

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

October 25, 2017
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Sayles called the meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m.

Present: Dana Sayles, Chair, AICP
Ed Ogosta, Vice Chair
Kevin Lachoff, Commissioner
David Voncannon, Commissioner

Absent: Andrew Reilman, Commissioner

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Comments for Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Sayles discussed meeting procedures and invited public input.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

o0o

Presentations

None.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Consent Calendar

Item C-1

Approval of Draft Minutes of September 27, 2017

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR OGOSTA THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2017.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, OGOSTA, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

o0o

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

PC: Administrative Modification, Administrative Use Permit, Site Plan Review, General Plan Map Amendment, and Zoning Code Map Amendment, Case No. P2017-0021 for The Development of a 3 to 4 Story Office Building with Ground Floor Retail and Restaurant at 9735 Washington Boulevard, and Request for Reduction in the Number of Required Parking Spaces

Chair Sayles reported a request that the item be continued to November 15, 2017.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR OGOSTA THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONTINUE ITEM PH-1.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, OGOSTA, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

o0o

Item PH-2

PC: Comprehensive Plan, P2017-0042-CP, General Plan Map Amendment, P2017-0042-GPMA, Zoning Code Map Amendment, P2017-0042-ZCMA, and Tentative Parcel Map No. 74999, P2017-0042-TPM, for the Construction of a New multi-site 26,835 square foot Commercial Development, including a Market Hall and Three-and-a-Half-level Parking Structure, and Creation of a Commercial Condominium Subdivision at 12337-12423 Washington Boulevard in the Public Parking Facility (PPF) and Commercial General (CG) Zone

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, provided a summary of the material of record.

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner, provided a summary of the Comprehensive Plan noting that staff had distributed an updated tentative parcel map provided by the applicant that addressed minor corrections.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the General Plan designation vs. the zoning designation; preserving the property for City use rather than having the state sell it for surplus property; elimination of the Redevelopment Agency; the zone change to public parking facility; the institutional zone; the planned housing development that was disapproved; previous plans to put in a retail project scaled to the neighborhood; the disposition agreement from the City to the state; parking allocated for general public use; parking demand for the project; legal non-conforming uses of flourishing commercial businesses in the area; implementation of the limitation to non-national businesses; approval rights of the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency for 7 years; providing the ability to repurpose if necessary; locations that can sell alcohol within the project; approval authority on the tenant; flexibility of the land use table provided by the Comprehensive Plan; Administrative Use Permit (AUP) requirements; discretionary review for alcohol sales; the traffic lookback provision; whether traffic diversion designs proposed along Colonial would be effective; the baseline for measuring the traffic; Condition 24: Before and After Counts; Condition 22: High Speed Design Driveways; establishing the radius of driveways; speed of traffic on Centinela and Washington; the 14 foot dedication on Washington Blvd and 12 foot dedication on Centinela Ave; legal boundaries vs. physical adjustments; the parcel map; relocation of bus

stops; bird migration mitigation measures; street tree removal; and federal regulations.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF AND SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR OGOSTA THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, OGOSTA, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

John Nahas, Regency Centers, provided a project overview.

Robert Mayhew provided background on the process; discussed project design; and discussed project goals.

John Nahas, Regency Centers, detailed the history of the project, as well as all aspects and components of the project; presented slides showing the progress of the design; discussed pursuit of a successful market hall; he sought further commercial use approvals for the site as well as amendments to the environmental mitigations and landscaping requirements; he asked for a review of conditions regarding street tree removal and archaeological requirements; and he requested additional information regarding automated traffic control fees.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Nahas, staff and Commissioners regarding including additional uses subject to the leasing conditions in the development agreement; the Comprehensive Plan; included uses; public concern with traffic impacts; bus stop and parking locations; ingress and egress; turning restrictions; enforcement; potential for changing the pedestrian crossing timing in the area; sustainability and projected photovoltaic availability and usage; garage elevation, mechanical ventilation required for screening/enclosing garage and landscaping; interior dining spaces; reasons for the lack of interior visibility along the Centinela elevation; the compact footprint; whether windows could be added along Centinela; looking at the success of spaces on Broadway (at Grand Central Market in Los Angeles) when considering outdoor accessible tenants; proposed hours of operation; special event permits for live music and entertainment on the upper decks; a proposed condition to address inadequate bicycle parking; and concern with the lack of design or color on some elevations.

Chair Sayles invited public comment.

The following members of the audience addressed the Commission:

Andrew Donnelly, resident, voiced concern with the 7 year provision, allowing anyone to come in and use the land however they want; he felt miscommunication prevented the community's overwhelming support for option one of the Colonial Avenue ingress/egress to be heard; he discussed concerns with traffic and congestion; and he pointed out the need for the neighborhood to be protected.

Michael Downey, resident, voiced concern with the height of the property's walls adjacent to his property, and ensuring security and privacy for his property which immediately abuts Site A; was happy that condos and the cul de sac were not part of the plan; he discussed anchor stores; he wanted to see stores that are useful to the residents; and he was looking forward to shopping at the location.

Ted Atkatz, resident, voiced opposition to the project citing the developer's lack of experience with this type of project; he voiced concern with the 7 year provision; noted the large carbon footprint of the project; and he discussed the amount of young children residing on Colonial who are not offered any protections from the impact of the project on their neighborhood.

Amy Santo, resident, asserted that the design didn't reflect the needs of the community and that the 7 year clause showed a lack of commitment to supporting the community; discussed a previous project that was not approved; voiced concern that the project would hinder the entrepreneurial impulse of the community; agreed the project was over-parked and under-biked, and not permeable to the street; and he noted that the project was surrounded by other large projects and not pleasing to many residents.

Leslie Gardener, resident, thanked staff for their patience with her; voiced concern with traffic and parking; discussed view obstruction by the three-story parking structure; noted that her neighborhood is downwind of the sounds and smells of the project; voiced support for reducing the parking and

lowering the structure's elevation; felt the garage was disproportional to the space; questioned whether small businesses would be able to lease within the project and whether the project would interfere with existing businesses that have established organically in the community; she asked about the curator; and she questioned whether the 8-foot wall along Lot B would be enough considering the hours of operation.

Scott Malsin, resident, voiced support for the project and urged the Commission to vote for approval, citing developer modifications made to lessen the impact to Colonial Avenue; he agreed with previous speakers that the street wall was non-descript; asserted the size of the project was in keeping with the area; stated the extra parking was necessary for prosperity of surrounding small businesses; felt the project would enhance walkability and actually support other businesses in the neighborhood; expressed concern with the 7 year provision; and he reported a lot of support for the project from the neighborhood.

Ariadne Reynolds, resident, voiced support for the project; noted that artisanal can be broadly defined and that the 7 year provision is not enough; she proposed forming a committee to attract, oversee and vet future tenants; she stated the project was marketed as pedestrian focused but the majority of the square footage was for parking; and she proposed that the parking space in excess of the requirement be dropped in favor of additional bicycle parking and green space.

Heather Moses, resident, expressed excitement about the project; shared concern with the look of the project from Centinela; and reported the lack of a necessary left turn lane at the Washington east/west stop-light.

Susan Yun, Senior Planner, read comments into the record from:

Jim Suhr - The written comment expressed support for the project.

Jovanne Arias, resident, voiced support for the project.

Cooper Olson discussed living on the border of Culver City (Campbell Drive), where he is impacted by Culver City

businesses but not served by the City's services; he expressed concern with overflow parking; supported the extra parking provided by the project; and asked for a condition to provide street sweeping and permit parking for the surrounding area to lessen impacts.

Robert Valandra, resident, expressed support for the project; suggested allowing more than two alcohol-serving tenants; and he asked that the project be approved.

Toby Contarsy, resident, voiced support for the project; agreed that more than two alcohol-serving tenants should be allowed; expressed excitement for the opening; and warned against using Mexican feather grass.

Patricia Graf, resident, reported on years of redevelopment ideas; expressed support for the project; support for all parking spaces; asked the seven-year provision be expanded; and gave support for additional bike parking and artwork.

Marcin Markiewicz, resident, reported on the number of young children on Colonial Avenue; referred to the developers' slide showing the three options for Colonial Avenue, stating the first option at the top right was the one residents thought would be used and that the third option was voted down; agreed the project is over-parked and under-biked; and expressed overall support for the project.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, OGOSTA, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed concerns raised in public comments; clarification on the purview of the Commission; City approval rights of the tenants; the recommendation not to change the permitted use list; the staff recommendation to deny the developer request to change the land use table; reasons for the seven-year provision; land use table as a separate protection that will be in place beyond the seven years; the City's curator

requirement for procuring and vetting tenants; comprehensive plan amendments; the inability to amend environmental mitigations without new studies; required landscape treatments to the garage; necessary screening for mitigating lights at night; the need for the extra parking; and he clarified that Option One was recommended by Public Works as the first step but all options are considered viable.

Discussion ensued between staff, project representatives and Commissioners regarding unknown funding expenses related to Condition 117, recommended by the public works department, that the developer asked they revisit; Automated Traffic Surveillance Control and Active Transportation funding (ATSAC); clarification that the cinder block wall height starts at six feet and increases to 18 feet as it slopes up; the effect of the project on area businesses; the intent to complement the surrounding area; photo-voltaic requirements; the project's lack of a LEED qualification; garage loading and services which should ease the impact on the neighborhood; traffic studies; proposed parking costs; clarification that there would be no monthly parking; transient parking; developer discretion on onsite employee parking requirements unless the Commission conditions it; review of project safety; ingress and egress; traffic impacts in the surrounding neighborhood; prohibiting through traffic northbound on Colonial; street tree removal and replacement; streetscape improvements; Condition 18; maintenance; tenant minimums and maximums; floor plan flexibility; dining deck access; history of ideas for enclosing or covering the dining deck; concern with the look of the stairs from the hall to the dining area; and agreement by project representatives to revisit the design.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding support for the project; decreasing the visual massing; landscaping and design issues; bike parking needs; accommodating 56 employee parking spaces onsite; activating the patios; display windows; architecture issues including the parking structure height; lack of natural light; concern that the solar requirements are very low; the need for sustainability in project; insufficient bike parking; the need for more glazing on Centinela; support for staff greenery requirements in the garage; signage concerns; concern with allowing additional uses after seven-years; the suggestion for a community group to vet tenants for the site; support for Option 3; clarification on the options and their impact on Colonial; support for extra parking; reducing the

bulk of the parking garage; enlarging windows on Centinela; Colonial Avenue access; expanding bike parking; thanks for everyone's efforts towards the project; the foregone conclusion that the development will move forward and making the project the best that it can be; concern with lack of indoor seating; rigidity of the layout; the need for flexibility to make changes; an observation that the success of the project would hinge on the curator's ability to attract the right mix of tenants; treating site A and B as one use; the intent that the uses would complement the Market Hall; concern that the tenant may need a more flexible floor plan; shade control for the outdoor dining area; provisions for inclement weather; seating; the need for more creativity in the public space; dedicating a section of the public space to children; concern that the renderings are inconsistent with the developer's stated goals; creating a communal space for the west side of Culver City; a review of Condition 125 as it applies to the Chair's design concerns; clarification by staff of the seven-year provision and City Council control over it as a former Redevelopment Agency issue; clarification that the land use table and the seven-year provision are two separate issues; ensuring the viability of the project as a whole; food retail uses; the permitted food use table; employee parking issues; TAP card provisions; allocating spots in the parking structure for employees; preventing spillover parking in the neighborhood; monthly parking for employees; Condition 131; studying parking impacts; the problem with trying to comingle the requirement with the entitlement; options for dealing with employee parking through requirements; tenants concern with occupancy costs; a call for twice as many bike spots; support for the staff traffic improvement recommendation; clarification on parking calculations; staff assertion that the project is fully parked with the complement of uses that are proposed; landscaping the garage frontage; and clarification that end of trip facilities would not be provided due to the size of the project.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, summarized modifications proposed by the Commission including: weather control on the upper deck; informal seating; doubling the bike parking; flexibility in overall seating; requiring the developer to provide a study to identify employee parking demand and underwrite the cost to provide it on site as employee parking; vet the ATSAC requirement prior to the City Council hearing; additional façade treatment; larger windows

on the Colonial side and the Centinela side; and continuing landscaping on the garage face at the second level.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding

John Nahas, Regency Centers, asserted that the conditions discussed were not acceptable; he cited concerns with additional costs; stated that design recommendations and parking studies were costs that would make the Market Hall undesirable to potential tenants; he noted the length of the process; indicated willingness to comply with certain provisions; and he indicated opposition to paying for the cost of a parking study.

Further discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding developer ideas to address the issue of employee parking; identifying employee parking demand; whether there is precedent to require a study; modifying the TAP card condition to satisfy the parking cost issue; mobility related conditions; the project as an anomaly; developer parking rights in the City garage; whether to require the developer to underwrite the costs of the employee parking; concern that a condition is not viable with an unknown number of employee parking spaces needed; rewording the condition to remove the word "study" and state the developer will provide the numbers for employee parking spaces needed; support for one-time costs with long term benefits; the chance that employee parking may not be an issue; understanding cost implications; developer agreement to work with staff to identify employee parking demand and, as an open issue, work to address it onsite; finding a viable price point to address employee parking; scheduling; working to be realistic about where employees will park; providing flexibility with the design; the requirement for garage screening; screening alternatives to landscaping; concern with costs associated with elevated landscaping; applying vegetated screening; cost benefits; a suggestion for horizontal louvers over the openings; the many iterations of the design; solving the light/glare issue; the requirement for vegetation and louvers; addressing design flaws; finding a long term viable solution; developer can move forward by acknowledging the upper level screening to address light glare to be brought back for a conformance review prior to issuance of a building permit issuance; blocking the view into the garage; money that the Redevelopment Agency has put into the project; clarification that the City is the client;

asking the developer to deal with a significant issue; the importance of defining the issue to address light glare and/or view perspectives; the need for defined requirements; City Council discretion; and the proposed condition that the developer shall provide screening along all garage elevations and submit plans to the Planning Commission for a conformance review with findings to minimize glare and views into the garage.

Additional discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding unproven traffic improvements; the staff recommendation do the driveway to see how things go with the intent that in the future there is an island; written confirmation from the neighbors to eliminate northbound traffic before changes are made; the traffic look back intended to formalize the median; the intent of the public meetings with the City to review the options and specify their preference; the level of participation by residents on Colonial; the consistent theme throughout the community meetings; and the effect of turning Colonial into a one way street.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, summarized the additional proposed conditions discussed by the Commission:

1. Use option 1 for the configuration at Colonial.
2. Double the bike parking capacity for both short and long term.
3. Enhance the façade with art or murals or articulation and add larger windows on Colonial and Centinela Market Hall Frontage.
4. The developer will work with staff to identify employee parking demand, as an open issue subject to further discussion, work to address it onsite and it will be an open issue for further discussion with the City Council.
5. Clarification of the ATSAC requirement with respect to cost prior to the City Council hearing.
6. The developer shall provide screening along all garage elevations and submit plans to the Planning Commission for a conformance review in order to minimize glare and views into the garage.
7. Install weather control, such as a retractable cover on the upper dining deck.
8. Public parking signage indicating there is public parking available in the garage.

Further discussion ensued between the project representative, staff and Commissioners regarding the additional glazing to be added on Centinela; the location of glazing depends on how the Market Hall gets merchandised; a request to work with staff to determine the appropriate locations; timing; pre-leasing; building materials; accommodating more permeability; greater flexibility with the design to accommodate tenants and pedestrian activation; and the need to add a requirement in the condition for signage indicating that public parking is available.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL, APPROVAL OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, P2017-0042-CP, GENERAL PLAN MAP AMENDMENT, P2017-0042-GPMA, AND ZONING CODE MAP AMENDMENT, P2017-0042-ZCMA AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2017-P016.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, OGOSTA, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY FINDING THAT THE PROJECT, WITH THE MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED, WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT, AND

2. APPROVE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 74999, P2017-0042-TPM, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2017-P016 AND INCLUDING ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS AS DISCUSSED.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: LACHOFF, OGOSTA, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: REILMAN

o0o

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

None.

o0o

This item was considered out of sequence.

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Michael Allen, Contract Planning Manager, thanked those who confirmed availability for upcoming meetings; he discussed upcoming meeting dates; upcoming items to be considered; and availability of meeting materials.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

Susan Yun, Senior Planner, reported that one item had been submitted for item PH-1 which was continued and she indicated that the correspondence would be included as part of the item when it returns at the meeting on November 15, 2017.

o0o

The motion to adjourn was moved by Commissioner Lacoff and seconded by Commissioner Ogosta.

There being no further business, at 11:46 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to the Special meeting on Wednesday, November 15, 2017, at 7:00 p.m.

o0o

SUSAN YUN
SENIOR PLANNER of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED _____

DANA SAYLES, AICP
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

Date