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

April 28, 2021
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Voncannon called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:08 p.m.

Present: David Voncannon, Chair
Dana Sayles, Vice Chair
Nancy Barba, Commissioner
Ed Ogosta, Commissioner
Andrew Reilman, Commissioner

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Voncannon led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Voncannon invited public comment.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, discussed procedures for making public comment and indicated that no public comment had been received for Items Not on the Agenda.

o0o

Consent Calendar

Item C-1

PC: Approval of Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 27, 2021

MOVED BY VICE CHAIR SAYLES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER OGOSTA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 27, 2021 AS SUBMITTED.

o0o

Item C-2

PC: Approval of Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of March 10, 2021

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BARBA, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR SAYLES AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF MARCH 10, 2021 AS SUBMITTED.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Public Hearing Items

Item PH-1

PC - PUBLIC HEARING: Consideration of a City-Initiated Zoning Code Amendment Clarifying Development Standards for the Single-Family (R1) Residential Zone, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and Micro-Units

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, introduced the item.

Deborah Hong, Planning Technician, and William Kavadas, Assistant Planner, highlighted cleanup items as part of the zoning code amendment; discussed the goal to resolve conflicts with R1 and Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)

development standards, streamline the permitting process, and encourage construction of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Junior ADUs (JADUs); better defining JADUs; balconies vs. roof decks; setback standards; setbacks for Accessory Residential Structures; ADUs; micro-unit density bonus allowances; ADU Through Lot Setbacks; and the Zoning Code Map Amendment to illustrate the Residential Hillside Overlay.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, reported a request to speak.

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

Chair Voncannon invited public comment.

The following member of the public addressed the Commission:

Mark Lipman, Advisory Committee on Housing and Homelessness (ACHH), noted that he had originally proposed the ADU grant program as a source for low income housing; expressed support for ADUs and JADUs; discussed house-rich, cash-poor homeowners; and noted the potential for 6,600 units of affordable and low-income units to help people and meet Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding parking requirements; relaxed standards; disincentivizing expansion without creating housing units; facilitating opportunities for housing; differences between state and City code for ADUs and JADUs; the different kitchen and bathroom requirements between ADUs and JADUs; state law; a suggestion to create different parking requirements if the JADU has separate access; the intent of the ADU law; independent bathroom facilities; relaxing the kitchen requirement; building a 1,200 sq. ft. unit vs. converting a 400 sq. ft. garage; the focus on encouraging housing; space constraints; requiring a bathroom in JADUs; state law that allows sharing sanitary facilities, but requires a separate kitchen; and consensus to modify Note 5 to indicate that no replacement parking is required for JADUs.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding mixed use development standards; the sliding scale; the requirement for one ¾ bathroom with a minimum toilet, sink and shower; removing the word partial as there is no definition for a partial kitchen; the kitchenette definition; desire to not require specific fixtures for a kitchen; concern with basements possibly resulting in a 1,700 sq. ft. one bedroom ADU or a 2,400 sq. ft. 2 bedroom unit; concern with inviting trouble by allowing large amounts of square footage underground; concern with not including the floor area of basements in maximum floor area; not allowing a basement for an ADU or JADU; concern with being punitive; habitability standards; Floor Area Ratio (FAR); ensuring that in no event the ADU can be more than the maximum in the code whether it is above or below grade; limitations on total size; clarification regarding the item under consideration; consensus that if someone chooses to build basements under JADUs or ADUs they are still limited by current maximum size limitations; and the draft text amendment.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding park fees; codifying current provisions; state law; the Hillside Overlay; allowable setbacks; and definitions.

Chair Voncannon summarized proposed changes including: not requiring replacement parking when a garage is converted into a JADU, and adding a stipulation to the motion that the allowable total square footage does not change whether or not a basement is built.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding maintaining the status quo; owner occupancy and state law requirements for JADUs vs. ADUs; the intent to encourage additional housing; through lots; language to relax setback standards for the property line opposite the primary dwelling unit entrance; irregularly shaped lots; Community Development Director discretion; and clarification that owner occupancy is not required for JADUs.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARBA THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION OF ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENTS MODIFYING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR THE SINGLE-FAMILY (R1) RESIDENTIAL ZONE, ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS, MICRO-UNITS AND OTHER RELATED SECTIONS OF THE ZONING CODE, INCLUDING A ZONING CODE MAP AMENDMENT TO REFLECT THE

RESIDENTIAL HILLSIDE (-RH) OVERLAY ZONE WITH REMOVAL OF REPLACEMENT PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR JADUs.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BARBA, REILMAN, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: OGOSTA

o0o

Item PH-2

PC - Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit, Site Plan Review, and Administrative Use Permit to develop a five-story 175-Room Boutique Hotel Located at 11469 Jefferson Boulevard (Project)

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

Chair Voncannon disclosed that he had met with the project architect from Melman Inc. about two years ago and attended the three community meetings, but had not learned anything that was not in the public record.

Commissioner Reilman reported that he had learned of the project in the same way that the Chair did, in a meeting with Jeff Melman, but he did not attend the public meetings.

Commissioner Barba reported also having a meeting about the project.

Vice Chair Sayles reported that she had also met with the applicant about two years ago; she asked that Bike Share be available for guests at the hotel in addition to what is required; discussed in lieu fees for displacement of the street parking; and future parking demand.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding estimated loss of parking meter revenue; language regarding contact information; the liquor license condition; editing to make sure language is specific to the restaurant; the neighborhood intrusion study; performance conditions prior to the certificate of occupancy; traffic impacts; studying existing neighborhood conditions; the voluntary condition; clarification regarding the performance timeline; adding language to clarify that if the City determines an intrusion

within five years, the property owner is responsible for conducting a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan (NTMP) study to determine traffic calming measures; the current condition; bypass traffic; responsibility for mitigation measures if well-recognized issues in the neighborhood are exacerbated; possible mitigations to address issues; concern with putting an obligation on a project for a condition that they may not contribute to; cost of the study; neighborhood consensus; clarification that the Planning Commission is the entitling body and the project will not go before the City Council unless appealed; input from the applicant regarding willingness to fund anything beyond the study; and adding a condition for onsite landscaping for ongoing maintenance of the green wall.

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

Chair Voncannon invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Eric Kroh, Sandstone Properties, provided background on the company; discussed community outreach; and adjustments made in response to community feedback.

Steve Nakada, Nakada Partners, provided a presentation on the proposed project; thanked staff for their assistance; discussed the exterior elevation of the building; community outreach; parking access; the height limit; changes made in response to community feedback; the offer to fund a study of intrusions; creating a destination for the community; neighborhood discounts for the hotel and restaurant; landscaping and alley design; community improvements; lighting; landscaping; alley enhancements; sound and light attenuation; common areas; City improvements; terracing; and the green wall.

Discussion ensued between the applicant, staff and Commissioners regarding glass walls; varying balcony depths; clarification that the plans do not agree with the sections or elevation; the terraced façade; sunlight; plants that thrive in shade; maintenance of landscaping by hotel operations; screening views to the neighbors; window wall assemblies; materials; preliminary designs; design intent for the glass; views; non-reflective glass; minimization of heat

gains; property management; Bike Share for guests; mobility measures; bike parking; and demographics intended for the hotel.

Ryan Kelly, Transportation Consultant, reported working with the City on the proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan that includes onsite bicycles.

Jordan Sisson discussed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) issues including traffic impacts; average daily trips generated; annual Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) generated; removal of local serving retail; existing hotels in the area; significant impacts that warrant real analysis; the fact that the project is not affordable housing; noise impacts; construction noise; the need for maximum mitigation; parking; doubts regarding the study; and concern that only half of the 15% safety level requested would be provided.

Danielle Wilson, United Local 11, provided background on the organization; expressed opposition to the project noting the need for affordable housing, not hotel rooms; discussed the housing and climate crisis; the number of hotels in the area; the worsening the jobs/housing imbalance; and she urged the Commission to use their discretion to get the best development by denying the project and asking for a proposal that includes mixed-use housing instead.

Jonah Breslau provided background on himself; discussed the importance of housing on the site; noted that the Planning Commission had the discretion to deny the project and advocate for residents; asserted that the hotel would not be the highest and best use of the land for the location; discussed the General Plan; neighborhood serving uses; he noted that the project was designated for mixed-use; questioned whether the City would support General Plan goals and work toward solving the housing crisis, or whether it would support luxury hotel construction; discussed encouraging affordable housing; RHNA numbers; Conditional Use Permits (CUPs); conformance with the General Plan; concerns about the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review of the project; multiple reasons to deny the project; and he asked the Commission to vote against the project.

Gaylene Tomlinson provided background on herself; discussed rent increases over 10 years living in the City; luxury buildings being built; and she emphasized the need for affordable housing in the City.

Ana Diaz, United Local 11, asserted that more affordable housing was needed, not more hotels, and she expressed concern that the Commission was more worried about plants than they were about helping the community, solving the issue of homelessness, and keeping the community safe.

Natividad Cervantes was called to speak, but did not answer.

Cesar Altamirano was called to speak, but did not answer.

Blanca Rojano was called to speak, but did not answer.

Raul Macias was called to speak, but did not answer.

Jo Marie Agriesti provided background on herself; expressed opposition to the project; discussed existing uses; and wanted to see community serving and residential uses.

Mark Lipman was called to speak, but did not answer.

Raul Macias provided background on himself; discussed the difficulty of finding affordable housing in California; lengthy commutes; he asked that the proposal be rejected with affordable housing built instead; discussed the issue of homelessness; and the importance of representing the community rather than the large companies.

Mark Lipman, Committee on Homelessness, expressed apologies for coming into the process late, noting that this was the first he was hearing about the project; pointed out that just because you can do something, doesn't mean that you should; asserted that decisions for community development are not made by the community, but to the community by outside developers and investors; discussed pre-empting the General Plan Update process; signaling to all developers that they should come to Culver City because there are no constraints; multi-national corporations coming into the City; disproportionate housing stock; the need for a community-focused development process; he asked about the appeal process so that the community can bring the project before the City Council; encouraged the speakers to speak before the City Council; noted the prolonged emergency due to decisions about issues being governed by money; and he asked that the Commission reject the project.

Colin Diaz, Culver City Chamber of Commerce, expressed support for the project; discussed community outreach; feedback received throughout the process and changes to address concerns; economic impact; Transit Oriented Tax (TOT) revenue to support City services; he felt the project would be a catalyst for development and re-purposing of the space leading to jobs on the commercially coded, transit based corridor; and he stated that the community would be partners in the process.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding whether there is a need for hotels; avenues of revenue other than TOT; acceptable occupancy rates; and clientele served.

Eric Kroh, Sandstone Properties, discussed demand and the market analysis conducted.

Additional discussion ensued between project representatives, staff and Commissioners regarding another influx of jobs with no increase in housing; the MND; the application prior to the adoption of the VMT; adoption under the Level of Service standards; the location within the Transit Priority Area; bringing back the specific design of the north elevation and the curtain wall for a conformance review; precedent; implementation and details; concern that the plans as presented are not very detailed; granting conditional approval; ambitious designs vs. the reality of value engineering and construction; conditional approval with a requirement for a conformance review to ensure that the project lives up to the design; comments received; the value the project brings; whether the project gets in the way of affordable housing; the message from the community that more housing is needed; the General Plan; adding jobs that aggravate the impact on the jobs/housing imbalance; the need for affordable housing; low wage jobs being created; appreciation to those who provided comments; the number of parking spaces provided; adding a Look Back Condition; mitigation; clarification that a City Traffic Engineer did not call into question any aspects of the traffic study; the letter submitted by a member of the public; concern with trying to retroactively address the parking issue; offsite solutions; concern with a lack of justification for the 38% of code parking being put forward; concern that those who

spoke against the project were not from the neighborhood; health risk issues related to the location; redevelopment; architectural significance; utilization of an underutilized property; the fact that the hotel union does not want a hotel; purview of the Commission; consistency with zoning and the General Plan; support for adding Bike Share into the conditions; anchoring one end of the Sepulveda/Slauson/Jefferson corridor which is ripe for redevelopment; including Bike Share in Condition 42; adding language to Condition 84 indicating a designee as applicable; clarification that alcohol service is in conjunction with the restaurant and lobby bar service, and ensuring that a mini-bar is not subject to the same conditions in Condition 111; intrusion within five years of becoming operational; adding Conditional Approval with the requirement for a Conformance Review to further examine the design on the northern elevation and the curtain wall; codifying the maintenance of the green wall; difficulties with finding offsite parking if there becomes an issue; car sharing and mobility services; valet operations; anticipating peak demand; number of employees; parking demand; and shuttle service.

MOVED BY VICE CHAIR SAYLES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: ADOPT THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION; ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT P2019-0194-AUP SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2021-P003; AND APPROVE SITE PLAN REVIEW P2019-0194-SPR WITH MODIFICATIONS TO CONDITION 42 TO INCLUDE BIKE SHARE, CONDITION 84 TO INCLUDE THE DESIGNEE, CONDITION 111 ACCEPTING MINI BARS AND THE BAR WITHIN THE HOTEL ITSELF ALSO APPLIED TO CONDITION 114, CONDITION 135 REGARDING NEIGHBORHOOD INTRUSION, CONDITIONAL APPROVAL WITH A LOOK BACK FOR THE CURTAIN WALL AND THE GREEN WALL ON THE NORTH ELEVATION WITH THE ADDITION OF MAINTENANCE OF THE GREEN WALL FOR HOWEVER LONG THE HOTEL IS IN OPERATION, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT P2019-0194-CUP.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BARBA, REILMAN, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: OGOSTA

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, indicated that no correspondence had been received.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, discussed upcoming agenda items and meeting schedule noting that the May 12 meeting would be the Housing Element Kickoff meeting with a presentation from the Advance Planning Division.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the joint meeting with the City Council in June, and resumption of in-person meetings.

Vice Chair Sayles reported that she would be attending APA at Home and would report back, noting the focus on the post-pandemic recovery.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, agreed to provide information to Commissioner Barba regarding the scheduled community workshops on land use alternatives.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 11:18 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to a regular meeting to be held on May 12, 2021.

oOo

Susan Herbertson

SUSAN HERBERTSON
SENIOR PLANNER of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED 6/9/2021

David Voncannon

DAVID VONCANNON
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 — 17 JUNE 2021

Jeremy Green
CITY CLERK

Date