

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

July 10, 2024
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

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

Present: Stephen Jones, Chair
Jackson Brissette, Commissioner
Darrel Menthe, Commissioner

Absent: Andrew Reilman, Vice Chair
Jennifer Carter, Commissioner

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Brissette led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Jones invited public comment.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Current Planning Secretary, received clarification from those signed up to speak that their comments pertained to Item PH-1.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER MENTHE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BRISSETTE, JONES, MENTHE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: CARTER, REILMAN

o0o

Consent Calendar

None.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

PC - Consideration of a Comprehensive Plan, Density and Other Bonus Incentives, Zone Code Map Amendment, General Plan Map Amendment, Extended Construction Hours Request, and Environmental Impact Report, to allow development of a mixed-use residential and commercial project on an approximately 2.23-acre site located at 5700 Hannum Avenue

Jose Mendivil, Associate Planner, provided a summary of the material of record.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MENTHE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BRISSETTE, JONES, MENTHE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: CARTER, REILMAN

Chair Jones invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Rob Kane, Lincoln Property Company, applicant, provided background on the company; discussed previous projects in Culver City; experience developing residential projects; and active community engagement.

Stephen Lindgren, Lincoln Property Company, expressed appreciation for the work of Culver City staff and he introduced the project team.

Jonathan Watts, KFA, discussed the current site and features of the proposed project.

Stephen Lindgren, Lincoln Property Company, discussed the community engagement process.

Spencer Kallick, Allen Matkins, discussed requested entitlements and approvals, and he thanked Culver City for their assistance and consideration.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding community benefits; in lieu fees; development fees; and clarification that affordable units are exempted from fees.

Laura Michet indicated living one block away from the proposed site; expressed support for the project and ground floor retail noting the current lack of services in the area; discussed the dangers of riding her bike or trying to cross to the mall; outdated ideas of how food, shopping, and healthcare should be mixed into neighborhoods; and she was excited to see a project that would make living in the neighborhood easier.

Marco Icardo, Nadel, provided background on the company, discussed the property located at 5820 Uplander Way; investment in their property; and he expressed support for the project and for redevelopment of Fox Hills.

Brendon Chung provided background on himself; expressed support for the development and for having a walkable neighborhood and felt the project would be a great public amenity.

Barbara Effros was called to speak but did not respond.

Judi Sherman provided background on herself; discussed marketing from the company; lack of a cumulative impact review in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); the addition of

1,306 units planned for Uplander Way; those benefitting from the report; blocked breezes; lack of scientific study; the need to recommend that the EIR is inadequate and to decrease the density designation south of Slauson; support for housing; lack of action by the City Council; the focus on other issues with less impact on Culver City like the digital kiosk discussion; the 100 unit per acre designation being too high; the inadequate EIR; the General Plan; the Land Use Element; ensuring that units are distributed in an equitable way across Culver City; parking and traffic; and exacerbating issues with the proposed development.

Cindy Haas was called to speak but did not respond.

Sharon LeVine was called to speak but was not present to speak.

John Karr expressed appreciation for the development, but felt it was incongruent with the surrounding area; discussed people living in the area; safety issues; traffic; other developments; the inability of people to get in and out of the area; concern with changing the culture of the neighborhood; support for walkable cities; drawing people from the mall; he proposed less density; and expressed concern with the daily construction process, hauling dirt, driving piles, and noise.

Kathy Karr discussed landscaping; privacy; the ability of the high rise to look into their homes; the need for increased city services to address the increased population; traffic; construction hours; noise pollution; the need to provide double-paned windows for homeowners; construction damage to streets; concern with getting nails stuck in tires; and she expressed concern with the changes being proposed to an already impacted area.

David Kairo discussed concern with adding so many units to the already dense neighborhood; the disproportionate influx of people to the area; impact to traffic and natural wind corridors that provide natural cooling systems; the EIR; alternate locations for housing; and concern with impacts to traffic on Hannum and Buckingham.

Angelika Kischnick was called to speak but did not respond.

Dr. Richard Singerman provided background on himself; discussed existing insufficient parking in the area;

inadequate bicycle parking planned; street accessibility; similarities of the proposed building to the high tech complexes across the street; converting office buildings to residential; he felt the building was uncharacteristic of the neighborhood; expressed concern with construction on the weekend; discussed other proposed developments in the area; massive under-parking provided; he proposed adding speed bumps on the street; expressed concern with the impact of the large building on air flow; and he asked how the Commission would take public feedback into account to ensure that something is done to address concerns.

Joshua Bozman expressed opposition to the project for reasons stated by previous speakers; discussed the addition of places to eat; concern with putting all the City's required housing units into the already densely populated Fox Hills area; the large number of units planned to be added; he urged the Commission not to grant concessions; stated that if the development was going to have to happen, that it should not be made worse than it already is; noted the calmness of the area; he did not want the current family-friendly environment/atmosphere to change; expressed concern with worsening traffic and parking; noted concern over other developments planned nearby; and he wanted the area to stay the way it is now.

Tom O'Neill discussed looking out the window seeing trees, plants and sky vs. looking at a seven story structure; lack of parking; buildings that were not designed for central air; people who invested their life savings to live there; people who are supposed to be watching out for their best interests; the state mandate for increased housing; the out migration in California; reasons people are leaving; decreased revenue; the man-made crisis; the abuse of EIRs; developers making a quick buck with the help of the state; professional urban planners and advisors; the aim to eliminate cars; he criticized the dream of a 15 minute city; serving residents; and he proposed that the governor build affordable housing on his land to show solidarity with the people of Culver City.

Kareema Bozman was insulted by the vibe comment; discussed comments about the neighborhood being a hidden gem; asserted that the building was on the wrong side of the street; noted previous City Council discussion of rejuvenating Fox Hills; discussed the other project coming in; the need to increase capacity at the schools; and existing density in the area

that prevents her from inviting her family over as there is no parking.

Andrea Demmerella-Whelchel provided background on herself; echoed previous comments regarding resident investment and pride in the community; discussed the peaceful nature of the area; the natural breeze that comes through; replacement of greenspace; concern that the project would change the culture and the environment; opposition to the project from the majority of residents; existing parking challenges; traffic; she hoped that concerns would be taken into consideration; and she asked for answers to questions posed about construction.

Barbara Effros was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Jada Lyles provided background on herself; echoed previous comments; noted that adding 1,000 units was going to exacerbate severe traffic and parking issues; discussed the family-friendly area; existing issues that would be made worse with more people in the space; the quiet area; maintenance of the culture in the area; and she asserted that many young people in the area were not in favor of the project.

Joe Smith was called to speak but did not respond.

David Azzarello echoed comments of previous speakers about traffic issues; discussed the plan to add residential units with insufficient parking in an already dense area; issues with parking on the weekends and holidays due to the park; densifying an already dense area; other areas to build residential units in Culver City; bringing retail to the area; comments made by the business owner; the development as being good for those who work in the area, but not good for those who live in the area; traffic; parking; noise; he asserted that allowing construction 7 days per week from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. only benefitted the contractor; noted the need to examine how many units can be placed in the area before density is greatly affected; stated that allowing 100 units per acre was ridiculous and those who voted for it should be voted out of office; he observed that this would not happen in other areas of Culver City but is happening in the Fox Hills area with the least amount of resources; and he felt that it was unfair to pick on Fox Hills and it needed to stop.

Cindy Haas was called to speak but did not respond.

Sharon LeVine was called to speak but did not respond.

Angelika Kischnick was called to speak but did not respond.

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff, and Commissioners regarding reserved commercial parking; the method for determining the number of parking spaces; lack of a parking minimum; providing one parking space per bedroom; requirements for commercial parking; number of studio, one bedroom and two bedroom units; the proposed bike lane; maintenance of street parking; extended construction hours; weekend hours; clarification that the request for extended hours is not for the entire construction period; the intent to complete the project more quickly; providing the resolution on the extended hours to the public; the draft EIR; addressing increased need for city services; the request from the City Council to examine a fiscal impact analysis on zoning and land use changes associated with the General Plan; impacts to City revenues and demand on city services; the EIR for the General Plan; population increases and impacts to public services; release of the final EIR on July 17, 2024; the determination that there would be no significant VMT (Vehicle Miles Travelled) impact; the reality of impacts; addressing increased traffic over time; assumed increased traffic for unknown projects; projects that had not been submitted yet or were withdrawn at the time the Traffic Study MOU was approved by the City; the 1% assumed increase over time; the General Plan program EIR; other departments in Culver City with plans to improve and increase mobility options in Fox Hills; the Specific Plan process; the Circulation Element; clarification that all known developments are taken into account that would add traffic to intersections; traffic study; methodology; the 18-month long EIR process; and the conservative look at what traffic impacts are.

Additional discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation for the townhomes on Buckingham; landscaping; setbacks; support for mixed-use; problems with the way that Fox Hills was originally developed; the need for pedestrian and street-oriented construction; concern with the amount of public opposition to the project; the General Plan; by-right construction of the project in the future; similar projects likely in the Hayden Tract; under-utilized commercial office parks in the Hayden

Tract; concern with the extended construction hours; weekend hours; length of the project; support for project aesthetics; concern with the small amount of bicycle parking; resident concern with noise; whether residents support shortening the length of construction period with extended hours daily; the purpose of the Planning Commission; the opportunity for the public to be heard; repeated concern with the majority of state housing requirements being placed in the most dense area of Culver City; the Planning Commission's recommendation that other areas in Culver City should also be allocated increased density to better spread new housing in the City; concern with placing the burden on Fox Hills; the plan in process that has most of the required units going in Fox Hills; concern with the requirement for 1,100 units of very low income housing; 73 low income units at Project Homekey; the 27 units of very low income housing included in the project; the affordability covenant; research indicating that a 55 year covenant vs. a perpetual covenant does not affect project feasibility; the 55 year covenant as a ticking time bomb; the construction hours exception; making a recommendation of approval; and the ability of the Planning Commission to transmit information to the City Council that they could not agree upon the extended hours if there is no consensus.

Deborah Wallace asserted that the issue was fairness, equity, and being the kind of city the community wants; she discussed the racially diverse area; embracing inclusivity and opportunity; willingness to do their part; shouldering a disproportionate burden of housing requirements; the stark and unjust imbalance; missed opportunities; decisions that reflect a pattern of evasion of responsibilities to accommodate affordable housing by wealthy predominantly white neighborhoods; diverse neighborhoods that bear the brunt of housing needs; she asked that Culver City prioritize equity and fairness of housing distribution; she felt that every neighborhood, regardless of wealth or demographics, must contribute its fair share to provide affordable housing options for all residents; she asserted that Fox Hills was ready to do their part, but should not be expected to carry the bulk of the responsibility alone; discussed social justice; legal obligations; and she urged leaders to do the right thing.

Angelika Kischnick signed up again to speak but was not present on Webex or in Council Chambers.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER MENTHE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BRISSETTE, JONES, MENTHE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: CARTER, REILMAN

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding support for the extended hours with the two-month reduction in time and a correction was made to the wording of the motion regarding Attachment 3 to change the motion language from Resolution Number 2022-P006 to 2024-P006.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MENTHE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL:

1. CERTIFY THE PROJECT EIR, ADOPT CEQA REQUIRED FINDINGS, ADOPT THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP), AND ADOPT A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2024-P004 (ATTACHMENT NO.1); AND
2. APPROVE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, DENSITY AND OTHER BONUS INCENTIVES, GENERAL PLAN MAP AMENDMENT, AND ZONING CODE MAP AMENDMENT (P2023-0218-CP, -DOBI, -GPMA, -ZCMA) CREATING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NO. 18, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2024-P005 (ATTACHMENT NO. 2); AND
3. APPROVE AN EXTENDED CONSTRUCTION HOURS REQUEST, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2024-P006 (ATTACHMENT NO. 3).

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BRISSETTE, JONES, MENTHE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: CARTER, REILMAN

o0o

Action Items

Item A-1

PC - (1) Selection of the Chair and Vice Chair; and (2) Selection of the Committee Members

Emily Stadnicki, Current Planning Manager, read a statement submitted by the current Vice Chair who was unable to attend the meeting.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding customary procedures.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER MENTHE AND SECONDED BY CHAIR JONES THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ELECT VICE CHAIR REILMAN TO THE POSITION OF PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024-2025.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ELECT COMMISSIONER MENTHE TO THE POSITION OF PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024-2025.

Commissioner Jones proposed postponing appointments to the Board of Zoning Adjustment to the next meeting when more Commissioners could be present.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE AND SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR MENTHE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONTINUE APPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT TO THE JULY 24, 2024, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda (Continued)

Commissioner Jones invited public comment.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Current Planning Secretary, reported that no additional requests to speak had been received.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Mark Muenzer, Planning and Development Director, discussed the Housing Annual Progress Report required by HCD; monitoring of applications; the number of affordable housing units under review, entitled, in permit, or in pre-development review; finalization of the General Plan; increased visibility; outreach; efforts to encourage engagement; the City-wide mailer; and openness to input to get engagement prior to the hearings.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding similar outreach methods used for the Better Overland Project; wrapping on the light poles; coordination with Public Works; the removal plan; feedback received that outreach needed to be more than just events; and allowing visibility for the QR Codes.

Emily Stadnicki, Current Planning Manager, expressed appreciation to Commissioner Jones for his service as Chair and she provided an update on items planned for the July 24, 2024 meeting.

Vice Chair Menthe indicated that he would thank Commissioner Jones for his service at the next meeting.

Commissioner Jones welcomed Commissioner Brissette to the Commission.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 8:53 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to a regular meeting to be held on July 24, 2024.

o0o



RUTH MARTIN DEL CAMPO
SECRETARY of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED August 14, 2024



DARREL MENTHE VICE 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

20 AUG 2024
Date