

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL
UNTIL APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

JOINT MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

May 13, 2020
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Mayor Eriksson called the joint meeting of the City Council/Planning Commission to order at 7:06 p.m. in the Mike Balkman Chambers at City Hall via teleconference.

Present: Göran Eriksson, Mayor
Alex Fisch, Vice Mayor
Meghan Sahli-Wells, Council Member
Thomas Small, Council Member

Absent: Daniel Lee, Council Member

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

Staff: Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director
Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Eriksson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

**Community Announcements by City Council Members/Information
Items from Staff**

Council Member Small reported a sign from Linwood Howe that says "We Can Get Through This Together" recently appeared in John Krasinski's "Some Good News" show on YouTube.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, reported that applications were being accepted online at culvercity.org/serve for Committees, Boards and Commissions until May 18, 2020 at 5:00 p.m., and she announced that Webex events would be used for upcoming budget session City Council meetings on May 18 and 19, allowing members of the public to make live public comment on agenda items as they arise.

o0o

Joint Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda

Mayor Eriksson invited public comment.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, reported that no public comment had been received.

o0o

Receipt and Filing of Correspondence

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, reported that no correspondence had been received.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Action Items

Item A-1

CC:PC - 1) Presentation of the Travel Demand Forecast Model (TDFM) Project; 2) City Council and Planning Commission Discussion of the TDFM Project; and (3) Planning Commission Adoption of a Resolution Recommending to the City Council Adoption of the Culver City Transportation Study Criteria and Guidelines

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, introduced the item.

Ashley Hefner, Advance Planning Manager, introduced the consultants from Fehr and Peers; presented an overview of the new Transportation Demand Forecast Model (TDFM); discussed new and updated regulations; new tools and fees; updated transportation study criteria and guidelines; key project milestones; reduced public engagement efforts due to COVID-19; adoption of impact fees; compliance with Senate Bill 743; the General Plan Update; Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) impact fees; impacts of drivers vs. impacts of driving on the environment; changes to the way transportation impacts are measured; the environmental review process; Level of Service (LOS); the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); VMT screening thresholds; key Transit Priority Areas (TPAs); proximity to mass transit; in lieu fees; compliance with state guidelines; supplemental criteria; evaluating VMT impacts; project level tools; quantification of the effectiveness of the mitigation measures; consistent analysis for all projects in the City; new fees for projects that increase VMT; the nexus between fees, benefits and proportional cost share; economic analysis of the fee program; administrative processing fees; staff costs; the process; scheduling; and next steps.

Discussion ensued between the consultants, staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding the TPA designation; the omission of Venice and Lincoln; changes to bus lines; flexibility; state mandates; clarification that 80% of the City qualifies as a TPA; the ability to update thresholds; projects being run through the VMT calculator; applicability of VMT fees to project fees; concern with unintended financial impacts to small projects; the nexus study; creation of a TDM organization to manage details of the program rather than burdening staff; coordination between departments to develop the program; improving headways; expansion of transit priority areas; dedicated bus lanes;

updates to screening criteria; the recommendation vs. state guidelines; ability to collect fees; factors used to determine fees; screening thresholds; required CEQA findings; identified TPA areas; taking existing and future developments into consideration; the half-mile radius from the transit hub; transit and land use perspectives; exemptions from VMT analysis from CEQA; mixed use components as part of affordable housing; City Council discretion: exemptions on commercial corridors; ensuring effective modeling; flexibility within the guidelines; TPA screening; tools to incentivize development of affordable housing; the opportunity for additional City Council consideration; effectiveness of marketing TDM programs; outreach; whether there is a reason to keep LOS; mitigation of operational issues; infrastructure improvements; reducing carbon emissions; justification for the VMT threshold selected; the state technical advisory; ways to measure VMT; trip credits; private right of action; negotiating tools; frequency of updating the baseline; consideration of the VMT reducing project list; project implementation; ensuring that development is not discouraged; and data being used.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, indicated that no public comment had been received.

Additional discussion ensued between the consultants, staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding the importance of recommending policy for the future; TPAs; a request for flexible language to account for changes as they come about for evaluation; length of time necessary to make changes; staff discretion; concern with taking a more restrictive position; concern with conferring unfair advantages to certain types of projects; clarification that not many agencies have adopted new guidelines yet; additional research by staff; building in flexibility to the language; a recommendation to approve the traffic guidelines subject to modification of the transit area screening criteria prior to going to the City Council to provide flexibility for transit priority evaluation as changes in transit come about; evaluation criteria; and staff agreement to formulate wording that meets Commission criteria.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: ADOPT A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF THE CULVER CITY TRANSPORTATION STUDY CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES WITH LANGUAGE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SECOND BULLET ON PAGE 10 UNDER SCREENING CRITERIA TO ALLOW FOR FLEXIBILITY AND ADJUSTMENT OF THE TRANSIT PRIORITY AREA BY CRITERIA FORMULATED BY STAFF.

Vice Chair Lachoff expressed appreciation to staff for including the LOS analysis as part of the applications; noted support for VMT; and the immediate effects of projects on the intersection surrounding them.

Council Member Sahli-Wells received Council consensus to agendaize a discussion on exempting 100% affordable housing developments with mixed use from VMT requirements when the item returns to the City Council with the additional information that Commissioner Sayles had requested.

Mayor Eriksson indicated he did not support 100% affordable developments as he felt that mixing socio-economic groups was a more effective practice.

o0o

Item A-2

CC:PC - Joint Study Session to Review, Discuss, and Provide Direction Regarding Comprehensive Zoning Code Amendments Relating to Parking Strategies and Requirements

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, introduced the item.

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, provided a summary of the material of record.

Andrea Fleck, Current Planning Intern, provided a summary of proposed considerations; discussed development of a dynamic parking code to address best practices for parking; economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic; goals and objectives; strategies; reducing parking demand; and implementation.

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, discussed onsite car-share spaces; car stackers; requiring above ground parking that can be converted to habitability in the future; sustainability goals; in lieu parking; parking at off-site locations; setting parking limits; shared parking; pricing structures to de-incentivize the use of parking; best practices of other cities; enhancing mobility goals; and the goal to overhaul parking standards.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding providing a menu of options to incentivize developers; having

savings be experienced by more than just the developers themselves; ensuring that accommodations are offset to a parking or mobility fund; reducing parking needs; reducing fees for developers; the in lieu process; double dipping; implementation of bike culture in the City; exchanging bicycles for vehicular parking; concern with prioritizing cars over public spaces; the mobility rewards program; enabling ease of travel within the City; increased use of bicycles during the pandemic; developer need for certainty when approaching pre-entitlement on a contract; quantifying effective urban design; and financial viability of projects.

Mayor Eriksson invited public input.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, indicated that no public comment had been received.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the need for comprehensive code reform; looking to the future; imposing parking maximums and unbundled parking within Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas; repealing parking minimums; progressive parking fees; performance pricing; in lieu fees; varying levels of implementation; prioritization; differing views between the Commission and the Council; placing the focus on mobility measures rather than on open space; changes to the way mobility, traffic and parking are handled; reducing the number of vehicles on streets; encouraging people to use other forms of transportation; creation of a policy statement or set of principles; increased utilization of parking spaces; allocating in lieu fees to the mobility fund; above ground parking lots; mandating convertibility; necessary design changes; and site planning.

Additional discussion ensued between Commissioners regarding the feasibility of converting parking to living space; height restrictions; concern with limiting buildable square footage; support for creating adaptable buildings to the extent feasible; ensuring that above ground parking is attractive; and support for exploring rather than mandating convertibility.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding prioritizing strategies other than convertibility and whether to mandate congestion pricing in certain areas of the City.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding unintended consequences of making parking

prohibitively expensive in high traffic areas; concern with overflow into residential areas; permit parking; encouraging parking turnover; performance pricing of street meters; use of the curbside for bike parking or dedicated bus lanes; development of a more effective system; establishing parking maximums; penalizing for over-parking; support for reduced parking requirements for mixed use; encouraging shared parking for mixed use and affordable units; applying an extra mobility fee for those parking above parking requirements; those who fee compelled to park above minimums; charging an extra fee put toward mobility solutions for those projects that are over-parked; and current trends.

Additional discussion ensued between Council Members regarding TPAs; support for parking maximums; VMT; climate goals; ensuring a functioning business community that generates jobs and revenue; competing needs; projects built for a specific tenant with specific needs; compensating for the additional impact of more cars; addressing congestion issues; and the one-size-fits-all approach.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding addressing legal non-conforming parking issues; existing use vs. intensification of use; building re-use; the difficulty of adding parking later; the parking credit program adopted by West Hollywood; potential new uses; enacting a temporary holiday for any uses that come in for economic development for a period of time after the end of the pandemic; not allowing people to buy out of their parking shortfall; parking credits; and proximity to transit.

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding adaptive reuse; legal non-conforming uses; in lieu fees; clarifying principles; the Hayden Tract; working with businesses to solve issues; encouraging alternative modes of transportation; defining goals to understand the solutions; not requiring more parking, but solving the problem of getting employees to work; coordination with business; the importance of removing barriers to new business; lowering barriers to residential parking permits; parking intrusion; filling empty brick and mortar retail; Samitaur's efforts to facilitate getting their employees to work; moving forward on transformational items for the City; rethinking the status quo; appreciation for making bold changes; and appreciation to staff for their efforts.

o0o

Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda

Mayor Eriksson invited public comment.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, reported that no public comment had been received.

o0o

Items from Council Members

Vice Mayor Fisch thanked the Planning Commission for their guidance, and he received Council consensus to direct staff to examine what Glendale and Los Angeles are doing in opening up streets to recreational uses.

Chair Reilman thanked the City Council for the opportunity for real time interaction.

o0o

Council Member Requests to Agendize Future Items

None.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 10:25 p.m., the City Council and Planning Commission adjourned.

o0o

Jeremy Green
CITY CLERK of Culver City, California
Culver City, California

GÖRAN ERIKSSON
MAYOR of Culver City

ANDREW REILMAN
CHAIR of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Culver City, California