1	CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
2	THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2011 AT 6:30 PM
3	PROCEEDINGS
4	CHAIR YEBER: Good evening. We're going to start
5	this meeting in about two minutes, so if everyone will
6	take their seats.
7	And if you are planning to speak tonight, please
8	turn in a speaker slip to Mr. David Gillig. We'll
9	need that in advance.
LO	And could I ask Lauren Meister to join us or lead
l1	us in the Pledge of Allegiance, since we haven't seen
L2	you in a while?
L3	LAUREN MEISTER: Good evening.
L4	(Pledge of Allegiance)
L 5	LAUREN MEISTER: Thank you.
L6	CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Ms. Meister. David, can
L7	I have a roll call?
L8	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Good evening.
L9	Commissioner DeLuccio?
20	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Here.
21	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner
22	Hamaker?
23	COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Here.
24	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner
25	Buckner?

1 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Here. 2 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner Bernstein? 3 4 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Here. 5 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner Altschul? 6 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Here. 8 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Vice-Chair 9 Guardarrama? 10 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Here. 11 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Chair Yeber? 12 CHAIR YEBER: Here. 13 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: And we have a 14 quorum. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Great. Approval of the Agenda. We 16 have a request to move item 9B to the consent 17 calendar, unless we have speakers on that. 18 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: We have one 19 speaker. 20 CHAIR YEBER: One speaker. All right. So how 21 about if we move that to 9A, and so that we can get 22 that one out of the way? COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll make a motion --23 2.4 COMMISSIONER GUARDARRAMA: If the speaker can 25 speak right now; we can still do it.

```
1
          CHAIR YEBER: Well, let's just let -- we'll just
 2
     go through the normal --
 3
          COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Who is -- David, who's
 4
     the speaker? Is it the applicant?
          COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG:
 6
          CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Why don't --
 7
          COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll make a -- I'll make
     a motion that we move 9B to 9A and motion to adopt the
 8
 9
     agenda.
10
          CHAIR YEBER: Do I have a second?
11
          COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:
                                Second.
12
          CHAIR YEBER: Any objections?
13
          COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:
14
          CHAIR YEBER: All in favor?
15
          (All members present state, "Aye".)
16
          CHAIR YEBER: Seeing no objections, the
17
      agenda passes. Approval of the minutes from
18
      February 3rd, 2011. Is there a motion to approve
      the minutes?
19
20
          COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:
                                  Move to approve.
21
          COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:
                                   Second.
22
          CHAIR YEBER: All in favor?
23
          (All members present state, "Aye".)
2.4
          CHAIR YEBER: Any objections?
25
          [COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN]:
                                      Please note my
```

2.0

2.4

abstention.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. So noted. All right.

We'll move on to public comment. I have two
speakers, starting with Lauren Meister, followed
by Steve Martin. Thanks again for leading us.

LAUREN MEISTER: Good evening, Commissioners.

Lauren Meister, resident of West Hollywood. You spend a lot of time reading staff reports and listening to the public and deliberating when you have a public hearing regarding a CUP.

Residents such as myself also spend a lot of time preparing in order to articulate the community's feeling and communicate our issues.

I've discovered that all of our hard work is for nothing because now, behind closed doors,

Planning Staff is changing conditions of CUPs at their discretion, without your input, without the community's input, and due process and public hearings have become a farce; for example,

Craig's Restaurant on Melrose.

This is a symptoms of the ills of City Hall and this can only be cured with a change starting at the top. John Damico and Steve Martin have a real chance of making that happen, and I hope the community will get out and vote on March 8th. We

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

need to vote for change. We need to vote for transparency in government and vote for a city that respects its residents, respects its commissioners, respects the public process. March 8th. Vote John Damico and Steve Martin and Thank you very much. vote no on Measure A. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Thank you. Martin? Thank you, Lauren. MR. MARTIN: Steve Martin, West Hollywood. Apparently a flyer is being sent out to all renters indicating that John Dimico is no friend of West Hollywood renters. But I want to tell you who really isn't a friend of West Hollywood renters; all of the incumbents: John Heilman, Abbe Land, and Lindsey Horvath. Over the last five years we have witnessed a barrage of demolition of rent-controlled units to make way for luxury condos, and our City Council has done nothing to help tenants. Myself and a number other people in the community have been arguing and pleading and coming before this Commission and the City Council and the general plan asking that the City

repeal the incentives that encourage the

2.4

destruction of rent-controlled units. Those pleas have fallen on deaf ears because we have the best city council money can buy. And that's not my quote; that's Jean Dobrin's.

Our City Council is bankrolling this campaign by developers. And if you don't think so, ask where John Heilman, Abbe Land, and Lindsey Horvath's campaign headquarters are. They're at the [Caston] project, the project that this Commission said was too big because it's 10 stories on Santa Monica. It's the same project that our own transportation department said would cause gridlock on three intersections.

But money talks at City Hall and that's why our City Council approved the Caston project, despite the incredible impacts it will have that will be adverse to the quality of life of this city.

Tenants in West Hollywood don't have friends at City Hall. No one cares. If you're a low-income person in a building that's being demolished, and right now there's five buildings where people have received notices that they're being [L-S'd] out. You don't get to the top of the line for rent stable -- or for affordable

2.4

housing. If you're not -- if you're not on the list, it's -- you're out of luck.

But right now we have a number of -- we've got over 100 people who face eviction, including people on Olive because the City Council, John Heilman and Abbe Lane in particular, voted for the Sunset Time which is allowing all the rent-controlled units on the east side of Olive to be demolished to make way for rent-controlled housing.

That's not leadership. That's not leadership that protects the diversity of this community.

Our renters, this entire community, deserves better. Thank you so much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. All right. With that, we'll move onto items from Commissioner. Commissioner Guardarrama.

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Many of you already know this. But for those of you that don't, tonight is my last Planning Commission meeting. I have resigned from the Planning Commission effective tomorrow because I've taken a job practicing law that is not compatible with this particular appointment.

But I wanted to thank everybody for a

1 marvelous and challenging eight years. Commissioners that are still on this Commission 2 when I first came onboard that helped me so much, 3 Commissioner Altschul and Barbara Hamaker and 4 Donald DeLuccio, and then all the new Commissioners, Sue Buckner and Allen Bernstein 6 and our Chair, Marc Yeber. And many 7 Commissioners that are no longer on this 8 9 Commission that also helped me out. And I'd also like to thank the late [Sal 10 11 Guarriello] for appointing me and giving this 12 opportunity to a 28-year-old. That was amazing. 13 Thank you, Sal. And also to Lindsey Horvath for 14 keeping me onboard after Sal died. And I also wanted to thank our marvelous 15 planning staff for making this very easy on me 16 17 and to our great City Attorney, Mike Jenkins, and 18 Assistant City Attorney, Christi Hogan, for being 19 so fantastic and so supportive of me. So thank 20 you. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Commissioner 22 Buckner. 23 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I just wanted to tell 2.4 Commissioner Guardarrama that I'm going to miss 25 you a lot and I wish you really a great

2.4

experience in your new job. I look forward to connecting up with you downtown.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Bernstein?

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I want to echo those thoughts and just say how much I'm going to miss having you here. And I also just want to say, since you may be watching, that I'm sad that Jean Dobrin isn't here tonight. I hope she is doing well and will be back here soon.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul?

commissioner altschul: Yeah. I too am very sad that Joe is leaving the Commission. It seems that eight years went by very, very fast. And your service here was brilliant, congenial, intellectually marvelous, and just such a joy to be able to serve on this Commission with you. And lots of good luck in your new job and hope to see you around city activities quite frequently.

Also, with respect to what Lauren said about changing CUPs, I believe she was referring to circulation and valet parking in an alley behind the restaurant that used to be Figaro's. And when -- in one of its prior iterations right after Figaro's, there were heated discussions about using that alley for -- for circulation and

1 for the res -- the various restaurants on that 2 block. So I was wondering if we could please 3 agendize a review of that situation and take a 4 look to see whether or not it's appropriate at this point. 6 7 I can certainly give you an JOHN KEHO: 8 update on what that change was today. 9 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, along with the 10 update, could we please agendize it so we can 11 discuss it to see if it's appropriate? 12 JOHN KEHO: Sure. 13 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Hamaker? 14 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'm thrilled for you, 15 Joe. I think it's going to be wonderful. I'm really going to miss you a lot. And you have 16 17 just been a wonderful Commissioner and a joy to 18 know. So very, very best to you. 19 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner DELUCCIO? 20 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: You've been a 21 wonderful Commissioner from day one, Joseph. 22 were up and running from the beginning. You're 23 so -- you're very modest. And I'm just a little 2.4 disappointed. I thought you were going to be a 25 lifer like Commissioner Altschul and myself.

2.0

2.4

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I realized that I forgot to thank a couple members of the public that always come to Commission meetings and always say thoughtful comments. I can think of many off the top of my head. Jeanne Dobrin, your comments and your presence were always helpful. Though we may not always agree, they were very helpful.

And also members of the public like Lauren

Meister and Steve Martin and Tom DeMille and a

lot of other members of the public, Ed Buck, that

would come and give their opinion. We listened

all the time, though we may not always agree.

Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: All right. Well, everyone has pretty much said what I was thinking. But I did want to focus on something that Commissioner Altschul said about the congeniality that's been expressed by Commissioner Guardarrama.

One of the things that struck me when I joined four years ago was the level of grace and fairness that you seem to approach every issue. And that makes a big difference. And I want to thank you for that. I want to thank you for

2.0

2.4

serving as Vice Chair. I know you made my job a little easier because we were able to consult on a couple of issues to help, you know, move the process along and -- and make sure it was clear and understandable, not only for this body but also for the public, so.

But congratulations, mazel tov. Good luck.

And I hope you will stay involved in the City.

With that, we will move to -- we have nothing on the consent calendar. We'll move to our first public hearing. Does staff want to make a brief presentation since it seems like this is not a controversial issue and we only have one speaker?

ANTONIO CASTILLO: Sure. Good evening,
Chairperson Yeber and Members of the Commission.
The item before you this evening is a request to
convert an existing rental housing building into
a condominium, property located at 1031 North
Crescent Heights Boulevard.

The building was built in '89 and consists of a two-story, 15-unit apartment building above semi-subterranean garage. The property was developed with individual open spaces, balconies, terraces, and a common open space within the rear, rear yard area consisting of a swimming

2.4

pool and a patio area.

The proposal does not include any physical changes to the building or site. And the property owner has indicated that there are no immediate plans to sell the property and intends to maintain it as rental units.

It is staff's assessment that the development is well designed, it is complimentary to the context of the neighborhood, and meets the development standards with the exception of the open space. The building is as nearly in conformance with the minimum open space requirements as is practical without substantial modifications to the building and site.

Therefore, the staff recommends approval of the project as conditioned in the attached resolutions for the development permit as well as the tentative tract map.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Are there any disclosures regarding this particular property from the Commission?

Okay. Seeing none? Any questions for staff?

All right. And we have only one speaker. Is
that the applicant? Mr. King? Are you the
applicant?

1 MICHAEL KING: No, I'm not. Okay. So three minutes? 2 CHAIR YEBER: 3 MICHAEL KING: I won't need that much. CHAIR YEBER: 4 Okay. State your name and city 5 of -- city of residence. 6 MICHAEL KING: Yes. My name's Michael King. I live in West Hollywood. I'm a 24, 25-year 7 resident of the City. For a number of years, I 8 9 lived about four blocks from this particular 10 building. And the reason I'm here today is to ask you to approve it. I fear if you don't that 11 12 the current owner will be tempted, even though he states otherwise, the current owner may be 13 14 tempted to sell the property to somebody who will 15 develop it. And we have a lot of developments in the city now that are three and four stories and 16 17 going taller, and we certainly don't want that in 18 any of our neighborhoods. 19 So please go ahead and approve this. 20 you. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. David, we have no 22 other speakers on this item? 23 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: None. 2.4 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. So with that, we'll 25 close the public hearing as long as there's no

1 objection. And there's a question from 2 Commissioner Altschul. 3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No, not a question. I would move --4 5 CHAIR YEBER: Comment. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- the staff 6 7 recommendation. 8 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Second. 9 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. All in favor? 10 (All members present state, "Aye".) 11 CHAIR YEBER: Anybody opposed? All right. 12 So passes unanimously. 13 All right. So we'll move on to the 14 conditional use permit, development permit for 15 1317 Crescent Heights Boulevard. We'll start 16 with a staff report. 17 Thank you, Chair and JOHN KEHO: 18 Commissioners. As Adrian's getting situated, I 19 just wanted to first off acknowledge to the 20 Commissioners that this is a very complicated There's a lot of issues involved in this 21 22 project. 23 The first complication is that this facility 2.4 is a nonconforming use. The temple was built 25 many, many years ago under county regulations

2.4

and, therefore, it doesn't have a conditional use permit that the City has issued. So, therefore, it's nonconforming to City requirements for not having a conditional use permit.

Because the applicants want to build a parking structure on the property, they have to first get a conditional use permit to come into compliance. By obtaining a conditional use permit, the City now will have the ability to add land use regulations that regulate the operations of the facility, including the proposed garage and the banquet facilities.

And what staff has proposed -- has proposed before you is a resolution that includes regulations of the garage and banquet facilities and the establishment during construction, after the garage is built, and we're also proposing now tonight conditions that would regulate the establishment prior to construction of the garage.

Another complication involved in this project has to do with the fact that it's a religious facility and it doesn't fall neatly into the categories that the Planning Commission is used to reviewing. It's -- you know, the City

2.4

typically deals with either residential properties or commercial properties.

This is a religious land use, and the City allows religious land uses to be developed in both residential and commercial zones. So it doesn't really fall under the traditional categories of those two standards.

That leads to the complication of what development standards apply to something such as the addition of a parking garage on this facility. So what we do is we apply the development standards of the residential zone where appropriate, such as height limitations and setbacks. And then we use other portions of the zoning ordinance to regulate it such as the development standards for parking structures.

So again, it's kind of a interesting use since it doesn't fall into our typical neat categories.

So that's kind of just a overall kind of acknowledging the complications with this project. And I'm going to turn the item over to Adrian to go over the staff report.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you.

ADRIAN GALLO: Thank you, Chair Yeber, and

2.4

good evening, Commissioners. The proposal before you this evening is for the property located at 1317 Crescent Heights Boulevard, the Iranian American Jewish Center. The applicant is proposing to construct a three-level parking structure, one level below grade and two above.

The subject site is the northern most parcel of the temple at the northwest corner of Fountain Avenue and Crescent Heights Avenue. The development in this area consists mostly of high density, multifamily structures from two to seven stories in height.

The temple has existed prior to the City's incorporation and is considered legal and nonconforming. As John mentioned, the parking structure addition which would require the applicant to obtain a conditional use permit to legalize the existing [religious] facility.

The parking structure would provide 101 onsite parking spaces. The increase in parking would bring the facility closer to compliance with current parking standards. The representatives of the facility state that the structure is needed to alleviate parking and noise issues that have been reoccurring concerns

2.4

of the neighborhood community.

Although the project is providing additional parking, no increase in attendance is expected because Neman and Sapper Hall will remain with the same occupancy.

This project is part of an institutional use in an otherwise multifamily residential district. As such, the project respects a character of existing properties in the immediate area to the use of similar setbacks, building arrangements, buffer yards, and the avoidance of (inaudible) [building scale].

The application as proposed will not have substantial adverse impacts on the environment and is categorically exempt from the requirements of [SEQUA] pursuant to the [info] exemptions of the guidelines.

A traffic and circulation assessment of the proposed parking structure was conducted by the City's Long Range and [Mobility] Planning Division. The assessment focused on the potential offsite traffic impacts of the proposed parking structure and its interface with the public right-of-way. It is anticipated that the size and arrival patterns for the events held at

2.0

2.4

the IAJC will remain the same even with a garage. Therefore, there will not be an increase in traffic and significant impacts at adjacent intersections are not expected.

After having considered all of the concerns expressed by the neighbors, staff has concluded, with heavy conditioning, the potential adverse impacts of the proposed parking structure should be prevented -- should prevent -- be prevented or significantly mitigated.

The applicant has provided an events operations plan that seeks to build a relationship -- a relationship with its residential neighbors that is both transparent and verifiable. The permit will be reviewed six months after the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. This particular condition will provide ample opportunity for the neighbors to report unforeseen negative impacts resultant from this permit.

And therefore, staff recommends conditional approval of the request because the proposal would provide additional onsite parking for current and future visitors of IAJC, enclose the parking, and locate the loading zone and visitor

2.3

2.4

drop off and pick up inside the parking structure.

Furthermore, the conditions placed on the project will help protect the integrity of their residential neighborhood while allowing the IAJC to operate.

After consulting with legal counsel, staff has amended the following conditions, 1.1 and 14.1, and added section 15 regarding operations of a religious facility before construction begins. These additions were forwarded to you earlier today and a hard copy was provided before the meeting.

Additional comments have been placed for public review.

Thank you. And I'm available for any questions you have.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you, Adrian.

Commissioner Altschul?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The conditions with respect to the operations of the facility itself just arrived today. And I notice on the agenda for April the 7th, there's a proposed zone text amendment for banquet facilities in residential areas, under which I assume this facility falls.

2.0

2.4

So is it not either premature or putting the cart before the horse to hear conditions of operation of the banquet hall itself prior to a discussion and adoption or non-adoption of the zone text amendment regarding the same subject?

JOHN KEHO: No, because the applicant has an application for your review at this moment in time and they are applying for a conditional use permit. And so that gives us the ability to establish these conditions.

What the point of the zone text amendment would be would be to address facilities in residential zones that don't have a CUP and aren't moving forward with any project. And so that would allow us to require them to come into compliance as well.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So in other words, if this were adopted tonight it would be totally dispositive of this location and this facility and the zone text amendment coming forth in a month addresses every other possible facility? And I see a nod of the head.

JOHN KEHO: Right. Presuming that the applicants accept and acknowledge the conditions of this permit.

1 MICHAEL JENKINS: That's exactly right. 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Have the conditions of this permit been discussed with the applicants? 3 JOHN KEHO: Yes. 4 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And have they accepted 6 and -- accepted and acknowledged them as you just 7 said? 8 JOHN KEHO: They certainly acknowledged them. 9 They've accepted some of them. I think they might be 10 in disagreement with some of the others. 11 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay. 12 CHAIR YEBER: (Inaudible) 13 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Would this -- excuse me. 14 CHAIR YEBER: Go ahead. 15 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Would this project be 16 subject to all the conditions or whatever governing 17 restrictions and -- from the zone text amendment or 18 will they be excluded because they're getting their 19 CUP prior to the zone text amendment? 2.0 MICHAEL JENKINS: The zone text amendment as contemplated does not establish any conditions. 21 22 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Right. 23 MICHAEL JENKINS: All it does is require that 2.4 facilities in residential zones that do not have a 25 conditional use permit obtain one.

2.4

25

conditions.

1 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Okay. 2 MICHAEL JENKINS: The reason it doesn't have any 3 specific criteria is because these are case-by-case 4 determinations based on the specific characteristics 5 of each individual facility. And so it's very difficult, if not impossible, for us to conceptualize 6 7 conditions that could apply with equal force across the board. 8 9 Consequently, all it does is say that if there is 10 a facility, banquet facility, in a residential zone 11 that does not have a CUP, it must obtain one, at which 12 time it would be subject to a public hearing and the 13 imposition of conditions that would be suitable for 14 that facility. 15 As John indicated, in this instance, we have a 16 conditional use permit application before us tonight, 17 which would, therefore, vitiate the need for a 18 subsequent application under that ordinance. 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Thank you for the 2.0 clarification. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Donald? 22 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: What do I have before me this evening? You said I have another resolution? 23

ADRIAN GALLO: You have revised -- additional

1 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have revised conditions 2 -- and what -- there's a whole -- there's like pages 3 of them or just a couple? 4 ADRIAN GALLO: It's one page, back and front. 5 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. 6 ADRIAN GALLO: There's a memo attached to it. 7 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: What is -- can you just 8 like maybe read into the record, briefly, the key 9 emphasis of what these conditions are, what they have to do with? 10 11 We amended condition 1.1, ADRIAN GALLO: Sure. 12 which added language that requires the applicant to 13 accept the approval or not -- the approval within 90 14 days of adoption of the resolution. 15 Condition 14.1 added specific parameters for the 16 director to look at the operations plan submitted by 17 the applicant during the construction phase of the 18 project. 19 Section 15 is completely new. It wasn't in the 20 previous resolution. This section talks about 21 operation of the facility the moment we approve the 22 project, with hours of operation as well. But that's 23 up to the Commission to decide. 2.4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Well, what are the --25 what is the conditions that you're proposing right

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

now? Once this gets approved, up until the time it gets -- construction begins, correct? Are you proposing hours of eight a.m. to 10 p.m.?

ADRIAN GALLO: So currently the resolution that was in the packet only had to do with hours when the garage was built. The revised resolution -- the additional conditions address operation hours as of today if the CUP is adopted.

JOHN KEHO: And those are all listed on 15.7 on the back side. And it actually shows three different possibilities. One proposes hours as the applicant would request. The second shows hours that were being contemplated when the City Council was considering a business license for the establishment. And a third one is another alternative that could be added to encourage them to build the parking garage more quickly than otherwise by allowing them to have hours of operation as proposed by the applicant if they build the parking garage within one year. don't build it within one year, then the hours would be more restrictive.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. That's helpful to know this. I have another question actually. This piece of property where they want to build the parking structure, it's currently zoned R4?

1 ADRIAN GALLO: Correct. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Does it have a parking 2 3 overlay designation on it? ADRIAN GALLO: It does not. 4 5 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: So how can they build a 6 parking structure? 7 JOHN KEHO: The parking goes with the use. the religious facility can have parking. And so it 8 9 doesn't need an overlay to build parking for religious 10 use. The zoning ordinance talks about parking structures. And it says, parking structures for 11 12 residential or non-residential uses, so the park -- so the zoning ordinance contemplates parking structures 13 14 in residential zones. It is true that it's extremely rare for a parking 15 16 structure or residential zone to be built beside a 17 building because normally our properties are so small 18 the parking structures are built below, and so the 19 residential units are on top. There is at least one 2.0 residential building on, I think it's Larrabee, where 21 there is a parking structure built beside the 22 building. 23 So, you know, we don't have that many large 2.4 projects in which parking can just be built by the 25 So that's why they can build a multi-level

site.

1 structure without a building on top of it. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I only can ask questions. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Anybody else have questions 3 4 at this point? I just have a couple questions, 5 clarifications. In the staff report on 7/11, it says, this is the 6 paragraph below that picture on the staff report, 7 second sentence, as such, neither the City's 8 9 commercial nor its residential design quidelines seem 10 to strictly apply to the building design in this 11 particular case. 12 If you could clarify, Adrian or John, what -- how did you -- what design guidelines were used then to 13 14 determine that this is appropriate? I'll start talking and if Todd want -15 JOHN KEHO: - our urban designer, contract urban designer, he may 16 17 want to comment as well. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 19 But basically we take a look at the 20 existing building, try to make sure it's compatible 21 with the existing building and look at the scale and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. 22 23 What we're talking about in neither the 2.4 commercial or residential quidelines because those are 25 talking about a particular type of land use.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

residential quidelines are saying, if you're building a residential building, let's make it look like a residential building. Or the commercial guidelines talk about we want to have transparency and openness on the ground floor so you can see into the -- into the store. This is a religious facility, which doesn't do that. And it -- not only is it a religious facility, this is the garage component of that. So the guidelines don't apply strictly. But that's what we did is we take a look at how this is designed, does it kind of go with the existing building, and how does it impact the adjacent -- the adjacent buildings. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. I was wondering, do we -does our contract urban designer need to chime in from an urban design standpoint? We'd normally hear from someone at this point. JOHN KEHO: Sure, we see if he has anything. CHAIR YEBER: And while you're situating, I'll ask Adrian another question. Adrian, it says that currently it stage -- it can fit 51 cars. Is that in actual spaces or does that include the valet attended, you know, the stacking, the full-on stacking?

ADRIAN GALLO: Let me check really quick.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Gish? 2 TODD GISH: Commissioner -- or Chair Yeber and Commissioners, thank you. Am I answering a question, 3 4 or? CHAIR YEBER: Well, if you just want to speak 6 real quickly from an urban design standpoint. We usually do get, you know, projects of this nature, we 7 get someone to chime in on the urban design aspects at 8 9 this stage. 10 TODD GISH: All right. In terms of the City's design guidelines, that was a paragraph that I wrote 11 that I was looking at essentially the City's 12 residential quidelines. And it's not a residential 13 14 project. But there are -- there is reference in the 15 City's residential design guidelines about parking 16 structures and maintaining neighborhood features. 17 so those were the portions of the residential 18 guidelines that I was looking at, and parking design, 19 and the visual impact of parking. 20 So I looked at the residential guidelines that 21 applied to this part of the project, and that's --22 that's what I used. 23 In terms of -- of compliance, the design of the 2.4 parking structure with the horizontal banding, that 25 parapet with the square dentals along it, as well as

2.4

the -- sort of a similar fascia parapet along the assembly hall and sort of a similar treatment on that tower. All is, in general -- generally fits with similar fascias and parapet treatments of existing buildings along the street.

So I found that to be in general compliance, as well with varying setbacks of the different facades of the complex.

In terms of the parking design relative to the guidelines, I interpret the treatment of that parking structure to be integral with the design of the overall complex.

And in terms of the visual impact of parking, I interpret that design to be partially in compliance with minimizing adverse visual impacts of parking areas and garage openings with the exception of the sort of size of -- of the parking entrance. My read is that that opening could be made smaller, at least lower. I'm not sure what the minimum required headroom is, but it seems awfully tall in terms of sort of a big, dark, opening on the street. So that would be a suggested revision from an urban design standpoint.

commissioner hamaker: But doesn't it -- excuse
me. But doesn't it have to be for loading large

1 trucks and --2 CHAIR YEBER: Right. 3 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: -- vehicles too? 4 ADRIAN GALLO: Correct, Barbara. 5 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Yeah. Thank you. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 7 TODD GISH: Okay. So then I'll withdraw that. don't know what the minimum -- if it's currently at 8 9 the -- at its absolute. 10 CHAIR YEBER: Minimum for the trucks for loading 11 and unloading. 12 TODD GISH: If it is, then it couldn't be reduced 13 14 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 15 TODD GISH: -- from that standpoint. 16 CHAIR YEBER: All right. Go ahead. 17 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You indicated, John, that 18 the, as I heard it, that the conditions that you're 19 proposing seem to rise and fall on the acceptance of 20 these conditions by the applicant. So if the 21 Commission decides that some of these conditions are 22 not acceptable to us or needed to be modified to be 23 acceptable to the City's processes, then can the 2.4 applicant say, no, we don't accept these and the whole 25 thing topples without the applicant having to appeal?

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

JOHN KEHO: I'm maybe not quite following you. But what I was referring to is we have a standard condition on every permit that says the permit's not effective until the owners of the property acknowledge acceptance of all the conditions in the permit and record it on the property. So that's what I was referring to is that they -- once the City approves a permit with all these conditions, they may not like one or two of them, but in order to take advantage of the permit, they have to acknowledge and accept them, and record it to the county, and then it's valid. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So if they don't like one or two of these conditions, maybe --JOHN KEHO: They would need to appeal it. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: They appeal it? JOHN KEHO: Right. CHAIR YEBER: Adrian, I have just one more question. On page five of 11, it -- and you mentioned it through your presentation about this notion that this project gets them closer to compliance. And I was wondering if you were able to put something -- I mean, closer is sort of a -- kind of this nebulous thing. What are we talking about? mean, are they 50 percent closer? Are they 75 percent closer? I mean, can you attach something to it so

2.4

that we know what we're dealing with when you say,
make a turn like -- you know, make a statement like
that? Are they slightly closer just because, you
know, they're -- they're enclosing, you know, their
minimizing disruption to the neighborhood?

ADRIAN GALLO: Currently the site has 51 marked spaces. Based on the calculations of the temple in terms of the fixed seats inside of the --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- synagogue.

ADRIAN GALLO: -- synagogue, the number of parking spaces required based on the fixed seats, the revised parking count based on the parking structure would bring them closer to that count. I'd have to do the math right now to figure out what the actual count would be based on the number of fixed seats.

JOHN KEHO: And so what we're talking about is being -- becoming closer to compliances. They don't have enough parking spaces. They don't meet our code requirements for parking. So this particular project is adding these additional parking spaces. And so the deficit of parking spaces is becoming smaller. And so just from a conceptual standpoint, that's what the City would want to happen. We'd want a nonconforming use that has a deficit of parking conceptually to add more parking spaces.

1 CHAIR YEBER: So is the parking the only thing 2 that makes them closer to compliance or is there some other issue that's tied to this? 3 JOHN KEHO: The CUP makes them -- obtaining the 4 5 condition use permit it [helps] -- makes them 6 compliant. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. So those two issues --8 JOHN KEHO: Right. 9 CHAIR YEBER: -- bring them closer to compliance? 10 JOHN KEHO: Right. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul? 12 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The Business License Commission has attached certain conditions, I believe, 13 14 to their business license. I understand that they're 15 not in compliance with several, if not more than 16 several, of those conditions. Is that -- could you 17 assess the condition -- the status of that? 18 MICHAEL JENKINS: The Business License Commission took an action to add conditions to the license. 19 That 20 action was appealed to the City Council. While that 21 appeal was pending in front of the City Council, the 22 applicant withdrew its application for the -- with --23 what it did, technically, was it surrendered its 2.4 business license, asserting that it did not need a 25 business license for public eating on the ground, that

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

it was not serving the public.

Consequently, that license is not in effect depending on who you talk to, I guess. The City took the position that the license remains in effect. I would -- I would say that at this point that's an issue currently in dispute. In the meantime, this application for the parking structure and for a conditional use permit was in process and coming forward before the Planning Commission. Consequently, your staff determined that the conditions that had been presented to the Business License Commission and the City Council on appeal would appropriately be presented to you in the context of this CUP, insofar as they do relate to the regulation of a land use. That's why those conditions are being presented to They are virtually the same as the conditions that were being presented in the context of the business license, and, in my judgment, more appropriately presented in the context of a CUP.

So I would say that the business license is in limbo at the present time. And if the Planning Commission's -- if the Planning Commission were to approve this CUP, subject to whatever conditions you determine to be appropriate, it would moot the business license dispute.

2.0

2.4

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Okay. One more follow-up to that, Mike. It -- I just can't seem to get my hands around or arms around the concept of the CUP attaching to the garage and then from the garage moving through the portico into the main business structure activity.

In the years that I've been familiar with this, the CUP attaches to the activity and not to the parking. So how does this differ? And why is this either a preferred or not so preferred a way? Or is it just a mechanism to get the thing moving and going and it doesn't make any difference whether the CUP is generated by the primary activity or by the garage?

MICHAEL JENKINS: Commissioner Altschul, let me - I don't think that you and I see this differently.

And so perhaps it's just a function of our not
explaining it well enough. Because it -- from the
sound of your question, it seems to me as though we
see it virtually the same. So let me try, then if I
haven't answered your question, let me know and I'll
try again.

The synagogue, at the present time, is nonconforming for one reason; it lacks a conditional use permit. It may continue to operate without a conditional use permit as a nonconforming use forever.

2.4

However, under our code, it may not expand or intensify. In other words, it is fixed like a snapshot. It can only do what it was doing at the time the City adopted its zoning ordinance and rendered it legal nonconforming.

The synagogue has expressed a desire to build this parking structure. Our code does not allow it to expand or intensify its operation by constructing a structure as long as it is nonconforming. Hence, in order for it to be eligible to expand, it must become conforming. And there's only one way that it can do that. And that's by the approval of a conditional use permit.

The conditional use permit is for the entirety of the use, the synagogue and in -- in the end, the parking structure, but the -- the -- globally, the entire activity. It legalizes that activity so that it's no longer legal nonconforming. It would then be fully conforming if the CUP were approved.

Once it's conforming, it's then in a position to ask you for an intensification in the form of the construction of a parking structure. And what we have done here tonight is joined those two things together in a single application. So you are, in effect, concurrently considering both things.

2.0

2.4

Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes, but it leads to one more question. If we're bringing it up to conforming status and the main activity here that we're discussing is a social hall or a banquet facility, which I suppose or propose is an assembly use which requires 28 spaces per 1,000 square feet, the last I recall, how in the world would a 50-some-odd space garage accommodate making that conforming?

MICHAEL JENKINS: I'm going to let John first respond to that.

JOHN KEHO: And how we've handled those situations is, as we talked about, we're bringing it more into conformance. So it's in conformance about the use that has a CUP, so it's in total conformance with that. However, the structure, other components of it, might remain noncompliant.

For example, I think there are some setbacks on the back that aren't compliant 'cause it was built before cityhood. So we can't -- we're not going to bring the building into compliance by making them carve away at the back of the building to meet current setback requirements. And for the parking, we don't make them meet the full requirement of parking spaces; we hope the site has the ability to bring it more into

2.0

2.4

compliance.

MICHAEL JENKINS: And allow me to supplement that before your next question by making this observation.

The -- the ac -- the structure may be nonconforming as to standards in certain respects and the use is nonconforming as a nonconforming use. Those are two different categories of nonconformity, use nonconformity and structure nonconformity.

The CUP would eliminate the use nonconformity. It would make it a conforming use because we require that institutional uses in residential zones have a CUP. Why? We require them to have a CUP so that we can impose reasonable conditions to assure conformity with the surrounding residential neighborhood. That's very typical in a zoning ordinance where you have institutional uses that are commonly associated with residential uses.

And for the history of zoning in this country, it's always been believed that certain activities of an institutional nature, schools, churches, belong in the midst of residences, and that's why they're allowed in residential zones.

So the CUP addresses the use nonconformity. It doesn't cure the structural nonconformity in its entirety. As John indicated, it simply brings the

2.4

structure closer, as close as they can get it onsite, to our parking requirements.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So would that then lead to the conclusion that if you give the CUP to the garage before you address the CUP to the main facility and its uses, then you're getting around or obviating the need to have current standards apply because you're not giving the CUP first to the social hall itself?

MICHAEL JENKINS: I fear we are engaged in a chicken-and-egg sort of a discussion.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right.

MICHAEL JENKINS: We're not giving a CUP for the garage. What we are -- what has been applied for and what is before you is a conditional use permit for the synagogue, as an activity, as a use in a residential zone.

What is in front of you for the garage is, in effect, a development permit which is a permit that is required for the construction of this structure. So you're not giving them a CUP for the garage. The CUP legalizes the activity, and the development permit grants the garage.

Now, if -- does that -- does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. But again, they

1 wouldn't need a CUP to legalize the activity of a 2 synagogue. But since the synagogue has morphed into 3 either a party hall, a nightclub, or whatever else you 4 might want to call it, then it needs a CUP. MICHAEL JENKINS: Actually, no. And in this --6 well, actually no. The synagogue, to become conforming, would require a CUP if it had no banquet 7 hall at all. The existence of the banquet hall does 8 9 not play a role in that. A religious facility of any 10 kind, with or without a banquet hall, needs a CUP in a 11 residential zone to be conforming. 12 The fact that there is a banquet hall that is 13 being used for banquets in the manner that it's being 14 used simply has created some other issues that are 15 addressed or proposed to be addressed in some of the 16 operating conditions. 17 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Okay. I promise this is 18 my last question. 19 MICHAEL JENKINS: You can ask as many questions 2.0 as you like. We're here at your pleasure. 21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. So John keeps 22 using the term more conforming. 23 MICHAEL JENKINS: I didn't hear that. I'm sorry. 2.4 The term what? 25 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: More conforming.

1 MICHAEL JENKINS: More conforming. 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That this is going to 3 bring it into a more conforming --4 MICHAEL JENKINS: Structurally. From the point 5 of view of compliance with standards. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: What is the advantage of 6 having it more conforming rather than totally 7 conforming? 8 9 MICHAEL JENKINS: There are some structures that 10 cannot achieve 100 percent conformity with standards 11 either because of their current situation, as John 12 indicated, they may violate setbacks and it would 13 require massive demolition in order to make them 14 completely conforming, or there's insufficient square 15 footage on the property. In this instance, the 16 applicant has -- has come up with a plan for a 17 structure that is -- that works on that site and it 18 can't hold any more spaces than it holds. So that's 19 the problem. 2.0 The only way to make it more -- 100 percent 21 conforming is if they had more land, but they don't. 22 And we have certain parameters in terms of setbacks, 23 height, that they have to operate in. And so this is 2.4 the maximum number of spaces that they could achieve,

given what they've got to work with.

1 And as was indicated by -- by our staff, it gets 2 them closer because it provides more spaces onsite 3 than exist there today to help meet the demand. 4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So the philosophy is 5 better to be more conforming than not more conforming 6 because you can't achieve the goal of totally conforming? 7 8 MICHAEL JENKINS: I'd agree with that. 9 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Okay. Thank you. And 10 thank you for your indulgence. 11 I actually have a question, 'cause CHAIR YEBER: 12 this was sort of a discussion that I had with the planning manager earlier regarding this, because you 13 14 said that the condition -- the CUP runs with the entire facility. And, yet, on page nine of 11, it 15 16 states otherwise, and that it's only running with the 17 banquet and social halls, not necessarily the school 18 or --19 JOHN KEHO: Right, because those are other 20 entities. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Right. 22 JOHN KEHO: So the conditional use permit is for 23 the religious organization that operates the full 2.4 building. They operate the entire facility. 25 The entire facility, including the CHAIR YEBER:

1 school? 2 JOHN KEHO: Well, the CUP is for the primary 3 occupant of --4 CHAIR YEBER: Which is the IAJC? 5 JOHN KEHO: IAJC. They may sublet to other 6 tenants --7 CHAIR YEBER: Right. 8 JOHN KEHO: -- that have been there for years and 9 years and years. And so the CUP is for the religious 10 facility, it's not dealing -- because those sublessees aren't applicants. They're not doing anything to 11 12 their uses that are requiring any changes. So they're 13 just a tenant per se. 14 CHAIR YEBER: So if a new tenant were to come in 15 16 JOHN KEHO: -- and wanted to --17 CHAIR YEBER: -- that required a CUP, so it would 18 be a CUP --19 JOHN KEHO: Then they -- then they would need to 20 apply for a CUP for themselves. 21 CHAIR YEBER: A CUP that would be on top of the 22 CUP for the entire --23 JOHN KEHO: In addition to. 2.4 **CHAIR YEBER:** -- facility? 25 JOHN KEHO: Sure.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 2 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: The school doesn't use a 3 CUP now? COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I had a question. 4 5 CHAIR YEBER: Go ahead, Commissioner Bernstein. 6 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yeah. Mike, I just 7 wanted to clarify, given the disputed business license, and my guess that we'll be hearing testimony 8 9 about that. 10 MICHAEL JENKINS: I hope not. 11 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: What is the legal 12 relevance of the uncertain status of the business license to what we are going to be considering 13 14 tonight? 15 MICHAEL JENKINS: None. 16 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Okay. And then just one 17 other question about that. 18 MICHAEL JENKINS: And -- and consequently, I hope 19 we're not going to hear anything about that. 2.0 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Thank you. A CUP 21 wouldn't cover a public eating license. Wouldn't that 22 be what the purpose of a business license is? Because 23 there's a condition here --2.4 MICHAEL JENKINS: A business -- a business 25 license is required for public eating. The dispute,

2.4

in part, centers around whether or not this is a facility that provides public eating.

The applicant, when it surrendered its license to the City, took the position that it was not a business that served the public, but, in fact, it only served food in connection with its own activities.

Consequently, the -- one of the conditions that's being proposed endeavors to reflect that by -- by stating that the banquet halls are restricted to activities associated with and tradi -- well, traditionally associated with a synagogue. That's 15.2. To make it clear that it's not a place that rents itself out for -- to the general public for parties in the same way that a banquet facility in a commercial zone is permitted, such as a hotel or a restaurant.

And 15.3 is, if that's where you are heading -- COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yeah.

MICHAEL JENKINS: -- with your question. As I read it and understand it, is designed to further affirm that point, that this is not a commercial banquet facility that holds itself open and available for rental for any party or banquet, that anybody out there in the world wishes to hold, that it -- that this is a synagogue and that it's facilities must be

1 used in a manner that is consistent with the mission, 2 the religious mission of the synagogue. 3 And so what they're saying is that it doesn't --4 they can't do anything that would require a public eating license because that would make it a commercial 6 operation that opens its doors to the public. And 7 that's not what it is and not what it's proposing to 8 be. 9 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: But correct me if I'm 10 wrong. If I'm reading this right, that only would 11 apply to pre-construction and what you're describing would seem to be relevant for the entire life of the 12 13 enterprise. 14 JOHN KEHO: No, we've added that in the new con -- in the new conditions. Well, it does say pre-15 16 construction --17 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: (Inaudible) 18 MICHAEL JENKINS: The heading in 15.0 is 19 misleading, and you've raised a good point. We might 2.0 want to --21 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: So we can make sure that 22 it's in all of the condi -- all the way through. 23 MICHAEL JENKINS: We want to make -- let's make 2.4 that clear right now that if -- if 15. -- 15.1 --25 **JOHN KEHO:** The public eating license is 15.3.

1 MICHAEL JENKINS: Right. But some of these conditions only apply in the preconstruction period. 2 3 For example, portions of 15.1 and --4 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Fifteen point four should 5 also --No. Most of these will remain 6 MICHAEL JENKINS: in effect afterwards. And so we really should 7 probably change the title in 15.0, and we can work on 8 9 that while you're hearing testimony. 10 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: 15.5 also, most of it. 11 MICHAEL JENKINS: Right. We will work on that 12 and get back to you after you've heard the testimony relative to which ones of these are limited to 13 preconstruction and which ones would remain in effect 14 after the structure's in place. 15 16 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Thank you. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Hamaker? 18 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Yeah. This is a question for Mike Jenkins. Mike, back up to about 10 minutes 19 2.0 ago when you were talking about a snapshot in time 21 where use cannot be intensified when the zoning 22 ordinance was written. 23 According to a lot of the correspondence in the 2.4 staff report, there -- and I don't know when the 25 zoning ordinance was written. But the en -- there has

2.0

2.4

been an incredible intensification of use. And so I'm wondering why that intensification of use does not apply in this case or does apply in this case.

MICHAEL JENKINS: Well, I'll let John go first.

JOHN KEHO: I know there's been some discussion about some remodeling that took place in the past at that location, and was that an intensification.

The permits for -- that they applied for back in 2000, I think it was or sometime in that time period, show that there was a banquet facility in the structure. And so the proposal was just to rearrange the banquet facility in the structure. So that was not considered an intensification since that use was already there. So there was no -- so there's no purporting to the city staff that they were changing the operations or doing anything like that, that it was just, this is how the building had been for, you know, 40 years. We're now remodeling it. So that's what was approved.

MICHAEL JENKINS: And let me just add to that comment that I may have inadvertently used a word that I should not have used, and that created some confusion for you. Here's exactly what the zoning ordinance says: a nonconforming use shall not be enlarged or increased to occupy a greater floor area

2.0

2.4

or portion of the site than it lawfully occupied before becoming a nonconforming use.

It doesn't talk about intensification.

Consequently, the fact that they may be more successful in the last couple of years in terms of the number of parties or the number of people being attracted would not -- would not implicate this.

The structure itself may not be expanded either, but the code does not use the word intensification.

And in that regard I apologize for having misled you.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Okay. I understand now.

So you're talking about structure and I was referring to the actual --

MICHAEL JENKINS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: -- intensification of these? I have another question. Because there was -- there's a lot of correspondence about the structure as it appears in above ground inline with apartments around, I see that the renderings are -- do not address the surrounding neighborhood; they're in limbo. And I was expecting actually a massing model so that we could see how the above-ground structure was affecting the surrounding apartment buildings. Was that not required in this case? There's no visual comparison available.

2.0

2.4

JOHN KEHO: Sorry. I guess we don't have a model at this time.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: The condition that talks about who uses the facility, the banquet facility, and it kind of infers in its language that it is only people that are associated or affiliated with this particular congregation.

Nevertheless, there's I think going to be testimony and written evidence shown that they are appealing to, at least, people who are not affiliated with this congregation or affiliated with other congregations. Does this condition either anticipate, allow, or not anticipate and not allow, a member of a congregation in Pomona from coming here and having their party here?

MICHAEL JENKINS: Your question touches on probably what I consider to be the most difficult area of all in this particular matter; and that is, the -- the degree to which the City may regulate a religious activity. What constitutes an activity that is traditionally associated with a synagogue that is within its mission?

I can give you numerous examples of functions that don't and that clearly fall on the other side of the line. And I think we could all come up with

2.4

examples of such activities that are clearly unrelated. And then there are activities that we can all agree are clearly within the scope.

It's those that are closer to the line that are more difficult to ascertain. For example, if a -- if a nonmember of the synagogue approached the rabbi and asked if they could have their wedding or their child's Bar Mitzvah at the synagogue and it were a traditional, I'll use the phrase lifecycle event of the Jewish faith, would it be permissible in this synagogue?

If I were asked that question, I would say yes.

That's where I would fall on that side of it.

If -- if -- well, let me just leave it there. I think that there are going to be examples, there are going to be situations that come up that come in that gray area, and that's a function of implementation and enforcement on the part of the City.

I also can tell you that we have struggled mightily to come up with wording that addresses this issue and tries to constrain the activity without constraining it excessively and without unduly interfering with what constitutes an activity traditionally associated with a synagogue. And it's not been easy and it's not going to be an empirical or

2.4

scientific exercise where we'll be able to determine in every single instance there may be circumstances where we have to make judgment calls.

But the answer to your question is, I think I would probably conclude that a lifecycle event of the Jewish faith by a nonmember, if permitted in the synagogue, would probably be permitted.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But we are able to confine it to the Jewish faith since this is Jewish space?

MICHAEL JENKINS: That -- that's our -- that's our goal here. But I've got to tell you that I know of many churches that make their facilities available to Jewish congregations that don't have facilities big enough to handle the High Holy Day religious services. And that level of cooperation between religious institutions is very common.

And so I'm not sure I can sit here tonight and guarantee to you that if a local church needed a larger facility for a Christian service, that that wouldn't be permissible.

On the other hand, I think it would be fair to say that we would look very, very closely at evening events that involve large numbers of people, dancing, music, and alcohol that weren't associated with a

1 religious activity. 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But it could be a non-3 Jewish religious activity --4 MICHAEL JENKINS: Well, we've --5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- and we might have to 6 give it a pass. 7 MICHAEL JENKINS: We haven't addressed that question. And, frankly, it hasn't come up yet. 8 9 they've -- they -- as far as I know that's not 10 something that they've done. It's not one of the 11 examples of the types of activities that we've been 12 concerned about in the past. We have our code 13 compliance manager here; maybe he knows. Have we ever 14 had something like that? 15 To date we're not aware of that, that type of 16 activity. But again, the language -- the language is 17 necessarily imprecise, but it says activities 18 traditionally associated. That's what we're trying to 19 confine the activities in the facility to. 2.0 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And we don't have a 21 situation where for every event they have to get a 22 permit --23 MICHAEL JENKINS: No, they don't. 2.4 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- once we give a CUP? 25 MICHAEL JENKINS: That's correct.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: So you say we're going to take a very close look at it. Any look that we're going to take, and any event that they have there will have to probably be after-the-fact, won't it? MICHAEL JENKINS: Could be. It depends. Sometimes we know in advance. Sometimes neighbors tell us what's going on. Sometimes we see a flyer or sometimes we obtain information, and, yet, sometimes it would be after-the-fact. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can I jump in here? Isn't there a condition where on a monthly --JOHN KEHO: Right. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: -- basis they're going to give you a list of upcoming events? JOHN KEHO: Right. We do have condition 12.6, says a representative from the IAJC shall submit notice to the code compliance manager for staff each month of all banquet and dinner events to be held on the premises for that month. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Are there any other questions at this time? We'll have more opportunity after -- after the public testimony. Before I move on, though, I'd like to do disclosures starting with Commissioner Hamaker. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I have been to the parking

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

lot. I got my signals crossed with the meeting, actually. So I have not been inside of the hall. I did not meet with the applicant. I have met with some of the neighbors. That's it. CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner DELUCCIO? COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yeah. I requested a site visit. So I did meet with Kate Bartolo and Michael Lewis; they're part of the applicant's team. did meet with several of the neighbors also just to see, and they requested a meeting and I met with them. **CHAIR YEBER:** Commissioner Guardarrama? VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I met with the applicant last Wednesday and I toured the facility and we discussed matters that are contained in the staff report and supplemental materials. CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul? COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I've had several conversations with Ms. Bartolo. Commissioner Bernstein? CHAIR YEBER: COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I have visited the site. I have had conversations with the applicant's representatives. I have had conversations with neighbors in which we have discussed matters contained within the staff report and supplemental material. And I think I should also disclose that I am a

2.0

2.4

trustee of Congregation Kol Ami, only because it is mentioned at points in some of the material we have.

We are not affiliated in any formal way with this congregation. I'm unaware that we have taken any action regarding this, but I just thought I should mention that.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Buckner?

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I too have had several conversations, phone conversations with the applicant's representative, Ms. Bartolo. I received an e-mail and wasn't able really to engage in any kind of dialogue through e-mail with Ric Abramson. Other than that, I haven't had any contact with any -- anybody on either side. And the discussions with Ms. Bartolo related to matters in the staff report and supplemental materials that were provided by staff and the applicants.

CHAIR YEBER: And I too met with the applicant, specifically Ms. Bartolo, met her at the facility to discuss matters contained in the report and supplemental materials. I also extended the same courtesy and time to the neighbors, a group of neighbors, also discussing issues that were contained in the report and supplemental materials.

So with that, we have a number of speakers.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

Okay. Yeah, why don't we do that? There's been a request to take a quick break, a five-minute break, before we move on to public testimony. We'll start with -- yes, Ms. Bartolo? KATE BARTOLO: Is it possible -- excuse me. of the -- two of the speakers, one is Rabbi Huttler, and he's a congregation member who needs to visit -or visit a congregation member who is in mourning. it possible for him to speak? And Jane Tavyev and her husband, Arash Ashe, because Jane is ill and she and her husband drove together. Is it possible to speak before the break? And I'm sorry to ask, it's just they have to leave. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL. No. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can they speak when we come back? It's five minutes. COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: First ones? CHAIR YEBER: I mean, we're -- I'm willing to have --**COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Yeah. CHAIR YEBER: -- them speak first when we come back. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yeah. CHAIR YEBER: I'd rather put all the public

1 testimony together. 2 **KATE BARTOLO:** I understand. I do understand. 3 CHAIR YEBER: So if they can wait just five 4 minutes. KATE BARTOLO: Okay. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Please do not discuss this item 6 7 with the commissioners; it's in open testimony right 8 now. Thank you. 9 (Recess) 10 CHAIR YEBER: If I could get everyone to resume -11 - return to their seats; we have quite a long meeting ahead of us. 12 13 (Inaudible) cordial and efficient manner as 14 possible. We realize this is a very contentious 15 issue. And we're hoping that when you come to the podium you leave your emotions as best as you can at 16 17 the seat -- at your seat and be respectful, each side 18 be respectful. I ask there's no clapping. This is 19 not a competition. It's not who's going to win. 2.0 We're trying to come to a resolution where 21 everyone can be happy here. We're going to do two 22 minutes for all speakers, except the applicant will 23 have two -- 10 minutes. That applicant includes the 2.4 applicant's -- all the applicant's consultants, all

the board -- all the board members that are here, any

1 directors, any officers, anybody associated with IAJC, 2 okay. If you are -- fit any of those categories, you 3 4 are part of the applicant's 10 minutes, five minutes 5 rebuttal at the back end. Again, I really request that everyone be 6 respectful and let's try to get through as much of 7 this as possible in a very civilized fashion as 8 9 possible. 10 So with that, I'm going to ask the applicant's 11 representatives to come up and start us off. 12 KATE BARTOLO: Might we still talk -- have Rabbi 13 Huttler come up and Jane --14 CHAIR YEBER: Oh, yeah --15 KATE BARTOLO -- Tarvyev if it's possible. 16 CHAIR YEBER: -- you wanted to have those -- yes, 17 by all means. 18 KATE BARTOLO: Yes, please. And they can speak 19 for just one minute. 2.0 CHAIR YEBER: Sure, that's fine. 21 RABBI HUTTLER: Thank you very much. My name is 22 Rubin Huttler, and I am the Orthodox Rabbi of S. Jacob 23 Congregation which is located at 7659 Beverly 2.4 Boulevard. I have been rabbi there for 40 years. 25 have conducted many religious cultural services during

2.0

2.4

my tenure at S. Jacob. And I respectfully submit that Jewish religious services are linked to cultural traditions of our -- of our people.

I heard a few minutes ago that there was some concern about the mission of the synagogue. And I want to say clearly that when you talk about a wedding or a Bar Mitzvah or any religious service, you can't separate the religious aspect, meaning the ceremony which takes place under the Hukbo, when to marry the - when the couple gets married, from the festivities that take place afterwards; it's all one thing.

And this is historically true. If you look into the history of people, you will see that this is how the weddings were conducted and other services as well? So the mission is truly not only a religious, but a cultural one as well. And I would say the cultural really is part of the religious.

And if we deviate from these practices, then we put [into jeopardize] the very essence of the ceremony and the celebration.

I, therefore, respectfully urge the Commission to give every consideration to the Iranian American

Jewish Center which has become one of the most important centers for this -- for these religious cultural celebrations, to allow them to continue to

1 host these important religious cultural events. I think that means I'm not supposed to talk 2 3 anymore. That's fine. 4 CHAIR YEBER: RABBI HUTTLER: Thank you very much. 6 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you very much. Kate, who was 7 the next one that needed to speak due to an illness? 8 JANE TAVYEV: Hi. My name is Jane Tavyev. 9 is my husband, Arash Ashe. We live in Los Angeles. 10 We were married nearly a year ago, March 14th, at the -- we had our -- and I understand a lot of commotion 11 12 has come up because our ceremony was at Greystone and 13 our reception was at the IAJC. The idea being that 14 perhaps our reception was not a religious event. 15 We are both Jewish. We live at Jewish Life here 16 in Los Angeles. We're both physicians in the Jewish 17 Hospital at Cedar Sinai. 18 We -- our reception had our rabbi and our cantor, 19 who I brought from Houston where I just moved from 2.0 recently. We had many religious aspects to our 21 reception, including the [Halla] cutting. The rabbi and cantor did a ceremony where the wine was mixed to 22 23 represent the mixing of our families. We had probably 2.4 the longest Hora you've ever seen.

The reason why we didn't have our ceremony at the

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

IAJC is because my husband's father passed away about four and a half years ago, and his memorial, also a Jewish event, was held in the synagogue portion of the IAJC, and it was understandably too painful for him to have both his wedding and his father's memorial service in the same space. So we used Sapper Hall for our -- for our cocktail hour, which we needed that space rather than the foyer since we had about 380 people at our wedding. And then we had dinner, Hora, everything, in Neman Hall. So I think I'm just here to contest, at least on -- from my own experience, that our event, I know, has come up in question, and, certainly, it was definitely very Jewish all the way through. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. There's a question from a Commissioner if you have one more minute. JANE TAVYEV: Yes. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Hi. Can I just ask you the time frame, when your event started and how long it lasted and when it ended, and what day of the week it was? JANE TAVYEV: The event was on a Sunday. MR. ASHE: It was on a Sunday. The -- I think at the Iranian Jewish Federation we gathered around 5:30

1 I think most people left by 10:30 or 11, but or six. 2 it ended completely by 12. 3 JANE TAVYEV: We started, of course, a smidge 4 late with our ceremony, but. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 6 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Thank you very much. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Ms. Bartolo? KATE BARTOLO: Kate Bartolo, resident of West 8 9 Hollywood, representing --10 CHAIR YEBER: Would you -- just quick question 11 just so we know how you're going to organize this. 12 this, you're going to use the entire 10 minutes or are you going to split it with other --13 14 KATE BARTOLO: The entire 10 minutes. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Great. It's your soap box. 16 **KATE BARTOLO:** -- resident of West Hollywood, 17 representative of the applicant. First, I want to 18 commend Joe Guardarrama and we're very sorry to see him leave. And if John Altschul made the level of 19 2.0 commendations and compliments, I think that's 21 remarkable indeed. So kudos to you, and there is life 22 after Planning Commission. 23 Why the temple? The temple is -- was chosen 2.4 because it was in the original form. It was -- the 25 synagogue was built in the 1950s, because it was

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

centrally located and it was a non -- legally nonconforming use. It was more a bund at the time it was taken over as a synagogue, it was Temple Beth El and it literally had fallen into such a low level of participation and membership they had to almost start from scratch; and they have built something out of nothing since the late 1990s. So why the temple here? It's an R zone; many religious facilities are. There's a school, auditorium, social hall since the 1960s. This is a picture of the synagogue that was built in the 1950s, which I think is a candidate for historic designation. These are examples of the social halls that currently exist there and were approved in the 1960s, and more recently in a remodel basis in the City of West Hollywood. So what is this garage? This garage is for the purpose of adding 50 new parking spaces. It is 23 feet high. It is 17 feet high on the west side of the wall that is facing the parking -- facing the residents that are adjacent in the apartment building north. It is 21 feet high closer to Crescent Heights.

The site is also an allowable R4 use, has -- it

could potentially have four stories and 45 feet with

the same five-foot setback, were it built for these

2.4

other uses.

I think one of the unique characters that we need to look at at West Hollywood is that virtually every site in West Hollywood abuts residential, whether it's commercially zoned or whether it's residentially zoned.

Now, why build this garage? The purpose of the garage is for additional parking, but it's to stem neighborhood impacts. If you look on the drive in, if you see the ingress/egress, and it's really not, I'm sorry, blown up sufficiently.

But the way that we have designed it is that when you drive in, we're addressing one of the major areas of impact, which is, if you go to the left, it has a capacity for truck loading and unloading in the far west side furthest from residential of the site, to have vendors load and unload in a hermetically sealed physical structure.

The purpose of it originally was more parking, and it's been designed now, over five years of work with the City and at the desire of the temple, to stem neighborhood impacts, to serve as a sound buffer. And they're making a major investment for that purpose.

The design has been fully vetted by the staff, again, over -- on and off for five years. This is the

2.0

2.4

second site that had been proposed originally. It's gone through design review. It was one of the last projects approved by John Chase.

What we're asking that you focus on now is on mitigating on measures that mitigate the noise impacts but not on undue restrictions on the events themselves. The events -- the -- excuse me. The impacts, as we see it, are twofold. And it's really based on a review of all the complaints filed with code compliance over the last three years.

Most of the complaints have come regarding noise from vendors loading and unloading. Secondly, by 50 percent reduction, it was noise from patrons exiting mainly while waiting for valets.

The proposed structure and staff conditions for during construction set strict measures on this. The garage, we believe very strongly, is the solution; it is not the problem. The CUP is the solution, not the problem. This is very critical. It is the first time the City will actually have control over how this site and its uses and activities are regulated. That is a game changer.

The temple recognizes the terrible result of the breakdown in communication that's occurred, and they do take some of the responsibility for it and it has

2.4

not helped in the relationships. There have been substantial changes that have occurred in the last several years that now more recently are going to be, I think set a new direction. And what we hope is that after we get past this, we can set up a new relationship with the staff.

The bottom line, though, it has to be acknowledged, this is a legal, nonconforming use. To authorize the parking structure, the City has determined it needs a change in use. Now CUP is needed. Again, the first time it's going to be meaningfully regulated.

The original county construction, and you have heard, I think, a flurry of accusations on this, were contending that perhaps there were regulations in place; that is not the case. It was approved through permitting. And then it was in the 1960s, there were no regulations on hours and it approved social hours.

Now, here's what the CUP won't do. It's not going to increase occupancy in the property. It's not going to increase the frequency or attendance. It's not going to increase site area as has been pointed out, and it's going to be less than half the height as what -- of what is legally allowed were an apartment building be constructed.

2.0

2.4

What the CUP will do, it's going to establish standards for compliance, a series of conditions where none exist, 'cause previously no hours exist because the public eating license as has been discussed is in, quote, limbo, we believe it not to be applicable because it doesn't meet the standards for a public eating license.

The conditions preconstruction, the -- we have concerns about loading and unloading in terms of in front of the temple because it's become the solution. There are some rare instances, there are instances where people -- vendors have to leave at the end of an evening, they have to wait until the end, but -- that is a concern. But I will tell you, the other conditions, after review today, they were just introduced, are acceptable to us.

The key is to be able to continue the already volunteered hours that are part of those conditions as recommended by staff. Why these hours? Rabbi Huttler touched on it; other rabbis will as well.

Cultural and religious, from everything that I have investigated, and I started out as a skeptic, I have concluded, after talking to rabbis, scholars, who are conservative, orthodox, that cultural and religious in this context is absolutely inseparable.

2.0

2.4

The Federation serves a diverse membership, orthodox, conservative, Ashkenazi, Sephardic, from regions and continents all over the world, from Middle East to Africa to Eastern Europe, Russia part of Eastern Europe. And so they come together. They have all different cultures. They have all different rights and tradition that accrue from that. And one cannot separate their ethnic, cultural traditions from their observance of religion.

The late night hours tend to be more Sephardic, but the Ashkenazi, particularly the Russians, also tend to follow the late night hours. Sundown weekdays, the purpose of starting at -- after dark -- and weddings do occur very frequently in particularly in the orthodox community, on weekdays. And they -- because people have to come from work, they may need to start and go home, pick up the kids, pick up the husband or wife, dress. They need the time in LA for drive time.

Saturday after sundown, under orthodox tradition, you can't even start preparing for the event and get in the car until 72 minutes after sundown. In the summer, obviously it's starting later.

Now, the concern's been raised about event types. Let me give you an example of one that I attended the

2.4

other night. Mr. and Mrs. [Kay] were honored. And I think some of the people here will want to mention this. Very briefly, it was a fundraiser for Hatzola. It was serving the Jewish community. It's a group that -- it's a global group, several chapters throughout the world, for 45 years. They provide emergency medical assistance to the Jewish community, taking patients to the hospitals. It serves in adjacent neighborhoods to West Hollywood and portions of West Hollywood.

The meeting, I was very pleased to note, was

The meeting, I was very pleased to note, was literally wall-to-wall rabbis. By some estimates, the numbers were up to 75 rabbis.

So the issue is, that was a purely non-profit event and it was an event that benefited the Jewish community. The funds in this -- for anything raised after very high expenses for maintenance, go directly into actually helping people. And I've seen and personally reviewed the books for the charitable events and it's quite extensive and impressive. And at another time or if you have questions, I can follow up and give that to you.

Now, we can also show you comparable religious facilities. We reviewed eight religious -- Jewish religious facilities, all comparable to a certain

2.0

2.4

degree with -- but mainly with social hall use. Many others exist, but these are the closest proximity, closest comparison. There are four that are located in residential zones, all about residential. Most of their standards are comparable to the temple. Most have comparable hours. Nessah, in Beverly Hills, is the most restrictive; it is Beverly Hills, not West Hollywood; though another one has far less restrictive. And, but they can be open 'til 11 a.m., and episodically one a.m.

Temple Israel volunteered to have some reductions not required by city valet ordinance. They also have open rooftop parking without any eight-foot wall noise wall and it is a football-size field, open parking lot that surrounds a series of multifamily R uses.

In Kol Ami, that's the only West Hollywood facility comparable. It limits hours on rooftop but not in the interior, and the interior is sometimes used as a [Polish] social reception.

The neighborhood complaints over the years, what code compliance has found, they'd inspect the site within five minutes of the complaint and would find no observance.

As it relates to <39:21>, we're not saying that you have to follow <39:23>. It's not a prescriptive.

1 But there are quidelines in structures that deal with 2 that. Finally, if I can just suggest that we ask that 3 4 you accept the staff resolution, as it represents five years of exhaustive negotiation and we've worked 6 together. And I thank you very much, and I'm here for any questions. 7 8 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Yes. Are there any 9 questions for the applicant at this point? Maybe at the backend, Kate? 10 11 **KATE BARTOLO:** That's just fine. Thank you. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Great. 13 KATE BARTOLO: Oh, also, if you have any 14 questions separately about valet parking or about 15 landscaping, we have two of the people here who can answer those questions. 16 17 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. All right. Our next 18 speaker will be Rubin Huttler, followed by Marla Miller. 19 20 ERIN ANDERSON: He's the gentlemen who spoke 21 first, so we can pass him. 22 (All members present state, "Aye".)Oh, Rubin -23 - all right. Not Rabbi --ERIN ANDERSON: I think that was Rabbi Huttler. 2.4 25 CHAIR YEBER: No. I also have a Rabbi Reuben

1 Milikan. 2 ERIN ANDERSON: That would be somebody else. 3 Sorry. CHAIR YEBER: All right. 4 JOHN KEHO: Chair? CHAIR YEBER: Yes? 6 7 JOHN KEHO: Did you indicate the time that 8 everyone was getting? 9 CHAIR YEBER: Yes, two minutes. Two minutes. 10 RABBI MILIKAN: Good evening, ladies and 11 gentlemen. I'm Rabbi Reuben Milikan. I am Persian, 12 of course; you can take it from my accent. I have 13 I must tell you that the been here for many years. 14 lady have spoken very eloquently, and these are the 15 things that even though I don't know her, these are 16 the things that I believe would apply. 17 The -- having your structure, parking structure, 18 at that location would be beneficial to the community 19 as well as to the members of the temple. Now, I would 2.0 say, look at the other temples, Temple Sinai on 21 Wilshire is -- all around is neighborhood with a lot 22 of great apartments. You go to Temple Sephardic right 23 next to it, the same way; they built underground 2.4 structure and people park and everyone at peace. 25 So, therefore, I think also with the economy that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

we have these days, it would be recommended to have such a structure built. And the temple is actually not running the bulls, making noises, it's a facility, a cultural facility that will help the community for better being. So, therefore, I believe very much that looking at the other temples that are structured in and among community, the structure should be built, and I believe that all those neighbors who are living close at proximity of that neighborhood eventually will have a better life and better days. Thank you very much. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. RABBI MILIKAN: Any questions? CHAIR YEBER: No. Thank you very much. RABBI MILIKAN: Thank you. Good night. CHAIR YEBER: Marla Miller followed by Fred [Golbar]. MARLA MILLER: Hi. I have lived at 1341 North --CHAIR YEBER: State your name for the record, please. MARLA MILLER: Marla Miller. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. MARLA MILLER: And I've lived next door to the temple for almost 40 years I've been in that building. And the last six years have been a living hell since

2.0

2.4

Neman Hall was built and turned into a commercial banquet facility, and it acts way more like a nightclub.

I -- we -- all of our neighbors, all of the Jews
-- and I am Jewish and I'm religious, welcome
services. We want them to have religious Bat
Mitzvahs, Bar Mitzvahs, Brit Milahs. But there's no
reason that they should go on past 10 p.m.

The rabbi spoke about parties beginning after sundown on Shabbat, which is true. But the IAJF's parties don't have any religious ceremony; the parties just start around nine o'clock. They usually start about four hours after sundown, not even close to sundown, and there's usually no religious ceremony prior to the party.

We have begged the IAJF for years to hire a security guard to monitor the lot because the LA USD school students with their blaring radios, you have these parties, the extreme noise from the daycare, drunks from the par -- you know, everything. Anyhow, they told us it was too expensive. We asked for more than the 10 to 12 valets that they have every night; that was too expensive. But now they're offering to do it once the parking lot is built. So how can they afford it then unless there are more parties?

1 The other thing, we -- I cannot, along with the 2 other Jews in my building, cannot observe our Shabbat because of the extreme loading and unloading in the --3 4 what is required for these massive setups. There's five to six parties every single week. 6 What other church or temple has got 10 to 12 valets every night and five to six parties a week that go on 7 8 'til two a.m. Thank you. 9 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Have a quick question. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Ouestion. 12 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Just real quick. Where 13 are they doing the loading and unloading? 14 MARLA MILLER: Well, recently, now they've been -15 - ever since the Business License Commission, which I'm not supposed to bring up, they -- there was a very 16 17 short lull in the party activities when the loading 18 and unloading finally got moved to the curbside 19 designated loading zone. They used to have about --2.0 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Where's it currently 21 being done? 22 MARLA MILLER: Now it's being done in the loading 23 zone, but it's --2.4 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. Thank you. You 25 answered my question.

1 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** Can I ask a question? Yes. Ms. Miller, one more 2 CHAIR YEBER: 3 question. 4 MARLA MILLER: I'm sorry. 5 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Could you briefly expand 6 on what you meant when you say that they behave more 7 like a nightclub than a religious organization? MARLA MILLER: What I mean is that most other --8 9 I mean, I've gone to temple my whole life. Any other 10 temple or church in West Hollywood, even the Shoshu temple up the street, they don't have that kind of 11 12 loading and unloading with chairs going in and out daily, trees, couches, anything. It's like a fantasy. 13 14 I have pictures that I've submitted, a fantasy 15 fairyland, huge -- and it doesn't matter; chandeliers. 16 The other thing I was going to say, that when 17 asking for these type of hours 'til 1:30 in the 18 morning, for ceremonies for a Brit Milah is a 19 circumcision for an infant child, an infant little 2.0 boy. 21 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I'm also Jewish. 22 familiar with the service. 23 MARLA MILLER: Oh, I'm sorry. 2.4 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I was just curious about 25

1	MARLA MILLER: So what I meant is that
2	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: the nightclub
3	reference.
4	MARLA MILLER: anything that's where they
5	require
6	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: And, actually, you've
7	answered that. Thank you very much.
8	MARLA MILLER: Oh, I'm sorry.
9	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Thank you.
10	CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Okay. So Fred Golbar
11	followed by Ann Thorne. If you can actually, if I
12	call your name, go ahead and stage or queue behind the
13	current speaker; it'll make this go quicker. Thank
14	you.
15	MR. GOLBAR: Good evening, Commission. My name
16	is Fred Golbar. I'm a member of the board of Jewish
17	Federation, acting as CO-CFO.
18	CHAIR YEBER: Is that for the is this the
19	Jewish Federation or for the
20	MR. GOLBAR: For the Jewish Federation.
21	CHAIR YEBER: Separate from the IAJ IAJC?
22	MR. GOLBAR: Jewish Federation is IAJC [Israel].
23	CHAIR YEBER: Oh, you're on the board of the
24	IAJC?
25	MR. GOLBAR: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. I can't have you speak. was part of that 10 minutes; that's what I mentioned at the beginning. If you're a board member of the IAJC, you're part of the applicant's team. So I can't have you speak. I'm sorry. MR. GOLBAR: Okay. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. Ann Thorne followed by Brittney Verna. My name is Ann Thorne. I have lived ANN THORNE: at 1340 Crescent Heights Boulevard, which is across the street from the center, for 25 years. complained numerous times about the extreme noise due to the nightly parties. I have been told by the IAJF to move if I don't like the noise. I live between the Buddha Temple and the Iranian The Buddha Temple is respectful of the neighborhood and cares about their neighbors. They just celebrated the Buddhist New Year which goes on until four a.m. in Thailand, but closed at 10 p.m. here, and we never heard a sound because they showed respect. The last thing that the IAJF needs is a parking

garage. They have more parking than any other temple

or church and they have enough parking for their

religious needs. The parking garage would only

2.0

2.4

increase the parties, traffic, and extreme nuisance.

The center should be treated like the other religious institutions in West Hollywood and not like a nightclub. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Brittney Verna followed by Rabbi Ira Rosenfeld.

BRITTNEY VERNA: Hi. My name is Brittney Verna, and I live at 1341 North Crescent Heights, and I've attended these meetings in which the IAJF have told me and other members to move if we don't like their late night parties.

I'm sad that many of my friends and neighborhoods were forced and bullied to move. We have asked the center to operate as other religious facilities in West Hollywood instead of operating as a nightclub, but we are ignored.

There is hardly ever a religious ceremony held at the center, but nightly non-religious receptions, fundraisers, and parties that are held there throughout the week. The parties usually start after nine p.m. and continue until two, maybe three a.m.

I read Rabbi Rosenfeld's letter, which was the same letter that was written by the IAJF a month before. And we'd like to point out that the wedding that has a last dance at 1:30 a.m. is not a religious

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

law; it is something that the party planner planned. There are no religious laws that would justify the nightclub hours that they demand and that they continue to go by. The loud base drum that wakes me up every night, as do the drunks leaving at two to three a.m., the huge trucks that are constantly loading and unloading and the amount of traffic created by over 400 people coming in and out of our street right by my house to party every night is outrageous and should not be allowed in this residential neighborhood. The IAJF is so disruptive and so disrespectful to its neighbors in our community, while the Buddhist Temple two doors down from our building up the street has blended into the community and we have no issues with them. Please treat the IAJF like the other religious organizations in West Hollywood instead of giving them special treatment that they are demanding. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Rabbi Ira Rosenfeld, followed by Sheri Lin. RABBI ROSENFELD: Good evening. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. My name is Rabbi Ira Rosenfeld. I'm the rabbi and spiritual leader for Hollywood Temple Beth El and also for the American

2.0

2.4

|| Iranian Jewish Center.

I just feel compelled to make a few brief comments. Hollywood Temple Beth El, as you know, has been there since the 1920s. The current building has been there since the 1950s. And the American Jewish Federation has owned the building for nearly 14 years now.

And all this time we tried to represent positive values and community outreach. I can't speak for every conversation people had with individuals there.

And, you know, it's possible that there were things said that were not as positive as we would like to be.

But the issue here is the parking structure. And this is something that we voluntarily decided to do, to a large extent, to alleviate the protests that we're hearing this evening about the neighbors -- about noise. So this seems to be a way to get around the issue that everyone is mentioning. And I'm somewhat surprised that it's coming under the scrutiny that it has.

The other issues mentioned is for a different evening. But right now we're talking about trying to alleviate the noise issues through building this structure.

And again, as the other rabbi mentioned earlier,

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

religion and culture; they're very closely meshed. And to try to separate the two is, and I don't want to say discriminatory, but possibly borderline. You know, I point out with many Christian organizations they have midnight mass, they have events that are very early and very late. So to try to quantify what times religious events should take place is very tricky. And that's why we have voluntarily decided to build this structure to alleviate the noise issue to make it safer. And I hope that this is something that we'll be able to push through and I hope that it will cause a more positive relationship for everybody in the area in the future. Thank you. Rabbi, excuse me. CHAIR YEBER: There's a question from one of the commissioners. RABBI ROSENFELD: Sure. COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Rabbi, I'm just curious. If you don't mind, I have a question about religious celebration. For instance, things like weddings and Brit Milahs seem clear what the religious connotation If the teenagers in the congregation have a dance, is that a religious celebration or is --RABBI ROSENFELD: That's a great question. mean, you're getting into the very gray area we're

we're getting into a very gray area when we talk about

2.0

2.4

talking about. Look, a big part of any religious organization is a certain amount of outreach and trying to bring in new people.

As mentioned earlier, part of the problem with Hollywood Temple Beth El is that the older congregations were slowly dying off and there weren't new people brought in.

So part of what any temple or any religious organization does is to try to attract the youth and try to attract new people to come in. Obviously, we don't want to make it into a nightclub. But if we can provide events that always have a Jewish component with them, is it strictly a religious event? Is it a service? No. But if we have a singles even or something like that, clearly there's going to be Jewish content. And the goal is to help to build the membership at the temple. So is it directly religious? Not necessarily. But will there be blessings said? Will there be Jewish things discussed?

So and, you know, it certainly could be argued that it is a religious event, at least to some extent. I'm not going to say it's strictly. But clearly, that's part of, you know, what any religious organization, any temple, any church does.

1 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Rabbi, thank you for 2 offering your perspective. 3 RABBI ROSENFELD: Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Can I just remind 4 5 everyone to put your cell phones on silent or vibrate 6 so that we're not interrupted? Our next speaker is Sheri Lin, followed by Harry 7 -- I'm sorry, I'll mispronounce this -- Reb --8 9 Rebhuhn. 10 HARRY REBHUHN: Close enough. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 12 SHERI LIN: Hi. Sheri Lin, resident West Hollywood. I'm president of the Homeowners 13 14 Association, 1328 Havenhurst. That's the piece of 15 property that is just west to the proposed parking 16 lot. 17 Our Homeowners Association is adamantly opposed 18 to the staff recommendations in two regards. And there are two issues here. There's the parking 19 20 structure and then there's the hours of operation, and 21 the two intersect to create problems that the 22 neighborhood is experiencing. 23 Owners in my building, we do not want a parking 2.4 structure that is open air right next to our building, 25 with flood lights that'll be going on 'til 1:30 to

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Grafton Tanquary.

HARRY REBHUHN:

2:30 in the morning. We don't want the car exhaust. We don't want the noise. It's completely unfair to us property taxpaying residents of West Hollywood. did not buy into that condominium complex with the knowledge that a three-story parking structure was going to be built. We're -- our property values are going to decrease and that's -- it's not fair and it's not okay. The open-ended part of the parking, that's the problem. Perhaps the parking structure can be all underground, okay. The operating hours, if the operating hours were as what City Council had suggested that they be, a lot of these issues wouldn't be here. And those operating hours are consistent with other religious organizations in the city. So I'm really curious to know why staff feels that the applicant's hours should be allowed versus what the business license and City Council recommended, why should IAJF be allowed different hours than other religious organizations in West Hollywood? It's just another unfair fact. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Harry, followed by

Harry Rebhuhn. I'm the attorney

2.0

2.4

for Crescent Management, which owns the apartment building adjoining the northern parking lot. There's a big word that has to be spoken that nobody has mentioned, which is variance. In a residential zone where two structures are in the same lot, they have to be separated by a minimum distance of six feet. In this case the separation is zero feet from the proposed garage. That's inconsistent with residential zoning which is what governs.

If that is to be changed or deviated from, the applicant should be seeking a variance, should make the evidentiary showing to get a variance, and it should be decided on that basis. There's been no application for a variance and there's been no evidence presented supporting it.

Rooftop parking permissible in commercial zones categorically prohibited in all residential zones in West Hollywood. I don't know how it's justified. I don't know how you can put rooftop parking that's 10 feet away from the windows of -- the bedroom windows of adjoining apartment dwellers. But if that's to be allowed, again, a variance is the mechanism and there has to be a showing that there's some unique feature of this property, such as topography, which denies this property user the ability to make the same use of

1 his property that neighboring properties enjoy. 2 There's been no application for a variance. There's been no evidentiary showing for a variance. 3 Now let's get to the issue of setback. I believe 4 5 the position taken by the applicant is that it's permissible to apply commercial zoning to justify 6 7 these things as opposed to simply applying the designated zoning and seeking a variance. 8 9 This is -- essentially can be characterized as a 10 commercial building. It's a three-story parking structure serving two banquet halls. And the minimum 11 12 separation between a commercial building adjoining a residential zone is 15 feet, not the 10 feet provided 13 14 for by the staff. Again, your -- this is a violation of governing and zoning. 15 16 If you're going to pick and choose between 17 residential and commercial, which is completely 18 improper to begin with, at a --19 CHAIR YEBER: Mr. Rebhuhn, your time is up. 20 HARRY REBHUHN: Thank you. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. Grafton, 22 followed by Tim Riley. 23 **GRAFTON TANQUARY:** Good evening. I'm Grafton 2.4 I live at 1287 North Crescent Heights, Tanquary. 25 which is immediately south of the center. I think

2.0

2.4

everyone, including the Commission and the members of IAJF, should understand that we neighbors who object to building the structure are not critical of the activities of the center and of the foundation itself. I think their programs for outreach are very commendable. However, we do believe that they're inappropriate in a residential area, especially Crescent Heights.

You have had sufficient evidence given you -submitted to show that a number of occasions the late
night parties at the center have caused noise and
traffic congestion in the early morning hours,
sufficient to ny -- to deny our right to enjoy a quiet
life in a residential area. We, therefore, feel that
there must be reasonable limits placed upon the hours
of operation at Neman and Sapper Halls.

We do agree with Mr. [Ganz's] letter to the effect that the center should be treated the same as other religious organizations in the city, and, in effect, that's all we ask.

You were told earlier that the IAJF Synagogue in Beverly Hills, Temple Nessah, has a banquet room, but does not operate past 11 o'clock. Kate mentioned that was Beverly Hills, this is West Hollywood. I object to -- I think we ought to be treated in West Hollywood

2.4

the same way that the people in Beverly Hills are treated.

In West Hollywood, the church, the Methodist church at Fountain and Crescent Heights, was sued some time ago by its neighbors and, as a result, the City imposed a 10 o'clock curfew on the use of its meeting hall, limited the number of persons who could attend, and required that it be used only for non-profit organizations. There are similar limitations at Temple Kol Ami and the Buddhist Temple in north -- north of the center.

In contrast, the staff is operating -- is treating this as a nightclub, and I -- we object to that. Thank you very much.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Tim Riley, followed by Benjamin Chang.

TIM RILEY: Chairman Yeber, Honorable

Commissioners, Tim Riley, land use consultant representing Crescent Management.

Again, parking structures in residential zones, rooftop parking in residential zones are not allowed in your code. And you need to -- we would hope that you would consider a variance and try to adopt variance findings before proceeding for this garage.

Also, if you're going to establish a parking

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

garage in a residential zone, you need a parking overlay district. And you can do that in a residentially zoned property when it is contiguous to a commercial site or property, and that is not the case here.

Banquet facilities, in your code, are not allowed uses in any residential zone. In fact, if you looked at your code, it's not even allowed use in most commercial zones, except for the Pacific Design Center. And what happened before, the county approved -- when it approved a zone exception case, it approved a social hall which is not a banquet hall. And so to leap from social hall to banquet hall is a real stretch and is not compatible with your zoning, and, therefore, should not be allowed. In fact, it seems that the IAJC converted their Neman Hall to this banquet facility without any of the proper permits from the City. And there's, in fact, no record of the building permit that this occurred back six or seven years ago.

Also, we feel that the -- this project requires an environmental review far more significant than a categorical exemption. You have issues of traffic, noise, and air quality impacts that have not been addressed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

And also, the fire department of Los Angeles County has not yet reviewed any plans. In fact, they say -- and I handed out e-mails to the effect. say that the applicant's plans have not been submitted to them for review. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Benjamin Chang, followed by Ebon Alabastur. BENJAMIN CHANG: Hi. My name's Benjamin Chang. I'm sorry, I'm little bit sick. I try to make this brief. I just celebrated Chinese New Year couple weeks ago. The Chinese New Year will be celebrated for the 15 day. Originally and the traditional way of celebrating the Chinese New Year, we will have firecrackers all through the day through the midnight and early morning. But because we understand that we moved to United States and that is not allowed and that is a part of culture, we cannot force our culture into United States, and say, well, you know, we only do this once a year for 15 day and then we have firecracker all through the night, all through the day. But that's our culture, so you have to accept as.

So, you know, I live in Havenhurst. And then

sometime in the morning or at night, I hear this

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

noise. I go where -- where this come from? So I walk around the street and I find it's from the temple. And I go, oh, wow, you know, [they still can] party here. But, you know, I been listening to them for many of times. And then [they always] bring [out their] culture, their religion, and that's how they live their life. But I was thinking, what, this how you live your life in another part of the country, but we're -- you decide to move to United States. We need to blend in. We need to respect other peoples' culture also. that's my opinion, and I thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Ebon, followed by Michael [Sirjani]. EBON ALABASTUR: Yeah. Abon Alabastur, Sephardic Jew, City of West Hollywood. The [Talmud] or book of law states [dina-demacuta-dinal which translates to the law of the land as when we are living in non-Jewish nations, we have to abide by the laws therein. This is what the Dalai Llama was told when he asked how the Jewish people survived at Diaspora; you have to blend in. Now, going to the Neman Hall. It's an illegal use conversion from an education meeting center to

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Neman Banquet Hall. Neman Hall was dedicated March 2004, as memorialized in the Jewish Journal, March 18th, 2004. The Planning Commission does not have any permits on file regarding this million dollar improvement and conversion. There is a permit on file from the year 2000, for a kitchen. It replaced a rudimentary kitchen that served the meeting hall. The 1955 survey map does not show the kitchen which encroaches the 18-foot fire lane on the west side of the property. Also, the remaining fire lane has been converted to a play area for the day school. Google Maps show the additional structures that is -additional structures have been erected encroaching the remaining portion of that fire lane. Should a parking garage be built at 1317 Crescent Heights, there is a real fire safety hazard for both the partygoers and the residents of Havenhurst Drive, 1308 Havenhurst, 30 units; 1328 Havenhurst, 18 units; 1316 Havenhurst, 28 units; all within a 30-foot projection of the kitchen for Neman Hall. proposed garage blocks fire vehicles from serving the east side of these residential structures. Requests to Nancy Rodeheffer from the Los Angeles County Fire Department regarding the proposed 1317

Crescent Heights development has resulted in her e-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

mail dated 3/3/11, that they have not gotten any submittals regarding same. Where is the fire department's approval of this garage? CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. EBON ALABASTUR: Thank you. Michael Sirjani, followed by [Shalla Javdin]. MICHAEL SIRJANI: Commissioners, I'm here to answer any questions regarding parking operations, not to speak; that's why I submitted a slip. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. MICHAEL SIRJANI: Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Shalla? KATE BARTOLO: Shalla Javdin is unable to speak. She is actually the president of the IAJF. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. Allen Nazrine --Nazarian, followed by Andy [Cormarian]. ALLEN NAZARIAN: Hello, Planning Commission. name is Allen Nazarian, member of West Hollywood, 1230 Traffic in that area is unbelievable. I do a Horn. commute every day from work, so I hate traffic. interesting the irony in this situation, where in my area where I live there's all this going on, the City Council, and all the hubbub regarding traffic and parking and noise, and we all want parking. We want a parking structure. We want that huge gym to be built

2.0

2.4

with more parking.

But here, the irony is that the neighbors don't want parking. I'm baffled. They don't want parking. They do want parking, but not for the synagogue. It's interesting to point that out.

But the cities, in my opinion, their goal should be to create a win-win situation. The Jewish Center has a right to be there; it's purchased the property. It can't just close up shop and go ahead and maybe sell it to a developer, build a big condominium building, you know. I'm sure that would cause a lot more headaches.

I think there is a win-win situation here between the neighbors and the Jewish Center. It's right here in front of us. It says parking garage, which doesn't even look like a parking garage. This is not a parking garage. This is -- it looks like just an entrance into some Batman cave. This is not a parking garage. A parking garage typically three stories high.

So we've com -- the Jewish Federation has compromised. It's -- it's putting up the money. It's raising the money by having these Bar Mitzvahs and weddings and it's going into the betterment of this neighborhood.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

It's going to -- it's a win-win situation. curbing the hours, it's not going to allow for the Jewish Center to be able to raise this money to provide the parking that both the neighbors and the center need to co-exist. Thank you. Thank you. Andy, followed by Talia CHAIR YEBER: Shulman-Gold. KATE BARTOLO: I'm so sorry. He's also on the board. We really didn't anticipate this. I'm sorry. Some people can't speak. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. Talia Shulman-Gold, followed by Dr. Don Stewart -- Studt. TALIA SHULMAN-GOLD: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Talia Shulman-Gold. I'm a resident of Los Angeles and I'm the Western Regional Director of CAMERA, the Committing for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America, an educational non-profit organization that educates the public about Jewish life history, as well in the Middle East. And I am here to attest tonight that in my experience the IAJF does not function as a nightclub. It also functions as a vibrant center for Jewish programs on culture and history and Jewish life. in the past year CAMERA has partnered with the IAJF to

organize these Jewish cultural and educational

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

programs, all of which have been held at the IAJF building. And these programs have drawn in Jews from every walk of life and from every sector of the Los Angeles Jewish community. Jews who seek to enrich and broaden their knowledge and understanding of Jewish life, culture, Israel, and the Middle East. And these programs, I might add, which are usually held on weeknights, by necessity, sometimes continue well beyond 10 p.m. CAMERA and the IAJF plan on continuing their collaboration in the coming months. And the use of the IAJF building for CAMERA's educational and cultural programs is vital and indispensible. And IAJF's new parking structure will facilitate parking for the countless numbers of West Hollywood and Los Angeles residents who currently attend and enjoy our programs regularly. Thank you very much. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Excuse me. Could I ask for your name again? Talia? TALIA SHULMAN-GOLD: Talia Shulman-Gold. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. This is Dr. Don --DR. DON STUDT: My name is Dr. Don Studt. been a resident here for about 85 years, and I'm very

2.0

2.4

concerned about what will happen to my investment here on Havenhurst. I have attended every hearing on this matter since January of '09. And my letter that I wrote for the February 3rd meeting last month stated that I've never been opposed to having a synagogue or church as neighbors. The prior synagogue congregation were neighbors, not enemies. I personally have never heard of any complaints about them, for they fully respected their residential setting.

This is quite a contrast to IAJC's noisy, loud, late hours festivities, traffic congestions, which my tenant -- the tenants in our complex all complain about. Their website states they need this garage for parking for their congregation, but it's quite evident they do not need a new garage to accommodate the small congregation which already has quite adequate parking.

When the hearing was canceled last month for which I was here, I did start to re-study all the many documents and letters written by law-abiding citizens. After simulating this information, I left no doubt in my mind that IAJC's intention for the garage is that these facilities be used as a commercial, money-making venture.

I am now appalled that any religious group such as IAJC show such a blatant disregard for the laws of

1 the city by obviously misrepresenting the intended use 2 of their facilities. I also mention that the view from my complex, all 3 the windows and the porch, face the new proposed 4 garage. Just place yourself in that condo, and you 6 realize what a blight that would be and a hardship on us people who are already invested in that area. 7 8 Thank you. 9 Thank you. Mike Nazarian, followed CHAIR YEBER: 10 by Nahid Oberman. KATE BARTOLO: I'm sorry, Mr. Nazarian is on the 11 12 board. 13 Okay. And what about Mr. -- Ms. CHAIR YEBER: 14 Oberman? 15 NAHID OBERMAN: My name is Nahid Pirnazar I'm a lecturer at UCLA teaching history and 16 17 culture of Iranian Jews. Hollywood Temple Beth El has 18 been my spiritual home since I was a foreign exchange 19 student at Fairfax High School. My children have gone to Hebrew School there. I have had every event on my 2.0 -- cycle on my life except my wedding has happened 21 22 there. And I feel very attached to this place. 23 And I'm here to respectfully say that because I 2.4 have been attending all these meetings and have seen

their -- the effort of the Iranian Jewish Federation

2.4

to accommodate the complaints of the neighbors, I was at the meeting where the architects were talking, where they were talking about the noise, whatever they said we'll accommodate you.

And honestly, I think this parking lot is being built by the extra pressure on them to accommodate the issue of noise and the traffic jam. But let's look at it. You cannot, you know, demolish the temple.

There's a mall up on the Crescent Heights and Sunset, both sides. So traffic is growing. But we have to accommodate each other.

And please compare other temples like Valley (inaudible), Sephardic Temple, and others. We cannot go ahead and say why are you finishing at 10 o'clock while you see they are trying to accommodate you. I wonder how those people are treating that.

One more point that I would like to mention is the issue of respect. I don't think any event has happened in this temple to call it nightclub. So that's very respect -- disrespectful that everybody's trying to use that.

And the other one is the issue of non-Jewish

Events there -- sorry; I just finish my sentence -- is

that this is a house of worship; it should be open to

any faith and ethnicity, otherwise, we're racists

1 unless -- as long as it is for socials, communal 2 services, and philanthropics. Thank you. There's a question for you? 3 CHAIR YEBER: 4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. And may I please 5 have your name again? NAHID OBERMAN: I said Nahid. My maiden name is 6 Pirnazar, P-I-R-N-A-Z-A-R. And my married name is 7 Oberman, O-B-E-R-M-A-N. I'm a lecturer at UCLA. 8 9 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And I think it's 10 marvelous and exemplary that you lecture in Iranian 11 Jewish culture. 12 NAHID OBERMAN: With a lot of pride. 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But I would suggest and 14 hope that perhaps you would consider lecturing at this 15 congregation in American and other cultures than 16 Iranian Jewish cultures and how, when I assume that 17 most of the Iranian Jewish people that are here in 18 America --19 NAHID OBERMAN: Mm-hmm. 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- came because they said 21 to them in Iran, we don't like what you do. And here 22 we're hearing people say that the Iranian Jewish 23 temple says to them, if you don't like what we do and 2.4 you don't [recognize], you move. 25 NAHID OBERMAN: That is absolutely wrong if they

1 say that. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, would you please --2 3 NAHID OBERMAN: Maybe one individual has said 4 that. 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Would you -- would you 6 please investigate that, and if, in fact, even if it's 7 a little bit true use some of your efforts to help educate --8 9 **NAHID OBERMAN:** By all means. 10 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- your own people? 11 **NAHID OBERMAN:** By all means. 12 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 13 NAHID OBERMAN: If I am allowed to, in fact, 14 today my lecture was about this, the Iranian's who 15 came here at Sinai Temple in 1978. 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Unfortunately -- I wish 17 we could engage in this discussion --18 NAHID OBERMAN: Sure. No problem. 19 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** -- but we can't. 20 NAHID OBERMAN: Some other time. 21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But please teach our own 22 how to be respectful. 23 NAHID OBERMAN: I think they are. Maybe some 2.4 individual are both sides are not. The --25 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Nobody should be.

1 NAHID OBERMAN: The disrespectfulness comes from 2 both sides. 3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. 4 NAHID OBERMAN: I'm sorry. 5 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you so much. 6 NAHID OBERMAN: Thank you. 7 CHAIR YEBER: Monsieur [Parcy], followed by Elahe Bor -- Borokhim. And again I apologize if I'm 8 9 butchering peoples' names. 10 KATE BARTOLO: I'm sorry, they had to leave. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Which one had to leave, Kate? 12 KATE BARTOLO: [Farcy]. 13 Parcy did, okay. CHAIR YEBER: 14 KATE BARTOLO: Farcy. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Thank you. 16 **ELAHE BOROKHIM:** Good evening, my name is Elahe 17 And I'm very much involved in a volunteer Borokhim. 18 program at Iranian American Jewish Federation that helps the individual in our community to learn and be 19 2.0 educated about health issues. 21 In this center, it is not all about parties. 22 is not all about music. It's all about -- also very 23 much about education, prevention, treatment, and 2.4 offering the individuals in our community services 25 that will actually enhance their lives,

2.0

2.4

psychologically, medically, socially.

So it is rather important for all of us to realize that the existence of this center is not only for engagement in religious events because we believe that education is also part of religious event. It is also very much important to make sure that our youth is aware of illnesses that can be prevented, our premarital tests are being done to prevent genetic diseases such as I -- HIBM.

Iranian American Jewish Federation was the reason for the HIBM testing to be available. They were advocates to make sure that this test was being paid with -- by insurance companies.

It is extremely important for all of us to work with each other. Just as much as we want to accommodate the neighbors, we hope that they would understand why we need to exist. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. I have a speaker, we can't figure out the name, who resides on Holt. I want to say [Pariss]. [Parise]. Does anyone here reside -- huh?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible - microphone
inaccessible)

CHAIR YEBER: Possibly. Not the one that I just called. This is a first name it looks like.

1 KATE BARTOLO: Spell it? I'm sorry. 2 can't read it --3 CHAIR YEBER: P-A-R-I, it looks like S-C. 4 doesn't make sense, so. Does anyone here live on 5 Holt? ERIN ANDERSON: Oh, it was his wife. 6 7 KATE BARTOLO: It was his wife, not him. 8 CHAIR YEBER: Huh? 9 ERIN ANDERSON: It was the wife of the gentleman 10 who already left. 11 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Lana Branover, followed by 12 David Yocum. 13 LAURA BRANOVER: Hello. My name is Lana 14 Branover. Full name's [Elana] Branover. Come from former Soviet Union. And as many Jews that came from 15 16 Soviet Union in the late '70s had nothing to do with 17 the Jewish religion, was introduced here and we're 18 very proud to be part of Jewish community in Los 19 Angeles in West Hollywood. 20 And this temple had played a huge role in my life 21 and the life of my family and friends. My children 22 and Bar and Bat Mitzvahs in the temple. Many friends 23 had other religious ceremonies, as well as cultural 2.4 there. 25 And, you know, I've heard a phrase here which I

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

Stop clapping.

think is very important when you're saying serving the I think there's a huge Russian Community in West Hollywood that, up 'til this day, I mean, just less than a year ago, I was at the wedding at this temple for the daughter of my friends. Also a little bit shocking was to hear the word or phrase blend in. The last time I've heard that was in the Soviet Russia when we had to blend in because we could not, you know, be ourselves. I thought that the great thing of America, as well as West Hollywood, was a culture of diversity. You know, the blend in is fine, but we still want to be ourselves, right. we can embrace each other cultures. You know, we're -- we heard about other churches, which is great, and, you know, what they do is part of, you know, what we are here for. But, you know, we are all going to be as we are and, you know, I don't think we can point at our neighbors or anybody else to be just like I am. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. David Yocum, followed by Ric Abramson. (Clapping) UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Stop clapping.

25 DAVID YOCUM: Hi. I'm David Yocum. I live at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1287 North Crescent Heights Boulevard in West Hollywood. In addition to the late hours of the parties at the center --(Commotion) CHAIR YEBER: Excuse me. DAVID CARLAT: This guy just threatened me. SHERIFF'S DEPUTY: I want you to come over here, please. KATE BARTOLO: David, please. DAVID CARLAT: He just threatened me. KATE BARTOLO: David. DAVID YOCUM: Want me to hold on? CHAIR YEBER: Okay. We'll start -- can you restart that time for me, please. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Please disallow the clapping. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That's what started it. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: What's the problem? CHAIR YEBER: Okay. You may resume, Mr. Yocum. Okay. Sorry. So back to the DAVID YOCUM: issues of mutual respect. I mean, I think West Hollywood is all about wanting to invite diversity. But, you know, I think we have had so many late night

2.4

parties that the neighbors have been plagued by the sheer volume at the activity and noise at night. I mean, Fountain and Crescent Heights are already pretty congested. And when the lanes are blocked and the City employees and other things, as referenced in one of the memos I read tonight are needed at almost all these events, that's the issue. It's not about training or helping people. It's about, you know, a reasonable time to end at night and end on the weekends, so people who are in the surrounding area can enjoy their right to their own home and their own quiet.

You know, at break I was walking out and I noticed on the West Hollywood 25th Anniversary poster, two of the things it highlights hugely is respect and

You know, at break I was walking out and I noticed on the West Hollywood 25th Anniversary poster two of the things it highlights hugely is respect and support for the people and the quality of residential life. And we're asking for your help as the citizens of West Hollywood. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Ric Abramson, followed by Lynn Russell.

RIC ABRAMSON: Ric Abramson, city of West

Hollywood. I'm a little concerned about what has been

put before you this evening to consider. I've sort of

been referring to this as a square peg in a round hole

because I think while the -- you know, I think both

2.4

sides of the issue feel very passionate about their position, I really do think there is a solution here. And I wish that there had been more discussion about solutions instead of what everybody must have.

I would, though, like to say that I'm a little troubled by this sort of doctrine of more conforming that's been brought up tonight. Clearly the code does preclude any rooftop parking, as an example, in a residential zone; it's black and white. It says, rooftop parking shall only occur in a commercial or PF zoning district, period. And, yet, we have rooftop parking here.

That's clearly creating impacts. We're taking impacts that were once at surface level, noise, what have you, and now we're moving them 20 feet into the air right adjacent to a bedroom window and saying that there's no additional impact. It really doesn't make sense.

I think Mr. Ruben brought up certain setback issues that are black and white in the code. When you have an accessory use in a residential zone, it has to have a six foot setback; that's not here in this case.

So there either should be, in my mind -- well, let me say this. In the code it states how to do a residential parking structure in a residential zone.

2.4

25

1 It's called a PK overlay and it's very specific. 2 That's not what's happening here. And in order to do so it would take a zone change and other things. 3 So what's before you is not making sense, and, 4 5 ultimately, it's going to require some sort of 6 variance or zone change or other action to really make the findings for this type of structure. Thank you. 7 8 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Lynn Russell, followed 9 by Joubin Eshaghian. 10 LYNN RUSSELL: Good evening, Commissioners. 11 Russell, West Hollywood. I actually have a birds-eye 12 view of the activities of what goes on here from the sixth floor of the building up the street on Crescent 13 14 Heights. And it really doesn't seem to matter how 15 this facility is dressed up to be presented as a 16 The proposal seems as disingenuous as the 17 original remodel back in 2000. 18 In the run up to this magical parking facility establishment, virtually the entire congregation and 19 20 its powers that be have found themselves incapable of 21 respecting the community in which they have landed a 22 commercial entertainment party facility cloaked in 23 religious innuendo.

Similarly, they have shown equal disre --

disregard for the code compliance and other laws of

2.4

West Hollywood. Above all, they have acted with a very heavy hand devoid of common sense.

For whatever reason the city's parking enforcement, traffic control, and code compliance have demonstrated a lack of ability or sheer gumption to really constrain their misbehavior.

Just two nights ago I witnessed two hours of virtual mayhem, horns honking, fender benders, and so forth, with a city vehicle standing by almost powerless to do anything about it until the sheriff arrived.

The ingress and the egress of this facility will not change with a parking turtle shell over the problem. It is simply inappropriate and uncontrollable. I would suspect that not a single member of this Commission or even the City Council could tolerate the slippery nuisance in their own community.

Additionally, given the question -- the questions posed, with all due respect to the Commissioners this evening, I'm not really confident that the Commission, at this particular point, is in a position to understand the full dynamics that are in play here.

Please deny this proposal -- proposed parking structure and the conditional use permit. Thank you.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Ms. Russell, there's a guestion for 2 you from one of the Commissioners. 3 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Ms. Russell, could you 4 briefly expand on something? You suggest that -- you used the phrase religious innuendo, and it's one of 6 the issues we're going to have to be discussing. we've actually heard fairly consistent testimony that 7 would make it seem like there is a pretty clear 8 9 religious connotation to a lot of these things. Why 10 did you use the term innuendo? 11 LYNN RUSSELL: Certainly not in a -- in a -- in 12 any disrespectful way. But it just seemed as though 13 they -- everything seems to be stretched to the 14 absolute limit to -- to justify the behavior. And at 15 no time have I ever really seen them trying to 16 accommodate the area that we live in. 17 So I guess it was sort of a loose term of 18 innuendo. I didn't mean to suggest that they have 19 religious innuendo, but it was kind of a term of 2.0 descriptive adjective, perhaps. 21 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** That's clear. 22 you. . 23 LYNN RUSSELL: Okay. 2.4 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yeah. 25 LYNN RUSSELL: I hope.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. Joubin Eshaghian --2 JOUBIN ESHAGHIAN: Good evening. CHAIR YEBER: -- followed by Cantor Harris, I 3 4 believe. JOUBIN ESHAGHIAN: Good evening. My name is 6 Joubin Eshaghian. I live on 271 North Kenter Avenue, Brentwood. I have used the services of the synagogue, 7 this culture center, many times. I have never seen 8 9 any issues, any loud noises. There has always been 10 full supervision inside, outside. Also, Crescent Heights and Fountain Avenue is a 11 12 highly traffic area. The noise that's created by the cars driving up and down, up and down, is -- far 13 14 exceeds any noise coming from the center. 15 The center is a benefit of the -- to the society. After being there for many years, for 50, 60 years, 16 17 adding a few parking spot is not much to ask. Adding 18 the parking structure, if anything, it reduces the 19 noise and it provides more park -- offsite parking for 20 the neighbors, whereas, the residents, people coming 21 here, they have to use offsite parking right now. 22 Also reduces public -- creates safety for the people, 23 older generations who have to park close. You know, 2.4 right now, a lot of them, the senior citizens, they

have to park across the street. Women and children,

1 they have to walk, in the day -- you know, dark times to go back and forth. 2 I think it's a benefit to everyone, and they have 3 4 always been respectful to all the neighbors. Thank you. Thank you. Cantor Harris, followed 6 CHAIR YEBER: by our last speaker, Bruce Roberts (sic). 7 8 CANTER HARRIS: Hello, and good evening, Commissioner and Panel. I'm Cantor Harris, Shore End. 9 10 I very gratefully served as Jewish clergy for 11 Hollywood Temple Beth El for over a year up until December 31st. And I still have many friends and 12 13 colleagues at the -- at the center. 14 During the time that I worked there, I worked not 15 only with Hollywood Temple Beth El, which is the 16 smaller Ashkenazi group, but I also worked closely 17 with the Sephardic group known as the Iranian Jewish 18 American Federation. 19 There are so many issues on the table here 20 tonight that I'm afraid I might try to address all of 21 them and meet none of them. And so I'm going to 22 respond first, please, to a couple things that I 23 heard. First of all, the term adequate parking and 2.4 people saying that they already have adequate parking. 25 And I don't think it's a question of whether it's

2.4

adequate parking. I think it's a question of whether or not -- whether or not there's going to be parking that will be beneficial to both the center as well as the neighborhood.

The noise complaint that is coming from the neighborhood, by and large is about the noise that comes from the parking lot. The parking lot is an open area. If you put the cars down underground and into a parking facility, granted, absolutely, if there has to be a variance, there has to be a variance, if you have to meet certain code, I know a lot about the codes, you got to meet the codes. So that's not the issue either.

The issue is whether or not the neighbors want this place to exist in the first place. And if the people around don't want the place to exist in the first place, they're going to find every reason they can for it not to exist.

Now, I know the people here very well for almost a year and a half. The whole concept of Kehila, which is community, which is one of [Amudeum], and Amud is a stand. It could be a pillar -- I'm beeped; I know.

I've been beeped by many rabbis, why shouldn't I be beeped by you.

Now, I just want you to know that Kehila is a

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

sacred -- is sacred and there are many different ways to celebrate Judaism; sometimes it's with serious prayer and sometimes it's with celebration. You're going to get the whole gamut of life at this community. Some of it's going to be noisy inside. And whoever said what they think is going on inside, and they don't know what's going inside that place anymore than I know what's going inside her room and how is she -- she is celebrating Shabbat. I don't know how she is celebrating Shabbat and she doesn't know how these people are celebrating in their religious way. So that's all I want to say. Thank you for taking the extra time to hear me. God bless you all. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. (Applause) UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No. No clapping. CHAIR YEBER: Please. Okay. Our last speaker, Bruce Robertson. BRUCE ROBERTSON: Bruce Robertson, city of West Hollywood. As many of you know, I attend these meetings pretty regularly just because I'm interested. I don't live in the neighborhood, but I think it's been well established that the temple has not been an ideal neighbor.

2.0

2.4

I also think that the parking structure is beautiful and I think it should absolutely be approved because I think it will do nothing but reduce the noise for the neighbors. I have to say, if it's openended, that I would have concerns about exhaust or lights coming into a unit near me if I lived there. But, you know, certainly that could be considered.

As to the hours that staff is recommending, I certainly think that because of the previous behavior of the temple, and it's not just the temple, I'm just not trying to blame them, I really believe that this body should go with the City Council hours or, you know, the hours that were suggested by the Business License Commission just less than a year ago, until, you know, the temple can maybe prove itself, that they are willing to be good neighbors and respect.

A couple of other things. If there are events that need to be held and they need to be 12 or one or two or three or four o'clock in the morning, the City has an avenue for that; it's called a special event. They can apply for 12 special events a year and extent those hours.

Another suggestion is, what if you were to condition this permit so that the temple was to set up a line, and I know this has been done with previous

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

businesses, the Argyle Hotel in particular, that -- a complaint line that would be answered during all hours of operation that the residents could call and say, look, you guys are being noisy, tone it done. And also, possibly a sound engineer. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Thank you. That was our last There's been a request to take another fivespeaker. minute break to -- oh, yeah, Kate, actually, why don't we let you come up and do your --KATE BARTOLO: I can wait. It's okay. CHAIR YEBER: To rebuttal? KATE BARTOLO: Yeah, I can wait. CHAIR YEBER: Huh? KATE BARTOLO: Take a break. CHAIR YEBER: No, no, no. Let's do your rebuttal, and then we'll take a break after all the public testimony is complete. **KATE BARTOLO:** There's been a lot of focus on this being a nightclub. What I will readily concede is over the last several years the impacts were substantially more than they should have been. events were going very late, people were lingering outside talking, and as is common with people who are standing on a street that's a major arterial street, not fully cognizant it was a residential neighborhood.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Those problems are being dealt with, not fully. They haven't all been solved. But they are major changes, among which includes reduced hours of operation, better control of exiting. We did six reviews of events, beginning and end. Our observation was that the valet parking in the beginning was a mess and it could have been handled better throughout, and that a better job can be done in terms of handling the -- preventing the impacts that come from neighbors. That's why we're bringing in Michael Sirjani who represents the City of West Hollywood and all of its parking lots. And as he said in his first meeting to the IAJF board, don't hire me if you don't want to be held to a higher standard because I am held to a higher standard.

They will be increasing valet parking staffing.

They already have security guards at the event. The rooftop will be used as a last resort. And the hours, to talk about it, they do differ fundamentally from reformed. They have shaved it. They are working on it. But here's one of the things that needs to be addressed. In the last three years, two to three times a week, it's an average, there have been events. This February that has intensified, three point three times per week. That, however, is going to be offset

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

by Passover and a Persian holiday, which means that the center will be essentially dark through March and April.

So the problem is it's not feasible to limit the events per week because it's on average that I'm sharing that with you.

With regard to parking, we already have open (inaudible) parking. The -- there will literally be less open parking spaces under this garage. will be an eight-foot high sound wall. There won't be pointing flood lights. We've never -- what is important about parking is to know this, they've never had to actually cancel an event because of a lack of offsite parking. They have ample -- or excuse me -onsite parking. We have ample access to offsite parking, but some of that offsite parking has actually created problems where people are actually having to walk up and down on Crescent Heights Boulevard, and particularly late at night back to their cars, they're chatting, they're going in groups. Under our new valet plan, that will end.

The research on synagogues is interesting. One of the things it yielded is they all advertise about the availability, not just to their congregation, with one exception that is -- has a policy of limiting it

2.0

2.4

to congregation, but they still advertise. And they also -- the research has yielded they're almost all called social halls. So the differentiation between social hall and banquet hall on the websites of these other facilities is really indistinguishable.

As it relates to planning issues, if there are issues that need to be addressed by planning and -- excuse me -- during the permitting process, such as fire department compliance, that is part of the plan check process.

I think planning staff has amply demonstrated and provided extraordinary, actually excruciating oversight and review on whether a variance is needed and what the compliance standards are. My new line is, after representing this group I could, based on all that we've gone through in terms of working with planning staff, I could be a contortionist in Cirque do you Soleil. So these issues have been addressed ably.

The rooftop particularly is not prohibited. It is not called out. What is called out is it says you can do commercial, but it doesn't restrict you from doing rooftop in a residential zone. It then goes on to tell you how to design in a residential zone rooftop parking that is adjacent to residential.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR YEBER:

The garage is the solution. CUP is the solution. The special events, I understand the idea. a creative idea. But one of the difficulties is a lot of these events are planned up to a year in advance. The -- one of the conditions is there will be a complaint line. Finally, on RLUIPA, the issue of the federal ex -- the federal law. It is not a law that is prescriptive, per se. It doesn't say you -- they totally -- the federal law usurps the ability to have a city try to control impacts. But what it does say, and a religion here is defined by any exercise of religion whether or not compelled by or central to a system of religious beliefs, three main provisions, substantial burden, local zoning has to pick the least restrictive means of furthering govern -- government interest, which I believe is the garage, equal terms, it has to treat religious institutions on equal terms with non-religious institutions and religious institutions. And the fact is that most of those abut residential, and then nondiscrimination, forgetting discrimination on the basis of religious denomination. Thank you. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: We have questions.

We have a couple questions for you.

1 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Kate, I have a question 2 for you. 3 KATE BARTOLO: Yes. 4 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Why are you not putting a 5 roof on the rooftop on the second story of the garage? 6 **KATE BARTOLO:** The cost is very substantial. what they've done is they've mitigated the impact 7 through a seven-foot sound wall. The rooftop parking 8 9 is going to be used as a last resort. The plan for 10 parking for valet is going to be through Coast 11 Parking, the new -- the new-to-be-hired, and there's a 12 contract finalized, parking. It will start -- parking will start in lot A in the basement, it'll go to the 13 14 ground floor, it'll then go over to lot B, which has 15 80 car parking. And then when and if those are filled 16 only, it will go to the rooftop. 17 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'm -- she --19 **KATE BARTOLO:** And also -- what? 20 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: She asked a question --21 excuse me. 22 KATE BARTOLO: They also -- it only goes 17 foot 23 high in parts and 21 feet high. So it really isn't a 2.4 shadowing issue. They're going to see a wall of green 25 as distinguished from an apartment building they'd be

1 looking into bedrooms. 2 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: It's not the view I'm 3 concerned about, it's the noise. 4 KATE BARTOLO: It'll handle the -- also only by 5 valet driving to there and from there. 6 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have a question maybe 7 for staff afterwards when we come back. Can you let me know what the business license hours were, 'cause I 8 9 don't have the information in front of me? Thank you. 10 I know we're not going to discuss the business 11 license. I just want to know what the hours were that 12 they proposed. 13 CHAIR YEBER: Do you have a question for Ms. 14 Bartolo? 15 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: No, I don't. Thank you. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Anybody else? Thank you. 17 right. We're going to take a five-minute break. 18 Again, remind everyone not to approach the 19 Commissioners regarding this issue since the hearing 2.0 is still open. Thank you. 21 (Recess) 22 CHAIR YEBER: I'd like to get the meeting going. 23 We still have a lot more to do before the evening's 2.4 over. 25 All right. I'd like to start -- start before we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

get into Commissioner deliberation, now that we've heard testimony, does -- do any of the Commissioners have further questions of staff at this point? Well, Donald had one. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can you tell us what the business license hours were? ADRIAN GALLO: Yes, Donald. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Thank you. ADRIAN GALLO: From the Business License Commission, the hours imposed on IAJC were as follows: Sunday through Thursday, six a.m. to 10 p.m.; Friday, Saturday, and the day prior to a city holiday, six a.m. to 12 a.m. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: So those are the same ones that the City Council took up on consideration, and that's in resolution of the 15.7 this evening? ADRIAN GALLO: Correct. **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay. Thank you. CHAIR YEBER: Okay. In listening to -- I first want to thank everyone for coming out. Some of you came out three times for this, and I apologize. we finally were able to hear everyone who wanted to speak on this. So I want to thank everyone for coming out and speaking, you know, for the most part in a respectful, civilized manner. I really appreciate it.

1 It helped me in terms of my thinking about this. 2 I want to get a consensus from the Commission before we move on to detailed deliberation. 3 4 general, is there an objection to -- is there an objection conceptually to a garage? Because I think if we don't answer that -- if we -- if we don't answer 6 that question first, we're going to be all over the 7 place. And I'd like to know if there's a general 8 9 objection in a conceptual fashion to having a garage 10 on this particular piece of property, and then we can 11 move on to the particulars of the other issues. 12 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I don't see an objection 13 to having a garage, conceptually. 14 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I agree with 15 Commissioner Altschul 16 **COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** My objection to a garage 17 would not be based on conception. 18 (Laughter) 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: It's -- you know, I 2.0 understand that there's a garage and I understand --21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: How do you conceive a 22 garage? 23 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: No. I guess what we're 2.4 saying is conceptual -- Sue, I conceptually am okay 25 with the garage on the site. And I guess what I'm

2.4

saying is not necessarily accepting of what their -this particular proposal of a garage. But I am
amenable to a garage on the site conceptually.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. How about the other

COMMISSIONERS? Commissioner Hamaker? Commissioner Guardarrama?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I agree.

CHAIR YEBER: All right. So that gets the big
hurdle out of the way, okay. So now I would like to - I believe Commissioner Altschul would like to help
us frame the rest of the discussion.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Thank you. I think we have an institution that I -- as I had gathered, was put up in the 1920s, and this current main building was done in the 1950s. That's, you know, anywhere from 60 to 80 years ago. And up until not too long ago, there was never a peep about the operation of the religious activities that went on there.

Just in the last few years when this edifice was struggling and needed some rejuvenation and I know it did, and it's perfectly reasonable to expect that something needed to be done and had to be done to give some life to it and to make it -- and to make it a viable -- make it a viable space and a viable Jewish space, and it's wonderful that that happened.

2.0

2.4

It's not so wonderful that it had to be done at the expense of the quality of life of some of the neighbors. It's also quite obvious that the Beverly Hills synagogue, which I believe is on Rexford, quite apparently does not allow this kind of thing and the members of this congregation respect, quite dutifully, Beverly Hills' restrictions on these things, so they brought it over here.

Whether or not it was handled correctly by them, whether or not it was handled correctly by the City, we find ourselves now in a predicament where we need to resolve it and we need to make it work because we need to work -- make it work in everybody's best interests.

I think it's abhorrent that there is this pushpull between the two different factions and that this
push-pull has gone on for far too long. The City, I
think, has done a wonderful job recently in trying to
come to a meeting of the minds and trying to come to a
solution. And, of course, as we learn somewhere in
the Bible, the best solution is where everybody is
equally unhappy.

And I do believe that the people who are operating this facility have not done it in the best of good faith. And, you know, I do think that the

2.0

2.1

2.4

neighbors have been put to -- put to a lot of trouble and put to a lot of aggravation in trying to get the thing to where it can be livable.

Crescent Heights, on the other hand, is not some little street like [Glockalema] in West Hollywood that nobody knows it's there, but it is and it has nothing but residences on it. Crescent Heights, sooner or later will probably have a Walgreen's at Santa Monica. Crescent Heights is one of the widest streets in West Hollywood. Crescent Heights is the preferred route to get to and from the valley.

So everybody who is here who is complaining about traffic and noise and so forth has been used to the entrance and exit for Laurel Canyon for at least my entire lifetime here.

So come on, you know, there is -- there's got to be a little give on both sides. And I think this garage, which then precipitates a CUP, and I know that most of the people here don't speak CUP. I didn't speak CUP either, and I still don't speak it fully; still learning.

But CUP means you have more control. CUP means there is a higher standard of respect for the rules that exist with respect to the use of the land. And that's a simple concept.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Without a CUP, you don't have a guideline, you don't have a Bible, and you don't have parameters in which you can say, you've exceeded these parameters or congratulations, now you've been staying within these parameters. And that's -- that, I think, is our function tonight. And if we do come up with a CUP and say, okay, congregation, here's your CUP, you've applied for it, congratulations, mazel tov. And the City's going to give it to you. City, congratulations, mazel tov. Okay, now we're on the same page. I think Ms. Bartolo said all of the conditions that -- and correct me if I heard this wrong. All of the conditions that were recommended by the staff for the CUP, with the exception of the removal of the rental stuff on the same -- the next morning, rather the same night, was acceptable; is that correct? KATE BARTOLO: Yes. The -- we're expressing concern about the 10 p.m., but we're trying to adhere COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, you just answered my questions. KATE BARTOLO: Yes. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: To repeat it, she said,

all of the recommendations of staff for the

2.0

2.4

conditions, with the exception of putting over the rental pickups until the morning after were acceptable to the organization and to the applicant.

So, therefore, I would move that a CUP be granted with all of the conditions recommended by the staff in place and with -- and also with -- let's see. How do we -- how do we cut this thing in half to make everybody unhappy -- with on -- well, that's too subjective. I think -- I think I would be in favor of putting it over 'til the next day.

There is no rental company that's going to use their stuff from midnight until eight in the morning someplace else.

So who is this a burden on to pick up the stuff the next day? Nobody. What happens if the rental company charges an extra pickup charge for having to come back the next morning? You pass it on to the customer; that's not unreasonable to keep that kind of nose of loading tables and chairs and all this stuff from happening after midnight.

So I think I would move the -- I would move the CUP, including the garage and all of the conditions that the staff recommends with the pickups on the next morning.

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Commissioner Altschul --

1	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes.
2	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I have a question.
3	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes.
4	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: With regard to condition
5	15.7, which hours are you suggesting?
6	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I would what is 15.7?
7	Remind me.
8	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: It's the it's our
9	choice between hours - where the first set is more
10	permissive and the second set is more stringent.
11	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, I would think
12	Monday to Thursday, the difference between 10 o'clock
13	and midnight is 11. So let's do it from eight a.m. to
14	11 p.m
15	COMMISSINER DELUCCIO: And what about weekends?
16	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Monday through
17	Thursday, and the weekends from eight a.m. to 12:30.
18	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Would you make that one
19	o'clock on weekends?
20	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You want to go for 1:45 -
21	- no, 12:30.
22	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: 12:30.
23	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: 12:30. 12:30.
24	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I'll second that.
25	JOHN KEHO: I'd just like to point out on the

1 third of those three there was incentive to get the 2 parking structure built earlier. I didn't know if you 3 wanted that incentive of --4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Say again, please. 5 JOHN KEHO: Of the three choices, the third one 6 has an incentive to get the parking structure built earlier than --7 8 **COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL:** Oh, absolutely. 9 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: No, I -- my understanding 10 is these would be the -- you're recommending these, 11 Commissioner, also as being the hours, correct? 12 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: What the third one is is a disincentive. 13 14 JOHN KEHO: This -- this is on the -- 15.7 are on 15 the hours before the parking structure gets built. 16 15.7 is before the parking structure gets built. 17 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I -- I think the 18 Commission's also intent, if I understand is --19 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, I would suggest the 2.0 hours that I stated and then a disincentive that if it 21 doesn't get built within one year that the parking --22 that the hours be reduced an hour. 23 KATE BARTOLO: If I could just, point of 2.4 clarification on our position. We were willing to go 25 with the strong incentive, which is the third, which

is that they would be the staff was recommending
the hours we had requested for a period of one year.
And if the garage has not begun, the hours are reduced
to the opening hours or operating hours the City
Council was considering.
So I just want to have that as a point of
clarification our
COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: And what hours are you
KATE BARTOLO: acceptance of that.
COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: What hours are you
requesting?
KATE BARTOLO: Until midnight Monday through
Friday and 1:30 Saturday, and one a.m. on Sunday.
COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: And are those closing
hours
KATE BARTOLO: That was what staff had
recommended as an incentive.
COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Those closing hours are
when the doors are locked?
KATE BARTOLO: That is when the events are over.
And there are also conditions that say that you have
to start serving alcohol a half hour before, music
stops 15 minutes before, announcements are made that -
_
COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And, Ms. Bartolo

1 KATE BARTOLO: -- are very clear at the end of the evening. 2 3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Ms. Bartolo --KATE BARTOLO: Yes. 4 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- you can always come 6 back and ask for more. But I think a demonstration of 7 goodwill is to accept something like this, which the Council has indicated a predisposition for. And come 8 9 back and see us in a year and bring -- or cause none 10 of these neighbors to come here, and I suspect you'll 11 get what you want. 12 But, you know, I think to stick your toe in the water and to sort of crawl before you swim is not such 13 14 a bad idea. And who cannot end a party at those 15 particular hours? It can be done and it's not 16 unreasonable. After all, if you couldn't ever hold 17 your party in Beverly Hills, you come here and we let 18 you hold your party and the neighbors give a little 19 bit, you know. Please try. 2.0 KATE BARTOLO: We've already given is the 21 challenge here. There were -- frankly, there wasn't 22 excessive hours before. 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You've given and you've 2.4 given a lot. 25 KATE BARTOLO: We have given a lot, honestly.

1 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: But you've given a lot of 2 grief in addition. 3 KATE BARTOLO: Well, there was grief based on the 4 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: There -- you yourself --6 **KATE BARTOLO:** -- prior hours. 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You yourself have admitted that there was a lot of grief. 8 9 KATE BARTOLO: Yes, and those hours have been 10 changed voluntarily. And we're asking for these 11 reduced hours. And the permanent hours have a slight 12 variation, but they're actually slightly longer. 13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Again, we can look at 14 this in six months. We can look at this in a year. 15 It depends on whether or not you've got shovels in the 16 around. 17 KATE BARTOLO: The fundamental challenge we have 18 right now is that a lot of events are planned up to a year in advance: they are weddings, they are 19 20 ceremonies, they -- celebrations. We have contractual 21 obligations. It is a grave concern. We have been 22 advertising for a very long time. There are a lot of 23 negotiations underway that we've been making certain 2.4 representations. They're planning on going with us. 25 It creates very, very significant negative impacts --

1 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I understand. 2 KATE BARTOLO: -- to truncate at --3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I understand. **KATE BARTOLO:** -- this juncture. 4 5 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I understand. And there 6 are ways to renegotiate, to explain to people that you have certain constraints that the municipality has put 7 8 on your and please work with us and we'll give you X-Y 9 incentives, and please don't make one of them a shrimp cocktail. 10 11 KATE BARTOLO: I can only tell you I spend hours 12 and hours and hours internally working with people --13 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I understand --14 **KATE BARTOLO:** -- to really --15 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: -- and I know you have. 16 **KATE BARTOLO:** -- push on the hours. 17 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: This is my 18 recommendation. 19 **KATE BARTOLO:** I understand. 20 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: And I'm going to second 21 your motion. And there will be a six-month review; 22 that's one of the conditions in here. 23 I'm hearing from the neighbors, I'm not hearing 2.4 support for any hours longer than the ones we're going 25 to grant you. I actually did throw out even another

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
hour, and I'm hearing -- I'm hearing resistance from
the residents here. So I -- you are getting a -- it
looks like you may get a CUP this evening. There will
be a review in six months. And I just think this is
the best we can do at this time.
    We have to take into consideration not only the
business operations but also the residents.
    KATE BARTOLO: The fundamental issue --
    COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: And I cannot walk out of
here this evening if I give you any longer hours.
would not walk out in good conscience.
    JOHN KEHO: Chair?
    COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I feel this will be --
    COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I would --
    COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I feel this will be the
way to mitigate the impacts with the --
    KATE BARTOLO: But the problem --
    COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: -- parking structure.
    KATE BARTOLO: -- fundamentally --
    JOHN KEHO: Chair, I --
    KATE BARTOLO: -- is that we're giving up legally
nonconforming standards --
    CHAIR YEBER: Wait. Can I -- can we -- yes?
    COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You're voluntarily giving
them up.
```

1 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul. Yes? 2 JOHN KEHO: Yeah. I'm just wanting to make sure 3 we're clear on the hours. So I was wondering if you 4 can repeat -- so this is --COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Well, I'm getting the 6 hours of being Sunday through Thursday, eight a.m. to 7 11 p.m.; Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, eight a.m. to 12 midnight. Those are the only hours I think we're 8 9 recognizing at this time in the permit going forward. 10 We're not making a distinction between what's, you know, between preconstruction, construction, and after 11 12 construction. 13 JOHN KEHO: Okay. That's --14 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Then it'll be --15 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: That was --16 JOHN KEHO: -- what I wanted to clarify. 17 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: That was not the motion, 18 though. The motion was 'til 12:30. It wasn't 'til 19 midnight. 20 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Is it to 12 -- John, are 21 you fine with 12:30? 22 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Then 12 -- then that's 2.4 fine, I'm fine with that too then. 25 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And --

2.0

2.4

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I need clarification too, because I thought earlier in the hearing we were trying to get some clarification about the preconstruction or whether these conditions are going to apply beyond the preconstruction during the operation once the facility is built.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And my comment on that, which we could make part of the motion, is that

which we could make part of the motion, is that instead of making an incentive to give them an additional hour, use these hours as the base, and if they don't start construction within the one year, take an hour off of that as a disincentive.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I just -- I don't know if I can support that at this time. I think it -- I would just go with what you recommended initially as the hours and --

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Look, the idea is the -if the garage is good, make them build it. The only
way they're going to build it is to give them either
an incentive on the early hour morning, an early hour
morning closing, or take an hour away. But either way
you're going to -- either one of those ways you're
going to get that garage built.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: So the incentive would be if they don't build it in one year the hours would be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

scaled back Sunday through Thursday from eight to 10 p.m.; Friday, Saturday, and Sunday would be scaled back from eight to 12 midnight instead of 12:30. Would you be fine with that? COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. And that's not an incentive. It's a disincentive. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Disincentive, exactly. COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Okay. I'm also hearing two different Commissioners, one saying to start the building of the garage and another one saying to get -- go a little bit further. I mean, does that mean stick a shovel in the --COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You can't finish this thing in a year. No, you can't finish it. COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: But what does it mean to start it? They have to just, you know --COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Once it's started --**COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** -- break ground? COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Once it's started --**COMMISSIONER BUCKNER:** So they could break ground the day before the year's up? I mean, like what are we talking? COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I guess --Wait. If I can get clarification CHAIR YEBER:

1 from staff. What was the intention with the incentive 2 to --3 JOHN KEHO: The inten --4 CHAIR YEBER: -- expedite the construction of the 5 garage? The intention was that the 6 JOHN KEHO: Right. parking garage would be able to solve some of the 7 8 problems. So try to get the garage built sooner 9 rather than later. And so the idea was they would 10 need to take out a building permit, gone through the 11 entire plan check process, had their plans reviewed, 12 have the commitment that they have the funding 13 available, and they take out the building permit, so 14 that way they're moving forward on the project. 15 CHAIR YEBER: And based on what's being proposed here, what if they can't build it? Let's say 16 17 hypothetically the county fire department says you 18 can't build this particular garage --19 MR. KEHO: They can --20 CHAIR YEBER: -- based on this configuration or 21 strategy? 22 JOHN KEHO: Well, they can -- sometimes this 23 happens. For other projects it's happened where they 2.4 haven't been able to build the exact building that the 25 Planning Commission saw or was approved, and so they

1 do minor changes and that might solve the problem. 2 If it's a significant change, they might have to come back to the Planning Commission and get one of 3 the conditions changed to accommodate that, or --4 CHAIR YEBER: I sort of feel like we're putting 6 the cart before the horse here because I sort of feel like the garage is incredibly flawed as a feasible 7 structure on this site. I have a problem with the 8 9 rooftop parking in its entirety, okay, even with a 10 seven-foot or an eight-foot sound wall. I don't know 11 how the fire department would conceivably say that 12 they have access to the rear of the property or what we considered the western edge, especially where the 13 14 kitchen is because that's where the -- a fire would most likely start. There's no access to it. 15 16 So I'm troubled that we would even --17 JOHN KEHO: Sure. 18 CHAIR YEBER: -- have this discussion at this 19 stage with a plan or design that is quite flawed at 2.0 this point. 21 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Not to mention the 22 setbacks that were discussed. 23 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well --2.4 CHAIR YEBER: Right. 25 JOHN KEHO: The setbacks aren't an issue, 'cause

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

this is -- just think of this as an addition to a building. You don't put a setback between, you know, your building and an addition that's -- this is an addition onto the religious facility, so there's no setback requirement. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: The setback to the apartment --CHAIR YEBER: Wait a minute. Is it two separate parcels or one parcel? JOHN KEHO: They have to eliminate any lot lines because it is now considered one building. building. But currently is it -- is the CHAIR YEBER: No. parking on a separate parcel from Neman Hall? JOHN KEHO: I guess I don't know about that. ADRIAN GALLO: Yes. CHAIR YEBER: It is. So they're going to have to tie the lots together. JOHN KEHO: Right. ADRIAN GALLO: They're already tied. CHAIR YEBER: They're tied on -- okay. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'm talking about the setback on the northern edge where it abuts the apartment building. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, I don't think it's

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

our job here to design the garage. If there is a -if there is a bump in the road, it's staff's job to take care of it. If it needs to come back here for something, it will. COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: So we're not approving --COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: We're just giving an entitlement. **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** -- anything -- okay. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: We're not --COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Okay. Thank --COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: We're not cutting the corners and designing -- and designing, you know, the building. CHAIR YEBER: Again, we haven't resolved the rooftop parking. And there was some testimony made today that was compelling enough to tell me that, you know, this is not appropriate in this residential zone. So you're saying to basically move forward, you know, on that aspect. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Right. And there is -there are examples of rooftop parking abutting residential where the neighbors thought the world was going to come to an end but never did. CHAIR YEBER: But five feet? I mean --COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: It's close --

1 CHAIR YEBER: -- I think this is an extreme. 2 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: It's as close as that, if 3 not closer, at the Kings Road garage. 4 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. So you're saying it's okay 5 that we should perpetuate those kind of laws? 6 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Chair Yeber, didn't it come before design review? 7 8 CHAIR YEBER: I was not on --9 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I was there. 10 CHAIR YEBER: I was not at this particular design 11 review. 12 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay. But how does design -- obviously -- did design review feel about 13 14 it? 15 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I was there in place of Chairman Yeber. The Design Review Committee looked at 16 17 the design and, in general, found it compatible with 18 the neighborhood and with the building that it will be 19 attached to. 2.0 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Thank you. 21 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Perhaps you would want to 22 consider a setback on the roof so that the parking on 23 the roof does not go wall-to-wall or the full -- the 2.4 full area of the lot line. And they have already 25 volunteered reduced hours on the rooftop parking.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Would someone like -- else to chime I haven't heard from Commissioner Hamaker on 2 3 this. 4 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** On the rooftop? 5 CHAIR YEBER: Just in general on this item, on 6 the resolution that's on the table right now. We -- I 7 don't -- I'm not even clear we have a second on Commissioner Altschul's --8 9 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** I made a second on it, yes --10 11 CHAIR YEBER: Second. So we --12 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: -- for discussion. 13 CHAIR YEBER: -- have -- we have -- we do -- so 14 basically --15 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: We have to discuss the 16 motion. 17 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. So we basically, if I 18 understand correctly, you're -- you're asking for us 19 to move forward on the resolution as stated with a few 2.0 stipulations. There's been a second. So the floor is 21 now open and to discussion. 22 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Well, I'm a little concerned. I don't think I've ever voted on a parking 2.3 2.4 garage where I didn't know what I was voting on. 25 don't understand what it is actually that we're

1 considering here. A setback? No setback? Roof? No 2 roof? Are we just saying a generic parking garage and 3 staff will figure it out later? COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: No, it's the parking lot 4 5 that's in the plans. 6 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: There's a design --7 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Okay. So I have problems with the parking lot that's in the plans. 8 I have 9 great concerns about the setbacks and the rooftop, 10 open rooftop right, you know, abutting a neighbor's window. 11 It's crazy. 12 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Anybody else? Commissioner 13 Bernstein, you've been silent so far. 14 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I have been; this has 15 moved so quickly. I -- although fundamentally most of the elements 16 17 in the motion are things I can support, I wish we 18 hadn't gone to motion before having much deliberation. 19 We still don't have staff's input on how the 20 conditions laid out in point 15 should be brought up. 21 I think there are real questions. I think the 22 structure for the parking is compatible, but I share 23 Commissioner Hamaker's concerns about rooftop versus -- versus covered, some concerns about the lighting, 2.4 25 and just the feasibility of designing a parking

2.0

2.4

structure that is more enclosed.

I also, I have to say, the conditions for the hours that we are approving, are more restrictive than what the community already has right now. And I am not supportive yet of having punitive conditions laid upon that, when, in reality, we're already pulling back the hours of operation. So that's an element that I'm uncomfortable with.

Although I would also say I'd like to approve something. I think that the garage can be redesigned and brought back for approval. But fundamentally I'm in favor of what we're trying to do here tonight.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: What are the hours you are looking at? I'm sorry. I'm not clear. If I can ask, what hours are you speaking about?

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: If we go with 11 p.m., on weeknights, and 12:30 on weekends, that's already more restrictive than what the -- is being described as I believe the --

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: 'Cause they have midnight during -- they had midnight during the week and then on weekends they had one or 1:30. So we --

COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: We already are being more restrictive than that. I don't see the point of adding a punitive thing if groundbreaking or some

2.0

2.4

benchmark doesn't occur within a year; even if it doesn't, although I'd like it to because I think -- I think it would be helpful to have the parking structure, I still -- I would just keep the hours where they are. I wouldn't -- I wouldn't bump them down even further.

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: No, I -- I did second the

motion for discussion, but I sort of tend to agree with you on that portion. Though I do think the hours, that they need to be scaled back a little bit, but not scaled back even further. 'Cause let's face it, if there's an issue, it's going to come back to us anyway.

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: And I think these are the -- these are a little bit more lenient than what the Business License Commission recommended and what the Council indicated that they would -- that they would go for. And let's remember, you can always come back for more; it isn't easy to impose less.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Buckner?

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I think that when it's all said and done, that the parking garage will probably help the situation. Whether it's this particular garage with this construction with the open roof, I have some of those same concerns. But I think the

2.4

garage is a good solution to some of the noise problems. I think it will abate a lot of the noise. It'll keep a lot of the traffic -- people will be, you know, not walking down the street at 1:30 in the morning and so forth.

Personally I think that what I'm hearing from the neighbors is that the hours that the -- that they're operating on now is an issue at 1:30. I am supportive of scaling back the hours. I think it's a good compromise with the neighbors. And I think eight a.m. to 11 p.m., on Sunday through Thursday, and Friday and Saturday, eight a.m. to 12:30 is reasonable. And let's see how it goes.

And after the garage is built and it's quieter, maybe we can give them longer hours because it won't be impacting the community as much. That's my view.

CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Guardarrama?

VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: I live immediately adjacent to very bad neighbors. They come home at three and four in the morning and -- on any given night of the week, including those that I have to get up and go to work the next day. So I'm very, very sympathetic to what it's like to live right next door to a neighbor that keeps you awake when you have to go to work.

2.4

That being said, I believe that Commissioner
Altschul's suggestion is a great way of meeting
everyone's needs; 11 o'clock on the weekdays, 12:30 on
the weekends, that should be relatively enough so you
can have your parties and celebrations and also give
respect to the neighbors that live immediately
adjacent next to you.

This particular parking structure came before us at design review. It's fully enclosed along the sides and has to have ventilation to prevent sound from escaping; all loading and unloading is going to take place inside of the parking structure.

So I think a lot of the problems that are happening now are going to be abated, and that's why I'm supportive of the motion.

You know, we didn't get to be the architect on this project. We are simply the body that says yes or no to the application that's in front of us, and we're not designing this particular structure.

So what we have before us is something that's going to go a long way to fix the problem, and that's why I'm supportive of it.

CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Yes?

commissioner deluccio: [I know to] shut up. I
do have -- I have a couple questions actually. I know

it's getting late. The applicant expressed that they
would use the, you know, the top portion, the third
level of the parking structure, the surface portion as
a last resort. Is that is that you don't need
to, you know, tell me now. But is that conditioned in
here somewhere or would that be an operational an
operation plan?
ADRIAN GALLO: Operations plan.
COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. So that I strongly
urge that that be put into an operation plan.
And as far as a six-month review, that would be
after the structure is built, John, or have they is
it after approval of this permit this evening? The
six-month review.
JOHN KEHO: I'll try to find that condition.
COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay.
ADRIAN GALLO: Donald, the commission reads six
months after the C of O is issued for the building.
COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: After the what?
ADRIAN GALLO: Certificate
COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Certificate of approval -
_
ADRIAN GALLO: occupancy for the parking
garage.
COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: After it opens.
1

1 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Got you. Okay. 2 you. 3 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I'd like to say something 4 if I could. CHAIR YEBER: Yeah, Commissioner Hamaker. 6 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I really appreciate 7 everybody coming tonight, especially the people from the temple. I understand how important this is to 8 9 you. And I believe that the bad behavior of the 10 people that attend the events is not your -- you people aren't doing it. It's not your fault. 11 12 However, this is our staff report. And there are 13 hundreds and hundreds of people who have been affected 14 by years of abuse from the people who attend your 15 events. And I would bet that most of you have not 16 read these. And it's heartbreaking. 17 Home is the most important place in the world. 18 Each one of us when we leave here tonight, are going 19 to go home. It's 10 o'clock now. Hopefully I'm going 2.0 to get home at 11 o'clock, I'm going to close my door, 21 and it's going to be quiet. 22 If I had to go home and listen to three hours of 23 people going in and out of cars and honking horns and 2.4 dishes clattering and things like that for six years, 25 I -- I'd be pretty angry. And so that's what this

2.0

2.4

||reflects.

And as a resident of West Hollywood, the one thing that we have always done is protect the quality of life of our residents. Most of you are not our residents. You -- you attend a synagogue here that is a wonderful place, and I'm very, very happy that you have it.

However, there were three educators who spoke tonight very eloquently about what they do for the Persian community in America. And what I would like to hear from them is to have a goal to build kindness and respect and decency into the fabric of the people that attend your events, because I have not heard that.

Hundreds and hundreds of West Hollywood residents have been held hostage to your events. And we would like --

unidentified Audience member: (Inaudible microphone inaccessible)

CHAIR YEBER: Excuse me. Please.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Excuse me. This is my time to speak. And we would like to have some respect given back to our community because they are very, very angry.

And I -- I appreciate what you do. Nothing I say

2.4

has anything to do with your religion or any -- you could be Methodist. You could be Catholic. You could be Buddhist. You could be whatever. It doesn't matter what you are. I respect what you do. It's the activities of the people attending your event and the chaos that it brings into other human beings' lives that we are talking about here. So that's really what I wanted to say. Thank you.

CHAIR YEBER: Well, I sort of want to echo something similar. I was actually -- I'm more troubled that there wasn't more of a outreach from the IAJC to the community. You would think a religious, cultural-based, community-based organization would be the first type of organization that would reach out to the community and be an integral part.

And I was also amazed and appalled by some of the comments that were written by the neighbors and some of the suffering that they have gone through in the last couple of years.

I really think that there needs to be some leadership on part of IAJC to get together and try to mediate and diffuse some of this problem. I can support further activity and a garage, parking garage on this site. I just -- I have trouble supporting this particular scheme as it is proposed to us at this

1 point. And I think for me the rooftop parking is a 2 deal breaker and it has been from early on. And I 3 wish it could be redesigned in a way that would not in any way bring further impact on the neighborhood. 4 And I appreciate that you're reducing impact on 6 one level, but now you're creating a new one with rooftop. Even if it's occasional, I don't think I 7 want to see the residents subjected to that. They've 8 9 been subjected to it enough. So therefore, I can't 10 possibly support the motion as it stands right now. 11 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I have one last question. 12 Is there a condition in there for a complaint line? 13 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yes. 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. Thank you. 16 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Altschul? 17 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Let's look at tonight and 18 let's look at this particular process which hasn't culmina -- which hasn't really come to a starting 19 2.0 point until just in the last couple of days. That the 21 abili -- that the willingness and the desire to get a 22 CUP is, in fact, a huge community outreach and it's 23 going to solve many more problems and it won't create 2.4 any new ones.

And for an organization that has sat and dug in

2.4

its heels for years and years and years, saying we don't need to live by the rules or we don't want to live by the rules, to come and say, please, we'll take the rules, give us, you know, something that we can work with, is a tremendous step forward, and I think we need to recognize that.

And I think -- I don't like to disagree or disavow the statements of somebody else who's sitting up here. But I think the concept of that there hasn't been any decency or that there's been some lack of decency on the part of the people that are running this organization is abhorrent. Of course there has. Everybody is decent in this whole thing. They want to have a successful synagogue and they want to have a successful organization that teaches the precepts of the Judeo Christian ethic and we want to have the same thing in our quality of life. So there's no difference here.

And in order to have a party, you need to have some decent hours. Unfortunately, you can't have it until four or five or six in the morning because it's in a residential neighborhood. If it were out in the middle of wherever, you could.

But we all have to deal with what there is. And I think the members of this organization are starting

1 and making a great deal of effort to bend over 2 backwards to meet us more than halfway. So thank you 3 all. Excuse me, John. I just 4 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: 5 want to ask John, were you suggesting that I was 6 saying that the temple wasn't decent? 7 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I thought I heard you say 8 that. 9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes (inaudible). 10 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: I -- no, I wasn't. I was 11 asking them to teach the people that attend their 12 events to have -- teach decency to the people that attend their events who are offending the neighbors. 13 14 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: People that attend their 15 events, they are co-congregants. 16 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** Well, they're -- they are 17 the people that are documented in here. 18 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: May I? 19 CHAIR YEBER: All right. That's a discussion --20 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Can I call a question? 21 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: May I? 22 CHAIR YEBER: I'd like to hear from Commissioner 23 Bernstein and Buckner and then --2.4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Anybody, he can call the 25 question if he wants. Takes precedence.

1	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Want to call the
2	question?
3	CHAIR YEBER: Okay. The question's been called.
4	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: We haven't even
5	clarified the we haven't clarified item 15 yet.
6	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You vote on the motion
7	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Wait. What haven't we
8	clarified?
9	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: You take the is there
10	a second
11	CHAIR YEBER: Is there a
12	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Second to the motion to
13	call the question.
14	CHAIR YEBER: Is there
15	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: It's not going to pass
16	(inaudible).
17	CHAIR YEBER: Okay. Are you withdrawing your
18	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yes. Yes.
19	CHAIR YEBER: Okay. All right. Resume,
20	Commissioner Bernstein.
21	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I just am so sad that
22	Joe's leaving, I don't want to go home yet. I want to
	stay a little bit longer.
23	
23	I actually to add to something that Joe said.

2.4

that the problem is as much the attendees at the event as it is the trucks and things. I think that's the biggest problem. And I just would remind every, as Joe said quite well, the creation of this garage will do a huge amount to alleviate what is clearly the biggest and most consistent problem.

And we do not, as Mike and John explained, we do not hold all the cards here. We need to find a way to condition this so that it gets done because that's the biggest problem in the community is the trucks doing all the drop off and pickup. John had some very good suggestions on how to minimize some of the impacts.

I just think we have to, in my opinion, maintain a focus on getting something passed here tonight because we need to improve the community to the best that we can, and that is getting the pickups and drop offs off of the street and into an enclosed structure. I share some of Mark's concerns about the parking structure. I don't totally know the answer to that. I have some questions about some of the conditions. But I don't want us to lose site of the fact that we not only need to pass something tonight in my opinion, but we need to pass something for the temple, who, as John pointed out, are showing good faith by agreeing to consider a CUP we'll live with.

1 CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Buckner? 2 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I still don't know what 3 we're approving because these conditions, as they --4 as I read them, they only apply to preconstruction. And I think our city attorney was going to clarify that for the Commission, and I haven't hear yet what -6 - how that is, because I would not be comfortable if 7 this only applies to preconstruction . 8 9 JOHN KEHO: Sure. 10 MICHAEL JENKINS: Well, I think that what we should do, perhaps, is we have a housekeeping chore 11 12 here, is we need to walk you through the conditions as 13 they will be changed based on the motion. 14 doing so, we can identify which conditions are limited 15 to the preconstruction period and those which will be in effect post construction of the structure, and 16 17 staff is prepared to do that. 18 And maybe we should do that now. 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: It's the one that's 20 preconstruction, frankly --21 MICHAEL JENKINS: Right. 22 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: -- 15.1. 23 MICHAEL JENKINS: Maybe we can do that now 2.4 because there's several other conditions that we need 25 to address, including 11.5. And so -- and I have one

1 very minor language change that's non-substantive in 2 1.1, that I'd like to include. And it's simply moving 3 the 90-day clause from the second sentence into the 4 first sentence. And that shouldn't trouble anyone. But with that maybe John or Adrian can walk you 5 6 through the rest of the conditions. 7 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I also have a question because the representative, Ms. Bartolo, apparently 8 9 was not happy with our conditioning the hours. So we 10 don't know that they're going to agree to it anyway, 11 right? 12 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: It's up to us now to decide what we want. 13 14 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Okay, that's fine. 15 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: We've heard from them, 16 so. 17 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: All right. 18 JOHN KEHO: Sure. So on the resolution that's in 19 the packet, the full resolution, 11.5 were the hours 20 of operation. And so that had been divided in three 21 different categories. Based on the motion, there's 22 now only two categories where it's -- and I wrote down 23 Sunday through Thursday, eight a.m. to 11 p.m.; and 2.4 Friday and Saturday, eight a.m. to 12:30 p.m. 25 And then if construction doesn't occur within one

1 year, then the hours would be reduced to eight to 10 2 and eight to midnight. And so that's the change to 3 11.5. In the conditions that we handed out to you on a 4 5 separate piece of paper, we had condition 15 talking about operations of the religious facility 6 preconstruction. So the preconstruction would only be 7 15.1, 15.5. Those would be the only ones that would 8 9 be precon -- preconstruction, 'cause the rest would be 10 permanent, which would be 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.6, and 11 15.7 is gone 'cause we already talked about the hours of operation, and 15.8, and 15.9. 12 13 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Is 14.1 okay? Is that --14 'cause that's one you handed out tonight also. 15 JOHN KEHO: 14.1 --16 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Is that --17 JOHN KEHO: Right, that's a construction period, 18 that's --19 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Uh-huh. 20 JOHN KEHO: That's having them submit a plan to 21 us how it operates during the construction period. 22 MICHAEL JENKINS: But you should perhaps make 23 clear that the operation plan, you'll note that it 2.4 says -- it includes hours. 25 JOHN KEHO: Excluding the hours.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MICHAEL JENKINS: So we would exclude that if your intention is that the hours set forth in 11.5 would apply across the board during preconstruction, the construction, and the post-construction period, if that's your intent. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That means the hours take effect immediately. JOHN KEHO: And stay all the way through --MICHAEL JENKINS: Upon their acceptance of the CUP. **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Mm-hmm. Okay. COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Mike or John, I would also, on item 15.5, the -- I think that the condition that they employ a security staff to monitor the parking lot and people coming, be prevented from loitering in the parking lot making noise when entering/exiting, that could easily be a condition that should exist beyond. They should have security in the lot or in the -- or in the structure and they should be responsible from keeping people from creating noise entering and leaving the events. JOHN KEHO: So to do that we would need to add monitor the -- staff to monitor the parking lot and

parking garage so it would be for both.

That's --

1	COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I would prefer that.
2	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Now I'd like to call the
3	question.
4	CHAIR YEBER: Is there a second?
5	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Second.
6	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: For what?
7	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Call the question.
8	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: All those in favor of
9	calling
10	CHAIR YEBER: All those in favor of calling the
11	question say aye.
12	COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Aye.
13	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Aye.
14	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Aye.
15	COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Aye.
16	CHAIR YEBER: All opposed?
17	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Nay.
18	CHAIR YEBER: Nay.
19	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Nay. I think Alan had
20	something he want
21	CHAIR YEBER: What did you have?
22	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I think Alan wanted to
23	make one more comment, then I'll be
24	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Take a roll call.
25	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: happy to call the

1 question. 2 CHAIR YEBER: Let's do a roll call. 3 **COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO:** Okay. 4 CHAIR YEBER: Can you do a roll call on calling 5 the question? It takes a two-thirds vote. 6 MICHAEL JENKINS: 7 CHAIR YEBER: It takes a two-thirds vote? 8 MICHAEL JENKINS: Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: That doesn't pass. 10 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 11 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Alan? 12 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Yeah. I'd like to ask the motion makers to consider some amendments to the 13 14 motion. I notice that 11.5 is constructed as though 15 the weekdays Monday through Wednesday and the weekend 16 is Thursday through Sunday. Given the religious 17 observation of Friday night to Saturday night and the 18 ample demonstration that there are major lifecycle 19 events that take place on Thursday night and Sunday 2.0 night, I think it's important to condition the hours 21 so that Thursday through Sunday have the more liberal 22 hours and Monday through Wednesday have the more 23 restrictive hours, which is not how it's conditioned 2.4 right now.

COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:

So what are you asking?

1 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I'm asking for the 2 motion makers to amend their motion so that the temple doesn't -- I mean, clearly the temple will lose the 3 4 ability --5 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: No. I mean, give specific 6 hours. 7 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: That -- well --8 **COMMISSIONER HAMAKER:** What do you want? 9 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: What I'd really like is 10 Monday through Wednesday to go to 11:30 rather than 11 11, and for Thursday through Sunday to go to 12:30. 12 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I don't know if I can go with 11:30 Monday through Wednesday right now. 13 14 don't know. John, you made the motion. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I don't -- I don't 15 understand what lifecycle events are typically on 16 17 Thursdays. 18 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Weddings. 19 COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: No. 20 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I've never been to a 21 Thursday night wedding. 22 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Yeah. But the reason we 23 were wanting to reduce the hours to 11 o'clock is not 2.4 so people could, you know, have their weddings. 25 so that the people that live right around there can go

1 to sleep and be productive at work the next day. 2 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: So let's leave Monday 3 through Wednesday at 11. I'm -- that's a much smaller 4 5 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Okay. 6 **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** -- point to me. 7 point is, they have booked wedding -- I don't see why they're going to accept this if they have already 8 9 booked weddings for the next year on Thursday nights 10 and Sunday nights. The people who came up and talked 11 to us about their wedding got married on a Sunday. 12 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: You mean the doctors who were sick and had to leave early? 13 14 CHAIR YEBER: Yes. 15 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Okay. 16 COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I also just wanted to 17 make note that condition 12.6 is structured sort of 18 oddly in that on the first of the month they will give all their events for the month. And perhaps it could 19 2.0 be worded in a way that gives a little bit more advance notice to code compliance than literally day 21 22 of notification for the month. 23 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: That's -- I'm okay with 2.4 that. Are you okay, John? [They want to] re-word 25 that.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, perhaps -- yes, of But, you know, let's give it some -- let's give it some specifics. Maybe on the 15th of the month they will give notice for the following month. JOHN KEHO: We were suggesting the 15th, on the 15th of the month for the following month. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yeah. Yeah. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: That's just what I said. JOHN KEHO: Okay. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Anything else? **COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN:** So is the answer to the Thursday through Sunday no or --COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I say no. COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I say no right -- yeah. COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: And I don't know if you wanted to talk about the parking structure or if we're done with that and ready to call the question. COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Well, I leave it to the wonderful expertise of the staff to get the plans right with respect to the parking structure. It's not our job to do working plans or final plans. job to grant entitlements. CHAIR YEBER: Granted. But we're not talking about technicalities here. We're talking about rooftop parking; that's bigger than a technicality.

1 And that's where I'm concerned that, you know, we're 2 not really having --3 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: What about doing the 4 entitlement as encompassed in the motion and referring the rooftop aspect of the garage back to design review 6 for additional comments and suggestions and then bringing that one item here alone at a certain --7 8 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I would make a -- John, I 9 would make -- like that, but maybe it doesn't come 10 back here, maybe it goes to the director or something. 11 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Fine. 12 COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: If it goes to design 13 review one more time. 14 JOHN KEHO: So this one is to direct the applicants to look at doing what with the rooftop? 15 16 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: To making the rooftop as 17 neighborhood compatible as possible? 18 CHAIR YEBER: What's that mean? 19 JOHN KEHO: And then taking it to design review 2.0 subcommittee for comments and then the director would 21 act on it? 22 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: No. And I think it 23 should be brought back here because it's a policy 2.4 consideration. Let design review work with the 25 applicant to see the best way they can possibly do it,

1	come back with it together, bring it back here, and
2	let's decide whether or not it works.
3	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: I don't know. I rather
4	go to the director. I then I'm going to have to
5	withdraw my motion if you do that, John.
6	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Then let it go to the
7	director. Let it go to the city attorney.
8	CHAIR YEBER: All right. So
9	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Bet you we'd get the
10	other one.
11	CHAIR YEBER: So is that are you you're
12	amending your motion?
13	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: I guess.
14	CHAIR YEBER: And does the second seconder
15	accept that amendment?
16	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes, except for the
17	hours. We were going to amend our motion for Alan for
18	the other two things.
19	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: We're amending the motion
20	just for the rooftop situation.
21	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: And also for the 15th of
22	the month prior to give out the
23	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: schedule of events for
24	the next month.
25	CHAIR YEBER: Commissioner Commissioner

2.0

2.1

2.4

Buckner? Sorry. It's a late hour.

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: I just, I mean, department has already approved it and it basically suggested that we approve it the way it is. So why give it back to the department?

COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Well, that's why I'm suggesting it doesn't come back to the Planning Commission. I think it's fine for them to check it one more time and bring it to design review subcommittee one more time, and then -- then the director can make a final determination.

JOHN KEHO: So what I'm hearing, and this happen
-- has happened before on many occasions where the
Planning Commission's completely satisfied with the
design issue but they send it back for additional -the applicant has to do some additional work, the
design review subcommittee looks at it, and the design
review subcommittee will make comments on it, and then
the director is able to act on it. And that's
happened before in the past.

UNIDENTIFIED COMMISSIONER: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Perhaps it will be helpful when it comes back to design review if we have some information about sound mitigation and what the sound would be like from that open air thing.

1	JOHN KEHO: Right. And that's why I was asking,
2	and the point is to make it neighborhood compatible.
3	COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Good.
4	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Can we call the question
5	now?
6	CHAIR YEBER: Is there a second?
7	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: I'll second.
8	CHAIR YEBER: All in favor of calling the
9	question say aye.
10	(All members present state, "Aye".)
11	CHAIR YEBER: Anybody opposed? All right.
12	So that means we are ready to vote.
13	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Roll call.
14	CHAIR YEBER: A roll call vote. David,
15	please.
16	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner
17	Altschul?
18	COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Yes.
19	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner
20	DeLuccio?
21	COMMISSIONER DELUCCIO: Yes.
22	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner
23	Bernstein?
24	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Aye.
25	COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner

1 Buckner? COMMISSIONER BUCKNER: Yes. 2 3 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Commissioner Hamaker? 4 5 COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Aye. COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Vice-Chair 6 7 Guardarrama? 8 VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: 9 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Chair Yeber? 10 CHAIR YEBER: Yes. 11 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: Motion carries 12 unanimous. 13 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. We need to just continue our 14 meeting. So if you're going to exit, please exit quietly so we can finish. 15 Thank you. New business, we have none. Unfinished business, 16 17 none. Excluded consent calendar. Items from staff? 18 JOHN KEHO: I just wanted to provide an update on the general plan. The general plan was heard at the 19 2.0 City Council at their last meeting. 21 CHAIR YEBER: Excuse me. If you can take your 22 conversation outside; thank you. Go ahead, John. 23 JOHN KEHO: So at the last City Council meeting, 2.4 the Council addressed the last remaining aspects of 25 the general plan, including historic preservation,

1 social services, parks and recreation, transit overlay 2 issues, and concluded all the discussion that they had 3 identified earlier in the process. 4 So what that means now is that we're going to be 5 bringing -- we're going to be going -- we're going to 6 take the document, take all the comments and recommendations that the Planning Commission provided 7 and that the City Council provided, and update the 8 9 document to have all of those comments put in it, and 10 we'll bring that back to the City Council for their 11 final review. And we have that scheduled for May 2nd. 12 And so that's the update on the general plan. 13 Great. Anything else? CHAIR YEBER: 14 JOHN KEHO: That's -- that's it for tonight. 15 CHAIR YEBER: Okay. 16 JOHN KEHO: Other than I'm sad to see 17 Commissioner Guardarrama go. 18 CHAIR YEBER: Let me see your agenda. 19 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Public comment. 20 CHAIR YEBER: Do we have any public comments, 21 David? 22 COMMISSION SECRETARY GILLIG: No. 23 CHAIR YEBER: All right. So and --2.4 COMMISSIONER ALTSCHUL: Items from Commissioners. 25 Items from Commissioners? CHAIR YEBER:

1	COMMISSIONER BERNSTEIN: Good night.
2	CHAIR YEBER: No, wait. I think we have
3	something. Do John, do we have anything? No
4	we're at items for Commissioners.
5	MR. KEHO: Are you asking for items next time?
6	CHAIR YEBER: No, no, no, no. I wasn't doing
7	that. So no one has further comments?
8	CHAIR YEBER: No?
9	COMMISSIONER HAMAKER: Well, I could say Happy
10	Saint Patrick's Day, but it's two weeks away.
11	CHAIR YEBER: Okay. You want to bid your last
12	VICE-CHAIR GUARDARRAMA: Au revoir.
13	CHAIR YEBER: Au revoir. All right. With that,
14	so we adjourn to our next scheduled meeting which is -
15	JOHN KEHO: March 17th.
16	CHAIR YEBER: March what?
17	JOHN KEHO: 17th.
18	CHAIR YEBER: March 17th.
19	(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded)
20	-000-
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS $21^{\rm ST}$ DAY OF APRIL, 2011.

MARC YEBER, CHAIF

ATTEST:

DAVID GILLEG, COMMISSION SECRETARY