

SUBJECT: A REQUEST TO DEVELOP A MIXED-USE PROJECT (EXPANSION/CONVERSION OF AN EXISTING OFFICE BUILDING TO RESIDENTIAL WITH GROUND FLOOR RETAIL AND CONSTRUCTION OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON THE ADJACENT PARKING LOT) INCLUDING A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, A SPECIFIC PLAN, A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, A VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP AND OTHER PERMITS.

ADDRESS: 8899 BEVERLY BOULEVARD AND
8846 – 8908 ROSEWOOD AVENUE

INITIATED BY: DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
(David J. DeGrazia, Planning Manager, CHPP)
(Emily Stadnicki, AICP, Senior Planner)

This additional information supplements the original August 7, 2014 staff report.

STATEMENT ON THE SUBJECT

On August 5, 2014, the applicant submitted the attached letter agreeing to shared amenities as recommended by the City's housing staff. This programmatic change better aligns with City policies and staff is now in support of the affordable housing portion of the project as conditioned in the August 7, 2014 staff report [Housing Recommendation and Analysis (Exhibit E) and Resolution (Exhibit I)].

However, staff has determined that this project still does not meet the thresholds for a General Plan Amendment to the extent required and continues to recommend denial of the project.

In response to Mr. Haber's suggested modifications to Resolution No. PC 14-1093 (Exhibit I of the original staff report):

- Staff acknowledges that Conditions 7.16 through 7.21 and 7.23 were included in error and confirms that they will be removed.
- Staff maintains the position that the project would benefit from additional revision to the design and will not delete subsections a through d of Condition 9.10 outlining that process.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Letter from Jeff Haber for Beverly Blvd Associates, L.P. (August 5, 2014)
- B. Additional correspondence received since staff report was published

This page intentionally left blank

August 5, 2014

West Hollywood Planning Commission
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Re: 8899 Beverly Boulevard
DMP-012-022, DVP-012-043, GPA-012-003, TTM-012-004, ZMA-012-017

Dear Chair Huebner and Honorable Commissioners:

On behalf of Beverly Blvd Associates, L.P. (the “**Applicant**”), the owner and developer of the proposed project located at 8899 Beverly Boulevard (the “**Project**”), we are writing to respectfully request that the Planning Commission adopt the resolutions of approval attached as Exhibits G through J of the Community Development Department Staff Report (the “**Staff Report**”) prepared for the August 7, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. We would like to thank City Staff, and in particular Emily Stadnicki, for preparing resolutions that clearly set forth the extraordinary and tangible public benefits that justify the Planning Commission’s ability to recommend that the City Council amend the General Plan, adopt the Specific Plan, and approve the Project.

I. PROJECT REVISIONS IN RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY INPUT

As described in my letter of July 15, 2014, and discussed at the Planning Commission hearing on July 17, 2014, the Applicant has agreed to reduce the number of market-rate units along Rosewood Avenue in response to comments from neighbors and representatives of the West Hollywood West community about the Project. The Project would now include only 9 detached single-family homes along Rosewood Avenue,¹ rather than 13 attached townhomes. The single-family homes are designed to be integrated with the neighborhood, and would fully comply with the R1B development standards, including the 25’ height limit, the 15’ front yard setback and a floor area ratio of 0.5:1 within the Rosewood portion of the Project. In fact, the total number of units along Rosewood Avenue, including those in the City-required affordable building, is 33% lower, with 25% fewer driveways, than would otherwise be permitted under the R1B zone.

II. SHARED AMENITY CONDITION RECOMMENDED BY STAFF

As the Staff Report indicates, the Applicant has had many discussions with Staff about the affordable housing to be provided in this Project. While the previous housing conditions had required affordable amenity space comparable to the market-rate amenities because Staff believed that those conditions better met the affordable housing needs of the City, Staff has changed its recommendation to require shared amenities, and the Applicant will accept the shared amenity requirement recommended by Staff if that better meets the affordable housing needs of the City.

¹ These single-family homes would be airspace condominium units over the subterranean garage.

West Hollywood Planning Commission
August 5, 2014
Page 2

III. THE PROJECT IS CONSISTENT WITH ALL RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN USES, GOALS AND POLICIES

The Project is consistent with the uses, goals and policies set forth by the General Plan for the Project site. On the Beverly Boulevard side, the Project provides new residential uses within the existing commercial building, which is not only permissible, but encouraged under the General Plan. On the Rosewood Avenue frontage, the Project converts an incompatible, fully commercial parking lot used by more than 2000 cars per week into a fully residential use. The existing building and adjoining parking lot have existed as one entirely commercial use for nearly 50 years, long before the City incorporated, much less the adoption of the General Plan in 2011. At the time of adoption of the General Plan, no one contemplated that the commercial use would or could change. What the Project does, however, is take an office building with a commercial parking lot in a residential zone and turn it into a mixed-use development with affordable housing and a 2.8 FAR, a project that is not only permitted but actively encouraged throughout the General Plan.

The Project implements numerous General Plan goals and policies, as set forth in detail in Exhibits H and I attached to the Staff Report. Exhibit I to the Staff Report describes how the Project aids the City in achieving General Plan goals, objectives, and policies pertaining to the provision of affordable housing, economic development within the City, land uses and forms within the City, and increasing the efficiency of the built environment. Consistent with these goals and policies, the Project would support a broad range of housing choices, retail businesses, employment opportunities, and other supportive urban uses within the City (Policy LU-1.1). With respect to the 8899 Beverly Boulevard building, consistent with adopted General Plan policies, the Project would involve an adaptive reuse of the existing building (Policy H-4.3) to provide a mixed-use development with a diverse range of housing options (Policies LU-2.3 and H-3.1), including affordable rental housing (Goal H-1), and located along a major commercial corridor served by high levels of public transit (Policy LU-2.1), which would encourage a variety of retail, creative office, commercial and residential uses to support the City's vision for the area (Policy LU-11.1). The street-level renovations would focus on human-scale frontage design by removing the elevated entry ramps and storefronts and bringing the retail storefronts to street level, which would significantly enhance the pedestrian experience in this area (Policy LU-4.2). The Project would enhance and activate the Beverly Boulevard frontage by creating direct street-level access to several of the retail tenant spaces, as well as through the installation of street trees and landscape elements. The Project would facilitate the transformation of Beverly Boulevard into a walkable, mixed-use boulevard (Policy LU-11.4) by creating an attractive and interesting pedestrian environment. The conversion of office space to residential uses would result in only residential uses being located on the north side of the building facing the residential community to the north, instead of the current commercial uses.

Along Rosewood Avenue, the Project would remove an incompatible commercial parking lot and restore residential uses with a combination of setbacks, scale transitions, and buffers in relation to the existing residential areas to the north and east, in order to maintain physical compatibility between the new and existing buildings. The replacement of a commercial parking

West Hollywood Planning Commission
August 5, 2014
Page 3

lot with residential uses (Policy LU-8.9), and providing opportunities for new construction of housing (Goal H-4), including affordable rental housing (Goal H-1), are specifically identified in the General Plan as policies of the City, and would be implemented by the Project. The restoration of residential uses to Rosewood Avenue would also serve to stabilize and protect the surrounding residential areas.

Moreover, this adaptive reuse Project implements all these General Plan goals and policies without creating any adverse impacts. The EIR concludes that the Project would not result in any long-term significant impacts, and would generate less traffic than the current use. Indeed, the traffic study concludes that the conversion from a 100% commercial use to a primarily residential use would actually reduce traffic, including a 47% decrease in AM peak hour trips and a 20% decrease in PM peak hour trips.

IV. CONCLUSION

As discussed in detail in Exhibit H to the Staff Report, the Project meets all four of the criteria set forth in General Plan Policy LU-2.8 that should be used to consider increases in the General Plan's permitted FAR and height, namely that the Project would: i) expand an existing facility and introduce new uses considered to be of significant importance; ii) provide significant benefits to the City; iii) offer architectural design that is of unusual merit and would enhance the City; and iv) provide affordable housing. The Project would include 17 on-site affordable units, including 7 for very low-income households, which the City would not otherwise require. The affordable units would be appropriately-sized and would remain as rentals rather than for-sale, in order to more closely fit the City's affordable housing needs. In addition, the Project would contribute \$1 million to the City's Affordable Housing Trust Fund for the development of additional affordable housing units in the City. The Project would also provide amenities for the affordable units, space for meetings and gatherings for use by neighbors and the City, as well as additional public benefits. Finally, the Planning Commission Design Review Subcommittee determined that the Project was "elegant and understated" and "absolutely sensational".

Therefore, if the Planning Commission agrees, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution Nos. PC 14-1091 through PC 14-1094 attached as Exhibits G through J to the Staff Report, with the following modifications to Resolution No. PC 14-1093 (Exhibit I):

- i) delete Conditions 7.16 through 7.21 since they are applicable to a different project;
- ii) modify Condition 7.23 to reflect the correct description of commercial uses and corresponding areas for each within the Project; and
- iii) delete subsections a through d of Condition 9.10 and require that the final design of the Project be in substantial conformance with the approved plans.

PAUL
HASTINGS

West Hollywood Planning Commission
August 5, 2014
Page 4

Thank you for your consideration, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely yours,



Jeffrey S. Haber
of PAUL HASTINGS LLP

cc: City Staff
Beverly Blvd Associates, L.P.

LEGAL_US_W # 79429141

August 4, 2014

Via email

City of West Hollywood Planning Commission
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90069

RE: 8899 Beverly Boulevard Mixed Use Project — August 7 Planning Commission hearing

Dear Chair Huebner, Vice-Chair Aghaei and Honorable Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment again on the 8899 Beverly Boulevard Mixed Use project, and, specifically, to address the letter submitted by the applicant (attorney, Jeffrey Haber) at the last Planning Commission hearing.

For the record, I am not opposed to adaptive reuse of the 8899 Beverly Boulevard building nor am I opposed to kicking out the first floor commercial towards Beverly (south side) to improve “the Beverly Boulevard retail experience.” However, I am opposed to the request for a Specific Plan – specifically, changing the zoning of Rosewood, and adding height and density to the east, west and north sides of the 8899 Beverly building, which, as you know, is already non-conforming. The existing building is at least three to four times taller than any building would be allowed in a CC1 zone, and has a far greater density (floor area ratio or “FAR”) than what is allowed in the CC1 zone. The existing building could not be built under current zoning.

The Applicant suggests that under applicable state law and the city’s municipal code, “the city may not deny the project since it qualifies for a density bonus and provides affordable housing.” The Applicant’s use of California Government Code Section 65915(e)(1) is not entirely correct, as the code has limitations in its application to an expansion; i.e., increasing height/density, of an already non-conforming building. According to California Code Section 65915, the law pertaining to the SB 1818 density bonus, “Maximum allowable residential density” is based upon the density allowed under the zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan.

“Maximum allowable residential density” means the density allowed under the zoning ordinance and land use element of the general plan, or if a range of density is permitted, means the maximum allowable density for the specific zoning range and land use element of the general plan applicable to the project. Where the density allowed under the zoning ordinance is inconsistent with the density allowed under the land use element of the general plan, the general plan density shall prevail.”

According to California State law, a density bonus is calculated based on the current zoning allowed by the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, not a non-conforming building.

That is not to say that the Applicant can't undertake an adaptive reuse of 8899 Beverly. They can still convert the commercial building to housing as they can include the required affordable housing within the existing building and still meet the requirements of the City's affordable housing ordinance — without adding any additional height or density to the building.

It is important to note that the feasibility of this project as proposed is completely dependent upon the City's approval of a Specific Plan. However, the City is not required by California Code 65915 to approve a Specific Plan so that the Applicant can propose an out-of-scale project that happens to provide affordable housing. There is no such requirement. The City is not required to change R1B zoned land to a non-residential zoning through a Specific Plan.

The proposed Specific Plan, which would provide the change in zoning that the Applicant is asking for (or should I say, demanding!) in order to accommodate this project, is clearly spot zoning.

The Applicant claims that the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") "found no inconsistencies between the Project as proposed and the General Plan." The Applicant is mistaken as there are some very obvious inconsistencies between the project and the General Plan. The proposed project is not the type of mixed-use project that is alluded to in the General Plan, its residential component is not the type of housing specified in the General Plan (i.e., artist live/work housing), and Beverly Boulevard is not a designated Transit Overlay Zone, so the additional height and density is not planned for in the General Plan or the Program EIR. LU-11.1 of the General Plan, which speaks specifically to the Melrose/Beverly District, clearly states:

"Encourage a variety of retail, creative office, commercial, and residential uses to support the vision for the area.

a. Maintain and enhance the concentration of arts and design-related uses.

b. Continue to allow a wide variety of uses including retail, galleries, boutiques, cafes, restaurants, creative office space, entertainment venues, bars, and nightclubs.

c. Allow limited housing on Beverly Boulevard. These opportunities should be focused on artist live/work housing."

The Applicant claims that the project is presenting a "unique opportunity" to locate units in the far west area of the city. The offering of affordable units on the west side of the city is actually not unique. The Melrose Triangle project is offering 15 affordable units; the Palm project is offering 8 affordable units. In fact, several buildings comprised entirely of affordable units already exist on the west side, including, but not limited to, one on West Knoll and two on Palm – all located on the west side of the city and within a reasonable distance of a major transportation corridor.

The applicant claims that the project provides “extraordinary public benefits” and that the public benefits justify adopting the Specific Plan and amending the General Plan. Offering one million dollars in exchange for a General Plan amendment and “the gift” of a Specific Plan is surely “extraordinary” – although more so because it appears to be a blatant attempt to buy off our City’s General Plan and zoning codes.

If the City Council accepts this offer by approving this project, they are sending a very clear and dangerous message: that our City’s General Plan is for sale – and that zoning and land use policies can be bought – albeit at a high price – but also to the detriment of its local businesses and residents. Is this the direction we want to take as a city?

Interestingly, in the Applicant’s discussion of public benefits, they do not address the public benefit that the City would be losing if the project were to be approved, and that is, much-needed green space. The original approval of the 8899 Beverly building required, as a condition of approval, a landscaped buffer along Rosewood Avenue. That landscaped buffer – now filled with large, lush trees and bushes and other greenery – would be removed and a public benefit taken away from the community if this project were to be approved as proposed.

In this urbanized area, a little green space goes a long way in terms of being a public benefit – especially when one sees the number of people walking their companion animals at the landscaped buffer on Rosewood on a daily basis. I don’t believe anyone can argue the point that our city has limited green space and, particularly, for our four-legged friends.

Further, removing this green space would be contrary to our City’s Climate Action Plan. Section G-1.1 of the City’s Climate Action Plan specifically gives direction to: ***“Increase and enhance the City’s urban forest to capture and store carbon and reduce building energy consumption.”***

In the Applicant’s discussion regarding reduction in market-rate units along Rosewood Avenue, they state that, with these changes, the development along Rosewood Avenue “would respect all material zoning requirements of the R1B zone, including the height limit, setback requirements, and density limits (the floor area ratio would be 0.675:1, which equals the base 0.5:1 density with the 35% bonus for providing affordable housing).”

A .675:1 FAR, which is 35% larger than the floor area ratio currently allowed in the R1B zone – is certainly not respecting the zoning requirements of the R1B zone – materially or otherwise! Please note, the neighbors don’t necessarily object to the construction of single-family homes or duplexes on Rosewood as long as the Rosewood property remains residentially zoned R1B, the structures comply with R1B zoning requirements, and are subject to the NCOZ, which is being prepared to cover the entire West Hollywood West neighborhood.

Letter to Planning Commission
8899 Beverly Blvd. Mixed Use Project
Page 4

Lastly, the City is not required to grant the concessions or incentives requested by the Applicant if the City makes a finding, based upon substantial evidence, of any of the following:

“(A) The concession or incentive is not required in order to provide for affordable housing costs, as defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code, or for rents for the targeted units to be set as specified in subdivision (c).

(B) The concession or incentive would have a specific adverse impact, as defined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households.”

If the Applicant miscalculated returns on their investment, it is not the burden of the City to alter the City’s zoning or General Plan in order to accommodate their proposed project.

I respectfully ask that you recommend denial of the proposed project and Specific Plan. Again, to allow additional density and/or height on top of an already non-conforming structure and to compromise our R1B zoning would set a dangerous precedent that would jeopardize the integrity of the commercial and residential neighborhoods adjacent to the project as well as throughout the city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Lauren Meister
West Hollywood Resident
ph: 310 [REDACTED]; email: lauren@[REDACTED]

Cc: Stephanie DeWolfe - Director of Community Development, City of West Hollywood
John Keho - Assistant Community Development Director, City of West Hollywood
David DeGrazia - Planning Manager, City of West Hollywood
Emily Stadnicki - Senior Planner, City of West Hollywood
Richard Giesbret - President, WHWRA
Seth Meier - Rosewood Resident

Subject:

FW: 8899

August 5th, 2014

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We live one-block from the 8899 Beverly Blvd project on Ashcroft in West Hollywood West, so please consider these comments as coming from both neighbors and from citizens of this City who want it to move in the right direction.

First, in addressing the Rosewood part of the property, it seems to us that there has been substantial consideration and sensitivity by the developers to accommodate our concerns by scaling down the Rosewood side of the property to single-family homes. Certainly we are very pleased with the change. With regard to the Beverly building, we only hear one objection: that of modifying the General Plan in order to accommodate this project. Of course this argument is meaningless without the context of the General Plan itself by which to examine the project.

The simple fact is that the proposed project is perfectly consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. Moreover, it should be the example of responsible development for furthering the City's vision for progress and innovation, particularly in that it creates no significant impacts but rather reduces some impacts. Specifically, we would like to point out the overwhelmingly consistent policies from all elements of the General Plan, be it the Mobility section, the Land Use section, the Housing section or the Implementation section. The following are just some of the policies that seem as though they were tailor-written for this project:

- a. "Mixed-use development with residential, commercial and office uses is encouraged near major intersections and in locations with high frequency service." CHECK
- b. "Direct the majority of new development to the City's commercial corridors served by high levels of existing future public transit." CHECK
- c. "Continue to implement parking strategies and standards that ensure parking areas do not dominate street frontages and are screened from public views whenever possible." CHECK
- d. "Allow residential mixed-use development in commercial corridors." CHECK
- e. "Implement Transit Overlay Zone that allows for modifications to the development standards to encourage mixed-use development near major transit nodes." CHECK
- f. "Allow increases to permitted density/intensity and height for projects that provide affordable housing." CHECK
- g. "Encourage the reuse of existing commercial structures..." CHECK
- h. "Facilitate the transformation of Beverly Blvd over time into a walkable, mixed-use boulevard that capitalizes on nearby planned fixed route transit service and the areas proximity to Cedars Sinai Medical Center." CHECK
- i. "Require high quality and varied architecture of all new developments to reflect the creative businesses and to showcase international design talent." CHECK
- j. "Support the overall experience of the streetscape through the active and transparent ground floor frontages with main entries that face the street." CHECK
- k. "Facilitate the diverse range of housing options including but not limited to single family homes, second/accessory units, multi family rentals, condominiums and townhomes and housing in mixed use developments." CHECK
- l. "Encourage and provide incentives for the development of housing in mixed-use and transit oriented developments." CHECK
- m. "Encourage the adaptive reuse of existing structures for residential purposes." CHECK
- n. "A key policy direction of the City's General Plan is to ease the development pressures from residential neighborhoods while providing opportunities for new housing construction and mixed-use and transit oriented along commercial corridors. The City proposed rezoning and upzoning [...] Beverly Blvd to encourage commercial, mixed-use, and transit oriented developments. The Mixed-Use Overlay zone is intended to focus on commercial corridors." CHECK
- o. "To encourage the construction of affordable housing..." CHECK
- p. "Density: Generally, the closer that people are geographically to where they work, live, and/or shop, the shorter distances they have to travel to meet their daily needs, and the more origins and destinations that are within walking distance. In densely populated environments, people are more likely to access their daily needs by walking, for example, because the distances are accessible to pedestrians." CHECK
- q. "Diversity: People need not to travel as far and as frequently when they are in proximity to a diversity of land uses, such as housing

within walking and biking distance of jobs, services and stores- including the essential grocery store, coffee shop, neighborhood eatery, hardware store, schools, childcare, and other everyday goods and services.” CHECK

Big picture, this project is doing three fundamental things that are not only positive, but also downright necessary:

1. Add diverse housing opportunities, including affordable housing, without depleting the current housing stock of the City.
2. Return a commercial parking lot into low density residential.
3. Repurpose the City’s assets without causing any traffic or environmental impacts.

We will be highly encouraged to see a unanimous vote by this Commission to support this project and to move this City even closer towards its own express policy objectives.

We’re unfortunately unable to attend the August 7th hearing due to prior obligations, but we ask that you take these points under consideration prior to the hearing.

Sincerely,
David & Rocky Binswanger

[REDACTED]

From: Ash <abriskman@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, August 02, 2014 2:31 PM
To: Emily Stadnicki
Subject: 8899 Beverly Blvd.

Dear Ms Stadnicki:

I am one of the owners of [REDACTED] Rosewood and new to the neighborhood having moved in at the end of 2011. I just love the neighborhood. After my long days as an attorney it is really great to be able to come home and walk to most anywhere I might want to from my home. The neighbors all watch out for one another and most take pride in their homes continually upgrading and maintaining them in a first rate condition.

The only issue for me as a single woman is the lack of security I sense when walking my dog late at night. The dimly lit blighted area on the property mid block is always a "what if". I am very supportive of the idea that the owners of 8899 Beverly Blvd. have applied for permission to develop those vacant lots. Proper lighting and increased viability will make for a more secure environment for the entire neighborhood.

I fully support the proposed plan to upgrade our block. I hope with the proper conditions in place to minimize as much as possible the impacts during construction you will seriously consider approving the project.

Most sincerely,

Ashley M. Briskman
[REDACTED] Rosewood Drive

[REDACTED]

From: bjarne hecht <bjarneny@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 6:58 PM
To: Emily Stadnicki
Subject: Regarding 8899 Beverly Blvd

Hello,

I am a WeHo resident and I had heard about the re-development of 8899 Beverly Blvd. I understand there is a hearing this Thursday on the project, but unfortunately I cannot attend, so I wanted to let my thoughts be known here. I think the project looks and sounds good and I was all for it UNTIL today when I heard that the project wants to follow recent trends from other big cities, by basically segregating rich and poor. I understand that it is this projects intension to NOT allow full access to amenities of the building to low income residents. This is despicable and disgusting! As a society we can NOT move backwards in time, and certainly not in a progressive city such as West Hollywood. The fact that the developers have kept this a (dirty) secret in their flyers and promotional material up til now, makes it even worse -and make the developers untrustworthy! I can NOT put my support behind this project!!!

Bjarne Hecht
[REDACTED] Larrabee Street # [REDACTED]
West Hollywood CA 90069
[bjarneny@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:bjarneny@[REDACTED])

[REDACTED]

From: RepublicKaren@[REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 03, 2014 8:26 AM
To: Emily Stadnicki
Cc: 8899beverlyblvd@gmail.com
Subject: August 7th. Planning Commission Meeting

You had the nerve to mail me a letter to support this construction in my City of West Hollywood. How dare you when so many retail stores in the areas are empty, when apartments and houses in the neighborhood is empty for lease or sale? How dare you allow money to be spent on mailings like this when the City doesn't have enough money in the budgets to maintain the safety and maintenance of their residences and existing buildings.

I cannot and will not support this construction that will impact our neighborhood horribly with more empty retail stores, empty apartments and traffic congestion. I will be disgusted if I see this construction begin.

Karen R. Hirsch
Resident
[REDACTED] Westbourne Dr.

[REDACTED]

From: Vigdor Tsap <lltsap99@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 6:34 PM
To: Emily Stadnicki
Subject: 8899 Beverly Blvd Project Support

Honorable Commissioner,

My wife and I have been West Hollywood residents for the past 17 years and have witnessed numerous improvements to our beautiful City. We believe that the projects such as the **proposed 8899 Beverly Blvd** would aide in beautification and gentrification of our neighborhoods by making them more pedestrian friendly and help bring outdated buildings into the Eco-friendly 21st century.

Unfortunately, we are unable to attend the Planning Commission hearing on Thursday, August 7th at 6:30 pm. However, we would like to have our opinion heard. With this email, we would like to support the above-mentioned project.

Thank you for your time and service to our City.

Sincerely,

Viktor and Lyubov Tsap



West Hollywood West Residents Association

P.O. Box 691427
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Email: whwra90048@gmail.com
Voice Mail: 323-849-0048

August 5, 2014

City of West Hollywood Planning Commission
8300 Santa Monica Blvd.
West Hollywood, Ca 90069

RE: The proposed mixed use project at 8899 Beverly Blvd.

Dear Commissioners,

We continue to have several concerns about this proposed project:

The girth and height of the enlarged building will loom over the immediate Rosewood neighborhood and will be a significantly increased presence in the neighborhood for many blocks.

The proposed project is inconsistent with the General Plan.

The proposed plan would remove a neighborhood public benefit, the "buffer" park.

We oppose using the proposed affordable housing roof as a recreational space because the situation will broadcast noise disturbance to the neighborhood, additionally using the tower as a sounding board; there is the potential for light trespass as a consequence of its use and the loss of privacy for those on Rosewood.

We concur with the immediate neighbor's request that the Rosewood property remain residentially zoned as R1B, because it would set precedents for future development, which could potentially occur elsewhere on Rosewood.

We commend of the 9-residence Rosewood portion of the proposal, including consistency with the NCOZ, as it begins to replicate the existing Rosewood streetscape.

We also commend the remodeling of the Beverly ground floor commercial spaces, as it corrects a long-recognized problem.

Sincerely,

Richard Giesbret

President, West Hollywood West Residents Association

This page intentionally left blank