



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Special Meeting
January 31, 2008

West Hollywood Park Auditorium
647 N. San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood, California 90069

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Guardarrama called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:33 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Brian Lewis led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: D'Amico, DeLuccio, Hamaker, Yeber, Vice-Chair Altschul, Chair Guardarrama.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Staff Present: Jennifer Alkire, Associate Planner, Jory Phillips, Senior Planner, John Chase, Urban Designer, Susan Healy Keene, Community Development Director, John Keho, Planning Manager, Christi Hogin, Assistant City Attorney, and David Gillig, Commission Secretary.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

ACTION: Approve the Planning Commission Agenda of Thursday, January 31, 2008 as presented. **Moved by Vice-Chair Altschul, seconded by Commissioner Hamaker and unanimously carried.**

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

A. January 17, 2008

ACTION: Approve the Planning Commission Minutes of Thursday, January 17, 2008 as presented. **Moved by Commissioner DeLuccio, seconded by Commissioner Hamaker and unanimously carried; notating the abstention of Commissioner Yeber.**

6. PUBLIC COMMENT.

PHIL HOSKINS, WEST HOLLYWOOD, commented on the availability of Draft Environmental Impact Reports on-line and traffic impacts.

ERIC D'ARBELOFF, WEST HOLLYWOOD, supports the variance requested at 337 Westbourne Drive, West Hollywood, California.

7. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS.

Commissioner Hamaker commented on the Regional Transportation meeting, which will take place at Plummer Park on Wednesday, February 6, 2008.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR. None.

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

A. 337 Westbourne Drive.

Administrative Permit 2007-057, Variance 2007-007:

Jennifer Alkire, Associate Planner, provided a graphic presentation and background information as presented in the staff report dated Thursday, January 31, 2008.

She provided a history of the property and stated the applicant is requesting a variance for the elimination of the side and rear yard setbacks, elimination of parking and an administrative permit to convert a garage structure into a second residential unit on a lot that is zoned for two units.

She stated staff does not support the variance request because the evidence in the record does not support the required findings of fact.

Staff recommends denial of the variance and administrative permit.

Commissioner Hamaker questioned the width of the driveway.

Commissioner DeLuccio questioned the neighboring lot sizes and shaping.

Commissioner Yeber disclosed for the record he met with the applicant. Nothing additional was discussed that was not in the staff report.

Commissioner Hamaker disclosed for the record she met with the applicant and made a site-visit. Nothing additional was discussed that was not in the staff report.

Chair Guardarrama disclosed for the record he met with the applicant and made a site-visit. Nothing additional was discussed that was not in the staff report.

Chair Guardarrama opened public testimony for Item 9.A:

LAUREN MEISTER, WEST HOLLYWOOD, applicant, presented the applicant's report. She provided a detailed history of the property and timelines. She spoke on staff's requested denial of the variance, the State of California law regarding the Second Unit Law, she disagreed with staff's interpretation of California State Code AB1866; Chapter 1062. She spoke and detailed "granny flats", special circumstances, property line setbacks, neighborhood compatibility, neighborhood support, building and safety codes, parking issues, senior citizens, zoning and variance definitions, housing policies and public benefits.

Vice-Chair Altschul questioned the possibility of age restrictions.

AIMEE ELLIOTT, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

STEVEN GOLIGHTLY, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

KAREN HIRSCH, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

MARTIN STRUDLER, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

JEAN SCHERRER, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

JOSEPH CLAPSADDLE, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

JANET COLE, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

ROSIE MURRAY, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

JAY JASPER, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

TERRY LEFTGOFF, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

MARK KRAJEWSKI, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

JACK LEBOUF, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

JOAQUIN NAVARRO, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

PADI MOSCHETTA, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

RICHARD BLONS, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

DAN SIEGEL, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

RODNEY MC DONALD, WEST HOLLYWOOD, President, West Hollywood North Neighborhood Association, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

JEANNE DOBRIN, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

RON MORRISON, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

HELANE WILBOURNE, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. She supports the variance request.

JEFF SAIKHUN, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

MIKE MERA, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

PAUL MARQUEZ, WEST HOLLYWOOD, opposes staff's recommendation of denial. He supports the variance request.

LAUREN MEISTER, WEST HOLLYWOOD, applicant, presented the applicant's rebuttal. She spoke on zoning requirements, second units, special circumstances, and conditional tandem parking.

Commissioner Altschul fashioned a theoretical question regarding future land use after the property is sold regarding future "questionable" tenants.

Lauren Meister, West Hollywood, applicant, stated for the record, she would be willing to agree to an added condition: 1) if the property is ever sold, the converted garage (living unit), shall be converted back to a garage.

Christi Hogin, Assistant City Attorney, stated the commission cannot impose this condition, due to "land use" based decisions. She also had concerns with enforceability. She suggested perhaps a performance bond, in an amount reasonably calculated to reimburse the city, if it ever needed to convert the residential unit back into a garage.

Commissioner Hamaker questioned if a condition could be added stating the unit could not be rented.

Staff stated this condition could not be legally imposed.

ACTION: Close public testimony for Item 9.A. **Motion carried by consensus of the Commission.**

Chair Guardarrama moved to: 1) deny staff's recommendation of denial; and 2) bring back a resolution granting the variance to permit the granny flat.

Seconded by Commissioner DeLuccio.

Vice-Chair Altschul requested an added condition; 1) applicant and staff shall work out conditions; the granny flat shall be converted into a garage, should title to the property ever transfer from Lauren Meister.

Chair Guardarrama did not support this added condition to the motion.

Commissioner DeLuccio did not support this added condition to the motion.

Commissioner Hamaker stated her findings for special circumstances regarding the size and shape of the lot, and the width of the driveway. She would like to see the applicant's variance fees refunded.

Christi Hogin, Assistant City Attorney, stated the commission does not have the authority to waive and/or refund fees.

Vice-Chair Altschul reiterated that the use runs with the land.

Commissioner Yeber stated his support of the variance.

ACTION: 1) Deny staff's recommendation of denial; 2) bring back a resolution granting the variance to permit the granny flat, for the property located at 337 Westbourne Drive, West Hollywood, California."; and 3) Close Public Hearing Item 9.A. **Moved by Chair Guardarrama, seconded by Commissioner DeLuccio and passes on a Roll Call Vote:**

AYES: Commissioners D'Amico, DeLuccio, Hamaker, Yeber, Chair Guardarrama.

NOES: Vice-Chair Altschul.

ABSENT: None.

RECUSED: None.

THE COMMISSION TOOK A FIVE (5) MINUTE RECESS AT 7:45 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 7:50 P.M.

10. NEW BUSINESS.

- A. Draft Environmental Impact Report (Melrose Triangle Mixed-Use Project).
9040, 9060, 9080, 9098 Santa Monica Boulevard,
603, 607, 617, 623, 629, 633 Almont Avenue; and
9001, 9021 Melrose Avenue, West Hollywood, California.**

[VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION]

Provided and certified by Written Communications, Inc.

Guardarrama: *All right, Item 10.A. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Melrose Triangle Mixed-Use Project. The Applicant is Milan Garrison. The Planner is Jory Phillips. Good evening, Jory.*

Phillips: *Good evening, Commissioners. Before I start my presentation, I just want to mention that the Draft Environmental Impact Report and all of its appendices have been available online since January 17th. Tonight we're here to provide information to you about the proposed Melrose Triangle Project. Oh, I'm sorry, that says Historic Preservation, I thought I changed that. We also want to summarize the key environmental issues that have been evaluated in the report. We want to discuss some alternatives to the project and also talk about the schedule of the EIR and the decision making. And of course, the main reason we're here is to receive comments on the Draft EIR. I do want to emphasize that we're here to comments on the EIR itself, specifically the adequacy of the EIR. Of course, while we're probably going to hear comments on the project, we are really here to hear comments on the EIR. Just to give you a little overview of what the proposal is, it's a mixed-use development. It's located on the west side*

of the city on Santa Monica Boulevard. The site is bounded by Almont, Melrose and Santa Monica. The proposal includes 195 dwelling units and a little over 80,000 square feet of commercial space. It's up to six levels above grade. It's not six levels across the entire site. It's three and four stories on portions. It's the portion along Santa Monica Boulevard that is proposed to be six stories. It also goes six levels below grade including parking and personal storage. There's 856 parking spaces proposed and the project also includes a swimming pool, a community room and exercise room. In terms of the entitlements that the Applicant is requesting, the proposal includes a specific plan, which would basically write kind of its own policies, goals and zoning for this particular parcel. They also are requesting a General Plan Amendment, which would change the designation from the commercial zone to a specific plan. They're requesting a Zone Text Amendment and a Map Amendment, which would also do the same thing. They are not actually requesting a Development Agreement. I keep deleting that from the presentation and it keeps coming back. Of course, they're also requesting a Development Permit, Demolition Permit and a Grading Permit once they get into Building and Safety. And of course, they are seeking certification of the final EIR. That would be included in the recommendation from you that goes to Council that'll likely be happening later in the summer. I've got Lisa Williams from LSA Associates here with me this evening and she is going to provide a presentation on the EIR itself.

Williams: Thank you. Good evening. The, these topics here are the typical environmental topics that are required by the State California Environmental Quality Act or SCEQA. The only two topics that are not addressed in this EIR are agriculture resources and mineral resources and that is because they are not applicable to the site. This flow chart gives an overview of the EIR process and specifically it shows the steps that the EIR goes through and all of the opportunities for both public agency and public review and comment. The Notice of Preparation was issued last summer and there was a scoping meeting and then the Draft EIR was released on January 17th, and then we're here at the first meeting during the circulation period for the Draft EIR. The key environmental issues for this project, there's...out of the few...the 13 or so that we studied, these are the key issues. The first one is esthetics and as you may be familiar, the project is a larger scale development compared to what is existing on the site. For air quality, the key issue is the construction vehicle exhaust, the amount of vehicles and the amount of grading and excavation at the site. Historic resources or I should say potential historic resources, the project would involve demolition of a streamline Roduran style building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. Geology and soils, we have high ground water at the site and seismic conditions with the nearby faults. Land use, it requires an amendment to the General Plan for storage uses and an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for the height variance. And last, traffic is always an issue in a city, in area, built out areas such as this during construction and after development. There's three significant unavoidable adverse impacts and what we mean by that is these are impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. The first one is construction related air quality and specifically that's nitrogen oxides that are from diesel exhaust associated with the construction vehicles, so the grading, excavation and the trucks that will haul dirt from the site. There are certain measures that will reduce those impacts such as not having equipment idling, not having...using more equipment than you need on one day, but there's only a

certain amount of measures that you can employ because the emissions will...you know, they're being emitted no matter what and in this case they will exceed the AQMD Air Quality Management District daily thresholds on the peak grading days. For traffic, based on the city's thresholds of what determines a significant impact, there is only one intersection that went above those thresholds and that's at the intersection of Doheny Drive and Burton Way and that's in the City of Beverly Hills. We have identified a measure to reduce that impact to less than significant. The northbound right turn lane, but because it is outside the City of West Hollywood, the City of West Hollywood cannot make sure that that mitigation is implemented. And then last is the loss of a potential historic resource and this shows the façade of the building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard and the reason we say potential at this point is because when we did the evaluation and we determined that it was eligible for the California Register, but that final determination needs to be made by the State Historic Office...the State Historic Preservation Office. And they will be making that determination as part of the public review period and the City will receive a comment letter on that. There's a few alternatives of the proposed project. Under SCEQA, we're required to look at a reasonable range of alternatives. One of the alternatives needs to be a no project or no development. So this alternative would not involve any change to what is existing, so there would be no, you know, demolishing of the historic building and no amendment variance and it would not meet project objectives that were developed by the City and the Applicant for this site. Alternative two is a reduced project and it's consistent with the existing General Plan and Zoning. It still would demolish the historic building, but it wouldn't need the General Plan Amendment and no height variance. It has a little bit more square footage of commercial use and fewer dwelling units. It would meet some of the project impacts and it would not have the significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to the construction air quality and traffic and that's because it's...the square footage is a little bit lower than the project. Alternative three is a reduced project and it's consistent with the General Plan and Zoning and it also avoids that historic building. So similar to alternative two, it doesn't require the amendment and the variance. Less commercial square footage, fewer dwelling units, meets a majority of the project objectives and there would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts. Alternative four is a design alternative to the proposed project, so it's similar in size and scope, but it does avoid the historic building. So it would still need the General Plan Amendment, the height variance. Has a bit more commercial square footage. It has more dwelling units, but they're more one-bedroom versus two-bedroom, so the square footage of the dwelling units is smaller and the art and wine storage is about one-third of what the project is. This alternative meets all of the project objectives and it does not have any significant unavoidable adverse impacts. So this table shows the alternatives and comparison. As you can see, the proposed project has the three impacts. Alternative one, which is no build, doesn't have any impacts. Alternative two is reduced...a reduced project but it does not avoid the building, so you see the significant impact there. And alternative three is reduced and it avoids the building, so all of those impacts are less than significant. And alternative four is a little bit less square footage than the proposed project and it avoids the historic building and so those, all those three impacts are less than significant. The EIR process, we will receive comments at this meeting and, and we will receive them in writing and they will be responded to in writing and they will be incorporated into the final EIR. The final EIR will

contain findings and a statement of overriding considerations for significant unavoidable adverse impacts, those three I mentioned before. The findings are basically documentation that mitigation measures have been evaluated and applied where feasible. And the statement of overriding considerations is basically documentation that compares those impacts to the benefits of the proposed project. The EIR needs to be certified. The City Council, when they certify the EIR, they would find that the EIR is adequate and complete. Let me say that...go back a little bit. The EIR is either certified by the City Council or not, but the process of certification means that the City Council finds that the EIR is adequate and complete. This shows the projected schedule. The Draft EIR was released for public review on January 17th. The 45-day, that's the State mandated period. It closes on March 3rd, 2008, so as long as you have your comments in by when the City closes on March 3rd. The EIR, the Final EIR is projected to be completed in April/May time frame and that depends on the number of comments and then EIR certification and project decision is projected for summer 2008 and that'll depend on meeting schedules. So lastly, I'd just like to encourage everyone to submit their comments on the EIR. You can do that today at the meeting or in writing to this address and then also the City has an e-mail address where you can send your comments, so one of those three ways is fine. And that concludes my presentation.

Guardarrama: *All right, is there any question for staff or for the representative? John?*

D'Amico: *I have two questions. The first is, on your slide that had the alternatives, the first alternative said there's...thank you, significant unavoidable adverse impact. That's based on the three possible unavoidable or the, the two certain unavoidable impacts and the one possible unavoidable impact of the designation of the part of the property that may be found to be historic, is that right?*

Williams: *That's correct. The proposed project has the three, the three impacts, assuming that the historic resource building will be determined by the State to be eligible for the California Register. And alternative one doesn't have...is the no build, so there's no impacts.*

D'Amico: *Right, but if...okay, so now I understand that. Thank you. And then in your planned and future projects, can you just explain to me the difference between Table 4.8b, which is Planned Future Projects and 4.10e, which is Cumulative Projects. Should both...should the projects and the future projects be on the project, cumulative projects list? I know that's a....*

Williams: *What page is 4...what's it, 4.8?*

D'Amico: *4.8-8.*

Williams: *Dash eight. I think that...*

D'Amico: *There's a small table with five or six...one, two, five projects and then in this larger cumulative list, some of them are not listed.*

Williams: I'm sorry, what was that table, the 4.8 table?

D'Amico: 4.8b.

Williams: Oh, b. They are...I'm going to say basically, they basically do both represent cumulative projects. For each topic area, whether it's land use and I think...I'm not sure what the other table was. We have to look at what, what would be a cumulative project area and for...so for traffic, the area is much bigger. We go into Beverly Hills. But for land use, we're just within the City of West Hollywood and I think specifically this is the corridor, Santa Monica Corridor, so that's why there's only a few projects on here. So that's why the tables do...but they're basically the cumulative projects.

D'Amico: Okay, thank you very much.

Guardarrama: Commissioner Altschul?

Altschul: Yeah, I'm, I'm interested in knowing when you highlighted the most, what you considered to be the most significant aspects Of the one, the aspects of this EIR that need discussion, why the hydrology part of it was not one of those. In my...I didn't, I didn't get the appendices, which I guess is somewhat unfortunate, but in the hydrology section of the part of the EIR that I did get, it seems that the report is somewhat sketchy. At one point it says that the ground water begins at 30 feet below the surface. In another point it suggests that whether or not the watering is necessary should be determined by the contractor at the time they start the project. I would've thought that, you know, a complete analysis would have really looked further into this, into this issue because we know from prior projects that just a few blocks away, for instance, a project at Melrose and La Cienega, which had wanted two levels of underground parking. Had to come back and request only one because of the high water table and since they're requesting six stories underground, which is equivalent to the amount that they're requesting above ground. If you consider 10 feet per story, 60 feet underground, you're going to hit the water. I believe, shouldn't there be more attention given to the analysis of this particular issue?

Williams: Should I go ahead?

Guardarrama: If you'd like.

Williams: Okay. Thank you. It's correct that, that ground water, dewatering will be required during construction and that is because they are digging below the ground water level and there is a...it's...there might be more of...there's more discussion on the foundation in the geology soils section, so some of that discussion that you might be looking for is not in the hydrology and water quality section. There'll be a specialized foundation, and I think the Applicant has some consultants here that can explain that later, to keep water, ground water from penetrating after it's constructed. So that the dewatering would only go on during construction and then they also have a backup system, they'll have a backup system of pumps in case there was any problem with the foundation or, or something during operation. That's as I understand it, but they could give more explanation for that.

Altschul: *And what about a study or some kind of addressing the issue as if you displace this ground water by whatever method other than, other than pumping, but if part of it is going to be displaced by creating barricades, where does it go and how might it adversely or not adversely affect surrounding properties?*

Williams: *I don't...*

Phillips: *Commissioner Altschul, we'll definitely make note of your questions and make sure that they're reflected in the final EIR.*

Altschul: *Thank you.*

Guardarrama: *Does anyone else have questions for staff? No? All right. Let's open up the public comment portion of this item. Members of the public will have three minutes to make their presentations. We are receiving comments and questions solely on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. So your comments and questions will be answered in the Final Environmental Impact Report. Our first speaker is Jeff Saikhon to be followed by Joseph Clapsaddle.*

Saikhon: *Hi, my name is Jeff Saikhon. I'm a property owner in West Hollywood West. My question refers to traffic and circulation. I would like to challenge the report's cumulative peak hour ratings for intersections, Doheny at Santa Monica Boulevard, Doheny at Beverly Boulevard, Robertson at Melrose. By comparison for the traffic study at Greenwich Place, the Melrose Triangle Report has grossly underestimated the cumulative negative impact. Thank you.*
Guardarrama: *Thank you, Joseph Clapsaddle to be followed by Phil Hoskins.*

Clapsaddle: *Joseph Clapsaddle, resident of West Hollywood and I'm speaking to you tonight on behalf of Sharon Sandow, the President and Chief Executive Officer of the West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. The Melrose Triangle is an important project of the city because of its rental housing, its 38 units of affordable housing, its 80,000 square feet of retail including a neighborhood serving uses, design oriented uses and restaurants. This type of project we feel with these uses particularly in the retail portion of the development match with our creative city, that is, West Hollywood. Further, this project is an attractive architectural design to enhance and improve the Western Gateway of the City. And I want to pause on that because I think one of the attractions to that whole area of our community, when people are greeted there is very important, whatever direction the project finally takes. The major impacts of the project are being mitigated and have been addressed in the draft EIR itself. The three items which require overriding consideration include as has been stated the pollution during construction, the possible historic status of the building at the western end of the project and the intersection in Beverly Hills. However, we strongly believe that these three items are outweighed by all of the positive elements of the project and should be overridden. The city's goal of providing housing and the Chamber of Commerce's goal of enhancing the creative city are met with this project and we urge you to proceed. Thank you.*

Guardarrama: *Phil Hoskins to be followed by Ira Handelman.*

Hoskins: *Phil Hoskins, resident of West Hollywood. I will try to fit everything within the time. Really I'm focused on the traffic component. I think there's a couple of missing intersections that should've been examined. One in particular is Melrose and Huntley. Because of the narrowing of Melrose, the traffic accumulates there and already at the evening hours it's a failed intersection. It's always blocked for an excessive amount of time and that intersection was not included in the study. It's a unique intersection because of the narrowing of Melrose. Likewise, there's nothing in there that I see that addresses the question of traffic at the corner of Almont and Melrose, and I'm rather suspicious that the City's going to have to install a traffic signal at that intersection because of the additional burden of traffic. Apart from that, I think there's a big flaw in the methodology. I admit I'm not an EIR specialist, so I may not have understood, but it appears as though the assumptions made in the, in the report about the LOS are false assumptions. They...the, the analysis is taking traffic as it currently is as the starting point, which of course is proper. But further than that, then the analysis of the impact of the project assumes that the current project were completely...the project site as it is were completely occupied. And, and the argument is made that there's not a significant increase because if nothing's done and the project's completely occupied, there wouldn't be a big change, but that's apples and oranges analysis because the current traffic flow is based on the project not being very occupied. So there's a false analysis there that I think needs to be corrected. Either you assume the current traffic load as if the project were full at the present time or you don't compare it in the way that the EIR, Draft EIR apparently did. I think something is missing also that if in fact the project goes forward with the storage component, I didn't see anything in the traffic section that addressed the fact that there's going to be a lot of trucks involved in delivery and takeout of goods in a storage facility. Trucks are a different commodity and present different traffic flow problems than passenger vehicles. I didn't see anything that addressed the impact of that and I wasn't clear from the Draft EIR. By the way, it was available online. I just couldn't get to it. I didn't know where to look, so thank you. I...is it appropriate for me to submit in addition comments in writing?*

Guardarrama: Yes. You can submit them in writing as well.

Hoskins: Thank you.

Guardarrama: Thank you. Ira Handelman to be followed by Elizabeth Marquart.

Handelman: Good evening. Good evening, Commissioners. Ira Handelman, Handelman Consulting representing the Charles Company. And I just want to make an announcement that the entire project is going to be granny flats for the future development. So, and I'm glad you approved it, 'cause I didn't want to face an angry audience. To Mr. Altschul, there's a lot of technical information on the underground that's in the appendices. And there's been a lot of work done. We have our entire consultant team of hydrologists, soils, construction, structural, waterproofing, here to answer any questions along with our Architect. We held a meeting in the community with all of our consultants to deal with the underground issue, so a lot of information is in that 1,000 pages of appendices. So we're here tonight to listen to comments. We worked a long time on this

project for many years communicating with the community and working with them and we want to continue to do that and we'll have some comments ourselves later, but there's a lot in that 1,000 pages and interesting reading. Thank you and if you have any questions from us, the entire team is here to answer them at any time. Thank you.

Guardarrama: *Thank you Mr. Handelman. Elizabeth Marquart to be followed by Janet Cole.*

Marquart: *Hi, I'm Elizabeth Marquart, local realtor and West Hollywood property owner. I'm here to support the project. I think for the Gateway entrance from Beverly Hills to West Hollywood, this is a really important project. The design of it is beautiful and just the impression that it makes when people enter our city is extremely valuable. I also want to address the three main issues on the EIR, the pollution, the historic impact and the intersection. Obviously, some of those cannot be mitigated anymore than they've already been, but I think the benefits of this project far outweigh the issues that are brought up by those three issues and then as far as the esthetics and the land use, there were things that are beneficial. The esthetics, just the beauty of the project, all the things that it brings to the neighborhood, the retail, the local things so people who live in West Hollywood West can walk and have little neighborhood shops and all of that for that area I think is extremely important because right now that's lacking in that little bit of the neighborhood. And I think obviously the housing component. Being a realtor, you know, this project is 100 percent rentable units, which in our city is something that is severely lacking. So I think that's extremely, extremely important and should be considered. Thank you.*

Guardarrama: *Thank you. Janet Cole to be followed by Terry Leftgoff.*

Cole: *Janet Cole, resident of Rangely Avenue in West Hollywood. My biggest concern about the Melrose Triangle project is traffic, which is already of nearly nightmare proportions in our area. I'd also like to respectfully disagree with the intersection ratings in the Draft EIR, based on having lived on the 9000 block of Rangely Avenue, three buildings east of Doheny and one block south of the Melrose Triangle project site. I'd have to give C's, D's and F's to replace the current ratings of A's, B's, C's and an E in the five intersections named in the Draft EIR. From my front yard I can see north and southbound traffic on Doheny backed up for at least a mile in all directions including east and west on Santa Monica Boulevard. I'm hoping that this project won't do what the East Side Gateway project did to traffic in all four directions of the La Brea and Santa Monica Boulevard intersection. And I ask that you please, please look at the traffic flow of this project very carefully and to use environment, environmentally responsible alternatives for mitigating traffic. Also, along with other potential problems that I didn't mention such as water table and seismic issues, but to me traffic mitigation is the most important to preserve our quality of life in our neighborhood. Thank you.*

Guardarrama: *Thank you. Terry Leftgoff to be followed by Bryan Smith.*

Leftgoff: Good evening, my name is Terry Leftgoff, I'm a resident of West Hollywood and I'm speaking as Vice President of West Hollywood West Residents Association. We're submitting comments in writing, but I'll give you a few highlights and lowlights. The geological and hydrologic setting description we believe is incomplete and inadequate. We know empirically that this site overlays major underground water system and its sufficient reliable flow to supply the Beverly Hills Water Department Water Wells on La Cienega. Excuse me, that these...that the systems supply the Beverly Hills Water Department for close to a century. There are extensive historic records but the DEIR is silent about it. Please describe the system including source water shed, flow...source flows, routes and dimensions of major aquifers and rivers, flow rates, directional flows and pressures. This isn't adequately described and the impacts of its interference have not been properly analyzed in the DEIR. We have empirical local experience that ground water table levels permanently rose immediately following the construction of the Sofitel Hotel at Beverly Place. We know the hotel must now pump the water 24 hours a day. It would appear the hydrology near the Sofitel is likely part of the same system and geological features as the project site, yet there's no review, no discussion, no analysis. The DER...DEIR lacks any data or modeling to assess similar impacts related to interference with this water system. What happens should the proposed project act like a dam or a huge impenetrable obstacle across the major water system? Will the neighborhood to the north saturate and flood? How much can we expect the ground water to rise? What happens should the neighborhood to the south where many mature trees draw from the existing water table go fallow? What is the projected new route of this water system when it's interrupted with this project? What impact will there be to surrounding property, streets and major public and private assets? What protection is needed toward certainty, completion and indemnification for potential damages? And how much variability is caused by actual accumulated seasonal rainfall? Let's see, the DEIR uses a metaphor of a bathtub or a boat when discussing construction techniques within such conditions. It relies upon 100 percent perfection and certainty about many complicated and sometimes untested building techniques and systems. This is unrealistic. What happens should there be a reasonable three to five percent error rate as is statistically probable and humanly commonplace? What happens if the error rate should prove to be greater? What happens when, as eventually happens even to boats and bathtubs, it springs a leak? To continue the DEIR's metaphors, what happens should the boat pull up its anchors due to inverse pressure expulsion? Thank you.

Guardarrama: Thank you. Bryan Smith to be followed by Midge Barnett.

Smith: Good evening, I'm Bryan Smith, I'm an attorney residing in Los Angeles and I'm here on behalf of West Hollywood Business Owner Kathleen Spiegelman, who runs K. Spiegelman Designs in the Melrose Triangle. You are hearing comments from other people about the inadequacy of the EIR with regards to hydrology and traffic concerns. Those are my concerns as well, but in the short time I have, I'm going to concentrate on esthetics. The City of West Hollywood has always prided itself on being a pedestrian oriented community, on having a wonderful balance of residences and independent businesses, eschewing corporate culture, eschewing homogeny and you can see that throughout West Hollywood and that should be a, an example and reflected in

the Gateway to West, West Hollywood. I don't see that in this project as planned. And except for the small plaza at the very west end of the building, it consisted of four, five and six story edifices for which you will have to allow a 70-foot height variance pushed up against the lot line with only a modicum of space for sidewalks and a little bit of landscaping. It strikes me as one of the most pedestrian hostile designs one could imagine and it's completely out of scale and out of proportion with the rest of the neighborhood, unless you're planning on building six story buildings all the way up and down Santa Monica Boulevard and if that's the plan, well, I suggest you take a walk down Beverly Glen Boulevard during rush hour. If you survive that, then you can come and talk to me about esthetics. Everyone agrees that development should be made in, in the Melrose Triangle. It's right for development, but the builders could look at the rest of Melrose Avenue and up and down Robertson Boulevard to see traffic developments, a reasonable scale in keeping with West Hollywood's unique environment. That's not reflected in these buildings. With the possible exception of the Gateway building, again at the west end, the rest of the project is a bunch of blocky rectangles painted in Tuscan colors. A corporate cliché repeated in strip malls all over the United States. This is not the Gateway that West Hollywood wants. I would also like to draw your attention to Appendix A of the Draft Environmental Report and the letters written in response to the Notice of Preparation of the Report. You will find 60 pages of pointed questions and vociferous objections. There are some people in some organizations in support of the plan as proposed, but you will also find that the residents don't want it and many business owners don't want it. It needs to be scaled back and it needs to be more in keeping with West Hollywood's flavor. Thank you.

Guardarrama: Thank you. Midge Barnett to be followed by David Warren.

Barnett: *Hi, I'm Midge Barnett and I'm a resident and homeowner in West Hollywood West for over 20 years and I'm here speaking on behalf of seven other of my neighbors and homeowners on the north side block of Rangely between Almont and Robertson. I have read through the EIR, all 300 and whatever pages. My concerns also are about the traffic. We have a very small lovely walk-able community that this is going to change totally with the...with this project coming on. The alley just south of Melrose is how all of us access our garages and get into our homes. I'm really concerned that that's going to become a through, throughway, throughway, thoroughfare. Anyway, people driving their cars down our alley instead of to avoid traffic on Melrose when this project is being built. The traffic as other people have said with how they graded the intersections I think is totally off. If you spent time in the neighborhood, as we have, I mean it's quicker to walk places than to get in your car and try and drive three blocks away. Also the impact, the, the report doesn't...and maybe it's not supposed to cover this, but I mean counting up the number of units that they're going to be building there, you're basically almost doubling the, the number of units in that area, just in that one small little space. All...most of West Hollywood West in that area just south of this project is all one-unit single homes, duplexes, and now we're going to have this gigantic space with 190 units, which is almost what we have in the area just spread over many, many blocks. So I'm very concerned about this. Thank you.*

Guardarrama: Thank you, David Warren to be followed by Steve Pollard.

Warren: Hi, I'm David Warren. My partner and I live a couple blocks from the project in West Hollywood. I have...there are four areas in which, at least four areas in which I think the EIR is not yet adequate. Three of them you're not going to be surprised have to do with traffic. First, after I read the traffic report, I tried to step back and say, okay, well, what did it really say? Well, it said that given...despite the size of the project and despite the congestion and the sensitivity of many of the intersections around here, the only significant impact is that an intersection several blocks away in Beverly Hills down at Burton. And I asked myself, you know, I live in this neighborhood, I see this traffic every day, do I actually believe that? And the answer is I don't. So then I went and I started pulling out older traffic studies and I found the same thing that many of the other folks found and that is that this study is systematically more optimistic about current and future traffic conditions at these intersections. And I actually counted it up. I took the Palm study and the Millennium study and I compared for the intersections around here and 75 percent of the time this study had a better grade, a more optimistic view of current and future traffic, 75 percent of the time. Only 10 percent of the time did it have a more negative review. Well, and I have to say, the other two studies, what they were saying felt to me much more correct. So what that says to me is that, you know, I don't know if it's in the data or the methodology, there's a problem here in the traffic study and I don't know what it is, but it needs to get fixed. I'll actually give you an example. For Santa Monica Boulevard in the, in the afternoon, currently the study says it's a B. The other study says it's an E or an F. In the future, this study says it's going to be a D, the other studies say it's going to be an F. Okay, these are dramatic differences at the intersection that's closest to this project. Second thing, I too missed the analysis of Almont at Santa Monica Boulevard. I think given where the entrances and exits for this project are, there's going to be an awful lot of merging, left turns, a couple of different ways, U-turns, so a lot going on in that intersection. If that intersection fails, it's going to disrupt all of Santa Monica Boulevard. It doesn't matter what's happened in the other intersections, but there's no analysis of it and I think there needs to actually be much more detailed, very micro level analysis of what happens given where the entrances and the exits are. Third thing, construction impacts, we're talking about as I understand it's something like 33 months of construction. They say in the current report that something like 15,000 truck trips just during the excavation phase. I don't think it's adequate to say, okay, well, there are going to be huge construction traffic impacts but the City will take care of that when the construction plan is filed. This is an Environmental Impact Report. We're supposed to quantify what the impacts of the project are going to be including during that 33 month period and then if necessary, lay out ways to mitigate it, and I think that needs to be done now, not just by saying, well, the City will take care of it. And finally, I didn't feel the...that the EIR really grasped the size of this project. I looked at the square footage, it looks to me like it's 50 percent bigger than the Reg building, twice the size of West Hollywood Gateway and the same size as all the Sunset Millennium put together. It's enormous and I don't feel like the EIR reflects that now. Thank you.

Guardarrama: Thank you, Mr. Warren. Steve Pollard to be followed by Alan Pullman.

Pollard: *Hi, I'm Steve Pollard, a business owner at 9006 Melrose, which is right across the street. The question I have is, we have a lot of parking spots over there right now and I heard an interesting debate for an hour and a half about one parking spot earlier. What's going to happen for the 33 months when the construction's going on for the people that are in the businesses around that area? You know, where...is it...what, what's going to happen with parking is my question.*

Guardarrama: *Are you finished?*

Pollard: *That's it.*

Guardarrama: *Yeah, okay. Thank you. Alan Pullman to be followed by Mehran Pourzanjani.*

Phillips: *These are just two of our consultants, so they're, they're waiting. If they're asked any questions, they'll speak.*

Guardarrama: *Oh, okay. And is...and Milan Garrison another...?*

Garrison: *Milan Garrison here on behalf of the, of the project applicant. Just here to answer any questions that you may have. We know that it's just taking public comment on the Draft EIR and we're appreciative of that. We do have one comment and we'll be forwarding this over. We generally agree with the findings concluded within the Draft EIR. We do have some concerns with the designation of the streamline modern building is not listed on your local, on the national or even on the State Register, so therefore to conclude that it requires a Statement of Overriding Consideration when it's on, on...considered to be a historical impact or to remove a potential historical resource, we kind of find that there's some conflict with that statement. It had been reviewed by the City a number of years ago when you put together your local list and it was excluded from that list. We submitted the project through the appropriate channels through City Staff and still hadn't found that it had not been on the list and now we find in the Draft EIR that it is considered to be a potential and requiring an SOC. Just a little confusing for us and so maybe we can get some clarification. We don't want to leave that to the state. Then they come back and say that, oh, yes, it should be considered to be on the list. So, that's our basic comments at this point and thank you very much.*

Guardarrama: *There's a question for you.*

Altschul: *Sir, at one of the Design Review Committee meetings, which probably was two or three, maybe more years ago now, it was pointed out to the applicant that this historical or potentially historical art deco building was there and would the applicant consider perhaps incorporating it into the design and the applicant at that time I believe indicated that he would. Is there still such a potential for consideration of this?*

Garrison: *I'd have to go back to the property owner and determine what they were looking at.*

Altschul: *Right, this is just a comment here, but can we just include that in our considerations too?*

Garrison: *Sure. Thank you.*

Guardarrama: *Thank you. Lauren Meister to be followed by Dan Siegel.*

Meister: *Thank you, Lauren Meister, President of West Hollywood West Residents Association and resident of West Hollywood. I'm here tonight actually to deliver our written comments. They, they are preliminary and we probably will have some more comments and there's obviously too much to talk about in three minutes. It's about eight pages, but I will bring up one, one area that we found having to do with population and housing. The projected population growth from 2005 to 2010 conflicts with the growth projected by the actual number of approved or pending residential units, which is substantially larger. The first set of projections dramatically under (CUT OUT) other sections including cumulative impacts, growth inducing impact, traffic and services, among others. Real data and projections based on real...projections raised...based on real data should be utilized. What is the actual population of West Hollywood now? The report shows a net of 829 units approved, pending or in the pipeline that would be completed by 2010. Table 41, 4.10a, demographic projections, shows a net change of 200 from 2005 to 2010. So we've already exceeded SKAGS growth projections with actual growth between 2005 and 2010 being quadruple the SKAG projections. So if the environmental impact analysis is based on SKAG projections, which are clearly understated, then all of the reports on public services, utilities, the demand for water, electricity, gas, Sheriff and Fire Department, traffic needs cannot be correct. And then just to mention about water, due to current water supply conditions, cities are going to be required to cut back on water use and demand. Yet, development is moving along as if there's unlimited sources of water. Any new development should be evaluated in the current environment of diminishing water. Why should existing uses be forced to conserve so that there can be new development? Shouldn't existing water use and demand have priority over new development that will be by definition creating new demand? I also just wanted to say that our organization, you know, we are...we're just here to give the comments. We're not here to oppose the project or, or give our support. We're just really here to give our comments and we will have more comments when we have a chance to get through the other 1,500 pages. Thank you.*

Guardarrama: *Thank you. Dan Siegel to be followed by Jeanne Dobrin.*

Siegel: *Hi, I'm Dan Siegel, I'm a resident of the City of West Hollywood. I'm...I serve as Executive Vice President of the West Hollywood West Residents Association and have served on the Melrose Triangle Committee for a number of years since its inception. Now, we...six of us got together from the, the Board of Directors of our organization and the Committee and we actually sat down....*

Guardarrama: *Mr. Siegel, pay no attention to that. It's the wrong time. David, if you could start his time over.*

Siegel: So we, we actually shared...each of us had read different chapters. We, we went through the...this is...people I guess know the DEIR is very...a big volume. We read it as well...as closely as we could. What we kept finding is that the fault...we have no...you know, we're not speaking for or against the project here today, we're...but the Environmental Impact Report at this point is...it seems to be very flawed, so that's what we wanted to talk about. For instance, the population increase, the number of units compared to what the City has actually said is going to be produced between now and 2010 and what the EIR is, is off like 75% of the increase. It, it doesn't feel that there are...these numbers are working with it and as far...we, so we brought out the Greenwich Place EIR, which we still have from the...and the numbers are very different as far...and that was done a few years ago and it was much...they were much greater as far as the impacts on all of the different intersections for traffic. So I think that if the numbers are this suspect, we have to really look at, at the report itself rather than the project. I...but I did want to discuss some of the things because I'm on the Traffic Committee of it. The local streets were...that were not considered at all, which we have two alleys that actually serve as streets that are right, come right up to where the...this project is. The alley just east of Doheny between Melrose and Rosewood gets lots of traffic. It was not included at all in the study. The alley just south of Melrose between Almont and Robertson was not included in the study. The local streets themselves were not included in the study. And as far as, you know, the big numbers, it's hard to understand, but the...if you just take it down to human scale, they're talking about the size of the excavation, but if...it really comes down to the number of truckloads over a nine month period translates to 10 trucks per hour of soil being removed five days a week for eight hours for nine months. That's the number of truckloads to excavate that site. So this really has to be included into what...how...the impacts of the project and it's not even included into one of the main problem areas. It's just the intersection of Burton Way and Doheny, the historically significant building and...I don't remember the third one. But there's a lot more that actually have to be considered. Thank you.

Guardarrama: Thank you Mr. Siegel. Jeanne Dobrin.

Dobrin: Jeanne Dobrin, a 31-year resident of West Hollywood. I do not live close to this project, but I live at the north part of the Norma Triangle on Cynthia Street. At the scoping hearing that I attended, I spoke to the experts there and I said that now they claim that they have a 30-foot water table. We have had many, many, many dry years except for the last week or two we had a little more water and I predict that if we have a normal water, whatever you call it, that it will be much, much deeper than 30 feet. At that particular time, the experts said that the building was going to float like a boat and from what I remember that they were saying something about how they're going to build sort of a beginning building and then build another big thing on top of that. I don't like the idea that it's going to float like a boat. And it also does worry me considerably that this project if built this way would dam up, as Terry said the water there, which would flood the Norma Triangle. We have identified nine huge projects between Doheny and La Cienega and Melrose and Santa Monica plus the Greenwich Place that are going to be built shortly in West Hollywood. We know the traffic service levels are already F. Not only from the people in our city who use these streets, but also the people who are passing through our city.

I respect the developer of this project. I understand that he is a very fine person and he has great plans, but I think this project is far, far, far too big for the city. I do not want to see...this lawyer spoke about, it's a city plan, you build six story buildings, yes, they passed a General Plan Amendment that would allow them to build up to 62 or 65 feet and of course as you probably all know, I filed a lawsuit two weeks ago against this particular thing with four causes of action. I also feel the same as Lauren spoke about that this is not addressing the cumulative effect of all of these buildings that have their entitlement or are in construction and soon to get entitlement. And the City of Beverly Hills is a water server for this area. I did not see anything in there, but I didn't get a chance to look through the whole thing. Have they consulted the City of Beverly Hills about this? About 15 years ago we were rationed by water by the City of Beverly Hills. I do not want that to happen again. Thank you.

Guardarrama: *Thank you Ms. Dobrin. That's our last public speaker. Do any of the commissioners have any further questions for the record? Barbara?*

Hamaker: *Yes, I have a liquefaction question for one of the experts.*

Guardarrama: *Well, if you'd like, you could state it for the record and then they can answer it in the final EIR.*

Hamaker: *Okay. It's actually a clarification of what I read and I just want to understand. Maybe I'll just ask you. I just want to understand if I...what I read is what I think I read. Because this is a liquefaction zone and there are...the strata that has a tendency to liquefy is actually the strata that will be removed for the six stories of parking that when that is removed, at least the place where this project is proposed to be built will not be a liquefaction zone because the liquefacted stuff is going to be gone. So I am assuming that everything from what I read, and John is shaking his head, every...that it will all be stabilized around there, but then the problem is the potential for liquefaction may exist outside of the project itself. So did I read that correctly? And I don't know that...John's saying yes, my expert over there. And I don't have any particular disagreement, it's just an interesting concept when you're thinking about all the different possibilities that could happen if we have a very bad earthquake. Okay.*

Guardarrama: *John Altschul?*

Altschul: *I think it was Mr. Warren and perhaps one other speaker who pointed out that there are several places in this Draft EIR where it says, well, if there is a problem, the City will mitigate it and therefore the mitigations will result in less than significant impacts. I think that those kinds of comments are not sufficient and that you should go through the EIR and try to analyze what these impacts would be rather than just put them off until the future when they might occur and then let somebody handle it then. And it was in several places other than the hydrology. Also, in the final EIR I'd like to see some kind of addressing of the issues, of the issue of statements of overriding considerations other than construction impact. Can we take a look at what would need to be reduced or cut back in the project in order to avoid statements of overriding considerations on issues that might require them?*

Guardarrama: Okay. Commissioner Yeber, do you have anything to add?

Yeber: No.

Guardarrama: No? Commissioner D'Amico?

D'Amico: I just have one request I guess that clearly the concerns generated by the hydrology, the word, the idea, the, the common building practice of dewatering have raised a lot of questions, which to this commissioner are answerable in my own head anyway, and maybe some graphic representation and notations of other buildings that we're familiar with locally, citywide, even nationally that we've stepped over the threshold of and not sunk into the earth at the sidewalk of, would explain sort of the what is now a pretty regularized process for development at this scale. I was both shaking my head yes at Commissioner Hamaker and no because I do understand it, but I am not an expert. I'm not. I don't pretend to be one and I understand why dewatering is required. I, I...unfortunately this idea of a floating boat has entered the talking stream and if this...a building like this is anything but a floating boat. You know, a floating boat is a floating boat and this is a building. And so I just think we should have a real...something that would fall right out of Sesame Street into this document and explain to all of us how dewatering is and is not an impact to this community and to this building and, and so on, 'cause I, 'cause I think they're clearly good questions and people spend, you know, eight years in college and graduate school learning how to dewater and learning how to be safe and, you know, we can't do it in, in three hours.

Hamaker: I'd like to just jump in for a minute. Are there other buildings in the vicinity that have gone down six stories? How unusual is that?

Guardarrama: Okay.

Hamaker: Our, our panel out there is saying no.

Keho: Yeah....

D'Amico: Well, I think that's exactly right. We should know that list. We should have some idea about it. We can, you know, I'm sure within 10 miles of this building there are more than a handful and we can go visit them, maybe even find out...

Hamaker: Okay, cause I, I....

D'Amico: ...how they were dewatered when they were made. I personally have worked on a building that had a six story parking structure...

Hamaker: Oh, you did, okay.

D'Amico: ...that was dewatered and, you know, I know exactly how it worked and why it, why....

Hamaker: I'm usually, I usually think, and I don't go into that many large buildings, but I usually think of the parking as going up rather than going down. John? Yeah.

Altschul: I think we need to get past the assumption that these six below levels are for parking. I don't think they are. I think they're for storage and as we know, there might be a further height requirement for storage than...and for access with vehicles than...I mean large vehicles than there would be for just parking automobiles.

Hamaker: So it'd be deeper you're saying than we're thinking.

Altschul: It might be...

Hamaker: Yeah.

Altschul: ...more feet than we think.

Hamaker: Yeah, yeah, okay, thanks.

Guardarrama: Donald?

DeLuccio: Just a couple of things. Just to...maybe look, I know one speaker spoke about Almost and Melrose, that intersection. I don't know if it was looked at, but if not, I think we do need to look at that one. That is like right where the project is and also I heard about inconsistencies possibly between this study and other studies in terms of, for example, of LOS, levels of service. So I think we need to try to bring some consistency between different studies, EIRs that have been done. Also I am concerned about the streamline modern building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. I think we need to explore that further to see if it's going to become historic by the State or, or been explored I know on a thorough level and I think on a local level too. I think we know the answers, but we need to look further at that. And also I'd want to know more, maybe it has to do with the project, if we find that it is a historic, is there a way to incorporate it into the, into the project itself? So those are my comments at this time.

Guardarrama: Commissioner Yeber?

Yeber: Yeah, I just wanted to sort of dovetail on Commissioner Altschul's comments regarding the storage. If we could, in the EIR if it could be addressed how the storage parking ratio will kind of layout over the six stories below ground, that might be a little bit more helpful to determine what we're dealing with. 'Cause I too am a little unsure what they are referring to when it comes to storage units. I, I know what to expect when it comes to a parking garage, but when you add a component of storage and it's storage for art and wine, that's an animal I'm not familiar with, so more information regarding that would be very helpful.

Hamaker: And dovetailing in with that, there were comments made about trucks accessing those storage facilities. So I wonder if trip generations could be discussed regarding, in other words, I'm assuming that the local store is not going to store his beer down there and drive trucks in and out every day getting his beer out. So who...how, how often are they going to access the Rembrandts and the wine? And, and how large are the storage sites themselves? And I just would like to thank everybody from West Hollywood West for testifying, especially about the traffic, because I live on the other side of town and I don't travel on any of these intersections and it's really unbelievable how specific each one of us are about our own cross streets and our own territory and so what you say is really probably the truth and exactly what happens on those intersections, so your, you know, continued involvement in this traffic study in particular is really important to me and to us I'm sure.

Guardarrama: Yeah, my concerns have to do with traffic, particularly if someone in the final EIR can address the comments made by Mr. Warren as to the assumptions for the levels of service in this particular traffic study versus comparable traffic studies and then also if the intersections of Melrose and Huntley and Melrose and Almost could be addressed. Is there anyone else who has a comment? No? All right, Jory I think that gives you guys a lot of homework.

Phillips: Thank you.

Guardarrama: All right. So if...just to...I know you guys already said it before, can you let everyone know when the public comment period closes and when the final EIR should be available?

Phillips: March 3rd is the last day to get public comment into our office and the final EIR will be done once we're finished responding to the comments that we've received on March 3rd.

Guardarrama: And, and just to remind everyone at home, comments may be submitted in writing to City Hall.

Hamaker: Jory, are Volume II and III going to be with the final EIR and not with this?

Phillips: They're available online. We can get you copies if you want, copies of those. They're quite large and that's why we didn't distribute it to all the Commissioners.

Hamaker: Okay, 'cause, only because the applicant had mentioned there was more information in there that I thought we should have. So how...when you're saying large, are you saying larger than this? Oui.

Phillips: It's, it's probably two to three times larger than the original document. It's very technical.

Keho: *They're the, they're the technical. Yeah, they're the technical appendices that are all the actual...when they do the traffic studies, it's all the documentations on the traffic studies and all of that.*

Hamaker: *Oh, I see, okay. I pass. I'll pass on that.*

Guardarrama: *All right and I guess we're going to turn now to the General Plan update.*

(ITEM 10.A. OFFICIAL RECORDING ENDS).

B. General Plan Update.

Susan Healy Keene, Director of Community Development, presented an update on the General Plan. She stated the first Community General Plan Fair will take place on Saturday, February 23, 2008, from 9:30 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. at West Hollywood Park Auditorium.

The Visionary Training Session is scheduled for Saturday, March 8, 2008, from 9:30 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.

ACTION: 1) Receive and file. **Motion carried by consensus of the Commission.**

11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS. None.

12. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR. None.

13. ITEMS FROM STAFF.

A. Director's Report.

Susan Healy Keene, Director of Community Development, stated there will be a public hearing regarding transportation alternatives by the MTA Regional Transportation Association at Plummer Park on Wednesday, February 6, 2008.

The Movietown Mixed-Use Project will be holding another neighborhood meeting on Saturday, February 9, 2008; 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. in the Community Center, on-site.

B. Planning Manager's Update.

John Keho, Planning Manager, provided an update of upcoming projects tentatively scheduled for Planning Commission.

14. PUBLIC COMMENT.

JEANNE DOBRIN, WEST HOLLYWOOD, commented on the Movietown Mixed-Use Project.

15. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS.

Commissioner DeLuccio complimented David Gillig, Commission Secretary, on the work and prompt attention given to the commission minutes.

- 16. ADJOURNMENT:** The Planning Commission adjourned at 9:10 P.M. to a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission, which will be on Thursday, February 7, 2008 at 6:30 P.M. at West Hollywood Park Auditorium, 647 N. San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood, California. **Motion carried by consensus of the Commission.**

APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS 21ST DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2008.



CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR