

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

November 12, 2025
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Menthe called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers and online.

Present: Darrel Menthe, Chair*
Jen Carter, Vice Chair
Jeanne Black, Commissioner
Stephen Jones, Commissioner
Alexander van Gaalen, Commissioner

*Chair Menthe exited the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Menthe led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Menthe invited public comment.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Current Planning Secretary, indicated no requests to speak had been received for Items NOT on the Agenda.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BLACK AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE.

o0o

Consent Calendar

Item C-1

**Approval of Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of
September 24, 2025**

MOVED BY VICE CHAIR CARTER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAN
GAALEN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVE DRAFT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF
SEPTEMBER 24, 2025.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

**(1) Adoption of an Addendum to the 2021 Mitigated Negative
Declaration per CEQA and (2) Consideration of a Site Plan
Review and Administrative Use Permit (P2024-0246-SPR/AUP) to
allow the development of a 147-room hotel with ground floor
restaurant spaces located at 11469 Jefferson Boulevard**

Troy Evangelho, Advance Planning Manager, reported that Mark
Muenzer, Planning and Development Director, would be joining
the meeting online later as he was accepting an award at the
Westside Urban Forum for multi-family housing.

William Kavadas, Assistant Planner, provided a summary of the
material of record noting corrections that included
Conditional Approval 133 to remove the requirement to repave
the intersection of Slauson and Jefferson as the intersection
was repaved in 2022, and language added to Condition of
Approval 64 that reflects a project design feature to address
insurance for the adjacent ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit).

Christina Burrows, Assistant City Attorney, discussed a request that the City conduct a subsequent EIR (Environmental Impact Report); CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) guidelines describing when a subsequent EIR would be required after a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) has previously been adopted; and she cited CEQA guideline 15162 indicating that no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for a project that meets the criteria, unless the lead agency determines on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, that certain circumstances have occurred, none of which have occurred.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding conditions that are part of the record included as the staff recommended motion, and clarification that modifications to what was in the agenda could be accessed at the rear of Council Chambers.

MOVED BY VICE CHAIR CARTER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAN GAALEN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Atman Kadakia, Greens Group, applicant; provided background on the company; discussed how this project was a significantly improved and less intensive version of the original hotel that has already been approved for the site; the smaller and more neighborhood-compatible project being proposed for the site with equal or reduced impacts; existing conditions; project design; landscaping; increased setback; addressing privacy concerns voiced at community meetings; developer requirements; acceptance of all mitigation measures from the previous project; the temporary soundwall; commitment to delivering the project responsibly; community meetings held; anticipated type of guests; the expectation that guests would bring daily economic activity to Culver City; amount invested into the project; annual estimates on the amount of money generated by the project; the plan to be local community partners providing active support of schools and youth programs; hotel staff programs that allow children to earn laptops; taking care of people that work at the hotels and become part of the community; the quieter, safer, smaller, and more responsible project than what was previously

approved; community benefit; and he thanked the Commission for their consideration and support.

Andy Schmidt provided background on himself; discussed concern that the new proposal with significant changes introduced new hazards to the community that were dismissed with little consideration or evidence and had been inadequately addressed by the MND; discussed the significant change from the previously approved project that introduces new hazards to the community that need to be understood before they are decided upon; he requested an EIR to allow a full understanding of project impacts to the neighborhood; noted a lack of landscaping to buffer the residential zones from rooms that face directly into the back yards; discussed failure to address the fundamental change to residential privacy; understanding the danger the hotel presents with regard to increased alleyway traffic in an already congested area; ingress and egress; he presented photographs of the current blind alleyway exit; discussed lack of visibility; the downgrade to pedestrian safety with new plans; reducing parking while increasing demand by adding a coffee shop and restaurant; the fundamental change to pedestrian paths and parking proposed with new plans that have not been addressed with the MND; and he asked that concerns be considered and addressed before making the decision to approve or deny the new plans.

Emily Fischer received clarification that windows would be fixed; discussed balconies; impacts of air pollution and living too close to the 405 freeway; affects to quality of life by building tall buildings next to small buildings; adding more capacity to roads that cannot be enlarged; infrastructure; and she noted harm being done to the entire community.

Edward Wolkowitz was called to speak but was not present online or in person.

Lahari Katam indicated living adjacent to the project; discussed the legacy of excellence in Culver City and the duty to uphold standards; placing resident health, safety, economic, and housing security as the priority over project approval; concern with catastrophic impact to her housing and economic stability; property damage liability; a critical error in the noise and vibration study; significant risk of damage to adjacent property; introduction of toxic vapor into homes with excavation of the former gas station that

contaminated the ground water; concern with placing the burden of proof on adjacent residents; the need to mitigate unprecedented disturbances with comprehensive protections; she demanded that the City reject the current noise and vibration analysis, mandate a pre-construction structural survey, and require weekly professional exterior cleaning as a condition of approval; and she reported that one of her neighbors wanted to speak but did not have the link.

Jason DeNagy was called to speak but was not present online or in person.

Allyson Tom was called to speak but was not present online or in person.

Dedric Rogers indicated managing a property adjacent to the location; expressed concern with construction impacts; and questioned what would be done to mitigate impacts.

Bill Robertson expressed appreciation for the presentation; echoed concerns of those living in the area about noise, pollution, traffic, and the previous gas station at the location; discussed other neighbors who are concerned and do not support the hotel going in at the proposed location; confusion as to what to do; community frustration with trying to make ends meet and live their lives while the large project is coming in; problems created with the large project; bringing in money to the City; concern with the focus of developers on making money; and he expressed support for putting in a restaurant at the location rather than bringing in a project that does not serve the neighborhood at all.

Perry Meade, Unite Here Local 11, Hospitality Workers Union, provided background on the organization; discussed the way development shapes Culver City; the importance of time limits on developments; the Jeff Hotel project site; delaying opportunities for Culver City to create housing and connected neighborhoods; lingering permits that stall progress and undermine the findings that justified the project in the first place; he urged holding the Jeff Hotel to a fair and firm timeline; noted a recent extension; asked that no more than one additional year be provided to obtain the building permits; discussed language provided in their comment letter; the revised MND; and the importance of timely development.

Andrea Romero, Unite Here Local 11, discussed initial approval of the project; multiple extensions received;

imposing time limits to ensure timely development; urged that a condition be placed on the project requiring building permits to be obtained within one year; and she did not want to see any more delays to building the hotel.

Patrick Godinez indicated being a member of the Advisory Committee on Housing and Homelessness (ACOH) speaking on behalf of himself; expressed appreciation for the project; acknowledged concerns cited; discussed the scenario if the hotel is not built; benefits of the project to the community; marketing the hotel to ensure that negative influences are not brought in; and he wanted to see the project expedited.

Rhonda Leuschen was called to speak but was not present online or in person.

Susana Benton discussed other meetings; safety issues; traffic; environmental concerns; her allergies; she questioned why the project was accepted; discussed the line of traffic getting on and off the 405; disappointment that the project was approved; noted that the project would be nice for those using it, but not for the neighbors; and she asked that Commissioners observe current conditions.

Edward Wolkowitz, Culver City Chamber of Commerce, provided background on himself; reported that they had endorsed the original project; discussed money spent in the community by hotel clients; Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) generated; the financial situation of Culver City; the alley acting as a buffer between commercial and residential uses; mitigation of externalities to the best of their ability; and he asked the Commission to approve the project.

Jason DeNagy was called to speak but was not present online or in person.

Allyson Tom was called to speak but was not present online or in person.

Atman Kadakia, Greens Group, acknowledged concerns raised by stakeholders and efforts to put forward a project that is right for the community and for the site.

Charity Schiller, BBK Law, provided background on herself; echoed comments provided at the beginning of the item by the Assistant City Attorney; discussed the issue of whether changes would result in any new circumstances identified in

state CEQA guidelines; reductions to impacts with modifications made; agreement with independent CEQA analysis and the staff recommendation that substantial evidence in the record supports approval of the project; existing entitlements; and reconfirmation of the adopted MND as required by the project.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding keeping the Public Hearing open to allow questions of the applicant; appreciation for the presentation and for public comment received; existing traffic conditions; addressing issues with the heavily used alley with Public Works; commitment to a traffic study if additional issues occur; less traffic generated with a hotel rather than a housing development; earning community trust; lagging projects; support for allowing the project to move ahead as quickly as possible; granting a one year approval vs. a two year approval; and concern that denial of the project as proposed could result in a return to the larger project, or no project at all.

Additional discussion ensued between the applicants, staff, and Commissioners regarding mitigation of the former gas station; best management practices; rehabilitation of contaminated sites before construction in a way that does not pose impacts to the community; the distance used in the environmental study; impact of the vibration if large equipment is within 40-45 feet of the ADU; modification of Conditional Approval 64 to address issues; monitoring during construction; distance used when calculating impact; threshold for vibration; and consistency with other analysis.

Mike Hardin, ESA, discussed vibration levels as a function of distance; large equipment setback from the ADU unit; clarification that when the MND was being prepared the ADU had not yet been converted from a garage; implementation of conditions to ensure that distances are maintained so that there is not a vibration impact at the ADU unit; the site-specific analysis to determine the distance that needs to be maintained; site constraints; maintaining flexibility; and meeting the threshold at 45 feet.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding maintenance of exiting included in the original traffic study; the time extensions; the new application; approval of the previous project and the current application under the previous zoning code; receipt of a letter with

proposed modifications to Conditions of Approval; and Planning Commissioner discretion to require the proposed modifications.

Atman Kadakia, Greens Group, applicant, acknowledged thoughtful, logical, and practical questions; discussed vibration levels; requirements to halt drilling if they are detected over a certain threshold; modification of construction techniques; the noise consultant employed by ESA; hesitancy of accepting a condition without understanding the ramifications; clarification that a device would be at the location to monitor vibration levels at the nearest residential structures; the need to bring ESA to address whether a change from 45 to 50 feet is feasible; time extensions; the cleanup process; California as a highly regulated state when it comes to environmental cleanup; required completion of a Soils Management and Remediation Plan (SMRP) submitted to the LA Water Board for review and approval; oversight; ensuring a path forward in a timely fashion; time modification; length of time to prepare the first submittal to the Building Department after approvals are received; contingencies; length of time to obtain building permits; plan review; financing; construction bids; the construction timeline; the objective to build as quickly as possible; and the infeasibility of breaking ground within one year.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Kadakia, staff, and Commissioners regarding reasoning behind not building the original plan; the out of scale plan that the developer did not feel was the right product for the market; difficulty ensuring a certain time period; different city stakeholders involved in the complex project; staff workload; numerous other entitled projects; the letter that is requesting a certain timeframe during which the construction permits be applied for; concern with treating the current project like it is the previous project; concern that the same environmental review and site plan are being used; the proposed condition vs. Culver City code that allows applicants two years to exercise the use which is not deemed exercised until actual construction has been commenced; changing the standard under which City staff would be evaluating compliance with the Condition of Approval; concern with not having the intended effect; the proposal to change from a results-based deadline to an application-based deadline; potential for confusion; extensions processed by staff using Municipal Code Standards; making modifications to

what is proposed to reduce unintended consequences; the ability to extend or reduce the two year initial period; unexpected delays in the application process; the previous extension to July 2026; the actual date as being one year from the date of approval; focusing on having the building permit issued by a certain date; getting the permit application in on time to meet the deadline; and support for adding the condition, removing the words "and issued" and changing the date from July 2026 to November 12, 2026.

Chair Menthe, Vice Chair Carter, and Commissioner Black reported meeting with the applicant.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation for the attention to detail; support for the smaller project; the feeling that the property will fit at the location; financial motivation to get the project done; concern with putting in a timeline that creates a future issue; neighbors who do not want the project built at all; those who want the project built more quickly; the job of the Commission; prior approval for the larger project; those who want to see affordable housing that would result in a larger project; MND vs. EIR; reducing impacts; current lack of amenities in the area; and reluctance to impose any other restrictions on the project or to penalize the new owner for the actions of the previous owner.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VAN GAALEN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BLACK AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Commissioner Van Gaalen moved to adopt the staff recommendation and Chair Menthe seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding vacant sites in Culver City; negative effects from granting extensions; the importance of reining projects in; uncertainty as to why the previous developer did not move forward with their approved plans; lack of a guarantee that the currently proposed project would be completed; ability to make the timeline; extending additional time; and putting the responsibility on the applicant rather than the City.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VAN GAALEN, SECONDED BY CHAIR MENTHE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2025-P015 (1) ADOPTING AN ADDENDUM TO THE 2021 MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PER CEQA AND (2) APPROVING

SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT REQUEST FOR PROJECT P2024-0246-SPR/AUP, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS STATED IN THE RESOLUTION AS AMENDED.

o0o

Item PH-2

Consideration of a City-Initiated Zoning Code Amendment (P2025-0240-ZCA) to: Adopt an exemption pursuant to CEQA Section 15183 and Public Resources Code Section 21080.17; Amend the Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC) Chapter 15.10, Subdivisions to Permit the Addition of Accessory Dwelling Units in Qualified Lot Subdivisions; Amend CCMC Section 17.400.095, Residential Uses - Accessory Dwelling Units to Remove Owner-Occupancy Requirements for Junior Accessory Dwelling Units; and Adopt CCMC Section 17.400.096 to Permit the Separate Sale and Conveyance of Accessory Dwelling Units as Condominiums

Gabriel Barreras, Senior Planner, provided a summary of the material of record.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the ability to have an internal connection to the residence for a JADU (Junior Accessibility Dwelling Unit).

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY CHAIR MENTHE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following member of the public addressed the Commission:

Michael Colich discussed the difficulty for young people to afford homes; Los Angeles as the fourth most unaffordable city in which to buy a home in the United States; he felt Los Angeles should follow the example of San Jose that enacted AB 1033 allowing the separate sale of ADUs as condos; he wanted to get established in Culver City; discussed getting on the path of home ownership by buying a starter home; the ability to buy a detached property that feels like a home with a yard for his dog; transportation improvements made in Culver City; the General Plan Update; and he acknowledged forward-thinking objectives in Culver City.

Patrick Godinez was called to speak but was not present in person or online.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation to staff for implementing state law quickly; looking for state law to allow Culver City to implement changes; options with 684 and 1123; AB 1033 as an optional, powerful tool to extend home ownership opportunities at a smaller scale; the obligation to implement AB 1154 by January 1; state bills enabling housing; extending more renter or homeownership opportunities; ADUs as condominiums; ownership of the underlying property; and multiple reasons why people might want to build an ADU rather than split their property.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAN GAALEN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2025-P016 RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL: ADOPT AN EXEMPTION PURSUANT TO CEQA SECTION 15183 AND PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21080.17; AMEND CCMC CHAPTER 15.10 TO ALLOW ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS IN QUALIFIED LOT SUBDIVISIONS; AMEND CCMC SECTION 17.400.095 TO REMOVE OWNER-OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS FOR JUNIOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS; AND ADOPT CCMC SECTION 17.400.096 TO PERMIT THE SEPARATE SALE AND CONVEYANCE OF ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS AS CONDOMINIUMS.

o0o

Item PH-3

Consideration of a City-Initiated Zoning Code Amendment to Implement the 2021-2029 Housing Element and an exemption from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061 (b) (3)

Chair Menthe exited the dais.

Troy Evangelho, Advance Planning Manager, provided a summary of the material of record.

Chair Menthe returned to the dais.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAN GAALEN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Emily Fisher recommended that Commissioners read the entire General Plan; discussed air pollution; inferior transportation routes; the common transportation route through Culver City to bypass the freeways; she noted that Culver City had worse air quality than most of Los Angeles; asserted that increased density within 500 feet of a major road ended up shortening the lifespan of every person and negatively affected everyone's health; discussed dangerous ozone levels; increased traffic congestion; offered to share information with Commissioners; and pointed out the number of units being built vs. the number of affordable units being built.

Joseph Cohen May, Los Angeles Housing Production Institute, expressed support for the item; discussed following state Housing Element Law; the 20% affordable income threshold; affordability percentages in the Housing Element; state density bonus; including more affordable housing at different affordability levels; and he encouraged the Commission to consider allowing the process for projects that maximize affordability for very-low and moderate income using state density bonus law as a way to get more affordable housing in Culver City.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding clarification on what kind of environmental checks are in place; compliance with objective design standards imposed by Culver City; state exemption from CEQA for all multi-family development; the minimum 50% requirement; residential requirements and minimum density for Adequate Sites Inventory properties; dwelling units per acre; the zoning code update; and adding minimum density requirements.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding clarification that the proposed items do not increase or change density; ministerial approval; establishing a new minimum density; CEQA implications; proposals required by state law; the MU1 zone; conferring

with property owners before changing their development rights; ensuring against imposing the will of the City on property owners without their consent; inclusion in the updated Sites Inventory List; the need to study impacts to parcels on the Sites Inventory List; clarification that the action being proposed is consistent with part of a program in the Culver City Housing Element allowing ministerial approval for housing projects with 20% affordable units for sites that are not on the Sites Inventory List and is not part of state law; lack of discussion with the property owners as part of the Sites Inventory List generation; lack of notice of taking potential action to make a change; concern that HCD (Housing and Community Development) would consider the part not implemented since action has not been taken; commitments made; state law; extensive work with HCD; detailed discussions as part of the Prohousing Designation Program; and clarification that the issue had not come up as part of separate discussions with HCD about compliance.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding concern with lack of implementation; the minimum unit dwelling size that shows up in the housing inventory; the larger analysis as part of the Housing Element; identification of items to follow up on for establishing minimum densities; programs for higher density multi-family neighborhoods to ensure against smaller developments; implementation of zoning that puts in minimum densities; minimum densities established for larger categories; intentional lack of minimum density for M1 zones; and anticipated consolidation.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding lack of 20% affordable housing projects being proposed; concern with ministerial review; the importance of public comment; concern with eliminating public input and the process; projects that change as a result of interaction between the public and staff; state actions; acknowledgement of the value of allowing people to talk about what is in their neighborhoods; and clarification that one community meeting is still required and the projects are appealable to the Planning Commission.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY CHAIR MENTHE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: 1) ADOPT A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE ZONING CODE AMENDMENT P2025-0229-ZCA TO IMPLEMENT THE 2021-

2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND COMPLY WITH STATE HOUSING ELEMENT
LAW.

oOo

Item PH-4

(1) Approval of a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) checklist pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 determining that the environmental effects of the operation are within the scope of the Culver City Plan 2045 and Zoning Code Update Certified Programmatic Environmental Impact Report and (2) Consideration of Site Plan Review, Tentative Parcel Map, and Extended Construction Hours (Project P2024-0190-SPR/TPM) to allow development of a mixed-use project with 1,077 residential units and 5,772 square feet of commercial space on a site located at 5757 Uplander Way

Peer F. Chacko, Senior Planner, provided a summary of the material of record.

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

Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Spencer Kallick, Allen Matkins, thanked staff for their efforts; introduced members of the project team; provided a presentation on the project; discussed current conditions; land use and zoning; and community outreach.

Jaime Olmos, KFA Architecture, discussed design directions presented to the community; community feedback received; popular elements; parking concerns; design objectives; history and character of the community; project features; open space; commercial space; parking; landscaping; the paseo; public art; residential courtyards; passive and active programming; trash collection; and rideshare and loading zones.

Spencer Kallick, Allen Matkins, discussed community benefits; requested approvals; CEQA letters received from labor unions; environmental impacts were found to be within the scope of the programmatic EIR certified by Culver City as part of the

General Plan Update; same technical analysis was conducted as would have been required for an EIR to fully vet this specific project, and results showed there were no new significant or unavoidable impacts, with mitigation measures already in place; comment letters attached project-specific analysis for a different project.

Edward Wolkowitz, Culver City Chamber of Commerce, discussed loss of the golf course; support for the new project; satisfying the obligation under the Housing Element; and he asked the Commission to approve the project.

Sharon LeVine requested that public hearings be held at a more reasonable hour; discussed cumulative impacts to the neighborhood for what is being proposed; lack of infrastructure being added to support the 3,000 units soon to be constructed in the area; parking and traffic impacts; retention of the trees; and she expressed concern with lack of a plan to address impacts to the community.

Gloria Smith was called to speak but could not be heard.

Eric Shabsis provided background on himself and delivered letters of support received after the 3:00 p.m. deadline.

Ken Mand expressed support for the proposed project; suggested making additional bike parking available; and discussed the importance of allowing the 7:00 a.m. construction start to expedite the building schedule.

Gloria Smith, Supporters Alliance For Environmental Responsibility (SAFER), reported submitting public comment earlier in the day; requested that the Commission not approve staff's CEQA checklist; discussed the Programmatic EIR that was not intended for specific development projects like 5757 Uplander; the 2024 CEQA initial study by staff indicating that the project would have numerous significant impacts requiring an EIR; she asserted that the project was not within the scope of the City's Programmatic EIR; discussed the analysis for legal compliance and zoning code consistency; lack of information regarding specific development projects; speculation; ghg (greenhouse gas) emissions; disclaimers for many CEQA issues; Programmatic EIRs as guidance documents to help inform later CEQA review for specific projects; the staff CEQA clearance document; lack of specificity; staff preparation of an initial CEQA study for Uplander that found that an EIR was required to investigate significant impacts;

she noted that the Programmatic EIR did not propose project-specific measures to mitigate impacts identified in the initial study which is the only CEQA analysis for Uplander that allowed public comment; and she felt the Commission should reject the proposal.

Spencer Kallick, Allen Matkins, discussed labor unions trying to use the CEQA process to require the use of union labor; adoption of the Zoning Code Update and the Housing Code Update that changed zoning regulations; the Programmatic EIR prepared; the compliant project; the project-specific analysis; the traffic study; consideration of all cumulative projects in the area; he asserted that an EIR was not needed and no additional impacts required study as they had complied with state law and CEQA; discussed infrastructure; money paid in developer fees; plans contemplated for Fox Hills; code required bike parking; the parking analysis; parking demand; and ensuring the project can be fully parked within the parking garage.

Chair Menthe, Vice Chair Carter, and Commissioner Black reported meeting with the applicant.

Discussion ensued between Spencer Kallick, staff, and Commissioners regarding clarification that a formal request to reduce parkland fees had not been made by the applicant; plans for the three parcels to be done in their own standalone projects and phases including demolition; amenities and community-facing services; inclusion of commercial and retail in the first phase; concern that the paseo would become gated and not publicly accessible; the intent to maintain the private space owned by the developer as a community benefit; building a better project with an amenity for the community; Conditions of Approval; lack of assurances that the space would remain open to the public; and clarification that there are no public-facing spaces that are only accessible from the paseo.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation for the low-income units and to staff for the sites inventory analysis and no net loss analysis; caution regarding discounting for the likelihood of development of the sites remaining in the inventory; concern with not meeting RHNA numbers on the low-income side; incentive to build more publicly accessible parkland; and support for not providing a discount if it is not requested.

Further discussion ensued between the applicants, staff, and Commissioners regarding appreciation for taking the palm trees out; support for the shade trees; providing a habitat pollinator resting place; native plants; the importance of consistency with the new Culver City Parks Plan; potentially insufficient bike parking spaces; the Bike Culver City infrastructure biking tour; the Better Overland project to connect the northern-most part of Culver City to the Fox Hills Transit Center; planned enhancements; clarification that the resolution does not contain a reduction to parkland fees; the need to incentivize family units rather than units for single people and couples; support for stoop units; and appreciation for low-income units built without spending money as a City.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BLACK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VAN GAALEN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BLACK AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2025-P013:

(1) APPROVING A CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) CHECKLIST PURSUANT TO CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15168 DETERMINING THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE OPERATION ARE WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE CULVER CITY GENERAL PLAN 2045 AND ZONING CODE UPDATE CERTIFIED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND;

(2) APPROVING SITE PLAN REVIEW, TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, AND EXTENDED CONSTRUCTION HQURS FOR PROJECT P2024-0190-SPR/TPM, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS STATED IN THE RESOLUTION.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding confirmation that the reference to a request for a 50% credit for onsite open space was an error, and clarification that Culver City does have a local incentive in place for three-bedroom units or more in the new density bonus ordinance.

o0o

Action Items

Item A-1

- (1) Receive an Update on the Hayden Tract Specific Plan; and**
- (2) Discussion and Comments**

Chair Menthe recused himself from the item and exited the meeting.

Troy Evangelho, Advance Planning Manager, provided a summary of the material of record; discussed project goals; and plan outline.

Ashley Hoang, AECOM, discussed study sessions; feedback received in April 2025 from the Planning Commission and City Council; height alternatives; and proposed land use standards.

Troy Evangelho, Advance Planning Manager, discussed preliminary analysis of the impacts for SB 79; base densities; upzoning; density bonuses; Transit Oriented Development (TOD) alternative plans; inclusionary requirements; ensuring that what is being proposed is consistent and that every relevant policy is included; Housing Element Law; low-income mixed-use projects; the Low Income Adequate Sites Inventory; and integration of all requirements.

Ashley Hoang, AECOM, discussed mobility and open space; safety and traffic flow; Complete Streets; increased connections; public spaces; increased bicycle and pedestrian spaces and crossings over the creek; paseos; incorporation of publicly accessible open space; creating more amenities for pedestrians; dedications tied to development; community engagement events and feedback received; timeline and next steps; preference for height alternatives; incentives for onsite open space and hotels; and feedback requested from the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Carter invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Joseph Cohen May, Los Angeles Housing Production Institute, discussed the new skyline on the Los Angeles side of the creek; support for alternative Band additional height and density in select areas than what is currently being proposed; extending the height limits along National Boulevard; base density for the tallest section; inclusionary requirements applicable to those projects using SB 79; using inclusionary requirements for SB 79 in areas that are part of the Specific Plan; a suggestion for an additional pedestrian bridge over Ballona Creek tied into future improvements on the LA side;

connecting neighborhoods; and a suggestion to add a pedestrian bike paseo in the parking alley between Steller and Warner.

Kyle Allen Niesen indicated being a homeowner in the area; expressed support for alternative B with maximum allowed height and increased density; discussed opening up flexibility for implementation of SB 79; potential modification of maximum height in impacted areas to match the 2045 General Plan; potential impacts of SB 79; and support for providing as many options as possible to balance the need for new housing and state legal compliance with existing community and zoning guidelines in the adopted General Plan.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation to staff for their efforts; Eric Owen Moss buildings in the Hayden Tract; protecting and enhancing resources; architecture as art designations; consideration of a Conservation District Overlay; consultation with the Cultural Affairs Commission; support for adding affordable housing; certain densities needed to make affordable housing feasible; concern with adding an overwhelming amount of generic housing over retail that dilutes the creative industrial Hayden Tract; inclusionary requirements; density bonuses; project size; providing a livable area; incentivizing more open space with increased height; and creating more of a pedestrian environment with a car-free area.

Additional discussion ensued between the applicants, staff, and Commissioners regarding expansion of SB 79 to the entire Hayden Tract; uniform application of transportation related requirements; required dedications; specific requirements with Complete Streets; providing room for bike lanes rather than parking; parkettes; integration of eating spaces as part of the walkable space; incentives for onsite open space available to the public; lack of access to open space; waiving park fees or adding density for projects that would provide public accessible open space; and height incentives for hotels.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding concern that bike lanes are not included; providing better wayfinding to get to the bike path; the Ballona Creek Path; making it easier to get to the train station; support for the designs and for more car-free spaces; making the old rail line into a park; connecting bike infrastructure at Obama

and Jefferson; support for adding another crossing that connects to the Baldwin Hills Scenic Overlook; support for exploring higher densities and extending inclusionary; incentivizing hotels; the intent for the Hayden Tract to be a mixed-use area; concern with incentives that could reduce the amount of housing built; building interesting buildings that people want to live in; and support for adding a pedestrian bridge over National and extending the bike lane.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda (Continued)

Vice Chair Carter invited public comment.

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

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Emily Stadnicki, Current Planning Manager, discussed upcoming agenda items and meeting schedule.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 11:10 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to a regular meeting to be held on January 14, 2026.


oOo



RUTH MARTIN DEL CAMPO
SECRETARY of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION


APPROVED

01/28/2026



DARREL MENTHE
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 Bocchino
CITY CLERK

28 Jan 2026
Date