

ATTACHMENT NO. 5

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

April 10, 2019
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Ogosta called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

*Vice Chair Reilman arrived at 7:05 p.m.

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

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

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Ogosta invited public input.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

o0o

Consent Calendar

None.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

PC: Administrative Site Plan Review and Tentative Tract Map No. 77092, P2018-0056, for the Development of a 9-Unit Townhome Style Condominium Subdivision at 4051 and 4055 Jackson Avenue in the Medium Density Multiple-Family Residential (RMD) Zone

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

Vice Chair Reilman joined the meeting.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding types of errors in the plans; allowing staff time to do further clean up before submitting for plan check; and the standard project review committee meeting.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Ogosta invited public comment.

The following members of the audience addressed the Planning Commission:

Shakil Patel, applicant, provided an overview of the project; discussed parking; bike racks; existing conditions in the area; compatibility; general design objectives; neighborhood character; Gateway Planning Guidelines; prevailing lot coverage; setbacks; height; feedback from community meetings; addressing concerns; architectural style; characteristics and massing; landscaping; rooftop units; ADA accessibility; elevator access; the garage; egress; electric car chargers; guest parking; and the media room.

The contractor for the project discussed routing of construction trucks.

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding turn around; stacking; staging; parking width; on-street parking restrictions; the firm condition regarding off-site parking of construction vehicles; the concrete pour; renting vacant lots for off street parking; shuttling; solar panels above the mechanical area; ventilation; height; private open space; side yards; open space on the roof decks; access; clarification on the surface of the private open space; correct labeling of plans; and clarification of intent of the open space.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding concern with the presentation of the plans and the number of errors; reluctance on the part of the applicant to make corrections to the errors; type and prevalence of errors; ensuring that the General Contractor is clear on the intent; concern that the project could come out other than as intended; matching up call-outs; conditioning that elevations do not change; concern the sloppiness of the project could continue through construction documents and budgeting; the wood finish; value engineering; conditions requiring changes to the prepared plans; responsibility of the Commission to ensure that affordable housing and densification is done correctly; Condition 30 as it relates to elevations and materials; clarification on procedures; City Council jurisdiction; concern with placing a burden on staff; fixing issues before they go to the City Council; potential implications with the number of technical errors; placing the burden on the developer to return with an approvable set of plans; staff agreement that plans be corrected before submission to the City Council and return to the Commission prior to permit issuance; items the staff can control; concern with approving a substandard document; concern with delaying the project; Commission consensus to allow staff to provide an informational packet to the Commission once the plans are corrected; concern with changes in construction; and revised language for Condition 30 to indicate: "...except as provided in this condition ... changes to an improved

project. Any changes to the materials or elevations as presented at the April 10, 2019 Planning Commission meeting shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission through a modification application."

Additional discussion ensued between project representatives and Commissioners regarding elevations; consistency; revised documentation; working drawings; contract documents; Commission purview; compatibility with surrounding land uses; ensuring that the renderings match the elevation; the need for clear, consistent documentation; the landscape plan; and concern by the applicant with City response.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding concern with creating additional work for staff; careful consideration of projects by the Planning Commission; concern with sloppy work and setting a precedent by accepting subpar work; moving the project forward with the caveat that the Commission review plans before the project is permitted; bringing the item back for a conformance review; encouragement to staff to hold their ground; staff direction to the applicant; applicant insistence; the legal obligation to bring the plans forward to the Commission; bringing the plans up to the right caliber before permit issuance; and Commission agreement to approve the item with a conformance review and changes to Condition 30 as discussed earlier, modification of Condition 22b regarding core samples, and changing the date in Conditions 62 and 23b to April 10, 2019.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR REILMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE PROJECT WITH A NEW CONDITION REGARDING THE CONFORMANCE REVIEW AND MAKING CHANGES TO CONDITION 30 AS DISCUSSED, CHANGES TO CONDITION 22B INCLUDING THE SENTENCE REGARDING CORE SAMPLES AS MODIFIED, AND CHANGING THE DATE IN CONDITIONS 23B AND 62 TO APRIL 10, 2019.

ooo

Item PH-2

Conditional Use Permit, P2018-0071-CUP, and Administrative Use Permit, P2018-0071-AUP, for the Implementation of Two- and Three-level Parking Stackers and Tandem Parking to Support the Parking needs of an Existing Media Production

**Facility at 10950 Washington Boulevard in the Commercial
Regional Business Park (CRB) Zone**

Vice Chair Reilman and Commissioner Voncannon recused themselves from consideration of the item due to their proximity to the project and exited the dais.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

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

Chair Ogosta invited public comment.

The following members of the audience addressed the Commission:

Andrew Reilman indicated that he had recused himself from consideration of the item as he lives in close proximity to the project; expressed concern with safety issues related to exiting the parking; and he felt there needed to be better control of the vehicular traffic exiting the ramp between the mosque and the NFL.

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner, provided a summary of the material of record.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the new layout; the original recommendation for angled parking to allow for additional landscaped space; aisle dimensions; managed parking; size of the landscape buffer; and code requirements for parking that abuts a residential zone.

Jean Liu, Gensler, provided a presentation on the plans and drawings to better illustrate the proposal for 10950 Washington Boulevard.

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding landscaping; buffering; visibility; wall height at the property line; and visual screening.

Chris Pearson, Hudson Pacific Properties, discussed hours of operation and managed parking.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the intent to minimize noise impacts to the neighbors; stacking; phasing; long term plans; prospective tenanting; creative office; and neighborhood benefits.

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding creative use vs. use by the NFL; future plans; taking a longer-term lookback under a different tenant scenario; providing background information about the operations up front; the proposed phasing; the ability to refer the matter for reconsideration or revocation if issues arise; and the potential for decreased intensity with a different user.

Commissioner Sayles disclosed that she had worked in the building 13 years ago when the NFL had the ground floor of the building and there were multiple office users, noting that there was ample parking at that time and that perhaps in the future there would be less parking demand with a different user.

Commissioner Lachoff disclosed that he had sold the property next door to Hudson Pacific 7-8 years ago.

Further discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding the timeline for installation of the stackers; the request for no construction on Sundays; impacts of limiting construction to Monday through Friday; late materials distributed to the Commission that had not been reviewed; and the ability to modify the condition during the hearing.

John Bowman, Elkins Kalt, presented the proposed modifications to the Conditions of Approval; discussed Condition 11; current vs. future demand for charging stations; the proposed modification to provide 11 active stations upon project completion with infrastructure provided for 41 more rather than 52 active up front; the modification to require a pre-construction inspection rather than an onsite biological monitor; and deletion of Condition 63 due to redundancy with Condition 46.

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding the Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council on EV standards; methodology for determining the number of required EV stalls; accommodating demand; managed parking; cycled charging by valet during the day; modification to condition 79 regarding the evaluation of parking demand; revisiting noise and nuisance conditions; and cleanup of Lookback Conditions.

Sal Lapardo expressed concern with noise issues; the number of spaces added by the stackers; quality of life issues; construction; community involvement with selection of landscape; recent issues with Hudson Pacific cutting trees and landscaping; remediation; and the need for a contact person at Hudson Pacific rather than having to file police reports when issues arise.

Bryant Rivera discussed operating hours; issues related to providing additional parking; light pollution; disturbances in the middle of the night; concern with landscaping being destroyed; and the need for a contact person.

Stephen Collins expressed concern with fence height; adding trees to provide a visual buffer; operating hours; early morning noise issues; management of parking behind the sound wall during early morning hours; and that parking stalls that abut the wall affect residential properties the most.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the location of Mr. Collins' property and the proposal to add landscaping and sound buffers.

Nicole Peraza questioned whether the proposed landscaping that would be planted would be mature; discussed noise issues; the nature and type of the noise; the feeling that landscaping does not remediate noise issues; and concern that noise would be increased with construction.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the landscaping plan.

John Greenway discussed wall height; lighting issues; noise issues; parking on Elenda; and he received clarification on the distance from the stackers to the property line.

Rhia Uytingco discussed noise abatement with shrubbery; received clarification regarding proposed landscaping; and she indicated that she thought that residents were to have input regarding landscaping.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

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

Discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding proposed landscaping; spacing; the condition that the applicant work with the immediate neighbor to identify an appropriate landscaping plan; noise related to the 24 hour production facility; loading; addressing issues; on-street loading; resident communication of complaints; instituting a hotline or email; phasing; the location of parking spaces; demand; directing off-hour parking as far away from residents as possible first; weekend management; 24-hour response; and Chair Ogosta expressed appreciation to those who came to the meeting to provide comment.

o0o

Recess/Reconvene

Chair Ogosta called a brief recess from 9:58 p.m. to 10:09 p.m. to allow Commissioners a chance to review the proposed changes to the Conditions of Approval.

o0o

Item PH-2
(continued)

Conditional Use Permit, P2018-0071-CUP, and Administrative Use Permit, P2018-0071-AUP, for the Implementation of Two- and Three-level Parking Stackers and Tandem Parking to Support the Parking needs of an Existing Media Production Facility at 10950 Washington Boulevard in the Commercial Regional Business Park (CRB) Zone

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding Condition 11 for EV charging stations; the original condition; the current proposed modification to require a minimum of 22 parking stalls with EV charging stations and an additional 45 with infrastructure for future installation; the applicant request; demand for EV; Commission consensus to support consistency in projects with new parking and support the staff recommendation; concern with taking an arbitrary assessment from a tenant; past City Council recommendations for additional EV ready spaces; managed parking; staff agreement with applicant clean up language for Condition 39; staff clarification of the assertion by the applicant that Condition 63 contains redundant language; standard wording for environmental documents; staff support for retaining the original language in Condition 63; work within existing areas that are not landscaped; the need for removal of trees and landscaping; nesting possibilities; identifying all provisions if applicable; adding a sentence to Condition 69 to indicate "this shall not apply to any comments that have been modified during the PPC process" to make it clear that it does not apply in situations where things have been changed; staff agreement with the change proposed by the applicant to Condition 79; intent of the wording in Condition 89; making clear that abutting owners are giving their concurrence and must be a party to the selection of the final landscaping at abutting areas; imposing landscaping requirements; Conditions of Approval vs. private party property agreements; ensuring that landscaping discussions continue; atypical condition; support for changes suggested by Mr. Bowman indicating that consultation continues; expanding to all abutting property owners; agreement to substitute the word consultation rather than agreement; possible recommendations for the property line; a suggestion that the landscape architect meet with the neighbors; providing latitude to the design; agreement that language be changed to indicate that: "The applicant and applicant's landscape architect shall continue to discuss the landscape planning"; appreciation to the applicant for their thorough work; neighborhood parking intrusion; improving neighbor experience through parking management; requiring notice that an ongoing 24-hour hotline is available to residents; signage; and Commission agreement to ensure that references to items in the parking plan on page 6 of the staff report are included as conditions: indicating that alternative parking plans are required upon the occurrence of each non-

operation event, requiring an updated and revised parking operations plan in the event of future changes to uses or tenants, and requiring that a final parking operations plan is submitted reflecting requested changes in terms of operating hours.

Additional discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding operating hours for the stackers; feasibility issues; the intent; Commission consensus to allow operation of the stackers until 6:00 p.m.; and balancing neighbor concerns with applicant requests.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, read back agreed upon modifications including: Condition 63, leaving in original wording; Condition 69, use original condition with a limitation indicating "that shall not apply to any comments that have been modified"; Condition 79, agreement with the changes proposed by the applicant; Condition 89, include changes proposed by the applicant with the following wording: "The applicant and applicant's landscape architect shall continue to discuss the landscape plantings with the abutting property owners in order to ensure..."; add a condition on 24-hour hotline notification with wording to indicate that the "owner shall provide a mailing to abutting owners on 24 hour notification"; adding Conditions not shown in the staff report on page 6: "The project is required to submit a final alternative parking plan upon each occurrence of a non-operation event"; "Any future changes to the uses or tenants occupying the building will require the submittal of an updated revised parking operations plan; a final parking operations plan is required prior to permit final outlining all changes discussed regarding operations; and a revision to Condition 11, "The project shall provide a minimum of 22 parking stalls with EV charging stations and an additional 45 parking stalls shall be constructed with infrastructure necessary..."

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the number of agreed upon EV charging stations and EV ready parking stalls; Commission adoption of the text amendment; Condition 39 accepted as proposed by the applicant; "Parking stacker operations shall be restricted to the hours of 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday; elimination of Saturday construction; and the requirement for a five-foot landscape planter on the south lot based upon the diagram.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER LACHOFF THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE PROJECT SUBJECT TO MODIFICATIONS AS AGREED UPON BY THE COMMISSION.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

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

o0o

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

None.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

None.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Michael Allen, Planning Manager, discussed the upcoming joint study session with the City Council scheduled for May 8.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding Commissioner availability and the upcoming site tour.


Commissioner Sayles indicated that she would provide a report from her visit to the EPA at the next meeting.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 10:59 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to a joint study session with the City Council on Wednesday, May 8, 2019, at 7:00 p.m.


o0o



SUSAN HERBERTSON
SENIOR PLANNER of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION


APPROVED

6/12/19



ED OGOSTA
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

14 JUN 2019