

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE
CULVER CITY GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
CULVER CITY GENERAL PLAN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

April 8, 2021
7:00 P.M.

Call To Order & Roll Call

The special meeting of the Culver City General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) was called to order at 7:16 P.M.

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Members | Bitania Beniam, Member |
| Present: | Patricia Bijvoet, Member |
| | Cicely Bingener, Member |
| | Peter Capone-Newton, Member |
| | Diana Hernandez, Member |
| | Ken Mand, Vice Chair |
| | Paavo Monkkonen, Member (arrived 7:23 PM) |
| | Anthony Pleskow, Member |
| | Freddy Puza, Member |
| | Denice Renteria, Member |
| | Frances Rosenau, Chair |
| | Claudia Vizcarra, Member |
| | Noah Zatz, Member |
| Members | Dominique Djedje, Member |
| Absent: | Scott Malsin, Member |
| | Wally Marks, Member |
| | David Metzler, Member |
| | Jeanne Min, Member |
| | Kristen Torres Pawling, Member |
| | Jamie Wallace, Member |
| | Andrew Weissman, Member |
| Staff | Ashley Hefner Hoang, Advance Planning |
| Present: | Manager (Secretary) |
| | Lauren Marsiglia, Associate Planner |
| Consultants | Jovanni Carter-Davis |
| Present: | Luci Hise-Fisher, ESA Associates |
| | Martin Leitner, Perkins + Will |
| | Meghan McNulty, Raimi + Associates |

Public Comment for Items NOT On the Agenda

Secretary Hefner Hoang invited public comment. No attendees requested to speak.

oOo

Consent Calendar Items

Secretary Hefner Hoang explained that no one submitted eComments on the consent calendar item and invited the GPAC Members to ask questions on or pull the consent calendar item for discussion. No Members made a request.

Item C-1

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 11, 2021 GPAC MEETING

MOVED BY MEMBER BIJVOET, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR MAND AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 11, 2021 ARE APPROVED (ABSENT MEMBERS DJEDJE, MALSIN, MARKS, METZLER, MIN, MONKKONNEN, TORRES PAWLING, WALLACE, AND WEISSMAN).

oOo

Action Items

Item A-1

1. REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES

Secretary Hefner Hoang commented an e-mail correspondence on Item A-1 was shared with the GPAC Members; Perkins + Will, the General Plan Update (GPU) urban design consultant, would facilitate the discussion; and the next GPAC meeting would be on mobility alternatives.

Leitner introduced himself and his colleague Jovanni Carter-Davis, summarized the conversations related to land use the GPU team has held to-date, and explained what progress the team has made since those conversations.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about when the land use alternatives maps would be approved. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained that the GPU team is facilitating a public workshop on land use alternatives on April 29 to get

community input, GPAC would review mobility alternatives at the May 13 GPAC meeting, Planning Commission and City Council will meet on June 23 to review and give direction on the land use alternatives.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about the process to review the land use alternatives, whether the timeline is too short and driven by the Housing Element deadline, if it allows enough public input, and whether the meeting can include a poll asking the GPAC Members about their preferences on the land use alternative scenarios. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained the maps are informed by feedback since the project started 1.5 years ago, including several GPAC meetings and community input on the draft vision and goals for Culver City; the GPAC will meet once more on the topic; there will be more meetings including the community workshop and joint session; the GPU schedule has been the same since the project started, is planned for the Housing Element deadline, and has not changed because of COVID-19; and invited suggestions on how the GPU team can improve community engagement.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about polling GPAC Members about the proposed maps, whether the maps reflect the suggestions that the GPAC and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members made, and if the maps are ambitious enough. Leitner said the feedback is helpful and asked to finish the presentation before discussing.

Leitner discussed Culver City's general plan land use map and what general plan land use maps represent (e.g., policy, land use distributions in city, and future growth); how zoning discussions will follow the GPU process; the relationship between land use and mobility; existing land uses in Culver City; the advantages and limitations of different approaches to land use growth; the land use intensity scale from less dense to more dense; prototypical place types in Culver City and how they accommodate growth; how the GPU team removed an intermediate growth option after hearing feedback against it; how the updated maps reflect some new feedback the team has heard; how GPAC Members should share anything they believe is missing; what the GPU team has heard (Culver City is a desirable place with a high quality of life, the GPAC wants to ensure people of diverse racial and economic backgrounds can live in Culver City, Culver City has diverse housing that attracts creativity, many want to increase housing

opportunities without drastically changing the existing scale, the need for affordable solutions, and the goal of avoiding concentrating new housing along freeways and corridors); some of the topics the GPU team has asked about (the implications of density and homeownership opportunities with what the State law allows in single family zoning (accessory dwelling units "ADUs" and junior accessory dwelling units "JADUs") compared to allowing three full residential units, small lot subdivisions, affordable housing bonuses, increasing density on shallow lots, scale transitions, concentrating residential uses along corridors, converting vacant commercial spaces, and integrating local-serving uses in neighborhoods); and showed the alternative maps.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about Alternative 1 "Concentrated Growth," what single-family zone symbology represents and why it is not consistently applied across all single-family neighborhoods in the city. Leitner explained that the symbology reflects state law changes to single-family zoning, the GPAC Members can offer feedback on the hillside neighborhood and the State ADU law, and some areas do not use the same symbology because it does not reflect development trends. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained that the zoning code currently prohibits ADUs and JADUs in the Culver Crest neighborhood.

Marsiglia explained that a few other GPAC Members requested to speak. Secretary Hefner Hoang asked that Members ask clarifying questions now and hold comments.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about what the phrase "regional center" means. Leitner explained that it refers to a place that draws people beyond local residents, and it is considered one of the densest types of commercial and mixed-use development.

Leitner continued the presentation and discussed the Alternative 2 "Dispersed Growth" map, ADUs, JADUs, single-family zoning, and small lot subdivision; the differences between existing conditions and the alternative map; the differences in corridors, commercial, and neighborhood uses in Alternative 1 "Concentrated" compared to Alternative 2 "Dispersed;" and stopped for public comment.

Marsiglia noted Suzanne Debenidittis sent a message in chat requesting that members of the public have more opportunities to review the maps.

The public comment period was opened.

Suzanne Debenidittis asked to see more information about climate regeneration; about land uses, whether the maps consider carbon sequestration from existing vegetation that may be removed; whether these land use analyses quantify and evaluate tree loss and consider climate preservation; and discussed the need for rainwater capture. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained that the GPU will look at how land use affects the climate; goals, policies, and actions will be defined to achieve Culver City's vision for climate, and that the environmental analysis phase will consider climate change and adaptation. Leitner explained that those factors are not considered in these land use alternatives, the team will consider streetscape designs and landscaping, and invited everyone to think about what they would like to see in Culver City's future.

Meg Sullivan discussed her role in the community and participation in the GPAC process, the letter she shared with Secretary Hefner Hoang before meeting, the triplex she owns on a large lot on a street with other low-density and medium-density properties, the city's capacity to house people, how much land is dedicated to parking, allowing increased building heights by putting parking below grade, how she has heard many housing providers express interest in more density, and the financial viability of renting out properties compared to providing owner-occupied properties. Leitner posed her question about whether we should plan for more change in low- to medium-density areas to the GPAC Members, related that to a question about accommodating growth while preserving existing affordable homes, explained how he has heard comments about wanting to keep renters in the city and asked for others, including those who work in development, to share their perspective.

George Montgomery asked about the areas grayed out on the maps, particularly those around the Hayden Tract, which he suggested could accommodate missing middle housing; what the phrase "missing middle" means; and whether Culver City will adopt the City of LA's low-rise plans. Leitner explained that the GPU team has not gotten much input on the Hayden Tract and invited input, explained that cities

that provide missing middle housing have found that consolidating lots is difficult, that missing middle housing works when regulations give owners of one or two properties options for parcelization and that this allows small developers to develop more easily in the city.

Secretary Hefner Hoang closed the public comment period and opened the discussion to the GPAC Members.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff that the grayed out areas in the Alternative 2 map are not expected to change so they were grey to focus attention on the areas with expected change; how the Hayden Tract, Smiley Blackwelder, and areas along Ballona Creek are all near transit and can accommodate housing; what the process has been for those areas so far and in the future; what the future density will be in areas mixed with low- and medium-density residential and how to get public input from those areas; how staff have been engaging property owners in the GPU process; polling GPAC Members about their preferences with the alternatives; whether the maps reflect all available opportunities; and what the alternatives assume about ADUs. Leitner asked the Member what color they would use for the Hayden Tract, Smiley Blackwelder, and areas along Ballona Creek and the Member suggested hot pink (which represents Mixed Use Medium land use). Leitner explained that areas with mixed low- and medium-density residential land uses are considered successful and that the remaining low-density areas would likely become higher density, many lots in the area are already consolidating, so increasing density in these areas likely would not be drastically different from the areas' existing trends. Meghan McNulty, of Raimi and Associates, explained that staff conducted a preliminary analysis on the number of ADUs for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) cycles in January, that they need to do analysis on the new alternatives, and estimated a range of 9,000 to 11,000 ADUs for future projections.

A Member discussed the effectiveness of the graphic showing Culver City's land use distribution, how Culver City is considered to be a very high resource area per the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee's opportunity maps, the density levels required (at least 30 dwelling units per acre (du/ac)) to meet affordable housing goals set by Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), how lot consolidation is complicated and sometimes financially

infeasible, how Portland's Residential Infill Project could serve as a model for Culver City, how other countries have modeled how successful high density areas can be, the suggested geographic limitations of accommodating ADUs and JADUs in the hillside neighborhoods compared to places with steeper geographies, like Hong Kong, that accommodate high density; allowing as much housing as needed to address the jobs to housing imbalance in Culver City (60,000 jobs to 17,000 housing units); the timeline it would take to close the gap in the jobs to housing imbalance; the connection between addressing the jobs to housing imbalance with climate sustainability; illustrating the alternatives alongside data on estimated changes in zoning capacity by time (e.g., 10 years, 20 years); how much housing Culver City actually built compared to how much it set out to build in the last Housing Element cycle; setting higher housing targets for this cycle; how maintaining the State's changes to the single-family residential zone without increasing density to full housing units limits homeownership opportunities, the social and economic limitations of that (e.g., it perpetuates hierarchical inequality in zoning), and how this compares to what Vancouver experiences; and how Culver City can densify in a way that will make the city better and not destroy it.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about the importance of remembering that the alternatives show what change can happen and not what will happen, allowing the whole city to rise and become denser, but reserving some areas if necessary; their preference for the dispersed model, or a combination of models; their confusion over the density restrictions for parts of the corridor (e.g., if lots are too small); exemptions to consider for lots with perceived density restrictions; retaining creative workers in the Hayden Tract; their concern over losing areas for certain work specific to Culver City; accommodating housing and creative offices; increasing density in the R-2 zone as long as it does not displace those living there and affordable units in the redevelopment process.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about whether the term "missing middle" is misleading and should be re-named to more accurately reflect how staff have been using it (i.e., to refer to housing stock density) and how financing policies should address who can afford to live in "missing middle" housing; whether focusing on "missing middle" will achieve AFFH goals; what triggers to use if

density bonuses do not work or developers do not use them, how increasing density tends to reduce the price of individual units, but increases the property's overall value; imposing a tax on upzoning so the City can capture some of the increased property value and invest it in the public good and affordable and inclusionary housing; real estate transfer taxes; how upzoning can benefit the public and not just developers; how upzoning includes the possibility of developing a parcel, so no parcels should be excluded from upzoning (e.g., those in the Culver Crest and Studio Estates neighborhoods); whether excluding certain neighborhoods from the upzoning conversation is linked to class, race, and politics; and commercial requirements along corridors like Washington Boulevard and how they affect commercial synergy related to walkability and transit. Leitner explained the team can reconsider the term "missing middle" and how its context has evolved over time, how the number of units we want to see is related to who is developing for whom; how simplifying regulations and reducing fees invites small, local developers to build; how large developers tend to build most of the development in the LA area; how decisions around density depend on their corresponding goals; and invited input on density tradeoffs. Secretary Hefner Hoang encouraged the attendees to join the City Council meeting on Monday, April 12 since it will include a discussion on the Housing Element Guiding Principles, which affect the land use alternatives, the minimum density, AFFH, and sets a housing target buffer; explained that other jurisdictions like Long Beach are having similar conversations on neighborhoods like Culver Crest; and confirmed with Leitner that the GPU team will incorporate the feedback on the alternative scenarios before the next GPAC meeting.

A Member explained their preference for focusing on two alternatives; how megalopolises in other countries show that dense areas can have charm and neighborhood character; how density can work if done thoughtfully; how sprawled development can extend commute times and negatively impact the environment; the need for accessible, affordable housing; the group's goal in setting a bold, big picture and map and considering the systems involved; the value of creating ownership opportunities and increasing diversity by offering affordable housing; and echoed the question "who is developing for whom."

A Member discussed reflecting bold visions in the maps; policies that capture increases in property value and invest the funding locally to create more housing; allow aging in place and multigenerational opportunities; instituting zoning that sets repercussions for building below the allowed density; their support for four- and six-plexes on 5,000-square-foot lots; and examples of low-density development in the Rancho Higuera neighborhood.

A Member discussed going big with the maps; a Swedish program in the 1960s that added 25% more social housing in a decade; Sweden's universal approach to housing that builds a lot of social housing, makes it available to everyone, and creates multigenerational opportunities; the U.S.'s approach to social housing which is typically stigmatized and "others" the low-income residents who live there; implementing programs that use public funds to build housing accessible to everyone; the real estate transfer tax's role in capturing land value and funding affordable housing compared to development taxes; how landowners benefit more than developers from increasing zoning allowances; whether charging developers would benefit the public; using a taxing sale that allows developers to build four- and six-plexes; how the Portland model enables market-rate four-plexes or affordable six-plexes; how the U.S. does not have a have model to build subsidized affordable housing in single family neighborhoods; whether Culver City could set that model; their availability to help design the model; and how the U.S. mainly uses Low-Income Housing Tax Credits to produce affordable housing.

A Member discussed how many fewer affordable units compared to market-rate units they have built in Culver City despite the existing programs that the City and state offer; the financial constraints with building affordable housing, including land and construction costs; potential locations for housing opportunities in Culver City (e.g., the parking lot in front of Target); the relationship between density and funding; the difficulties of achieving income diversity in neighborhoods with the current structure; the limitations of looking at affordable housing models in countries with different government structures to the U.S.; creating new ground floor opportunities when there is limited space; taking right-of-way space from streets to increase a place's buildable area; transforming Ballona Creek from a concrete ditch into an asset and using it for green space and housing; the studies that LA is doing on

the LA river; ground floor retail and office spaces along corridors; maintaining and activating life along major corridors by retaining retail and keeping the corridors walkable; re-negotiating with the County and State over how much property tax Culver City charges; the relationship between property tax and land use; the lengthy and bureaucratic process of entitling projects and it discourages small developers; and using diagrams to show what the alternatives would look and feel like in reality for the neighborhoods and in the public realm.

A Member discussed presenting the alternatives visually, examples of four-plexes in LA neighborhoods, Christopher Hawthorne's design competition in LA, pre-entitling projects that advance affordable housing goals like four- and six-plexes and ADUs, reflecting those incentives in the maps; and the benefits of pre-approved plans.

A Member discussed Christopher Hawthorne's role with the City of LA and the design competition in LA called Low-Rise, how Low-Rise will announce the design competition's winner in April 2021, how Low-Rise pre-entitles projects and includes pre-approved designs for ADUs, and how those models could potentially be appropriate in Culver City.

A Member suggested that the GPU reconsider jargon in addition to the "missing middle," and use more descriptive and clear terms to help people visualize the concepts; shifting the responsibility of providing affordable housing to the government if the market cannot provide enough after setting goals around equity, justice, and affordability; and that Culver City dream big and be a leader.

Leitner explained how previous presentations on land use alternatives included images that illustrated density; the relationship between land use and mobility and how the amount of space and money dedicated to cars limits density opportunities; how 32 du/ac is a common density which accommodates more complicated building types; how residential density tends to occur along corridors; how parking at lower ratios can accommodate more people; how regulations, lenders, and codes tend to prohibit this approach in other places and that the GPU may not be able to address all those barriers; how parking is typically the most burdensome requirement for developers to meet; and asked GPAC Members about their thoughts on parking.

Several Members explained that they want to reduce parking dramatically, want parking maximums, want a shared parking system, how parking requirements tend to be less intense in other communities, and the importance of educating people.

Leitner discussed the commercial requirement along commercial corridors, how planners tend to designate commercial areas as corridors, how it can be challenging to fill commercial corridors with retail but other uses like offices can work, and asked if incorporating residential corridors to improve walkable streets and downtowns like LA and San Diego have done could work in Culver City.

A Member discussed how Playa Vista activates streets with homes that have front patios that allow residents to sit outside, how Amsterdam uses a similar approach it recognizes that filling a street solely with commercial uses is challenging, allowing land uses that can be easily interchanged like how we use garage spaces, and allowing pleasant spaces along boulevards that can switch between living uses to something else.

A Member discussed growing up in Manhattan; keeping Washington Boulevard commercial and the side residential streets residential since those residential streets are walkable; preventing homogenized land uses in Culver City; allowing residential uses everywhere to support mixed use and allow people to live close to where they work; how Fox Hills is zoned to allow mainly office parks and its potential to become a high density mixed use neighborhood that has neighborhood-serving commercial and allows people to live and work nearby; eliminating high parking requirements; and how housing is economically complicated.

Leitner asked the GPAC Members how the pandemic affects economic opportunities like small retail, grocery stores, or bodegas when people are doing more from home and can run those businesses in a home addition or front yard; and whether we can do these things on collector streets or corners and not just boulevards and arterials.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about the mobility benefits of allowing more retail out of residential uses and what downsides exist. Leitner explained that the most common restrictions this approach is that the employees must be part of the household and speculated that customer traffic may be a concern.

A Member explained their support for allowing diverse land uses in residential zones and allowing residential uses in former commercial zones, removing minimum parking requirements and the studies describing the negative impacts of keeping them, how developers tend to build parking even if it is not required and will do so inexpensively without going underground, how commercial uses can improve walkability, affordable housing overlay zones, and Portland's incentives for developers who build six- to eight-plexes on 5,000 square-foot lots.

Leitner invited Members who have not contributed the discussion to share their thoughts.

A Member described visiting a small town in Mexico for 18 years and seeing many homes that operate stores, how living next to some retail uses like a tortilla factory can be a minor inconvenience, but provide a broader benefit to the neighborhood; how some larger cities allow businesses to operate out of homes; expanding commercial uses like Jackson Market throughout Culver City; and how most people tend to walk to Jackson Market than drive there.

A Member described the challenges for some homeowners in Culver City to increase density on property because of parking requirements and their experience with this challenge on a property they own in an R-2 zone.

A Member described Culver City becoming a model around racial and economic justice, pushing limits beyond comfort zones, being ambitious with ideas, and creatively redoing the corporate park.

A Member described the City's live/work ordinance, reducing its limitations on commercial corridors to fill retail space, and its benefits related to mobility.

Leitner acknowledged the changes the GPAC Members suggested to the alternatives and asked for an informal poll on the alternatives as presented. A Member explained their preference for Alternative #2, and asked to see another option that reflects the changes the GPAC Members have suggested and that pushes the boundaries more. Leitner asked about Alternatives #1 versus #2 and what other nuances the maps should reflect (e.g., overlays related to transit, differentiation between regions north

or south of Ballona Creek, or nuances related to the hillside areas).

A Member requested seeing housing everywhere and asked if anyone supports Alternative 1.

A Member described their preference for limiting the conversation to two options, reconsidering parking lots, and reflecting bigger changes in the maps.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about a Member's preference for Alternative #2, going bigger and pushing what is allowed; minimum densities in parking lots; increasing the height limit to increase density (e.g., allowing up to seven-story buildings or whatever is feasible for cheaper construction); showing the maps alongside data of the corresponding changes to the zoning capacity; allowing 30 du/ac to achieve AFFH; producing affordable housing in Culver City and how that would affect land use; and their surprise that an alternative showing the status quo (Alternative #1) existed given feedback from past GPAC meetings. Leitner said a few City Councilmembers supported Alternative #1. A Member discussed how keeping Alternatives #0 and #1 is important for community members, their preference for Alternative #2, which is consistent with most of the other GPAC Members; and how the GPAC is a small representative body for the community.

A Member discussed how those who tend to participate and make comments in City Council meetings are typically rich, white homeowners; sharing a paper that surveys and evaluates public policies around land use; how non-white renters typically support increasing housing production, whereas older wealthier white homeowners, who show up more at public meetings, tend to oppose increasing housing supply; the importance of reflecting the community's opinions; and recognizing that the comments staff hear at City Council and GPAC meetings generally reflect the opinions of a subset of the community. Discussion ensued between Members on whether the GPAC is representative of Culver City or is older than the average resident. A Member described how many residents may not speak up about community projects; that those who speak up may not always represent everyone; and that some people may be more vocal on platforms like Facebook, but not in places where decisionmakers would hear them.

A Member suggested increasing the GPU's budget to send the community mass updates on the GPU.

A Member explained the challenge of discussing inclusion in a place that was historically founded on excluding others, how surveying all Culver City residents would privilege those who benefited from Culver City's exclusive past and may not include the voices of those who would choose to live in Culver City if they could afford it, and the challenge of being a small city near a large metropolis.

A Member described how a mass survey would include renters' voices.

A Member discussed the challenge of including people in the GPU conversation this far along in the process and the importance of framing the feedback opportunities in materials so people new to the conversation will feel like it is not too late to provide meaningful input.

Secretary Hefner Hoang asked the Members to help spread the word about the Land Use Alternatives Community Workshop and if it was clear what levels of density are desired for the gray parcels, Hayden Tract, and along Jefferson Boulevard. Leitner explained the south side of Jefferson Boulevard will be designated hot pink and brown for the north side of the creek to activate it as suggested earlier.

A Member explained Ballona Creek's potential for activation and Hayden Tract's potential for small ground floor uses and higher buildings mixed with low industrial uses. Secretary Hefner Hoang asked if these ideas resonate with others. One Member said yes and suggested removing parking requirements, tying land use to mobility solutions, and discussed Hayden Tract's potential. Another Member described Smiley Blackwelder's potential for growth.

Leitner asked about the proposed changes (missing middle with three to four or four to six units) for the residential neighborhood south of East Washington Boulevard and whether the GPAC Members support incremental growth there or designating it with the brown color.

A Member expressed their interest in hearing the public's input and Culver City's opportunities around infrastructure, Transit Oriented Development, parking maximums, and other density triggers.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about the potential challenges of aggregating parcels and changing neighborhood scale, whether it is possible to aggregate lots to meet 30 du/ac in the Arts District and Hayden Tract, considering goals and intentions before acting, and presenting maps and images in a way that helps residents understand what the changes would look and feel like. Leitner explained how previous meetings included more visuals, the input evolved into the maps, and the importance of considering streetscape and other building typologies before the next public meeting.

A Member described how the maps focus on maximum permissible uses and density, how these changes will occur gradually as people sell their property and will not be immediately dramatic.

A Member emphasized the need to help people understand what a four-, five-, or six-unit building would look like and how increasing density to those levels may feel radical for those who have not participated.

A Member suggested framing conversations around increasing density with its benefits: aging in place, reducing barriers to entry in homeownership, and increasing opportunities for building wealth.

A Member asked when the plan will be adopted, the rate at which properties typically sell in a neighborhood, and for a graphic showing a time-lapse of how many properties sell each year and what change could look like if people built out to the maximum density allowed. The Member suggested that when zoning changes, behaviors around sales will change; re-zoning will attract new types of buyers; and understanding what increasing density will look like in a city that has predominantly single-family homes.

A Member discussed how in a typical year, maybe one house per block is sold and redeveloped into a mansion; how increasing density would allow those projects to develop into four-plexes instead of mansions; how people tend to view upzoning as eminent domain; how change only happens when people sell; how people tend to flip their arguments around density (e.g., people oppose four-plexes citing a lack of interest but also fear that people will take advantage of the opportunity to develop four-plexes when

given the chance); and the need for setting reasonable expectations based on past trends. A Member commented that change happens independent of zoning.

Leitner reminded the GPAC that the GPU focuses on land use designations, not zoning codes; zoning changes will occur after the GPU; the land use alternatives discussion is still broad at this stage and not about implementation; and that conversations around height have changed (e.g., discussing stories versus heights).

Discussion ensued between Members about re-framing the conversation around height to stories, allowing buildings to be at least as tall as the tallest building in Culver City, how Washington, DC requires that no building is taller than the Washington Monument, the relationship between the existing 56-foot height limit and the state bonus, adding the height limit to the ballot for the public to reconsider, whether the limit is arbitrary, and whether the GPAC can decide on the height limit. Leitner explained that it would require a public vote.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about how the height limit is quasi-constitutional and would require voter approval, how using stories as a measure may make more sense for development, using a criterion to set the limit like the height of the tallest firefighter's ladder, being bold with height in areas without much housing, and reinvesting increased property values into a fund for affordable housing and mobility. Leitner explained how using combinations of height limits and stories could make more sense depending on the objectives around density, scale, and the city's vision; how deciding on what makes sense depends on definitions used.

Discussion ensued between Members and staff about setting the Housing Element's deadline as Phase 1 of the land use alternatives process and getting more funding to extend the process to Phase 2. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained that the Housing Element Guiding Principles that City Council will consider suggests a two-phase approach, where in Phase 1 the City tries to meet as many Guiding Principles as possible in the Housing Element to be adopted by the state's deadline and Phase 2 would allow for exploring the Guiding Principles further and would amend the Housing Element if needed. There is a limit to how flexible the

timeline can be for the land use alternatives since it affects the environmental review process.

A Member expressed their interest in being part of a conversation around this with City Council if it needs their review and approval.

Secretary Hefner Hoang invited final words for evening.

Leitner thanked all for their time, effort, and thoughtful responses. Secretary Hefner Hoang thanked everyone.

o0o

Public Comment for Items NOT On the Agenda

Secretary Hefner Hoang invited public comment. No attendees requested to speak.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

Secretary Hefner Hoang stated that staff received one piece of correspondence from Meg Sullivan, shared it with the GPAC before the meeting, and will file it for the record.

o0o

Items from Members/Staff/Consultants

Secretary Hefner Hoang invited Members, staff, and consultants to share items. None shared. Secretary Hefner Hoang discussed upcoming GPU events: City Council meeting on Monday, April 12 to consider the Housing Element Guiding Principles; April 20 Housing TAC meeting on land use alternatives; April 29 community land use alternatives workshop; May 12 Planning Commission Housing Element kickoff meeting; May 13 GPAC meeting on on mobility alternatives; and a community health and environmental justice workshop in August or September. Secretary Hefner Hoang explained City Council approved a collaboration between the City and University of California to study an online engagement platform and its ability to improve broad representation in community engagement at the Community Health and Environmental Justice workshop, and that staff will share more information as it becomes available.

McNulty explained that the community will also be able to respond to a survey on land use alternatives even if they are unable to attend the workshop. Secretary Hefner Hoang reminded Members to add stories to the Story Bank.

oOo

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 10:22 P.M., the General Plan Advisory Committee adjourned to a regular meeting on May 13, 2021, at 7:00 P.M.

oOo

Ashley Hefner Hoang
SECRETARY of the Culver City General Plan Advisory Committee
Culver City, California

APPROVED _____

Frances Rosenau
CHAIR of the Culver City General Plan Advisory Committee
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