

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

August 11, 2021
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Sayles called the regular meeting of the Culver City Planning Commission to order at 7:07 p.m.

Present: Dana Sayles, Chair
Nancy Barba, Vice Chair
Jennifer Carter, Commissioner
Ed Ogosta, Commissioner
Andrew Reilman, Commissioner

o0o

Pledge of Allegiance

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, led the Pledge of Allegiance.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda

Chair Sayles invited public comment.

Ruth Martin del Campo, Administrative Clerk, discussed procedures for making public comment.

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

Bryan Sanders discussed Public Records Requests he had made and shared with the Commission and the public; concern with work done by a University of California, Davis Law Professor with Mayor Fish, Ashley Hefner, and Veronica Tam; he expressed concern that a Professor from UC Davis, who seemed to disagree

with the paid City consultant, was guiding the Mayor on crafting the Housing Element; discussed transparency; concern with recommendations made to the Mayor as well as the Housing and Community Development Board; concern with guidance to craft the Housing Element in a way that precludes future changes; and he asked the Commission to analyze the correspondence.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding Commission purview; the recommendation of the Planning Commission regarding the Housing Element; a suggestion that Mr. Sanders submit comments to the Advance Planning Manager who can prepare a response regarding input from various sources; and encouragement to the speaker to provide staff with contact information.

oOo

Consent Calendar

Item C-1

Approval of Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 14, 2021

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER REILMAN AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARBA THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JULY 14, 2021 AS SUBMITTED.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

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

oOo

Order of the Agenda

No changes were made.

oOo

Action Items

Item A-1

PC - Review and Discussion of Update and Informational Materials Regarding Comprehensive Revisions to Zoning Code Requirements and Standards Relating to Required Off-Street Parking Citywide

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed the origins of the text amendments; time and effort put into the process; highlighting mobility goals; the work plan; departmental collaboration; and the process.

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, introduced the item.

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner, presented a summary of the material of record and provided an overview of the financial incentives portion of the mobility measures.

Andrea Fleck, Planning Technician, discussed the draft amendment as well as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements and data.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding the process for consideration.

Chair Sayles invited public comment.

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner, indicated that no public comment had been received.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed the large amount of information to digest; the summary of the proposed parking code changes; the process for consideration; additional opportunity for public comment on the item; minimum parking ratio requirements; and elimination of off-street parking requirements within ½ mile of a major public transit stop or station.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding compliance with state law; that minimum parking requirements could be eliminated in the City since most of the City is located within ½ mile of a major public transit stop or station; the ability of the City to make parking standards more restrictive or less restrictive; gaging the feeling of the Commission on the concept of AB1401 whether or not it is

approved; the maximum reduction of parking with the credit; the strategy for implementation of TDM; parking reductions vs. requirements based on the scale of the project; proximity to transit and parking reduction; market driven parking demand; providing parking for tenants; concern with being too lenient and the potential for abuse; making changes to accommodate and inspire bigger shifts; marketability; idealistic vs. realistic; maximum vs. minimum parking standards; concern with imposing a hardship; finding the right balance; the overdue, necessary parking amendment; and eliminating City Council discretion.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding support for a parking cap; EV (Electric Vehicle) requirements; Commission support for penalties with fees directed toward transit programs; other cities in the area with parking maximums and minimums; finding a balance; clarification that fees would relate to the project being considered; car share; draft language from AB1401; alternative parking solutions for mobility improvements; automatic parking reductions with implementation of TDM measures; required improvements; entitlements; Commission support for trading parking for TDM; clarification that 40% would be the maximum including combining any type of mobility measure; the intent to shrink the parking footprint; allowing a menu of items for the developer to choose from; achieving larger goals to address air quality, mobility and climate change; the ability to opt out of reductions; and Commission consensus for more robust TDM requirements.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding Commission support for revising the parking code to substitute bicycle parking for car parking as a tradeoff; requiring minimum bicycle parking; extending automated and stacked parking throughout the City; the potential for automated and stacked parking to be a nuisance; administrative approvals vs. Commission hearings; costs for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP); simplifying the process; ensuring that Building and Safety requirements are maintained; user experience; support for a more relaxed application of the process; noise related to the use of parking stackers; public input; smaller scale automated projects; required technical studies related to noise and circulation; screening measures; adjacency to residential; enhancing sound attenuation issues; elimination of the CUP requirement; instances where a hearing would be appropriate; the timeframe for Administrative Use Permits (AUPs) vs. CUPs;

costs; support for eliminating the CUP unless it is adjacent to R1; the importance of determining where public review is appropriate; support for getting rid of the process except for smaller projects that warrant review; single-family homes; determining what qualifies as a smaller project; consideration of location and size of the project; proximity to potential impact; number of parking spaces to stack; implementation of parking management devices to reduce requirements; the mixed use ordinance; setback requirements; support for streamlining processes; and general support for reducing parking.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding subsidies; Commission consensus to wait to consider the rest of the issues at a future meeting; acknowledgement that the proposed changes are a big step for the City; larger scale commercial development; the Housing Element; residential parking standards; the General Plan Update; placing the focus on the largest parking consumers; agreement to continue the discussion once there is a better understanding of single-family and R1 development; the focus on commercial development; California Environmental Quality Analysis (CEQA); what is considered discretionary; and agreement to continue the discussion on the TDM program and mobility measures.

o0o

Item A-2

PC - Review and Discussion of Proposed Revisions to Streamline the Multifamily Housing Entitlement Process

William Kavadas, Assistant Planner, provided a summary of the material of record on Housing Entitlement Streamlining.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed the connection between housing costs and entitlements; the importance of building affordable housing; promoting housing production by making it simpler to process plans through the City; discretionary review; optional thresholds; design standards; process costs and timing; and market-rate housing vs. affordable housing projects.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding whether to omit review in the interest of housing production; including robust design standards in the process; eliminating

review if there is confidence in the design standards; allowing ministerial approvals for six or fewer units; shortening the process to make building housing more affordable; average site plan review costs; costs for a comprehensive plan; using CEQA exemptions, robust design standards and the state process as opposed to the public hearing process and discretionary review; length of time to create the design standards; using the six or fewer threshold; the number of projects coming through with four-six units; cost implications; public concern with changes in zoning; concern with doubly silencing the public; multi-family design standards; Commission purview; prevailing conditions; conforming the project to the neighborhood; the design vocabulary in the commercial corridors; finding a substitute for discretionary review; administrative review vs. ministerial review; removing Commission jurisdiction; choosing between administrative, ministerial, or discretionary review; development costs; at what point small projects become financially competitive; support for requiring discretionary review only for 30 or more units; clarification on design requirements; requirements that become onerous for smaller projects; the need for continued discussion at a further hearing; support for streamlining the process; the need to know what design requirements are before approving up to 30 units to streamline the process; support for eliminating discretionary review on parcel maps; prohibitive costs for small developments; Site Plan Review Threshold removal for six units or under and elimination of discretionary review for small subdivisions; ensuring that the City abides by the government code; the importance of accelerating affordable housing; application to small subdivisions; consideration of Net New to determine the number of units in a project; environmental thresholds; neighborhood impacts; neighborhood character; contextual issues; factual findings; and moving parts to consider.

Additional discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding addressing the design review process; design review vs. discretionary review; concern with taking public review out of the process; clear standards for ministerial approval; the need for a robust design review process; CEQA requirements; required environmental analysis for more than six units; text amendments; creating an avenue for administrative review that does not go before the Commission or discretionary action; current exemptions under CEQA; creating conditions for the target of 30 or fewer units for non-discretionary review; extending no design review or

standards for projects that are exempt from the statute for six units or under; adding regulation for over six units; ensuring reliability; the need for a clear, concise, reliable set of easily understandable standards; efforts to promote housing production; larger projects as having the greater number of affordable housing units; promoting housing production across the board with a focus on a larger number of units; statutory exemptions; and providing a ministerial review checklist for design review.

Further discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding statutory exemptions with respect to design standards and a review process for affordable housing; state mandates; the Government Code; CEQA exemptions; density bonus projects; thresholds; projects coming up for review with developer incentives; clarification that affordability requirements do not summarily eliminate the discretionary review requirement; ministerial review for projects of 50% affordability; SB35; mandatory affordability with community benefits; local density bonuses; allowing ministerial review for projects of any size containing 30% or greater affordable units; the 200 unit threshold; transit priority projects; SB375; support for affordability; escalating density for additional affordability under the current ordinance; the micro unit density bonus; further incentivizing by allowing ministerial approval; the inability to get conventional financing for 30%; concern with creating a policy that no one ever uses; the choice of the development community to build very low income units; required workforce units; the goal of the developers to get higher density; incentivizing projects to provide more affordable housing; the contribution of the ministerial review to the bottom line of a project; solicitation of feedback from developers on viability; the analysis from the financial consultant; gauging the amount of affordability that can be attached to a project; percentage of units; level of affordability; creating a new paradigm to encourage low income housing; and the importance of examining all variations.

o0o

Public Comment - Items NOT on the Agenda (Continued)

None.

o0o

Receipt of Correspondence

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

o0o

Items from Planning Commissioners/Staff

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, indicated that this was the last meeting for Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, discussed his important role in all the divisions he has been involved with; he stated that Mr. Allen had taken the City to another level; discussed improvements made; and he indicated that Jeff Anderson would be stepping into the position at the next meeting.

Commissioners thanked Michael Allen for his depth of knowledge, guidance and hard work.

Heather Baker, Assistant City Attorney, noted that Mr. Allen had made her life easier, was a tremendous partner, and she wished him the best of luck.

Michael Allen, Current Planning Manager, thanked everyone for the validation and acknowledgement, and he expressed pride in the work done with the team which he felt to be a testament to the partnership of all City staff in the productive, creative, and innovative environment.

Discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners regarding projects moving forward; scheduling; the Housing Element; and holding a special meeting for the Housing Element Update on December 1, 2021.

Commissioner Reilman discussed the Work Plan and Reach Codes.

Sol Blumenfeld, Community Development Director, discussed work on the Seismic Strengthening Ordinance and the Electrification Reach Code.

Vice Chair Barba received clarification that the second item on the agenda had been considered and that staff would keep moving forward on both items with additional information provided to respond to Commissioner inquiries.

o0o

Adjournment

There being no further business, at 10:53 p.m., the Culver City Planning Commission adjourned to a meeting to be held on August 24, 2021.

o0o




RUTH MARTIN DEL CAMPO
ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK of the CULVER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED Sept 29, 2021



DANA SAYLES
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

7 OCT 2021
Date