

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

July 25, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Ogosta called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

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

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

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

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Ogosta invited public input.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

o0o

Presentations

None.

o0o

Consent Calendar Items

Item C-1

Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of June 27, 2018

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON, SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR REILMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 27, 2018.

oOo

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

oOo

Public Hearings

Item PH-1

Consideration of a Zoning Code Amendment, P2018-0052-ZCA, amending Zoning Code Section 17.210.015, Table 2-2 and Section 17.400.095 related to the development standards for Accessory Dwelling Units

Vice Chair Reilman congratulated Chair Ogosta on being selected as a 2018 Design Vanguard winner in Architectural Record magazine.

Michael Allen, Planning Manager, provided a summary of the material of record.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding correction of a typographical error in the resolution referring to June 25 instead of July 25; consistency with state law and suggested re-wording of amendment text language in exhibit A on page 2a; clarification that the map of prohibited ADUs includes situations where someone wants to build an ADU inside an existing dwelling; life safety concerns and considerations as part of the amendment; whether ADUs should be permitted at all in certain areas; Emergency Service access; increasing density in an area with surficial slides, high fire danger and substandard streets; matching

the state language indicating that the ADU is located within one half mile of public transit; lifting size limitations within a structure; state law; whether there is property that qualifies to have no parking required if it is within one block of a car share facility; the portion of the City that is within one half mile of public transit; whether bike share qualifies; fixed portals; restrictions on building ADUs for R-2 and R-3 lots; prohibiting higher density; maintaining a 2 unit property on R-2 lots; clarification that ADUs are capped by their square footage outside of the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and the FAR only applies to the single family dwelling unit; treating the ADU like attached garages; clarification that the dwelling has to exist on its own before it can be considered an ADU; the ability of the City to make the requirement more restrictive; including the ADU as part of the overall FAR; maximum size of the ADU for detached vs. attached; applying the overall FAR for the primary dwelling unit and the ADU located inside; ensuring that the ADU is part of the FAR and would not exceed the permissible FAR; clarification on the use of the word "existing" within the Location section; and parking requirements related to converting an attached garage into an ADU.

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

Chair Ogosta invited public comment.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding state dictated requirements; clarification that maximum size does not exceed the total FAR; the one block requirement for car share and bike share; the limited number of properties that would qualify; a suggestion to clarify a global term for a transit share facility; the likelihood that there would be a car share within one block that would occur independently of a transit stop within a half mile; clarification regarding the definition of transit; including bike sharing with car sharing language; abiding by the maximum house standards; concern that a detached ADU could be larger than accessory

structures; concern with creating a loophole that people take advantage of; the prohibition on two-story ADUs; accessory structure rules; the need to revisit accessory structures to clarify that one of the two structures can be an ADU but there cannot be two structures plus an ADU; and the definition of accessory.

The Commission agreed upon the following changes: correct the date in the resolution from June 25, 2018 to July 25, 2018; match state language in section 2.3 regarding one half mile to transit; add bike share to section H3E; add language about FAR relative to ADUs to indicate that they are included in the total FAR allowable; and modify G2 and H2 regarding existing single family dwelling units and the parking provision for the existing single family dwelling unit.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPT THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION AND RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT P-2018-0052-ZCA REGARDING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS WITH CHANGES AS NOTED.

o0o

Item PH-2

PC - Conformance Review for Comprehensive Plan, P2017-0042-CP, to Recommend to City Council Whether the Revised Plans Provide Screening to Minimize Glare and Views into the Parking Structure, and Confirm If Designs for Converting a Portion of Parking into Outdoor Dining Space is Consistent with the Intent of Condition No. 9 of City Council Ordinance No. 2018-004 to Reduce Building Massing

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

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

Chair Ogosta invited public comment.

The following members of the audience addressed the Commission:

John Nehas, Regency Centers, discussed the screening issue; taking a holistic approach; the proposed solution for the garage screening; and the need for mechanical ventilation.

Aaron Benefiel, JRDV, provided a presentation comparing the previous design to the changes being proposed.

Discussion ensued between project representatives and Commissioners regarding clarification on fixed glazing for the windows; the possibility of leaving entrance doors open if the tenant desires fresh air; allowing an opportunity for the tenant to have a more open configuration; permeability; acknowledgement of the work done to improve the project; changes in the landscape programming; self-climbing vines; ensuring that the elements not shown are codified so that they are not lost; the focus on the open garage bay; the number of changes in the elevations; disappointment with the need for mechanical exhaust in the garage; the goal of natural ventilation; achieving the same aesthetic without the panes of glass; requirements in the original conformance review; light spillover and noise minimalization; addressing glare, light and noise with the glazing system and making the garage look more like a building and less like a garage; potential noise issues with the air handling system; energy consumption of the ventilation system; the festoon light fixtures; the glazing units; the solar heat gain coefficient; Title 24; clarification that only one layer is enclosed and there is natural ventilation on the upper levels; and clarification regarding the dimensional profile of the frame.

Erin Stacey questioned how many parking spaces the garage would have; whether parking would be free; whether parking restrictions would support the neighbors; and she expressed unhappiness with not being able to park near her house.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, explained that the garage would be City-owned and charges would be the standard City rate; he indicated that there would be 176 parking stalls available in the garage with 20 stalls across the street; he noted the intent of the project to provide extra commercial parking; discussed money paid by the Redevelopment Agency for the garage; and he indicated that permit parking was being studied.

Patricia Graf spoke on behalf of other residents who are concerned that the volume of the parking structure is massive compared to the Market Hall and she expressed regret that

enclosing the parking structure would result in making it look even larger and dwarf the Market Hall.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding support for the Centinela/Washington corner; the old converted warehouse look of the Market Hall; the architecture as matching the use; support for the loss of the bougainvillea; appreciation for the effort involved and for the improved design; disappointment regarding the need for mechanical ventilation; regret that the garage could not be made smaller and less visible; the softening effect of the landscaping; maintenance of ground level plantings; adding scale and relief to an industrial building; the importance of landscaping in streetscape harmony; keeping some of the original façade greenery; whether a tweak to the sill level would achieve light spillage and ventilation goals; support for thoughtful use and design; operability of garage doors; logistical issues with travelling upstairs to eat; incorporation of a rooftop bar; light diffusion; second floor seating; making it clear that the second level is meant for dining; and ensuring that what is approved is what is built.

Additional discussion ensued between John Nehas, staff and Commissioners regarding clarification that the dining area would be covered; a suggestion for vines on the trellis; the loss of landscaping; proposed maximum hours of operation; the feasibility of keeping the bottom level of the garage open; keeping the design cohesive; and ensuring that ground level plantings shown in the October 25, 2017 plan submittal are provided in the final plans.

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION: RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE CONFORMANCE REVIEW, AS IT FINDS THE PROPOSED REVISED PLANS PROVIDE THE SCREENING NECESSARY TO MINIMIZE GLARE AND VIEWS INTO THE PARKING STRUCTURE AS REQUIRED BY CONDITION NO. 9 OF CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE NO. 2018-004 WITH GROUND LEVEL PLANTINGS SHOWN IN THE OCTOBER 25, 2017 PLAN SUBMITTAL INCLUDED IN THE FINAL PLANS.

oOo

Item PH-3

PC: Consideration of a Zoning Code Text Amendment, P2018-0124-ZCA, Amending the Zoning Code as it Relates to the Standards and Requirements for Height Projections, Including Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC) Section 17.300.025

Chair Ogosta noted the need to recuse himself from consideration of the item and he exited the dais.

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the county formula for height; allowances for a projection without specifying a limit; and policies of other cities.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

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

Vice Chair Reilman invited public input.

No cards were received and no speakers came forward.

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

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

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

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding requiring a setback if a certain height is to be exceeded; non-residential buildings that could be larger; concern with allowing 13 foot 6 inches for a residential structure; the feeling that the setback makes a big difference in how things are perceived; proportionality; residential vs. commercial;

the location of elevator overruns; concern with making a blanket decision without practical applications; sensitivity to residential; requiring a setback if the project abuts residential; protecting sensitive uses; minimizing the impact on roof space; removal of the step back; impacts to buildings with stairs located at the edge of the building; compliance with the overall height limit; leniency if the project is below the height limit; other jurisdictions that require a five foot setback; integration of stairs into the architecture; differing elevator technology and height requirements; condensers; a suggestion to allow the overrun for elevator or stairs only and not including guardrails, parapets, boilers or cooling towers; rooftop deck issues; large multi-family in commercial zones; concern with 13 feet 6 inches as it relates to elevators; keeping the height to the top of the stair tower; distinguishing between projections and equipment vs. elevators and roofs; having a lower height projection for equipment; the practice of Los Angeles to exempt mechanical equipment from height limits; ventilation plans; making sure not to violate the provisions of the building code; adding language to indicate: "unless otherwise provided in the building code, the maximum height shall be..."; the exemption in Los Angeles that if it is required by the building code it is exempted from all height issues; adding language to indicate "...shall apply except where otherwise required by the building code"; screening required on rooftops for equipment exposure; zoning code requirements vs. building code requirements; potential conflicts; line of sight from the curb; providing staff discretion where there is a conflict; clarification on how measurements are taken; concern with penalizing someone who builds under the height limit; rooftop decks as more of a design element; multi-family in commercial industrial zones; whether the condition applies; support for the clarification that only the elevator be allowed to exceed; requiring that any roof mounted structure be set back from the structure a minimum of five feet; constraints with a commercial building; building code egress requirements for certain uses; origin of the item; location of the stairs near the perimeter; larger buildings requiring a second method of egress; issues with offsetting the stairs; visibility from the street; the Market Hall Project; concern with requiring a five-foot setback for everything; an observation that nothing should be required to be setback that cannot be seen behind the parapet; determining the point of visibility; stair towers; requiring a five-foot setback for anything visible beyond the parapet for any roof mounted structures other than stairs; suggested

wording: "in multi-family zones up to a maximum of 13 feet 6 inches above the height of the building"; the intent to ensure that anything greater than the height of the parapet is set back from the edge a minimum of 5 feet; addressing instances where there is no parapet; screening mechanical equipment; perception of the parapet as the roofline by the public; not requiring setbacks for non-residential; agreement to add wording to indicate: "with the exception of stairs, roof mounted structures, exceeding the height of the parapet shall be set back a minimum of five feet"; adding language in item C to indicate "...following manner except where otherwise required by the building code"; and adding language to allow for discretion where there is conflict in the zoning provisions that require screening: "In multi-family and non-residential zones where the requirements for screenings pursuant to the code section 17.300.035c1 conflict with the requirements of the section 17.300.025, such conflict shall be resolved at the discretion of the Director".

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER VONCANNON AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SAYLES THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2018-P004 (ATTACHMENT NO. 1) RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT P2018-0124-ZCA RELATED TO HEIGHT PROJECTIONS WITH THE AGREED UPON CHANGES.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: REILMAN, SAYLES, VONCANNON
NOES: LACHOFF
RECUSED: OGOSTA

Chair Ogosta returned to the dais.

o0o

Action Items

None.

o0o

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

None.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

None.

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Commissioner Sayles requested an advance calendar for the next few months indicating items to be considered and she asked about a timeline for the tours.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, reported on the American Planning Association (APA) tour of larger projects; suggested that some of those projects could be included in the Commission tour; and he discussed the intent for a forensics look of the outcomes and the projected date of September for the tour.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding taking the tour on bicycles or Birds to eliminate the need for parking; Commissioner Voncannon noted that he would be absent on August 8 and 22; and Commissioner Sayles indicated that she would be absent on August 22.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 9:46 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to the next regular meeting on Wednesday, August 8, 2018, at 7:00 p.m.

oOo




Rita Martin del Campo for Susan Herbertson

SUSAN HERBERTSON

SENIOR PLANNER of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED


9/12/18



ED OGOSTA

CHAIR of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Culver City, California

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that, on the date below written, these minutes were filed in the Office of the City Clerk, Culver City, California and constitute the Official Minutes of said meeting.



Jeremy Green
CITY CLERK

25 SEP 2018
Date

