

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

August 14, 2024
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Reilman called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m. in Council Chambers and via Webex noting that at least a portion of the meeting would be conducted pursuant to California Government Code Section 51953 in that he would be participating via Webex, in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act, and his teleconference location had been identified in the notice and the agenda for the meeting.

Present: Andrew Reilman, Chair*
Darrel Menthe, Vice Chair
Jackson Brisette, Commissioner**
Jen Carter, Commissioner
Stephen Jones, Commissioner

*Chair Reilman participated remotely.

**Commissioner Brisette joined the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

o0o

Ruth Martin del Campo, Current Planning Secretary, received clarification that Chair Reilman could hear the proceedings, he had a copy of the agenda for the meeting and had posted it at the location, he confirmed that his location was reasonably accessible to the public and they could participate if they wished to do so, but that there was no member of the public present that wanted to participate in the meeting; she received clarification from Planning Commissioners that they could clearly hear Chair Reilman and that no Commissioner expressed doubt that Chair Reilman was the person participating by teleconference; and she indicated that all motions and votes would be taken by roll call.

Chair Reilman requested that Vice Chair Menthe act as Chair for the meeting.

Commissioner Brissette joined the meeting.

Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chair Menthe led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Vice Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Steve Siegel discussed the General Plan and Land Use notice for the area between Elenda and Sepulveda on the south side of Culver Boulevard.

Vice Chair Menthe indicated that Mr. Siegel's comments were related to Item PH-1.

Andrew Flores was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Michael Josephson was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Paul Vowell was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Chris Pack was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Celeste Lear was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Judi Sherman indicated that her comments pertained to Item PH-1.

Dr. Richard Singerman reiterated points made at the last meeting regarding the mixed-use development for 5700 Hannum; discussed insufficient parking; increased traffic; concern with allowing weekend construction; the fact that Fox Hills is taking the brunt of all the dense housing requirements; other upcoming development; he noted that the building did not fit in with the character of the neighborhood; expressed

concern with comments made by Commissioners after the meeting; and concern that the public had not been heard.

Suzanne Stolting spoke on behalf of Chris Pack, discussed the Hayden Tract neighborhood; concern with a planned exhibition on the Palestine/Israel Conflict in a residential neighborhood; protests in other cities when the exhibit has taken place; affects to nearby schools and businesses; and concern that plans to provide fencing and security for the event are insufficient.

Nick Maurillo was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECEIVE AND FILE CORRESPONDENCE.

o0o

Consent Calendar

Item C-1

Approval of Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 10, 2024

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE THE DRAFT MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 10, 2024.

o0o

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

o0o

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

PC – Consideration of General Plan Amendment, known as General Plan 2045, Zoning Code Map and Text Amendments, together known as Zoning Code Update, and Environmental Impact Report

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

Mark Muenzer, Planning and Development Director, introduced the item; acknowledged the community for their active engagement in the five-year process; thanked the City Council, the Planning Commission, staff, and the consultant; discussed events held over the course of the process; General Plan 2045; the Zoning Code Update; the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR); the need to make a recommendation to the City Council; the state deadline of October 15, 2024; community engagement; and he provided his contact information for any questions or ideas for additional community engagement.

Troy Evangelho, Advance Planning Manager, introduced the team involved in the process; discussed development of the Draft General Plan; public input; the review process; outreach for the Zoning Code Update; non-conforming uses and notification; the zoning code framework presentation; review of the final General Plan; efforts to provide transparency and real time updates with the creation of a dashboard; the adopted Housing Element; policies Culver City chose not to include; required vs. optional General Plan Elements; the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Element; the narrative for each element; policies designed to guide decision-making in the City; implementation actions; the Land Use and Community Design Element; creation of new mixed-use corridors and neighborhoods; opportunities for job creation; the twenty year plan that exceeds the required RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) units; special study areas; the Community Health and Environmental Justice Element; state requirements; SB1000 neighborhoods; threshold neighborhoods; prioritization for investment; policies throughout the elements relating to SB1000 neighborhoods; developing policies to integrate health into the decision-making process; development of an action plan for implementation; the Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities Element; the Parks Master Plan; the Mobility

Element; the Bicycle Network Map; the Zoning Code Update; streamlining approvals; the shift to mixed-use; compatible development; reduced Floor Area Ratio (FAR); heavy industrial uses; adoption of best practices; growth projections; environmental impacts; the PEIR; circulation of the Draft Element; mitigation programs to address impacts; identification of significant unavoidable impacts; making a statement of overriding consideration; anticipated revenue expenditures; the Economic Development Element; areas the public has asked to focus on; the Inglewood Oil Field (IOF); zoning in Fox Hills; SB9 (Senate Bill 9); ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) law; incremental infill; and auto dealerships.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding heavy industrial, and the financial incentive for auto dealerships.

Vice Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Commission:

Jamie Wallace discussed removal of incremental infill from the General Plan; City Council direction that staff take incremental infill language out; SB9; ADUs; inconsistencies between the Zoning Code and the Housing Element; concern with lawsuits; SB330; and the deadline for submission.

Steve Siegel spoke representing 26 residents surveyed from the area between Elenda and Sepulveda on the south side of Culver requesting the General Plan remove the proposed change to mixed-use; discussed drastic changes to the existing nature of the neighborhood; traffic issues; parking difficulties; natural increases to density; efforts of residents to be engaged and to communicate with staff over the past several years; the petition submitted; and he noted that anyone seeking commercial use could travel to nearby areas.

Andrew Flores was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Cindy Aragon provided background on herself; discussed her initial suspicion of development; lack of excessive traffic with Playa Vista and the Hughes developments; freeway access; and she expressed support for mixed-use retail with housing.

Judi Sherman provided background on herself; expressed disappointment that after all the collaboration with the City, they came to the conclusion that Fox Hills is the prime location to accommodate most of the state required housing assigned to Culver City; she asserted that the General Plan and zoning needed to be amended to reflect equitable distribution of the required amount of housing throughout Culver City; discussed the 100 units per acre density designation on the south side of Slauson; the 1,706 units planned so far with more to come; continued ability to make changes to decrease the density designation in the General Plan; the job of public servants to prevent problems rather than create them; she read from the Zoning Purpose in the Zoning Code noting that the planned density was not reflected in the Zoning Purpose; acknowledged that housing is needed; and she noted that decreasing the density to 50 units per acre would still allow Fox Hills to absorb some of the much-needed housing.

Karyn Marks provided background on herself; discussed the map at the farmers market that illustrated the density planned for Fox Hills; emails sent to residents; sandwiching residents between the 405 freeway and the 7 story buildings going in; the area that can accommodate good housing; current structures that are 2-3 levels high; consistency with what exists; the cemetery; the new post office; current issues with traffic and parking; people who come to use the park; and meeting housing needs in other areas.

Jeff Dritley spoke on behalf of his three sons; discussed the descendants of J.V. Vickers; the amortization agreement signed with the Oil Field operator; he stated that the Open Space designation reflected on page 115 of the Land Use Plan was considered a partial taking noting that that they would pursue remedies if that occurred; indicated that the IOF in the county is designated Mineral Resources, not Open Space; questioned the purpose of the map as he felt it to be misleading; and declared that the 38 acres were the last opportunity of Culver City to create single family housing.

Travis Morgan reported serving on the board of the largest homeowners association in Fox Hills, but speaking on his own behalf; he discussed number of Commissioners and participants involved in the General Plan who live in Fox Hills; the number of events held in Fox Hills; the definition of exclusion; the history of Fox Hills as an excluded community; modern day redlining; he pointed out that Fox Hills was taking the brunt

of the density with 85% of 100 units per acre being put into the lowest socioeconomic neighborhood in the City with the most Black and Brown residents; he noted that there were other parts of Culver City that could take the same density as Fox Hills; and he asserted that approval of the map would be approval of modern-day redlining.

David Kairo provided background on himself; indicated that he and his neighbors were concerned with planned developments to add high density housing to the area; discussed increased traffic and noise pollution; exacerbating the already difficult parking situation; inequality with the way neighborhoods in Culver City are treated; Fox Hills as the most dense and culturally diverse area in Culver City; the new plan to put all state required density in Fox Hills; other appropriate areas in Culver City; and he demanded that density be distributed equitably throughout the City noting that high rise buildings should be built along major arteries.

Richard Singerman echoed comments he made at the beginning of the meeting noting that they applied to the General Plan; discussed inconsistency of the large developments with the character of the neighborhood; lack of parking; increased traffic; concern that the City has ignored repeated comments from residents; the need for thought and sensitivity with the neighborhood; his family history in the City; he felt that many of the speakers had brought up good points; expressed concern that staff was ignoring resident feedback; and questioned what was going to be done to make the process more inclusive.

Gabriela Gualano provided background on herself; expressed concern with worsening existing issues; discussed exacerbating traffic congestion and limited parking with new commercial and residential development; frustrating commutes; increasing pollution in an area that already abuts two freeways; strain on infrastructure and public services; degrading the quality of life; overburdened amenities and greenspaces; reduced availability for new and existing residents; beneficial impacts to spreading mixed-use development across the City; ensuring a more sustainable and equitable environment; and she expressed concern with her home becoming unlivable in the future.

Jack Walter reported being involved in the process since it began; indicated attending almost every meeting; discussed notification; meetings; information from the Planning

Department; he expressed strong support for the General Plan Zoning Code Update as presented and the Mixed-Use High designation in Fox Hills which he felt to be a lightly populated area compared to the rest of Culver City; he asserted that the industrial park area between Buckingham and Fox Hills was a prime area to allow high density, multi-family, and mixed-use projects to help meet goals in the Housing Element; he stated that the City had hired the best consultants to craft a Zoning Code Update appropriate to Culver City needs; and the sound went out, making the balance of his comments inaudible.

Nick Maurillo was called to speak but was not present online or in Council Chambers.

Tom O'Neil discussed the purpose of the Zoning Code to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the City's residential neighborhoods; he questioned how that goal was possible when 90% of the 3,300 units planned for Culver City would be placed in Fox Hills; asked how the community would be served by increasing density to 100 units per acre in the most populated part of Culver City; discussed protecting quality of life; references in the code to thoughtful planning and design that enhances visual character and avoids conflicts between land uses; project renderings for Fox Hills in relation to existing units and architecture; he wondered how natural resources would be preserved by cutting down old growth trees and blocking natural air flow by allowing structures to be 7 stories high where existing structures are not more than 2-3 stories high; discussed adequate and efficient planning to achieve the goal to create a comprehensive and stable pattern of land uses for public services and infrastructure; he questioned whether the plan was meant to serve the existing community or the fantasy future; and he was not sure who would be moving in noting the out-migration from California.

Kevin Wene provided background on himself; asserted that the plan takes the problem of getting more housing without alienating homeowners created by Governor Newsome and dumps it in Fox Hills; discussed the win for homeowners and developers, but the loss for Fox Hills residents; comments made by previous speakers; Fox Hills residents who do not have the time and money that the developers and homeowners have; he appealed to the hearts and inherent goodness of Commissioners and staff; indicated that as a therapist he had seen what happens to those who ignore their hearts in the

name of taking the easy road; and he asked the City to do the hard thing and find a way to share the burden of the new housing.

Vice Chair Menthe received clarification that Jack Walter had about one minute left to make comment when his sound went out.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation to staff and the speakers; approval of a Specific Plan for Fox Hills and the Hayden Tract with the purpose of having community-focused meetings to help develop standards to guide building and development; taking more of a holistic view; the next phase of the General Plan; potential grant funding; additional funding from the state of California; the auto lots; financial advantage; the goals for community health, fairness, equity, and well-being; the fact that goals do not mention income for the City and no one wants to live next to an auto park; whether there is a way not to grandfather the auto lot in; current auto dealership locations; changing the code to allow dealerships in Mixed-Use Industrial and along the corridors; higher density mixed-use; allowing dealerships in Mixed-Use Medium through the Conditional Use process; strict limits for housing; additional discretion allowed with commercial uses; and Planning Commission consideration.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the IOF; areas outside of Culver City that impact the City; the Open Space designation; future intent; regulation of unincorporated areas; ensuring consistency with the General Plan moving forward; adjustments with the zoning map; clarification that privately owned areas have not been touched; the future study area; future engagement with the community and stakeholders; the map in the presentation vs. the one in the staff report; addressing the discrepancy between Single-Family shown on the Zoning Map and Open Space shown on the General Plan map; addressing inconsistency in a future map; the opportunity to do something with private developers; properties proposed to be rezoned for Open Space; addressing oil extraction through the Amortization Ordinance; and legal issues.

Vice Chair Menthe reminded members of the public that this was the time for Commissioner deliberation, not public comment.

Christina Burrows, Assistant City Attorney, discussed the Historic Oil Termination Ordinance; the Settlement Agreement; implementation; lack of a public process for the vision of the IOF; future opportunity to bring in stakeholders; lack of a cohesive vision for the area; lack of an Oil Use Zone; and the recommendation to keep the area zoned as is and studying the area in the future.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding appreciation to the consultants for their hard work; concern with ending up with vacant and decrepit buildings that have not been maintained; parking concerns; RHNA; looking at a longer time horizon than the Housing Element; capacity projections; estimating how many units would actually be built; the 20 year plan that would cover three cycles of RHNA; RHNA numbers reflected in the projection for the build-out; quantifying and showing how many units are being produced to satisfy requirements from the state; state guidelines for identified sites; state accounting requirements; what was zoned for vs. what was built; keeping an accurate up-to-date accounting; the sites inventory; the built in buffer; identified surplus; reducing the FAR to .45; state law requiring a zero loss; compensation; upzoning throughout the entirety of Culver City; compensation for single family neighborhood buildings; increased density throughout the City; reducing overall bulk of buildings in single family neighborhoods; other areas being upzoned; downzoning; the Fiscal Impact Report; implementation steps of the Housing Element; by-right projects with 20% affordable housing; Director approval for density bonus projects; redundancy; by-right approvals; standards for single family residential neighborhoods drafted to protect the existing density; existing language; reliance on ADU production; differences between incremental infill and the ADU ordinance; maximum size for ADUs; Junior ADUs; elimination of maximum sizes; bringing in new sources of revenue; conflicts with other policies in the Housing Element about the environment; car dealerships as separating the Arts District from the Downtown area; creating a mixed-use neighborhood in the Hayden Tract; high value use; making a recommendation to the City Council to increase density in MU1 to 50 dwelling units per acre; MU1 on commercial corridors; codification of mixed-use anywhere while density is not being added; small lots; by-right building of commercial but not residential; concerns of Fox Hills residents; public comment about those who did not realize what was going until the map was presented;

examining what works; and strong monetary incentives for developers to pay attention to what is happening.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding other areas that are not being proposed for as high a density as is being proposed for Fox Hills; significantly increased density for the Jefferson corridor which was formerly light industrial; the proposal for up to 65 dwelling units per acre; creating a balance of use; acknowledging the history of the area; allowing for housing and opportunities for business; and regular required study of fees for development.

Vice Chair Menthe indicated that public comment from the audience was not accepted after the public comment period was closed.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding acknowledgement of public comment from Fox Hills indicating that they do not feel heard; Fox Hills as being unrepresented on City bodies; City efforts to mitigate impacts to the Fox Hills neighborhood; scrutiny of the State Housing and Development Department; changing the designation in Fox Hills; the Builders' Remedy; and reexamination of the Guiding Principles.

Eric Yurkovich, Raimi + Associates, discussed drafting the Guiding Principles in 2020, and the decision made to remove the Guiding Principle after the City Council directed the consultants not to move forward with the Reimagining Public Safety Element of the General Plan.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding Public Safety as informing other elements of the General Plan; a recommendation to put Reimagining Public Safety back in; the survey answered by Culver City residents; accountability to the people of Culver City who contributed to the element; concern with City Council direction to delete the new element; the different timeline for review for the non-required element; the recommendation of the General Plan Subcommittee to bring it to the City Council for review; and the review process before public release.

Commissioner Jones recommended reinstatement of Public Safety as a Guiding Principle as defined in the public draft, increasing MU1 zoning to 50 dwelling units per acre, removing the purpose "to protect the existing density" from the Zoning

Code, removing maximum ADU unit sizes, and not allowing auto dealerships in other zoning designations.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the importance of making sure all residents are heard; concerning comments about equity and outreach; other areas where more density is being added; support for the increase in density along MU1; making things more inviting to development; appreciation to staff and the consultant for their work on a very long process; elements directed to job growth that is part of the General Plan; preparation for projected increased population; understanding types of neighborhoods; the south side of Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda; adding mixed-use vs. adding number of units per acre; existing multi-family zoning; consistency with the 35 units per acre density; adding commercial possibilities to the zone; leaving the area multi-family residential rather than mixed-use; concern with provocative comments about redlining; lowering density in Fox Hills vs. spreading density elsewhere; using words like equity; concern making other areas have the same 100 unit per acre density; and those who want to use concerns about density to raise levels in other areas of Culver City.

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

Commissioner Brissette proposed a motion to adopt the staff recommendation to:

- 1) Certify the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) P2022-0053-EIR, Adopt CEQA Required Findings, Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), and Adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations as stated in Resolution No. 2024-P009 (Attachment No. 1); and,
- 2) Approve the General Plan Amendment P2022-0053-GP, known as the General Plan 2045, as stated in Resolution No. 2024-P010 (Attachment No. 2); and,
- 3) Approve the Zoning Code Text and Map Amendments, P2024-0186-ZCA, and -ZCMA, together referred to as the Zoning Code Update, as stated in Resolution No. 2024-P011 (Attachment No. 3). Vice Chair Menthe seconded the motion and the discussion continued.

Commissioner Jones proposed an amendment to increase the density of MU1 to 50 dwelling units per acre and Chair Reilman seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding a proposed amendment to increase the density of MU1 to 50 dwelling units per acre; the height limit; density needed to get housing built on smaller lots; the large number of fourplexes on commercial corridors; concern with over-allocating; existing properties above 50 dwelling units per acre that are below the 56 foot height limit that would comply with a 50 unit per acre designation; concern with the ramifications of changes; the amendment to MU1, not to Mixed-Use Neighborhood; the need for analysis of the ramifications before recommending 50 units per acre to the City Council; and clarification that the vote on the amendment comes before the vote on the original motion.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES AND SECONDED BY CHAIR REILMAN THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND THE ZONING CODE TO INCREASE THE DENSITY OF MU1 TO 50 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: CARTER, JONES, REILMAN
NOES: BRISSETTE, MENTHE

Commissioner Jones moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council remove language indicating the purpose of residential zoning districts for R1 to protect the existing density and maintain the character of residential neighborhoods from the Zoning Code and remove maximum ADU unit size noting that the goal was to increase density and promote ADU production as part of the RHNA and SB9.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding clarification that the Government Code does not establish ADU size; there may be a Building Code limitation on ADU size; information provided to the City Council; percentage of units produced as part of meeting RHNA goals that are ADUs; taking out incremental infill because of ADU production; leaving the language as it is for consistency of preserving R1; advantages to having a larger ADU size; limiting income by limiting the ability to increase property value; providing the most

flexibility to promote creation of more housing; reducing limitations; and allowing better lives for the renters.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND THE ZONING CODE TO REMOVE LANGUAGE ON MAXIMUM ADU UNIT SIZE.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: CARTER, JONES, REILMAN
NOES: BRISSETTE, MENTHE

Commissioner Jones moved to recommend not allowing new auto dealerships in MU Industrial and Mixed-Use Medium.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding concern with limiting demand from users who employ people and service the community; the isolating nature of auto zones; flow; community; reductions to property value; frequency of car purchases; public health; concern with overlooking revenue for the City; the importance of commercial uses; the importance of generating tax revenue for the City; continuing already existing uses; revenue generated by auto dealerships vs. by mixed-use with commercial; significant revenue generated by auto dealerships; significant interest in the land use; anticipated revenue; costs of services for potential new residents; the high revenue production land use that helps provide services to residents; M1 and M2 as being other areas in Culver City where the use is allowed; existing dealerships near the downtown area; and concern that there will be long-term regret if Hayden becomes a mixed-use area and a car dealership is located there.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL NOT ALLOW NEW AUTO DEALERSHIPS IN MU INDUSTRIAL AND MIXED-USE MEDIUM.

THE MOTION FAILED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: CARTER, JONES
NOES: BRISSETTE, MENTHE, REILMAN

Commissioner Jones moved to recommend reinstating Public Safety as a Guiding Principle as defined in the public draft

of the General Plan that was distributed in September 2023 and Commissioner Carter seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding procedural impact of the recommendation; informing future policy; the health of the City as standing on the foundation of safety; and addressing increased traffic.

Commissioner Jones read language from the Public Safety Guiding Principle.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding social policy that does not necessarily belong in the land use document.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER JONES AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CARTER THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL REINSTATE PUBLIC SAFETY AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE AS DEFINED IN THE PUBLIC DRAFT FOR THE GENERAL PLAN THAT WAS DISTRIBUTED IN SEPTEMBER 2023.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: CARTER, JONES, REILMAN
NOES: BRISSETTE, MENTHE

Vice Chair Menthe moved to change the proposed zoning on the south side of Culver Boulevard between Elenda and Sepulveda to remove the mixed-use designation and leave it as Multi-Family noting that all the residents there wanted to see the change; he observed that the justification for mixed-use appeared to be that residential neighborhoods should be open to commercial activity; he pointed out that housing density issues would not be changed; and he asked that residents be listened to. Commissioner Brissette seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the vibrance of the mixed-use on Washington; value to the community; providing a framework that lets development make an investment in Culver City; providing a dependable option for redevelopment to add value; concern with a potential loss of housing; the requirement to replace residential units at the same affordability level; the recent update to replacement requirements of SB8; differences with Tilden Terrace; preserving the very residential area; and looking at reimaging the area with additional residential density.

MOVED BY VICE CHAIR MENTHE AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL CHANGE THE PROPOSED ZONING ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF CULVER BOULEVARD BETWEEN ELENDIA AND SEPULVEDA TO REMOVE THE MIXED-USE DESIGNATION AND LEAVE IT AS MULTI-FAMILY.

THE MOTION FAILED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: BRISSETTE, MENTHE
NOES: CARTER, JONES, REILMAN

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BRISSETTE, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR MENTHE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL:

1) CERTIFY THE PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR) P2022-0053-EIR, ADOPT CEQA REQUIRED FINDINGS, ADOPT THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM (MMP), AND ADOPT A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2024-P009 (ATTACHMENT NO. 1); AND,

2) APPROVE THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT P2022-0053-GP, KNOWN AS THE GENERAL PLAN 2045, AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2024-P010 (ATTACHMENT NO. 2) AS AMENDED; AND,

3) APPROVE THE ZONING CODE TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS, P2024-0186-ZCA, AND -ZCMA, TOGETHER REFERRED TO AS THE ZONING CODE UPDATE, AS STATED IN RESOLUTION NO. 2024-P011 (ATTACHMENT NO. 3) AS AMENDED.

o0o

Action Items

None.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda (Continued)

Vice Chair Menthe invited public comment.

The following members of the public were called to speak but did not respond:

Nick Maurillo

Gabriela Gualano
Andrew Flores
Michael Josephson
Paul Vowell
Celeste Lear

Travis Morgan discussed future Specific Plans designed for the Hayden Tract and Fox Hills; 2,700 units ready to go in Fox Hills as soon as things are passed; the existing 2,500 units in Fox Hills; plans to more than double the population before the Specific Plan is even started; the distinction between dealerships and showrooms; sales tax revenue; reduced impacts to neighborhoods with showrooms; the idea of discrimination; retaining the Hayden Tract with a more gradual transition into housing vs. upzoning from zero to 100; treating disadvantaged neighborhood differently; clear discrimination when neighborhoods are treated differently; and segregating Culver City.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff


Emily Stadnicki, Current Planning Manager, discussed upcoming agenda items for August 28, 2024.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 10:11 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to a regular meeting to be held on August 28, 2024.

oOo



RUTH MARTIN DEL CAMPO
SECRETARY of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED

September 25, 2024



ANDREW REILMAN
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 Bocchino
CITY CLERK

30 Sep 2024
Date