

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF WEST HOLLYWOOD
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of Planning Commission Agenda -August 3, 2006

Address:)
West Hollywood Park Auditorium)
647 N. San Vicente Boulevard)
West Hollywood, CA)
_____)

DATE OF MEETING: AUGUST 3, 2006

PLANNING COMMISSION:

John D'Amico, Chair
Joseph Guardarrama, Vice-Chair

John Altschul, Commissioner
Kate Bartolo, Commissioner
Donald DeLuccio, Commissioner
Barbara Hamaker, Commissioner
Eric Thompson, Commissioner

IN ATTENDANCE:

Francie Stefan, Sr. Planner
John Chase, Urban Designer
John Keho, Planning Manager
Christi Hogin, Asst City Atty
David Gillig, Comm. Secretary

Consultant:
Eric Wilson, EDAW/AECOM

PUBLIC SPEAKERS - VARIOUS

1 **Planning Commission Meeting**

2 **Thursday, August 3, 2006**

3 D'Amico: All right, let's call this meeting to order. Good
4 evening. Liza Amtmanis, would you please lead us
5 in the Pledge of Allegiance?

6 Amtmanis: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United
7 States of America and to the republic for which it
8 stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with
9 liberty, justice for all.

10 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Roll call, please?

11 Gillig: Good evening. Commissioner Thompson?

12 Thompson: Here.

13 Gillig: Commissioner Hamaker?

14 Hamaker: Here.

15 Gillig: Commissioner DeLuccio?

16 DeLuccio: Here.

17 Gillig: Commissioner Bartolo?

18 Bartolo: Here.

19 Gillig: Commissioner Altschul?

20 Altschul: Here.

21 Gillig: Vice Chair Guardarrama?

22 Guardarrama: Here.

23 Gillig: Chair D'Amico?

24 D'Amico: Yes.

1 Gillig: And we have a quorum.

2 D'Amico: Terrific. May I have a motion for the approval of
3 the agenda, but before we do that, if there's no
4 objections, I'd like to move new business to just
5 after the consent calendar so that we can handle
6 some of that business and then any commissioners
7 who need to recuse themselves can do so with the
8 night's business done for them. Any objection?

9 DeLuccio: No objection.

10 D'Amico: Can I have a motion?

11 DeLuccio: You have a motion.

12 Hamaker: Motion approved.

13 D'Amico: So moved.

14 Hamaker: Second.

15 D'Amico: Excellent. All those in favor?

16 Various: Aye.

17 D'Amico: None opposed?

18 D'Amico: Agenda's approved as amended.

19 D'Amico: The agency is approved as amended. The next item
20 is the approval of minutes. May I have a motion
21 for the approval of the minutes of July 20th?

22 Hamaker: Moved to approve.

23 D'Amico: Moved and....

24 DeLuccio: I need to recuse myself, I wasn't at the last

1 meeting.

2 Thompson: I'll second.

3 Altschul: And I need to abstain because I wasn't at the last
4 meeting.

5 D'Amico: Moved, seconded with two abstentions and all those
6 in favor?

7 Various: Aye.

8 D'Amico: None opposed? Those are approved. We have public
9 comment. We have one, two...we have five people
10 speaking in public comment...six rather. I'm
11 assured that none of you are speaking about the
12 Item 9A, which is about the development permit on
13 West Knoll nor about Item 9B, which is the 1343
14 Laurel Avenue. So with that said, why don't we go
15 right into public comment. Our first speaker is
16 Steve Martin.

17 Martin: Thank you, Chair and congratulations.

18 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

19 Martin: Thank you Commissioners. A few months ago...see
20 what I did here. A few months ago...what am I
21 supposed to do, John? Thank you.

22 D'Amico: Before you begin, would you remind us of your name
23 and city of residence?

24 Martin: I'm sorry, Steve Martin, West Hollywood. You'll

1 recall approximately six months ago, a number of
2 people in the community came out in regard to the
3 Mixed Use Ordinance and we had quite a lot of
4 lively debate about that, at least among the people
5 who came and spoke and during that process, I must
6 say that even though the Commission perhaps didn't
7 side with me and some other people in the
8 community, we could at least appreciate the fact
9 that you did listen because a lot of your comments
10 and, and deliberation were addressed to issues that
11 were brought up by the community and, you know, we
12 do appreciate that because dialogue, particularly
13 in these kinds of issues, is so important. I wish
14 I could say the same was true when we were before
15 City Council because we had scores of people
16 testifying and raising issues about whether it was
17 gridlock, loss of parking or just changing of the
18 character of the boulevard and virtually none of
19 the concerns of people who were opposed to the
20 Ordinance were ever addressed by any of the Council
21 members. And that was a real shame because that
22 let...that sent a signal to, to the community that
23 they weren't interested in dialogue. So I want to
24 say that, that I appreciate being able to come to

1 you because I, I know that you are listening. May
2 not always agree, but at least we're talking and
3 when we're dealing with important issues, that
4 dialogue is really important. West Hollywood,
5 we're making a lot of decisions tonight and always,
6 and sometimes you just need to take that long view
7 because you don't want to be here 20 years from now
8 and think, what was I thinking when I voted for
9 that. I mean I've been in that situation and I've
10 had the opportunity to kick myself. So, anyway,
11 thank you for your consideration.

12 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Tom DeMille will be followed
13 by Roslyn Krause.

14 DeMille: Says 52 on it. Tom DeMille, West Hollywood. I
15 actually came here today to thank all of the
16 residents who came and attended the National Night
17 Out on Tuesday. I thought it was a great success.
18 I'm saddened to say that we had a 21-year-old man
19 stabbed to death in front of the House of Blues
20 last night. There were 12 people scattered all
21 over the ground and it was a miserable mess.
22 Please take heed that been talking about cameras on
23 Sunset for four years. We need to protect the
24 customers, the residents, we need to protect the

1 women that are date raped, drugged...I'm gonna move
2 on, and change our city. If you read the paper or
3 watch the news, it's now apparent that this country
4 is going in the wrong direction and that's wrong
5 with a W. I heard a bad joke today. It was about
6 Mel Gibson. I didn't think it was very funny. It
7 said every time Mel Gibson opens his mouth, more
8 people die. I don't think it's right to judge one
9 man or one woman for the world's mistakes nor is it
10 right to stand and watch. And we're standing and
11 watching a hundred days before the election. We
12 need to stand and look and see what we have in
13 front of our country. In our own city, the medical
14 marijuana dispensaries, as they're called, not
15 dispensaries. I think that this Planning
16 Commission, I think that our City Council to ensure
17 that Proposition 215 is held to its highest
18 standards and not just for the very rich. People
19 living with cancer and AIDS cannot afford the very
20 thing we were afforded in the first place. With
21 the passage of 215, furthermore, if these clubs
22 want to live in green, I will make this a major
23 campaign issue for Steve Martin or for anybody
24 that's foolish enough to get into this race. I

1 really think we can do better in our city. We can
2 have the safest city. We could have eyes on our
3 residents to protect them, to protect our deputies.
4 I'd like to congratulate Captain Goldman for
5 becoming our new Captain. He's an old friend of
6 our city's. I think...of our city, I think he'll
7 lead us in the right direction. We need to have a
8 plan for our homeless. The heat devastated people.
9 We need to thank our fire reserve people and our
10 rescue people. Those fire alarms are going 20, 30,
11 40 times a day, saving people from death all over
12 our city. We need to take a look. With a hundred
13 days left and, and before the elections, we need to
14 take a good look and decide which direction we want
15 to proceed in or change. Thank you.

16 D'Amico: Thank you very much, Rosalyn Krause to be followed
17 by Polly Businger.

18 Krause: Roslyn Krause, West Hollywood. You'll never guess
19 what I'm going to talk about. I've been talking
20 about the hedge at 8629 Rugby Drive...what do you
21 do? I've been talking about....

22 D'Amico: Ros, Ros, do I need to recluse myself since that's
23 next door to me. That hedge.

24 Krause: You haven't done anything.

1 D'Amico: Please go ahead.

2 Krause: I've been talking about the hedge at 8629 Rugby
3 Drive for the past six years. That should give you
4 an idea how the City listens to the residents.
5 This 20-foot hedge interferes with traffic
6 visibility on the corner of Rugby and Westbourne
7 Drive. While driving west on Rugby, one must pull
8 out into the intersection to see if it's safe to
9 make either a left or right-hand turn. At the
10 Planning Commission Meeting held March 17th, the
11 year 2005, which was only a year and four months
12 ago, this is what was decided. "Prior to issuance
13 of a building permit," a building permit, this is
14 for the second story, "the hedge on the perimeter
15 of the property shall be reduced and maintained at
16 a height of three feet from the grade of the
17 property where the hedge interferes with the
18 traffic visibility on the corner of Rugby and
19 Westbourne as determined by the Department of
20 Transportation." Well, the second story of the
21 building is 98 percent complete, yet just typical
22 band-aid trimming has taken place. Is there any
23 wonder why builders are standing in line to build
24 in West Hollywood? They're able to do anything

1 they want and all it takes is a lot of money.

2 Thank you.

3 D'Amico: Thank you. Polly Businger followed by Helen Levin.

4 Businger: Hi, my name is Polly Businger. I'm a resident of
5 West Hollywood. I just wanted to make comment
6 regarding the fact that I know that West Hollywood
7 is gung-ho to get businesses to come here to
8 increase the economy, but I feel that there is then
9 a liability to provide appropriate parking equal to
10 the number of space that we need to provide for
11 those businesses, for those restaurants, for
12 instance and that...I understand there is some
13 parking, but perhaps it's on the east side of the
14 City. I'm not aware of anything that's on this
15 end. Oh, I know you can't respond to me to tell me
16 one way or the other, but I just don't feel that
17 we're providing...we're taking our responsibility
18 seriously to provide parking. I know that my
19 friend came...we have all this gridlock, my friend
20 has come down from Larrabee and Sunset twice to my
21 house at Westbourne and Melrose. It has taken her
22 20 minutes each time to get to me. That's
23 outrageous and here we're going to do, we're gonna
24 take steps that are gonna increase that traffic.

1 The other thing is that when building occurs, I
2 wish there was some way the Planning Commission
3 could mandate that live, very, very old trees be
4 maintained rather than being torn down so people
5 can build on every inch of the property. Thank
6 you.

7 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Helen Levin to be followed by
8 David Nash.

9 Levin: Helen Levin with Hollywood Russian Community
10 Center, Executive Director. And I would like to
11 support this project on the top of the center and
12 there were plans and I know that we love this city.
13 We love everything it represents in the entire
14 world, but it's also about those who need our help
15 and it, it....

16 D'Amico: Helen, I'm sure you're not talking about the Laurel
17 Project, but you may....

18 Levin: I am talking about the Laurel....

19 D'Amico: Then you'll have to speak during comment on that
20 project...

21 Levin: I'm sorry.

22 D'Amico: ...which is Item 9B.

23 Levin: I'm sorry.

24 D'Amico: Thank you, Helen.

1 Levin: Okay, should I rewrite my slip?

2 D'Amico: It's here, I'll give it to David when, when he
3 comes back. Thank you. David Nash to be followed
4 by Jeanne Dobrin.

5 Nash: David Nash, resident of West Hollywood. I do
6 happen to be a resident of a West Hollywood
7 Community Housing Corporation Building. I'm not
8 here to address any of the issues at Laurel
9 tonight. I'd like to share some of my experiences
10 and concerns about my long-term residency and
11 experiences on Palm, however. One of those is our
12 city's favorite topic, parking. There were not an
13 equal number of parking spaces allotted to the
14 number of apartments in the building. Apparently
15 there's some formula configured that takes into the
16 account that not everyone would have a car that
17 rents an apartment in Los Angeles. Let me tell
18 you, this is the most car attached people city on
19 the planet and the people that don't have cars
20 deeply resent that they pay the same amount of rent
21 as the people that do have cars and are not
22 allotted a parking place. This has caused numerous
23 incidents and issues throughout the, the history of
24 the building and recently some resident's car was

1 towed for being parking in an inappropriate place
2 that was not yet, yet guest parking, but was soon
3 to roll over to guest parking from employee
4 parking. It was very sad to have that happen. So
5 I want to tell you that in my opinion, future plans
6 should be made when a building is designed, one
7 bedroom equals one parking place, two bedrooms
8 equals two parking places and forget about any
9 formulary that takes into account that someone
10 might not have a car because if I'm betting man,
11 I'm gonna go to Vegas. If somebody lives in Los
12 Angeles, I'm gonna bet they do have a car.
13 Secondly, I'm concerned about the maintenance and
14 management at Palm View in general. The so-called
15 historical facade is badly peeling on both of the
16 Craftsman's Buildings, especially over the
17 manager's residence. The flooring in the public
18 areas is, is cracking in the public walkways.
19 We're in the eighth month of the eighth year and
20 it's beyond time that, that these sort of issues
21 were addressed. I suggest that all housing in
22 future developments in the City of West Hollywood
23 be under the rules of rent stabilization and
24 Maintenance standards because it causes a lot of

1 confusion when they're not. There's a back
2 stairway at Palm in which the carpet is grossly
3 stained so far beyond in need of replacement, but
4 there seems to be no current plan in place to do
5 that. Finally, I want to comment on the
6 resignation of Executive Director Paul Zimmerman
7 last February. It's now six months since his time
8 of resignation. When I spoke to Mr. Skorneck the
9 other day about how the replacement was going and
10 he informed me that they were getting very close to
11 making a final decision on selecting a Head Hunter
12 company to search for the Executive Director. I
13 can't believe we're at six months after his
14 resignation and we're just getting close to making
15 a final decision on contacting an organization to
16 search for a new Executive Director.

17 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Nash.

18 Nash: Something's not right about that.

19 D'Amico: Mr. Nash to be followed by Jeanne Dobrin.

20 Dobrin: Jeanne Dobrin, long time resident of West
21 Hollywood. One of the previous speakers was
22 speaking about parking. It's laughable. This new
23 Nightclub 11 on the corner of Larrabee and Sunset
24 was declared by the hysterical commission to be

1 hysterical historical and therefore that they
2 should have a big reduction in parking. So they're
3 only going to be required to provide 30 odd parking
4 spaces instead of 90, ridiculous. I wanted to tell
5 everybody that a, a new development is being
6 planned for 9062 Nemo. Nemo is the little tiny
7 street that's a shortcut from Santa Monica going
8 west to Doheny. The FAR means the amount of square
9 footage they can build in the Zoning Ordinance is
10 one and a half and since it's 10,400 square feet,
11 that means that they can build over 20,000.
12 However, they are asking for 1.93 FAR, not one and
13 a half. The Zoning Ordinance calls for three
14 stories. They are proposing four stories. They
15 also want to build a pedestrian bridge overhead.
16 The planner is a new person who's come to this
17 city, Joey Phillips, and he is brilliant. He wrote
18 a letter to the Lobbyist Todd Elliott and among
19 others they criticized the incomplete application,
20 but the best thing that he said was since this
21 pedestrian bridge has been given no evidence of a
22 benefit that he...that it's not going to be
23 approved. I like that very much. I think that we
24 all ought to pay a lot of attention to the things

1 that are happening in this city before they happen
2 instead of after they happen. Go to more meetings
3 and support more people who care about these
4 things. Also, I feel that the Planning Commission,
5 which has had several subcommittees, should also be
6 addressing this situation. Years ago when compact
7 cars were the desirable thing, the city allowed a
8 lot of compact spaces to be part of the Zoning
9 Ordinance. A compact space is 7½ by 15. A regular
10 space is 8 by 18 or 19 if it's next to a wall.
11 Some of the Ford...I think the Ford Explorer is
12 already longer than the...that's an SUV, naturally
13 is longer than the 18 feet. It's I believe 19 and
14 some odd inches. So therefore, we want to get rid
15 of this thing for the compact spaces and I feel
16 that this should be addressed as soon as possible.
17 Also, a lot of developers recently are going for
18 tandem spaces and the Planning Commission knows
19 that that's gonna be tougher to sell and they say
20 that they can't...the developer says they can't do
21 any better. Oh, yes, they can, by building one or
22 two less units, they can provide freestanding
23 spaces. You know what happens when there's tandem
24 spaces and there are two cars, somebody parks on

1 the street because they don't want to move the car
2 at night or in the morning. Thank you.

3 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Dobrin. That ends our public
4 comment period. Items from Commissioners, Donald?

5 DeLuccio: None at this time.

6 D'Amico: Kate?

7 Bartolo: None.

8 D'Amico: John?

9 Altschul: Yes, John, I think if you will please check that
10 file on that house at the corner of Rugby and
11 Westbourne and if in fact the direction is what Ms.
12 Krause said it was, to make sure that there's no
13 Certificate of Occupancy on that thing until the
14 hedge is trimmed.

15 Keho: We can check on that.

16 D'Amico: Anything else?

17 Altschul: No.

18 D'Amico: Joe?

19 Guardarrama: Nope.

20 D'Amico: Barbara? Eric? And John I just wanted to ask
21 about a project list. Maybe next time you can....

22 Keho: That's correct. We'll bring a project list to the
23 next meeting.

24 D'Amico: Excellent. Okay. There are no items on the

1 consent calendar and wanted to get to Item 10,
2 which is new business. Subcommittees of this
3 commission and I wanted to be...to talk about the
4 Design Review Subcommittee. I am going to step
5 away from that subcommittee and Kate will be taking
6 my seat if she will accept for the Design Review
7 Subcommittee? Excellent. For the Robertson
8 Boulevard subcommittee, Barbara had expressed an
9 interest in being on that along with Joe and Kate.
10 The Green Building subcommittee, I am going to take
11 Barbara's seat on the Green Building subcommittee
12 along with Eric and for the Business Signage
13 subcommittee, that includes Barbara, Donald and
14 Joe. Now if anyone has any further comments, we
15 can hear them. Otherwise, we'll go with those
16 subcommittees and any business that comes forward,
17 the staff will let us know. All right. Moving on
18 to public hearings. Public hearing 9A was
19 continued.

20 Hamaker: Mr. Chair, I, I would like to recuse myself from
21 the pub...are you talking about one that was....

22 D'Amico: I'm 9A, but you can recuse yourself from both.

23 Hamaker: Okay, let me just recuse myself now...

24 D'Amico: All right, Barbara.

1 Hamaker: ...because I'm on the Board of Directors of the
2 Housing Corporation. Thank you.

3 D'Amico: All right, have a nice evening. Public hearing 9A
4 was continued to Thursday, September 21st. That's
5 correct. All right. We'll wait for Barbara to
6 leave. Item 9B, Certificate of Appropriateness
7 2004-017 Conditional Use Permit, 2004-012
8 Demolition Permit, 2004-020 Development Permit,
9 2004-026 Modification, 2006-006 Variance, 2004-006
10 Variance, 2004-007 Variance, 2006-002 Certificate
11 of Final Environmental Impact Review. The
12 Applicant is Laurel Place West Hollywood. The
13 location is 1343 Laurel Avenue. The Planner is
14 Francie Stefan. Good evening. Francie, if you
15 would give us a introduction and then we're going
16 to hear from the Environmental Consultant. I think
17 that's the way we're gonna go.

18 Stefan: Great, thank you very much Chair and Commissioners.
19 Tonight we're here to review a project located at
20 1343 Laurel Avenue, known as the Laurel Place
21 Project. It's being proposed by the West Hollywood
22 Community Housing Corporation and involves three
23 primary components. One is senior affordable
24 housing, another is rehabilitation of a locally

1 designated historic structure and the third is
2 creation of a public neighborhood park. The
3 purpose of tonight's meeting is twofold. One is to
4 consider certification of the file EIR with its
5 attendant mitigation monitoring program, findings
6 of fact and statement of overriding consideration.
7 And number two, consideration of the permits
8 required for the project itself. So I would like
9 to introduce Eric Wilson from EDAW who will discuss
10 the analysis in the final Environmental Impact
11 report, which analyzed the 35-unit project, as well
12 as a, a range of project alternatives. As Eric
13 will describe later, the range of alternatives
14 considered includes a 28-unit project which is the
15 one being proposed by the Applicant and the one
16 before you tonight.

17 D'Amico: Before you begin, Christi, I wanted to call on you
18 to just do one quick little thing and give us the
19 City's lawyer's opinion about what EIRs do and what
20 it's supposed to do and then we can bear that in
21 mind while we hear about this EIR.

22 Hogin: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the
23 Commission. I know you've heard this before so
24 I'll keep it short, but there is a critical

1 distinction which sometimes is lost on newcomers to
2 the process and that is that the City prepares an
3 Environmental Impact Report, which evaluates what
4 the potential environmental impacts are of a
5 proposed project and when you certify the EIR, what
6 you're saying is not that you approve of the
7 project or you like the project or you're rejecting
8 the project, it's just that the environmental
9 information is all in front of you, that the Impact
10 report is in fact complete and that you have all
11 the information you need to understand what the
12 potential impacts are and when there are
13 significant impacts, what mitigation measures might
14 be imposed to reduce those impacts to a level
15 that's less than significant and also finally which
16 impacts are significant but there may not be
17 mitigation measures that could reduce them to a
18 level that's less than significant. And then
19 you're asked to certify that the report itself is
20 complete and again it's not a judgment on the
21 project, it's really a judgment on the completeness
22 of information. Then the second thing you're asked
23 to do is to look at the project itself against the
24 findings in the Code and I know Francie's gonna

1 walk you through all of that as you go along.

2 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Eric?

3 Wilson: Okay, maybe we could dim the light so everyone can
4 see the presentation here. I'm sure all of you are
5 very familiar with the actual project site and
6 we've got a few aerial, historic aerial, aerial
7 photographs here for you to see the lower one from
8 1960 you can see is a much more bare site and as it
9 continues up to 1990 and 1994, you can see the
10 property has a much more dense vegetation on site
11 and really we've characterized the condition of the
12 site or the conducting conditions of the site in
13 terms of three primary components and that's the
14 main building, which is a pre-World War I version
15 of the Colonial Revival style and the building was
16 constructed in 1914 and then remodeled
17 significantly in 1941 at the interior entrance and,
18 and the exterior of the building. In addition, the
19 second piece of the...there we go, the second piece
20 of the site includes the various outbuildings on
21 the rear portion of the property including a three-
22 car garage, a four-car garage addition, a major and
23 then a chauffeur's cottage, which is in the
24 northwest corner of the property. The third piece

1 being the landscape, which has several periods of
2 significance, which are shown here at the bottom of
3 this slide. Just very quickly, here's a view of
4 the northern portion of the site facing west. You
5 can see the main house and the fence vegetation.
6 On the, on the...I apologize, that was the southern
7 portion of the site. There's the northern portion
8 of the site looking down the driveway and the next
9 photo is looking...standing along the driveway and
10 looking back towards the outbuildings that I
11 mentioned a moment ago. Here's a colorful overview
12 of the SEQUA process and I'd like to start with the
13 initial study, which is the first step in the SEQUA
14 process which started in October of 2004 and I see
15 many familiar faces from, from when that process
16 began. The, the notice of preparation was
17 distributed back in October of 2004 and a scoping
18 meeting was held for the project and as a result of
19 the initial study analysis, it was determined that
20 an Environmental Impact report would be prepared
21 for this project, which is the document that, that
22 was made available for public review between
23 February 11th and March 28th of 2005. So the
24 document was released for public review in early

1 2005 and there were three opportunities for public
2 comment during the public review period and those
3 are shown on the top of this...top right-hand
4 corner of the screen and then in December of 2005,
5 the final EIR, which you have in front of you here
6 today, was, was completed and I'd like to flip to
7 the next slide and give you more detail of the
8 final EIR process 'cause there's some really
9 important pieces of information here that Christi
10 mentioned a moment ago.

11 D'Amico: Eric, hold on one second. I want to ask the
12 cameraman a question. If you need to talk, can you
13 just turn around and talk that way. Thank you so
14 much. Go ahead, Eric.

15 Wilson: So the first step in the final EIR process is
16 preparation of the final EIR document, which is
17 composed of three separate pieces. The first is
18 response to comments on the draft EIR and I
19 mentioned to you a moment ago that there were three
20 public hearings. The testimony at those public
21 hearings as well as all public comment letters that
22 were received were responded to in writing by the
23 City in the final EIR. The second section of the
24 final EIR is clarifications and revisions and this

1 is any modifications or factual corrections to the
2 final EIR that resulted from those public comments.
3 Those are also included in the document and finally
4 the mitigation monitoring and reporting program,
5 which is a tool for tracking and implementing the
6 mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The
7 next piece you've heard of this, Christi mentioned
8 the findings of Fact and the Statement of
9 overriding considerations and I think this
10 is...we'll come back to this point again later
11 because this is an extremely important piece of
12 the, the final SEQUA step here and I'm gonna read
13 this, this textbox, which summarizes that point.
14 SEQUA requires the decision maker to balance the
15 benefits of the proposed project against its
16 unavoidable adverse risks in determining whether to
17 approve a project and, and a few more slides on
18 that talk about those benefits and they talk about
19 those risks. If the benefits of the proposed
20 project outweigh the unavoidable adverse
21 environmental effects, the adverse impacts may be
22 considered acceptable and that's the statement of
23 overriding considerations. So moving forward, the
24 document was distributed according to SEQUA

1 requirements and ultimately it's being brought
2 forward here for your decision today. This site
3 plan is the 35-unit configuration that was
4 evaluated in the draft EIR and those 35 units
5 included one unit in the chauffeur's cottage as
6 shown. Construction of a four-story building
7 behind the existing residence and that included 28
8 units. An additional six units in the main house
9 and a neighborhood park in the front, which would,
10 would result in the preservation of existing
11 landscaping in the front and north side of the
12 yard. So here are the various environmental
13 categories that were evaluated in detail in the
14 environmental documentation for this project and
15 the first three categories shown here were
16 determined in the EIR to have no impact after the
17 environmental analysis was concluded. So as...for
18 example, for aesthetics light and glare, key
19 observation points were identified and photo
20 simulations were conducted to evaluate the
21 project's impacts on aesthetics light and glare.
22 The next slide you see there are impacts that would
23 be less than significant with mitigation, meaning
24 that a number of mitigation measures were

1 identified and presented in the draft and final EIR
2 that would reduce impacts to those categories to a
3 less than significant level and that leaves us with
4 one final impact, which is cultural resources.
5 That impact was determined to be significant and
6 unavoidable as a result of the project. So when
7 we're getting back to the statement of overriding
8 considerations, that's the significant and
9 avoidable impact that we're referring to. So I'd
10 like to take a few minutes to elaborate on the
11 cultural resources analysis that was undertaken for
12 the project and this slide describes the
13 methodology that was undertaken and the first step
14 was to describe the regulatory setting. So to look
15 at which environmental regulations apply to this
16 project. For example, the Secretary of Interior
17 Standards for Rehabilitation. The second was to
18 describe the existing conditions of the site and
19 this involved looking at documentation that already
20 existed such as the Natural Register Eligibility
21 Evaluation and Arborist reports in addition to new
22 technical reports that were prepared for the
23 Environmental Impact Report, such as the historic
24 landscape documentation, which is included as an

1 Appendix to the EIR. This was used to determine
2 the character defining features of the property.
3 We then evaluated the impacts based on the
4 conformance with the Secretary of Interior
5 Standards, the 10 Secretary of Interior Standards
6 for Rehabilitation and define mitigation measures
7 as appropriate. So this is a summary of the
8 various categories of impacts that resulted from
9 the cultural resources analysis and the first three
10 impacts are those significant unavoidable impacts
11 that I mentioned a moment ago. The first being
12 impacts to the setting of the main residence and
13 these impacts would occur as a result of the
14 construction of the new 28-unit building in the
15 rear portion of the property, which would change
16 the relationship of the existing building to the
17 setting of the property. The second would be the
18 demolition of the outbuildings in the rear, which I
19 mentioned earlier and the third would be the
20 removal of the historic landscape features and the
21 disruption of the spatial and land use
22 relationships in the rear of the site. So again,
23 those impacts are focused on the rear portion of
24 the site. The, the next category is less than

1 significant mitigate...after mitigation, these
2 impacts, for example the impacts to the
3 remodeling...from the remodeling of the main
4 residence and from the chauffeur's cottage would be
5 mitigated through a host of mitigation measures,
6 which I'll show On the next slide. And finally,
7 archeological impacts were determined less than
8 significant. So this is a summary of the six
9 mitigation measures that were identified for...to
10 reduce impacts to cultural resources. For example,
11 a historical architectural building survey was
12 recommended for not only the main house but the
13 chauffeur's cottage as well as the existing garages
14 and bachelor's apartment and the historic landscape
15 preservation plan was also recommended as
16 mitigation for the project. As part of the SEQUA
17 process, you're required to evaluate a reasonable
18 range of alternatives and the EIR evaluated five,
19 five such alternatives starting with the no project
20 alternative, which is what would happen in the
21 absence of the proposed project on the site. The
22 second alternative that was evaluated is the
23 relocation of the cottage and construction of a
24 three-story building. Now granted, this was a

1 three-story building that would still accommodate
2 35 units, so it required the relocation of the
3 cottage in order to provide enough space to, to
4 construct that facility. Alternative three would
5 be a reduced into the alternative that would bring
6 the total number of units on site down to 15 units.
7 Alternative four looked at historic preservation.
8 This would not result in the construction of any
9 new buildings. Rather it would just simply involve
10 preservation of the main building. And the fifth
11 alternative was the construction of no senior
12 housing, rather an art center and park on site.
13 And it's a bit hard to see that red text there, but
14 it says alternative six 28-unit alternative and
15 this is an alternative that was developed after
16 the, the release of the draft EIR and I'm gonna
17 talk about that on the next slide. The 28-unit
18 alternative was proposed by the Applicant after the
19 draft EIR was submitted and this alternative was
20 analyzed in a memo, which was submitted to the HPC
21 on May 22nd and within that memo, we identified
22 that that alternative fell within the range of
23 alternatives that were already evaluated, so those
24 five alternatives that I mentioned in that last

1 slide, this new alternative fell within the range
2 of the alternatives that had already been
3 evaluated. Construction of the 28 units would not
4 increase the severity of any of the impacts or
5 create any significant new impacts and this is
6 important 'cause that would be a trigger for re-
7 circulation of the document if that were to occur.
8 Impacts to aesthetics, public services, utilities
9 and transportation would be reduced simply because
10 there'd be fewer units on site and then the
11 proposed project there'd be seven fewer units and
12 in addition impacts to cultural resources would be
13 reduced through a number of measures and Francie's
14 gonna talk about all the different revisions that
15 would occur between the proposed project and the
16 28-unit alternative, but those that really pertain
17 to the, to the reduction in cultural resources are
18 shown here and those include retaining and
19 rehabilitating the landscape immediately behind the
20 main house. So design revisions were, were
21 undertaken so that there would be a larger
22 courtyard for use of residents behind the main
23 house between the two buildings. There would be
24 improving...improvement of the scale and spatial

1 relationships at the rear of the site, so again a
2 reduction in those impacts, not an elimination, but
3 a reduction of those impacts, reducing the height
4 and the footprint of the south wing projection of
5 the new building. The balconies were removed,
6 which also increased that, that...the spatial
7 relationships in the rear of the site and finally
8 the front facade changes that would reduce the
9 height of the screen setback parapet walls and
10 create three new planes that respond to the main
11 residence articulation. Now I talked about the
12 Secretary of Interior Standards a moment ago.
13 These changes would eliminate one impact that was
14 identified in the EIR, specifically this would make
15 the project conform with the Secretary of Interior
16 Standards for Rehabilitation Number Two. Now there
17 are still several other standards that would not
18 conform even under this alternative, so it would
19 still result in a significant unavoidable impact to
20 cultural resources. It would just be less than
21 that identified for the proposed project. In a
22 final note, this was...this alternative, this 28-
23 unit alternative was recommended for approval by
24 the HPC on May 22nd, 2006. So with that, I'd like

1 to turn it over to Francie who is gonna talk about
2 that alternative in a little bit more detail.

3 Stefan: Okay, so the 28-unit project alternative continues
4 two of the three main parts of the project. Well,
5 it continues all three, but doesn't change two of
6 them. It continues the rehabilitation of the main
7 house and the chauffeur's cottage and also
8 continues the creation of the public park in the
9 front and the north yards of the site. The main
10 changes for this alternative were to the new
11 building to be built in the rear of the site. Most
12 importantly, that new building was reduced from 28
13 units to 21 units, which involved removal of the
14 entire fourth floor of the building. The building
15 was also changed and it...the footprint of the
16 building was also changed to increase the width of
17 the courtyard so the area from between the rear of
18 the main house and the front of the new building.
19 This increased from about 11 feet to a range of 20
20 to 22 feet, which incidentally is under our City's
21 Courtyard Housing Standards considered to be a
22 viable courtyard for a building. It also increased
23 the width between the chauffeur's cottage and the
24 new building. So this distance here increased, the

1 separation between those two buildings. Balconies
2 that had been projecting from the front of this
3 facade into the courtyard were removed and a
4 silkscreen image was added to the front of the
5 screen of this building here. The height of the
6 screen was reduced so it went from approximately
7 about 36 feet down to 24 feet and openings were
8 added in the wood screening that goes across the
9 stairwells at this part...portion of the building
10 and over here as well. The angle of the balconies,
11 the angle of the screen, which is at the front of
12 the new building had been angled and now was
13 divided into three parallel planes that responded
14 to the articulation of the rear of the building.
15 So where the, the building breaks here and breaks
16 here, the plane was now also responding to
17 that...the plane of this, of the, of the screen.
18 The stairwell addition of the cottage was also
19 moved to create more separation from the cottage
20 and to be parallel to the new building. Next slide
21 please. The projection of this portion of the
22 building was reduced and pulled back so that it
23 aligned with this notch of the main house so it
24 responded to the existing structure there, and

1 there was a trellis on the end of the south wing
2 that was removed and pulled back, basically pulled
3 back to being flush with the facade as opposed to
4 being pushed forward, so further reducing its
5 visibility from the street. The parapet walls on
6 the roof that were screening the HVAC and other
7 things on the roof were pulled back so that
8 they...from a, from a person standing on the ground
9 would not visible anymore, which reduced the
10 apparent height of the building. The courtyard was
11 raised about two feet so this courtyard that's
12 created between the two buildings here was
13 depressed in an earlier iteration or in order to
14 reduce the overall height of the new building, but
15 that got raised up so that there would be more
16 continuity between this landscape here and coming
17 around the side of the building so that this would
18 be more of a unified landscape that surrounded the
19 main structure. The court...the parking spaces
20 were reduced to approximately 17. That wasn't
21 in...that wasn't to mitigate parking provision, it
22 was to minimize the amount of excavation that had
23 to be done for the subterranean parking here and
24 the affect of that was to create more separation

1 from this wing here. The previous version had come
2 fairly close to the end of this wing and there was
3 concern about the impact that would have to the
4 footings of this...of the historic structure, so it
5 was pulled back a bit. Incidentally, the Applicant
6 has figured out a means to provide two more spaces
7 in that subterranean garage without increasing the
8 footprint of it and that is in the plans that they
9 provided for us today, so that's actually up to 19.
10 Additional private storage space was added to the
11 subterranean garage for the use of the residents
12 and the landscaping and hardscaping as part of
13 the...in the rear of the, of the site was to
14 integrate a little bit more with the overall
15 property. So those are the primary changes of the,
16 of the 28-unit project. Because this alternative
17 was determined to be feasible and substantially
18 lessen significant environmental impacts of the
19 proposed project, it was determined by the City to
20 be preferable to the 35-unit project that's
21 reflected in the draft findings that you have
22 before you tonight. And as such, if the project
23 were to be approved, it's recommended that the 21
24 changes illuminated here be required for the

1 project. This project was reviewed by the Historic
2 Preservation Commission as well as the
3 Environmental Documentation. They reviewed
4 Certificate of Appropriateness for the 28-unit
5 project on May 22nd, as Eric said, and unanimously
6 recommended approval to the Planning Commission.
7 Prior to this action, they had reviewed the 35-unit
8 project and felt that there were issues of height
9 and scale of the new building in relation to the
10 historic resource and that's, that did spark the
11 change that you see with the 28-unit project. When
12 they reviewed it, they did feel that this project
13 addressed those concerns. Because this project has
14 a public park component, it was also reviewed by
15 the Public Facilities Commission. They reviewed
16 the park description, the components and the
17 mitigation measures that are in the EIR for the
18 park portion. The Public Facilities Commission was
19 supportive of the park and did recommend approval
20 of it to the Planning Commission as well. If the
21 project's approved, the Public Facilities
22 Commission would then begin the process, the public
23 process of the park's final design using the
24 description that's in the EIR as well as the

1 mitigations, mitigation measures that were
2 outlined. This project is supposed to be receiving
3 funding from HUD and because of that, it's also
4 subject to the National Environmental Policy Act or
5 NEPA. NEPA is very similar to SEQUA. It has many
6 of the same categories that it analyzes, looks at
7 maybe the same issues, uses just slightly different
8 language, but in many, many regards it's similar.
9 This is being done by HUD staff. The NEPA document
10 did identify similar impacts to cultural resources
11 as the SEQUA document did and what NEPA requires is
12 that in these cases a Memorandum of Agreement be
13 made between HUD, the California State Office of
14 Historic Preservation and the City of West
15 Hollywood. This Memorandum of Understanding
16 ensures implementation of all of the identified
17 mitigation measures for the project and as of now
18 it's our understanding that the draft document has
19 been prepared to the satisfaction of all those
20 parties and does implement the mitigation measures
21 that are identified in the EIR. This project had
22 required neighborhood meeting in July 2003 and the
23 Applicant at that time had prepared a number of
24 project alternatives that they presented for public

1 discussion. Primary concerns expressed at that
2 meeting were regarding the use of the site, the
3 loss of landscaping and the impacts to cultural
4 resources. Those reflect similar concerns as were
5 conveyed in the draft EIR comment period and
6 responded to in the final EIR. The park
7 alternative discussed at this meeting was taken
8 forward as an EIR alternative called the West
9 Hollywood Art Center and park alternative and so it
10 was analyzed in more detail. Most importantly,
11 project revisions have been made that address many
12 of...as many of those concerns as were feasible and
13 possible to address. The project has been modified
14 numerous times. This 28-unit project is probably
15 the sixth or seventh iteration that have involved
16 and I think the, the different iterations are
17 illustrated in the staff report. They've involved
18 everything from significant removal, removal of
19 entire wings of the new building, depression of the
20 building below the ground, different articulation,
21 different materials, different architectural
22 design. So there have been many efforts made to
23 reduce the impacts of any changes to the site with
24 regard to massing, compatibility with adjacent

1 structures on this site as well as with adjacent
2 historic structures to the north and adjacent
3 residential structures to the west and the south,
4 so there have been numerous efforts made to, to
5 address these issues. In general, this project
6 would be the third major change on this property
7 since it was originally constructed. The single
8 family house was changed to a four-unit building in
9 1941 and the property would now be converted to a
10 total of 28 units, which continues a pattern of
11 increasing density on this site. The landscape has
12 also been significantly altered over time with the
13 parts that were originally the open lawn design
14 eventually being used for multiple functional uses
15 such as a badminton court, incinerators, animal
16 pens and other things that were located in the
17 southwestern portions of the site. This would
18 increase...this would continue that by adding a
19 public park component that would allow greater
20 public access to the, the landscaping environment
21 of this, of this property. One of the most
22 important aspects of the property is the
23 relationship of the main residence to the area of
24 the lot and that's actually nicely illustrated in

1 the figure ground diagram that you received with
2 your, with your plan set. It shows that this
3 approximately 5,000 square foot house sits on a
4 30,000 square foot lot, so that it appears as an
5 estate, as an object surrounded by open space. The
6 new building has been sited in the back of the
7 residence in the space that was historically a
8 service yard and has the greatest amount of paved
9 area and least landscaping. This figure ground
10 drawing does illustrate that the new...the
11 footprint of the new building is actually quite a
12 bit smaller than the footprints of surrounding
13 buildings that you would see and also still retains
14 a significant portion of open space on the lot in
15 comparison to surrounding properties, both old and
16 new. The location of the new building minimizes
17 the impact on the envelope of space around the
18 historic structures. It's also the location
19 furthest removed from the street in a location in
20 which the majority of the new structure is blocked
21 from view by the historic house itself. This
22 approach leaves the majority of the open space
23 intact, accommodating both meaningful historic
24 contacts for the building and a viable public park.

1 At this point, I'd like to turn it over to John to
2 talk a little bit about the architecture.

3 D'Amico: And John, while you're talking about the
4 architecture, would you give us a comment or two
5 about the neighboring historic property and any
6 sort of urban design discussion you might include
7 in discussing that neighboring property and how it
8 was discussed along the way?

9 Chase: The property to the north was a consideration in
10 the massing of the building and the fact that the
11 carriage house was retained as part of the
12 buildings on the site that are being preserved
13 lessens the impact of the new building on the old
14 building to the north. The architecture of the
15 main...of the original main building has some
16 regular simple and straightforward aspects. Some
17 of the same simplicity has been applied to the
18 window placement, the massing and the detailing of
19 the new building in terms of directness and
20 straightforwardness. Located at the rear of the
21 property, the L-shaped building, one unit in depth
22 creates the courtyard space between the old and the
23 new buildings. The building steps down towards the
24 house on the south wing in order to lessen the

1 impact on the historic house and also to the north
2 in order to lessen its impact on the carriage house
3 and the historic property to the north. The open
4 circulation along the east space of the new
5 building is spaced by a light emitting two-story
6 polypropylene plastic screen in order to rate the
7 same kind of proportion of opening in a wall to, to
8 solid wall that is found in the existing historic
9 building that it faces. The design places the open
10 corridor with small widened areas for social
11 interaction next to the major courtyard space
12 between the two buildings, thus linking a small
13 open space for circulation in the manner that is
14 encouraged by various City policies and standards
15 such as the Courtyard Housing Section of the Zoning
16 Code. The longer western wing of the building is
17 finished in stucco with horizontal expansion joints
18 and the southern wing is finished in...and I want
19 to make a correction to the staff report, which
20 says wood, it's chip board siding, which is also
21 horizontal in the same kind of proportions that
22 wood siding is found. There are additional areas
23 of vine trellis and wood slat screening that are
24 used on various bays of the building to further

1 subdivide it into smaller pieces. The project has
2 been conditioned to substitute another material for
3 the expanded metal proposed by the Applicant on the
4 plans that were submitted on the balconies to the
5 west and the, the south facade and there is another
6 condition to make the tree pattern proposed on the
7 polypropylene screen monochrome white or off-white
8 rather than multi-color in order to soften its
9 impact as a competing design element to the
10 historic house.

11 D'Amico:

11 Thank you. We're gonna take five minutes and
12 invite everyone to come up and look at the model
13 and the boards while they turn on the lights. And
14 then we'll come back and we'll have the design
15 review subcommittee comments explaining what the
16 design review experience of this model was. So
17 we'll be back in five minutes. Take a look. All
18 right, take your last looks at the model and the
19 boards and we will start back again with Francie,
20 who has a couple more items to review about the
21 EIR. Take a minute. If everyone could take their
22 seats. Meanwhile, the Vice Chair will hum a tune.
23 All right, thank you everyone. Go ahead Francie.

24 Stefan:

24 Thank you. So this project combined three

1 essential goals, public policy goals. The three
2 habilitation we use of historic buildings, creation
3 of the park space and provision of affordable
4 housing. This combination of objectives is a
5 strategic choice based on the efficient use of
6 scarce land resources and the multiple needs of the
7 community. The multiple uses also create a
8 meaningful adjacencies where the housing creates an
9 on-site constituency for the park and the park
10 enriches the affordable housing. Furthermore, the
11 sitting of the new building to create a courtyard
12 space continues the intent of courtyard housing and
13 orientation of multi-family structures to the
14 outside that we have in West Hollywood, to balance
15 the of public policy objectives to achieve the
16 maximum benefit for as many of these goals as
17 possible. I just want to make a few...we need to
18 go back quickly to the Statement of Overriding
19 Considerations.

20 D'Amico: Don't go quickly. Take your time.

21 Stefan: Slowly and deliberately.

22 D'Amico: We got nothing but time.

23 Stefan: To the Statement of Overriding Considerations. I
24 just wanted to make a few statements that are

1 reflected in the staff report with regard to the
2 need for affordable housing and the need for a park
3 area in West Hollywood. The housing element of the
4 General Plan identifies a provision of affordable
5 housing and particularly housing for seniors
6 and...well, yeah, particularly for seniors as well
7 as the Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan identifies
8 affordable housing as a primary strategic goal of
9 the City. Affordable housing for seniors is
10 especially critical since people over 65 constitute
11 17 percent of the City's population and people over
12 55 account for more than a quarter of the City's
13 population. Often living on fixed income, seniors
14 find their options for affordable housing in the
15 open market extremely limited. Illustrating this
16 point is the fact that in 2005 when the City last
17 opened its waiting list for low income housing
18 units, 742 applications from senior households were
19 received. Of these, 81 percent of these households
20 have less than \$24,000.00 in annual income. The
21 average rate for a vacant rental unit in West
22 Hollywood was \$1,311.00 in 2005. This rental
23 amount would consume the entire gross income of
24 seniors living on Social Security and up to 66

1 percent of the gross income of even the most
2 affluent of low, of the low income seniors on the
3 City's waiting list. In addition, in addition, the
4 City's Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan and the General
5 Plan identify the expansion of parks as a primary
6 goal. The City currently provides only half an
7 acre of park land for every 1,000 residents in
8 spite of having a goal of three acres per 1,000
9 residents. Participants at a community workshop
10 for a recent park and recreation needs assessment
11 identified pocket parks as one of the top five park
12 and recreation needs in the City. The proposed
13 neighborhood park would provide much needed open
14 space in the City. In addition, the project would
15 provide community meeting rooms available for
16 public uses by reservation in the main house. In
17 general, the absence of vacant undeveloped
18 properties and high cost of property makes the
19 development park space in West Hollywood very, very
20 difficult. So before we go into discussion, just
21 want to be clear that the proposed project has been
22 determined through the balance of these different
23 interests, has been determined that the...that in
24 the findings that you have in front of you that the

1 unavoidable adverse environmental impacts that were
2 identified in the EIR acceptable due to the
3 specific considerations, namely the need for
4 housing and the need for park space, which outweigh
5 the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of
6 the project. This project does require multiple
7 permits including a development permit for
8 construction of the new building, a demolition
9 permit for the garage, a conditional use permit for
10 the provision of senior housing, a finding of
11 General Plan consistency for the public park and a
12 modification to reduce parking stall length by 10
13 percent. There's also a number of variances,
14 namely to reduce the rear yard setback from 15 feet
15 to 10 feet and allow semi-subterranean parking in
16 the rear setback, to reduce the separation of
17 habitable structures particularly between the new
18 building and the chauffeur's cottage from 10 feet
19 to seven feet and to reduce private open space
20 requirements. The findings for all of these
21 variances are based on the exceptional and
22 extraordinary circumstances created by the existing
23 historic structures on the site and the fact that
24 these circumstances do not...prohibit the use of

1 the entire lot area. Each of the variances reduce
2 the impacts to the site and historic features
3 without creating undue impacts on the surrounding
4 properties. The project complies with all other
5 provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and, and in
6 addition it was found that the public park is
7 consistent with the policies of the General Plan.
8 The findings for each of those permits are detailed
9 specifically in the draft resolution and we can
10 discuss some in more detail later if you'd like.
11 In summary, the project is consistent with the
12 applicable provisions of the Municipal Code and
13 General Plan and has been reviewed in accordance
14 with SEQUA. Although significant and unavoidable
15 impacts have been identified, the public benefits of
16 the proposal outweigh and offset these impacts.
17 The reduced 28-unit project in staff's
18 recommendation is of a scale and design that
19 compliments the existing historic resource and the
20 surrounding properties and based on this, staff is
21 recommending approval of the permits and the final
22 Environmental Impact Report.

23 D'Amico: Thank you very much. The...next we want to hear
24 from the Design Review Subcommittee and actually

1 I'm gonna ask for both Joe and John to speak about
2 the project since there were two versions of this
3 project presented. You don't need to speak on both
4 of them, but I think it can't hurt to have more
5 than one opinion from that Design Review
6 Subcommittee meeting. So Joe, John, whoever wishes
7 to go first.

8 Guardarrama: All right, we most recently got this project back
9 at Design Review, I guess it was about a month or
10 two ago, I think it was in June, and we generally
11 like the fact that the project behind the main
12 house got lower. We did express some concern or at
13 least I remember expressing some concern again
14 about the polypropylene screen in front of the, the
15 new building. We felt that...we felt that it was
16 not quite appropriate to go with that main house.
17 We also expressed concern about the leaf motif that
18 was used for the silk screening of the
19 polypropylene screen and finally I was deeply
20 concerned about the use of metal, not the
21 corrugated variety, but the, the perforated metal
22 that was going to be used on some railings.

23 D'Amico: John?

24 Altschul: The original design or the original renderings for

1 this project were shown about maybe almost two
2 years ago and I can't remember when the original
3 Design Review Committee meeting was, but it was at
4 least, well over a year ago. It was recognized by
5 the Design Review Committee that this particular
6 property presents tremendous, tremendous challenges
7 and a lot these challenges just simply may not be
8 able to be overcome. When you start with a place
9 that has been designated historical and there are
10 certain constraints and requirements attributable
11 to that, you're kind of limited in what you can
12 present in terms of architectural design versus a
13 property where you can tear down to the ground what
14 is there and start afresh and all over again. And
15 I know the Design Review Committee, at least I on
16 the Design Review Committee felt terribly
17 frustrated that it took a very, very long time and
18 there was a tremendous amount of intransigents in
19 order to, to bring something forth that was
20 somewhat acceptable and as Joe said, what made it
21 somewhat acceptable was taking off the top floor.
22 What it does, of course, is it camouflages the new
23 building behind the old building and perhaps
24 it...that's the only way to achieve something with

1 respect to this particular property given its
2 historical nature, but it is what it is.

3 D'Amico: Okay, moving forward, I just want to sort of go
4 over how I'd like to go through the next couple of
5 procedural items. Next we have disclosures and
6 then after that we're going to take questions over
7 to the staff, either about John Chase's
8 presentation or Francie or Eric's presentation and
9 then we're gonna open up public testimony and when
10 we get to that point, we'll talk about the process
11 from there. So why don't we start at that end,
12 Eric, do you have any disclosures?

13 Thompson: Yeah, I met with the representative of the West
14 Hollywood Housing Corporation to discuss the
15 project and equally I also met with several
16 residents. I met on site with one of the residents
17 on the site at the time. This was years...a
18 couple, a year, year or so ago to walk the project.

19 D'Amico: Joe?

20 Guardarrama: I most recently visited the site last week. I have
21 visited the site previously and been given a tour
22 by Allegra Allison. I have spoken about the merits
23 of the project with a number of people including
24 Steve Afriat, James Arnone and a few others just in

1 passing.

2 D'Amico: Okay, Donald?

3 DeLuccio: Right over to me. Actually I have been on the
4 site. This past Saturday I spent a good hour on
5 the site with representatives of the Housing
6 Corporation. I did speak with some of the
7 residents. I spoke with Allegra a couple years
8 back so just to balance it out so, yeah, I've had a
9 lot of visibility with this project over the last
10 couple of years.

11 D'Amico: Kate?

12 Bartolo: I have met with...I've toured the site. I met with
13 or talked to by telephone Jim Arnone, Allegra and
14 I'm embarrassed to say I don't know your last name,
15 but I think...Allison, excuse me, everyone knows
16 you so you're just the...you're like now Cher, you
17 know? Helene Winderman and a number of other
18 people who are actually not connected to the City
19 of West Hollywood on historic preservation issues.

20 D'Amico: John?

21 Altschul: I visited the sites on several occasions and talked
22 to num, innumerous people about this project over
23 the last two years, most recently with Jim Arnone
24 this, this week.

1 D'Amico: And I also have spoken to Cher and met with
2 representatives of the Housing Corporation and the
3 Board and had long discussions about the design of
4 the, the rear building. And most recently have
5 walked past the site and had e-mail and telephone
6 conversations with representatives from the, the
7 project, the Applicant and also with Allegra. So
8 those are our disclosures, one and all. Now I'd
9 like to open this up for Commissioners to ask
10 questions of the staff. Anyone wish to go first?
11 Donald?

12 DeLuccio: Yes, I have a couple of questions. One has to do
13 with the number of parking spaces being proposed,
14 17 and then they're, they're gonna be adding two,
15 19, that does meet Code doesn't it for senior
16 housing?

17 Stefan: Yes, it does. Code requirement for senior housing
18 is half a space per unit plus one guest space for
19 every 10 and 17 is exactly the amount that they
20 would be required.

21 DeLuccio: Then my next question in regards to the overriding
22 statement and consideration, I know that the, the
23 massing was reduced of the, the new buildings being
24 proposed. Is there any thought given to how many,

1 maybe it's not even possible, how many units would
2 need to be there, which would then not require an
3 overriding statement of consideration? Was
4 that....

5 Stefan: Hmm. There was an additional reduced density
6 alternative looked at in the EIR. I believe it was
7 15 units? And I do think that that still...we're
8 looking right now, sorry for the delay, but I do
9 think that still resulted in a significant
10 unavoidable impact to cultural resources. If you
11 want, we can, we can look it up and come to you in
12 a minute if you wanted to move on.

13 DeLuccio: Okay, that'd be fine 'cause I'd like to know the
14 answer to that.

15 Stefan: Okay.

16 D'Amico: Okay, anyone else have any questions? Eric?

17 Thompson: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify. I think Francie,
18 you touched on this in your presentation, but I
19 just want to be sure I have the distances correct.
20 The distance now between the back edge of the front
21 structure and the front edge of the back structure
22 is what? The...it's a range.

23 Stefan: Yeah, from 20, 20½ feet to 22 feet.

24 Thompson: Okay and does the back...does the, does the back

1 side of the back structure intrude into the rear
2 setback?

3 Stefan: Yes.

4 Thompson: That's the....

5 Stefan: That's the variance.

6 Thompson: That's the variance, okay. Okay, thanks.

7 Stefan: And so we found the answer to your question,
8 Commissioner DeLuccio. The introduction of the new
9 building would still cause substantial adverse
10 changes to the historic property because its
11 physically removing the garages as well as portions
12 of the landscape, so any footprint that would be
13 placed there, it would significant and unavoidable
14 so that 15-unit alternative still had significant
15 unavoidable impacts. So in that sense, you...there
16 is nothing without, you know, as soon as you
17 disturb those things in the yard, then it's
18 significant and unavoidable.

19 DeLuccio: Thank you.

20 D'Amico: Okay, Kate, do you have any questions or am I
21 getting to you too quick?

22 Bartolo: Not at this time.

23 D'Amico: Okay, John?

24 Altschul: Francie, we'd had some, some talk and discussion

1 about putting or setting aside some mechanism or
2 some way to get the City Line shuttle on to the
3 property to pick up people and to take...and to
4 drop them off after taking them to the major
5 corridor boulevards. Do you have any language to
6 suggest for that kind of a condition to add to the
7 resolution at this particular time or, or when do
8 you think it's appropriate to, to go into that?

9 Stefan: Perhaps after we hear from public comment, we can,
10 you know, talk about language if you want a
11 condition the permits.

12 D'Amico: Okay and I just had one quick question. The public
13 hearing or the public meeting, community meeting
14 was in July of 2003, the official one, though there
15 have been numerous different ad hoc public meetings
16 in which public concerns were addressed, but does
17 the City in its findings, I mean I understand
18 you're recommending approval, but City in its
19 findings find that that was a sufficient public
20 hearing on this project which is before us, that
21 2003 hearing?

22 Stefan: Well, it certainly addressed a project that was
23 larger and of a greater scale than the one that's
24 before us now. There have been so numerous

1 opportunities for comment through the, the three
2 hearings that were, were provided on the draft EIR
3 as well as Public Facilities, multiple ones in
4 front of the Historic Preservation Commission and
5 the, the most recent one in front of the Historic
6 Preservation Commission did specifically address
7 this and provided time for public comment.

8 D'Amico: Excellent, thank you. Terrific, so...oh,
9 excellent, Kate, go ahead.

10 Bartolo: You had mentioned, you referenced that there were
11 other opportunities for public comment, what were
12 those forums? Other than the formal...I know that
13 there's one formal requirement for the meeting, you
14 referenced that in your staff report, can you give
15 me some examples of the other opportunities?

16 Stefan: Well, what we had was first of all a scoping
17 meeting for the draft EIR just to define the
18 parameters and the issues to be discussed in that.
19 We also then once there was a draft EIR available
20 had three, three comment hearings, which is
21 significantly more than is actually required by
22 procedural requirements and then after that we've
23 had Design Review Subcommittee meetings with the
24 Historic Preservation, Design Review Subcommittee,

1 Design Review Subcommittee of the Planning
2 Commission meetings, a number of those. We've also
3 now had I believe three or four Historic
4 Preservation Commission meetings to look at
5 different parts of this project, initially to look
6 at the 35-unit project and then a couple in between
7 and then the May meeting where they looked at the
8 28-unit project. So all in all we're probably at
9 about 10 to 12 meetings so far.

10 D'Amico:

11 Okay, at this point, having nothing else from the
12 staff, we're going to open the public hearing and
13 in order to facilitate and shine as much light on
14 this as possible and in order to get the full range
15 of public comment, what I have asked the Applicant
16 and members of a loosely formed group that have
17 been most vocal about this project to do is to make
18 their presentation...the Applicant to make a
19 presentation about the EIR and any concerns they'd
20 like to address and then have a representative of
21 the community take an equal amount of time and
22 discuss only the EIR and after that happens, then
23 I'd like to have the Applicant come back up again
24 and discuss the entitlements and the project before
us and again have members of the community use

1 their speaker time to talk about that and I think
2 that's a parallel process. It gives all of us
3 commissioners an opportunity to hear first about
4 the EIR, take our comments and our concerns, and
5 jot them down, then hear about the entitlement of
6 the project, jot those down, and then we'll hear
7 from the...all of the people in the, in the
8 audience who wish to speak for two minutes. Thank
9 you. Thank you ladies and gentlemen. Order
10 Deville. We'll...so if the Applicant would like to
11 come up, introduce himself, you'll have 10 minutes
12 to speak about the EIR and don't forget your name
13 and city of residence.

14 Arnone:

14 Thank you. My name is Jim Arnone, I'm a resident
15 of the City of Malibu. I'm a partner at the Law
16 Firm of Latham & Watkins and I am here tonight
17 representing the West Hollywood Community Housing
18 Corporation. I'm going to take a lot less than 10
19 minutes. I have reviewed the staff report, I have
20 reviewed very carefully the draft EIR, the final
21 EIR, the technical appendices supporting it, the
22 memorandum that EDAW prepared. EDAW as I know this
23 Commission knows is a very well respected EIR
24 preparation firm. Their instructions consistently

1 from the staff dating back two years for the two
2 years this process has been going through the staff
3 has been to be conservative in every way. I have
4 been practicing environmental and land use law for
5 16 years. I've been teaching environmental law at
6 USC's law school for 10 years and I can tell you in
7 the range that you see for EIRs, this is far on the
8 conservative range. It took every pot, potentially
9 significant impact and resolved all doubts towards
10 declaring it to be a significant impact. This is
11 on the far end of the conservative range. You have
12 an extraordinarily thorough staff report in front
13 of you. It is clear, it is to the point. You've
14 got an extraordinarily well written I think EDAW
15 memorandum describing the, the revisions, the
16 further concessions that the corporation has made
17 in response to comments from, from this
18 Commission's subcommittee, from the Historic
19 Preservation Committee, from the public. I think
20 you've seen this evolve and evolve and evolve and
21 this is a careful EIR. It's a well written EIR and
22 it's a thorough EIR. We urge you to support this
23 EIR. We urge you to accept it for what it is, a
24 fully complete legally accurate document. I was

1 trying desperately to peruse the 20-page letter
2 that was sent in this afternoon criticizing the EIR
3 and I can't, I can't, I can't say that I actually
4 was able to get through the whole thing so far, but
5 it's a very typical trick. I know this Commission
6 has seen it before. It's not that uncommon to get
7 very lengthy lawyer letters at the very last minute
8 saying that the EIR that's been worked on for two
9 years is inadequate. This is a fully adequate EIR.
10 I am confident that if this were ever to be
11 presented to a Judicial challenge, it would be
12 upheld and I would urge this Commission to accept
13 the staff recommendations, to certify this EIR and
14 to adopt the statement of overriding
15 considerations. So with that, I thank you very
16 much for your time this evening.

17 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Arnone. Amy Minter I understand is
18 gonna speak about the EIR. Amy, please mention
19 your name and your city of residence before you
20 begin. You'll have 10 minutes, thank you.

21 Minter: Good evening, both Commissioners. My name is Amy
22 Minter. I'm, I'm a resident of West Los Angeles.
23 I'm here from the Law Firm of Chatten, Brown &
24 Carstens representing the group Save Tara and their

1 opposition to the proposed project at 1343 North
2 Laurel Avenue. I would like to begin by
3 apologizing for sending in that 20-page letter
4 today. The reason for that and the reason that I'm
5 also requesting a continuance of this hearing is
6 that more than...a staff report of more than 200
7 pages in length including detailed findings was
8 made available less than a week ago and this report
9 contains the first environmental analysis of the
10 newly proposed 28-unit alternative. The first time
11 that this has been made available to the public to
12 comment upon. There has not been adequate time for
13 public review and comment on this alternative.
14 Additionally, the attorney at our office that is
15 most familiar with this case, Katherine Crisellini
16 is unavailable this evening. She had planned the
17 vacation that she is currently on around this
18 hearing as she had expected it to be held two weeks
19 ago. Ms. Crisellini would be best able to answer
20 any questions about the project you, you may have.
21 She did submit the letter today and I will
22 summarize in case you have not had time to review
23 it. We request that you deny certification of the
24 final EIR and do not adopt the statement of

1 overriding considerations because this approval
2 would violate the California Environmental Quality
3 Act. The final EIR is inadequate because it fails
4 to adequately disclose impacts and improperly
5 defers mitigation. The EIR's discussion of
6 cultural resources impacts does not disclose the
7 extent of these impacts to this important resource.
8 It does not correctly assess compliance with the
9 Secretary of Interior's design standards. It
10 also...additionally, the discussion of impacts to
11 the character defining features, landscaping and
12 interior features is too vague to properly serve
13 the public disclosure goals of SEQUA. The EIR
14 attempts to mitigate these significant impacts with
15 uncertain mitigation measures that are improperly
16 deferred. The project will also degrade the
17 existing visual character of the site and its
18 surroundings resulting in significant aesthetic
19 impacts, which are not disclosed in the EIR. The
20 biological impacts associated with removing much of
21 the historic landscaping on the project site
22 including at least 25 mature trees are additionally
23 underestimated by the EIR. The EIR also fails to
24 consider an off-site alternative that would

1 eliminate the significant impacts to a historic
2 resource. It further fails to analyze a reasonable
3 geographic scope for cumulative impacts. These
4 inadequacies found...were found in the draft EIR
5 and were commented upon by our offices, but were
6 not corrected or adequately responded to in the
7 final EIR. The final EIR's problems are further
8 replicated in the analysis of the 28-unit
9 alternative. The memorandum describing this
10 alternative misleadingly tries to distinguish
11 between important and unimportant character
12 defining features without any justification for
13 this distinction. For all of these reasons, a
14 statement of overriding considerations is not
15 proper for this project. Public Resources Code
16 21002 prohibits the approval of a project that will
17 have significant adverse impacts such as the
18 significant historic impacts that this project will
19 have when there are feasible mitigation measures or
20 alternatives that will lessen those impacts. There
21 are feasible mitigation measures and alternatives
22 available prohibiting the approval of this project.
23 For all of these reasons and those that will be
24 addressed by Mr. Dewan and Ms., and Ms.

1 (INAUDIBLE), we request that you deny the
2 certification of the final Environmental Impact
3 Report and do not adopt the statement of overriding
4 considerations. Thank you for the opportunity to
5 provide these comments.

6 Altschul: Question.

7 Minter: Yes?

8 Altschul: Are you a member of this law firm, Miss....

9 Minter: I am a member of the Chatten, Brown and Carstens,
10 yes.

11 Altschul: And, and Ms. Crisellini had time to sign this
12 letter today before she scooted out of town?

13 Minter: She was actually...she prepared and electronically
14 signed the letter while on vacation.

15 Altschul: And we were given it at 6:30 this evening.

16 Minter: I, I submitted it at (TALKING OVER).

17 Altschul: No, no, we were given it at 6:30 this evening. You
18 submitted it by fax at 12:16, but at 12:16 seven
19 people were sitting here and not at City Hall and I
20 think Ms. Crisellini certainly knows that, so I
21 would like to know for whom this letter was
22 written? Who, who did you think it was written
23 for?

24 Minter: I, I'm sorry, I'm not understanding your question.

1 Was, was it faxed to the wrong place, is that
2 the....

3 Altschul: No, no, no, it was faxed to City Hall at 12:16 this
4 afternoon. The Commissioners got it at 6:30 when
5 we sat down here this evening. For whom do you
6 think you wrote it?

7 Minter: It, it was intended for the Commissioners.

8 Altschul: I see, and the Commissioners sitting here at 6:30
9 at night are supposed to digest 20 pages of this
10 stuff. I think that's a little bit onerous and I
11 think it's wrong, as Mr. Arnone pointed out, and I
12 would request that this letter not be considered as
13 a part of the record because it was untimely
14 submitted. I think your summation of it or your
15 attempted summation of it, whatever you said
16 orally, should be listened to but I think the
17 contents of this letter are strictly out of order
18 in terms of putting it into part of the record.
19 Thank you.

20 Thompson: Actually, Mr. Chair, I respectfully...I disagree.
21 I think that Commissioners who were able to digest
22 the letter should use it as they see fit and if you
23 weren't, then you shouldn't and certainly we can
24 all take into consideration her oral, her oral

1 comments on the subject, but I don't think that we
2 should specifically exclude the letter.

3 Altschul: Well, we can discuss that at, you know, afterwards,
4 but I really think that since people did not...a
5 lot of us did not have a chance to read it, that if
6 in fact there is any action brought at some
7 subsequent date, that this letter should not be
8 considered a part of the record.

9 Minter: I would like to again apologize for it. The
10 Commission....

11 Altschul: Well, an apology, an apology is accepted, but
12 I...from my perspective, the letter is not.

13 D'Amico: Let's....

14 Minter: The reason for this late submission was that....

15 D'Amico: Give me one...thank you.

16 Minter: Sure.

17 D'Amico: Christi, maybe you can shed some light on whether
18 it came in 17 single pages or one 17-page lump, if
19 there's any meaning either way.

20 Hogin: Are you finished with the....

21 D'Amico: I believe she had some time left so unless someone
22 has any other questions, you can probably sit down.
23 If they do have questions...Kate will have a
24 question so let's listen to Christi and then Kate

1 will have a question for you.

2 Thompson: And stop, and stop their time.

3 D'Amico: Yes.

4 Hogin: It's stopped. The answer to your question is
5 legally this letter is a part of the record. I
6 would add and I understand because I too have been
7 sitting at public hearings for upwards of 18 years
8 now, that professional law firms are fully aware of
9 the time that's required to digest their arguments
10 and ordinarily prepare and submit them well in
11 advance and it is at minimum a disservice to one's
12 client and at least rude to drop on you
13 Commissioners at this late date these lengthy dense
14 records and we will try and go through them as the
15 hearing goes on and we'll bring to your attention
16 anything that we think is new, but you are required
17 by law to accept it as a part of the record and
18 we'll have to make sure that this transcript is
19 also available for any Judge who might be seeing it
20 so they understand the circumstances.

21 Altschul: Right, so the transcript can reflect that the
22 letter was not submitted in a timely fashion for
23 digestion by a great number of the Commissioners.

24 Hogin: And so it has been.

1 DeLuccio: I have a question.

2 D'Amico: I think Kate was next, Donald.

3 DeLuccio: I'm sorry.

4 D'Amico: Go ahead, Kate.

5 Bartolo: (INAUDIBLE).

6 DeLuccio: No, I don't. I just wanted to see and make sure
7 there's a copy available to the public.

8 Minter: I have copies with me if there are....

9 D'Amico: I think you should make a copy available.

10 Altschul: Did you put one on the table in the back?

11 D'Amico: So put one on the back table.

12 Minter: I can, I can do that, yes.

13 D'Amico: Thank you.

14 Keho: Yes, there are copies on the back table.

15 D'Amico: Thank you. Kate?

16 Bartolo: My question is, you had indicated that there were
17 an inadequate mitigation measures that were
18 proposed. Could you give me some examples of
19 mitigating measures that you believe would've met
20 the adequacy standard you're describing?

21 Minter: I cannot actually answer that question for you.
22 As, as I stated, I have not done any work on this
23 project until today and I'm not familiar with the
24 record enough to, to tell you other mitigation

1 measures. It's my understanding that, that we have
2 proposed off-site alternatives that would reduce
3 the historic resources impacts that were not
4 adequately analyzed in the EIR. They were
5 summarily dismissed without any real consideration
6 of them.

7 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Are you finished with your
8 presentation on the EIR?

9 Minter: There are...we are splitting the time and there are
10 two other speakers.

11 D'Amico: Please. Excellent, thank you.

12 Minter: Thank you very much.

13 D'Amico: Could you...sir? Thank you, Amy. When you start,
14 begin with your name and city of residence.

15 Dewan: My name is Geoff Dewan. My city of residence is Los
16 Angeles. Far from being a lawyerly trick, that
17 letter was a last desperate measure to try and
18 make...what's going on?

19 D'Amico: (TALKING OVER). Are you (TALKING OVER).

20 Dewan: I'm talking about this...and I want to discuss the
21 model here.

22 D'Amico: Excellent, 'cause it's (TALKING OVER).

23 Dewan: Over here and the reason I have this microphone is
24 so that I can discuss the model.

1 D'Amico: Give me one second. Just stop, your time is up.

2 Dewan: Yes, sir.

3 D'Amico: This isn't the Phil Donahue Show so...

4 Dewan: Okay.

5 D'Amico: ...I would like it if you would point to the model
6 and then go back to the podium and speak with
7 the...

8 Dewan: All right.

9 D'Amico: ...to the Commissioners. That would be terrific,
10 thank you.

11 Dewan: What I want to point out in this model is you've
12 seen some lovely trees here and this is...you've
13 talked about how this is gonna be fabulous and
14 wonderful and have all this landscape around here.
15 Well, I beg to disagree. I'm gonna go back and
16 I'll talk over here. I also want to point out that
17 the courtyard that's been made so much of is...the
18 three-story house is approximately twice as high as
19 that and the courtyard is over here, it's about
20 here, so you have a courtyard that's like that.
21 It's about being at the bottom of an airshaft,
22 okay? So shall I talk in this one? Okay.

23 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

24 Dewan: All right. Now I've been in the construction

1 business for 30 years and I've done a lot of
2 construction with plants, trees, shrubs, existing
3 projects and trying to protect them. They seem to
4 have made...the idea here is that there's going to
5 be some kind of immaculate evacuation of this
6 thing, this excavation project. I want you to
7 imagine this room half full of dirt up to the
8 ceiling. Now take that dirt out without using any
9 of the doors. That's about what they're proposing.
10 This project will destroy every tree on this lot
11 including the deodar cedars that are at the front.
12 They're the most sensitive trees. I'd say that
13 they have about a 10 percent chance of survival.
14 They said...well, in the Environmental Impact
15 Report, it says that there's four trees, only four
16 trees of 30 inch diameter they're gonna be
17 destroyed in this project. Well, excuse me,
18 there's only six trees, so two-thirds of the trees
19 are getting destroyed. The other thing that they
20 say was like we're going to...we need to have park
21 space. Well, you have a 30,000 square foot lot and
22 you're reducing that down to 9,000 square feet and
23 calling it, be, because you're now defining it as
24 park space, you're saying, oh, we've increased the

1 park space. No, there is a park here. There is an
2 irreplaceable resource, which is going to be
3 destroyed by this, make no mistake. This project
4 destroys this lot. It destroys the historical
5 character of this project. It is absolutely
6 inappropriate and I think that you could find a
7 better way to get 14 units for the seniors here.
8 That's what it amounts to. You're gonna get 14
9 units and you're gonna spend \$4 million doing it to
10 make a 60 square foot unit. That's about...600
11 square foot unit, that's about \$500 a square foot
12 to destroy something that is irreplaceable, that
13 belongs to the City of West Hollywood. The EIR
14 keeps saying over and over again about how you
15 can't, you cannot mitigate the, the damage that's
16 gonna be done. It's absolutely true, you can't
17 mitigate it and it's always been proposed that the
18 only thing, the reason you can't do this is because
19 we have to have these units, we have to have these
20 apartment units and every alternative has been
21 rejected because it can't...you can't have the
22 apartment unit, you can't have the apartment units.
23 Well, what if you don't have the apartment units?
24 Well, no, it's, it's...you can't do this because

1 you don't have the apartment units, it's completely
2 circular and we've had 12 meetings. This thing was
3 presented as a fait accompli at the beginning.
4 It's been shoved down our throats for 12 meetings.
5 There never has really been a way of approaching
6 this in any way in open...that was actually left to
7 the community. It was presented, done deal, and
8 it's been that way since the beginning and it
9 really is time, I think we could take a few more
10 days to think about this thing. Yes, we had a 200-
11 page report that was slid around on a website for
12 five days and by God, Kathy Crisellini managed to
13 get a, a response out and sorry it didn't get here
14 right on time, but it's part of the record and it
15 should be included in the record. It needs to be
16 part of the record. We need to be part of the
17 record. We need to be represented. I asked you to
18 please do not vote for the overriding concern. You
19 have to give this project, give this site, give
20 this house, give this...it's part of the soul of
21 West Hollywood. Please, don't let it be destroyed.
22 D'Amico: Welcome, how much time does she have left so we can
23 all be....
24 Amtmanis: I think I have....

1 D'Amico: You don't remember?

2 Gillig: One minute 47 seconds.

3 Amtmanis: A minute and 47 seconds.

4 D'Amico: Have at it.

5 Amtmanis: Well, I was ready for three minutes, so I guess
6 I'll just talk less. You know, I also want to
7 point out that....

8 D'Amico: Your name and city of residence?

9 Amtmanis: Oh, I'm sorry, Liza Amtmanis.

10 D'Amico: Thank you.

11 Amtmanis: Los Angeles. I led the Pledge of Allegiance so I
12 must be patriotic. The...I want to point out that
13 the 200-page staff report and the final EIR only
14 became available on the City's website last Friday
15 afternoon. Everybody so far has trashed Kathy
16 Crisellini's 200...20-page letter. I think it's
17 amazing that she digested a 200-page staff report
18 and wrote what she did. No doubt, if she had had
19 more time, she could've been much more concise, but
20 she did it in less than a week while she was on
21 vacation I believe in Texas with her family. I
22 also want to point out that even though it's very
23 popular here in West Hollywood to pretend that the
24 West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation is

1 going to be the sole owner of this proposed
2 project, that is in fact not true. Laurel Place is
3 going to be the owner of the project and Laurel
4 Place is 51 percent owned by a corporation called
5 WASET Inc. The West Hollywood Housing Corporation
6 is only a 49 percent interest holder and nobody
7 likes to admit to that for reasons that are
8 certainly beyond me. An EIR is supposed to be an
9 unbiased document so that the public can have a
10 picture of the real impact of a project. EDAW did
11 a good job. What the staff has done, tries to mask
12 that...and that's all I have to say.

13 D'Amico: Please finish your thought and then we'll move on.

14 Amtmanis: I was going to say that what the staff has done
15 with the EIR has rewritten it to make it look much
16 more favorable than this project really is. There
17 are immitigable impacts and this Commission should
18 consider those very seriously. Thank you.

19 D'Amico: Thank you. So Commissioners, do we have any
20 further questions of the staff before we move to a
21 presentation on the entitlement of the...on the
22 building proposed. Go ahead, Kate.

23 Bartolo: Could you please tell me who WASET Inc. is?

24 Stefan: I would have to defer that to the Applicant when

1 they're doing their presentation. Can I make one
2 quick clarification about something that was said
3 about availability of documents? The final EIR has
4 been posted on the City's website since January and
5 has been continuously available since that time.
6 The memorandum for the 28-unit project alternative
7 was made available a week...well, about, about May
8 20th and has also been...for the Historic
9 Preservation Commission meeting, it has been
10 available since that time as well.

11 D'Amico: Thank you. That's helpful.

12 Altschul: I have a question.

13 D'Amico: John?

14 Altschul: Francie, the Housing Manager, Mr. Skorneck is in
15 the room I believe. Could we get him up here to
16 explain from his perspective what WASET what and
17 who WASET is?

18 Skorneck: Good evening, Commissioners, Jeff Skorneck, Housing
19 Manager. WASET is a nonprofit organization similar
20 to the West Hollywood Community Housing
21 Corporation. It has developed numerous senior
22 projects and low income projects in the Los Angeles
23 area. It's very highly regarded, has an excellent
24 reputation with HUD and we have with us Noel

1 Sweitzer this evening if you'd like further
2 background on the organization. She is the, the
3 serves as Executive Director.

4 Altschul: And the connection with HUD is important because?

5 Skorneck: WASET brought with it a lot of experience in going
6 after Section 202 funds and WASET's participation
7 in this project I think was a major ingredient in
8 this project receiving an award from HUD.

9 Altschul: The award has been received?

10 Skorneck: The award has been set aside for this project, \$4.2
11 million.

12 Altschul: So that means it is written in stone, we get it?

13 Skorneck: If, if the City, if, if the project moves ahead in
14 a, in a deliberate way. Now we have a
15 representative from HUD here also if you would like
16 further elaboration on...

17 Altschul: Perhaps.

18 Skorneck: ...on their process.

19 D'Amico: I have a question. So the, the property changes
20 hands from the City to the West Hollywood Community
21 Housing Corporation and then after 50 years to
22 WASET?

23 Skorneck: No, there is a separate nonprofit organization
24 that's been established and it's called Laurel

1 Place West Hollywood Inc. We are looking at two
2 options. One is a fee transfer and the other is a
3 long-term leasehold transfer. Now the leasehold
4 transfer has come up fairly recently so it...we
5 haven't been talking about that yet, but if this
6 project comes to City Council, that is something
7 that is gonna be recommended. However, for 99
8 years the project will be required to serve as
9 affordable housing. There will be use covenants
10 that go with the property. If it ever is not used
11 for affordable housing, it'll revert to the City.

12 D'Amico: John?

13 Altschul: If it becomes a lease transfer after that 99 years,
14 the City of West Hollywood would still own the
15 land?

16 Skorneck: Well, if it's leasehold interest that is conveyed,
17 the City of West Hollywood would continue to own it
18 in all through those 99 years...

19 Altschul: Up through.

20 Skorneck: ...as well.

21 Altschul: Okay. And if it is not, if it's the way it was
22 originally proposed, then when does the ownership
23 transfer?

24 Skorneck: The ownership would revert at such time as the

1 project is not used for its intended purpose, which
2 is affordable housing.

3 Altschul: And it only would revert to....

4 Skorneck: And it only...it only, it's only the portion of the
5 site that is not being as a public park. The
6 public park would remain under public ownership.

7 Altschul: Would remain under West Hollywood ownership?

8 Skorneck: Correct.

9 Altschul: And it...when it was not used under the, under the
10 original idea, when it was no longer used for
11 affordable housing, then the ownership of the land
12 would revert to the City of West Hollywood?

13 Skorneck: That was the...that was what was included in the
14 original conditional agreement, yes.

15 Altschul: And is there any subsequent conditional agreement
16 that is in effect now?

17 Skorneck: No.

18 Altschul: Thank you.

19 D'Amico: Kate?

20 Bartolo: Oh, Mr. Skorneck, one quick question. What is the
21 reasoning that the City is implying for considering
22 these alternative methods of either ownership or,
23 or leasehold relationship?

24 Skorneck: There had been some thought expressed by City

1 Council in its initial deliberations on whether to
2 approve the conditional agreement that there might
3 be a preference for the City retaining fee
4 ownership. So we have been exploring that with
5 HUD. We have not gotten a final reading on it, but
6 it's something that we're continuing to explore and
7 if it's feasible, it sounds like it would be in the
8 City's best interest.

9 Bartolo: Thank you.

10 D'Amico: Okay.

11 Altschul: I have one more question.

12 D'Amico: Go ahead.

13 Altschul: Since this whole thing has been around for about
14 two years, how is it that the, the recommendations
15 or the decision with respect to fee ownership is
16 just now coming to light in, in protecting the
17 City's asset?

18 Skorneck: We had previously discussed this when we were
19 preparing the conditional agreement and at that
20 time we had had some...a response from the legal
21 counsel for Laurel Place that this was not
22 something that would be possible. So we have since
23 learned that it's something that may be possible.
24 It's...we have not had an opportunity to come back

1 to City Council with anything but that conditional
2 agreement, but as we're going forward, we're
3 thinking about what would be the terms of a new
4 agreement or disposition and development agreement
5 restated and it's come up in that light.

6 Altschul: Well, I...this I think in my opinion is a very
7 important aspect of this particular decision as to
8 whether or not the City owns the property in
9 perpetuity or it doesn't own the property in
10 perpetuity. So since this is still in kind of the,
11 the embryonic stage, isn't...is it not perhaps
12 premature to come to some kind of a conclusion this
13 evening?

14 Skorneck: No, I believe that the, the project will be...the
15 physical project will be what it will be depending
16 on what the, the Commission here decides tonight.
17 The physical manifestation part....

18 Altschul: Well, don't you think it's important for the
19 Commission's consideration to know who in fact will
20 own this, this land? Isn't this information that
21 is somewhat important and vital to the decision
22 that we're being asked to make?

23 Skorneck: Well, I would say that the, the, the worst case
24 would be that the fee interest would be conveyed

1 and then we'd have a right of reverter. That's,
2 that's what's in the, the conditional agreement at
3 present and we'd be safe in assuming that that
4 would be possible.

5 Altschul: In other words, you're making the absolute
6 statement that if the fee interest was conveyed,
7 there would be a right of reversion as soon as it
8 was no longer affordable?

9 Skorneck: Correct.

10 Altschul: A right of reversion or an absolute reversion?

11 Skorneck: I'm...don't think I have the legal qualifications
12 to answer that question.

13 Altschul: Okay, so now I go back to my other question. Then
14 is it not perhaps premature until we know that
15 information?

16 Skorneck: I don't think it is because the, the project in
17 its...in the form that it's been described to you,
18 whether it's conveyed in leasehold or fee, the net
19 effect is really the same. It would have the same
20 impacts, it would have the same use....

21 Altschul: Well, not really because....

22 D'Amico: John, I think John Keho has something to...

23 Altschul: Good.

24 D'Amico: ...slip in here may (TALKING OVER).

1 Keho: Right, also I just want to make sure the Commission
2 is clear. The Commission is looking at the land
3 use of the property and not really the ownership of
4 the property in this case. You're looking at how
5 the land is used, what's appropriate in this
6 location, the size, the impacts, the physical
7 impacts, but not related to ownership in this
8 particular case.

9 Altschul: Well, I somewhat disagree because when you're
10 talking about ownership of an asset of the City, I
11 think the Commission has somewhat of an obligation
12 to track that and, and make sure that we ourselves
13 and the community knows what's happening with the
14 ownership.

15 D'Amico: I guess what we can do 'cause I, I'm, I'm actually
16 interested in moving on, is we can consider that
17 and we can ask Christi as we're moving towards a
18 motion whether or not that's an appropriate
19 condition for whatever it is we decide we wish to
20 do about this. How's that? Is everyone willing to
21 pick that up again as we have discussions?

22 Altschul: Sure, and I want to thank Mr. Skorneck for coming
23 and explaining it to the extent that he can.

24 D'Amico: Okay, thank you. So right now, we're going to move

1 sideways a little bit and we're gonna ask the
2 Applicant to come back up and make a presentation
3 about the project that will be developed, that they
4 propose to develop were this approved. So if I'm
5 understanding correctly, Rick you're gonna be...oh,
6 Rick and the architect. So whoever it is, whoever
7 goes first, you have 10 minutes. Please state your
8 name and city of residence. Oh, does Donald want
9 to...Donald wants to take a break so you guys walk
10 over there slowly. Donald's gonna take a quick
11 break. John's gonna stretch. I'm gonna keep
12 talking.

13 Bartolo: And with you speaking, I'll be happy to....

14 D'Amico: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, let's settle back down
15 and get this train back on the track. All right.
16 Kate, is around I'm sure of it, so we'll assume
17 that Kate is in earshot. I want to get this going.
18 Okay.

19 Bartolo: Don't put me on a milk carton.

20 D'Amico: Here's where we're going. The Applicant is gonna
21 make a 10-minute presentation and then we're gonna
22 hear from members of the community in an equal 10-
23 minute presentation and then we're gonna have
24 public comment. If, if there's anyone here in

1 public comment who would like us to consider that
2 you have some reason to need desperately to leave,
3 a disability, you are over 150 years old, that sort
4 of thing, just speak to David and we'll see if we
5 can't move you up on the list 'cause we do want to
6 hear from everyone and I realize it's running long.

7 Altschul: May, may I make another suggestion.

8 D'Amico: Please.

9 Altschul: I've been told that there are an awful lot of
10 people out here who are very hungry. If we can
11 come up with somebody who can make a telephone call
12 for a delivery or perhaps go up to, to Pavillion's
13 for sandwiches, we...what? The lawyers, thanks.
14 And if you wish to purchase a sandwich, perhaps we
15 can find somebody who would volunteer to go up and
16 get them. So is there somebody who would....

17 Thompson: I'll go.

18 D'Amico: Commissioner Thompson has volunteered, but he is
19 otherwise disposed.

20 Altschul: Is there somebody who would volunteer to stand in
21 the lobby and take orders? Norman Shramoff. Go
22 out in the lobby and see Norman Shramoff and if
23 you...and give him some money and he'll go and
24 bring sandwiches.

1 Keho: Chair, I'd like to ask you, earlier I thought you
2 had indicated that time that the individuals would
3 have to speak, was that two minutes or three
4 minutes?

5 D'Amico: Two minutes.

6 Keho: Two minutes.

7 D'Amico: Yes. Okay, so I see in front of me Ric Abramson
8 who is with the Applicant. Mr. Abramson, please
9 state your name, city of residence and you will
10 have 10 minutes to present the projects at Laurel
11 Place, thank you.

12 Abramson: Did we lose Kate or...we're gonna go ahead.

13 D'Amico: No, she's gonna order a sandwich. She can hear.

14 Abramson: Oh, okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ric Abramson, a
15 resident of West Hollywood appearing on behalf of
16 the West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation as
17 a Board Member. We're very pleased to be here
18 tonight to present this project, a joint venture
19 between the West Hollywood Community Housing
20 Corporation and our nonprofit development partner,
21 WASET. Laurel Place is a true, is a truly rare and
22 special opportunity because it consists of three
23 important strategic planning goals for the City.
24 The preservation effort resulting in a fully

1 rehabilitated historic structure to contain six
2 senior units and it's companion chauffeur,
3 chauffeur's cottage as an additional one unit. A
4 new quarter acre public park spanning across the
5 front north side of the property and a new 21-unit
6 senior housing building along the rear and south
7 portion of the property. The project tonight
8 represents our responses to the feedback, comments
9 and concerns we have heard over a very lengthy
10 process and during thorough reviews including
11 neighborhood scoping meetings and at least nine
12 noticed public hearings. We appreciate and have
13 benefited greatly from this feedback and attempted
14 to listen well and incorporate what we could when
15 we could considering the demands of multiple
16 partners and various funding agencies involved in
17 this project. At least 14 different designs and
18 eight configurations have been studied in order to
19 put before you tonight what we feel is the most
20 inclusive project possible. The Laurel property is
21 zoned for the City's highest density, R4, and
22 interestingly if the historic structures were not
23 in place, the zoning would allow for 69 senior
24 affordable units on this property. However, given

1 that the original building and cottage represent an
2 important historic resource for the community, this
3 option was of course never even considered. But
4 instead at 41 units less than the allowed density,
5 Laurel Place seeks a balance of three major
6 priorities in West Hollywood's General Plan,
7 preserving the estate's core heritage, providing
8 desperately needed senior affordable housing and
9 providing neighborhood green space, which we all
10 know is extremely deficient in this area of West
11 Hollywood. The plans in your packet have undergone
12 key changes during our previous Historic
13 Preservation Commission review that staff outlined
14 for you. We now have a significantly reduced scope
15 and a more modulated relationship between existing
16 and new buildings, specifically the density has
17 been reduced by a full 20 percent from 35 to 28
18 units and we've considerably lowered, lowered the
19 massing and scale as you've heard, the courtyard
20 distance between the buildings as you heard, you've
21 heard as well. Knowing the important of this
22 project to the community, we sought to put together
23 a very highly respected team of designers and
24 consultants. Our architect John Mutlow, our

1 landscape architect Katie Spitz and historic
2 consultant Christy McElvoy from HRG are all renown
3 within their respective fields and we feel
4 fortunate to have their involvement. Laurel Place
5 is not just about a building. If approved and
6 constructed, it will make an immediate difference
7 in the lives of 27 individuals and will serve
8 hundreds more over its lifetime. It's a unique and
9 special opportunity of which we are very proud and
10 enthusiastic to be a part. Our entire team would
11 be pleased to address your concerns and comments
12 after Mr. Mutlow and Ms. Spitz have presented the
13 project design. Thank you.

14 D'Amico: Thank you. Please state your name and city of
15 residence.

16 Mutlow: My name is John Mutlow, Architect, City of Los
17 Angeles. I would like to maybe just point out
18 though that my model maker Ricky Lao who made the
19 models is a resident of the city of West Hollywood.
20 I think this fight, we're gonna unfortunately
21 repeat and may be something of what Francie said
22 will go through very quickly. I think we very
23 clearly see the situation of the three elements
24 that we're proposing here. The...but at the same

1 time I think it's important to look at the
2 precedents and we actually selected some historic
3 precedents that contribute the relationship of new
4 to the old and these are being recognized by the
5 Historic Preservation Community and are being
6 published as exemplary projects. This first one is
7 the Boston Library. As you can see, the addition
8 attaches immediately to the library, a very simple
9 and straightforward addition. The second is the
10 Shaw Center for the Arts, which was an addition in
11 fact on the top. The third is Saginaw Arts Museum.
12 No, go back, where's the Saginaw Art Museum? This
13 is the Santa (INAUDIBLE) in Barcelona, Spain. This
14 is a slide basically that shows a new extension of
15 a building. It happens to be a market, over a
16 historic market. The next is the Stanford Art
17 Museum. You could see the new on the left and the
18 old on the right and, and certainly recognition of
19 height, relationship, material sympathy. This is
20 the James Library in Kansas. As you can see, the
21 new to the old of a very simple mass in terms of
22 relationship. Again, a respect of the height of
23 the building to the eaves of the existing building,
24 but they're clearly a, a new set of materials. And

1 here you can see the relationship clearer, attached
2 again. And this is the Saginaw Art Museum. This
3 is as you can see a historic house, which actually
4 is connect, connected by a brief story with a very
5 simple new art museum is added to it. Now these
6 are just basically examples to show you that, that
7 there are recognized ways of attaching new to old
8 and these are not just only in America, but in fact
9 in, in Europe as well. So the question is where do
10 you go from here? This is a drawing we did way
11 back when to show actually what you can actually
12 see from the street here because of the extensive
13 landscaping and when looking at the site, we, we
14 realized that maybe the rear of the site where the
15 accessory building was, was the least important
16 aspect of the site. The large concrete area, the
17 conditions of this building, it's a one-story,
18 basically a four-car garage with the small
19 efficiency unit and a two-car garage that was
20 attached next to it to the chauffeur's cottage. So
21 what we have is an evolution of an idea. We
22 actually have, Francie said I think, seven or
23 eight, we've actually gone through about 15
24 alterations. On the left is the HUD application

1 and this is how we actually developed the number of
2 units. First of all, we looked at basically not
3 coming in front of 50 percent of the house, the two
4 wings being two-story and the back building only
5 being three stories. So we located that we were
6 initially only ever talking about three stories and
7 this gave us 35 units. This is where we are today.
8 Big changes at the park has extended on the north
9 side, that the chauffeur's cottage has been
10 retained, the wing of the house is being retained,
11 the courtyard has been increased dramatically. We
12 still have the setback and we still have not come
13 in front of 50 percent of the house. So there are
14 some I think very clear differences of where we've
15 come over time and changes we have made. This is a
16 planning context. What's critical here I think is
17 to look at the mass of the surrounding buildings
18 and still the openness that we have on this site
19 and I think one of the advantages of placing the
20 building at the rear is that you can see there is a
21 continuation of mass of buildings on the rear. So
22 we fit into the existing context I think extremely
23 well. We are requesting that the rear yard only
24 have a 10-foot setback instead of the 15 feet.

1 This has happened as you know in several locations
2 within the city, but we wanted to show this diagram
3 'cause you can see conceptually it appears to fit
4 in I think quite well with the existing, existing
5 infrastructure and buildings. If we look at the
6 site section, we've always been very concerned
7 about the visibility of the site from the street.
8 This is on the other side of Laurel Avenue and this
9 you can see, this building is lower than the
10 rooftop of the existing apartment construction. So
11 basically we'll not be able to see the building
12 above the roof, you'll only be able to see the
13 building on either side, the north or the south.
14 It also, if you look at the courtyard, the
15 courtyard has been increased to between 20 and 22
16 feet. As you can see, this in fact is greater than
17 the distance that we have at the rear. So we
18 actually are very concerned about the relationship
19 of, of these two spaces and I think we've looked at
20 that quite carefully. A little history, my office
21 was established in 1976. We've actually completed
22 about 35 HUD projects, design of 35 projects. This
23 happens to be a senior project in Downtown Los
24 Angeles, which is 75 units. I'm just showing them.

1 This is a project of 34 units. I'm showing this
2 because not only does it have kind of a sense of
3 three-story, also the breaking of the mass and the
4 scale, but this project actually was sponsored by
5 WASET Inc. This is a project that was completed
6 last year in Reseda. This is a 50-unit senior
7 project and I show this project for a couple of
8 reasons. One again as you can see in the extensive
9 landscaping, the well maintained condition of the
10 project. This again is a project that was
11 sponsored by WASET Inc. Yes, a rose garden. This
12 was one of the requests of the elderly. We do work
13 very closely with the elderly, but also I wanted to
14 show the use of this material. This in fact is
15 perforated metal. As you can see, the transparency
16 of it and in fact it does not look like metal at
17 all. And we have it here, here and here. And
18 actually it provides kind of a sensitive screen and
19 it doesn't give you a very solid feeling of a
20 building mass. It gives you a screening sense of
21 area. Here we're looking at building materials
22 that we're actually using. As you know, we are
23 using wood slats on the two stairs and this example
24 of wood slats is actually, actually comes from Lime

1 House. This is a comparison....

2 D'Amico: David, is their time up?

3 Gillig: Time is up.

4 D'Amico: That's 10 minutes, thank you very much. Our next
5 opportunity to speak will be by members of the
6 community to speak about the project that is
7 proposed and...they ran out of time. Well, I hear
8 Kate saying she has questions. We're gonna hear
9 the other people and then we'll be able to ask
10 questions of the Applicant and members of the
11 community. So who will be next? State your name
12 and city of residence.

13 Minter: Good evening, my name is Amy Minter. I'm a
14 resident of West Los Angeles and I'm here again
15 from Chatten, Brown and Carstens on behalf of Save
16 Tara. I just have a few short comments and then
17 Allegra Allison and William Neish will be providing
18 more detailed comments. Save Tara requests that
19 you deny the approval of a Certificate of
20 Appropriateness for this project because it would
21 violate the West Hollywood Municipal Code. A
22 Certificate of Appropriateness is not appropriate
23 for this project. The project will adversely
24 impact the character defining features of this

1 significant historic resource, which includes all
2 of the buildings on the site and....

3 D'Amico: Excuse me, we were gonna spend this period of time
4 talking about the development and not speaking
5 about the EIR.

6 Minter: This is....

7 D'Amico: So I would like you to try and focus your comments
8 on the proposed development. I know this is a lot
9 for you to be doing on your first day on the
10 project, but we're trying to do this in a way that
11 we have a parallel track, so if you can focus your
12 comments on their proposed development and not
13 focus on the EIR, that would be very helpful.

14 Minter: Sure, I...my, my comments were on the, the
15 Certificate of Appropriateness, which it was my
16 understanding was not part of the EIR.

17 D'Amico: Okay, thank you. All right.

18 Minter: So if...my, my only comments on that are that the
19 findings cannot be made that are required to be
20 made by the West Los Angeles...West Hollywood
21 Municipal Code because it will impact the character
22 defined features of this significant historic
23 resource and the project does not comply with the
24 Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

1 Thank you.

2 Allison: Cher, West Hollywood.

3 D'Amico: Cher, welcome.

4 Allison: Thank you.

5 D'Amico: Allegra Allison.

6 Allison: Allegra Allison.

7 D'Amico: Posing as....

8 Allison: Cher.

9 D'Amico: Thank you.

10 Allison: I'm here to speak in favor of senior low income
11 housing on another site. Of course, providing
12 senior housing to poor seniors is more important
13 than preservation unless you can do both. We can
14 do both. This project will provide housing for 14
15 West Hollywood seniors. Maybe it'll be 15, it
16 could be 10. If we have a desperate shortage of
17 senior housing in such a long, long list in West
18 Hollywood, then why are we providing housing for
19 people outside of the city of West Hollywood and
20 giving or leasing half the property that could be
21 sorely needed parkland and a total parkland to a
22 Los Angeles company. We should be using the \$2
23 million the City is giving or whatever it is now,
24 giving toward the project to build 24 units on the

1 City property at Spalding and Santa Monica instead
2 of 14 here and destroying the site that could be a
3 park. And on Santa Monica and Spalding, there's
4 services that the seniors use right next door. The
5 developers are planning to have only half that
6 number, half that number of 24 West Hollywood
7 seniors that we could on a hill away from those
8 services. We proposed the City owned property at
9 Santa Monica and Sierra Bonita as an alternate site
10 for senior housing. We were told or the EIR said
11 even though this isn't about the EIR, I jumped in
12 late, that the property would have to be mixed use
13 and would generate traffic and noise to an already
14 congested corridor. This property has now
15 been...this property is in the middle of what's now
16 been approved for mixed use. It has been giving to
17 the House...given to the Housing Corporation to
18 build 43 units of disabled housing. The Housing
19 Corporation's last development was 24 units of
20 disabled housing on Havenhurst. If we have this
21 desperate need for senior affordable housing, then
22 why aren't we providing it at these other city
23 sites? That's my question. I believe we can do
24 both things. In July of 1999, Kings Road Park was

1 dedicated. That site was initially slated for
2 affordable housing. The affordable housing project
3 was relocated to another site in the city and the
4 city has a park. We have to...this is a huge
5 decision. Once this, once this land is gone, it's
6 gone forever. It's not reversible and I also
7 wanted to say that, you know, all of the pictures
8 that are shown never have the fences that are
9 around the park, they...in that one chart didn't
10 have the driveway. It's been...it's being
11 misrepresented. It's not gonna look like that.
12 This property will be destroyed forever. This is
13 irreversible even though the EIR says it's
14 reversible. And now to William Neish.

15 Bartolo: I want to ask...I have one quick question.

16 D'Amico: Can we let them finish and then they'll come back
17 up.

18 Bartolo: It's just...all right. That's fine.

19 D'Amico: Okay, thank you.

20 Neish: Did you have questions for Allegra?

21 D'Amico: William, but you're go and then we're gonna go back
22 and get questions.

23 Neish: Okay. My name is William Neish, I'm a resident of
24 West Hollywood. It's nice to see you all this

1 evening no matter what the circumstances. I know
2 you have a difficult job to do. I think it's
3 really hard to divide the project from the EIR,
4 which talks about demolition 'cause one can't
5 happen with the other...one triggered the other,
6 but I think that something that's representative of
7 how this city stands although there's been talk
8 about...we had community input, we took a lot of
9 options, we're looking at them. We have an email
10 from Lisa Belsanti writing on behalf of Abby Land
11 in 2004 telling a resident, we are happy to
12 consider variations on the approach. However,
13 inasmuch as the city and its development partner
14 has been awarded a \$4.2 million Federal grant to
15 help develop this project for senior housing, we
16 must continue on a path that fulfills this
17 obligation. So that's the stance of the City
18 Council's representatives? I don't...there's a
19 lawsuit going on Downtown now about this EIR
20 process and the Judge there said, I don't think
21 that we can consider this in a bubble. I want more
22 information, and I think that the City's stance,
23 their employees, which is seemingly understandable,
24 are trying to please their employer or their

1 appointees who want to stay on a commission for
2 personal prestige and gain or sweetheart deals. I
3 think that there's been a lot of intimidation.
4 George Cradle was dismissed from the HPC over this
5 issue, not invited back. He was the most vocal
6 supporter. There's another member of the HPC who
7 offered their resignation and was told by a City
8 Council member it would make the City look bad for
9 them to do it at this time. That was over this
10 issue. If how the certification recommendation
11 passed through the HPC is any indication, which I
12 would consider intimidation of them, two years of
13 browbeating, exceptions to due process by allowing
14 the developer to come back after they'd already
15 taken their vote, that would be like me coming back
16 after you took your measured vote on Carlton Manor
17 to come back next month and say, I want to go back
18 and present it all over again and had I done that,
19 I don't think the City or any of its legal advisors
20 would've said, let's do that. That's a, that's a
21 good idea. So that's violation of due process. I
22 hope you will prove me wrong in this situation as
23 the public basically throws themselves on your
24 mercy. I think the thing that is not satisfying

1 about this project is that...well, I think the
2 pictures speak for themselves about how successful
3 putting these two attempts together can be. I'm
4 saying that sarcastically. What is talked about
5 this so much in the original sites designation is
6 its estate like setting and all of this discussion
7 seems to go back, well, we've put the development
8 at the rear of the property, but it is basically
9 now the second half of the property. It's not at
10 the rear of the property, it is the rear of the
11 property. It goes...we've heard over and over
12 again and all the documentation, the large lot on
13 which the residence was developed is intact as are
14 the outbuildings although the neighborhood is now
15 comprised of apartments. The size of the property
16 itself is such that it forms its own setting for
17 the buildings. So what that means is now we're
18 gonna take a site that is unique and turn it into
19 another apartment structure, which is not what that
20 block needs. The site is characterized by a high
21 degree of historical and architectural integrity on
22 a unique landscape setting. The site is a rare
23 surviving example of the period before the rapid
24 urbanization of West Hollywood. Well, isn't it

1 even more intense today and shouldn't we keep some
2 examples before that rapid urbanization? Integrity
3 feeling is part of the criteria for the National
4 Register. Also, it's been placed important for the
5 site being one of the few remaining examples in the
6 city, region, state or nation of an architectural
7 site or specimen. That's here. It's not gonna be
8 here anymore. I was telling the HPC it, it's sort
9 of like a sci-fi fast forward where some day we're
10 gonna say...kids are gonna say, do you mean the sky
11 was blue once, it wasn't brown? And it's like,
12 yeah, it was. Well, can you show that to me? No,
13 'cause we really screwed it up. And you mean
14 people once lived on big lots and they had all this
15 room? It's like, yeah, they did. Well, can you
16 show me that in West Hollywood? No, 'cause we kind
17 of screwed it up. And what is the trade off? We
18 get a little pocket park, we get some senior
19 housing, but we don't know who it'll belong to
20 eventually. We have, we have all this talk about
21 multi use. The City doesn't have any other
22 location that it can build senior housing on? What
23 about...can't they fit 28 units on top of City
24 Hall? I think we own that site. That's a modern

1 site that would match this architecture really
2 well. This is just not an appropriate site for
3 this project. In the, in the 20/20 Vision and in
4 the General Plan, senior housing and preservation
5 and parks are not supposed to be in conflict with
6 each other. I think it's sad that Sandy...that the
7 Linnick Family is mentioned in here. Hasn't come
8 up for discussion that while the Linnick Family,
9 one elderly woman without legal representation gave
10 this to the City. The City then after she died,
11 started due process to evict her cousin, who is a
12 senior citizen from that, with no assurance that
13 he'd be given a place to return to. And I...my
14 final note is...

15 D'Amico: Okay, Mr. Neish, you can finish your thought.

16 Neish: ...there isn't a need to do it at all. Thank you.

17 D'Amico: Thank you. So, wait, we have plenty of questions I
18 think. Why don't we start with Allegra and William
19 and then we'll work back to the architect and their
20 representatives. Kate?

21 Bartolo: You'd indicated that there were, there were 14
22 senior citizen units. Is that...how did you arrive
23 at that calculation?

24 Allison: There are...Paul Zimmerman from the Housing

1 Corporation says in his letter in the, in the EIR
2 that typically this is a National lottery,
3 typically in the past half of these units have gone
4 to West Hollywood seniors.

5 Bartolo: Oh, it does, okay.

6 Allison: That makes it 14 units even though I understand
7 that the number's actually 40 percent, but since
8 Paul Zimmerman said 50 percent, we'll go for...it's
9 27 units, so it's 13½ people.

10 Bartolo: Gotcha, okay.

11 Allison: Any other questions? No.

12 D'Amico: No. Okay, did anyone have any questions of the
13 Applicant regarding the architecture of the
14 building? Eric?

15 Thompson: I don't know, I had a question that was, what was
16 raised by one of the comments, I think it's a
17 question for staff, so when do you want me to ask
18 it?

19 D'Amico: Go ahead, we're gonna....

20 Thompson: Well, the question is and I don't know, maybe this
21 is for Jeff Skorneck, I don't know, but
22 I...just...the comment was made about site
23 selection for affordable housing and we could've
24 put 28 units here or 26 units, I just want to

1 understand that process. Like how, how....

2 Skorneck: Well, the...this site was...has been under city
3 ownership since Elsie Wiseman donated it in 1997 I
4 believe it was and there were, there were only a
5 few stipulations on how the site could be used.
6 One was that she should be able to live there for
7 the rest of her life, which she did, and the second
8 was that the tenants would be able to stay on six
9 months beyond that time and she actually died in
10 the year 2000. So this site has been available
11 for, for public purpose since basically 2001. One
12 of the opportunities we saw was that this could
13 serve multiple purposes. The senior housing or
14 house, or affordable housing, open space and
15 historic preservation. So that is...we identified
16 the site because the city had it. It, it posed
17 these opportunities. With the City Council's
18 endorsement, we applied for the...or Laurel Place
19 applied for the, the funding, which we were lucky
20 to get. It was a, it was a long shot actually and
21 we have been proceeding on that track ever since.
22 This did not mean that we were not exploring other
23 sites to use for other kinds of affordable housing.
24 We are pursuing affordable housing at multiple

1 sites along Santa Monica Boulevard including the
2 Sierra Bonita site. One applies for funding where
3 the funding opportunities present themselves. The
4 reason that the Sierra Bonita site is being
5 proposed as housing for the disabled is because
6 there are special funding sources including a
7 million dollar grant we got from the state a couple
8 of years ago that can only be used for special
9 needs housing. So all these decisions or all these
10 factors present themselves when looking for
11 appropriate public purposes.

12 Thompson: That's actually a very enlightening answer. Thank
13 you.

14 D'Amico: Kate has a question for you.

15 Bartolo: Could the, the Section 202 grant, the HUD grant be
16 transferred to another site? And if so, how would
17 that work? I need to...I want to understand that
18 more 'cause I think I have an understanding, but I
19 want to hear you explain it in greater detail.

20 Skorneck: I do not believe that it can transferred to another
21 site. The way the application process works is
22 that you have to show that you control a site, that
23 you have a plan for a particular site and HUD then
24 evaluates that according to its criteria. In this

1 case, the site was 1343 Laurel Avenue. The
2 application was for 35 units. We still need to go
3 back and, and, and hope that HUD will approve this,
4 this smaller project, but the...it's not
5 transferable to another site. It...we'd have to
6 start the process over again. And we also have Tom
7 McMillan from HUD here and he can also answer this
8 perhaps in more detail. I should also say just if,
9 if I may be afforded the opportunity to elaborate
10 on one of Ms. Allison's comments.

11 D'Amico: I would love to have you do that if you want to
12 fill out a speaker slip. I just think it's not
13 appropriate for us to be cross talking that way if
14 someone wants to do that. Thanks, Jeff. All
15 right, so we have 54, did I count correctly? Some
16 speaker slips?

17 Gillig: It's closer to 70 now.

18 D'Amico: Oh, I guess I can't count past 54. You can. In
19 one second. We have closer to 70 speaker slips.
20 We're gonna take two minutes each and Kate's gonna
21 ask a couple of questions of the Applicant, who's
22 gonna walk up now. Who are they for?

23 Bartolo: Well, one is for the architect and the other is for
24 the landscape architect.

1 D'Amico: Okay, so if we can get them to walk over there and
2 the first two, two people are Daniel Watson and
3 Bryan Dahlgren. If they'd like to get ready to
4 speak, they're gonna go right after the architect
5 and the landscape architect. Go ahead, Kate.

6 Bartolo: I don't know if you'll have the answer now, but
7 what I'd like to know is when you look at the
8 footprint in terms of the new building additions,
9 one includes...is...I'd like to know what the net
10 increase in terms of parcel area that the building,
11 the new, the, the ground up buildings would be
12 occupying. In other words, you're gonna be tearing
13 down the garage and there's...and then there's a
14 foot...so there's an overlap there and then I want
15 to know also the square footage of the new
16 building, the building that's on the side, the
17 south side. And if you don't know the answer now,
18 if you could get back to us on that.

19 Mutlow: Yeah, we'll work it out for you.

20 Bartolo: Thank you. And then my second question with regard
21 to landscaping is...'cause I know that you ran out
22 of time and this is an extremely important question
23 to me, there are varying estimates of the trees
24 being removed. I don't know if you're gonna be

1 addressing the estimate in another venue in this
2 conver...in this discussion, but if this is my only
3 chance, I need to ask the question now. Okay, how
4 many...'cause I'm hearing all over the map and then
5 I...how many trees have you projected based on this
6 footprint, separate from construction issues, would
7 be removed?

8 Spitz: We, we project that there would be 18 trees of six
9 inch or greater caliper removed.

10 Bartolo: Okay, can you evaluate...are there any trees that
11 you would consider to be...I mean how would you
12 evaluate in terms of the tree removal?

13 Spitz: My, my sense of the trees on the site was that they
14 were...some of them were in just poor health,
15 some...one is leaning, for example, some of them
16 are overgrown pittosporum and things that may have
17 started their lives as shrubs and become trees over
18 time. And so in my professional evaluation, these
19 are not historically significant trees.

20 Bartolo: Can you give me an idea of the ratio of the shrubs
21 that grew into trees versus the trees that are
22 being removed?

23 Spitz: I, I can't do that accurately...

24 Bartolo: Roughly?

1 Spitz: ...right now.

2 Bartolo: Okay, what def...what is the definition of a
3 historically significant tree?

4 Spitz: I think for example the, the cedars are quite
5 important obviously. I think that a tree that was
6 planted to be a shrub and becomes a tree is not
7 something you would consider historically
8 significant. There are ash trees on the site I
9 believe, I need to check that. There are very fast
10 growing trees. We don't know exactly when they
11 were planted or what era they're from.

12 Bartolo: Another question and I'll be done. The issue was
13 raised about construction and what trees would be
14 in jeopardy that you're not planning for removal
15 based on this increased footprint?

16 Spitz: I think the only trees that I believe would be in
17 jeopardy, I'm going to have to kind of describe
18 them to you, are...there are some existing trees,
19 which we will be protecting along the foot path to
20 the rear on the south side of the, of the Laurel
21 house and some...oh, thank you. There's an
22 existing tree here and here. I have to look more
23 close...here is an existing tree and I believe this
24 is an existing tree. Those trees are a little bit

1 close to construction. We normally have very
2 elaborate protection means. We, we ask for fences
3 around it so no one can get anywhere near the root
4 zone of the tree. They cannot get near the trunk
5 so they can't really endanger it. This is gonna be
6 a little bit of a challenge for the contractor.
7 These trees do not pose any challenge whatsoever
8 for, for building.

9 Bartolo: Okay, and one...I, I'm sorry, I just...you didn't
10 deal with landscaping and to me this is so...this
11 is an important part of this. You're doing
12 subterranean parking, what tree roots are impacted
13 potentially by the subterranean parking? That are
14 not the ones scheduled to be removed.

15 Spitz: I would say the only trees that are slightly
16 impacted are actually this one existing tree.

17 Bartolo: Which tree is that and is that of historic
18 significance?

19 Spitz: This is a...it's a pittosporum I believe and it's,
20 it's here. And I need to...I can confirm that for
21 you.

22 Bartolo: Okay, thank you.

23 Spitz: But the, the parking is under here.

24 D'Amico: And for the record, before you leave, could you

1 state your name and....

2 Spitz: Yes, my name is Katherine Spitz, I'm a Landscape
3 Architect and I reside in the city of Los Angeles.

4 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Francie has one more comment
5 and then we're definitely getting to David Watson
6 followed by Bryan Dahlgren.

7 Stefan: I just wanted to clarify that the Environmental
8 Impact Report went into great detail about
9 landscape removal, what was considered historic
10 portions of the landscape including hardscape and
11 trees, and if you want to look on the...in the
12 final EIR that you received, on page 3.5-46 and 47,
13 it goes into specific detail about which trees,
14 which specimen trees and ornamental shrubs that
15 date to the property's period of significance would
16 be removed and it goes through a specific bullet
17 list of which ones those would be.

18 D'Amico: Thank you. Okay, we're going to begin our public
19 comment period in earnest with two minutes of
20 speaking for each speaker. The first speaker will
21 be Daniel Watson.

22 Watson: Hello, good evening Commissioners. My name is
23 Daniel Watson. I reside in the city of West
24 Hollywood up the street here. Gosh, I put

1 seriously thousands of hours in trying to protect
2 this property and I know that if we add up all the
3 hours that everyone including the architects and
4 yourselves and the fine staff have put in, I'm sure
5 it's in the millions by now and the dollar amount
6 is beyond. My point is, is when Elsie Weisman
7 signed over the property to the City of West
8 Hollywood, after it was designated historic, she
9 did not have the years that we've spent on this
10 project and she was not told about variances, she
11 was not told about overriding considerations, she
12 was not told about any of this garbage. She was
13 told her home was made historic. She trusted this
14 city. You're the Planning Department, you're the
15 Planning Commission, it's your job to respect this
16 community and the people who live here and plan to
17 leave historic structures to the city. If you want
18 them to leave historic structures to this city, you
19 need to honor this woman's wishes. You need to do
20 what's morally right. I don't care what's legally
21 right. On Chapter Nine inside this book, it says
22 that there are significant unavoidable impacts.
23 These impacts are avoidable. You can build this
24 project on another piece of property and honor

1 Elsie Wiseman's memory. This is a 98-year-old
2 woman. She did not have the opportunity to sit
3 here and go through this. She signed a piece of
4 paper in 10 minutes and now we've taken years and
5 time to make this final decision and I think the
6 whole city would benefit if this was made into an
7 alternative project like a Hollywood Arts Center
8 and park that the whole city could enjoy. Thank
9 you.

10 D'Amico: Thank you, Bryan Dahlgren followed by Ric Rickles.

11 Dahlgren: Bryan Dahlgren, City of West Hollywood. Because
12 there is a short amount of time and a lot to cover,
13 I will be reading this. I'm partially sighted so
14 please bear with me and I may stumble over some of
15 the words. I am a member of the Disability
16 Advisories Board. I also am the Resident Manager
17 of the Historic...not Historic, WHCHC's Havenhurst
18 project, which addresses the very important and
19 needed...a need of permanent affordable housing for
20 low income disabled citizens, some are...some are
21 seniors. The apartments are configured around a
22 spacious courtyard boarded by beautiful...bordered
23 by beautiful flowers and plants. The buildings
24 front set is about twice the size of the typical

1 distance from the street. This was done for
2 historic preservation of the two mature sycamore
3 trees, which provides shaded, spacious and open
4 scene area and a...and creatively presents a very
5 pedestrian friendly experience from the sidewalk.
6 The residents love the opportunity for disabled
7 household for seniors and live independently in
8 clean, safe and affordable housing. I addressed
9 the City Council in support of the Laurel project
10 and affordable housing long before I became,
11 became...began to work with WHCHC. WHCHC's
12 centralized management, well organized systems,
13 procedures and vendors are in place. These
14 facil...this facilitates the residents and the
15 buildings smooth and effective standard, high
16 standard of operation. Thank you.

17 D'Amico: Thank you, Ric Rickles will be followed by Clara
18 Denson.

19 Rickles: Ric Rickles, resident of West Hollywood. John, I
20 may not be 140, but I'm a lot closer to it then
21 when I came in tonight. According to the Los
22 Angeles Times Monday, in relationship to the bond
23 measure that Los Angeles is planning for housing,
24 bond measure proponents point to a grim picture of

1 housing needs in Los Angeles, noting that the
2 median monthly rent for a two-bedroom apartment is
3 \$1,426. That's \$1,426, which is double what it was
4 seven years ago. When I moved out of my apartment
5 in West Hollywood last year, a one-bedroom, the
6 former landowners getting \$1,700 a month. One
7 bedroom. The need is growing and it isn't just for
8 today's seniors, it's for the seniors in the
9 future. Not all of the today's baby boomers are
10 going to reach their seniority in financial ease
11 especially after they pay off their credit cards.
12 I have been a proponent at the White House
13 Conference on Aging where I proposed housing
14 solution. I'm on the California Senior Legislator
15 when I proposed a legislation for housing and I
16 chair the Housing Committee at the L. A. County. I
17 want to point to my city as a model for living up
18 to the expectations and fulfilling the needs of
19 that are necessary here. Thank you.

20 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Rickles. Clara Denson will be
21 followed by John Angelo.

22 Denson: Good evening, my name is Clara Denson. I'm
23 currently a resident of Havenhurst project, which
24 is the newest venture by the West Hollywood Housing

1 Community Housing Project. And I'm here to
2 advocate the Laurel Project for many, many reasons,
3 but firstly because it will create some critically
4 needed units for affordable, you know, rates for
5 the disabled and for seniors. Secondly, it will
6 preserve the historic manner of the property and
7 third it will add a new park for our city. On a
8 personal level, as a disabled person and as a
9 senior citizen sitting here before you this
10 evening, I want to say how grateful I am to West
11 Hollywood for being here. I moved into Havenhurst
12 on January 19th, 2005. Prior to that, I lived in a
13 Victorian, old Victorian home for 15 years. I have
14 polio and my condition progressed and for the last
15 two years of that residence, I crawled up and down
16 18 stairs every day to do whatever I had to do
17 daily and had to have someone take apart my chair
18 and put it back together. After being involved
19 in...with West Hollywood and winning in the
20 Lottery, I moved in. Today I returned to the
21 Corporate community, corporate work arena. I work
22 part-time. Every day when I come home from work, I
23 open that door to the, to the lobby and sometimes
24 it's just more than I...my heart can bear just to

1 be independent, just to be able to take out my own
2 trash, to be able to motor up Sunset and go to work
3 and do what I can for the community. This is so
4 important. It is important for everyone in this
5 room whether you agree or realize it or not, it is.
6 We need it and I'm just so thankful to be here
7 tonight to share this with you. Thank you.

8 D'Amico: Thank you very much. John Angelo will be followed
9 by Heavenly Wilson.

10 Angelo: My name is John Angelo and I'm a resident of West
11 Hollywood for 55 years. I'm 55. And I support
12 this project 100 percent. Why? Because it would
13 create more affordable housing for low income
14 senior citizens. You all sit around, you're all
15 gonna be senior citizens one day. Also, it would
16 preserve a beautiful historic mansion to the
17 highest national standards. A new park and a
18 community space for seniors and residents to go and
19 that's what I want. I want to see community space
20 in the mansion that I could teach acting, I could
21 teach chair exercise, and I can teach interpretive
22 dance. Seniors go from the affordable housing to
23 the apartments across the park and come to my
24 classes. In the park we have outdoor performances

1 like Shakespeare in the Park. New York has it, why
2 not West Hollywood have it. And then with my
3 senior drama group, we may find another senior
4 Hamlet or maybe another Lady MacBeth, who knows?
5 The chair exercise would find a Rockette or maybe a
6 senior June Taylor dancer. And then the inter...in
7 the interpretive dance class another Dora Duncan or
8 a Martha Graham. Let the seniors show their, their
9 thing. How wonderful to have the affordable
10 housing apartments in this great area. I would
11 like to call it Senior Historical Center of the
12 Arts. As a senior, I'd like to....

13 D'Amico: Thank you Mr. Angelo.

14 Angelo: Thank you very much.

15 D'Amico: And I nominate Jean Dobrin for Lady MacBeth.
16 Heavenly Wilson will be followed by Rob Bergstein.

17 Wilson: Heavenly Wilson, sorry, what did you say? I want
18 to, I want to be one of the riches. Heavenly
19 Wilson, resident of West Hollywood. Tara was built
20 in 1914. That is almost 100 years of history.
21 There are no other homes of its kind and era in
22 this area. In eight years, we will celebrate the
23 100th year of Tara and what will it look like in
24 eight years if this project is built? Not what it

1 looks in this pretty model. Squished, squeezed and
2 thoroughly deformed by all the alterations to its
3 setting. The main house will be a mere facade, a
4 mocking vestige of the original. You don't
5 preserve a building by destroying the context of
6 that building. The garages and the grounds are an
7 integral part of the main structure. They make
8 sense of its relationship to its site and the lives
9 for which the house was built. You are the
10 Planning Commission for West Hollywood charged with
11 planning for this 1.9 square miles of city and its
12 38,000 residents. The shape and character of this
13 city and its amenities are what you have to hold in
14 balance. This may seem harsh, but needs outside
15 this city are not part of what you have to balance,
16 much as you might want to. More than one-half of
17 the affordable housing units in this city have gone
18 to people who are not resident at the time. If
19 this means there is ample supply for our residents,
20 then how can housing be an overriding
21 consideration? We cannot house the world in West
22 Hollywood much as we would like to. We've already
23 done a great deal. Why don't we give West
24 Hollywood a break and leave something that everyone

1 in this city can cherish now and for the future.

2 D'Amico: Thank you, Rob Bergstein will be followed by Helen
3 Levin.

4 Bergstein: Good evening, Honorable Commissioners, my name is
5 Rob Bergstein. I'm a resident of the City of West
6 Hollywood. I'm a homeowner and a member of the
7 Eastside Project Advisory Committee. I'm here to
8 speak out in favor of this project. This property
9 was left to the city with very few restrictions,
10 which have long since been met. It will create
11 much needed senior affordable housing and I've come
12 before this commission previously to speak out in
13 favor of the affordable housing project on Genesee
14 Avenue, my block of Genesee, which is a wonderful
15 addition to this city. This will add a much needed
16 pocket park, community meeting space. There's
17 funding from the Federal Government and for those
18 who have seen my house know I'm in favor of
19 rehabbing and historic property, as this will
20 restore historic property. So I'm here to speak
21 out in favor of this project. Thank you.

22 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Bergstein. Helen Levin I believe
23 has left. Tom DeMille will be followed by Julie
24 Summers.

1 DeMille: I'm gonna need an ambulance after this. Tom
2 DeMille, West Hollywood. I'd like to make an
3 announcement, a solemn announcement that as we
4 speak a candlelight vigil is being held up at the
5 House of Blues for the 21-year-old boy that was
6 killed last night. You have my respect and the
7 family will have justice. Oh, previous speakers
8 talked about respect. Our core values. Respecting
9 other residents. Vision 20/20. Let's cut to the
10 chase. I believe the actions of Wihona has broken
11 from our city's core values. They have become a
12 hate based organization. They have posted our old
13 mayor John Hielman who's now a city Council Member
14 who won overwhelmingly, a hateful picture of him
15 all over this city. They have called an ex-mayor
16 Abby Land, who is now a City Councilwoman a money
17 grubbing whore. Fifteen years I've been here, I've
18 never seen two sides of an isle of democrats, one
19 of love and one of hate. Never have I seen that
20 and that's what it's become. You will not
21 intimidate, you will not intimidate the residents
22 with hate. You will not intimidate us. We will
23 build senior housing. I know most residents in
24 West Hollywood. They don't want hate. They reject

1 hate. They don't want personal assassination like
2 this group has brought for the last two years and I
3 am sick to death over it. They have no plans, they
4 have no pers...no, no, no positive thinking, they
5 have no, no...they're not good for our city. If
6 they don't have something nice to say, they should
7 not come here. The residents of West Hollywood
8 would lose every time we have this going on. Thank
9 you very much.

10 D'Amico: Thank you, Julie Summers will be followed by
11 Reverend Keith Mozingo.

12 Summers: Good evening, Julie Summers, proud resident of West
13 Hollywood and also a member of the West...of,
14 sorry, also a member of the Housing Corporation. I
15 would just like to urge you please the Commission
16 to approve this project this evening. Thank you.

17 D'Amico: Thank you. Reverend Mozingo will be followed by
18 Ivy Bottini.

19 Mozingo: I'm Reverend Keith Mozingo, resident of West
20 Hollywood. My name is Reverend Keith Mozingo and
21 I'm a resident of West Hollywood. I rise to speak
22 on behalf of the Reverend Neil Thomas, Senior
23 Pastor and also myself as the minister of
24 congregational care of Metropolitan Community

1 Church that is located here in West Hollywood. We
2 are in support of the proposed Laurel Project that
3 has attracted much controversy as it has progressed
4 through its planning stages. As a church, we are
5 committed to the needs of the poor and the
6 disenfranchised. We have watched this project move
7 through its process during the past two years and
8 although we may have done things differently,
9 dealing with the tenants of the current buildings
10 that needed to be vacated with perhaps a little
11 more empathy. We understand that the project as
12 now proposed and before the Planning Commission
13 will meet vital needs of our community at large.
14 We support the application that includes 28 units
15 of permanently affordable housing to very low
16 income seniors and the fact that the project comes
17 with Section 8 certificates. We believe that the
18 project addresses multiple levels and multiple
19 goals including something which we passionately
20 believe in, affordable housing in West Hollywood.
21 Historic preservation and open spaces. While we
22 understand and have compassion for the residents
23 that will be displaced, we support the proposed
24 plan and urge the City Council to work with

1 compassion and with the city's values to ensure
2 that both the current tenants are treated fairly as
3 well as ensuring that the project as it is
4 developed does not lose sight of its intent and
5 delivers all that it promises. We urge the
6 Planning Commission and City Council to support
7 this application. Thank you.

8 Guardarrama: Our next speaker is Ivy Bottini to be followed by
9 David Eichman.

10 Bottini: Good evening Commissioners. I call your attention
11 to your own agenda 9.2.3, Rehabilitation of locally
12 designated cultural resource. You're absolutely
13 right, Shane. Thank you. My name is Ivy Bottini.
14 I live at 1015 North Kings Road, Unit 213. I'm 180
15 pounds. Okay, getting back. The section I quoted
16 begins, preservation of the historic resource has
17 been paramount from the beginning of the project
18 design process. I submit that there are two
19 historic resources here. One is the property and
20 the other are the seniors of this community. The,
21 the seniors have been resources and founders of
22 this city in 1984 and they are patiently waiting
23 for the City Council, Planning Commissions,
24 whatever, wherever it is, to come up with some

1 affordable housing. We are woefully way behind
2 other cities. There are seniors who are counting
3 on this project who are waiting, who are hoping
4 that their name is going to be drawn. I imagine
5 that most everybody in this room, most everybody
6 will not have to look for affordable housing. So I
7 ask you to put yourselves in the position of those
8 seniors who are losing their homes, who want to
9 stay in this city and some of them are no longer
10 with us and they have waited two years and probably
11 another two years before the project is built.
12 This is a win-win situation. We got a great piece
13 of property, culturally the house would be
14 wonderful, there will be green space and seniors
15 will have a most deserved place to live, having
16 served this community for many years. Thank you.

17 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Bottini. David Eichman will be
18 followed by Dennis Stratton.

19 Eichman: Good evening Mr. Chair, Commissioners. David
20 Eichman, a resident of Los Angeles and a business
21 owner here in the city of West Hollywood. First of
22 all, I'd like to thank the Project Planner Francie
23 Stefan for clarifying the misinformation about the
24 availability of the EIR. In real estate, we say

1 the three most important things are location,
2 location, location. This project also has three
3 very important elements. First a park, second the
4 ability to save historically, historic structure
5 and third 27 units of senior housing. I would
6 prefer to see 35 units of senior housing, but you
7 can't get everything. You learn to compromise.
8 This Applicant has compromised over a period of
9 years and has incorporated many, many, many
10 concerns of the neighborhood into the version that
11 you see before you tonight. My mother tried to
12 teach me to be patient. Maria Altman was patient
13 when she was waiting for the Government of Austria
14 to return the Clint paintings that belonged to her
15 family and the seniors in and around West Hollywood
16 have been patient over all of these years as well,
17 waiting for another senior housing project to be
18 built. It's within your power to grant that wish,
19 so I encourage you as Ric Rickles says, as a future
20 senior citizen, I strongly recommend that you
21 approve this project. Thank you.

22 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Dennis Stratton to be
23 followed by Roslyn Krause.

24 Stratton: Dennis Stratton, resident of West Hollywood. I'm

1 not gonna give you my background. I'm a realtor I
2 guess as a job. My clients are developers, but
3 this project like I said before when I was here a
4 month or so ago, there is a ton of properties in
5 West Hollywood that are vacant, abandoned, etc. A
6 couple weeks ago I went to the City Clerk's Office,
7 I got a copy of those properties. The folks are
8 talking about senior housing, that's what the City
9 Council needs to be developing. You guys need to
10 be approving those properties and developing those
11 into senior housing. This is a historic property.
12 This property needs to be preserved. The other
13 properties are teardowns. Tear them down and build
14 homes for senior housing or whatever housing.
15 Beyond the senior issue, when you get out and you
16 talk to the younger folks like my age and my
17 partner who's 27, they're leaving the city because
18 they can't afford the rent. It doesn't affect only
19 the seniors, it affects the other people that live
20 in the city of West Hollywood as well. So there's
21 a lot of housing needs here to where we have
22 affordable housing for a lot of other folks as
23 well. So let's don't exclude the other part of
24 West Hollywood. We do that way too much. Now I

1 addressed that issue to a City Council member in
2 the past and their comments was really insulting,
3 actually to the seniors and I'm not gonna re,
4 regurgitate that here, but that's not the approach
5 the City Council needs to take on the seniors. We
6 need to provide housing for everybody. But this
7 property, there's a lot of legal issues there and I
8 tell you, as a notary, if I notarized someone's
9 property over and a Power of Attorney wasn't
10 present, if that's the case on this, 'cause that's
11 what I've heard, I don't know that's the fact,
12 somebody would be hanging and it wouldn't be me
13 because I would never do that. But there's a lot
14 of legal issues from the day this thing got turned
15 over to the city all the way up through the EIR,
16 the whole planning issue on this. I'm not gonna go
17 into those things. You all have a very hard job to
18 do and I envy you, but I would suggest on this
19 property, we need more facts. A lot of, lot of
20 other things need to be cleaned up before you guys
21 vote for or against.

22 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Stratton. Roslyn Krause will be
23 followed by Polly Businger.

24 Krause: Roslyn Krause, West Hollywood. Let's face reality.

1 Let's put the cards on the table. When the five
2 Council members in West Hollywood got together to
3 decide what to do with this magnificent property,
4 Land, Hielman, Duran voted for this terrible thing
5 that you're doing to this magnificent property.
6 Sal Guarriello &&&abstained from this pro...from
7 voting on this project because he's a coward and a
8 traitor. When he and the City Manager met with
9 Elsie Wiseman, well, when she was 98, Guarriello
10 promised her the city would take care of this
11 property. Well, they're taking care of it all
12 right. We had one Council member that voted
13 against this project and that's Jeffrey Prang, a
14 man with scruples. The other Council members don't
15 have scruples and it's a done deal, it's been a
16 done deal from the very beginning. You can...you
17 would all vote no on this, which of course you
18 won't because you want to keep your commissions,
19 but it's a done deal and Abby, John and Duran will
20 get their project.

21 Bartolo: Can I say something please?

22 D'Amico: You have a question for the speaker?

23 Bartolo: Yes, well, I just want to make a comment.

24 D'Amico: Hmm, no, if you have a question, that would be all

1 right. Let's, let's go on. We'll pick it up
2 later. Thanks. Ros...thank you, Ms. Krause.
3 Polly Businger will...oh, she went home, will be
4 followed by Stan Lothridge and Sofia Komskaya will
5 be after Stan. Thank you.

6 Lothridge: Stan Lothridge, a resident, long time resident of
7 West Hollywood. I had a prepared speech and I'm
8 gonna set it aside because I would like to answer
9 the questions about what trees will be remaining
10 with this project and will go by what has happened
11 in the past. There were two projects on, on Harper
12 that were undertaken by the West Hollywood Housing
13 Corporation. One of the projects was criticized
14 for being too bland and so they were told to put
15 some vegetation in front of it. You can see that
16 vegetation today because it is a ceramic plaque
17 with, with a flower bowl on the front of the, of
18 the building. The other building on Harper
19 contained a whole forest of trees like, like this
20 project, this property does, and Mr. Zimmerman
21 promised the people when it came up about the
22 trees, he said we will retain as many of the trees
23 as we possibly can. Approval was granted. The
24 next day a bulldozer came in and everything was

1 leveled to the ground. The third project was, was
2 the...is a property on Palm that, that was
3 undertaken. There were two Craftsman style
4 historically important houses on that property and
5 Mr. Zimmerman promised that that would be retained
6 and there was some promise that there was a large
7 eucalyptus grove in back that, that something would
8 be made with that. Again, bulldozers came in after
9 the approval, down to the, the bare ground and they
10 put in their place...well, we...they were told that
11 they saved all the wood and they would put it back
12 up. Well, it never was used. You, you now have a
13 square building there with nothing but just...

14 D'Amico: Thank you, Stan.

15 Lothridge: ...a fake front on it. So I hope that answers the
16 thing about trees.

17 D'Amico: Shirley Roberts to be followed by Esther Baum. Ms.
18 Roberts is making her way around.

19 Roberts: Shirley Roberts, long time resident of West
20 Hollywood. First I really, really want to
21 compliment the Planning Commission, the staff, the
22 City for taking the time, the effort on this entire
23 project. I'm so sorry it has taken so damn long
24 though. We've lost people that could've benefited.

1 There are a few things that need to be cleared up.
2 Number one, let's clear the air. Mrs. Wiseman gave
3 the city that property with no stipulations other
4 that she live there until she died and that her
5 tenants get six months additional time. There was
6 not another stipulation. At no time did she
7 request or desire the historical landmark or
8 preservation. So that should be clear. It is
9 known, it is done. What is happening now is I hope
10 we have given everyone a chance to express
11 themselves and we now get on to doing what this
12 city does best, care for its people, preserve the
13 space for open space and be the great city that it
14 is. I support this completely.

15 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Roberts. Esther Baum will be
16 followed by....

17 Baum: Esther Baum.

18 D'Amico: Just...excuse me, Esther, just wait one second. I,
19 I really want to be sure that we're not talking....

20 Thompson: Heckling the speakers.

21 D'Amico: Thank you, talking at speakers. Everyone has a
22 point of view and we want to hear them all right
23 through the microphone into our ears. So if you
24 can keep it to yourself until it's your turn to

1 speak, we would appreciate it. Thank you. Esther,
2 please go ahead.

3 Baum: Esther Baum, a resident of West Hollywood and a
4 resident of North Harper, across the street from
5 two of the housing apartment buildings. When the
6 more modern one was built, they didn't say they
7 would keep all the trees. What they kept was the
8 huge tree in front. The building was designed to
9 preserve that historical tree and it is doing fine.
10 The other building, they only did construction at
11 the back where the garages were. They didn't do
12 anything about any trees on that property. So I
13 don't know what that man's talking about. I'm in
14 favor of this. I think that there should be more
15 housing for low income seniors because they're
16 being forced out as Section 8 goes out. They're
17 being forced to leave the city and that's a shame.
18 I think that we're going to pre...restore this old
19 home to what it was. That's part of the funding
20 and we're going to have this little pocket park in
21 front that the neighbors can enjoy. I think it's a
22 win-win situation and we should go ahead with it.

23 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Mark Yaulvelevich, it says on
24 here this gentleman cannot speak English, does not

1 want to speak, just wants to announce his name and
2 state his support, I assume for the project. Will
3 be followed by Agassi Top...Topa...thank you,
4 Agassi Topchian. Has left, to be followed by Sofia
5 Gelman.

6 Gelman: Sofia Gelman, resident of West Hollywood, Senior
7 Advisory Board Member. As I understand, we speak
8 about a house for people with low income and
9 America is a country of giving. Everyone in the
10 world knows that the citizens of America are famous
11 for their tradition of giving and helping those who
12 are in need. Now a lot of working people are poor.
13 Their wages haven't been changed for 10 years.
14 They can't afford insurance for medical problems
15 and their rent for living constantly increases.
16 There is a need for them is affordable housing. We
17 have the same situation with disabled and the
18 elderly people. We have to use and develop every
19 chance to support those people showing our deep
20 understanding and readiness to be helpful. But
21 instead we see hatred and protests against building
22 them a shelter. I'm deeply sorry for you that you
23 are so (INAUDIBLE). Who knows what can happen to
24 us tomorrow? Our relatives, friends and even some

1 of us may need an affordable place to live. I
2 think you misunderstand the terrible situation.
3 Please change your minds and say yes now to be
4 proud of your decision tomorrow. Thank you in
5 advance.

6 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Agassi Topchian followed by
7 Mark Srolevsky.

8 Topchian: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Commissioners. Agassi
9 Topchian, resident of West Hollywood. I'm here to
10 support the project obviously and I'm doing it on
11 my behalf as a resident of this fine city and as
12 a...as well as on behalf of the Coalition for
13 Economic Survival, CES, that I work for, the
14 organization that basically was main force during
15 the creation of City of West Hollywood back in
16 1984. This (INAUDIBLE) organizations and I'm
17 speaking on behalf of that group and tonight I had
18 seven, eight Russian seniors, disabled seniors,
19 residents of West Hollywood, were ready to speak in
20 favor in support of this project, however, because
21 of their age and their health condition, so they
22 couldn't wait longer and I had to take them home
23 and I'm glad I made it. So this project is
24 important, is important for our community for, for

1 us, for every resident, young or old. I think this
2 is an amazing project. We desperately need
3 affordable units in this city and you know better
4 than anyone else that every year we are losing rent
5 control, low rent units, apartments in this city
6 and because of the demolitions and intentions for
7 the landlords to build condominiums, which is fine,
8 but...well, I won't say it's fine, but I think this
9 is a chance for us to, to build, to replace these
10 lost units with these affordable units and, and
11 the, and I'm actually sad. I'm really, really
12 disappointed that previously it was 35 units that
13 the project's supposed to be and now we have 28
14 only, but at least that's 28 lives, 28 families who
15 can save and I think...and City, it doesn't cost so
16 much.

17 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

18 Topchian: And I, I urge you to support the project. You can
19 lose this. Thank you.

20 D'Amico: Mark Srolevsky to be followed by Larisa
21 Ozadovskaya. Mark Srolevsky not here, Larisa
22 Ozadovskaya not here. Efrin Kutz to be followed by
23 Ruth Cislowski. Both of them have left. Bernice
24 Levin to be followed by Steve Wayland. Steve

1 Wayland to be followed by Julia Baranov.

2 Wayland: Good evening, Steve Wayland, resident of West
3 Hollywood. In 2003, hundreds of West Hollywood
4 community members participated in the development
5 of the Vision 20/20 strategic plan. The plan
6 identified five primary strategic goals,
7 maintaining unique urban balance with emphasis on
8 residential neighborhood livability, affordable
9 housing, expanding and enhancing the city's green
10 and public spaces, fiscal sustainability and
11 developing more parking. The proposal before you
12 tonight addresses three of these goals, the
13 affordable housing, neighborhood livability and the
14 enhanced green and public spaces. In 1998, the
15 City conducted a community needs assessment, which
16 noted that, "Seniors are the backbone and
17 conscience of the community. Their attention to
18 the details of urban life and their commitment to
19 civic involvement is an important community asset."
20 And one of the 10 formal recommendations that was
21 made in that plan was to prioritize the provision
22 of regular individualized services to older seniors
23 and seniors with health problems. Finally, within
24 the past year the City conducted a community study

1 in which over 600 community members participated.
2 When asked to identify the two most important
3 social service needs in their household, senior
4 services and affordable housing were in the top
5 five most noted areas of need. There is
6 demonstrable evidence that there is a need for
7 affordable housing, senior housing in West
8 Hollywood and there's a demonstrated committed on
9 the part of the community in support of more
10 affordable senior housing. Currently, 21 percent
11 of West Hollywood residents are seniors, a
12 percentage expected to grow significantly in the
13 coming years. More than 20 percent of the
14 residents are low income. The website put up by
15 the opponents has this question, the City of West
16 Hollywood is giving away a \$10 million piece of
17 property to 34 of the poorest people in America.
18 What genius came up with this?

19 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

20 Wayland: I sincerely hope (TALKING OVER)...

21 D'Amico: The next speaker is Julia Baranov...

22 Wayland: ...some of the geniuses here tonight. Please
23 support the project.

24 D'Amico: ...to be followed by Lovedy Brydon.

1 Baranov: Good evening, my name is Julia Baranov and I live
2 in West Hollywood. I own property in West
3 Hollywood and I'm a business owner in West
4 Hollywood and I'm here to speak in favor of this
5 wonderful and thoughtful project. I think that the
6 land is widely used combining apartments for low
7 income seniors, the preservation of a historic
8 resource and the quiet neighborhood park. There
9 obviously was great thought and planning put into
10 the design of this project and I think the
11 taxpayers should be proud that money is being used
12 by the City of West Hollywood for such important
13 resources that will probably...that most...that
14 will be here long past our lifetime. So please
15 vote for this project to be built as soon as
16 possible. Thanks.

17 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Lovedy Brydon will be
18 followed by Al Secunda.

19 Brydon: My name is Lovedy Brydon and I'm a resident, a
20 proud resident of West Hollywood. Also, I'm a
21 resident of Laurel Avenue. And as a tenant...oh,
22 and also I want, I want to, to say that I am a
23 newly appointed member of, of the West Hollywood
24 Community Housing Corporation. As a tenant of the

1 West Hollywood Community Housing, I can vouch for
2 them as wonderful landlords, not just because I was
3 appointed. That, that's one of the reasons I was
4 willing to be appointed. I have observed the
5 planning of this project for more than two years.
6 I have gone up the street many times and compared
7 the proposal to the existing house and grounds. I
8 am satisfied that the new housing to be built
9 behind the main house will blend beautifully into
10 the existing setting and I look forward to sitting
11 in the park to be built there. It will be an
12 absolutely wonderful place to live and a tribute to
13 West Hollywood's dedication to senior housing,
14 historic preservation and park space. It is a
15 crying shame that this project has been made into a
16 political football. My point is this project will
17 be...will result in 27 new affordable senior units.
18 It will preserve a historical house and I urge
19 your...to utilize common sense and approve this
20 project.

21 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Brydon. Al Secunda will be followed
22 by Mark Zangando. Zangrando, pardon me. Mr.
23 Secunda, Mark Sandran...Zangrando, are you present?
24 Excellent. Will be followed by Roy Oldenkamp.

1 Zangrando: Mark Zangrando, I'm a resident of West Hollywood.
2 I'm also a, a Jesuit priest and I come today
3 because I love living in this town as almost
4 everyone else here does because this town, maybe
5 more than anywhere else that I'm aware of, fights
6 for the little guy all the time to use a sexist
7 term and I was stationed in Berkeley for four years
8 and this town tops that place. There is no other
9 place that I'm aware of where we always watch for
10 those who are on the margins, those who are
11 ostracized, those who are forgotten and this is one
12 of those opportunities for us to say to the aged
13 poor, which I believe probably trumps just about
14 most of us when it comes to vulnerability, that you
15 not only belong here, but you will be fought for
16 here. It may not happen in the surrounding towns,
17 but here, you are welcome and what I would like to
18 say is that this project is extremely exciting. It
19 doesn't have enough units. I agree about Spalding
20 in Santa Monica. I agree that we need more of that
21 in this town. We always look at this town as a
22 place where we don't put ourselves first. We're
23 always scanning to see those who are most in need.
24 This is a wonderful opportunity for us to show

1 that. The aged poor, I just moved my pop into one
2 three months ago, debt collector, he had no money.
3 I'm grateful that we had that blessing. There will
4 be people here in this room that will have to do
5 that for their parents or it may happen to them.
6 Thank you so very much.

7 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Roy Oldenkamp will be
8 followed by Thomas Mann.

9 Oldenkamp: Hi, Roy Oldenkamp, city of West Hollywood. I was
10 looking earlier at the last slide that was up
11 regarding the two deodar cedars out front. They're
12 also on the diagram there. There's a driveway on
13 the left that's gonna have many metric tons of dirt
14 removed unless we use a bucket brigade that's gonna
15 destroy the roots, which go 40 percent beyond the,
16 the drip line, which is where the needles end. So
17 I think the arborist is probably incorrect or
18 hasn't really researched this enough and if you go
19 half a block up, you'll see the deodar cedar that's
20 already destroyed across the street. All those
21 roots are intertwined, both those trees will die.
22 There'll be nothing left on the property. Nothing
23 was mentioned, there would be Italian stone pine,
24 the finest tree on the property. That tree is

1 going directly where the...is going to be removed
2 for the building itself. Also, I think for Jeffrey
3 Skorneck to say he does not believe this is site
4 specific is, is disingenuous or incompetent because
5 at this stage it certainly should've been addressed
6 by now. I've mentioned it on seven or eight
7 occasions myself so I think someone here should
8 have had the initiative to do something about that.
9 Why can't someone...HUD is here, let's talk to HUD
10 about it. Has anybody seen this Quit Claim Deed?
11 Why is it not out so that we all know the facts
12 about Elsie's entire position on this? It's just
13 all, all been whispered as an innuendo. We don't
14 have any of these facts down. I hope you've all
15 been to Villa Aurora up in the Pacific Palisades.
16 An historic mansion that has been preserved as a
17 cultural center by the country of Germany and it's
18 a fantastic thriving center. Nothing has been
19 altered to the property besides some repairs. They
20 shuttle people up to the site for events. We don't
21 have that and we've been having discussions before
22 Council about a cultural center. Well, here it is,
23 folks. Take advantage of that. The whole property
24 is an historic estate. Do not mar it with this

1 building. Put it elsewhere. We know there's other
2 sites, you know there's other sites. If someone
3 could have the initiative and the strength to go
4 before HUD and say let's move this, can we still do
5 it? HUD will save face, the City of West Hollywood
6 will not be considered anti-historic preservation,
7 a staggering stance for a city as progressive as we
8 are now and the entire argument about affordable
9 housing will then become a moot point. Thank you.

10 Bartolo: Okay, wait, wait, wait.

11 D'Amico: Thank you. Thomas Mann will be followed by
12 Graciela Iparraguirre.

13 Mann: Hi, good evening, I'm Thomas Mann, I'm a resident
14 of West Hollywood. I'm also on the Board of
15 Directors for the West Hollywood Community Housing
16 Corporation. I'm here to ask for your support for
17 this project this evening. Unfortunately, not
18 everybody can be pleased by the outcome of this.
19 However, I think that we are serving the greater
20 good in the city by making this a senior housing
21 project. People talked about we're losing open
22 land, we're losing the house. In fact, we are
23 rehabilitating a house that's in disrepair and we
24 are providing park land to be used by all instead

1 of formerly three tenants on the property and right
2 now no one. So I'm asking you to, to approve this
3 project. Thank you.

4 D'Amico: Thank you, Graciela Iparraguirre to be followed by
5 Tom McMillan.

6 Iparraguirre: Good evening, Graciela Iparraguirre. Senior
7 housing I find offensive this fake choice as if we
8 are for Tara we are against seniors. Seniors don't
9 come from Planet Senior. As you will know, there's
10 many opposing the project as seniors themselves and
11 the reason not exactly (INAUDIBLE). We don't have
12 a vacant lot under consideration. We have to look
13 at what is there right now. We have a historic
14 designated property with beautiful buildings and a
15 green landscape, unique in size, age and variety.
16 Senior housing can be developed right now in many
17 other sites in the city if City Hall finds a way to
18 actually care about senior housing, historic
19 preservation. Actually this project would do
20 exactly the opposite by gutting in a glorious
21 structure and landscape. This historically
22 designated was bequeathed to the city of West
23 Hollywood in perpetuity, but whose obligation of
24 picking Applicant for the project. Two

1 corporations and in the front of one, a
2 park...park. This model is truly ridiculous and
3 dishonest. The normal trees and vegetation
4 including 130 or plus trees would be cut off and
5 roots excavated. The huge trees in the south side
6 will...south side will be destroyed by equipment
7 coming in, demolition equipment, excavation
8 equipment, pile drivers, trucks going to load
9 daily, mixed use concrete trucks. (INAUDIBLE) will
10 be destroyed by the building and excavation and
11 trees on the north side by all these equipment
12 coming out. This is a relentless process including
13 tons of material and massive 18, 18-wheeler trucks.
14 Even any minor trees in the front of the house
15 would be probably destroyed because of root system
16 degradation, changes in the drainage, parking for
17 construction workers and construction trailers,
18 etc. The unique eco system for local and migratory
19 animals will be destroyed. The property doesn't
20 need to become a public park in order to provide
21 benefits. Oh, shit, sorry. Save Tara.

22 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Tom McMillan followed by
23 Richard Loring.

24 Iparraguirre: You should consider that English is not my first

1 language. It's very hard to read this in two
2 minutes. I have tried.

3 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

4 Bartolo: And you did just fine.

5 D'Amico: Tom McMillan followed by Richard Loring.

6 McMillan: Members of the Commission, my name is Tom McMillan,
7 I'm Director of Development for the Los Angeles
8 Multi-Family Section of the HUD Office. I just
9 wanted to clarify two...answer two questions or
10 perhaps clarify two responses that were brought up
11 earlier today...tonight. One is that the...due to
12 the competitive process by which these awards are
13 made, they are not transferable. If, if for some
14 reason this project were not approved, the money
15 would be returned back to the Treasury for use in
16 either other related HUD projects or go back into
17 the General Fund. Second question that came up
18 that I wanted to address is that of maintaining
19 affordability. The way we protect that is the
20 grant, even though it's non-repayable and non-
21 interest bearing, if there's a default under the
22 underlying documents, then it's a typical
23 foreclosure proceeding. The defaulting party is,
24 is brought to task and the property is restored to

1 its affordability. Thank you.

2 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Yes, of course. Mr.
3 McMillan...

4 DeLuccio: I have a question.

5 D'Amico: ...here you are, Commissioner DeLuccio has a
6 question for you.

7 DeLuccio: I have a question. We were...before we...I think
8 right now the arrangement possibly will be a fee
9 transfer of the, of the property from the city to
10 the, the housing entity. Does HUD get involved
11 with that whether it's a fee transfer or a, a lease
12 transfer? Does it matter to HUD?

13 McMillan: It...we would have to approve it, but it...I can
14 say that it doesn't matter.

15 DeLuccio: Thank you.

16 D'Amico: There's more questions.

17 Thompson: I'm just curious, why isn't it...I mean just for my
18 own, why isn't it transferable? In other words, if
19 the goal is HUD is, or one of the goals of HUD is,
20 as we all know, why wouldn't the funding be
21 transferable to say a more suitable site? I'm just
22 curious.

23 McMillan: I think it's, it's tied, it's, it's both law,
24 statute, regulation and policy and the reason for

1 it is because it's a highly competitive process and
2 if we, if we made a grant to somebody, in this case
3 the West Laurel Place project, and then they came
4 back and said, you know, that site doesn't work, it
5 doesn't get approved, so we're gonna move it to
6 another site, then another sponsor who, who wasn't
7 successful in the competition would come back and
8 say, hey, I had a site that worked.

9 Thompson: I see. Okay, thank you.

10 Altschul: Question. Mr. McMillan, you stated that the grant
11 is non-interest bearing, is that right?

12 McMillan: Correct.

13 Altschul: But the principal is repaid?

14 McMillan: No, the way it's set up is that it's...the, the
15 grant is set up as a 40-year mortgage. There is a
16 stated interest rate in the mortgage. So long as
17 the property is maintained as, as housing for very
18 low income seniors in this case, it's not repayable
19 and at the end of 40 years, it goes away. If....

20 Altschul: That's won...that's really wonderful. Thank you.

21 D'Amico: Kate?

22 Bartolo: Okay. You said that the process is very
23 competitive. I checked with my sources and
24 confirmed that since I didn't have the opportunity

1 to call you directly. On what basis it's...did HUD
2 select this project? I know there's a very
3 complicated point system, what differentiated this
4 project?

5 McMillan: Well, typically what we do is we assess a variety
6 of things in, in, in reviewing the applications.
7 One is the, the strength and reputation of the
8 sponsor, one is the....

9 Bartolo: Just a moment, which, which one if I may ask?
10 'Cause there's one that has a...the, there's a new
11 one, is it...that has 51 percent interest or the
12 West Hollywood Housing Corporation?

13 McMillan: No, the original applicant....

14 Bartolo: Is it WASET...WASET?

15 McMillan: The original applicant I believe was WASET
16 and...well, I can't answer who the original. I
17 think it was WASET and that's...and we've had, you
18 know, the HUD Office has had lengthy experience
19 with them and they're consistently...they
20 consistently do what they say they're gonna do when
21 they say they're gonna do it. And that's, that's
22 one of the elements that, that's measured. The
23 needs of the community are measured and, and we
24 have somebody in our office who does an assessment

1 of, of a variety of kinds of statistics throughout
2 the L. A. area of Southern California and
3 presumably in this case, and now I'm just
4 speculating because I don't know the answer
5 exactly, but presumably in this case they made the
6 assessment that there is sufficient need for very
7 low income senior housing in West Hollywood and so
8 that, that's the second part of it. The third part
9 of it is that...has to do with the site control
10 itself, is it basically unconditional site control,
11 is it subject to zoning, what is it subject to and,
12 and the cleaner the site control the higher the,
13 the points are awarded. What else? Those are
14 probably the most important.

15 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Anyone else have any more
16 questions for Mr. McMillan from HUD? None. Seeing
17 none, thank you very much. Richard Loring will be
18 followed by Angee Beckett.

19 Loring: My name is Richard Loring and I'm a resident of Los
20 Angeles. I do work in West Hollywood. I've
21 appeared before the Commission on, on projects that
22 I've been involved with four times and have enjoyed
23 the, the Commission's support on all four of my
24 projects, so I know the Commission recognizes good

1 design when they see it. I want to address a
2 couple, couple issues I think that have been
3 presented. Number one, the distance between the
4 new project and the existing house. I, I would
5 like to assure the Commission that, that the 20,
6 22, 24 feet is very ample. We just completed a
7 project on Gardner with a courtyard component.
8 That courtyard component is about a 22-foot wide
9 component and the project I think looks great.
10 It's, it's received an AIA award recently and I
11 think it's a, a very good example of how a space
12 that size can, can be made to function very
13 effectively as, as a buffer between building
14 masses. Another point I'd like to address quickly
15 is the, the contention by the, the builder with 30
16 years experience that projects can't be done
17 without destroying trees. That's absolute
18 nonsense. I've also been a builder for 30 years
19 and if you have the proper mitigation measures in
20 place and you have a builder that has the proper
21 incentives and desire to save those trees, they
22 will be saved. You, you do need the attention of
23 an arborist. An arborist has to show up frequently
24 to care for the trees. I'm sure that will become a

1 part of the mitigation plan, but it's by no means
2 is it an impossible task. I would urge the
3 Commission to support this project. You'll not get
4 very many opportunities to support projects that
5 have a park component, restore a historic structure
6 and provide affordable housing. Thank you.

7 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Loring. Angee Beckett to be
8 followed by Victor Omelczenko.

9 Beckett: Angee Beckett, Executive Director of the West
10 Hollywood Tree Preservation Society and a resident
11 of West Hollywood. I came before this Board two
12 weeks ago over a property at 1200 Sweitzer where
13 there were trees that are gonna be demolished. I
14 come before you one more time two weeks later. I
15 mentioned at that point that West Hollywood alone
16 is losing so much of its canopy. I too am a senior
17 and I worry about senior housing for myself at some
18 point, but not when it is destroying so much
19 canopy, so much possibility for cleaning the air
20 that we breathe and helping the planet. I urge
21 you, I am really sorry for the...all the things
22 that have gone on over the last two years, but when
23 you're considering this project, I know there is
24 need for housing, but consider the loss of the

1 environment. Thank you.

2 Bartolo: I have a question.

3 D'Amico: Thank you. Kate has a question for you, Ms.

4 Beckett.

5 Bartolo: Okay, of the trees that are slated to be removed,
6 which do you consider to be the greatest loss and
7 why?

8 Beckett: This property consists of an urban forest within
9 itself, within this area. Many of those trees are
10 interrelated with one another. The, the staff said
11 that many of these are not important trees, but
12 they have created an environment there. There are
13 many important trees on that property including
14 very old trees that have been there a long time and
15 younger ones that have grown up to be trees. To
16 just say, oh, well, they started out their lives as
17 bushes and they just happened to grow into trees
18 and so they're unimportant really is not...doesn't
19 matter. This is an environment that once you take
20 this down, it is gone and it is one of the last few
21 places in West Hollywood. Representing the West
22 Hollywood Tree Preservation Society, we highly
23 suggest that you reconsider not letting this happen
24 and preserving the property. Thank you very much.

1 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Beckett. Victor Omelczenko followed
2 by David Nash.

3 Omelczenko: Good evening Commissioners, I'm Victor Omelczenko,
4 West Hollywood resident and I'm here urging you to
5 not approve the recommendation of city staff
6 regarding the project at 1343 North Laurel. This
7 is a very tantalizing meeting for me. It gives me
8 some tantalizing details, but it leaves me wanting
9 for more. Things get very, very murky when you
10 hear a lawyer from Malibu for the Housing
11 Corporation using words like tricks and then a
12 veiled threat that the final EIR would stand a
13 judicial review as if we can't question anything
14 about it and, you know, we did hear from the HUD
15 representative. As a taxpayer, is HUD satisfied?
16 I as a taxpayer want to know, is HUD satisfied that
17 the number of units is being reduced from 35 to 28
18 and is some of the grant money going to be returned
19 to all of the citizens of the United States and
20 what about this murky WASET? Why are we all asking
21 what is this WASET? Why isn't this process more
22 transparent? Who is this WASET? What has the city
23 done getting into bed with some outside
24 organization that owns 51 percent of this property?

1 Is HUD satisfied with this? Is this something that
2 maybe the HUD Office of the Inspector General needs
3 to be made aware of? To me, 1343 North Laurel and
4 its surrounding stand is a monument to the charity
5 of the Wiseman Family and is a last reminder in our
6 city of what it was like here in the 1910's. This
7 site retains a wholeness, a totality, an integrity
8 of structure and landscaping that are not
9 replicated anywhere else in our tiny city. It
10 deserves to be preserved perhaps as a cultural
11 center or a community meeting place, but not
12 overwhelmed by an incongruous structure and the
13 degradation by the uprooting of many precious
14 heritage trees. Preserve our urban forest and 1343
15 North Laurel as it is now.

16 D'Amico: Thank you very much. David Nash to be followed by
17 Fred Vanacore.

18 Nash: David Nash, resident of West Hollywood. I'm also a
19 resident of Palmview building run by the West
20 Hollywood Community Housing Corporation. I am so
21 grateful to have that apartment. It's a beautiful
22 apartment, but I'm not happy with the way the
23 building is managed and I am very much in favor of
24 senior housing, sensitive to senior issues, but I

1 feel this is the wrong project at the wrong place.
2 I think Mr. John, pardon me if I mispronounce your
3 name, Altschul, had, had it right, hit the deal
4 breaker point that it's not a teardown property.
5 Therefore, as one of the Housing Corporation's own
6 representatives pointed out, we're following 41
7 units short of the potential at a lot that size. I
8 would drop this project at a hot, like a hot potato
9 and move on to something else. In regard to the
10 trees, the trees at Palmview, the plan was for a
11 former tree, tree mature buffer at the back of the
12 building, totally vaporized once the, once the
13 project was built. They just ran out of space
14 somehow. There wasn't even a palm tree originally
15 stuck in the front of the building, though the
16 architectures had that all designed. If you
17 overlaid the plan as designed, that's actually what
18 we got. There's a tremendous lack in the green
19 space delivered. There's even an arbor as the
20 primary feature in the courtyard that was designed
21 to be covered with growth that's now forbidden to
22 have anything grow on it. Finally, I think the
23 Housing Corporation are ill suited to manage a
24 building with special needs like this. In my

1 experience, I find them to be insensitive and often
2 mean spirited and I wouldn't move a step further in
3 any project with the Housing Corporation until the
4 three key remaining players, the acting Executive
5 Director Ann Ehrental, who's about to be retired,
6 and the Director of Property Management Jim Martin
7 and the Director of Resident Services are all
8 resigned, retired or replaced. I would not...

9 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

10 Nash: ...forward with them until that happens.

11 D'Amico: Mr. Vanacore will be followed by Halli Lorentz.

12 Vanacore: Good evening Mr. Chair and Commissioners. Fred
13 Vanacore, resident of West Hollywood. I've been
14 marketing this city for 20 years as the founding
15 Director of the Convention and Visitors Bureau and
16 a member of the PAC trying to develop the east
17 side. I strongly urge you to support this project
18 and the need for affordable housing is getting
19 greater because also as a, as a volunteer for the
20 Sheriff's Department, I'm increasingly seeing
21 seniors or their representatives showing up at the
22 desk before me telling me about tenant...I mean
23 landlord harassment especially the people that are
24 shut-ins or live-alones and have nobody to speak

1 for them. So they send somebody or come over to
2 the desk and they tell me how the landlord is, is
3 creating noise and they're unable to tolerate it
4 and it's all to get the affordable and rent control
5 people out so they can do market rate housing.
6 This is happening more and more now especially with
7 the rent control being beat up by decontrol and a
8 couple of other factors. Anyway, I have nothing to
9 gain by being here. I have no agenda. I
10 don't...I'm not willing or trying to keep this
11 property for myself. So I urge you, I see a win-
12 win-win situation where the people of West
13 Hollywood will enjoy what it will become and the
14 residents will have affordable housing and there
15 may even be a meeting room I understand where other
16 people in the city can use it. So please do the
17 right thing and support this project and let's let
18 it go forward now. Thank you.

19 D'Amico: Halli Lorentz will be followed by Barbara
20 Robertson. Ms. Robertson will be followed by
21 Madeline Rackley.

22 Robertson: Barbara Robertson, long time, long time resident of
23 the city of West Hollywood. A question, was the
24 meeting between Elsie Wiseman and the city tape

1 recorded for posterity? Was there a court
2 stenographer present? Who exactly was present?
3 Was the meeting legal? These are all questions I
4 think we need answered. If the city of West
5 Hollywood would stop allowing developers to come in
6 and evict seniors and others including some of my
7 dearest friends, build senior housing on other
8 properties they own, this could be a benefit to all
9 of us including those most in danger. Real trees,
10 real plants and real wildlife, if there is any
11 wildlife left in the city of West Hollywood. There
12 are no shade trees on any new developed sites
13 because the only thing that can fit in a pocket
14 park is a palm tree. Maybe a historically
15 significant palm tree though. This city is
16 becoming noise, walls and cement. Excuse me, I've
17 lost my place. Let's see, please build an
18 incredible...please design and build an incredible
19 functional modern, easily accessible, well
20 landscaped apartments for our well deserved seniors
21 on another property. We could even have a design
22 contest, a worldwide design contest, students
23 architects, they're brilliant, they have a lot of
24 great ideas and they come cheap. Make it...this

1 project for the seniors, for their own without any
2 compromise and don't compromise the health and
3 well-being of another senior in our community,
4 Tara, of which was entrusted to the city of West
5 Hollywood for historic preservation. The city of
6 West Hollywood could've rejected her...happy global
7 warming everyone.

8 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Madeline Rackley to be
9 followed by James Noll.

10 Rackley: Good evening Honorable Commissioners, my name is
11 Madeline Rackley and I'm a resident of West
12 Hollywood. According to the U. S. Census Bureau,
13 the poverty threshold for a person over the age of
14 65 is \$9,367.00 a year and as we heard from our
15 planning staff this evening, the rents in our area
16 are...exceed \$1,000.00 a month, which means if you
17 live below the poverty level in West Hollywood, you
18 can't afford to live here. Approximately 8,000
19 residents of West Hollywood are seniors.
20 Statistically, that means about 800 people who live
21 in West Hollywood live under the poverty level.
22 Women are more likely to be living under the
23 poverty level than men, so statistically that means
24 there are about 450 women who cannot afford to live

1 here. They live on less than \$9,000.00 a year. I
2 urge you to support the, the city's proposal for
3 the Laurel Avenue property so that more of our
4 seniors will be able to live here especially those
5 800 who are living at or below the poverty level.
6 Thank you.

7 D'Amico: Thank you, James Noll will be followed by Elena
8 Gold, Elena Goldberg.

9 Noll: Hi, good evening. My name is James Noll and I'm a
10 resident of West Hollywood and I am also a
11 homeowner. I urge you tonight to not approve the
12 HPC06 Number 65. What the staff has proposed and
13 described tonight was a wonderful and a very
14 wonderful and exhaustive EIR, etc., about the
15 property and we commend them on their work. We
16 have to note too that these...this area on Laurel
17 is a very green area and we want to preserve that
18 area such as Plummer Park is in the east end as
19 well as the West Hollywood Park where we are right
20 now. These areas are very green and we need a
21 green area in this part of the central West
22 Hollywood. It has nothing at this point. There's
23 nothing really there to keep it this green zone as
24 we want to call it. With respect to the, to the

1 seniors, we give you our due respect, this area on
2 Laurel is not an area for affordable housing. We
3 hear constantly building proposals such as 1200
4 Sweitzer last week, a couple weeks ago, that they
5 want to build a building there and then they, they
6 put their money somewhere else for the affordable
7 housing allotment to build buildings elsewhere. We
8 want that money to be used to build a strong and
9 viable building for senior housing, not this Laurel
10 establishment on Tara as we call it because it is
11 not the place for this type of work. Thank you.

12 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Noll. Elena Goldberg to be followed
13 by Rita Norton.

14 Goldenberg: Good evening, my name is Elena Goldenberg and I'm a
15 resident of West Hollywood, city of West Hollywood
16 and I'm happy to be here and on, on behalf of this
17 project. I would share my happiness today.
18 I'm...I think I'm the happiest person in the world
19 and I want to thank City of West Hollywood for
20 that. I got apartment for low income. I am a
21 single mom with two children and unfortunately have
22 low income for now and I'm very happy to have this
23 beautiful apartment, which I got from city, like a
24 program. I work for Partners Adult Health Daycare

1 Center. I work in unit with seniors who has
2 Alzheimer. I see these people every day, I work
3 with them and I cry with them and smile with them,
4 laugh with them. I want these people to be happy
5 like I am right now and this is beautiful project.
6 No matter how you, you gonna share the percentage
7 of profit, people, this is more important things
8 here. We're all human. Trees is very important.
9 I understand, I love trees, I love to plant them.
10 Planting new trees around this house. It's
11 wonderful. We all love the trees, but the more
12 important right now is the people who's gonna live
13 next to these trees, okay? So these people, a lot
14 of people in this beautiful city needs this
15 affordable housing. They need it. They, they
16 waiting for it for a long time and some of them,
17 they, they will not see it maybe tomorrow. Well,
18 some of us, all of us actually gonna be at this age
19 one day and we will need it. I hope you will not
20 need it, but you never know, maybe you will. I
21 wish everybody to be rich and happy, but sometimes
22 it happen that the...at the age of 65 we are poor
23 and we need affordable housing.

24 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Goldenberg.

1 Goldenberg: We don't want to live on the tree. Thank you very
2 much for your attention.

3 D'Amico: Thank you, Rita Norton will be followed by George
4 Credle.

5 Norton: Good evening, I'm Rita Norton, resident of West
6 Hollywood and member of the Senior Advisory Board.
7 As a dedicated member of the Audobon Society, I am
8 possibly the greatest bird lover, tree lover
9 running around the city. However, I also love my
10 fellow man and if it comes to possibly sacrificing
11 a tree or two to get affordable housing for my
12 fellow man or woman, I certainly think that takes
13 priority and much as I would love to preserve every
14 tree and every bird at Tara, I think we have to
15 think of our fellow citizens first. Thank you.

16 D'Amico: Thank you very much. George Credle to be followed
17 by Lynn Russell.

18 Credle: George Credle, city of West Hollywood. Having been
19 on the Historic Preservation Commission, I have
20 been a party to the considerations of this project
21 for some time and have seen as many iterations and
22 gone to as many meetings as perhaps you have. My
23 experience with this process has been that
24 increasingly there has been more detail added, but

1 always there have been questions left unanswered.
2 This remains. Staff reports sometimes have a
3 genius for being opaque. I wonder what the State
4 Historic Preservation Office would say to us if we
5 had their letters at this point to read to
6 contribute to this process. And what has been done
7 and I was a member of the Design Review
8 Subcommittee when I was on the Historic
9 Preservation Commission, is to focus on minutia.
10 This project was first presented in the little
11 Hollywood, West Hollywood Newspaper virtually in
12 the form that you see it now. What has been done?
13 Its, its skirts have been drawn back, it's lost its
14 hat, but it's still the same project. Alternatives
15 were never seriously discussed or looked at. They
16 were given sort of a once over and that was it.
17 Public comment was only allowed on this project
18 after this publication the following May. So
19 public comment as extensive as it has been, has
20 been at times more window dressing than a
21 contribution. What has happened is sort of an
22 incremental retreat, which has only modestly
23 changed the scope of the project. We still have
24 the same project. We weren't given alternatives.

1 In the Vision 20/20, we talked about historic
2 preservation, we talked about affordable housing
3 and parkland. Well, the first two categories, in
4 the first two categories, we have in fact achieved
5 some progress during the 22 years of city, of city
6 hood. In terms of parkland, that is the area in
7 which we are most deficient. Please save Tara.
8 Thank you.

9 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Credle. Lynn...oh, George, Mr.
10 Credle?

11 Altschul: No, no, no, not for Mr. Credle. I would just ask
12 Mr. Chair if you would request that Ms. Roberts and
13 that group over there stop talking or take their
14 conversations outside because it is a little bit
15 disruptive. Thank you. Mr. Mann, Mr. Loring, Ms.
16 Roberts, if you'll please sit down and not talk or
17 talk outside.

18 D'Amico: Thank you, Lynn Russell will be followed by Bill
19 Cunningham.

20 Russell: Thank you. Good evening. Lynn Russell, I'm a
21 resident, kind of a garden variety resident of West
22 Hollywood and a private antique dealer. And I
23 continue to be...have concerns about this
24 confounding project. It has appeared wrong headed

1 on many levels from the beginning. The property
2 was given to the city. I would think that was the
3 city, the people of West Hollywood as a cultural
4 resource, not just a select few to be used at
5 their, at their private wishes. The city neglected
6 to explore feasible alternatives such as Robinson
7 Gardens in Beverly Hills and Barnsdall Park in
8 Hollywood, both of which were given by ladies of
9 vision to be used as cultural resources. They're
10 both heavily funded by private fund raising and
11 I've offered on many occasions to give entrée to at
12 least Robinson Gardens to the Historic Preservation
13 Commission to no avail. The staff report and the
14 EIR misinforms and minimizes among other things the
15 biological resources which are the, the trees of
16 the small urban forest on this property, which I
17 overlook. Home also to the great blue heron and
18 the brown pelican, which come and go along with a
19 great symphony of birds. I have by the way an
20 extensive tree list here for your consideration.
21 The pocket park is the size of a postage stamp. As
22 a mitigating factor, it's a sad offering. Just how
23 the public would benefit on a property that is
24 generally going to be considered private is really

1 questionable. Would the public really make an
2 appointment to come to this park or would they come
3 by, by a lottery? I don't think it's a good idea.
4 John Mutlow's design needs an appropriate
5 harmonious setting. This is not the appropriate
6 one for senior logistics or for his lovely project.
7 And this is not the last site for senior housing in
8 West Hollywood. It's un...it's almost insulting
9 for the city to keep pressing this point. It is
10 unwise and unfortunate precedent to set, to
11 squander this small jewel for a short-term vision.
12 Please I ask you to deny the project.

13 D'Amico: Thank you, ma'am.

14 Russell: Thank you.

15 D'Amico: Bill Cunningham will be followed by Ann Ehrenthal.

16 Cunningham: Hi, my name is Bill Cunningham, I'm a resident of
17 812 North Harper, Los Angeles. I'm a real estate
18 investor and developer by trade in the local area.
19 What a marvelous process? What a marvelous process
20 from the professionals in and out? The efforts
21 that have been made here, the professionalism, the
22 angles, I don't think they put this much attention
23 into rebuilding the World Trade Center.

24 D'Amico: Mr. Cunningham, will you speak into the microphone?

1 We want to catch every word.

2 Cunningham: I, I was saying I think the process is just utterly
3 marvelous. If you take a look at the things that
4 have been accomplished in this, the, the number of
5 people it will serve, the various segments of the
6 park space and the community space, the historic
7 preservation, the, the affordable housing for
8 seniors, I mean it would be very hard to accomplish
9 this many wonderful things in one project. It's
10 been about I understand three years and the city
11 has, has a real need for not only, not only
12 development, smart development and development
13 that, that satisfies this important housing need
14 that seems to be a major priority and in line with
15 this city's social objectives, I would urge you to,
16 to look at this as a culmination point and a time
17 to move this project along and not allow it to be
18 bogged down by, by the sentiments of some well
19 intended people, but by the same time, we have to
20 take into account as decision makers what's, what's
21 the larger good and, and it seems time that a
22 project of this size and scope and importance is
23 moved along the process, marvelous to the people in
24 and out of the city and I completely appreciate and

1 support the people who, who don't want to see
2 development and who, who don't think this is the
3 right place or the right time or the right thing,
4 but this project is here. It's been here for three
5 years. It was given to the city for public
6 benefit. The...you have to assume that the people
7 who work in the city and around the city understand
8 what the objectives of the city are. I think it's
9 well represented here and I appreciate the time to
10 speak.

11 D'Amico: Thank you very much. Ann Ehrenthal will be
12 followed by Elizabeth Peterson.

13 Ehrenthal: Ann Ehrenthal, I live in Los Angeles, I work at the
14 West Hollywood City Housing Corporation for 18
15 years, but I do want to correct the record, I am
16 not retired. Contrary to a, a popular belief. But
17 in any case, there were just a couple of points I
18 would like to make to the Commission. A lot of
19 wonderful points have been made, but what's
20 important to remember also and this is where the
21 financing from HUD is critical, the financing from
22 HUD will allow everyone who lives there to pay only
23 30 percent of their very limited income in rent and
24 I think that's a critical piece that no amount of

1 financing from elsewhere makes it possible. That's
2 one. The other is, we have a tremendous amount of
3 experience in saving trees. There are two projects
4 I can happily take you to where extensive efforts
5 were made to do just that. And I really urge you
6 to move forward with this project. Thank you.

7 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Ehrenthal. Elizabeth Peterson to be
8 followed by Peggy Kennedy. Ms. Peterson is not
9 here. Ms. Kennedy? Excellent, will be followed by
10 Ed Buck.

11 Kennedy: Peggy Kennedy, proud resident of West Hollywood.
12 How did we all enjoy this last heat wave? 164
13 people in California died, the majority of them
14 older residents. Welcome to global warming and
15 it's only going to get worse and we as a city are
16 contributing to it in a major way by our continual
17 building, adding cement and eliminating the green
18 canopy. I love this city. I care about it. I'm
19 also equally concerned about the direction it's
20 been, not just pushed in but shoved in. And I
21 vehemently oppose this development, not for any
22 coldhearted lack of concern for senior housing, but
23 for a far deeper concern that parkland and history
24 must be preserved. We practically have no parkland

1 left in West Hollywood. Vision 20/20 calls for
2 several things, affordable housing, historic
3 preservation and creation of new green space. One
4 and only one has really received the attention.
5 The city has currently gone against its own
6 mandate. If we need affordable housing so badly,
7 why are seniors being evicted from their current
8 affordable housing? Several seniors have died from
9 the stress of it. That's abominable. Everybody
10 talks about a win-win situation with building on
11 this property. A win-win is using an alternate
12 property and keeping the canopy the way it is
13 because we must all survive. We won't be surviving
14 if this global warming continues and we contribute
15 to it by adding cement upon cement. Thank you.

16 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Kennedy. Ed Buck to be followed by
17 Jean Dobrin.

18 Buck: Ed Buck, city of West Hollywood. Commissioner
19 Thompson, could you go down and sit on Commissioner
20 D'Amic...DeLuccio's lap? We're gonna be building
21 senior housing here at this end. We need you to
22 squeeze over. Let's go, come on.

23 Thompson: That's after the meeting.

24 Bartolo: Now do you expect an answer or was that rhetorical?

1 Buck: The....

2 D'Amico: Stop his time.

3 Buck: The, the...really. The property, when, when a
4 property is declared historic, it is the property
5 and all the improvements upon it. Anyone who's
6 done any real estate knows that the property refers
7 to the land and the improvements upon the property.
8 This property is historic. That means not just the
9 house, the land. That's what we're missing here.
10 It is the setting that is being destroyed here. A
11 developer earlier said that the trees could be
12 saved. You all remember that I did speak here
13 about the trees at 1426 North Laurel where this
14 Commission, perhaps in a different incarnation,
15 gave permission for entitlements, expansion of a
16 parking garage so that they would save the 100 year
17 old tree in front. Everybody intended to and the
18 tree died and they took it down. So in spite of
19 their best intentions, in spite of their promises,
20 they killed the tree. They didn't mean to, but the
21 development did kill a tree. Regarding the HUD
22 grant, let's be clear about this. The HUD money
23 will be used to build senior housing, just not
24 here. When this project is denied, that HUD money

1 will get used to build housing and probably a lot
2 cheaper than \$500.00 a square foot and more senior
3 housing.

4 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Buck.

5 Buck: Thank you.

6 D'Amico: Jean Dobrin will be followed by David Smith.

7 Dobrin: Jean Dobrin, resident of West Hollywood, and most
8 people always say what the Chair has asked them to
9 do, their name and city of residence and then they
10 don't make a snotty remark later about how many
11 pounds they weigh. This project is very, very
12 meritorious, but the Fairfax Senior Housing
13 Project, which was built before city hood is
14 supposedly controlled by HUD and yet the owners, a
15 private corporation, have at times caused neglect
16 and problems for the occupants there. One example
17 is nonfunctioning elevators. I tried to help the
18 people who live in the building, yet I found that
19 HUD bureaucracy was just too hard to crack. HUD
20 was not very response. In fact, they weren't
21 response enough at all. It was too hard to reach
22 anybody, calls weren't returned. Mrs. Ehrental
23 just answered partly a question that I was going to
24 raise, that there are some unanswered questions

1 including Mr. Altschul's concerns about the
2 eventual ownership. Another question that I was
3 going to ask is what protective conditions are
4 being imposed to control the future raising of
5 rents? Post 1979 construction as we know cannot be
6 rent controlled. This needs to be addressed and as
7 Mrs. Ehrenthal just partially answered that, but it
8 hasn't been fully answered. I want to say that a
9 statement of overriding consideration in my 22
10 years of going to all the meetings of this city and
11 eight years before that with the County, a
12 statement of overriding consideration is one of the
13 five most overworked and misleading words in our
14 bureaucracy. Also, I would like you to pay a lot
15 of attention to Mr. Loring, who's done a lot of
16 development here and he said he works and he saves
17 these trees. I think that the attitude that the
18 trees are going to be sacrificed is reiterated by
19 some of the other construction by other developers
20 who, who have destroyed these trees.

21 D'Amico: Thank you, Ms. Dobrin.

22 Dobrin: Thank you so much for letting me speak.

23 D'Amico: David Smith will be followed by Elsie Wiseman.

24 Just kidding. David Smith is our last speaker.

1 Smith: On behalf of Elsie, Dave Smith, West Hollywood. I
2 watch you guys on TV all the time and you deal
3 generally with small apartment buildings and
4 problems with tenants and landlords. I've been to
5 this property many times, probably first in like
6 '81. A photographer and I were working next door
7 at the Mediterranean building. She asked us to
8 take some pictures of the building. She loved it.
9 I don't know what she left or how she left it, but
10 she's spinning, spinning in her grave. I gave some
11 plans to the Planning Commission for alternatives.
12 Don knows I said, hey, save the house, move it to
13 Plummer Park, put a replica of George Washington's
14 gardens there. You know, use it as a cultural
15 center. There's another area on the other side,
16 it's green space. Waivers have to be used. I had
17 a plan for 40...60 apartments in that place, same
18 style building. Nobody talks about the style of
19 the building. I don't know what this is. I worked
20 some of the elementary schools. I don't like it.
21 The pictures they presented, I didn't like. You
22 couldn't even see the buildings through the trees.
23 I live at Palmview, 40 garden style apartments, all
24 facing north. We can't grow a bud. So seniors

1 will have difficulties. Section 8, you get on the
2 bottom of any list for assistance. You guys don't
3 need to deal with this now. Winona, hey, save
4 (INAUDIBLE) Land's buildings, save some of the
5 buildings. We used to love West Hollywood. It's
6 really one of the most important cities in the
7 world and I commend all of you for the meeting, I
8 commend everybody for showing up, but I looked on
9 the L. A. Housing Org., 630...688 listings for
10 senior family disabled in the community. It's
11 true. I lived on Havenhurst, I tore down the
12 building. It was Frank Lloyd Wright's nephew or
13 something built it. I couldn't get into the new
14 building they built. It was gonna be seniors and
15 it was both, it's lottery. When they gave me the
16 apartment at Palmview, I said no. So I say no to
17 this. Thank you.

18 D'Amico: Thank you, Mr. Smith. That's the last speaker. We
19 have a five-minute rebuttal period for the
20 Applicant. Jim Arnone is on his way up. After Jim
21 finishes, Mr. Arnone finishes, we're gonna take a
22 break.

23 Male: (INAUDIBLE) call her name.

24 D'Amico: She spoke at the beginning you'll remember.

1 Female: That means I can't speak twice?

2 D'Amico: That's right.

3 Female: Oh.

4 D'Amico: Thank you.

5 Arnone: First we're going to have Katy Spitz, our landscape
6 architect answer a few questions.

7 Spitz: Actually can I make a brief statement.

8 D'Amico: You may use your five minutes any way you wish.

9 Spitz: Okay. I'd like to answer some of the questions
10 that Ms. Bartolo...Katherine Spitz, resident of Los
11 Angeles. Sixteen trees over six inch caliper are
12 being removed. That was one of your questions
13 before. Of those 16 trees, four are trees which I
14 would say had started out there lives as shrubs,
15 many others on the site also started out as shrubs,
16 but I'm not counting that in that calculation. We
17 are adding 20 trees to the site. They will be
18 substantial size, 24, 36 or 48 inch box and we're
19 preserving as many trees as we can. That's my
20 statement.

21 Bartolo: Quick, quick follow up if I may, you're just
22 talking about the containers, can you be a little
23 bit more specific? You said...I, I couldn't hear
24 you exactly.

1 Spitz: I said 20...I said 20 trees of substantial size
2 will be added and I said either 24 or 36 or 48 inch
3 box. That's a size.

4 Bartolo: Oh, I know that, thank you.

5 Spitz: Oh, okay.

6 Bartolo: That's why I was asking.

7 Spitz: Okay. Thank you.

8 D'Amico: David, since those were in fact answers to previous
9 questions, you can start the rebuttal time when Mr.
10 Arnone begins and we'll let him have his five
11 minutes. Thank you.

12 Arnone: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To address a few of the
13 points that were brought up. Regarding the
14 entities, as, as you heard Mr. McMillan from HUD
15 say, WASET has a track record of performance with
16 HUD. Mr. McMillan's comments I think were very
17 strong statements about how very well regarded
18 WASET is and we need to remember that. It
19 partnered with the Housing Corporation in order to
20 create this project. Laurel Place West Hollywood
21 was created to be the owner, the property owner for
22 this project. It has a seven member Board, the
23 four members are nominated by the Housing
24 Corporation, three by WASET and that's how it's

1 governed. The traditional structure for funding
2 for these is that you have a sponsor, in this case
3 two, WASET and the Housing Corporation, and then
4 you have an owner, which is usually a special
5 purpose entity, that's the Laurel Place West
6 Hollywood entity that was created. The typical
7 structure is that you have the ownership, the...and
8 the special purpose entity. As you heard the
9 gentleman from HUD say, it's also possible to do a
10 lease arrangement. That idea was just floated
11 recently and really on a practical level, we don't
12 think it makes much difference because the,
13 the...if it's, if it's transferred in fee, it will
14 have an absolute reverter to the city. If it is
15 not used for affordable housing, it will have an
16 absolute reverter to the city. Under a lease, it
17 would be the same thing. So on a practical level,
18 it really doesn't matter, which is probably why Mr.
19 McMillan said HUD at the end of the day doesn't
20 care much. Where do the residents come from?
21 There was a comment about that. We looked at the
22 Housing Corp.'s data for senior projects and the
23 data shows that 55 percent come from West
24 Hollywood. The other 45 percent, the median

1 distance from which they came is one-third of a
2 mile away from West Hollywood. We're talking a few
3 blocks. We're not talking about outsiders from far
4 away. Commissioner Altschul suggested that there
5 might be a possibility of exploring if the city
6 line shuttle could come here. When, when you
7 deliberate, if this becomes a condition that the
8 Commission wants to impose, I would just ask you
9 please to make it be a condition to explore it. We
10 don't know if it's feasible and so we would
11 not...we would ask you please not to make it a
12 mandatory condition in case it proves not to be
13 feasible. Regarding the, the EIR itself, the final
14 EIR is dated December of last year. It was
15 available on the city's website starting in January
16 of this year, many months ago. The EDAW memo
17 discussing the reduced size project is dated in
18 May, was part of the HPC packet in May and was
19 publicly available during all of that time. I
20 don't want to argue with my friends at Chatten,
21 Brown and Carstens and I mean that sincerely. I
22 know these people well, I've worked with them a lot
23 and I like them. But the truth of the matter is,
24 I've had more time to look over their 20-page

1 letter and it mostly talks about the final EIR,
2 which has been available, it's dated in December,
3 available on the website since January and actually
4 it doesn't talk that much about the EDAW memo, but
5 that was available for more than two months.
6 Enough said about that, but you got this afternoon
7 a 20-page letter that mostly talks about a document
8 that was dated last December. I just wanted to
9 clarify that point. I meant sincerely no
10 disrespect to that law firm and I do respect them.
11 Tonight at the end of the day...you've heard a lot
12 of passion, you've heard a lot of vitriol
13 unfortunately, but tonight is not about villains
14 and it's not about heroes, it's about providing
15 affordable housing to seniors of low income.
16 Please consider that this is a balanced project.
17 It preserves and rehabilitates the historic
18 structure on this property. There's...it also
19 provides a community park. It provides community
20 meeting spaces on the first level of the historic
21 structure. And of course it provides very much
22 needed affordable housing. We ask you to recognize
23 that what you're seeing today was not the Housing
24 Corporation's very first choice. Of course, the

1 Housing Corporation would've preferred more units.
2 What you're seeing here is the way the process is
3 supposed to work. You see the result of a long
4 time of community input, a lot of community input.
5 Input from the Design Review Subcommittee of this
6 Commission, input from the HPC, input from city
7 staff and input from the public and as a result of
8 this long process, this has been changed to be more
9 compatible with the issues and the policy issues
10 that were highlighted. We ask you to recognize
11 that balance. This doesn't promote just one
12 priority of the city, it promotes several
13 priorities of the city and it's a compromise with
14 which I appreciate fair minded people may disagree,
15 but it's a, it's a good compromise in our view. We
16 ask you to adopt the staff's recommendation. This
17 is a terrific product...project. The staff has
18 done tremendous work. We support the staff's
19 recommendation and we ask you please to approve
20 this very much needed project. Thank you very much
21 for your time this evening.

22 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

23 Bartolo: John, quick question.

24 D'Amico: There are a couple of questions, Mr. Arnone. Gee,

1 there's a couple of questions I think from at least
2 Kate.

3 Bartolo: Yeah, seem to be the person asking questions
4 tonight. The...I'd asked earlier for the parcel
5 size, the net parcel size taking in terms of
6 physical improvements on the property? Did you
7 have....

8 Arnone: I, I know the parcel....

9 Bartolo: Is the answer obtainable?

10 Arnone: The parcel's about 30,000 square feet.

11 Bartolo: Right.

12 Arnone: The...I know the square footage of the, of the
13 structure is 5,000...

14 Bartolo: 2,500.

15 Arnone: ...with two stories so....

16 Bartolo: And it's two-story.

17 Arnone: Yeah, so about 2,500. I know the, the park....

18 Bartolo: Can I...for a second, the, the architect can
19 calculate it, just to make it easier for your
20 (INAUDIBLE).

21 Arnone: They told me there'd be no math.

22 Mutlow: We actually did some calculations, now I'm not sure
23 if we're answering exactly your question, but if
24 you look at one of the diagrams in the package that

1 was submitted to you, it's A04, which actually
2 looks at the new building envelope over the 15
3 conditions, which I think is, is in itself fairly
4 clear and I can give you some square footage in
5 relationship....

6 Bartolo: I got...saw it, but it didn't give me the square
7 footage. That's why I want the square footage.
8 I'm being very precise.

9 Mutlow: If you look at the....

10 D'Amico: Do you happen to know the number as opposed to
11 where to find it?

12 Mutlow: Yeah, yeah.

13 D'Amico: Okay, maybe you can give us the number.

14 Mutlow: Yeah.

15 Bartolo: Yes, give us the answer.

16 Mutlow: If we look at this, the new building, the two new
17 buildings, footprint is approximately 4,660 square
18 feet. The...within these two dark boxes. If you
19 look at the area outside of that, which is the
20 garage roof, which obviously also will be replacing
21 area, there is approximately 1,500 square feet. So
22 you have a total of approximately 6,160 square feet
23 and which is (TALKING OVER).

24 Bartolo: Okay, but the net increase is 4,462 square feet.

1 Mutlow: The net increase of....

2 Bartolo: It comes up....

3 Mutlow: No, no.

4 Bartolo: (TALKING OVER) footprint.

5 Mutlow: If we then look at the actual accessory building,
6 that's this dark building here, it's approximately
7 1,225 square feet, so you need to extract that from
8 the 4,660 for increase building coverage. If you
9 look at hardscape, we have 1,500 extra hardscape to
10 the garage...sorry....

11 Bartolo: No, just...I just want net square...the net parcel
12 area, okay, after you take out the garage in which
13 the new building is covering the footprint.

14 Mutlow: Yes.

15 Bartolo: The argument has been made here today that you can
16 create new parkland and I want to know how much
17 we're not creating, and that's what I'm asking.

18 Mutlow: So the...so I think that the correct figures for
19 you would be these two. The new building coverage
20 is 4,660 square feet. That's these two here.

21 Bartolo: Right.

22 Mutlow: We subtract from that the accessory building, that
23 is the build, building that we're removing, which
24 is 1,225 square feet approximately. The remainder

1 is the increased area of building we're occupying
2 by building.

3 D'Amico: Which is about 3,400 square feet.

4 Mutlow: Right.

5 D'Amico: Sometimes you have to go a great distance out of
6 the way in order to come back a short distance
7 correctly.

8 Bartolo: Okay.

9 D'Amico: That said, thank you very much.

10 Bartolo: I'm done.

11 D'Amico: Okay. We're going to take a break and when we come
12 back we're gonna close the public hearing. And
13 while John Altschul is walking up here, Christi is
14 going to tell us what's gonna happen next.

15 Hogin: Where we are?

16 D'Amico: Yes.

17 Hogin: So at this point, we've heard the presentations and
18 all of the public testimony, so it would be in
19 order for the Chair to close the public testimony
20 portion of the public hearing. And then you'll
21 move on to....

22 D'Amico: So let me do that. At this point, I will close the
23 public testimony portion of the public hearing.

24 Hogin: And, and now we'll proceed with your deliberations

1 and you might want to start, it's up to the
2 Commission obviously, but you may want to start
3 with some discussion about the EIR and the
4 Statement of Overriding Considerations and then
5 about the project generally.

6 Altschul: Excuse me, may we, Mr. Chair, see if somebody can
7 regular the temperature in here. It's like a
8 freezer.

9 D'Amico: I was just gonna get to that. I don't know if the
10 person who's responsible for that is still around.
11 Thank you. Thank you, it is cold in here.

12 Bartolo: No, it's cold. It's cold.

13 D'Amico: Okay. I just want to piggyback on what Christi
14 said. We're all...we're all ready....

15 Bartolo: And I'll stand aside if I need to.

16 D'Amico: We're, we're all ready to do this and we had two,
17 we had two discussions. We discussed the EIR and
18 we heard about the project entitlements and I have
19 a list of items from the EIR discussion that I
20 picked up on, which we may or may not want to
21 discuss. The first is, is the EIR adequate? The
22 second is significant and unavoidable impacts. The
23 third is impact on neighboring historic properties
24 and the fourth item that I heard was discussions

1 about trees and the landscape. Are there any other
2 items in the EIR to put on this list to make sure
3 that we touch on? Okay, so we'll begin the
4 discussion and I know Joe, you wanted to start. I
5 don't know if you wanted to start on this part or
6 on the project entitlements. Okay, so anyone have
7 a discussion about the EIR they would like to pick
8 up of those four? John?

9 Altschul: Well, the only thing that I think that is necessary
10 to discuss on, on the issue of the EIR is the
11 Statement of Overriding Considerations and backing
12 up a little bit, my understanding of what an EIR is
13 supposed to do and I've heard this from Ms. Hogin,
14 I've heard this from Mr. Jenkins over the course of
15 the years is it is not supposed to determine
16 whether or not this is a perfect or anything is a
17 perfect project. It's not supposed to determine
18 the solutions to anything and everything that
19 happens to come up. What it is supposed to do is
20 identify the issues that may come up on an
21 environmental checklist and you saw, we all saw on
22 the original presentation by the gentleman from
23 EDAW, the environmental checklist and the issues
24 that are typically addressed on an environmental

1 checklist and in my opinion and in my mind, this
2 particular EIR completely and adequately addresses
3 all of the issues on that checklist. It comes to
4 the conclusion that no issues on that checklist are
5 noteworthy of discussion from the standpoint of
6 impacts that are unmitigable with the exception of
7 the historical, historical items. And a Statement
8 of Overriding Considerations means, as I understand
9 it, that we are just saying that if you put the two
10 things on a scale, the benefits to the community
11 and the benefits to, to the public outweigh the
12 disadvantage of not having a totally culturally
13 historical piece of property. Even the Sistine
14 Chapel needs touching up and the touchup of the
15 Sistine Chapel is done by mortals of our, you know,
16 20th and 21st Century age group and, you know, poor
17 Michelangelo is probably turning over in his grave,
18 but it has to be done. And this property really
19 also has to be brought up into the present, but you
20 can still leave it, as you saw in some of the
21 slides that Mr. Mutlow showed, like the Boston
22 Library. They take this wonderful old historical
23 building, they put a new component on it and it
24 works. So this is what it, this is what it all is.

1 Now Mr. Dobrin quite I think wonderfully pointed
2 out that the Statement of Overriding Considerations
3 sometimes, or somebody pointed that out, can be
4 mitigated by taking off a corner or taking off four
5 feet. I remember one project some years ago was
6 the Bristol Farmer's Market. There was a need for
7 Statement of Overriding Considerations because the
8 traffic impacts on Saturday between 1:00 p.m. and
9 2:00 p.m. at Rosewood and Robertson was such that
10 it was not mitigable. So we took off 72 square
11 feet from Bristol Farms, which today I don't think
12 they missed, and you don't need a Statement of
13 Overriding Considerations, but you can't do that
14 here. So in my mind, in my opinion, the benefits
15 to the community strictly from discussing the
16 environmental checklist and the environmental
17 aspect of this, the supply of affordable senior,
18 affordable units to mankind and the addition of a
19 pocket park of 10,000 square feet plus meeting
20 rooms, I think certainly outweighs whatever impacts
21 cannot be mitigated to the historical character of
22 this particular structure. So it's my opinion that
23 we should recommend to the Council that they
24 certify the EIR.

1 D'Amico: Okay. Donald?

2 DeLuccio: I think what it really comes down to is the
3 Statement of Overriding Consideration, if...is the,
4 the parkland, I think the parkland would be
5 developed whether or not the, the housing was not
6 there. Basically, what the tradeoff here is, do we
7 want the housing and, and...but what's happening
8 here, we have a cultural resource which would
9 not...would...that's where the adverse and we
10 cannot mitigate the significant unavoidable adverse
11 impact to the cultural resource by putting the
12 senior housing there, but the benefit of having the
13 senior housing outweighs not being able to mitigate
14 the, the impact to the cultural resource, which is
15 the house is what's happening. Either way that...I
16 think there would be parkland there when it's all
17 said and done at the end of the day. I guess if I
18 can ask staff one more question 'cause I'm
19 wrestling with this. What I'm wrestling is with
20 this, yes, I'd like to see some senior housing
21 there, but at the same time I want to see it in a
22 way where we would also be preserving the house,
23 the property. So the setting...it would work with
24 in the setting. I know, I know there's like two

1 structures, one is on...is along the, the back and
2 then on the side is another structure. Is there
3 currently any...there's currently no buildings to
4 demolish on the side, correct, where, where one of
5 this...where the southern structure is going to go?

6 Stefan: Right, yeah, there's no buildings on that side.

7 DeLuccio: But how many...and that...well, that's only...that
8 would just provide a few units only, right? I
9 mean....

10 Stefan: Right, and you would still end up with impacts to
11 the historic landscape with regard to removal of
12 the trees in that area.

13 DeLuccio: So there'd still be, there'd still be a, an impact
14 to the, the site, the historic nature of the site.

15 Stefan: Yes.

16 DeLuccio: I think at the end of the day, already it's been
17 changed from 35, 35 units to 28 units when you
18 count the, the resident manager. I think when you
19 actually start reducing the number of units
20 further, I don't think the project becomes feasible
21 as far as providing senior housing on the site, if,
22 if you want...if you want to go in that direction.
23 I, however, do want to...I would love to see senior
24 housing on the site, I want to see parkland on the

1 site, but I also want to see the site preserve,
2 preserved in terms of the landscaping as well as,
3 as the house there. So I feel kind of
4 uncomfortable and I take very serious a Statement
5 of Overriding Consideration. We should not take
6 that lightly and that...I guess that's where
7 I'm...I need to hear more deliberation here 'cause
8 that is my, that is my big hang-up right now,
9 recommending to the Council the Statement of
10 Overriding Consideration.

11 D'Amico: Joe?

12 Guardarrama: I have a lot to say about whether this project
13 should be built or not, but I'm gonna limit my
14 comments right now to just the EIR. I think the
15 report that the city prepared with the outside
16 consultant is adequate and my question for the City
17 Attorney would be, are we permitted to vote to
18 certify the EIR, but vote against adopting a
19 Statement of Overriding Consideration?

20 Hogin: Yes, because they're two different questions. The
21 question on whether to certify the EIR is whether
22 it adequately provides you with all the information
23 about potential impacts to the environment as a
24 result of the project and the question with the

1 Overriding Consideration is, is a policy question
2 and that is knowing from the EIR what the
3 unavoidable impacts are to the environment, are
4 those impacts worth it? Are they tolerable given
5 the benefits of the project?

6 D'Amico: So just because I need to know the process clearly
7 before I take any motions, we are in fact voting by
8 a roll call to accept the EIR or are we, as part of
9 a motion including all items, you know, yes on the
10 EIR, no on the Overriding Considerations, and yes
11 on the building or no on the building, no on the
12 EIR and yes on the cert.... So I need you to
13 explain how many votes you would recommend we take
14 and what those votes might be on?

15 Hogin: Well, I...you know, I haven't heard enough
16 deliberation to know where you're at as a
17 Commission, but you have two options. One option
18 is that the staff has put in front of you a
19 resolution that is...one resolution that would
20 certify the EIR, approve the Statement of
21 Overriding Considerations and approve all of the
22 project entitlements. Your second choice would
23 be...well, more than exactly two, but we'll say the
24 second choice would be to take those as three

1 separate votes. One to certify the EIR, one
2 to...and then if you have any problems with the
3 individual entitlements, we could also appeal those
4 at....

5 D'Amico: And, and that's my question is, can they be taken
6 separately? I guess I could've asked it simpler.
7 Can they be taken separately?

8 Hogin: I probably could've answered it simpler too.

9 D'Amico: And so, yes, thank you.

10 Hogin: And we wouldn't be....

11 D'Amico: And...thank you. Okay, anyone have any more
12 discussion about the EIR?

13 Thompson: Well, I just....

14 Bartolo: Only that I would like to take it separately as an,
15 as an issue.

16 D'Amico: Great. Yes, okay.

17 Thompson: I just...it's more of a question than discussion.
18 In terms of sufficiency of information to certify
19 the EIR, Altschul had raised the question about
20 leasing versus, you know, the ownership thing and
21 so I just throw that out there, what are your
22 thoughts on that and do we....

23 Altschul: I don't think that's a component of the EIR. I
24 think that we should discuss that and my thought

1 on, on the thing is it's not all...it, it is not in
2 our purview to discuss that with respect to the
3 land use. I would...I, I intend to ask Ms. Hogin
4 if she can come up with some language where we can
5 recommend to the Council or pass on to the Council
6 if, in fact, this is our collective feeling, that
7 the, that the fee ownership remained with the city.

8 DeLuccio: I'd like that as a...possibly as a separate motion
9 also if we, if we go in that direction.

10 D'Amico: Well, since we've run out of Commissioners
11 interested in discussing the EIR, is anyone
12 interested in making a motion about the EIR?

13 Altschul: I will make a motion that we recommend that the
14 Council certify the EIR as the first motion and
15 then....

16 D'Amico: Can we take that one item at a time.

17 Altschul: Yes.

18 Keho: Chair, I just want to remind you that the Planning
19 Commission is the final authority so there's no
20 recommendation.

21 Altschul: Oh, it is?

22 Keho: Yeah, you're making the decision on the project and
23 the environmental.

24 D'Amico: Thank you.

1 Keho: Subject to appeal.

2 D'Amico: All right, so is there a second for the motion on
3 the EIR?

4 Altschul: Just...hang on just one second. Why do I have this
5 historical understanding that with respect to EIR's
6 only the Council can certify them?

7 Keho: There's....

8 Hogin: 'Cause you're used to seeing them in connection
9 with...'cause you're used to seeing them in
10 connection with legislative items like zone text
11 amendments and development agreements and things
12 that require ordinances.

13 Altschul: Thank you very much. I....

14 Hogin: Could I have one second though?

15 D'Amico: Yes, you may.

16 DeLuccio: We're not voting on the overriding statement....

17 Altschul: No, it's just....

18 D'Amico: We're just voting that the EIR....

19 Altschul: Be certified.

20 DeLuccio: Is adequate.

21 D'Amico: If this motion is seconded, we'll be voting on if
22 the EIR is complete. But we're waiting for Christi
23 to comment before I think we'll accept a second.

24 Hogin: If I may suggest then the motion would be to adopt

1 Sections one through 10 of Resolution PC 06-691,
2 which does nothing but recite the facts of the
3 application and the process and then in Section 10
4 indicate that the Planning Commission has
5 independently reviewed and analyzed the final EIR
6 and certifies it.

7 Altschul: That would be my motion. Couldn't have said it
8 better.

9 D'Amico: So that motion is to adopt Sections 1 through 10 of
10 the Resolution PC 06-691, which looks at the
11 portions of the EIR and at this point we need a
12 second to that motion.

13 Bartolo: Second.

14 D'Amico: There's a motion on the table and it's been
15 seconded. Is there any more deliberation on the
16 Environmental, Environmental Impact Report prepared
17 for Laurel Place at 1343 Laurel Avenue? Seeing no
18 more discussion, David, would you take a roll call
19 vote please?

20 Gillig: Commissioner Altschul?

21 Altschul: Yes.

22 Gillig: Commissioner Bartolo?

23 Bartolo: Yes.

24 Gillig: Commission DeLuccio?

1 DeLuccio: No.

2 Gillig: Commission Thompson?

3 Thompson: Yes.

4 Gillig: Vice Chair Guardarrama?

5 Guardarrama: Yes.

6 Gillig: Chair D'Amico?

7 D'Amico: Yes.

8 Gillig: Commissioner Hamaker is appropriately recused.

9 Motion carries.

10 D'Amico: Thank you, David. So we have an EIR and at this

11 point I, I guess it would be appropriate to discuss

12 the Statement of Overriding Considerations and if

13 anyone would like to speak and/or make a motion?

14 Altschul: I would move to adopt the Statement of Overriding

15 Consideration.

16 D'Amico: There's a motion, is there a second for that?

17 Hearing none, why don't we discuss it some more and

18 then we'll pick it up again. I, I actually have a

19 state...a part of the Statement of Overriding

20 Considerations. I, I think it is careful to, in

21 its 21 items, discuss the, the, the thrust of the

22 design of the building, but I don't think it is

23 careful enough to capture where I think this

24 building needs to move and I, and I want to ask

1 John Chase if you could just talk a little bit
2 about two of the items in here that are I think
3 specific to the design, which is the polycarbonate
4 screen and the, the printing on that screen and
5 the, the perforated metal and wood. If you could
6 just talk about those items and, and, you know, why
7 you chose that instead of the type of door or the
8 type of sliding window or whatever it was.

9 Chase: John, do you mean why did we condition the, the
10 project to recommend changing the printing on the,
11 the screen or do you mean....

12 D'Amico: Yes, and, and what I'm getting at is that, is, is
13 that mean that it's a Design Review Subcommittee
14 question or is this just here it is, these are the
15 conditions and the City will make, make that happen
16 as part of its, you know, everyday activities and
17 this no longer needs to be a Design Review
18 question?

19 Chase: We're checking the wording of the condition. The
20 printing on the screen is just a condition to be a
21 monochrome white or off-white. Doesn't return to
22 Design Review Subcommittee. The material on...to
23 be substituted for the punch, metal does return to
24 the Design Review Subcommittee. And the reasons

1 for putting that condition in were that the way
2 that the final material came to us to write the
3 staff report, the design on the polycarbonate
4 screen was, was quite vivid and we thought that it
5 would compete with the, the...with the historic
6 building itself and that that ought to be the
7 dominant primary building on the side and that this
8 building ought to be a backdrop and that that begin
9 to be a graphic pattern that was almost like
10 advertising or of a, of a different order visually
11 altogether. So that was the reason to hold it back
12 and in discussions with, with John Mutlow, the
13 Architect, he said that actually that was going to
14 be the intent anyway and then the, the point of
15 having that metal on was it seemed like the metal
16 that was furthest from the aesthetic of the
17 original house because it had a very active nature.
18 It's a very highly textured reflective material so
19 it attracts a lot of attention to itself and didn't
20 seem to serve a purpose in the sense of the
21 polycarbonate screen was a light transparent screen
22 that could make a, make a suggest of a wall, yet
23 still admit light. So it served a functional
24 purpose or it furthered the design, the building

1 whereas the, the metal on the balconies just seemed
2 to be an aesthetic decision that didn't necessarily
3 have a lot of other effects. You could have other
4 materials and it wasn't a make or break item.

5 D'Amico: Okay, thanks. Thank you. So I'm actually looking
6 back and forth 'cause I'm looking for some
7 direction. I mean we, we at some point need to
8 address the Statement of Overriding Considerations,
9 even if it has no items. But in this case, there
10 are 21 items, which may be the universe of items,
11 it may be more than are necessary or fewer than are
12 necessary, but I'm looking for anyone to comment.
13 If you look on...I mean are we all looking at the
14 same thing, on page 9.1 of...Chapter Nine,
15 Statement of Overriding Considerations.

16 Bartolo: I have just a question...

17 D'Amico: Okay.

18 Bartolo: ...which is procedurally, if there were to be
19 recommendations made in terms of mitigations, this
20 is not probably the time to do it or is it the time
21 to do it?

22 D'Amico: This is the time to do it to override...no?

23 Bartolo: No?

24 D'Amico: Christi's shaking her head.

1 Hogin: What we're looking at are the unavoidable...

2 D'Amico: Right.

3 Hogin: ...unmitigable impacts and if you don't adopt a
4 statement of Overriding Consideration, then you,
5 you can't approve the project because you can't
6 approve something that has adverse impacts unless
7 you've either A, mitigated them, or B, decided to
8 override them.

9 D'Amico: But so I'm saying, you can't just choose items not
10 related to this like you have to plant trees on the
11 parkway. Okay, okay. Okay, good.

12 D'Amico: Yes, Donald?

13 DeLuccio: Actually the bottom line here is these 21, they
14 would reduce some of the significant environmental
15 effects, however, we would...it doesn't...even if
16 we adopted, I don't know, 10 of the 21, we'd still
17 need to do the Statement of Overriding
18 consideration, is that correct, Christi? Because
19 we're demolishing the...we're demolishing
20 structures on the property and we're also
21 destroying some of the landscape.

22 Hogin: The, the EIR tells us that there's nothing that we
23 can do...

24 DeLuccio: Right.

1 Hogin: ...to avoid having an adverse, significant adverse
2 impact on those buildings in their context.

3 DeLuccio: Right, so it doesn't matter if we adopt any of the
4 21, it's still gonna have to do the Statement of
5 Overriding Consideration if we want to approve the
6 project this evening, is that correct?

7 Hogin: That's correct.

8 D'Amico: That's to adopt at least these 21.

9 DeLuccio: And that's...yeah, but still we have to do the
10 overriding statement.

11 Altschul: For those 21 of the mitigations...

12 DeLuccio: Right.

13 Hogin: Right.

14 Altschul: ...of the things that can be mitigated.

15 Hogin: I think what Commissioner DeLuccio is saying that
16 we're still going to have to deal with the
17 Statement of Overriding Considerations 'cause even
18 with all mitigation, we will be still left with
19 unmitigable impacts.

20 Altschul: Mr. Chair, at this point, I would renew my motion
21 to adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations
22 and see if there's a second.

23 D'Amico: Is there a second for that motion? Hearing
24 none....

1 Bartolo: I second it.

2 Hogin: So the, the motion would be to add in Attachment A
3 and the recital to Section Five of the Resolution.

4 Altschul: Exactly.

5 D'Amico: Okay, I, I want to vote on this, but I also want to
6 say that there's a lot of hesitancy and maybe it's
7 just torture to make us all talk about why we
8 hesitated, but it feels like there must be
9 something that's not being said and maybe there....

10 Bartolo: Can we back up for a second? I want to...the
11 reason I seconded it was the answer I got from
12 Christi, which assuaged my concerns, which is
13 let's...would you say it again with
14 precision...well, you always do, so please tell us
15 exactly what we're doing because what I'm, what I'm
16 sensing is I think we all have things that we would
17 maybe want to change or do but this is more really
18 an up or down vote. So please define the terms.

19 Hogin: This part is up or down. Let me just preview
20 before I answer the question, just preview what
21 you're gonna do next. What you're gonna do next is
22 look at the project. You can still reject the
23 project or you can condition the project to deal
24 with any impacts that are created that conditions

1 can deal with. What we're looking at now is a very
2 narrow thing and that is that the EIR has
3 discovered that there are some impacts that cannot
4 be dealt with, with any conditions. There's
5 nothing that you can do to change the fact that any
6 project there is going to have a significant
7 adverse impact to the building and its context and
8 now you have to ask yourself knowing that, is there
9 anything that outweighs it 'cause that's an impact
10 to the environment. Does the housing, does the
11 park, are these, are these policy's issues, these
12 values outweighing the impact? If they don't
13 outweigh it, then vote no. If they do, then vote
14 yes.

15 Bartolo: But a part of that is also, when you say overriding
16 considerations, it's also the belief it's
17 mitigable, the pieces of that are mitigable,
18 correct?

19 Altschul: No.

20 Bartolo: No? All right.

21 Hogin: This...we're dealing with the unmitigable.

22 Bartolo: Unmitigable, okay.

23 Hogin: But everything that's mitigable, you, you'll be
24 required to mitigate.

1 Altschul: (TALKING OVER), is subject and be required to
2 mitigate and is subject to further discussion when
3 you talk about the entitlement. This...

4 Hogin: That's right.

5 Altschul: ...is basically I think what Christi is saying is
6 up or down, is the senior affordable housing more
7 important in the scheme of things in this city than
8 maintaining the Sistine Chapel without touching it
9 up in the 21st Century?

10 D'Amico: All right.

11 Hogin: Well, the...let me just...you put it nicely, but
12 let me just say it this way too. The EIR has told
13 us we can't have both. We can't have the unharmed
14 building in its context and the senior housing. So
15 that's the question of the overriding
16 consideration, if you can't have both.

17 Thompson: I, I would just say it's in...well, it's just
18 explanatory to the comment that you made earlier.
19 My silence is not because of reservation or
20 confusion. My silence is because I actually...it's
21 very difficult for me to break it down into
22 discussion of the EIR in isolation and then
23 discussion on the merits of the project in
24 isolation and the...so I do have comments about the

1 project, but the way we've structured this, the
2 subsequent project comments aren't coming 'til the
3 very end. Does that make sense?
4 D'Amico: Okay, which is when we vote on the project.
5 Thompson: So, so don't misinterpret my silence.
6 D'Amico: Perfect.
7 Thompson: It's not that I'm confused.
8 D'Amico: Okay. So we have a motion on the table to adopt
9 the Statement of Overriding Considerations and we
10 have a second, and David can you take a roll call?
11 Gillig: Commissioner Altschul?
12 Altschul: Yes.
13 Gillig: Commissioner Bartolo?
14 Bartolo: Yes.
15 Gillig: Commissioner DeLuccio?
16 DeLuccio: No.
17 Gillig: Commissioner Thompson?
18 Thompson: Yes.
19 Gillig: Vice Chair Guardarrama?
20 Guardarrama: No.
21 Gillig: Chair D'Amico?
22 Altschul: Do you want to take a break?
23 D'Amico: Yes, let's take a break. No, I'm just kidding.
24 Yes.

1 Gillig: Motion carries.

2 D'Amico: Okay. Now we have finished the EIR portion of this
3 evening's discussion. We have before us, if Ms.
4 Hogin will make sure that I put this correctly, we
5 have before us an approved EIR for 1343 Laurel and
6 now we will discuss the merits of the project.
7 Would anyone like to start? Joe, do you have
8 something you'd like to begin with?

9 Guardarrama: I think before we get into the design of the
10 project, how many trees are gonna be killed, what
11 the house is gonna look like afterwards, I think we
12 need to ask ourselves is this the right thing for
13 the city to be doing? A very old lady gave this
14 house to the city with the intent that it'd be
15 preserved. And if I search my conscience, I can't
16 look at that building back there and say that we
17 would be doing her justice by allowing it to be
18 built. It's a very interesting situation when the
19 city is quasi applicant and also the decision maker
20 as to whether the project gets built. It, it's,
21 it's sort of almost having the fox guarding the hen
22 house and I think in this case, this project got
23 very, very far along without significant community
24 input on whether it should've happened anyway or

1 all along or, or to begin with and I think that if
2 that question would've been posed, maybe we
3 wouldn't be here today and I was just wondering if
4 there were any other Commissioners who felt the
5 same way. And I may go along and, and talk about
6 other issues as they relate to the project because,
7 you know, there may be a majority on this
8 Commission that will approve it and I'd like to
9 effect, you know, how, how the project eventually
10 turns out, but I don't support this project and I
11 don't think I, I could have my mind changed to do
12 so.

13 D'Amico: John?

14 Altschul: This whole procedure has been something that has
15 polarized this community in a very negative way and
16 what should be a very happy occasion, in other
17 words, taking a wonderful concept of making a
18 combination of a park and, and senior affordable
19 housing is not a very happy occasion and that's sad
20 and part of the responsibility I think lies with
21 both sides of this issue. And there is a situation
22 here where if we realize that we're at war in Iraq
23 and Afghanistan, the Middle East is exploding,
24 global warming is a terrible situation, the price

1 of gas is \$3.20 something a gallon, you know,
2 things are falling apart all around us and we're
3 calling each other names over 1343 Laurel? Come
4 on. Who are we? And who are the people who don't
5 have the compassion for the people who were evicted
6 and give them the leeway and give them the
7 opportunity and give them the right to be angry.
8 They have every right to be angry. Without being
9 called evil, which I've heard some of my best
10 friends call them, or being called obstructionists
11 and those are just two of the words that I've heard
12 bandied about. Combined with the fear that a
13 tremendous amount of people in this community have
14 that affordable rental housing is going to be
15 slowly, if not rapidly, eroded because of the Ellis
16 Act and because of the fact that, you know, people
17 have decided that they can make much more money by
18 selling their, their two-story ding-a-lings for
19 four-story condominiums at a million dollars apiece
20 and this is a horrible situation. It creates a, an
21 atmosphere of fear, which when we realize that five
22 people have been evicted from 1343 Laurel for the
23 good of 28 or 30 or 50, however many are gonna be
24 moving to these 28 apartments, and that's a

1 balancing act. And it's something that we need to
2 understand each other's point of view and for those
3 in this room that didn't understand the other
4 side's point of view, shame on us. And a lot of, a
5 lot of people who have been castigating, the angry
6 ones are card carrying members of the ACLU who need
7 to remember and realize that each individual's
8 rights and each individual's feelings are just as
9 important as, as a whole group of people. So let's
10 redirect our thinking and whether this project
11 passes or whether this project doesn't pass, let's
12 admit the mistakes, let's admit some arrogance and
13 let's go more than 51 percent...let those people
14 who are in favor of this project go more than 51
15 percent to reach out to the people who are mad and
16 angry and upset for very, very good reasons and if
17 you can't, I think that's shameful. I...and I will
18 speak more about the elements of the project too,
19 but that's my response to what Joe's comments were.
20 And by the way, one of the things that came out of
21 this project is I met some very new and very nice
22 people and I'll just use one name as an example.
23 I'm very happy to call, I'm happy and proud to call
24 Allegra Allison my friend.

1 D'Amico: Kate?

2 Bartolo: Somebody...sort of underscoring Commissioner
3 Altschul's comments, somebody earlier tonight kind
4 of bitterly said the fix is in. I don't think
5 anything to be further from the truth in the sense
6 that I...we can't discuss it really internally, but
7 I, I've rarely seen anything that is I think really
8 affected all of us in a manner that, that this has.
9 Very few other issues have left me kind of as, as
10 unsure and I literally came into this today not
11 knowing where I was going to go in terms of the
12 vote and I will...you'll...it'll become clear I
13 think fairly soon where I'm going to go. Let me
14 first address that...it's funny, cities
15 are...cities pass judgment over developers all the
16 time and then cities because they're not perfect
17 either do some of the very same things early in a
18 process that, that developers who are insensitive
19 do and I wasn't here in terms of observation so I'm
20 relying on secondhand recounting, but it...my
21 impression is that the city was not, was not
22 sensitive. They did not handle this I think in the
23 manner they could've, but I'm not persuaded at what
24 they did was illegal as much as determinately

1 taking a fixed position and pursuing it to the end
2 and what did resonate for me in my understanding of
3 that was when I began thinking about my experience
4 with affordable housing. And this is part of the
5 problem with the polarization of this issue because
6 we literally are pitting and we all agree, we're
7 all lamenting it, but we are pitting
8 environmentalists versus affordable housing
9 advocates and there's a fact that is overlooked
10 and, and it helped me to understand the city's
11 position on this, which is I have never been in a
12 situation where I have ever heard anyone in any
13 community in this Los Angeles, in the Southern
14 California area ever embrace affordable housing in
15 their neighborhood. I've never heard it. Everyone
16 agrees, affordable housing is absolutely essential.
17 They just don't want it in their neighborhood.
18 Just not on this property, just not here, gosh,
19 just not quite right. So the city I think made its
20 mistakes, but I think that part of what I'm sensing
21 that they...the position they took early on, maybe
22 they didn't do as much outreach as they might've,
23 but I think they were coming from a place of
24 determination and experience, which is to say

1 there's very little receptivity for affordable
2 housing. The opponent's positioning is more about
3 the setting, I'm hearing that loud and clear, and
4 the building. Let me first deal with the building
5 if I may. My background for those of you who don't
6 know me is that I have been actively involved in
7 the preservation and redevelopment of numerous
8 historic structures that are considered in Los
9 Angeles to be some of the most architecturally
10 significant preservation efforts that have occurred
11 and I'm really proud of that. I'm an ardent
12 preservationist and I'm a nature lover. The reason
13 I was comfortable with this EIR is because this EIR
14 I felt was very conservation in its approach and it
15 was really quite meticulous because when I walked
16 the property for the first time today, my
17 conclusion on this...on the building is that it's a
18 pretty facade, but there really...I did not find,
19 and I, you know, one of the things, I get to have
20 my opinion here and...but based on my expertise, I
21 did not find it to be at the level of historic
22 significance that would be comparable to something,
23 for example, this year I was a Judge for the L. A.
24 Conservancy's Awards process. I did not find it to

1 be at that level and I, I've seen the before and
2 after so I know what I'm looking at when I look at
3 it. This building was redone in the 1940's. It
4 needs a lot of work. What is interesting is the,
5 the issue of the, the bastardization or the change
6 that's being proposed as being so that is opposed.
7 From what I know, given the fact that in the 1940's
8 or later than date, it was carved into the smaller
9 apartments are really not changing it that much.
10 So in that context, I think this is actually in its
11 way the more cautious or conservative
12 preservationist approach. As it relates to
13 massing, it's an R4 property. My problem with the
14 building, the new building, the physically, the new
15 improvement has been, I've never much cared for the
16 facade. I'd like to see some changes. I've agreed
17 with Commissioner Guardarrama on several of the,
18 the...also Commissioner D'Amico who had made
19 references to it, it's improved, it's still not I
20 don't think quite where it could be. I've had a
21 problem with that. It's personal taste, but I
22 think in terms of massing, let me put this in
23 context, 'cause I did some math. What is
24 physically being improved, and I didn't net out

1 the, the square footage taken out for the garage,
2 but is...the new improvement is 11,000 square feet.
3 The senior citizen units are very, very small
4 square footages. If you assume that a 1,000 square
5 foot average size unit....

6 DeLuccio: Still have five units.

7 Bartolo: Pardon? No, no, I'm saying...no, I'm saying if you
8 use...if you assumed it was an 1,000 square foot
9 average unit out of 11,000 square feet, 'cause
10 that's kind of average size for condos and
11 apartments, you're talking about the equivalent of
12 11 units double occupancy. That's the number of
13 people we're talking about. We're talking about 21
14 new units and I don't find that to be a huge impact
15 or significant. I think for me what's really
16 guided me is what's the highest and best use.
17 Parkland versus housing and some of what really
18 brought me into this was, well, gee, you know,
19 we're not...it's really not that much housing. If
20 we really have a chance for something really
21 special, shouldn't we really be looking at a park
22 use and for me a decisive moment tonight was when I
23 asked the question, what do we really net out in
24 terms of what is the net square footage increase in

1 terms of the new building envelope coverage? And
2 what we're losing is 3,200 square feet of potential
3 parkland and then I looked at, what does that
4 really amount to? When you really walk it, I mean,
5 yes, you could landscape it, you could fix it up,
6 but I don't think you would make it into anything
7 that would be as comparable as the front, which is
8 being preserved. They're taking out a lot of
9 trees. I don't think it's an EIR issue, it's
10 not...they're not historically significant. Does
11 it always bother me when we take out trees? You
12 bet. I am not satisfied...I will not be satisfied
13 I think until I get a better sense of really a
14 detailing of what the exact preservation efforts
15 are, but I also know that you can preserve them and
16 I also want to make sure that the size of the boxes
17 are significant and the height of the trees after
18 they're planted are significant so that there isn't
19 a, you know, 10 to 20 year period before they get
20 there, but I think at the end of the day, all of
21 this is about...it's clearly about a balancing of
22 equities. We all agree on either side that both
23 issues are...that both principles are important.
24 I've waited extensively and one of...I think the

1 issue for me is highest and best use and I think
2 you would have trouble finding funding for this
3 housing with different grants. Grants are often
4 specific, they're patchwork...you have to patchwork
5 quilt them. It's not that easy. At the end of the
6 day, I think you end up with...if you didn't do
7 this project and you, you kept the, the housing and
8 you tried to preserve it, you'd end up with 3,200
9 square feet more of parkland that is really a
10 secondary quality. It's, it's really the back of
11 the house literally and figuratively and for that
12 reason, and I don't mean to go on this long and I
13 apologize, is....

14 D'Amico: Take 30 seconds more.

15 Bartolo: Okay, I know, I'm sorry, but I'm tired and I'm
16 rambling, but the...look, I think the larger issue
17 that the Wahona movement has brought up and I
18 actually do call it a movement now is, how do we
19 grow and what I think we need to debate beyond this
20 specific property is how we grow and particularly
21 in our residential neighborhoods and doing things
22 like easing mansionization. I think there are a
23 number of proposals we need to consider, but I
24 think on this property at this time I'm, I'm gonna

1 go with the affordable housing.

2 D'Amico: Eric?

3 Thompson: Now you won't be able to shut me up.

4 D'Amico: Go.

5 Thompson: Two quick cleanup items. First of all, thank
6 everyone for staying. Obviously, at quarter to
7 midnight, you all are the troopers of the city.

8 Altschul: But everyone didn't stay.

9 Thompson: What's that?

10 Altschul: Everyone didn't stay.

11 Thompson: I, I...no, but thank these people for staying. Two
12 quick cleanup items. Number one, staff report
13 availability, I get it, I hear you. The bottom
14 line there is we got the staff report last Friday.
15 We're expected to digest it over the weekend even
16 though it's 250 pages and be ready, and so, so
17 should a lawyer that's being paid \$300.00 or
18 \$400.00 an hour. I feel the need to just express
19 that. We all get the staff report at the same
20 time. Second cleanup item is so many people made
21 the comment tonight and it always makes me cringe
22 and Ros, if you're home watching, you tend to make
23 it frequently, and I want to try to impress upon
24 you that it's just not the case and that is the

1 comment that it's always a done deal when we come
2 in here. I very rarely speak on behalf of everyone
3 on this Commission, but I will on this issue and
4 say that the second that any one of us comes in
5 here having already drawn a conclusion on an item,
6 we have rendered ourselves ineffective at what we
7 do and we should resign. We do not come in here
8 with things being a done deal and I cannot impress
9 upon you, you know, more strongly that, that that
10 is not the case and I heard it said so many times
11 tonight and it bothers me. So those are the
12 cleanup items. The two issues for me that have
13 been kind of my theme throughout this process are
14 design and more of a political issue, which is, is
15 this better somewhere else? On the first one,
16 design, I was actually on the Design Review
17 Subcommittee two years ago when this project first
18 came through and I think the two members on the
19 committee with me will probably attest to the fact
20 that at the time I actually had the most visceral
21 negative reaction to the original design. I'm not
22 an architect, I'm the opposite, I'm a lawyer. So
23 I, I...when it came through, I wasn't even familiar
24 with the concept of contrast in architecture by

1 putting a, you know, starkly modern structure next
2 to something that's traditional. I didn't like it,
3 I told Zimmerman I didn't like it, I called Helene
4 the very next day and I said what are we gonna do
5 to fix this project? So I, I really initially did
6 have design problems with the project. Having said
7 that, I think that the design has, has come a long
8 way since that, that point. I think that
9 concessions have been made. I think that, you
10 know, trimming has occurred. Frankly, no offense
11 to you architects, but it's still taken me two
12 years to get used to the concept that you put a
13 completely, you know, different sort of, you know,
14 modern structure next to, to a traditional
15 structure, but I've warmed up to it over the course
16 of that time and so from a design perspective, I
17 actually am, am more in support of the project now
18 than I ever was. So on the second issue, which is,
19 is it better somewhere else? I get that that's not
20 really an entitlement issue, but it's more of a
21 political issue, but I want to speak to it anyway
22 because it influences me. You know, tonight there
23 were comments about...in particular, the comments
24 of, of Jeff Skorneck and the HUD guy really I think

1 were sort of eye opening to me because I really was
2 frustrated and when I originally met with Allegra,
3 I don't know, two years ago on this project and
4 walked it with her, that theme resonated with me in
5 terms of why wouldn't, you know, 48 units work on
6 Spaulding, you know, and be, you know, be more
7 effective. I think that with some of the testimony
8 that was provided tonight, namely that funding is
9 project specific, that it's not transferable, that
10 we don't view these projects in isolation or in a
11 vacuum, rather it's, it's a fluid process. In
12 other words, you have a situation where you select
13 a site, you begin a site specific...you begin site
14 specific funding efforts and then later it's very
15 well plausible that another site down the street
16 might come available that is a larger plot of land,
17 but you've already started your pro, process on, on
18 Parcel A. So that was very kind of enlightening to
19 me tonight and actually addressed a lot of my
20 concerns, you know, in terms of, in terms of
21 rectifying that whole notion of is it better
22 someplace else. Hang on. The last, or the...let's
23 see, the last comment I had is, is I think one of
24 the other themes that emerged from tonight was the

1 concept of there being two few, few units. You
2 know, at the end of the day, for me anyway, I don't
3 know about the rest of you, but some is better than
4 none. And I guess the last thing I would say
5 is...senior housing and, and housing for the
6 disabled are issues that are obviously of
7 importance to all of us, they don't necessarily
8 impact someone like me directly, although after
9 tonight, I'm a lot closer. So, so it's an issue
10 that I'm aware of and I'm passionate about, but
11 it's not an issue that necessarily directly affects
12 my life. When I hear an el...you know, you know,
13 an elderly person testifying tonight or, or the
14 disabled woman who I mean was...her testimony was
15 so moving about how, you know, even 28 units are so
16 needed in this city and how, you know, the design
17 of...it enables her to go in and out on first...you
18 know, on a first floor basis, I mean it is...it was
19 very, very compelling to me and it really brings
20 the issue which maybe doesn't necessarily impact me
21 directly to the forefront of my consciousness. And
22 so for, for I think all of those reasons, I am
23 actually prepared to support the project tonight.
24 Thank you.

1 D'Amico: John?

2 Altschul: Just along the lines of what you said, Eric, about
3 is it better someplace else. Sure, it's better
4 someplace else. If you can have 48 units on
5 Spaulding, please do it, but then we'll have 48
6 units on Spaulding and 28 units here. So I don't,
7 you know, I'm like Arnone, I don't do the math, but
8 whatever it is, that's fantastic. So and, and to
9 those people who on either side of this issue said
10 Elsie Wiseman wanted this, Elsie Wiseman wanted
11 that, none of you were there. You know, that's
12 really a combination of preposterous and ludicrous
13 to try to project what this woman wanted. The
14 woman left legally correct documents I assume,
15 because otherwise we wouldn't have gotten this far,
16 that allows the city to do with it what the city
17 deems appropriate and we're helping make that
18 decision. And if this is deemed appropriate,
19 that's what it's gonna be.

20 D'Amico: Donald?

21 DeLuccio: (INAUDIBLE) my opinion known. I actually...I mean
22 agree that we need the, the parkland, I agree that
23 we need the housing. I'd love to see housing on
24 that piece of property, but at the same time,

1 my...there's no way to do it without doing the
2 Statement of Overriding Consideration, which you
3 guys voted for earlier. And I don't think we can
4 speak to the housing...it's a given, yeah, the
5 housing may...could be someplace else, but that's
6 not what's before us this evening. What's before
7 us this evening is the housing on this piece of
8 property and, and I'm more where I want to see the,
9 the house preserved and in the setting its in right
10 now with the landscaping and, and I'm...so I was
11 prepared to do the Statement of Overriding
12 Consideration and you know what, we have to balance
13 everything in the city and some years ago...we have
14 the Kings Road Park now where that's a very dense
15 neighborhood over there. Laurel is a very dense
16 neighborhood also. So, you know what, by leaving
17 this to be just...I'm gonna say a cultural center
18 or anything like that, but a real park with
19 preserving the house does give relief to a very
20 dense neighborhood also. And wherever...and so
21 that's not a bad thing and it's not speaking to
22 whether there's, you know, it's, oh, there'll be
23 other opportunities to, to put housing someplace
24 else, be it and you know what, the city early on

1 actually went out and the City Council authorized
2 the, the Housing Corporation with the WASET entity
3 to go and apply for that...for the loan, the two,
4 whatever they got, \$2.4 million or whatever the
5 loan, the loan amount is and you know what, they
6 really didn't I believe solicit a lot of input
7 from, from the residents at that time. So maybe
8 going forward, this could be done a little
9 differently where you do bring the...get the
10 community more involved early on, not after you get
11 the loan and then, okay, now we do need to move
12 forward and we do need to make this happen. You
13 need to...we maybe need to involve people, the
14 community the little early on in these decisions.
15 I'm not saying this is a bad thing and if it gets
16 approved this evening, that's, which it looks like
17 it will be, that's fine and I, you know, we can
18 agree to differ.

19 D'Amico: Joe?

20 Guardarrama: Yeah, I think we can agree to differ too, but one
21 thing I didn't mention when I first spoke that,
22 that sort of strikes me at gut level is that this
23 piece of land belongs to all of us as residents of
24 this city and in approving this and permitting this

1 to go forward, we're saying that the park and the
2 community rooms can be used by all that particular
3 public, but the rest of the property, the benefits
4 will be derived by very, very few and it's that
5 point that sort of, it sort of gets me and, and I
6 have a real problem with telling the rest of the
7 citizens of West Hollywood that, no, it belonged to
8 you before, but you can't use it now.

9 Altschul: I see that and I understand that, but I personally
10 get a great benefit out of going to the opening of
11 the Housing Corporation's buildings and seeing
12 that, you know, in a small way the human condition
13 is improved and this in a small way will improve
14 the human condition for people like that disabled
15 woman who not only finds herself able to get in and
16 out of her place on a ground level, but has gotten
17 herself part-time employment and really pulled
18 herself up by the bootstraps as, as a post polio
19 person, it's marvelous and if we as a city can
20 cause one story like that, we can cause more.

21 D'Amico: It's late and my guess is it's time for a motion.
22 Would anyone like to make one? (INAUDIBLE).

23 Altschul: No, he didn't.

24 D'Amico: No, he didn't.

1 Altschul: But I'll make one, I move that we adopt the project
2 subject to several conditions and Christi I think
3 will have to help me in, in framing these
4 conditions. I move we adopt the project and some
5 of these I think will have to be, and I only have
6 three, some of these I think will have to be
7 recommendations rather than conditions. So you
8 help me as to what...how to do this. First of all,
9 I believe that the fee, the fee, the fee simple
10 interest, which is a legal term and who owns the
11 property should remain if at all possible with the
12 City of West Hollywood and that if it can't, there
13 be a, a lease with what Mr. Arnone described as an
14 automatic absolute, he used the word absolute, as
15 an absolute reversion to the City of West Hollywood
16 if in fact it is no longer used for affordable
17 housing. But preferably, that the fee, the fee
18 remain with the city. Secondly, all of a sudden it
19 occurred to me a couple of days ago that here we
20 have this, this wonderful opportunity, but it's in
21 the middle of nowhere when it comes to Whole Foods
22 or Ralph's or one of those things and if you put an
23 80 some odd year old person at 1343 North Laurel,
24 how can that person walk to Santa Monica, turn

1 right to Whole Foods or turn left to Ralph's and,
2 and get back? He or she can't and there's no
3 grocery stores up on Sunset. So we have this
4 wonderful city shuttle line and I would like to
5 make sure that the shuttle line includes 1343 North
6 Laurel on its route as it does on Kings Road with
7 the affordable housing facilities there and that
8 the stop or the, the place where it drops...picks
9 up and drops off be on the site rather than
10 removing or taking up any parking spaces. And the
11 third thing that I would like to see is a
12 continuation of the work on the design to get the
13 design as, as really sensational as it can be.

14 Bartolo: Okay, I'd like to add a motion too if I may or a
15 recommendation.

16 D'Amico: I'll second that motion.

17 Bartolo: Oh, sorry.

18 Bartolo: I thought we do it all at once.

19 Hogin: Okay, let me, let me comment on it and then too if
20 I can frame it into the different....

21 Altschul: Thank you.

22 Hogin: The first thing, let me just comment on this.
23 Right now there's an agreement between the city and
24 the developers involving the transfer of the

1 property, but because of the changes in the project
2 due to the reduction in the number of units and
3 their need to restructure the financing, that
4 agreement is being renegotiated. Under the
5 original agreement, the property was being
6 transferred in fee. Under the negotiated agreement
7 that's currently on the table, it is now a lease, a
8 long term lease and so I believe it is the
9 intention of the city to make it a long term lease
10 and that's certainly where the agreement seems to
11 be going. So...and that ultimately obviously is
12 something in the hands of the, of the City Council.
13 So on that point, I would suggest that we urge the
14 City Council to retain the fee interest of that
15 property and I, I don't believe that there are any
16 legal impediments to doing that by the way.

17 Altschul: Okay and then in the alternative, it, it is not
18 feasible to retain the fee interest, that a lease
19 held interest contain an absolute reversion clause.

20 Hogin: Okay and so that's a recommendation and the second
21 recommendation would be that the city consider
22 rerouting the shuttle line so that it goes past
23 this project once it's developed and that's in the
24 note, that would be a recommendation.

1 Altschul: Well, not past the project, goes on to the project.

2 Hogin: No, no, no, that will get there...first we have to
3 route...

4 Altschul: Thank you.

5 Hogin: ...it there, right?

6 Altschul: Yes, first we have to route it.

7 Hogin: Okay, so there's are the two that are just
8 recommendations to the Council. So then in
9 addition to that, the motion would be to adopt the
10 remaining Sections 11 through 19 of the Resolution
11 and then to add a condition that requires the
12 developer to provide a circulation plan that would
13 accommodate the shuttle on site that would be
14 approved by the transportation manager.

15 Altschul: Perfect, and if there is some kind of an impediment
16 to a public bus or, or Dial A Ride vehicle from
17 going on into a private garage, that perhaps that
18 be looked into to have that set aside because the
19 city can set aside if, if it wants to.

20 Hogin: Right, if they can't do it, they'll have to come
21 back to you and figure it out, but...

22 Altschul: Good.

23 Hogin: ...that's the condition of approval.

24 Altschul: Good. And the design?

1 Keho: On the design, did you want that to come back to
2 the Planning Commission Design Review or have that
3 looked at at the staff level?

4 Altschul: Well, what does everybody think?

5 D'Amico: I think it should come back to the Design Review.

6 Altschul: Okay, come back to the Design Review. That it
7 continue to be worked on and gosh knows, I think
8 there's plenty of time before the shovels turn.

9 Hogin: Okay. Let me add those two. So we're adding two
10 conditions and we're making two recommendations and
11 we're adopting the rest of the Resolution and
12 Counselor...I mean Commissioner Bartolo?

13 Bartolo: No plans on the former.

14 Hogin: That's for another day, sorry.

15 Bartolo: Oh, it's okay, I kept my run on. The...I know a
16 lot of this stuff is addressed in the EIR's that
17 relates to the landscaping and preservation issues,
18 but I'd really like to have it in the conditions
19 for approval if it's possible, maybe it's a
20 recommendation, but relating to...I want to have
21 real clarity with regard to the tree preservation
22 efforts. I also want to have an effort that...I
23 know that, you know, it can be up to 50 percent of
24 the trees, if you transplant or try to transplant

1 them, will die, but you know what, I want to see if
2 those trees that are going to be removed, if we
3 can't have the effect of a tree adoption program.
4 So I'd like to see if there's some way of trying to
5 use those trees. I, you know, I know the rate of,
6 you know, they're living isn't necessarily high,
7 but let's try. I think it's worth the effort. So
8 those are the...that's related to my concern.

9 Hogin: You want to, you want to add a condition that the
10 developer make a good faith effort to find someone
11 to adopt the tree...

12 Bartolo: Right, that, that....

13 Hogin: ...or transplant it?

14 Bartolo: And then the other part of it is I'd like
15 very...I'd like the conditions to be very specific
16 and the reason I want it in the conditions if I
17 could is because it'll be open for public scrutiny
18 and part of the public file, the precise method of
19 tree preservation for the trees that are remaining.
20 Because I think it's...during the construction
21 phase.

22 Keho: I believe we have this already in our mitigation
23 plan and Francie's...

24 Bartolo: Okay, that's...

1 Keho: ...taking a look at that.

2 Bartolo: And, and forgive me for now knowing it, I wasn't
3 sure so....

4 Hogin: Yeah....

5 Altschul: And did it also include that the developer in that,
6 toward that end worked with the West Hollywood Tree
7 Preservation Society?

8 Hogin: Just to....

9 Altschul: Well, they're very helpful in locating adopters.

10 Stefan: So the revised mitigation measures for cultural
11 resources goes through numerous points of what
12 should be done to protect the trees including
13 protection barriers during construction, storage of
14 materials, debris and waste materials, damages,
15 preventative measures, it involves retaining an
16 arborist to be on site to make sure the trees are,
17 are watered and fed properly before construction
18 starts and then monitoring them throughout the
19 process.

20 Bartolo: So those would be conditions for approval period?

21 Stefan: Yeah, these are already included.

22 Bartolo: I get....

23 Hogin: And then, well, we'll add in an adopted tree
24 program.

1 Bartolo: Adopted tree program, yes, okay.

2 Hogin: Okay.

3 D'Amico: So does the maker of the motion accept those...

4 Altschul: Yes.

5 D'Amico: ...conditions? And so does the second. David, if
6 you would take a roll call, seeing no other
7 comments?

8 Gillig: Commissioner Altschul?

9 Altschul: Yes.

10 Gillig: Chair D'Amico?

11 D'Amico: Yes.

12 Gillig: Commissioner Thompson?

13 Thompson: Yes.

14 Gillig: Commissioner DeLuccio?

15 DeLuccio: No.

16 Gillig: Commissioner Bartolo?

17 Bartolo: Yes.

18 Gillig: Vice Chair Guardarrama?

19 Guardarrama: No.

20 Gillig: Commissioner Hamaker is appropriately recused. The
21 motion carries.

22 Keho: And there is a 10-day appeal period for this item.

23 D'Amico: Thank you everyone. Eric, thank you. Francie,
24 thank you. John, thank you.

1 Altschul: Denise, thank you.

2 D'Amico: Denise, thank you. Oh.

3 Altschul: Camera woman, camera man.

4 D'Amico: Yes, we'll have to make National Camera Woman Day
5 one day. Yes, I'm about to go to unfinished

6 business, none. Excluded consent calendar, none.

7 Items from staff, John?

8 Keho: I don't have anything else for tonight.

9 D'Amico: We have one public comment. Victor Omelczenko?

10 Omelczenko: I'll make this real quick. I'm Victor Omelczenko,

11 West Hollywood resident. And this has been an

12 interesting evening and I, I'm hearing talk now, we

13 want things to be more transparent, maybe the city

14 should've let the, the residents in on, on this

15 particular project that we just finished discussing

16 earlier. So what I would just like to bring out is

17 that on my horizon I remember being in this room in

18 January of this year and that was when there was

19 the uproar and when the City Council met here and

20 it was all about the mixed use development and that

21 we were gonna all start looking at a west side

22 specific plan before we started getting real tall

23 buildings, you know, on the west side and now it's

24 like eight months into the year and, you know, I do

1 check the public notices, I look at things and
2 that, and I haven't heard anything, but I do know
3 that developers are running around and talking
4 about the Palm Restaurant project, the new
5 Pavilion's project, maybe a very tall structure in
6 the building that's across the street from the
7 Troubadour at, at the Melrose, the Melrose Triangle
8 project and so as all these people are running
9 around making...my perceptives is still that there
10 are deals being made and we're not being let in on
11 it and there really haven't been any kind of
12 gatherings of people to discuss the west side
13 specific plan as it relates to, you know, multi-use
14 and, and that kind of stuff. So I just...I bring
15 that up as a concerned citizen and I hope that we
16 hear something about it because the City Council
17 had us all in here for a meeting about it and then
18 I just have a feeling that the project will just
19 sprout up and one after another and then we'll all
20 be saying again, oh, well, maybe we should've all
21 been brought into the process before it all was a
22 fate accompli. So thank you and have a good night.

23 D'Amico: Thank you, Victor. Items from Commissioners.

24 Thompson: I, I would just add, Victor's right. He's dead on.

1 There is a mechanism, there is a mechanism for
2 which to have a, a neighborhood meeting after an
3 application is filed, but all the stuff goes...that
4 goes on before, which is when we should...and we
5 talked, we did, we talked about this in the context
6 of the mixed use ordinance about really getting the
7 community involved earlier on. We should really
8 try to...I know it's hard and I...because there's
9 not a met...a, a, an ordinance rule in place, but
10 we should try to figure out a way, you know, to get
11 people involved early on. It just makes all the
12 difference in the world. It would've made a
13 difference here tonight, it would've made a
14 difference with the next use ordinance. He's
15 right.

16 D'Amico: Thank you, Joe?

17 Guardarrama: No.

18 D'Amico: John?

19 Altschul: No.

20 D'Amico: Kate?

21 Bartolo: Nothing.

22 D'Amico: Donald?

23 DeLuccio: I just want to thank you, Chair D'Amico. You
24 really did an outstanding job this evening and you

1 came in prepared. I could see you thought about
2 this before you came to the meeting this evening.

3 D'Amico: Thank you.

4 DeLuccio: You did an excellent job running the meeting and
5 the way you treated...

6 Male: I agree.

7 D'Amico: Thank you very much.

8 DeLuccio: ...the, the speakers and, and all your fellow
9 commissioners and staff. And, and staff, you guys
10 are wonderful too, you really did a very good job
11 throughout this whole process so I (TALKING OVER).

12 D'Amico: Someone stole my thunder, I wanted to thank the
13 staff also.

14 DeLuccio: I'm sorry.

15 D'Amico: Thank you all very much, especially John Keho.
16 Good night, we're done. Have a pleasant tomorrow.
17 (MEETING ENDS).

18
19 APPROVED BY A MOTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS 7TH DAY OF
20 SEPTEMBER, 2006.

21
22 
23 _____
24 CHAIRPERSON

22 ATTEST:

23 
24 _____
25 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR