

**MINUTES**

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
March 23, 1988  
PLUMMER PARK - GREAT HALL  
7377 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD  
7:00 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Pro-tempore Albert called the meeting to order at 7:12 P.M.

**ROLL CALL:** Present- Albert, Heilman, Land, Schulte  
Absent- Mayor Viterbi

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

**WORKSHOP SESSION ON THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN:**

I10 - Councilmember Albert requested clarification, "when a developer is presenting a project, if he is not going to have affordable housing in his project that the in-lieu fees be high enough to make it worth while".

I13 - Councilmember Schulte requested language be rewritten "to tie it together so it makes sense later on".

I13 F - Council requests the date used to be the date of incorporation.

I15 C - Councilmember Heilman requests the addition of language that would allow them to "go after" private money, particularly churches, synagogues, private foundations, and entertainment unions.

I16 - Councilmember Land requested language regarding discrimination of people with aids. Councilmember Schulte requested language regarding sexual orientation, not preference.

I19 - Councilmember Schulte requested discussions with neighboring cities in terms of their addressing the housing issue be directed.

**2.0 PUBLIC OPEN SPACE URBAN DESIGN**

2.1.7 - Delete 150 ft. and say "within a distance to be determined on a case by case review", or something to that effect.

E Issue 5 - Councilmember Schulte requested something that addresses the maintenance of crosswalks or the identification of crosswalks.

2.1.8 - Councilmember Land requested language like "to work with existing groups with our street tree plan", like the tree people or the Sierra Club.

**ORIGINAL**

2.5.10 - Councilmember Land requested "also safe environment" be added.

I-11 - Councilmember Land requested the language be stronger.

2.5.14 - Councilmember Heilman requested language be changed to "consider developing sidewalk kiosks".

LAND USE AND GENERAL PLAN - Preliminary discussion by the Council.

Councilmember Heilman stated that he was surprised at the level of development this General Plan would allow. "My major concern is that I don't think that we as a community can accomodate, particularly the commercial development that is being suggested or which would be permitted under the Plan. I think that particularly on the main thoroughfares, we need to look at substantially lower height limits, and also reducing the FARS. Even though the plan has its very inspirational disscussion on housing and how important it is, I don't see that carried through on a lot of its land use. There are all sorts of encroachments and incursions into the residential area including parking overlay, which I don't think is a good idea, including changing some of residentially zoned property to commercial. While that may be appropriate in particular instances, I think it does it too often in this Plan."

Particular Issues:      Parking  
                                 How to encourage revitalization.  
                                 Protecting the integrity of  
                                 residential areas.  
                                 Developing more low/moderate  
                                 income housing and opportunities  
                                 for purchasing.

Councilmember Land stated " I was surprised to read of some of the density that was proposed by the Planning Commission for our General Plan. I was uncomfotable with 90 ft. at a lot of locations. That's very tall. Even 45 ft. I think if were trying to preserve pedestrian character and this village like atmosphere - I don't think in villages there were lots of tall buildings. I think one goal sort of contradicts the other and I'd like to address that. I'd like to have more discussion or more about the adaptive reuse kind of zoning for the buildings that we have and what incentives can be offered so people will recycle what they have and I think part of that we'll have to look at is about parking. I also don't think parking overlay is the way to solve the parking problem, and I would not support that in the General

Plan that we adopt, but I do think we have to deal with the issue of parking especially in asking people and working with businesses to rehab and basically reuse the parcels they already own. And another thing that I'm concerned about, I think maybe Council might want to have some more discussion on the types of land uses in the City, the types of businesses that are located in certain parts of the City. Is that the kind of uses of the land that we really want to continue to see or what other uses would be more suited to the image that we're trying to create of this pedestrian village-like atmosphere. I think there's not enough language that talks about preserving the integrity of the residential neighborhoods. I'd like to see more language to preserve that and to create more buffers between the residential and the commercial. As we go through it I think there'll be language that we can word. And other than that I had a concern about, it was only mentioned once but I'd like to talk more about, and I think it was the Chamber's vision of the city. It talks about over the counter approval and I'd really like us to take a look at sort of what the threshold would be of projects, because I think it's real important that each project has enough public input and chance to comment on it."

Councilmember Schulte stated "I think the challenge here really has always been to maintain the existing and unique quality about West Hollywood, which I think is a little bit hard to describe. We use the term village a lot to describe it but I think it's visible as you live in the City or walk around the City or wherever else and some of the extreme of that, and what most of us fear, I certainly hear it from people in the community fear as sort of a Manhattanization of the old town or something closer to home, sort of Westwoodization of the community. So, I think there's that challenge verses looking at this as a long haul and maintaining a city that has some viability, doesn't sort of lose out in the economic race in a sense. I think that's a delicate balance, and all of this I would suspect the council to come down on the first site they had to choose, but hopefully we won't have to make a strict choice. That's sort of just backup, I guess, I think there are three words that I would like to see define the land use element. I'd like to see it be restrictive, I'd like to see it be instructive in terms of telling people what we expect and giving them clear guidelines and I'd like to see it be enhancing of the quality that really is physically West Hollywood. So restrictive, instructive and enhancing would be the three words I would use. I certainly think, I agree with John and Abbe, I think the commercial is too generous. I can't imagine other than movie studio work, trying to beat 90 ft. heights, and it seems to me that in places where 60 ft. heights are mentioned, now that that's been experienced, that's too high. I have a couple of places where I would be interested

in looking at a little bit greater density and leaving some room for the Planning Commission to play with that, and I agree with this rather original General Plan Considerations about LaBrea and Santa Monica and the Doheny Triangle, which is going to be real controversial, but I would think there ought to be some consideration of those two areas, but, make myself real clear, I'm not talking 60ft. heights in those areas, I'm talking about lower heights and I'm talking about lower FARs, but at least something that allows some density there to have some defining points at places in the City. I think that the specific plan areas ought to be maintained again, with height and density guidelines. I personally think that 60ft. heights there are probably plenty high and I might be willing to leave that in the plan but I'm not going to include that tonight but I certainly don't think they ought to be higher than that and I think the densities ought to be similar but I think we ought to allow for specific plan raising when we mention those. I said last week and I'll just reinforce tonight, I want to see housing built, I want to see housing rehab, I want to see us create opportunities for low income seniors and low income families and I'm real sincere about that, but I frankly think that 900 is the top side of what we ought to allow over 5 years. I think that thinking of a thousand people in 5 years in West Hollywood would be pretty much pushing the limit in terms of increasing population and I think that's what it means, so I'd be restrictive on the residential. I'm also concerned that the residential pushes development into somebody else's neighborhood. I'd be concerned about that. I don't think there's any doubt that parking overlay is an idea that doesn't fit, I think John's right, we need to find some alternatives to that but I don't think it fits. Two other things I'll just mention here, one is that I think we really need to be concerned about pedestrian orientation and I think we've done a fairly good job about that, but I think we need to understand the full ramifications of that. What kinds of businesses, what we allow them, how will we be concerned about design and setbacks and allow people to be creative about that and the final point is in terms of adaptive reuse I was persuaded by Mark and by our own experience that we really do need to flush that out and I think that again means the work that we do is to look at the full ramifications of that and understand that it's a pretty complex detailed process and it's not just a good idea.

Councilmember Albert commented, "I go along with almost everything that's been said. I wanted to keep in mind that development is inevitable, but as much as we can control it and keep it at a slow pace, will benefit the City and I think that heights, Steve mentioned Westwood, in the beginning we talked about not wanting to make a Westwood Village out of West Hollywood, with their high buildings on Wilshire Blvd. and I think it's imperative we keep those heights down. Also

I'm concerned about the over the counter plan, that those plans be watched carefully and not just handed out easily so that we get small projects that are not what we want, and I don't know what controls we can put on that."

COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON FARS AND PARKING OVERLAYS

COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

COUNCIL RECESSED AT 9:08 P.M.

COUNCIL RECONVENED AT 9:30 P.M.

SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

MARCH 28 Regular  
MARCH 29 5:00 P.M.

APRIL 4 5:00 P.M.  
APRIL 6 7:30 P.M.


APRIL 18-MAY 5 Helen Albert gone.

Meeting adjourned at 9:53 P.M. to a regular meeting of the City Council on March 28, 1988 at West Hollywood Park at 7:00 P.M.

APPROVED BY MOTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL THE 20TH DAY OF JUNE, 1988.

  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

  
CITY CLERK