Committee: Planning and Land Use Committee  
Chairperson: Patricia Lyon  
Meeting Date: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 - 6:30pm

Committee Members
- Attending: David Oliver, Garrett Smith, Patricia Lyon, Kimberly Fox, David Voss, Don Hellwig
- Absent: Alan Quon, Joan Trimble

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

Item 2: Review and Approval - Minutes from 21 November 2017 Meeting
- Moved: Garret Smith
- Second: David Oliver
- Vote: Approved unanimously

Item 3: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Item - None

Item 4: Review of SB 827

Background - On 1/3/18, San Francisco state senator Scott Wiener introduced State Bill 827. It mandates that State zoning rules (as outlined in the bill) would override all local zoning regarding multi-family housing development near “transit-rich” locations. It would nullify the Measure JJJ-mandated Los Angeles “Transit Oriented Communities” ordinance recently crafted through a democratic process and approved by City Council. (This UrbanizeLA article is a good recap of LA’s “TOC” ordinance.)

Key text from SB 827: “The bill would exempt a project awarded a housing opportunity bonus from various requirements, including maximum controls on residential density or floor area ratio, minimum automobile parking requirements, design standards that restrict the applicant’s ability to construct the maximum number of units consistent with any applicable building code, and maximum height limitations, as provided.”

Presenters - Patricia Lyon, Committee Chair & Kimberly Fox, Committee Member

Fox / Legislation driven by the fact that many communities in California have not created travel-oriented community density ordinances. Bill proposed as top-down mandate, from State to Local, to bypass existing planning processes and grant broad exemptions that accomplish legislation’s author goal of forcing high density housing near key transit-rich locations in a community. However, same bill also eliminates the process of public input, structured planning and while creating an open check-book for developer greed. Los Angeles has taken the issue on and has crafted, through public process, a specific Transit-Oriented Communities housing density bonus scheme. Therefore, Los Angeles does not need the prodding of this state bill.
Lyon / Of specific concern to this community, where stakeholders still coming to grips with the impact of other State Bill mandates which override local planning and zoning, for example, SB1818.

Related Documents

- Westside Regional Association of Councils (WRAC) motion opposing SB 827.
- Del Rey Residents Association letter to oppose and withdraw SB 827.
- LA TOC Ordinance Text
- Committee Memo recapping situation.

Public Comment

Monica Wisebrich / No support for SB 827. Asked who to write to, against the bill, given has not yet been assigned to a Committee at state level. Asking NC to oppose.

Benjamin Steele / Spoken: Supports SB 827. Noted in Los Angeles 20% of population lives in poverty, 60K homeless. Believes lack of construction intended to protect property values. Cites co-workers spending 5x a month rent vs previous generations. Written on Speaker’s Card: Me and my generation have been systematically shut out of homeownership and the chance to forge our own future by a system rigged for existing landowners at every level. I oppose the PLUC motion and urge NCWP to support SB 827.

P. Dillmore / Against SB 827.

Committee Discussion

Voss / Suggests Committee secure map of CD11 target transit-oriented zone under LA TOC ordinance, versus proposed SB 827. This committee recommends to the NC Board; does not control or make policy for City of Los Angeles. Does not agree with proposed motion WRAC draft language. Views SB 827 as a free-for-all for developers. Issues of poverty etc are not addressed by this bill. Outside the Committee’s purview to comment on SB 827. Rather, Committee’s role to ask City to advise the State re SB 827 by objecting to the bill.

Smith / Main reason to act: SB 827 takes control out of local hands. State will trump local process and concerns.

Oliver / Bills seems to be totally anti what neighborhood councils are for. City of LA tries to put some responsibility for NC’s to give input because the city is so big. This bill it even worse because entire cities are cut out of the local process.

- Voss Motion: Los Angeles has been a leader in trying to address this at a local level and ask that you (City of Los Angeles) protect local control.
- Smith: Second.
- Vote: Passes unanimously.
Informational Item 5: 6711 S. Sepulveda (aka public storage replacement)

Background - First presentation to PLUC. Proposed construction of a new residential 180-unit apartment building with 210 parking spaces and 15 units reserved for Very Low Income households.

Presenter(s):

- Dana Sayles, AICP - Principal, Three6ixty (Developers rep)
- Olivia Joncich - Project Manager, Three6ixty (Developers rep)
- Rick Stinson - Development Partner, The Hanover Company (Houston, TX) (Developer)
- Ryan Hamilton - Development Partner, The Hanover Company (Houston, TX) (Developer)
- Michael Bates - President, The Mobility Group (Project Traffic Study)

Commentary from presenters. (See PDF presentations for detail.)

Project site

- Arizona Avenue - dirt. Ends and goes up the hill.
- Entitlements requested and provisions in plan:
  - Not include improving Arizona (street behind)
  - Transitional Height: single family homes uphill are 200 ft from site.
  - 180 units, max of 183. 15 units for Very Low Income; defined as making <50% of area income. Therefore, projecting 2 bedroom for VLI = $699/mo
  - FAR increase 5:1
  - Decrease in Open Space requirement
  - Height of 91’ as measured from lowest to highest points

Developer: Hanover Company

- West Coast development oriented
- “Lots of work in LA” - 4 in DTLA, 7 on 7 Olympic, projects in Westwood, Miracle Mile
- Target for property design: high-end hotel / club-type experience.
- 10 architects in-house. Also inhouse landscape design.
- Presented slides on amenities, visualizations of the property.

Traffic Analysis / Mike Bates (see PDF for details)

- Use the methodology that LADOT prescribes.
- Asked to look at 15 intersections by LA and Culver City.
- Document existing traffic, forecast out.
- Significant impact at Centinela and Sepulveda > working the mitigation re intersection in the City of Culver > developer to contribute to Culver City area-wide system for improved signals and traffic control.
- Both LA and Culver City have approved the traffic study.
- Driveway pattern: right in and right out

Related Documents
See attached PDFs.
Committee Member Questions

**Smith** / Considering putting equipment rooms on the roof? In terms of the 91’ height. Project immediately next to yours made concessions to make sure they don’t obstruct views of R1 on the hill.

**Oliver** / Have a couple things popping up, above the 91’?

  **Sayles** / Their elevator overrun is no higher than ours. Making sure we don’t exceed the height of their project at any point.

**Smith** / You’re planning a new curb cut? Replacing the existing one?

  **Sayles** / Confirmed.

**Smith** / Everyone coming in from North to South?

  **Sayles** / Yes.

**Smith** / What restrictions to keep people from turning in?

  **Bates** / A common system of pylons we’d pay for.

**David Oliver** / Therefore, people coming down the hill, are restricted from making a left turn?

**Lyon** / If I’m coming down the hill, where do I go?

  **Mike Bates** / The residents may adjust where they come from. We noted intersections where the U turns aren’t possible.

  **Sayles** / In traffic study, cut through traffic was something we were asked to look at. You can’t get to the site from the neighborhood to the West. Project vicinity map confirms it’s a challenging site for access. We’ve always anticipated the location will cater to jobs in Culver City and Playa Vista.

**Smith** / Would be a lot more desirable of a project if there was access from Arizona.

  **Sayles** / Arizona: rises steeply. A number of properties that have their own retaining walls. Slopes in 2 way. LADOT doesn’t allow streets with more than 15% slope. It’s not physically possible to improve without huge infrastructure. Also a problem: dead end that fire can’t turn around in.

**Voss** / Arizona is not the 15% grade in the first 100 or so yard. Fire dept would have no issue having a 2nd access from that side. There’s no requirement to build the road all the way into the neighborhood. Great concern about doing a U turn somewhere on Sepulveda, Centinela, into surrounding streets to get access.

  **Mike Bates** / Can make u turn in the hotel driveway.

**Voss** / NC spent a substantial amount of time working with Sandstone (immediately adjacent new apartment complex.) You don’t show an elevation from the property owners POV. The
drawing you’re showing are short the parapets and elevator overrun. If you need to, lose a story to hide the air conditioning units.

**Sayles** / Measured from lowest point on Sepulveda to lowest point.

**Voss** / We’re used to getting a traffic study. I don’t have any faith in your summation, and we know how to read a traffic study. Most of these intersections are already at grade F. So that when Culver City approved the now not happening office building, that EIR no avoidable impacts because intersections are already at an F so they couldn’t get worse. I need to see some analysis re Arizona - not 15% grade from Arizona to the back of your property. We explored this with Sandstone. As far in to the hill for them it’s a couple of stories high. Not with you. Show me the grading and that it can’t be done. It would make a much better project to have access not from one point but two.

**Bates** / The Mobility Group was hired to conduct traffic study for City of LA, not just Culver City.

**Oliver** / People coming down the hill, they’re restricted from making a left turn?

**Lyon** / If I’m coming down the hill, where do I go?

**Voss** / We want to see: did the study include the projections for Sandstone and changes for HH and Sepulveda, and the fact that there are 600 more units coming at HH also coming over Center Drive? These are real projects that are really taking place, dropping cars onto Sepulveda.

**Bates** / worked carefully with the City to identify future projects into the analysis.

**Lyon** / Note: before this leaves Committee, we need to get the traffic study, make sure we’re familiar with the data. Sometimes we’re aware of things in the process that need revisiting.

**Voss** / Additional absolute key things: What’s the view if I’m standing on the bluff? The other project (Sandstone) was held to 6” higher than where you’d stand. Given my view standing on the bluff, your building should be invisible from the hill top.

**Voss** / Do I understand correctly other than density bonus and site plan review, the only thing you’re asking for is the waiver of improvement for Arizona?

**Sayles** / Recap of requests (see above, presenter notes)

**Public Comment**

**Benjamin Steele** / Supports the project as perfect for the area. Urges the council to approve it as planned re # of units. Question: curious of the developers: given the tenants are likely young professionals, is it possible to make a safe biking route over to Playa Drive? Convenient to the buildings on the back side of Playa Vista? Also not sure all the extra parking is necessarily appropriate. It’s expensive to build of subterranean parking garage. Want to make sure it’s appropriate.
Jeffrey Rothman / Westport Heights resident for 35 years. I realize we have open spaces and we need to build. Insist that this project have entrance and egress only on the Arizona side. Sepulveda is a hell hole already. The developers would get a lot of love from the community with entrance on Arizona. Can also do bike ride friendly wide sidewalk. I used to bike in this city, but not anymore. If you do this you’d get a lot of love. The grade is minimal. This can be done.

Leigh Hill / A lot of what I was worried about have been covered. Curious about the water pressure and pipes. In a mile and a half is the Grinder project. There’s lots of development going on. After what happened at the 74th & La Tijera project, we found out they’d shut down the streets for weeks, didn’t have a permit for that. Very frustrating. Is there a way projects going forward could provide some transparency, so we can see what they’re planning, that they have the permits needed? Contractors at 74th & La Tijera closed the street repeatedly, and did so blatantly, without proper permits. We need more developer and project transparency.

Marianne Gutierrez / First, agree regarding issue that ingress and egress is only on Sepulveda. Would like to see it on Arizona as well. The likelihood is that people are going to do U’s and illegal turns. They’ll be turning onto 74th street. Traffic is very bad on Sepulveda already. I live 2 houses in from 74th and Sepulveda. Want to make sure that parking, construction workers are not allowed to park in the local residential area. Right now, on the Howard Hughes apartments project, we’ve got workers coming in, lining up at 6am. They park on my street, in front of my house, undress. Drop trow. After work it’s the same. And now we’re starting to get the residents of the Howard Hughes apartments parking on 74th as well. I think we need to get a guarantee in writing that this developer will be taking care of these issues, workers and tenants parking in the neighborhood.

Rosemary Lackow / Spoken: Currently a Westchester resident and retired planner. I understand this process is not a discretionary process, but site plan review. It goes through this vetting, NC makes a recommendation, a decision is made. Because it’s not a discretionary process, there would have to be a staff review of CEQA. Agree about traffic study. Concern about access other than Sepulveda. Thinking about the bluff project, that neighborhood fought hard to not have access to Lincoln. If you don’t have access on Arizona, please add some way for neighbors going through -- walk through. Trash pick-up is a big concern. Written: Concerned that infrastructure can’t support cumulative of new projects and their density. How long do affordable units stay affordable? When do they go up to market rate? Also believe the site is under-parked. Might meet code, but still under-parked.

John Ruhlen / Written: This area of Sepulveda does not have a median. This developer should fund to build a median at this location. It would prevent driver’s exiting this project to turn north on Sepulveda. Landscaping could also be part of the median.

Committee Discussion

- Voss Motion: Defer action
- Smith: Second
- Vote: Passes unanimously

Chair changed agenda items order, moved #9 into next discussion position.
Informational Item 9: MedMen LAX - 8740 S Sepulveda Boulevard

Background - Cannabis retailer near LAX. Part of chain operation (7 in SoCal, 5 in NY State, 1 store in Nevada). Business model based on vertical integration of growing facilities, manufacturing facilities and retail stores.

Presenter(s): Morgan Sokol, VP of Government Affairs, MedMen
- Took Committee through cannabis regulatory status landscape: LA, California and Federal level.
- Local MedMen retail shop expected to have recreational license with the week of this presentation.
- Local shop hours: 10am - 7:45pm
- Security: alarm, video surveillance, two security guards. One walks the perimeter to make sure no one is using in the area. Zero tolerance for any type of consumption in area around store.

Related Documents - MedMed presentation (PDF)

Public Comment

Gregg Aniolek / Attended cannabis social equity workshop. Discussion primarily about cannabis and statics: African American and Latino communities disproportionately arrested for cannabis. Kat Packard, new director of cannabis regulatory org spoke to point that people who live in the community should benefit from these new laws. Local people who’ve been persecuted for the longest time should benefit. PLUC might wish to get direction from Kat Packard. Submitted copy of 9/30/17 Workshop agenda.

Committee Discussion

Smith / Are you restricted 1000 ft from schools, adult center too?

   Sokol / Mapped the current location and got approval.

Hellwig / Charging sales tax? Cash only?

   Sokol / Yes and we accept credit cards.

Action Item 6: 5711 W 74th Street / Local Daycare Conditional Use Permit Request

Background - Third presentation to PLUC. Westchester community member Mary De La Rosa seeks support obtaining a CUP for a currently run in-home daycare to enroll more families. Business would convert from the property owner’s home and daycare operation to a daycare center using the whole house as a school. No construction or expansion of the property itself, just using the home as is. The home is in a R1 zone.

Presenters - Mary and Stephen De La Rosa, home and business co-owners; Lisset and Manny Gutierrez, business co-owers.
Lyon / From last time: asked you to do community outreach, find commercial locations, analyze options. Then come back to Committee.

Stephen De La Rosa
- Running under current licensing for 2 years.
- Capacity of 12 children; now 17 families = mixed of PT and FT care. At any one time no more than 12 children.
- Licensing agent suggested seeking CUP to expand the operation.
- Looking for our support for application to the City.
- Used 500 ft radius map, took that mailing list.

Mary De La Rosa
- Met CUP requirements and took further measures as well.
- Community Outreach: Met with Anna Kozma (CD11), took recommendations re outreach. Decided to go door to door. About to obtain 50 signatures. Neighbors that we share fences signed. Across the street, she signed as well. We left flyers, mailed it out. Some responses; came and toured the school. They also signed off in support. Some people signing off from addresses larger than the 500 ft radius. Got the Westchester Mom’s Better Schools group. Both admins came and toured and wrote letter of support. Some neighbors approached (across the street, 5 houses down) were not aware a daycare was in operation at that address.

- Safety: currently held accountable by licensing agency; can do surprise visit at any time. All staff required to be certified in first aide. As educator for over 15 years, never received a citation. Gated, locked entrance used solely for the school. Should the project go forward, would create similar secure entrance at front door. 24 hr surveillance camera. Partnering with neighbor on Flight to start a neighborhood watch.

- Parking: Parking was first requirement; City wouldn’t take school’s application without it. Got a lease with the Post Office -- had to work it with someone in DC. Copy in the packet. They were supportive and flexible. City only requires 2 additional parking spaces, but plan on leasing more to make sure staff parking is not a disturbance. Once enacted, policy will require faculty to park there.

- Traffic Impacts: Time-stamped sign in and sign out. Some PT students so have drops and pick-ups in middle of day. 50% of the families drop off after 9am. Flexible between 7:30 through 11am. Been almost a non-issue. The parking re the construction has been much more of a disruption.

- Priority for Westport Heights applicants: Definitely doable to prioritize accepted applications this way. Possible hold 60% for Westport Heights residents. 20 enrollment calls a day, 10 applications a week. Mostly from Westport Heights. Can write it into a condition that we give priority to Westport Heights. By keeping applicants and enrollees in neighborhood, less traffic.
Public Comment

Grace Yau / Speaking not as a board member or representing the university. Here as a parent and neighbor. Express support. Not just for school or ownership but all families served by the school. Preschool serve our community. There is a real lack of quality preschools in our community. I grew up here, moved back to Westchester 4 years ago and couldn’t find a preschool. Plenty of day cares for 2 and up. But toddlers, couldn’t find anything. I have friends who encounter problem send their kids to Santa Monica, etc. They were in a home daycare in Hollywood last summer, and it was like an extension of our family. Tuition is considerably lower than tuition other places. Huge need. Concern that if we do this the flood gates will open. Not everyone will qualify to open a school. Support for this community serving facility.

Marianne Gutierrez / I’m on the same street, but on the other end from the school. From what We still get a lot of cut through traffic and that’s one concern. The other thing is property values. Will it change the neighborhood? Property values? Things like that? Will there be a sign out now for their school in their front-yard. Don’t know how that changes the dynamic of the neighborhood.

Jennie DiPaolo / Lives at 5716 W 74th, the neighbor across the street. Moved to Westport Heights 13 years. We describe it as Mayberry in LA. We were happy to see the business for families, loving people, they’re concerned about safety. We often see the little ones dropped off and picked up. As we take our own children to school, there’s never a problem with traffic. The current “traffic” is negligible. They come a few at a time and at all different times. Parents are good about walking their kids on the sidewalk. See more women who are pregnant. Priority for the neighborhood and can walk to it. Understand concern about business on your street.

Courtney Armstrong / Son is 4 has being going there for half his life. It’s a truly astounding program, they grow their own food, they cook, huge emphasis on kindness and community. My husband and I are both working parents and need daycare to function. We looked at LMU and First Flight, he’s 4.5 and he’s still not off those waiting lists. That experience is not unique, as parent it’s terrifying to put your kids some place. I live on Gonzaga, I get traffic. I was the 11:30am pick up today, we stopped in their drive way, in and out. Administrators actively communicate with us re parking and that’s what we do.

Jessica Ferguson / Lived in Westchester 14 years, last 5 on 75th and Flight. Support CUP to add 7 more families to their school. Not enough quality early childhood programs in the
neighborhood. Drove to Culver City for my first, and El Segundo for my second child. I wish I had an option in my neighborhood. Support priority for local families. See it as a necessity. Let’s not drive out of the neighborhood for quality education.

Benjamin Steele / Spoken comment: Admire their effort to grow their business. Looked up census. 23% decline in young kids. The fastest growing demographic is elders. If you don’t allow new blood into the community, it gets old. Written comment: I support this daycare, and would like to point out the Council’s double standard in talking about R1 for the housing crisis.

Walt Fellows / Written Comment: Limited to no parking for drop off. Traffic congestion in residential neighborhood. Zone R1, not for commercial.

Jennifer Stripe Portillo / Parent of a one enrolled and one graduate. In this community for 5 years. Before the moving truck moved away from our home, I started looking for preschool. I got on lists. We commuted out of Westchester back to Mar Vista and that gets old fast. We found creative Explorers in late 2015 and delighted to be there ever since. There are a number of factors re the CUP request. There are an inadequate # of quality preschools. Hyper local, top quality program has turned my shy 3 year old, into someone who helps prepares snacks. Families good for Westchester, and Creative Explorers is good for families. Investment in Creative Explorers is an investment in good citizens, to be kind, etc.

Stacey Travis / Have some questions re potentially opposing POV. I spent a year to try and get Waze to stop coming onto our streets to get onto 76th. Many people who lived on 74th and 75th. You’ll hear we have condos at Sepulvenda, La Tiera. Will clog Sepulveda and challenge getting in and out of the Westport Heights. I get that it’s very hard to find childcare. On Walgrove: landlord said the day care there had lowered their property values lowered. It’s quiet now, but won’t necessarily continue. Concerned we already have 2 sober houses and 2 frats. Where do we stop? Business or residents?

Scott Henry / Spoken Comment: I’m back and forth on 74th out of La Tijera. I’ve never been blocked by anyone dropping off, no double parking. Talking about 7 cars max added on, doesn’t seem it will cause a tremendous back-up. Written Comment: I approve this business being located at the proposed address and have noticed no traffic issues during their time in the neighborhood.

Patrick Orr / Spoken Comment: We moved into 74th. This benefits us tremendously. The ability to walk my daughter is tremendous. There’s not a park we can walk to. Being able take her to school in the morning and pick her up by foot. We’re on the waiting list right now. This would be terrific. Written Comment: The expansion of this day care center would greatly benefit my wife and I who live in the neighborhood and will be hopefully sending our daughter to the school at the beginning of the Fall this year.

Sandra Mills / I live on 74th. Over the years I’ve seen it change a bit. I’d be pleasantly surprised if no more cars come up the street, hopefully not a lot of cars. What scares me the most is what would stop other homes from doing a business. I think it’s wonderful that the kids have a place to go. I don’t want any more traffic on the street, businesses on the street. 74th had become a highway. When I come home, I pass their home and I really didn’t realize it was daycare. And
worried the little sign might turn into a bigger sign. Worried the most about traffic and people who might want to take out a permit for something else.

**Robert Carbajal /** Speak in favor. 2 sober houses on our street too, we saved all our lives to come to Westchester. I see values are all going up, Playa Vista Silicon Beach, it’s only enhanced our property values. We’ve seen presentation of multi-units that are going to come. Going to create more traffic. I have a person on my street that’s running a chauffeur service and don’t know who that is. Sober houses - don’t know who they are. This a preschool, just adding 7 kids, and it’s not that much compared to what we’re going to see coming very soon.

**Committee Discussion**

**Lyon /** The issue that the Committee had was the same last time: the repurposing of the property without living in the property. Makes it a business. When you don’t live in the property, it’s no longer people living and running a business there.

When you came to use, we asked you: will you reach out to commercial property? What assurance do we have that when you buy another home, going to do this again? Possibly another set of neighbors saying I don’t want to live next to a business when I bought in R1.

**Stephen De La Rosa /** The CUP is restricted to the parcel it’s assigned to it. Just because ours gets through doesn’t translate to another business. We’re the first CUP to get daycare since 1987. No one else has done it since. Don’t believe it will open the flood gates. Because we’re 2 houses away from commercial properties, that’s what allows us to try for this. Also, blessed with huge yard and can’t meet that in commercial locations.

**Mary De La Rosa /** You can say you can’t start another business, I’ll sign up for that. Daycare is one of the few businesses you can CPU. Re commercial alternative, broker said “you’re looking for a needle in a haystack. Looked into the church. Pastor willing to rent out, but all upstairs. We can’t do that with our license. We reached out to all the churches, they all have to get a CUP. We’re on our 5th commercial broker. We’re willing to go outside Westchester. In addition: also reached out to another real estate manager, in the business for 20 years. His experience selling properties: has never seen a preschool in a residential area that negatively affected property values.

Understand you had negative emails. It’s common for people to interchange day care with preschool Daycare where there’s no curriculum, 12 kids. Ours is very different. They could make more $$ working in the school district. The hire staff to offer higher ratios than required.

**Smith /** Can’t find anyone who will say anything negative about you. Your request the hardest one that’s come to me. Our decision tonight isn’t about you, but about the use of the property.

**Oliver /** I also live on 74th street. I have nothing bad to say about what you do. It’s what you do Talking about a dangerous precedent. A couple of guys, only 7 then why not stay the way you are. Leave it. Everyone is happy. There are other criteria to get a CUP hair salon other in-home businesses. Then the guy gets two limo places on one side or the other. Stay the way you are. Keep looking for commercial space. Not like we’re seeking you go out of business. Just asking you to say with the status quo.
Many other things with bigger impact happening in the neighborhood. And the City of LA has already decided this is an acceptable use of R1 space. Hard time understanding why the homeowner would dedicate a property worth around $1M for the sole purpose of daycare. But if they want to, that’s their choice. Appears to have strong community support. Re argument of precedent setting: have confidence that if another applicant came for similar CUP, I trust that we would be able to judge by how the applicant presents and the work they’re willing to do to earn approval if they deserve support or not. Supporting this request does not obligate me, or the Committee, to support every other application in future.

I don’t see a problem. The traffic will be the apartments (at 74th & La Tijera.) That will be a much better impact than 7 kids. I don’t see an explosion of Westport Heights homes converting into daycare.

Do you think if you had time, more resources like the Mom’s Group you could find a commercial space solution? If we gave you another month or two, with the power of these people (indicates community in audience), do you believe you could find another location that’s not R1.

Licensing agent right now is under heavy work load. If we were to find a commercial property she can’t come for a year to qualify for licensing. So even if we find a property, we’d have to pay for up to a year before we can get licensed.

we want the space we need. If everything was right, willing to get a break for 3 months.

Plan is to move out, run the daycare, and get another house?

Probably have to rent.

Can we have another month to work on an alternative? Many churches are my customers.

One more month. If we take a vote tonight, it may not be what you want. Garret (Smith) volunteering to work with you. Call on others who support you to help.

If we get a church, we’d be asking for another CUP.

We would be more comfortable with placement in a church.

Committee Action: Chair to applicant to return in one month.

Action Item 7: 7366 Osage (aka Mortuary)

Background - Second presentation to PLUC. New property owner/developer proposing replacement of current mortuary with public storage building. 45,000 sq. ft. 45’ height. Possible to build “by-right” without community input, but developer interested in collaborative process.
Lyon / In last meeting asked developer to address community outreach, design modifications, community use or collaboration.

**Ehrlich & Emerson**

- **Design modification** - Per input revisited design of “skin” of upper stories. Determined better design solution to work business name into this skin rather than hang commercial signage. Have confirmed plan is within LA sign code ordinance for wall sign.

- **Community Service and Engagement** - redesigned of lobby area; removed mechanicals room at far end of lobby, to basement. Opened up entire run of lobby at building front. Ground floor façade is now completely transparent. Created a space for community amenity such as exhibition space.

Other modifications:
- Included 6’ perimeter wall in elevation drawing (missing on side shared with church parking lot.)
- Silver of the screen “skin” modified so not “too shiny”
- Moved back edge of top story out 6-8’ (taking up more roof area).

**CUP Requests:**
- Allow parking on R1 section of parcel (currently parking now)
- Allow basement extension: subterranean floors extend out under parking lot area
- Transitional Height: start point for calculations begin where R1 property runs coincident to C2 property.
- Allow residential units: housing for staff residents on 3rd floor. Improves safety of building and area around.
- Allow parking reduction: no truck rental or auto storage, therefore asking for reduction in parking to 17 spaces instead of 35. Note loading area for building customers located inside the building.

**Public Comment** - None

**Committee Discussion** - None

**Committee Action**

- Hellwig: Motion to support.
- Smith: Second
- Vote: unanimous to support.

**Action Item 8: Chick-Fil-A @ La Cienega and Centinela**

**Background** - First presentation to PLUC. Chick-Fil-A proposes to construct at 4642 sq. ft. building with a drive-thru on the NW corner of La Cienega and Centinela. The project requires site plan review approval from the city.
Presenter(s):
- Jonathon Lonner and Tina Choi, Lobbyists
- Jennifer Daw, Development Manager, Chick-Fil-A Inc.

- Site plan review, triggered by trip count via drive thru. Therefore, will have traffic study.
- Upgraded landscaping.
- Focused on sitting well on site, dealing with traffic.
- Drive thru staking to accommodate 20 cars, trying to capture as many car within the site as possible.
- Facilitating drive through order with team member in drive thru area taking orders. Gets trip through drive thru in 1 minute.

Related Documents
- Site Plan
- Exterior Elevations (B&W)
- Exterior Elevations & Renderings (Color)
- Preliminary Landscape Plan

Public Comment

Benjamin Steele / Not in favor of the project. Low value use. We’ve heard so many comments about traffic, pedestrian impact. Cyclist or pedestrian, must float through sea of cars (in drive thru line). I don’t see this as being very well in line for some of your stated goals.

Committee Discussion

Hellwig / Seating?

Lonner / 117 with playground area.

Smith & Oliver / positive on the project.

Fox / Per community comment, look again at pedestrian consideration re site layout and flow.

Lyon / Request return presentation to PLUC to address community benefits, traffic study, bike and pedestrian smoothing.

Item 10: Previous Committee Action Updates - No discussion

Item 11: Announcements - No discussion.

Item 12: Meeting Adjourned

[end]