that could be determined in the future. Thank you.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Buckner, you're itching  
9 to say something.

10 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'm itching to say something.  
11 Frankly, I think that Commissioner Altschul pretty much  
12 expressed a lot of what I've been thinking. Particularly  
13 as I'm listening to what the public has said and also  
14 what the applicant has said and reading the report and  
15 hearing all of that, I'm very concerned about the traffic  
16 issue. I must say that as far -- we're not going to get  
17 to the design. I'm much happier with the design that I  
18 see here. I think it can be a very beautiful building  
19 and add a lot to the neighborhood, but I am very  
20 concerned that there was no -- the traffic study  
21 information just came out within the last 24, 48 hours.  
22 People haven't had an opportunity to read it or digest it  
23 or see it, and I think that especially in our community  
24 where we have so much input from our neighbors, I think  
25 that we really need to give people an opportunity to look

1 at these issues of parking and of the density issue.

2 I don't know exactly what the legislative intent --  
3 I don't think it's been as clear as it might be in other  
4 situations, but it seems to me to infer just because it  
5 wasn't specifically said, that there be no commercial  
6 that we should then imply that there be commercial  
7 benefits to something that was clearly -- I think clearly  
8 and certainly in terms of the history of how we've been  
9 applying these advantages to the developments that we  
10 cannot at this point do that without having more  
11 information.

12 I tried to get on to research the legislative intent  
13 today but couldn't find anything specific about it  
14 because it was something that concerned me when I was  
15 reading the report, so I'm inclined to not approve it at  
16 this point.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

18 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Thank you, Chair. Well, I  
19 don't know that I entirely like what I'm about to say,  
20 but I think I have a fairly strong opinion about this,  
21 and that is while I agree with Commissioner Altschul that  
22 this is something that quite possibly could wind up in  
23 court, and I suspect whatever we do it will wind up  
24 before counsel, I think if I simply look at our function  
25 as a planning commission, it becomes simpler. And I want

1 to say before I say anything else how much it bothers me  
2 that 1818, which was a perfectly well-intended law  
3 designed for cities like Montecito, does not suit our  
4 community, but it is the law and we have not gotten any  
5 specific direction to ignore it or combat it. And  
6 although I find its giveaways extraordinary, that is what  
7 Sacramento has told us to do. And it's not clear enough  
8 to me that the intent of the law is to provide  
9 residential affordable housing by providing residential  
10 incentives. I think it's good that we have recommended  
11 that that be clarified in our statutes, but it hasn't.

12         And the other thing that I want to say very clearly  
13 is that I'm not sure that a negative declaration is the  
14 right way to go here for the applicants. But that being  
15 said, it would appear to be a legitimate way to go. It  
16 would appear that Staff has done a sufficient amount of  
17 work to demonstrate that there's some credibility to the  
18 argument, and from a planning commission point of view, I  
19 can buy it.

20         Whether it winds up holding up in court is not the  
21 Planning Commission's area of concern. If the applicant  
22 is willing to take that risk, that's their risk. I'm not  
23 honestly sure it's advisable, but they seem willing --  
24 actually, they stated explicitly that they're willing to  
25 take it.

1           So it comes down to the project. I have no idea if  
2 Restoration Hardware is ever going to go in there or not.  
3 For me, I take that out as a factor, and although there  
4 are reasons to be curious about the design and if we were  
5 to get to the point that we approved it, I would want it  
6 to come back to Design Review because they haven't really  
7 fully vetted this design, but it's a much better design  
8 than it was. And I would also say about Design Review,  
9 which I sit on, that when we had our meeting just a few  
10 months ago, it was an extraordinarily well attended  
11 meeting from the community. And while I think community  
12 input is super-important, there has been community  
13 awareness of this project in the last few months because  
14 there were several dozen community members who showed up  
15 at Design Review to talk about this project. And I think  
16 the other Design Review members would back me up on this,  
17 that it was not limited to their concerns about design.  
18 It was limited to impact -- people talked about impact  
19 concerns, as well, to a certain degree at that meeting.

20           So I don't say this with any great relish, but I  
21 think from a planning commission point of view, from my  
22 perspective, what we do here is actually fairly clear,  
23 and that's what I have to say at this point.

24           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

25           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, first of all, I'd like

1 to thank everybody that spoke. It's really a pleasure to  
2 hear from people who are intelligent and have really  
3 thought this through and aren't raging at the world,  
4 which we've all done from time to time, but it was a  
5 really interesting hearing.

6 I work for an affordable housing developer, and so I  
7 wrestled with this SB-1818 bonus idea. I can understand  
8 how someone would read it and interpret it other ways,  
9 but it seems fairly clear to me that it is intended for  
10 more housing.

11 As someone -- as John, I think, mentioned that it  
12 usually is a housing -- a mixed-use housing development  
13 where it's mostly housing and not mostly commercial, so  
14 this being turned on its end has been a little unusual.

15 What kept occurring to me as I was listening to  
16 everyone was why don't they just take away all of the  
17 housing, use the 3,400 square feet they're putting into  
18 the housing into the commercial, make it a project that  
19 fits in the zoning ordinance? Why go to all this trouble  
20 to force going outside of the zoning code?

21 It says in the Staff Report it is the commercial  
22 bonus area that is supporting the economic feasibility of  
23 the affordable housing. It's like why even go there?  
24 Why don't you just build a really wonderful commercial  
25 project, forget the housing piece altogether. It seems



1 clear to me, unless the owner wants to live there. I  
2 don't think he'd want to live in a single, though.

3         So I agree with what everyone has said. I was also  
4 struck by the juxtaposition of an incredibly stable  
5 neighborhood, West Hollywood West, and over the 40, 50,  
6 60 years that life goes on, commercial areas change. It  
7 is the nature of commercial property and retail,  
8 wholesale, whatever you want to call it, that they change  
9 and they go through cycles.

10         And so this neighborhood is so stable that change,  
11 and it seems by necessity change always has to be bigger  
12 and better, isn't a good fit.

13         At the same time, land costs are so high that as  
14 many of our speakers said, who are very small one and two  
15 business owners -- one and two-person business owners,  
16 they can't afford to own property on Melrose.

17         So what do we do? Do we bring in something like a  
18 Restoration Hardware, who is actually a chain, that  
19 doesn't actually fit into the envelope of what we all  
20 think of as small retail, when at the same time small  
21 retail can't afford to be there?

22         So it's complicated. I don't know that we have a  
23 solution tonight. I do know that my interpretation is  
24 that the housing bonus should be for housing and not  
25 applied to commercial. So I think taking that stance

1 will help me make whatever decisions, whatever motions my  
2 fellow commissioners make. Thank you.

3 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** When I think about this  
4 project, I think about the five units on top, and we're  
5 asked to consider whether SB-1818 permits the concession  
6 of the increased FAR in commercial.

7 There's been evidence that's been presented  
8 regarding the legislative history and what the  
9 legislative intent was of SB-1818, but the bottom line is  
10 that SB-1818 was intended to create more housing, and  
11 these five units wouldn't be proposed for this building  
12 if SB-1818 didn't give these concessions. And I think  
13 that's at the crux of the matter.

14 And the fact that we are getting five units, one  
15 unit affordable, now the applicant has agreed to do two  
16 affordable, I think that's a good thing for the city.  
17 That's five families that are now going to be able to  
18 live here, and two of them are families in financial  
19 need. So that's where I am on the SB-1818 thing.

20 With regard to the appropriateness of this building  
21 in this location, I think this project is fantastic. It  
22 goes very well with the new Rose Tarlow showroom. It  
23 could easily fit in with the [John Wolfe] shops on  
24 Melrose Place. It's keeping in line with where we want  
25 to be with the Avenues of Arts and Design. I couldn't

1 think of a better style or a better land use for this  
2 particular site.

3       So I don't know specifically where to go with this  
4 because I feel like the Commission, in general, really  
5 likes the building. There are some Commissioners that  
6 are sort of worried about where the process has been, but  
7 in the end, the appropriate environmental review was done  
8 to the satisfaction of Staff and also to the satisfaction  
9 of our City Attorney, and I'm very comfortable going  
10 forward with the record as it is.

11       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Well, I have to -- I agree with  
12 Commissioner Altschul. I'm not convinced that all the  
13 impacts have been adequately studied. I was always  
14 troubled with the exiting -- entrance and exiting off of  
15 Westmount and how that would impact the neighborhood, and  
16 I don't see any evidence that has helped me -- convinced  
17 me otherwise. So I agree that this needs to be further  
18 studied.

19       I feel that the request for three incentives/bonuses  
20 for a single -- even for two seems to be a bit exploitive  
21 of the whole nature of these incentives for affordable  
22 housing.

23       I'm certainly not convinced that the use that's  
24 being proposed, which is partially wholesale, will  
25 actually be wholesale, so therefore, it throws the

1 parking and the counts into question.

2         And, again, as with the previous design that was  
3 proposed or brought before us in Design Review six or  
4 eight weeks ago, even though this is a totally different  
5 direction, I still don't believe that the design is  
6 compatible with the neighborhood or the future direction  
7 of the Avenues, and maybe it's just the result of what's  
8 actually being presented or how it's being presented, but  
9 I'm just not convinced that the design works or fits in  
10 the neighborhood, and that's why I asked those questions  
11 at the very beginning about what factors or queues were  
12 taken from the neighborhood from Melrose to lead the  
13 architect to go in this direction as opposed to the  
14 previous direction.

15         I am very concerned that we only got two hand  
16 renderings and not a more rich material pallet and  
17 rendering so that we could better understand how this  
18 would fit in Melrose. So from that standpoint, I agree  
19 with Commissioner Bernstein that if we were to move  
20 forward on this project, I would request that it come  
21 back before Design Review because there's too many  
22 unanswered questions from design.

23         The bottom line is I'm not absolutely sure that the  
24 particular proposal is simply appropriate for this  
25 specific site. Not that I'm opposed to Restoration

1 Hardware coming to Melrose, I'm just not sure that it's  
2 appropriate for this block of Melrose and the impacts it  
3 could bring, not to mention that we're not even sure if  
4 it'll be Restoration Hardware.

5       You know, I advocate -- I'm an advocate of progress  
6 and moving forward and developing Melrose to a point that  
7 aids in economic development but not at the sacrifice of  
8 neighborhood livability.

9       So with that, I sort of want to get a consensus --  
10 well, first direction from Staff. You have three  
11 questions to us, and how would you like us to make this?  
12 Should we first -- do you want us to make a motion on our  
13 interpretation of the incentive or bonus and how we think  
14 SB-1818 should be applied in this particular case?

15       **JOHN KEHO:** Yes. We think that should be first  
16 because that will then determine the next steps.

17       **CHAIR YEBER:** All right. So Commissioner Altschul  
18 has entertained or willing to entertain a motion.

19       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I move that the applicant's  
20 request to apply SB-1818 bonus standards to commercial  
21 aspects of the subject property by providing one or two  
22 of one is actually --

23       **JOHN KEHO:** You're making -- you're verifying the  
24 interpretation on --

25       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

1           **JOHN KEHO:** -- 1818.

2           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** We've been using a shorthand. We've  
3 been sort of letting you use a shorthand of SB-1818 to  
4 describe what is really two different things. But what  
5 we're looking for, the interpretation, is whether the  
6 West Hollywood Municipal Code Section 1922050 allows the  
7 bonus density to be applied to commercial.

8           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay, strike what I said  
9 before. I move that West Hollywood Municipal Code Number  
10 --

11           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** 1922050.

12           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- 1922050 not be applied to  
13 allow bonus density to commercial --

14           **JOHN KEHO:** To commercial square footage.

15           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- to commercial square  
16 footage or to a commercial project.

17           **JOHN KEHO:** Commercial square footage.

18           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Commercial square footage,  
19 okay.

20           That being the motion, I would further like the  
21 Commission to direct or encourage direction for two  
22 neighborhood meetings and a redesign or a new  
23 presentation of the project in line with the discussions  
24 that we've had this evening.

25           **CHAIR YEBER:** If I can --

1           **UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** (Inaudible - multiple  
2 speakers)

3           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No, that's not part of the  
4 motion.

5           **CHAIR YEBER:** Oh, it's not part of the motion?

6           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Not part of the motion at  
7 all.

8           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, let's focus -- I guess what I  
9 was trying to get for Staff is if we could get some  
10 clarity on our interpretation --

11           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay, well, then you want to  
12 take the motion separately, that was the motion without  
13 the second sentence.

14           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so --

15           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Short sentence.

16           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Motion is essentially to support  
17 Staff's interpretation instead of the applicant's  
18 proposed interpretation.

19           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right, that basically -- that the  
20 bonus should be applied in a residential application.

21           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Right.

22           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Is there a discussion on this,  
23 further discussion on that?

24           **JOHN KEHO:** Was there a second?

25           **CHAIR YEBER:** Oh, is there a second?

1           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Second.

2           **CHAIR YEBER:** Second by Commissioner Buckner.

3           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I'd like to discuss it.

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

5           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** I disagree with the motion.

6 I think it is our desire, as already expressed by our  
7 request, that Counsel change zoning, but this is simply a  
8 question of does SB-1818 so want to provide affordable  
9 housing that it would allow a density bonus to be applied  
10 to commercial, and regrettably -- and I want us to talk  
11 more about 1818, which I think is going to be an ongoing  
12 mess for us in this community, but in my opinion, that's  
13 what the law says. And the fact that we don't want it to  
14 say that way is not, to my mind, relevant, and this  
15 interpretation is not an approval of the project. It is  
16 simply what the law says, and respectfully, I disagree  
17 with Staff. I think that it is simply our desire that it  
18 not have this meaning when, in fact, the law to me does  
19 have this meaning. It doesn't mean I like it, but that's  
20 what I think it is.

21           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

22           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I agree with Commissioner  
23 Bernstein. I think the law was intended to create  
24 housing, and in this case, it is creating five units.

25           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker, do you want to



1 chime in on this particular...?

2 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** No, I'd like to vote.

3 **CHAIR YEBER:** How about Commissioner Altschul?

4 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes. Yes, it does promote  
5 housing, but it doesn't say housing in a commercial zone  
6 or housing in commercial square footage.

7 This is what we in the law business call, I believe,  
8 a case of first impression, and unlike -- contrary to  
9 what Alan Bernstein says, SB-1818 does not mandate that  
10 the square footage be extended to commercial structures.

11 We have an opportunity here. We're like a court of  
12 first impression or a tribunal of first impression, and  
13 we get to promote our ideas on this subject, and I can't  
14 recall too many times where we've done this in the 15  
15 years that I've been here, but we get to give our  
16 impression first, and then it will go to the Council and  
17 then it will go to the court.

18 So I think it is as appropriate, if not more  
19 appropriate, for us to say that SB-1818 applies to  
20 residential because it deals with residential and because  
21 the only factual evidence of legislative intent that was  
22 presented tonight came from Ms. Meister, who gave us the  
23 citation where, in fact, it was specifically for  
24 residential.

25 So I think we're on very, very solid footing in

1 giving our first impression to apply it to residential,  
2 and I'd like to vote, too, with Barbara -- like Barbara  
3 would.

4 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Mr. Chair?

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes?

6 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** I'm sorry, I need to just throw  
7 something out there just so that you know this and it  
8 doesn't come as a surprise later.

9 Because we have been sitting here allowing you to  
10 use the shorthand, you may have lost sight of the fact  
11 that there are actually two ways that the commercial  
12 portion of this could be increased.

13 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

14 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** The first way is what you're voting  
15 on now, and you're basically eliminating the possibility  
16 of using a bonus density intended for housing to apply to  
17 commercial. That's the portion of our code that says the  
18 density of a -- if you're in a residential area, density  
19 allows you to build five units, but if you make them  
20 affordable, we'll add -- so you can build seven, and now  
21 we're putting that structure into the mixed use, and  
22 you're saying, well, if you want to -- we're going to  
23 look at what the density is for the housing part, and  
24 we'll only allow the increased density, the bonus part to  
25 be for housing. That's what we're talking about now,

1 period.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

3 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** There's a whole other issue that  
4 will come up later, and I think it speaks more to what  
5 Commissioner Guardarrama was talking about creating  
6 incentives for building the housing and that is with the  
7 concessions.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

9 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** So there may be -- you may hear at a  
10 future time the applicant saying, "Make a concession to  
11 me of creating more commercial space because I'll be  
12 using that to create the overall financial landscape for  
13 this project that will enable me to build the housing,"  
14 and it's a different legal framework, and that's really  
15 what SB-1818 is about.

16 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** But that's not on the agenda  
17 tonight.

18 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Well, it sort of is on your agenda.  
19 It's in your Staff report. It's not what --

20 **CHAIR YEBER:** I was thinking it was going to come  
21 next because once we decide on this interpretation of the  
22 housing incentive, then it only leaves the question --

23 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** The bonus.

24 **CHAIR YEBER:** -- the bonus -- it only leaves the  
25 question of, okay, can we decide on this project within

1 the framework of concession.

2       **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Right. I'm just bringing it up  
3 because when you vote to do this, this will mean that the  
4 bonus density will not apply to the commercial, but it  
5 won't be the last you'll hear of increased commercial.

6       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Mr. Chair?

7       **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes?

8       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** The public hearing is still  
9 open, right?

10       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

11       **CHAIR YEBER:** It is.

12       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** May I ask the applicant's  
13 counsel a question?

14       **CHAIR YEBER:** If you'll state your name again?

15       **CLAIRE BERNOWSKI:** Claire Bernowski.

16       **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.

17       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Counselor, during your  
18 rebuttal, you stated that originally the City was talking  
19 to you about a concession to make this project happen,  
20 and then it somewhere along the line switched and wanted  
21 us to give an interpretation on the code.

22       Could you give us a history of what happened,  
23 without divulging any attorney/client privilege,  
24 obviously?

25       **CLAIRE BERNOWSKI:** I didn't participate in every

1 conversation, but in the fall of 2009, the Staff was  
2 disputing the interpretation that we had based our  
3 application on to just use the bonus directly for the  
4 commercial. And there was some correspondence between  
5 myself and the City Attorney on this point.

6 At that point, the Staff had said, "We won't even  
7 process the application unless you ask us to take an  
8 interpretation to the Planning Commission as a separate  
9 agenda item without the project, just in the abstract,  
10 and then we'll go forward."

11 But in March of 2010, they changed. They gave us  
12 different direction and said, "No, we don't need to do  
13 that two-step process if you give us a letter that just  
14 says you're asking this as a concession," which is the  
15 second way that you can approve this. So we're here  
16 under that scenario.

17 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Thank you.

18 **CLAIRE BERNOWSKI:** So we're a little bit confused as  
19 to why the Staff wanted you to vote on this. We still  
20 would like our project to be discussed.

21 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Thank you.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, if there's no further questions  
23 regarding the motion that's on the table regarding the  
24 interpretation of the affordable bonus --

25 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, Mr. Chair --

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes?

2           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** -- now that I am hearing this  
3 for the first time, I'm feeling that the applicant was  
4 misled by Staff.

5           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, does that change the --

6           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** It changes -- it either means  
7 that I'm going to recuse myself from voting, but I'm not  
8 comfortable that there's been sort of a bait-and-switch  
9 thing going on here.

10          **CHAIR YEBER:** I mean, John, you can clarify this,  
11 but I read it as that it was just a --

12          **JOHN KEHO:** So in either case, they're asking for  
13 using commercial square footage as -- in either case,  
14 they're asking to get additional commercial square  
15 footage by providing one affordable unit and four at  
16 market rate.

17           The question is what's the process to get that,  
18 whether it's the interpretation or a concession.

19           Recently, the Planning Commission heard an item that  
20 was a 100% affordable housing, and they asked for a lot  
21 of concessions on that project. The Planning Commission  
22 was concerned about setting a precedent by approving the  
23 concessions for that project.

24           So when we're looking at this project, if an  
25 interpretation is made in favor of the applicant, it

1 would apply to one project only because if the City  
2 Council adopts the zoning regulations that are going  
3 through the process because there's no other projects in  
4 the works that are this type, so an interpretation would  
5 be basically restricted to this one project.

6 If, however, a concession is granted for commercial  
7 square footage, that's going off of our listed menu of  
8 concessions in the zoning ordinance, and it's possible  
9 that other projects may want to do the very same thing in  
10 the future. And so that's where Staff's concern is.

11 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So essentially what you're  
12 saying is if the Planning Commission interprets the  
13 zoning code to permit the housing bonus to increase the  
14 FAR, it would only be for this project.

15 However, in the alternative the Planning Commission  
16 can say the code does not have this sort of  
17 interpretation, or we shouldn't interpret the code in  
18 this way, but we will concede that because you're  
19 building affordable housing, you can have increased FAR.  
20 Then other developers can use this precedent to build  
21 housing on their sites and, therefore, increase FAR. Is  
22 that what you're saying?

23 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. Obviously, the City Council  
24 would have to support the zoning ordinance change, and  
25 also there (would) be the evidence that they need the

1 concession to make the project work.

2 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** So essentially we can vote  
3 that the code should not be interpreted this way and  
4 still grant the concession and the project still goes  
5 forward?

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** You're assuming that one vote's going  
7 to go one way and the next vote's going to go the other  
8 way. I mean --

9 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** Because they're two totally  
10 separate things.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right. I know, but I mean we haven't  
12 even got there yet. I sort of feel like let's --

13 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** He's just asking if that is  
14 a possibility, which, of course, the answer is yes.

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

16 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can I ask a follow-up  
17 question then just to clarify something? Does that mean  
18 that if we accepted the idea that you could apply it to  
19 commercial, which is the motion -- well, that's not the  
20 motion now. That's the opposite of the motion now -- we  
21 would not wind up discussing the other, or do we have to  
22 answer both questions tonight?

23 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** They just want a certain square  
24 footage. They don't really care how they get it.

25 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** But I don't --



1           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** You don't need [them both].

2           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** My understanding is that if  
3 we basically accept the Staff's interpretation, which is  
4 what the motion is, that we then could either decide to  
5 go forward and make another motion to accept the project  
6 with concessions or we could make some other motion like  
7 they need to do more whatever, correct?

8           **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

9           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** So we don't need to  
10 necessarily approve the project tonight, although I  
11 understand the applicant would like that.

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

13          **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** John, at any point, did the  
14 project have the residential units on the top and no  
15 affordable?

16          **JOHN KEHO:** They always had affordable.

17          **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, so that was always a  
18 part of the mix and at no time was it ever discussed or  
19 suggested that they just not build the residential so  
20 that they would have the square footage they needed to  
21 make the project work commercially?

22          **JOHN KEHO:** There was -- I believe there were  
23 several different iterations of discussions of how many  
24 units were going to be on the project. If they dropped  
25 below five, they wouldn't be eligible for 1818, so there

1 was some discussion about can they build fewer units,  
2 then they couldn't obtain any bonuses from 1818, so  
3 that's why there's the five units.

4       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** And I know money is not part  
5 of our deliberations, but for some reason, they think  
6 that these five units are going to pencil somehow. I  
7 mean I realize that's -- in other words, they wouldn't  
8 take the square footage that they [could've get] from not  
9 building the units and make it pencil?

10       **JOHN KEHO:** Right. Well, I'm sure they think it  
11 would pencil, but that's what the incentive of getting  
12 additional square footage --

13       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Right.

14       **JOHN KEHO:** -- helps make it all pencil out.

15       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Right.

16       **CHRISTI HOGIN:** And when you're talking about a  
17 concession, in fact, they need to show that the  
18 concession is necessary in order to build the affordable  
19 housing.

20       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay, (inaudible - multiple  
21 speakers).

22       **CHRISTI HOGIN:** On this unusual case, we usually  
23 don't look at the finances, but in this case, we do.

24       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Okay.

25       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. And other questions,

1 discussion?

2 All right, David, we take a vote on the motion  
3 that's on the table, which is our interpretation of the  
4 bonus, the affordable housing bonus.

5 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** The motion on the floor is to  
6 support staff's interpretation --

7 **CHAIR YEBER:** Interpretation.

8 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** -- and not the proposed one from the  
9 applicant.

10 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

11 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul?

12 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

13 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner?

14 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

15 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein?

16 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** No.

17 **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker?

18 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yes.

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

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

21 **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber?

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

23 **DAVID GILLIG:** Motion carries. Four ayes, two nos,  
24 and one recusal.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So now this brings us to number

1 two, and that's where we can discuss the other strategy,  
2 which would be the concessions, is that correct?

3 **ADRIAN GALLO:** Yes.

4 **CHAIR YEBER:** How they achieve this project with the  
5 concessions.

6 **JOHN KEHO:** Right. You can start talking about that  
7 or any of the other things, yes.

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

9 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I don't preclude the  
10 concessions, but I think before we get to the  
11 concessions, the project should go back for some review  
12 and redesign and a re-look at in terms of, number one,  
13 neighborhood meetings, which never ever occurred on this  
14 particular project and I think is totally essential to  
15 incorporate the feelings of the residents in West  
16 Hollywood West and the entire community if anybody wants  
17 to go to these neighborhood meetings. And I believe  
18 there should be two, and I don't believe they should be  
19 before Christmas.

20 I also think that there should be a process to vet  
21 and to have public comment and to have decision maker  
22 comment on the traffic study that either exists and was  
23 just released yesterday or that traffic study as amended  
24 and brought up to date to match the project as it appears  
25 today.

1 I think those two things are essential before moving  
2 forward and making a decision on either approving the  
3 negative declaration or the project, and that, I believe,  
4 would be in the form of direction or a motion, whatever  
5 the City Attorney would deem appropriate.

6 **CHAIR YEBER:** If I hear you, though, it sounds like  
7 you're making a motion to have this item continued to a  
8 date certain?

9 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** To a date certain or a date  
10 uncertain, whichever Staff feels is more appropriate to  
11 get accomplished.

12 The input of the neighborhood on what actually is  
13 being proposed and I think the very vital completion of  
14 an analysis of the traffic conditions that would be  
15 [extent] if this project were built.

16 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, so is that a motion?

17 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Sure.

18 **CHAIR YEBER:** Do we have a second?

19 **JOHN KEHO:** So, again, so you're wanting us to--?

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Continue the project to a  
21 date that you're --

22 **JOHN KEHO:** I understand that, to a date uncertain.  
23 On the traffic, you're wanting us to give an update to  
24 explain -- to have a written explanation by --

25 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** To have -- on the traffic, I

1 would like the traffic study processed in a way that  
2 serves the proper public process. In other words, the  
3 traffic study --

4 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** This project --

5 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** The traffic study analyzed  
6 and processed in a way that properly serves our public  
7 process --

8 **JOHN KEHO:** Okay.

9 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- which it hasn't been to  
10 date.

11 **CHAIR YEBER:** You mentioned a couple things. You  
12 mentioned the traffic --

13 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Neighborhood meetings.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** -- neighborhood meetings, and --

15 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** And design.

16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Design review.

17 **CHAIR YEBER:** Design.

18 **JOHN KEHO:** So two neighborhood meetings and a  
19 design review subcommittee meeting?

20 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Right.

21 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

22 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Or more than one Design  
23 Review subcommittee meeting if the Design review  
24 Subcommittee so feels it's necessary, which they might.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. Thoughts, discussion on this

1 particular motion, which is to continue the item to allow  
2 the applicant to --

3 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** I'll second the motion since  
4 we haven't a second.

5 **CHAIR YEBER:** Oh, sorry. Thank you, Commissioner  
6 Buckner.

7 Discussion? Commissioner Guardarrama?

8 **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I think the motion is  
9 onerous with respect to the two neighborhood meetings. I  
10 would support one neighborhood meeting and public  
11 discussion of the traffic study. Design Review is fine.

12 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Do you want to amend the  
13 motion to one meeting instead of two and see if there's a  
14 second on that? Would you accept that?

15 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** I would accept that  
16 amendment, one meeting instead of two, with the -- it  
17 doesn't have to be part of the motion, but with the hope  
18 that the applicant will coordinate with West Hollywood  
19 West and Mrs. Meister for the date so that the most  
20 amount of people that are interested could show up. And  
21 I think Mr. Afriat can be counted on to do that.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** And is -- the seconder of the motion  
23 accept the amendment?

24 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

25 **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, and then --

1           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can I --

2           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, Commissioner Bernstein?

3           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Just clarification, and  
4 maybe the motion maker can just explain this (inaudible)  
5 question. What are we -- in this motion, what are we  
6 requiring be done as far as the traffic study?

7           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** That the Staff take a look  
8 at it and process it in a way that it deserves to be  
9 processed. I don't know exactly what we're requiring.

10           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** This is my question then  
11 for Staff or City Attorney because I'm just really  
12 confused and I need clarification on this. My impression  
13 is that your study -- impression is that the former  
14 traffic study doesn't apply and that the traffic impacts  
15 that you've examined do not meet a threshold to require a  
16 traffic study. Can you clarify that?

17           **JOHN KEHO:** That's correct. So I guess what I was  
18 hearing is we need to have an explanation as to what  
19 happened with that old traffic study and why it doesn't  
20 apply so people can fully understand why it's not  
21 applicable --

22           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** It was never publicly  
23 vetted, and it needs to be.

24           **JOHN KEHO:** -- why it's no longer applicable  
25 anymore.



1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Or update it if you choose  
2 to do it.

3           **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

4           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Or if the applicant chooses  
5 to do it, which they may.

6           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** So if this motion passes  
7 and the traffic study -- and I apologize for dragging  
8 this out, but I'm just trying to understand this -- Staff  
9 explains why the traffic study did not apply to this  
10 project, they take public comment, and Staff remains of  
11 the opinion the traffic study did not need to be applied  
12 to this project, then what happens?

13           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Staff is not the decision  
14 maker.

15           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I think we're getting  
16 jumbled. There are two traffic studies. There's one  
17 that was done for the earlier project that Staff deemed  
18 nonapplicable and Staff needs to explain why it's not  
19 applicable. There is another traffic study that was done  
20 by Staff, not by an independent contractor, is that  
21 right?

22           **JOHN KEHO:** Correct.

23           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** And that traffic study, I  
24 think Commissioner Altschul wants public input on it. He  
25 wants a public process on that.

1           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Okay, thank you. Is that--  
2 ?

3           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

4           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Thank you.

5           **CHAIR YEBER:** I just have a question regarding the  
6 motion that's on the table in terms of the incentives.  
7 We never really have discussed the incentives that are  
8 being proposed before us. I don't know if this is the  
9 right avenue for that.

10           **JOHN KEHO:** I think it might be that at the next --  
11 when it comes back to you, you can get into overall  
12 project --

13           **CHAIR YEBER:** With the incentives?

14           **JOHN KEHO:** Right.

15           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay.

16           **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** I just want to clarify.  
17 It's completely possible that the traffics -- the Staff-  
18 done traffic study gets vetted by the public and the  
19 Staff comes back still with a negative declaration.

20           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes, it is.

21           **CHAIR YEBER:** The only thing I would add, if  
22 Commissioner Altschul is amenable, is that for Design  
23 Review that we do have more materials that give us a  
24 better sense of what it is that is being proposed from a  
25 design standpoint, including material board --

1           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Well, I was very surprised  
2 that there wasn't a massing model.

3           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes, there's a model, how that would  
4 fit into the neighborhood and the adjacent properties,  
5 maybe some more renderings that give us a better idea.

6           It would help immensely, at least for me, to  
7 understand how the compatibility issues fit in with this.  
8 Commissioner Altschul?

9           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** May I suggest that that be  
10 part of direction and not part of the motion because I  
11 think it's the purview of the Design Review Committee to  
12 require what it wants rather than be directed.

13           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right, but the problem is they're  
14 going to come to Design Review --

15           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** That's (inaudible - multiple  
16 speakers) --

17           **CHAIR YEBER:** -- hopefully with that. Okay, so part  
18 of the direction. Does that make sense, John?

19           **JOHN KEHO:** Yes.

20           **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay. So are we -- is everyone ready  
21 to make a vote?

22           David, will you do a roll call, please?

23           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Altschul?

24           **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yes.

25           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Buckner?

1           **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** Yes.

2           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Bernstein?

3           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Yes.

4           **DAVID GILLIG:** Commissioner Hamaker?

5           **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yes.

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

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

8           **DAVID GILLIG:** Chair Yeber?

9           **CHAIR YEBER:** Yes.

10          **DAVID GILLIG:** Motion carries. Five ayes, one no,  
11 one recusal.

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

13          Okay, we're going to move on so we can get out of  
14 here.

15          New business, we have none. No unfinished business.  
16 No excluded consent calendar.

17          Items from staff. John?

18          **JOHN KEHO:** The only thing I wanted to add was also  
19 at the last meeting you asked for an update on the 10-day  
20 appeal period for directors' hearings because that was a  
21 project that was before you previously.

22          So in consultation with the City Attorney's office,  
23 we've never in the past issued letters saying when a  
24 director's opinion is effective, so the 10-day period  
25 would start, so we'll start doing that, so that way it's

1 more clear to the public when that date starts.

2 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Okay, public comment.

3 Christie, remind me again, if someone speaks at the  
4 front half, they can't speak at the back end on public  
5 comment?

6 **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Jeanne, I think she spoke on the  
7 consent calendar item.

8 **CHAIR YEBER:** Right, that's fine, and we told her  
9 she could speak on that, but I do have a slip for Lauren  
10 in because, Lauren, you made a comment at the front end,  
11 you won't be able to make a comment at the back end.

12 So we'll start with Jeanne Dobrin, followed by Dan  
13 Siegel.

14 **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Thank you. It's Jeanne Dobrin,  
15 resident of West Hollywood.

16 I think because I'm not perfect -- I'm just almost  
17 perfect -- that the City requirement for -- that hooks up  
18 with SB-1818 works this way, or maybe it's a condition of  
19 SB-1818 that at least [24%] of the market rate new  
20 residential units must be affordable, but it doesn't say  
21 anything about 20% of what in a commercial building. 20%  
22 of the FAR, 20% of something else? No. It says 20% of  
23 the market rate housing must be at least provided in  
24 order to obtain the benefit. I think that is right.

25 The other thing is that our brilliant transportation

1 expert, the former director of transportation -- or  
2 manager, I should say, [Terry Slimmer], has been laid off  
3 by this city, and no one is taking her place. In fact,  
4 on the case of the Miller Drive and Sunset Boulevard and  
5 La Cienega intersection, I asked Mr. [Chung] when he said  
6 that just restriping the lanes of traffic would solve the  
7 problem if this Miller Drive thing went ahead, I said,  
8 "So if it would've solved it then -- now, in the future,  
9 why haven't you changed the lines of traffic now?" And  
10 he said to me, "I don't know."

11 So if that is going to be an example of our Staff  
12 ruling and giving direction or information to the  
13 Commission, I say it is no damn good. Thank you.

14 **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you. Dan?

15 **DAN SIEGEL:** I'm not sure of the process. I know I  
16 can't ask a question. I mean I can ask it, but I can't  
17 expect an answer, but -- am I allowed to talk about what  
18 we just discussed, or does it have to be a new issue?

19 **CHAIR YEBER:** Are you talking about the item we just  
20 --

21 **DAN SIEGEL:** Yes.

22 **CHAIR YEBER:** No, this is a time for items that are  
23 not part of the public (inaudible).

24 **DAN SIEGEL:** Okay, well, then this is just a general  
25 --

1           **CHAIR YEBER:** Right.

2           **DAN SIEGEL:** -- about any project in the city where  
3 some developer has -- he owns the block, but he takes one  
4 part of it and develops that, and then he takes another  
5 part and develops that, and he takes a third part and  
6 develops that, so he doesn't -- none of it is big enough  
7 to require an EIR.

8           But at the end, he ties the whole project together  
9 and says, "I want benefits from having the entire  
10 project, and I didn't -- what's left over, my FAR, which  
11 is on the first two things that I built, I want you to  
12 give me that because I didn't use it."

13           But then the EIR is going to look at the impact of  
14 the entire block. The last project, when he ties it all  
15 together, has got to say, "Well, I just optioned to tie  
16 everything together, so you've got to look at my impacts  
17 from everything going back to the very first thing I  
18 built."

19           That's my understanding. I've never heard of  
20 someone tying together something that they've already  
21 built and getting benefit for it and transferring FAR but  
22 not having to pay the price, which is that the impact has  
23 to be considered for the entire block because you could  
24 do this -- have a city block and do it 20 feet at a time  
25 until you've finished and there's no impact that's large

1 enough to require anything.

2       And then you want to tie it all together at the end  
3 to get the benefit on the last piece that you didn't get  
4 to use in the first ones. It doesn't make sense, and it  
5 wasn't addressed at all in the thing that we're not  
6 talking about.

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

8       **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Mr. Chair, I only used a small  
9 amount of time. I had a third thing that I wanted to  
10 say.

11       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Oh, please.

12       **CHAIR YEBER:** Come on, Jeanne.

13       **JEANNE DOBRIN:** May I finish it?

14       **CHAIR YEBER:** Go ahead, Jeanne.

15       **JEANNE DOBRIN:** I noticed that in this project, it  
16 says that it's required to have a 10-foot rear yard  
17 setback.

18       **CHAIR YEBER:** Jeanne, what are you talking about?

19       **JEANNE DOBRIN:** A rear yard setback.

20       **CHAIR YEBER:** I know. Which -- are you talking  
21 about a specific project?

22       **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Yes.

23       **CHAIR YEBER:** Which project?

24       **JEANNE DOBRIN:** This one.

25       **CHAIR YEBER:** Okay, we can't discuss this project.



1 It is closed.

2           **JEANNE DOBRIN:** Okay. Then I want -- but I will say  
3 this, that I have noticed that in all residential  
4 projects, they require a 15-foot setback. Somehow or  
5 other, this is not a residential project that is not  
6 going to have to supply 20% of its market rate units.  
7 Thank you.

8           **CHAIR YEBER:** Thank you.  
9           Comments from the Commissioners? Commissioner  
10 Buckner?

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

12           **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Bernstein?

13           **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Yes. I implore Staff, the  
14 City Attorney, our Chair, whoever, we need to figure out  
15 what we're going to do about 1818. We mandate affordable  
16 housing with our projects. It's going to trigger 1818.  
17 It's going to come to us over and over again, and it is  
18 burdensome and oppressive on our community, and we don't  
19 seem well prepared to figure out how to counteract all  
20 the additional requirements that people are entitled to  
21 ask for under it, and --

22           **CHRISTI HOGIN:** Entitled to ask for if they  
23 establish that it's required financially to make it work,  
24 and that's your standard. So you just need to make sure  
25 that the evidence in front of you establishes that the

1 concession is required to make the project financially  
2 feasible.

3       **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Then I feel like we need  
4 better guidance on what creates financial feasibility or  
5 prevents financial feasibility if that's the  
6 determination we need to make going forward.

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

8       **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** No.

9       **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Hamaker?

10       **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Happy holidays. It's a  
11 little early, but we're not going to meet again before  
12 the holidays, so everybody drive safely, don't drive  
13 drunk, and have a wonderful time.

14       **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama?

15       **VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA:** And Happy New Year because  
16 we won't be back till January 20.

17       **CHAIR YEBER:** And I want to echo both Commissioner  
18 Guardarrama and Hamaker. Be safe.

19       I also wanted real quick -- a couple commissioners  
20 have approached me about getting a little more  
21 information about architects and identifying different  
22 styles, so I looked and found two really inexpensive  
23 books, but they're really helpful in terms of  
24 illustration and explaining.

25       One is *Rice's Architectural Primer* and the second

1 one is *Language of Doors*. Even though it shows doors, it  
2 really incorporates a lot of fenestration ideas.

3 Also, if you wanted to find out more information  
4 about modern in Los Angeles and its place, there's a very  
5 good documentary out called *Visual Acoustics*. It's  
6 basically a documentary on Julius Shulman, who's the  
7 foregone -- who is the foremost authority on  
8 architectural photography. He's since passed, but his  
9 photographs everyone has seen. You may not know his name  
10 or recognize his photographs, but I recommend that if you  
11 want to find out more about the evolution of the modern  
12 movement in Los Angeles and why it's so important.

13 And with that, we adjourn until our next meeting,  
14 which is January 20, 2011. See you in the New Year.  
15 Thank you.


16 [Meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.]

17 -o0o-

18  
19 APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON  
20 THIS 20<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY, 2011.

21  
22   
CHAIRPERSON

23 ATTEST:

24  
25   
COMMISSION SECRETARY