

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL  
UNTIL APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

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

June 28, 2021  
3:00 p.m.

**Call to Order & Roll Call**

Mayor Fisch called the joint meeting of the City Council/Planning Commission to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Mike Balkman Chambers at City Hall via Webex.

Present: Alex Fisch, Mayor  
Daniel Lee, Vice Mayor  
Göran Eriksson, Council Member  
Yasmine-Imani McMorris, Council Member  
Albert Vera, Council Member

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

\*Vice Chair Sayles left the meeting at 4:12 p.m.

o0o

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Mayor Fisch led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

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

Mayor Fisch announced that the state would be enacting a budget that includes \$3.8 million for an emergency shelter and transitional housing project in Culver City.

o0o

**Joint Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda**

Mayor Fisch invited public comment noting that speaking time would be limited to one minute, and cut off at 6:00 p.m. due to the regular City Council meeting scheduled at 7:00 p.m.

The following members of the public addressed the City Council/Planning Commission:

Daryl Oriel expressed support for maintaining R-1 zoning; discussed concern with traffic, air pollution and diminished quality of life; vacant buildings; high rents; and she felt that masking the development as affordable housing was an outright lie.

Adelaide Zimmerman provided background on herself; expressed concern with the lack of community outreach; noted the need to return to in-person meetings and questioned why that was being delayed until August; discussed the rushed process; and lack of respect for the community.

Carrie McCune was called to speak but did not respond.

Leslie Ostrin was called to speak but did not respond.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin expressed concern with the way the City Council was pushing through major changes; discussed meeting the letter of the law vs. the intent of the law; asked that the City Council reschedule the meeting; reported attending mandated ethics training; and she felt that Commissioner Barba should recuse herself from discussions and voting as she is a principle organizer with Culver City for More Homes, the organization that demanded that elimination of R1 zoning be agendized.

Steve Siegel felt it was rude to ignore Council Member Vera's request to adjourn the previous meeting at 1:15 a.m. as nothing was accomplished after that time; he noted that not one Council

Member had acknowledged that 80-90% of the speakers expressed opposition to eliminating R1 zoning; and he asked the City Council to acknowledge that they are going against the will of the residents.

Mark Lipman reiterated his call to double the amount of support for Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) programs; discussed the costs of construction; investment in local community; the return on investment; the need for consideration of a community land trust to create permanently affordable housing at rents controlled by the City; helping those traditionally excluded by economics and race; joining the public bank that the City of Los Angeles is forming; existing vacant housing in the City; and he asked for a real conversation about Housing First.

Ron Ostrin agreed that Commissioner Barba should recuse herself due to her conflict of interest as an organizer with Culver City for More Homes; discussed due process problems with the hearings; technical difficulties with the City website preventing people from submitting comments; he asserted that the meeting should be adjourned until in-person meetings can resume in August; he asserted that approving direction to eliminate R1 zoning in the face of overwhelming opposition is not democracy; and he noted people not able to participate in the current process.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, indicated that one minute had been ceded to Mr. Ostrin for Item A-1 which his comments pertain to, and she clarified that only one additional minute per speaker is allowed to be ceded.

Laura Ackerman asked that the City Council pause the process to allow taxpayers to be fully and transparently informed about considerations; discussed impacts, pros/cons and alternatives; advantages for developers; the inconvenient meeting time for people who work; inadequate, insufficient notice given; exclusionary practices to prevent people from participating and speaking out against the proposed changes; and she asked the City to go back and spend more time on the item.

Suzanne Debeneditis indicated that Rashelle Zelaznik had ceded one minute to her; discussed the devastating heat wave; benefits provided by research from the community brain trust; she asked the City to pause until a meeting could be held with enough public notice to revisit the nexus between housing and sustainability; and she urged the City Council to slow down and allow for collaboration.

Carrie McCune, Leela Dance, provided background on herself and asked about City sponsorship for an event planned for September 26 at Town Plaza as part of a ten-day celebration to educate and inspire audiences.

Responding to Mayor Fisch, John Nachbar, City Manager, encouraged Ms. McCune to contact him to be connected with the appropriate staff.

o0o

### **Receipt and Filing of Correspondence**

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER MCMORRIN, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER VERA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE.

o0o

### **Joint Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda (Continued)**

Bubba Fish thanked the City Council for approving the City's first Pride Celebration; he discussed the success of the event; and advocating for an inclusive City.

Mayor Fisch indicated that public comment would be cut off at 6:00 p.m.; he indicated that the staff presentation would be truncated and focused exclusively on the R1 issue with additional context; and he indicated that the entire report was available on YouTube.

o0o

### **Order of the Agenda**

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda was heard before and after Receipt and Filing of Correspondence.

o0o

### **Consent Calendar Items**

None.

o0o

**Action Items**

Item A-1

**CC:PC - Continued from June 23, 2021: (1) Presentation on and Discussion of the Proposed General Plan Update Land Use Alternatives and Preferred Land Use Map; (2) Planning Commission Recommendation on the Preferred Land Use Map and 2045 Growth Projections; and (3) City Council Direction on the Preferred Land Use Map and 2045 Growth Projections**

Discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the Housing Element deadline; the continuing General Plan process; public engagement; seniors who feel left out of the process; necessary information for staff to proceed with the Housing Element; and allowing public participation.

Council Member Eriksson proposed a motion to adjourn the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting to August 23. Council Member Vera seconded the motion.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding the meeting objective; direction to staff regarding the preferred alternatives for the Housing Element; direction on the preferred land use map in order to conduct the sites inventory analysis as part of the Housing Element; consistency with the preferred land use map; a suggestion to focus the conversation on the specific issue; and concern regarding conflicting information.

MOVED BY COUNCIL MEMBER ERIKSSON AND SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER VERA THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADJOURN THE JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL MEETING TO AUGUST 23, 2021.

THE MOTION FAILED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: ERIKSSON, VERA

NOES: FISH, LEE, MCMORRIN

Ashley Hefner Hoang, Advanced Planning Manager, provided a summary of the material of record; clarified that there would be no vote to change land use; discussed direction to study potential land use changes; the process to make changes; Article 34; eminent domain; consolidation of responses to questions included in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on the City website; the need for City Council direction; phases of the General Plan process; study of the preferred land use map; the

sites inventory analysis for the Housing Element; consideration of the draft elements; adoption of the land use map; she provided a summary of land use alternatives; discussed community input; the land use survey; differing views between owners and renters regarding residential infill; removal of the six-unit option; the survey summary; upcoming engagement activities; and next steps in the process.

Martin Leitner, Perkins & Will, discussed the preferred land use map for all areas other than low-density single-family areas; options for low-density single-family areas; general agreement on direction to allow more residential development on commercial corridors and larger sites, underutilized sites, parking lots, and less developed buildings; maintaining existing commercial and studio land use capacity; expanding opportunities for housing City-wide; encouraging developments that are walkable and address scale and context; additional density in existing multi-unit areas; the need for direction on R1; key engagement takeaways; strong support for generally maintaining and creating new affordable housing options in the City; identifying areas for housing other than the corridors; support for maintaining R1 zoning; concern with overdevelopment on small lots; maintaining opportunity for green trees and permeability on individual sites; reasons for consideration of incremental infill; the ADU ordinance that allows for three units on R1; size and location constraints; modifying the ordinance to allow for whole units and encouraging ownership opportunities; allowing for a fourth, affordable unit; maintaining single-family R1 standards for height and setback; addressing building scale concerns; current standards; examples of multi-unit development in Los Angeles; and he presented maps illustrating single-family options.

Ashley Hefner Hoang, Advance Planning Manager, discussed the three points of direction needed in order to move forward with the next phase of the project.

Vice Chair Sayles indicated that she would need to leave the meeting early and noted that she had provided her comments to staff.

Discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding the report provided for the item; differing options presented to the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) vs. what has been presented to the City Council; changes made based on community input from the Land Use Alternative Workshops; lack of support for an option for 6-8 units; support

for density along corridors and key sites; lack of a consensus as to whether to make changes to low-density, single-family areas; growth projections; detrimental effects of continuous growth in major cities; methodology for growth projections; industry in the City; concern with projections made on a fairly short timeframe; taking a more long-term view; obtaining more representative figures; the growth spurt with the opening of the Metro Station nine years ago; the chart on page 23; applicability of the research; providing options with density around transit; 80% of the City as serviced by high quality transit; connectivity with regional destinations; increasing the mix of land uses within the City; shortening the distance between trips; reductions to auto travel with coordinated land use and transportation; Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas reduction benefits; the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); mode-share; estimation of greenhouse gas emissions; required technical studies; concern with using standard metrics that do not apply to Culver City; temperature shifts in cities; concern with adding more concrete and increasing temperatures in the City; the need for permeable surfaces; property taxes; concern with potential bias in figures used in the Relative Net System Impacts of Alternatives; urban land use changes as context specific; urban footprint; large-scale modeling efforts; land use scenarios; context sensitivity; similar results to the Culver City specific SB 743 VMT model; the similar footprint whether missing Middle housing is legalized or not; and the position taken by Greta Thunberg regarding the climate and capitalism.

Commissioner Barba addressed comments made regarding her potential for bias; reported on the City Attorney's determination that there was no need for her to recuse herself; asserted that she was maintaining an open mind during consideration of data presented by staff and the consultants; she discussed the perception that the majority of the comments were in favor of preserving R1; the emotional and personal nature of the issue; and stated that she did not plan to recuse herself.

Mayor Fisch invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the City Council and Planning Commission:

Paulette Benson discussed the lack of a connection between changing R1 zoning and affordable housing, and she asked that consideration of R1 be halted.

Kevin Lachoff had one minute ceded to him; stated that, as a real estate professional, he could confidently assert that proposed changes would result in single-family home buyers beat out by developers paying cash for properties, there would be no more starter housing, affordable garage conversions or ADUs, and that everything would be new, 4-8 unit, mostly market-rate apartments; discussed the ensuing land rush; accelerating gentrification; altering the size, scale and mass of the neighborhoods; he proposed revising the units per acre allowed in the current mixed-use ordinance as it pertains to increases allowed with community benefit, continuing to look at minimum unit size, and voter consideration of increased building height rather than upzoning; discussed inclusion; density bonuses; adding affordable units at scale without forever altering the City the way elimination of R1 will; the inability of trickle-down intentions to work; the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA); capacity for development in the current code; and he asked the City Council to reconsider.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, indicated that Commissioner Sayles had exited the meeting at 4:12 p.m.

Marla Koosed provided background on herself; echoed comments from former Planning Commissioner Kevin Lachoff; expressed interest in what Council Member Erikson referenced regarding RHNA numbers vs. the General Plan Update as separate issues; discussed ethics training; and she expressed surprise that the City Attorney did not see a conflict of interest for Commissioner Barba.

Steve Jones encouraged the City Council to select Option 2 which spreads housing more equitably; discussed the percentage of land taken up with single-family homes; making it illegal for less wealthy people to have access to neighborhoods; and he strongly encouraged more density.

Jessica Harwood was called to speak but did not respond.

Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin, Culver City Homes United, had one minute ceded to her from Jerry Isono; provided background on the organization; discussed the petition with over 1,500 signatures gathered from diverse residents demanding that R1 single-family zoning not be eliminated and that residents be allowed to be part of the discussion vs. the number of people participating in the online workshops and survey; she asserted that most people do not want to get rid of R1 zoning; noted that



people wanted to be involved and tweeting did not constitute involvement; discussed resident comments submitted in opposition to elimination of R1 zoning; paid YIMBY (Yes In My Back Yard) lobbyists; meeting RHNA targets; failure to provide affordable housing; she asserted that the meeting should not be happening as it is not democratic; stated that R1 zoning and affordable housing are separate issues and should be treated as such; and she asked the City to get creative.

Bryan Sanders provided background on himself; wanted to see a true public discussion and debate; discussed statements regarding a lack of a consensus; the petition and public comment indicating opposition to elimination of R1 zoning; a video with Mayor Fisch indicating a desire for more fourplexes in the City; and the lack of public engagement.

Amy Pechansky provided background on herself; expressed opposition to eliminating R1 zoning; agreement with statements made by the previous speaker; observed use of the terms exclusionary and inclusivity; citizens who are unable to engage; being inclusive by holding an inclusive meeting and allowing a vote; and she wanted to see the meeting halted.

Jamie Wallace had one minute ceded to her by Jenny Manriquez; discussed the current ability to meet RHNA numbers; concern with the push to go beyond state required planning proposals; encouraged the City to focus on affordable housing and to choose Alternative 1 that leaves single-family alone while encouraging growth for ADUs and Transit Oriented Development (TOD); discussed staff direction to meet the Housing Element deadline; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) data indicating Culver City has a lower percentage of single-family homes than surrounding areas; the relationship between density, single-family homes and affordability; infeasibility of the option with the fourth affordable unit; affordable housing; building generational wealth; existing diversity in all neighborhoods; and she agreed that the meeting should be halted.

Rashelle Zelaznik discussed the need for true affordable housing; addressing RHNA goals; the inability of eliminating R1 zoning to achieve the stated goals; the need to house the homeless and provide wraparound services; and violating the rights of residents by precluding voting on the issue of eliminating R1 zoning.

Ken Alexander asserted that Alternative 3 was the most radical and exclusionary option; discussed the developer land grab that

will result with the elimination of R1 zoning; immediate demolition of the most affordable units in the City resulting in displacement of seniors and people of color; support for Alternative 1 as resulting in the least displacement; attaching a label of anti-racism to the "Palms, but with higher prices" option; and he urged all Council Members to support a decision based on reality rather than on a feeling of moral purity.

Mayor Fisch pointed out that comments made by Mr. Alexander related to a dated staff report and he encouraged everyone to ensure that they were looking at the correct staff report.

Kimberly Ferguson received clarification regarding additional time to make Public Comment for Items NOT on the Agenda; asked everyone to work together to build up the City thoughtfully and fairly; she discussed time available to consider the General Plan and allowing for additional public engagement; applying for Article 34 authority; the need for homeless housing; ensuring that developers adhere to minimums; she proposed submitting the RHNA plan now as housing minimums are already fulfilled; questioned why Beverly Hills had lower housing minimums than Culver City; and she asserted that upzoning would not solve the affordability crisis.

Ron Ostrin had a minute ceded to him by Susan Tillerson; discussed substantial opposition to the elimination of R1 zoning; the pretext of anti-racism; following the money; SB 9 and 10; eliminating the possibility of creating wealth for people of color; input from residents; efforts to destroy the quality of life and micro-climate in the City; paid political operatives; YIMBY; he discussed selling his family home; and he asserted the item was a fraud and should not move forward.

Philip Lelyveld had a minute ceded to him; reported a discussion that he recently ran on bias in artificial intelligence; the importance of diversity of thought to reduce bias; discussed unintended consequences; concern with strong feedback from 77 self-selected citizens characterized as representing the views of a much larger cohort; the rejection of all suggestions for proactive community outreach, education and data gathering while decrying misinformation spread to fill the information void that is being maintained; lack of awareness by the larger community; concern with less proactive community outreach that is done than when trees are trimmed or roads fixed; seizing the chance to educate the public and gather meaningful input, ideas and guidance; and he asserted that the issue went far beyond what Mayor Fisch was elected to decide.

Brad Thompson provided background on himself; discussed feedback from real estate professionals indicating that the proposed changes would do nothing for affordability; he questioned the continued push by the City Council for removal of R1 zoning; long-term ramifications for homeowners; requested factual proof that upzoning works; and he asserted that the issue deserved a City-wide vote.

Lisa Miller expressed support for comments made by Ron Ostrin; discussed the change of zoning in 2020 during lockdown for her neighbor from R2 to R5; ethics; asserted that the vote is fueled by money; discussed lack of affordability; and Culver City code loopholes that encroach on living space.

Kelli Estes expressed support for Option 1; discussed the affordable housing overlay; constant confusion due to poor communication; repeated opposition to upzoning R1; she stated that Sydney Kamlager and Isaac Bryan did not support upzoning R1 either; asked that Council Members stop showing contempt for residents and accept Option 1; and that Commissioner Barba recuse herself due to a conflict of interest and contemptful comments toward residents.

Michael Clemente was called to speak but did not respond.

Karen Kuo was called to speak but did not respond.

Walker Dunn, with one minute ceded by Tammy, questioned whether the City was proceeding without considering the long-lasting consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic; discussed the General Plan Update and reports based on 2019 data; important issues not incorporated into the report; the importance of collecting new data and updating the Housing Element and General Plan; the new normal; emerging and still-evolving population trends and effects to housing needs; the state deadline; minimal penalties compared to the potential for disastrous consequences of an ill-prepared decision; and determining how to best position the City for the next 30 years.

Barbara Hollander asserted that building apartments in the middle of homes was not going to help affordable housing; she did not want to see the City ruined; and she asserted that there was plenty of land to build apartment buildings.

Carol Inge had one minute ceded to her by Jack Kurihara; discussed the lack of notification; concern with trying to sneak

an action through; rectifying the situation by delaying the action pending proper notification and community meetings; the small amount of housing provided by spreading fourplexes throughout the City; concentration of housing around transit; intensifying sprawl, increasing arterial traffic, pollution, global warming, reduced setbacks, increased lot coverage, and removal of vegetation and trees with Options 2 and 3; planned one-bedroom units; the lack of options for families; increased traffic, less transit usage, fewer children, and inadequate parking; unaffordability; and she felt the City could do better.

Brian Tjomsland discussed the commitment by the City with initial R1 zoning; requirements for R1; sacrifices made to maintain R1 and forego maximum profit; residential neighborhoods; commercial spaces; covenants; the obligation of the City; and he asserted that the City Council had no right to negate sacrifices made or to ignore the agreement of R1, and that to change zoning in such a way would amount to government taking of property.

David Wheatley was called to speak but did not respond.

Scot Lara was called to speak but did not respond.

Jane Brown was called to speak but did not respond.

Chak Chie saluted the idealism of affordability and equity coming from Council Members; asserted that Culver City was not going to solve the nationwide problem by eliminating R1; discussed the cost of housing on the westside; noted that a countywide solution was necessary; and questioned why 50% of the City should be disrupted for a non-solution.

Mark Warwick provided background on himself; expressed appreciation that the City Council had clarified that elimination of R1 zoning restrictions had nothing to do with affordability; discussed previous R1 zoning to a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .45 to reduce structure massing and accommodate the state-mandated ADU conversions which provide additional renting units; the effective conversion of R1 to R2 zoning; he suggested eliminating the R1 rezoning discussion, and instead placing the focus on expanding opportunities in R2 through RHD, and IL and IG zones over the next 8 years to meet state mandates.

Council Member Vera reported seeing a message from a hearing impaired individual and he asked that volume be increased so that people can hear when their names are called.

Jacob Harper provided background on himself; expressed opposition to upzoning; discussed reasons for settling in Culver City; and potential loss of neighborhood character and long-term ownership appeal with the proposed changes.

Laurie Horn provided background on herself; expressed opposition to elimination of R1 zoning; support for comments made by Philip Lelyveld regarding diversity of outreach; and concern with the way the City Council is not demonstrating democratic principles.

Elias Platte-Bermeo asked the City Council to adopt the land use alternative, end exclusionary zoning, and equitably distribute new housing; discussed underrepresentation of younger people and renters; and the connection between housing, climate change and racial and economic justices.

Jeff Nadel provided background on himself; asked Council Members to save the City money on lawsuits and resign; discussed the regional nature of the issue; maintaining the quality of life in the City; he asserted that if the City had not approved projects like Google, there would not be such a demand to mitigate traffic and provide cheaper rents; and he stated that affordable housing would not result from the proposed changes.

Jessica Forgeng was called to speak but did not respond.

Bonnie Wacker discussed the inaccurate picture presented of a triplex in Long Beach; parking issues; the experience of her daughters in trying to find housing; asserted that upzoning would create more unaffordable housing for the highly paid influx of tech employees; expressed concern with forcing out affordable "Mom and Pops" and replacement by expensive developments; and she expressed support for Option 1 and opposition to the exclusionary practice of not making City Council meetings accessible to seniors.

Anne Shin asked the City Council to slow down the process; discussed the number of people who are unaware of the proposed changes; allowing elderly neighbors a chance to be heard; and she asked that the City not discuss inclusion while excluding.

Sean Baryzel asked that the presenter turn up their volume so that participants can hear the names read; provided background on himself; asserted that Commissioner Barba should recuse herself from the proceedings; expressed concern with dodgy behavior by the City Council; insufficient outreach; allowing

77 people to make a decision for the entire City based upon antiquated data; and he was proud to have voted for Council Members Eriksson and Vera.

Jeremy Green, City Clerk, indicated that feedback issues precluded her from increasing her volume too much.

Faye Walker was called to speak but did not respond.

Jennifer Carter was called to speak but did not respond.

Crystal Alexander, former City Treasurer, had one minute ceded to her by Renate J., provided background on herself; discussed the inconvenient truth that the push to upzone is a developer's dream; developing neighborhoods in an unplanned way; destroying chances for generational wealth, especially for persons of color; deceiving the vulnerable into believing that upzoning is an answer to affordable housing; destabilizing democracy with shapeshifting proposals backed by outside special interests, uncited data and non-peer reviewed student studies; decimation of community trust in elected officials; continued resolve to bring the debate into the open; dismantling communities; and the burden of proof on the proponents that has not been met.

Greg Jamrok provided background on himself; discussed legal requirements to provide housing; affordability requirements; and he supported adoption of land use alternatives that equitably distribute new housing throughout neighborhoods and end exclusionary zoning.

Charlie DeFaria was called to speak but did not respond.

Ethan Titleman provided background on himself; noted that apartments provided transitional housing; and he proposed finding other areas to build affordable housing.

Michael Ainslie was called to speak but did not respond.

Noah Clark was called to speak but did not respond.

Amy Levin was called to speak but did not respond.

Traci Davis was called to speak but did not respond.

Judy Levitow was called to speak but did not respond.

Cameron Spencer provided background on herself; expressed concern with a lack of transparency and a rush to eliminate R1 zoning without proper outreach; urged Council Members to come visit her on LaSalle where single-family homes are being torn down and replaced with fourplexes; she noted that the first thing to go is the trees; asserted that the argument of creating affordable housing is false; expressed concern with the argument that R1 zoning is racist; discussed a video from Leimert Park; and she pointed out that 32 people had spoken in favor of maintaining R1 zoning and 3 had spoken to eliminate it.

Thomas Taubman was called to speak but did not respond.

Steve Siegel reiterated his call to Council Members to acknowledge that 90% of the speakers had expressed opposition to elimination of R1 zoning; he asked Council Member McMorris to show leadership; stated that affordable housing means subsidized housing; asserted that the City Council was being punitive by going against residents in favor of developers; he discussed the state and county issue; and the change in land use from Sepulveda to Elenda to mixed-use without notification to residents.

David Stout asserted that removing R1 would not change the already diverse neighborhoods or make housing affordable; discussed years spent working with the City on acceptable R1 zoning practices; rushing through a plan that will permanently change the character of the City; and he noted that infrastructure does not exist to support the increase in density being proposed.

Patrick Meighan, Culver City for More Homes, urged the City Council to adopt the land use alternative that ends exclusionary zoning and equitably distributes housing throughout the City; discussed new workers coming into the City; displacement of poorer people in and around the City; increased commutes and pollution; the broader impacts of neighborhood preferences; and the responsibility and opportunity to be a part of the solution.

Anne Lefton was called to speak but did not respond.

Joan Davidson discussed the historic City; cultural resources; consideration of using vacant real estate to house people; inflated RHNA numbers; the Embarcadero Report; and she expressed disbelief that the City would take away property owner rights.

Luanne Chang provided background on herself; asked that the City Council listen to the majority of residents and maintain R1 zoning for the good of the community; she asserted that R1 zoning was not exclusionary or racist; expressed concern that Council Members were not listening to constituents and wondered whether a hidden agenda existed; discussed the exclusionary nature of the way changes are being handled and items are rushed through during the pandemic; those who are not tech savvy; and insufficient outreach and engagement.

M Banks provided background on herself; questioned what affordable housing was; felt the plan was not feasible; asked about the ability of infrastructure to handle the increased density; discussed the danger of earthquakes; and suggested providing incentives for homeowners to build ADUs.

Jean Stout provided background on herself; discussed water main breaks in dense areas; lack of parking; loss of neighborhood feel; quality of life; developer profit; and she asked that the item not be a three-two vote.

Bruno Sauer was called to speak but did not respond.

Brandon Barr provided background on herself; wanted to see R1 zoning preserved; echoed previous comments; felt that Culver City would never be truly affordable; and she proposed that if the intent is to broaden opportunities for minorities, the City should look at subsidized housing or providing property tax breaks for minorities.

Diane Miller was called to speak but did not respond.

Laura Ackerman provided background on herself; echoed sentiments of previous speakers; questioned the impact of additional housing on the infrastructure of the City and the school system; the need to look at the matter holistically; and the importance of taking input from all residents into account.

Dana Fieda was called to speak but did not respond.

Monica Arnold was called to speak but did not respond.

Arthur Litman reiterated previous comments; pointed out that moving forward in the face of such strong disapproval would be a slap in the face to the community; and he expressed hope that the City Council would be open to other ideas.



Simon Johnson wanted to see the supply of housing in every neighborhood increased so that the younger generation would be able to afford to live in Culver City.

Laura Minnix provided background on herself; discussed the petition with over 1,500 signatures reflecting strong opposition to upzoning; she asked that the City not be turned over to deep pocketed developers who will outbid families and turn homes into expensive luxury units; discussed exploration of other options such as repurposing older buildings which would benefit the environment and provide a greater number of affordable units than smaller buildings; promoting ADUs in R1 neighborhoods; a 2019 MIT study indicating that the impact of upzoning in Chicago was an increase in land value and decrease in affordability; and she asked that the City Council select land use Alternative 1 and maintain R1 zoning.

Blake Buckley was called to speak but did not respond.

Sandy Nitz provided background on himself; thanked whoever placed the flier on his front door for alerting him to the issue; he questioned why the City was rushing the process and keeping it quiet; felt the matter should be put to a ballot; noted that opposition also outnumbered support at the last meeting and that Council Members were voted in to represent the voters; asked about parking; and he asked that R1 zoning be left alone.

Khin Khin Gyi provided background on herself; pointed out problems with Figure 8 of the GPAC document regarding residential energy and water use; she discussed annual utility costs; references to a SCAG public policy document; the lack of a scientific reference from a peer-reviewed journal; the need for out of the box solutions such as conversion of vacant commercial zoning or mixed-use housing; building workforce housing on chain grocery stores; and she proposed a partnership with the city of Los Angeles and Los Angeles county to build housing on City-owned land as a way to leverage funds from Measure HHH and Measure H.

John Wacker provided background on himself; discussed housing prices across the country; choices made; he asserted that saying there is a housing shortage is a lie; and he proposed creating a plan to house everyone.

Jane Leonard provided a history of the neighboring community of Palms and information regarding demographics; she asked that

the City Council consider the opinion of residents as it plans the future of the City; observed that the majority of comments did not support upzoning; noted that true leadership means reaching consensus; and she challenged the City Council to get to a 5-0 resolution.

Norman Johnson provided background on himself; discussed options presented on the website; distribution of information; insufficient outreach; quality of life; investment in the community; he questioned why the popular vote was not being respected; and he asked that the matter go to a public vote.

Megan Oddsen Goodwin was called to speak but did not respond.

Melissa Sanders echoed comments from Jamie Wallace that the meeting should not be happening at all; expressed alarm at the lack of transparency and undemocratic process; she did not want to see R1 eliminated; discussed the lack of equity with a triplex or fourplex next to an R1 home; she asserted that affordable housing could not happen in R1 areas; welcomed diversity; stated that the City should work on true affordable housing which can only be accomplished through subsidies; and she indicated that affordable housing should be placed in commercial areas where it has already been studied.

William Delaney was called to speak but did not respond.

Reverend Heidi Worthen Gamble was called to speak but could not be heard.

Andrew Yamamoto discussed providing affordable housing without touching single-family zoning, and referenced a letter he sent to Council Members and Planning Commissioners dated June 27, 2021 with suggestions on how to increase affordability, including utilization of crowd funding and non-profit housing.

Amy Palmer provided background on herself; acknowledged that elimination of R1 zoning would not create affordable housing; noted that additional units could be created through ADUs and housing along transportation corridors; discussed the vast majority of public comments against upzoning; the 1,500 residents who signed a petition against the proposed elimination of R1 zoning, and residents who are unaware of what is happening; she questioned the justification for pushing the changes through; and she felt it irresponsible for three Council Members to make Culver City a guinea pig for their non-transparent agenda.

Bubba Fish provided background on himself; discussed the average price of a single-family home in the City; those who were fortunate to buy a home before prices increased; and he noted that condos and co-ops are cheaper than single-family homes, so affordable housing would be created.

Ron Bassilian pointed out that new construction goes for about 2-3 times what was torn down; asserted that the only way to make things affordable would be massive subsidies that have not even been discussed; he discussed the GPAC survey that did not require proof of residency; laying legal cover for the foregone conclusion; slippery language; concerned citizens watching the meetings; loopholes; and changes to zoning due to the fact that 80% of the zoning is transit-rich.

Marla Berk provided background on herself; expressed disbelief that there were not options available other than to eliminate R1 zoning; discussed McMansions; and effects to neighborhoods by the proposed changes.

Iain Gulin discussed going against the will of constituents by attempting to rezone single-family properties; the lack of a nexus between single-family zoning and significant affordable housing stock; asked that efforts be focused on large-scale public/private partnerships to build affordable housing; noted the magnification of waste in small construction projects; larger apartments as the best hope for green buildings in the City; and he asked residents to remain engaged because while they cannot stop the current City Council majority, the Council can be replaced.

Rich Waters was called to speak but did not respond.

Anthony Rizzo provided background on himself; noted the big takeaway from the previous Planning Commission meeting that single-family zoning is not exclusionary and should not be eliminated; he discussed the land use report; diversity in the community; the last minute play to discuss a 100% affordable housing overlay; the clear community response opposing the elimination of R1 and a 100% overlay; he observed only one alternative that maintains R1 zoning noting that one alternative is not an alternative; and he expressed confidence in the Planning Department to provide several alternatives to hold R1 constant while addressing affordable housing needs.

Jeanne Black provided background on herself; noted that successful change requires understanding the impact on all stakeholders and clear communication; felt it was premature to take any action because alternatives as currently presented are unacceptable; discussed the atmosphere of animosity and opposition; lack of specific, feasible plans; acceleration of gentrification; and the need for design standards.

Shelley Gilad provided background on herself; echoed comments from M Banks, Ms. Barr, and Mr. Ostrin; expressed opposition to elimination of R1 zoning; and discussed overcrowded schools.

Karen Marcus was called to speak but did not respond.

Margot Bennett expressed opposition to upzoning; discussed insults from upzoning supporters voiced at the last meeting; asserted that upzoning did not equal affordability; and she proposed options to address affordability if that is really the intention.

Alison Bonn provided background on herself; discussed the hypocrisy of Council Members who support upzoning living in single-family homes; the effects of rezoning; driving families out of the City; overstressed infrastructure; neighborhoods like Beverly Hills, Bel Air and Brentwood; and attacking the middle-class.

Josh Sharf was called to speak but did not respond.

Meghan Sahli-Wells thanked the City for the discussion and for the notification and outreach on the item; asked that the City Council adopt a land use alternative to end exclusionary housing in Culver City; and she discussed the official infill policy for the Sierra Club.

Kate Ainslie, Culver City for More Homes, provided background on herself; asked that the City adopt a land use alternative the ends exclusionary zoning with an affordable housing overlay to facilitate development of 100% affordable housing; order a study to develop incentives to maximize production of affordable housing; study funding sources; and she expressed concern with the building of McMansions rather than fourplexes.

Marc Baur provided background on himself; reported serving on the Finance Advisory Committee; and he expressed support for building more dense housing with condos and co-ops to allow

police officers, fire fighters and teachers that cannot afford to live in the City to live in the community and share resources.

Lindsey Kozberg discussed a letter sent to the City from Carney Properties; stimulating the creation of new homes; the risk of downzoning with the proposed height limits, FAR (Floor Area Ratio) limits, and land designations; encouraging utilization of commercial sites; transit growth; the need for more attention to density and more analysis; the concentrated growth alternative to apply more generous designations; the Washington/National TOD; increasing the FAR for commercial designations; and she asked that limits be increased or deferred.

Melissa Stucky asked that R1 not be eliminated; discussed diversity in Culver City schools; the need for additional greenspace; slowing the process down; in-person meetings to allow for transparency and participation; and she acknowledged voting for important Council Members.

Robert Gray was called to speak but did not respond.

Joan Salvaterra was called to speak but did not respond.

Joanna Hoffman provided background on herself; expressed opposition to the proposed upzoning that she felt would not increase affordability but instead exclude people; discussed increased traffic; parking issues; overtaxing of utilities; noise and pollution issues; and the need for subsidized low-income housing.

Jared Morgan provided background on himself; discussed people who choose to maintain their privilege; injustices experienced by ancestors; support for land use alternatives that equitably distribute housing throughout the City; achieving greater density and safety in the City; noted developers that have opposed upzoning; and the assertion that developers are driving or will profit from the initiative.

Bradley McAfee was called to speak but did not respond.

Ken Niles was called to speak but did not respond.

Discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding length of the process; public support for the renovation of Culver Studios and the need to house those people; opportunity in Culver City; people and businesses that want to

be in the City; providing less expensive housing options; adding missing Middle housing in the City; the need to move away from exclusionary zoning; clarification that abolishing R1 zoning is not under consideration; direction to investigate different options on how to proceed with infill housing; support for putting larger numbers of units in corridors; homelessness vs. opportunities for housing; the SB 9 and 10 video; differences between Culver City and Leimert Park; the lack of affordable rental housing to get people off of the streets; the four unit neighborhood design option for home ownership; and concern with rhetoric.

Additional discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding the number of speakers who did not want to see any changes in R1 neighborhoods vs. those who want change; feedback from homeowners vs. renters; taking all residents into account as well as those who would like to live in the City; the high opportunity community; acknowledgement of difficult decisions to be made; the regional nature of the issue; embracing changes necessary to accommodate more homes; being a leader; application of changes City-wide; exceptions; penalties for not submitting a compliant Housing Element; making informed decisions; the percentage of the City that is transit rich; trees vs. permeable surfaces; large homes vs. fourplexes; sprawl; environmental impact; the need for a multi-faceted approach to address homelessness and affordable housing; patience required; and safety and neighborliness with multi-family development vs. single-family housing.

Further discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding turning the issue into a win/lose situation rather than a win/win situation; using innovation to address problems; examining access to housing in a way that is considerate to the neighborhood; looking at the situation as a design problem; justified fears of a neighborhood takeover by developers at the expense of the quality of the City; the need for quality housing; the recent design exhibition at The Helms Bakery; creative design possibilities; the competition put on by the city of Los Angeles to come up with creative ideas for housing in traditionally R1 neighborhoods; the need for more options to consider; changing R1 into R2 or R3; subdividing existing houses into multiple units; concern with narrow options presented; presenting perspective views to illustrate the true bulk and mass being proposed; support for considerably designed developments; smart buildings that address design challenges; concern that the current for-profit development culture is not incentivized for quality and innovation; efforts to make

developers do better and try harder; creating different tools for the City to ensure quality development; creation of a design review; the mistake of pretending that developers have the City's best interests in mind; locking down design options; sensitivity to local conditions; establishing housing volume options with reasonable footprints and heights; the climate emergency changing the psychology of consumption; and doing more with less.

Further discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding the in-rush of jobs with access to mass transit; converting commercial real estate into housing; promotion of additional ADUs to be used for rental housing with increased grants; different design aesthetics; the lack of options being presented for consideration; support for providing smarter design alternatives; recognizing environmental costs to tear down the old and build new, environmentally smarter housing; design guidelines; the subjective nature of design aesthetics; and support for possibilities within Alternative 1.

Additional discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding the amount of agreement; finding missing Middle housing; using the General Plan to reenforce the wall made by segregationists vs. making change; getting ahead of the almost-certain state preemption on land use; rent burden; displacement; perpetuation of racial disparities; commutes; climate, social and economic impacts; incentive programs to end exclusionary zoning; the Blueprint for More Housing 2020 by the League of California Cities; proposed actions to spur housing production; concerns regarding privacy, aesthetics and parking; the need to increase affordability and access and reduce climate footprint; Fair Housing; the requirement for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing; promoting housing supply, choices and affordability in areas of high opportunity and outside areas of poverty; raced-based zoning replaced by single-family zoning; measurable racial disparity; expanding opportunity; the Homes Guarantee; replacing exclusionary zoning with equitable zoning; creating economically integrated communities; offering stable housing to middle and working classes; the question of what constitutes affordable; inclusionary zoning; subsidies; ways to meet housing requirements; achieving a portion of the goal through private market; preapproved design and permit-ready plans; land use reform to achieve climate goals; limiting greenhouse gases; California Air Resources Board (CARB); historic patterns of growth; longstanding racial and economic injustices; lack of active transportation infrastructure; the impacts of growth patterns on health; lifespan; allowing access

to opportunity; heating in inland areas; climate refugees; opportunity for the public to weigh in on important details; crafting rules to bring developers under control and ensure quality buildings; the need to address affordability, opportunity and resiliency in the General Plan; helping to maintain the last bits of middle class in the City; and help to explain why missing Middle housing should be legalized.

Discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding opinion vs. fact; the current situation; racial disbursement in neighborhoods; lack of segregation in the City; the fact that 6% of greenhouse gas impact comes from residential; energy production; use of renewable energy; transportation as a major pollutant; the feeling that infill will not be affordable; public comment that overwhelmingly asked the City to wait and include community engagement; the small amount of people involved in the process to date; the staff report indicating one and two bedroom units would be built; the need for single-family housing for families that need more space than a one or two bedroom apartment; development of Westfield Mall as a mixed-use development; building affordable units; opportunity; an observation that Palms has housing but not jobs; other areas that serve Culver City; developments in the region; support for Option 1 out of the limited options available; people who want to live in single-family homes who will move away; unintended consequences not addressed in the report; the need to offer staff direction; and a suggestion to direct staff to explore two options.

Chair Voncannon read comments submitted by Vice Chair Sayles regarding public perception about eliminating R1 zoning; adding incremental density in the City; affordability; separate consideration of land use strategies to meet the RHNA allocation and how to encourage development of more affordable units within the City; mansionization; cohesiveness of single-family homes and duplexes; support for Option 3; allowing for additional density; the single-family zoning standards process; support for the .60 FAR; allowing two reasonable dwellings on a property; the unrealistic proposal for one extra affordable unit; opposition to incremental intensification in hillside areas; the importance of affordability issues; the need for a streamlined process; SB 35; AB 2162; extending by-right development beyond transit priority areas; opposition to a blanket affordable overlay zone; and support for incentive-based programs, for adopting a City-wide density increase ordinance; and adopting incentive programs near resources that people use.



Further discussion ensued between staff and Council Members regarding apologies to those who were not able to speak; concern with the rush; promoting fear and anger; concern with forcing ideas upon people; the need to acknowledge opposition; uncertainty; misinformation; meeting RHNA numbers with ADUs and Junior ADUs; development along corridors; creating true affordable housing; costs for land and materials; making sure the process is done right; whether the City Council should be able to determine what happens to the City for generations; concern with following a certain agenda without listening to the community; concern with limiting ideas; infrastructure; the need for regional solutions; and concern with excluding certain sectors of the community.

Additional discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding appreciation to everyone taking part in the process; making information available on the GPAC website; misinformation in public comment; sharing how the process works; educating each other on the process; accountability; borderline attacks and threats; interpretation of comments; the importance of being kind to each other; comments on process; requests to delay; confusion; concern with segregating those who cannot buy-in; privilege and power; those who cannot come to meetings; reasons why people cannot make public comment; the importance of hearing all perspectives; providing housing in all neighborhoods; openness to other options; fact-based conversations; support for Option 3; making materials available to the public; and support for continued public engagement.

Further discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding residential requirements for those running for City Council; the pandemic; virtual meetings; increased participation at meetings since the pandemic began; outreach; appreciation to Commissioner Barba and Mayor Fisch for their comments; providing more home ownership and rental opportunities; inadequate market-based solutions; the failure of trickle-down economics; addressing economic equity; discussion of an affordable housing overlay in the context of the General Plan; sharing the burden of building equitably; RHNA numbers; building housing on big box properties; the inability to force private property owners to build mixed-use developments; support for missing Middle housing; limited space in the City to build; support for Option 3; use of multiple policy decisions to address issues; the responsibility to address covenant restrictions; guiding principles; providing opportunities in the City; addressing affordable housing; *The*

*Color of Law*; SB 50; the need to address historic racial inequities; dwindling areas in Los Angeles with Black ownership; and separation of class and race.

Discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding excluding lots under 5,000 square feet; consideration of smaller lots; overtaxing the surface area; and microunits.

Mayor Fisch moved to direct staff to pursue Option 3 with the flexibility to take remarks by Commissioner Ogosta and Vice Chair Sayles into account regarding design, and approve the growth forecast recommended by staff.

Additional discussion ensued between staff, Commissioners and Council Members regarding bifurcating the motion; exploration of finding other options as suggested by Commissioner Ogosta and Vice Chair Sayles; ensuring that design standards match community character; and caution to staff that there may be a change in direction after the next election.

MOVED BY MAYOR FISCH AND SECONDED BY VICE MAYOR LEE THAT THE CITY COUNCIL DIRECT STAFF TO PURSUE OPTION 3 AND APPROVE THE GROWTH FORECAST RECOMMENDED BY STAFF.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: FISCH, LEE, MCMORRIN

NOES: ERIKSSON, VERA

MOVED BY MAYOR FISCH, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER VERA AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE CITY COUNCIL DIRECT STAFF TO STUDY THE DETAILS OF HOW MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING INTEGRATES INTO NEIGHBORHOODS WITH ATTENTION PAID TO COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONER OGOSTA AND VICE CHAIR SAYLES REGARDING DESIGN.

oOo

#### **Public Comment - Items Not on the Agenda**

Mayor Fisch invited public comment.

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

o0o

**Items from Council Members/Commissioners**

None.

o0o

**Council Member/Commissioner Requests to Agendize Future Items**

None.

o0o

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, at 7:42 p.m. the City Council and Planning Commission adjourned.

o0o

---

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

---

ALEX FISCH  
MAYOR of Culver City

---

DAVID VONCANNON  
CHAIR of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Culver City, California