

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
CULVER CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

January 6, 2022
6:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Sayles called the special meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 6:14 p.m. via Webex.

Present: Dana Sayles, Chair
Nancy Barba, Vice Chair
Jennifer Carter, Commissioner
Ed Ogosta, Commissioner
Andrew Reilman, Commissioner

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Sayles led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Sayles invited public comment and discussed procedures for making public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Bryan Sanders discussed the environmental report; use of data from Urban Footprint rather than locally measured recently acquired data to determine the assumption that multi-family dwelling will create fewer greenhouse gas emissions; the assertion that single family houses are bad for the environment; and concern with efforts to rush changes to the City using inadequate data.

Robin Turner was called to speak but was not present on Webex.

Jeff Cooper was called to speak but was not present on Webex.

Suzanne Debeneditis discussed repurposing buildings; the amount of carbon emissions from buildings; assertions that multi-family housing would have a net-zero effect; the climate crisis; and she urged the Commission to direct studies to measure what is happening in the region instead of using outside algorithms.

Chair Sayles indicated an additional opportunity for public comment for Items Not on the Agenda at the end of the meeting.

o0o

Consent Calendar

Item P-1

PC: Approval of Draft Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes of November 30, 2021

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE DRAFT PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 30, 2021

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Action Items

Item A-1

PC - Review and Discussion of Proposed Zoning Code Revisions to Streamline the Residential Mixed Use Entitlement Process

William Kavadas, Assistant Planner, provided a summary of the material of record; discussed proposed mixed-use residential entitlement streamlining; goals; streamlining options for affordable housing; related Senate Bills; and design guidelines.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed the Design Checklist and establishing objective standards.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding by-right development for projects that meet most of the items on the checklist; ministerial review; providing confidence for developers that if they meet the checklist that they will be able to move forward; the need for more specific language; maximum number of units before the project is required to go through public review; level of affordability; project size; providing a list of projects in the pipeline to give the Commission an idea of which projects could be ministerial; state law; programs being considered to increase housing production in the City; the small number of projects that are over 250 units; concern with surrendering Planning Commission review for the majority of mixed-use projects in the City; the environmental review process; stimulating and facilitating housing production by reducing the amount of time a project takes from concept to production; creation of Design Guidelines vs. a Design Checklist; concern with subjective review; creating an objective process; comporting with state housing law; expediting review for certain kinds of projects; practicality; and Assembly Bill (AB) 1397.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER OGOSTA, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR BARBA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Chair Sayles invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Stephen Jones expressed support for streamlining the process to encourage housing production and lowering costs; he pointed out that the current draft Housing Element extends ministerial review to any project with 20% affordable housing; and he encouraged the removal of all parking minimums.

Bryan Sanders expressed opposition to by-right ministerial approvals; he did not see a need being met by speeding up the process; opposed eliminating parking minimums; discussed political speak with proposed changes to the City; concern with too much politics and not enough honest dialogue with residents and developers; the narrative that the larger buildings would reduce greenhouse gases; concern with bringing in ideas and making decisions without examining

local data; speakers regurgitating political talking points from YIMBY (Yes In My Back Yard) law organizations; and he pointed out the conflict of interest with Vice Chair Barba as a part of Culver City for More Homes, a political lobby group.

Con Howe, CityView, provided background on himself; discussed the recent completion of the Haven project in Culver City; setting policy and standards; clarifying the process; increasing certainty; timing; providing a clear understanding of what can and cannot be built; areas that deserve more consideration; income levels; encouraging workforce housing; and Area Median Income (AMI).

Cindy Bailey expressed appreciation for the hard work done on the process; discussed differences of opinion; court challenges to SB 10; R1 zoning; meeting the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) through SB 9 and SB 10; by-right building; she felt that the process should not be rushed; expressed concern with a potential lack of oversight; concern with deregulating parking; meeting residential parking needs; increased greenhouse gases; and support for streamlining processes.

Kevin Read, Bastion Development, provided background on the organization; expressed support for codifying the proposed design guidelines for the Mixed-Use Ordinance; wanted to ensure that a one-size-fits-all approach would not be taken; discussed alternative approaches; the popularity of workforce housing; the burdensome 20% requirement; and finding solutions to enable a builder to make a project economically feasible while providing more affordable housing.

Erik Paesel expressed support for the elimination of parking minimums; urged the Commission to move forward quickly; asserted that affordable housing was needed; discussed compliance with SB 9 and SB 10; and he wanted to see the City be at the forefront of making changes.

Suzanne Debeneditis expressed support for building additional affordable housing; questioned which levels of affordability would be addressed; discussed the marginalization of people who then fall into homelessness with the building of housing for above moderate income; getting people off the streets into transitional housing; creating mixed-use with mixed income levels; assuring that teachers get housing; addressing the real needs of real people in the City; carbon lost into the environment with tearing

down buildings; refurbishing buildings as a way to reduce carbon emissions by 60%; documentation; and consideration of proven data.

Tara Barauskas, Community Corp of Santa Monica, discussed a planned affordable housing project in Culver City; planning and incentivizing affordable housing; land costs; costs of building high quality sustainable housing; support for 100% affordable housing approved by-right, meaning the project can be approved through a ministerial process; the 250 unit threshold; including any 100% affordable housing project under 120% AMI in by-right approvals; ensuring that affordable housing is distributed throughout the City; inclusionary zoning; support for a 20% minimum; permitting and design restrictions; prioritizing affordable projects as highly regulated by the funding sources; allowing developers to right-size the parking; she proposed ensuring timely response by adding another Planning position; she opposed the design checklist; expressed concern with added costs; and she felt that affordable design developers should be allowed to choose the best designs to operate their projects.

Khin Khin Gyi provided background on herself; discussed SB 8; Culver Crest as a high fire hazard zone; the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); exemptions for community land trusts and qualified non-profit corporations; reimbursement for local agencies and costs mandated by the state; and she did not believe that SB 10 applied to the Crest.

Carolyn Libuser felt that the 20% affordability requirement should be increased to 30%; discussed the focus on increasing affordability; concern with taking projects away from the authorization of the Planning Commission; subverting the general public from weighing in; ministerial review of 200-unit projects; and the importance of further discussion of the differences between guidelines and a checklist.

Melissa Sanders discussed existing density in the City; workforce housing; focusing on housing for those who serve the City rather than those who work at large corporations; the fluid nature of the City; the importance of streamlining based on small areas; differences between various areas of the City; parking; she noted that there were many things to consider in the process; felt that 250 units was much too large to be built by-right; stated that Vice Chair Barba should not be serving on the Commission as it is a disservice

to the City and a violation on many levels; and she felt staff should be getting funding from the state for affordable housing.

Daniel Young expressed appreciation for Vice Chair Barba; provided background on himself; felt the City should do whatever necessary to ease permitting and design restrictions; discussed lots that have been sitting empty for years; and he encouraged the City not to put all the high density units into all the lower income neighborhoods.

Darcy Leslie Parsons provided background on herself; urged the Planning Commission and City Council to retain single family neighborhoods; did not want to see a tremendous amount of density in the City; embraced the idea of creating more low income housing; discussed condos and apartments; retaining the small town feel of the City; climate change; people who grow fruits and vegetables and greens that take carbon out of the atmosphere; and encouraging greenspace rather than building an urban monolith of big buildings.

MOVED BY VICE CHAIR BARBA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding application of the mixed-use ordinance to all housing; concern with having too narrow a focus; time and expense to review a 20 unit residential project; the mandatory retail component put on projects; development that does not take place on commercial corridors; the need for quantitative standards to provide dependability; creation of a timeline for staff response to a ministerial checklist; scaling; the 20% requirement for small projects; mobility measures; the infeasibility of applying mobility measures to small projects; evolution of the streamlining ordinance; and a suggestion that the title be changed to the Residential Streamlining Ordinance.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding larger projects on the corridors; concern with larger projects without a commercial aspect; opportunity sites that are not on corridors; facilitating the production of housing; concern with creating disincentives for non-corridor locations; challenges to senate bills; removal of parking requirements; MOVE Culver City; support for ministerial review for up to 30-40 units; concern that setting

a 250 threshold would eliminate all Commission review; appreciation to staff for their work; the Design Checklist; concern with the inclusion of step backs, roof planes and variation of materials on the checklist; concern with mandating items integral to the design; the need for thoughtful deployment; concern with arbitrary application; incentivizing gestures of articulation; concern with designing a building like an income tax worksheet; the importance of public and Commission involvement in larger projects; the need for meaningful, beneficial and fundamentally integral design requirements; adding specificity to the requirements; the importance of rigor in the application of articulation; the need for additional effort to implement a robust set of guidelines that will not impede streamlining or create a hardship; the Gateway Design Guidelines document; providing examples, diagrams and an explanation of the principles of quality that need to be encouraged; the insufficiency of a checklist that will be halfheartedly applied; and a suggestion to engage with the architectural and development community in the process.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding support for a document to streamline residential and mixed-use developments; concern with disadvantaging smaller developments; smaller infill opportunity; the need to streamline smaller developments; equitably creating housing opportunities; creating livable neighborhoods and communities; sustainability; SB 10; addressing community concerns; creating small and medium sized buildings; being welcoming neighbors; support for the 250 unit cap; moving housing projects along expeditiously; creating effective standards; finding the right incentive mix; the need to attract developers; the importance of committing to a review timeline; application of objective standards; anti-mansionization standards; community input; the lowered Floor Area Ratio (FAR); concern with losing objectivity when focusing on standards; learning from other cities; mobility requirements for larger projects; incentivizing sustainable development; concern with placing undue burden on smaller development; support for instituting parking maximums; incentivizing alternative modes of transportation in the City; and addressing climate change.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding raising the Site Plan Review (SPR) threshold; the 250 unit threshold; scaling; additional review of design guidelines; the comprehensive parking amendment coming forward; reducing

the burden for small projects by raising the limit from 3 to 10; staff evaluation of the threshold for larger projects; scaling related to affordability; defining affordability; timelines; SPR thresholds and number of units; guidelines vs. a checklist; scaling the amount of affordable relative to the amount of review; providing reliable guidelines; consultation with the design community; stringent guidelines related to affordable housing funding sources that could be hindered by standards; elimination of parking minimums; consultation with affordable housing developers; process streamlining vs. code standards; addressing the burdens of parking to help facilitate housing; and implementing general guidelines.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding streamlining the process for developments that are 10 units or fewer for SPR thresholds; condominiums vs. for lease units; parcel maps vs. tentative tract maps; examples in nearby cities; discretion for subdivisions but not for the project; elimination of SPR discretion not the subdivision map act items which are less flexible; the goal to expedite residential development; text amendments; the goal to eliminate the burden of Planning Commission consideration for small projects; inflammatory comments in the chat; meeting procedures and protocol; off topic comments; differences between live public meetings and virtual meetings; and the Chair's prerogative.

oOo

Public Hearing Item

Item PH-1

PC - PUBLIC HEARING - General Plan Element Amendment, P2021-0241-GPE, and Negative Declaration Regarding the 2021-2029 Housing Element

Lauren Marsiglia, Interim Advance Planning Manager, provided a summary of the material of record; discussed consultant involvement; submission of questions for the consultants; previous Planning Commission and City Council comments; opportunity site outreach; the changes to the Housing Element; the environmental analysis: the Initial Study and the Negative Declaration; comments from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD); and next steps.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding addressing development standards as part of the Housing Element; requiring that two units are built on a Residential Two Family (R2) lot; implementation after certification of the Housing Element; underlying principles; new development standards and new zoning requirements; approval of the concept with additional details coming forward at future meetings; the requirement to build to the minimum of the underlying zoning; clarification that requests for removal of potential sites by the members of the public who own those sites and indicated no intention of developing the sites were honored; options for the Commission; the ability of the Commission to recommend changes to the Housing Element through the Resolution; clarification on the 30-day requirement for review of the Housing Element; AB 215; clarification on the CEQA process; the reason for the Negative Declaration vs. a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND); the timeline for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); expected adoption of the General Plan Update (GPU) in Fall 2022; implementation over the three years after adoption; putting existing zones into new land use categories; and Residential Load Density (RLD).

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR BARBA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Sayles invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Stephen Jones noted that the state had asked the City to go further with more density and a commitment to achieving affordable housing programs and outcomes; he asserted that the City's draft did not go far enough; discussed Culver Center; the inability to count projects unless they are 100% certain; the site inventory; he expressed concern that the Commission had not addressed the state's critique; concern with overestimating in commercial areas; and concern with not meeting the amount of housing required by the state.

Jamie Wallace acknowledged the hard work of staff; asserted that staff made misstatements that required correction; discussed requirements under AB 215; allowing for public input; she asserted that the Housing Element rules zoning and that a non-compliant Housing Element could not be adopted; she stated that HCD had indicated that the draft is not

compliant with state law; she discussed the certification process; the small amount of housing units generated with the proposed changes to Residential Single Family (R1); asserted the large amount of speculation in the process; and owner intent.

Carolyn Libuser asserted that updates on the Housing Element that have not been clearly presented to the community; the need for more transparency; and she indicated that residents just wanted the ability to participate in the process.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Sarah Hartley to speak but she was not present in Webex.

Elias Platte-Bermeo expressed concern that more was not done to address the requirements and critique from HCD; he wanted to see the Housing Element do more to affirmatively further fair housing and more realistically enable housing in every neighborhood; he wanted to see by-right fourplexes and 100% affordable sixplexes; a commitment to mid-cycle rezoning and density adjustments of estimates that are off-target; elimination of parking restrictions that prevent affordable housing; ensuring that the Housing Element reflects the city's values; previous efforts to keep people out of communities; using the Housing Element to right past injustices; and the importance of meeting state requirements.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Bikram Shakur and Darcy Leslie Parsons to speak but they were not present on Webex.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin discussed reasons to not adopt the resolution; non-compliance with the task from HCD; asserted the lack of citizen involvement in the process; asserted inadequate notification; allowing time for residents to review the Element; and she felt that the Housing Element was filled with too many assumptions.

Michael Ainslie felt that the Housing Element did not do enough to meet the housing crisis; discussed misrepresentation of comments from HCD by the public; asserted lack of outreach to low income renters and parts of the community historically left out of the Housing Element process; the importance of comments from HCD about affirmatively furthering fair housing; providing housing opportunities for low income families throughout the City; easing permitting and design restrictions that prevent

housing from being built; the need to end parking minimums and commit to by-right approval of residential construction; he urged the City to adjust mid-cycle if production is not on track; and he thanked the City for their efforts.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Gary Guthman to speak but he could not be heard.

Nick Guthman discussed the need to comply with the law to affirmatively further fair housing; easing permitting and design restrictions to allow for the construction of housing; continued opportunity for public input; and important sacrifices that need to be made.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Bubba Fish, Disa Lindgren and Michael Colich to speak but they did not respond.

Zachary Brown discussed setting appropriate height limits to accommodate the proposed density to meet Culver City standards.

Scott Kelly was called to speak but was not present on Webex.

Ron Harari, Culver Capital, expressed support for the work put into the Housing Element; discussed the importance of new housing at all income levels to keep up with the growth of the City; concern with the length of the timeline to get housing developed in the City; meeting RHNA mandates for 2029; he suggested that the City look for ways to speed up the process; and he expressed concern with not meeting housing goals for the RHNA cycle.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Karim Shahabi, Ruth Ann Arbuckle, Tara Barauskas, and John Buck to speak, but they were not present on Webex.

Cindy Bailey provided background on herself; expressed concern with Commissioners who have a conflict of interest; discussed difficulty parking in nearby cities and her advocacy for Metro in the City; tearing down homeowners who want to welcome people into the City; the importance of working together; and concern with an asserted lack of transparency.

Marta Valdez was called to speak but could not be heard.

Marcus Baisley, Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters, asserted that he would be affected by the environmental impacts of the project; discussed the importance of using a local, skilled, and trained workforce to reduce impacts and benefit the local economy; he referenced *Putting California on the High Road: A Jobs and Action Plan for 2030*; successful outcomes in other cities that have adopted policies to use a local skilled and trained workforce; and minimizing Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT).

Melissa Sanders reminded everyone that Culver City is twice as dense per square mile as Denver; asserted that describing the potential 135 units that would be generated by changes to R1 zoning as significant is a misstatement; the ability to meet required numbers without making changes to R1 zoning; compliance with HCD; adding sites to the site inventory; clarification on what a neighborhood is; multiplexes going in between single family homes; the city within the city; and inventory on the list that is not going to be redeveloped.

Bryan Sanders discussed the determination that the number of units that could be added in R1 neighborhoods was insubstantial and not needed to meet RHNA; asserted an inability to adopt a Housing Element that is not in compliance; asserted the need for a letter of substantial compliance from HCD; concern that the public is being misled; legal consequences; asserted that people on different sides of the political spectrum agree that the Housing Element is not in compliance; and he urged the Planning Commission not to move forward with adoption.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Robin Turner and Daniel Young to speak but they did not respond.

Suzanne Debeneditis expressed support for hiring locally; discussed social and environmental justice; the theoretical notion of reducing VMTs; the immense carbon load that will go into the environment with the tearing down of existing housing; preservation; building up rather than out; pretending to save carbon; the importance of greenery; housing in the Target parking lot; focusing housing on Transit Oriented Corridors; and she indicated that she was considering building microunits on the top of her house to accommodate youth who cannot afford to live in Culver City.

Ronald Boykin commended the Commission and staff for their efforts; provided background on himself; echoed comments made

in support of more affordable housing in every neighborhood; discussed accommodating the middle class; confusion as to whether the document is in compliance; and he felt that the Planning Commission was working in good faith.

Gary Guthman provided background on himself; expressed support for Vice Chair Barba, RHNA goals, and the state-wide initiative; discussed SB 9 and SB 10; affirmatively furthering fair housing; Housing Element compliance; easing permitting and design restrictions and setting parking minimums; and he expressed support for by-right fourplexes.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, called Disa Lindgren, Marta Valdez, and Daniel Young to speak, but they did not respond.

Sara Hartley expressed concern that the process was sloppy and non-transparent; provided background on herself; feels that planning is more than data and numbers; discussed neighborhood character; the need for specific guidelines; and she wanted to see the correct information used and evaluated by knowledgeable people.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OGOSTA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding concern with mandating people to build more than their anticipated scope of work on their own property; the need for more information for certain items; requirements in the code that appear to be onerous; turning regular people into landlords; by-right, not mandated fourplexes; opening up income streams; concern with putting new housing on busy boulevards; concerns with equity; restrictions with SB 9; addressing concerns with flipping houses and changing the neighborhood; the Neighborhood Multi-Family category; concern with imposing a floor; owners who may not know what they were getting themselves into; long-term grandfathering; opportunity vs. obligation; support for the mid-cycle evaluation to allow for course correction if necessary; serious concern with falling short of the goal; the letter from HCD; the failed budget amendment; the original scope of work; the need for more analysis of the site data; likelihood of development; concern with how realistic the calculations are; the need to identify more sites; not zoning for the right amount of sites; streamlining; exploring setting a floor for

the number of units in multifamily zones; the already changing nature of neighborhoods in the city; determining what type of community the city wants to be; comments from previous meetings; consistency of themes and concepts; working out the details; achieving goals; eliminating the Culver Crest and hillside areas from consideration; housing opportunities and live/work in the industrial areas; the creative culture in the city; fee waivers for affordable housing projects; fee concessions to offset the cost of projects; eliminating minimum unit sizes; height limits; accommodating density and intensity; personal choice and property rights; special circumstances; concern that a one-size-fits-all approach does not work; the difficulty of getting housing approved, built and ready for occupancy; concern with the timeline; length of the processes; facilitating housing; prioritizing the zoning ordinance; length of cycles for the General Plan vs. the Housing Element; creating land use categories without zoning; staffing resources; moving projects forward; concern with imposing a mandate; the feeling that fourplexes can be smaller than McMansions; providing opportunities for ownership with condos; the need to commit to a timeline to achieve RHNA goals; the incremental infill option in the plan; feasibility of the fourth unit if it is required to be affordable; the right to personal choice; elegant duplexes in single family neighborhoods; allowing owner discretion; single family residential standards; proposing four units with no lot split; consistency with state law requirements; constructing three units by-right; whether to require the fourth unit to be affordable; allowing but not mandating people to build four units without requiring affordability; creating equity; not increasing affordable housing; tripling the density on a single family lot; the proposed development at Culver Center; transferring density through the implementation ordinance; promoting a robust implementation of SB 9; affirmatively furthering fair housing; clarifying that there is flexibility if one product underperforms; the buffer built into the Housing Element; realistic outcomes; reducing the potential outcome by not requiring the fourth unit to be affordable; the breakdown of extremely low-, very low-, low-, or moderate-income; the ability to meet the RHNA without the fourth unit in incremental infill; the state directive for equity; equitably distributing housing throughout the City; and hardships imposed by the permitting process.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding minimum units in residential zones; the Land Use Element; the timeline for the Zoning Code Update;

habitability; the proposed resolution; providing the recommendation to the City Council in the staff report; modifying the resolution to reflect desired changes; adding the Commission's recommended changes to the Housing Element in the resolution; providing additional specificity; adding a floor for multi-family housing; eliminating or establishing a different minimum unit size; City Council recommendations; the ability of the Commission to come to consensus; Commission action reflecting community approval; and the record of input from the community and the Commission.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding 4-1 opposition to establishing a 3-4 unit floor for multi-family development in multifamily zones due to practical difficulties and hardships on individual owners; 4-1 support for fourplexes by-right through incremental infill with one affordable unit with the one opposing vote indicating that the affordable requirement made the project infeasible; unanimous support for redeveloping shopping centers in commercial and industrial districts as opportunity sites and offering special development incentives; the mandate to implement SB 9 by state law; concern with working out the details on how to streamline projects to reduce the timeline for development; revisiting actual processes during the zoning code update; lack of closure on Item A-1; consideration of project streamlining measures before the zoning update; and unanimous support for bringing the streamlining text amendment to the Commission before the City's Comprehensive Zoning Update.

o0o

Recess/Reconvene

The Planning Commission called a brief recess from 11:43 p.m. to 11:47 p.m. to allow staff to formulate wording for the motion.

o0o

Item PH-1
(Continued)

PC - PUBLIC HEARING - General Plan Element Amendment, P2021-0241-GPE, and Negative Declaration Regarding the 2021-2029 Housing Element

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed revised wording in the draft resolution agreed upon by the Commission: oppose support for infill by-right, support fourplexes by-right for incremental infill, support for redeveloping shopping centers in commercial and industrial districts as opportunity sites offering special development incentives, and support for streamlining projects relative to timelines and have staff return with a text amendment prior to the Comprehensive Zoning Amendment.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners clarifying that the Commission supports infill fourplex development as currently defined in the Housing Element, not as proposed by the City Council; the majority recommendation to maintain the draft as it currently stands in the incremental infill strategy with the fourth unit being affordable; the omission of SB 9 implementation because it is mandated by the state; and staff agreement to make the correction regarding incremental infill for the draft GPU.

MOVED BY CHAIR SAYLES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN
THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY FINDING THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT (ATTACHMENT NO. 2); AND,
2. ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2022-P001 (ATTACHMENT NO. 1) RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN ELEMENT AMENDMENT, P2021-0241-GPE REGARDING THE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT (ATTACHMENT NO. 5); AND,
3. RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE HOUSING ELEMENT WITH THE CLARIFICATIONS AS SPECIFIED IN THE COMMISSION DISCUSSION TO MAINTAIN THE FOURTH UNIT STRATEGY AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED IN THE HOUSING ELEMENT.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: CARTER, OGOSTA, REILMAN, SAYLES
NOES: BARBA

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda (Continued)

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, reported that no requests to speak had been received.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, reported that correspondence received had been distributed to Commissioners.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, indicated that he would email Commissioners regarding items for consideration at upcoming meetings


Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the schedule of upcoming meetings.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 11:57 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned.


o0o



RUTH MARTIN DEL CAMPO
ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION


APPROVED

Feb 9, 2022



DANA SAYLES
CHAIR of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Culver City, California

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that, on the date below written, these minutes were filed in the Office of the City Clerk, Culver City, California and constitute the Official Minutes of said meeting.



Jeremy Green
CITY CLERK

2/14/2022

Date