

Official Transcript
City of West Hollywood Planning Commission
West Hollywood Park Public Meeting Room – Council Chambers
625 N. San Vicente Boulevard, West Hollywood, California

Regular Meeting
Thursday, June 5, 2025

Commissioners Present

Chair Michael A. Lombardi
Vice Chair David S. Gregoire
Commissioner Rogerio Carvalheiro
Commissioner Lynn M. Hoopingarner
Commissioner Stacey E. Jones
Commissioner Erick J. Matos
Commissioner Andrew Solomon

Speakers Present

Jennifer Alkire, Assistant Director, Community Development Department
Saima Qureshy, Planning Manager, Current and Historic Preservation Planning
Doug Vu, Senior Planner
Roger Rath, Associate Planner
Isaac Rosen, Deputy Legal Counsel
David Gillig, Secretary

* * *

- 1 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Good evening. I would like to begin with the land acknowledgement.
2 The West Hollywood Planning Commission acknowledges that the land on which we gather and
3 that is currently known as the City of West Hollywood is the occupied, unceded, seized territory
4 of the Gabrieleño Tongva and Gabrieleño Kizh peoples.
5
6 The time is 6:34 p.m., and I would like to call this regularly scheduled Planning Commission
7 meeting to order. And now we will do the Pledge of Allegiance. I'll lead us in the pledge this
8 evening.
9
10 (Conducts Pledge of Allegiance).
11
12 Thank you. Secretary Gillig, may we please have roll call?
13
14 DAVID GILLIG: Good evening, Commissioners. Commissioner Solomon.
15
16 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Here.
17
18 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Matos.
19
20 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Present.

1
2 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Jones.
3
4 COMMISSIONER JONES: Here.
5
6 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Hoopingarner.
7
8 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Present.
9
10 DAVID GILLIG: Commissioner Carvalho.
11
12 COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Here.
13
14 DAVID GILLIG: Vice Chair Gregoire.
15
16 VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: Here.
17
18 DAVID GILLIG: Chair Lombardi.
19
20 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Present.
21
22 DAVID GILLIG: And we have a seven-member quorum.
23
24 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Thank you. Item 4, approval of the agenda. Would anyone like to
25 move approval of tonight's agenda?
26
27 VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: I move approval of the agenda.
28
29 COMMISSIONER JONES: I'll second.
30
31 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Motion by the Vice Chair and second by Commissioner Jones. Okay,
32 thank you. And because we have a lot of members of the public out here, I just want to remind
33 you all that we do have a consent calendar item. If you did for any reason want to speak on Item
34 8A, which is the Capital Improvements Program, you can do that during public comments,
35 general public comments, which are at the beginning and end of tonight's meeting. Thank you.
36
37 DAVID GILLIG: And just for the record, the agenda was approved as presented unanimously.
38
39 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Okay. Item 5A is approval of the minutes from May 15,
40 2025.
41
42 COMMISSIONER MATOS: I'll move approval.
43
44 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Motion by Commissioner Matos.
45
46 VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: Second.
47
48 CHAIR LOMBARDI: And seconded by the Vice Chair.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

DAVID GILLIG: And the motion passes, noting five ayes and Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Carvalho abstaining from this vote, approving the minutes as presented for May 15, 2025.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Item 6 is public comments. As noted, this is an opportunity to talk on Item 8A. Are there any public --

DAVID GILLIG: Chair, I have one public comment here in the chambers that has signed up, Stephanie Harker.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. Please state your name and city of residence.

STEPHANIE HARKER: Good evening, Commissioners, Stephanie Harker, City of West Hollywood.

A couple of things. Something I was just reminded of when we did the land acknowledgement, I think it's time that we do something substantive about acknowledging what we did to the residents here, the original inhabitants. Somehow, the acknowledgement seems like, "Nyah, nyah, we're telling you what we did to you." But why don't we find out what the trail name was for Santa Monica Boulevard and rename it, really acknowledge the people who did live here on this land? Just an idle thought.

But I wanted to bring up something that has been brought to my attention, that we're all talking about housing, which is great. We want to house people, even though we do not house the homeless. We've had a little over 100 on our count in West Hollywood for the last number of years, and none of them seem to have been housed. In downtown L.A., as you know, there's around 100,000 people on the streets. Are we building housing for them? I don't think we are, and perhaps we need more mental institutions and drug rehab programs to be built in the interim so that they do have some place to be housed and take care of the issues while they are on the streets.

But I have recently gotten not one, not two, but three announcements from West Hollywood Community Housing Corporation reminding people to sign up and apply for one of their buildings. I believe it's in the West Lake area in Los Angeles. They seem to be having trouble getting applications, which is odd to me because we certainly know that there's a 3,000 waiting list. They're asking people to please put their names into the lottery.

I'm confused by that except for one thing. These buildings are being built with no parking, with the blessings of the state and the city, the county. But it makes it difficult -- for people who don't have a car, that'd be great. But it makes it difficult for people who do have a car, who use it to take their kids to school and to work their one or two different jobs on their low income. But I find that curious, don't you, that they are asking people to, please -- the third one was a reminder, "Please don't forget to apply for this," when we have 3,000 people on the list.

So maybe we need to look again at our future planning with no parking and see if we have enough people to fill places that don't have to go any -- people to live there who don't have any way else to get around. Thank you.

1
2 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you. And Chair, that is our last public speaker we have for this general
3 public comment item.

4
5 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. That brings us to Item 7, the Director's Report.

6
7 JENNIFER ALKIRE: Good evening, Commission, Chair Lombardi, Vice Chair Gregoire,
8 members of the Commission. My name is Jennifer Alkire. I'm the Acting Director of
9 Community Development. And I have a little feedback. Hopefully -- can you still hear me if I
10 back up? Okay.

11
12 Since our last meeting on May 15, we welcomed a new current and historic preservation
13 planning manager, Saima Qureshy, to the City of West Hollywood. Saima's finishing up her
14 third week here in WeHo, and we're so grateful to have her. Saima's been a professional planner
15 for more than 25 years and she was most recently with the City of San Marcos, but we're super
16 excited to have her here in West Hollywood.

17
18 I also wanted to acknowledge and thank Doug Vu, Antonio Castillo and Garen Yolles for their
19 work as acting managers. They took turns over the last seven months since I stepped into the
20 Assistant Director role, and the division has been in very good hands and I'm extremely grateful
21 for their work in that capacity.

22
23 The City Council held a meeting on May 19. And on that agenda, the Council heard a Zone Text
24 Amendment for redevelop -- I'm sorry, for development agreement noticing. The Council opted
25 to move forward with neighborhood meetings for development agreement projects, but didn't
26 make a change at this time to mailing radii for those projects and Staff is directed to bring more
27 information back for further discussion. And we will report back to you if there's any changes on
28 that.

29
30 And finally, regarding upcoming Council agendas over the summer, the Community
31 Development Department only has a few items coming up on the next couple of Council
32 agendas. On Monday, June 9, which is this coming Monday, there is a Metro update on consent.
33 The agenda is out now if you'd like to take a look at that. And then on June 23, the Council will
34 be hearing a Zone Text Amendment for EV charging stations, which the Commission reviewed a
35 couple of meetings ago. And also of note, on June 23, the Council will be discussing and
36 deciding on the operational budget for Fiscal Year '26.

37
38 So that's something to keep in mind. And that's all I have for updates. If you have any questions
39 for me, I'm here.

40
41 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Great, thank you. Commissioner Solomon?

42
43 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: You mentioned the Council item on the noticing for projects
44 with the DA and that they requested more information to come back. Does it come back through
45 us or does it go straight to Council?

46
47 JENNIFER ALKIRE: It would go straight back to Council. Any major changes to the ordinance
48 language could potentially come back to Planning Commission, though.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Thanks.

JENNIFER ALKIRE: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Item 8A is our consent item, the Capital Improvements Program for fiscal year 2026 to 2030. There is a resolution included, so we do need to do a formal vote on this consent item. And I believe Staff also has an update to the resolution that went out today. Is there anything else the staff would like to add?

ISAAC ROSEN: Nothing from Staff, Chair Lombardi.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MATOS: I'll move approval of the consent calendar item with the updated memorandum from Staff.

VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: I will second.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Motion from Commissioner Matos and seconded by Vice Chair Gregoire.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: [Indiscernible].

CHAIR LOMBARDI: I'm sorry. I'll try to look next time.

DAVID GILLIG: And Chair?

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Yeah.

DAVID GILLIG: Thank you.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Mine is slow today, or maybe it's me. I'm not sure which.

DAVID GILLIG: And the motion passes unanimously with seven ayes. This is approving Resolution #25-1607. There is no appeal process. This is an item going forward to the City Council.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Item 9, public hearings, Section 1, subject to the Housing Accountability Act. We have no items. That brings us to our first hearing of the evening, so Item 10A. These are other items that require public hearing under law. And 10A is 8020 Santa Monica Boulevard. It's a hearing to request to demolish all existing structures and an existing service station and construct a new 2,000-square foot commercial building with two tenant spaces as well as alcohol sales. And we will now lead with the Staff report. Thank you.

ROGER RATH: Yes, thank you. And good evening, Chair Lombardi, and members of the Commission. My name is Roger Rath. I'm an Associate Planner with the Community Development Department, and tonight I'm presenting a request to redevelop the existing Shell service station at 8020 Santa Monica Boulevard.

1
2 The proposal includes a new one-story, 2,000-square foot commercial structure with two separate
3 tenant spaces, a convenience store offering off-site alcohol sales and a cafe/restaurant use with an
4 outdoor dining area. The project also includes a redesigned fuel canopy with 12 pumps,
5 improved site circulation, enhanced landscaping and new pedestrian connections. The
6 presentation will take approximately eight to nine minutes. If this thing moves. There we go.

7
8 The project site is located at the southwest corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Laurel
9 Avenue. The area is characterized by a mix of commercial and residential uses. Directly north is
10 a recently approved seven-story mixed-use development. To the south is a four-story residential
11 building. Irv's Burgers sits across Laurel Avenue, and to the west is a one-story commercial strip
12 with local shops like a florist and dry cleaner. The project is within a CC1 zone with a mixed-
13 use incentive overlay.

14
15 As you can see, the existing site is very utilitarian in nature, designed in the late 1960s and has
16 not changed since other than signage. It includes a small 240-square foot kiosk, eight fuel pumps
17 under a basic canopy and minimal landscaping or pedestrian amenities. Also, the driveways are
18 wide and dominate the frontages.

19
20 From the aerial image, you'll see that the site is mostly paved, with only a small amount of green
21 space. The four wide driveway openings and the current layout are mostly focused on vehicle
22 access with minimal room for other uses.

23
24 So this project was submitted on October 26, 2022 and deemed complete on November 10, 2022,
25 before ordinance number 22-1190 took effect. That ordinance limits fossil fuel station uses.
26 Therefore, this project is reviewed under the rules that were in place at the time of the
27 completeness. This includes the former service station standards, which the project meets.

28
29 The new site design includes several improvements, reducing the number of driveways from four
30 to two, adding a fuel island for a total of three station islands, increasing landscaping to over
31 3,700 square feet and includes two EV charging stations. The project will provide a total of eight
32 new canopy trees on site in addition to preserving existing landscaping at the rear. In the public
33 right-of-way, new street trees will be added and maximized in coordination with the city street
34 and parkway improvement plans.

35
36 The new building has two tenant spaces, a convenience store and a cafe, with the cafe oriented
37 towards Santa Monica Boulevard and outdoor seating available. There's also a walkway along
38 the building to connect both entrances and improves pedestrian access from Santa Monica
39 Boulevard. Sorry, it appears I lost my connection. I think I have to reshare.

40
41 So the new canopy features rusted metal cladding and a curved corner to help define the corner
42 of the site. This version was revised in response to the Design Review Subcommittee feedback,
43 which asked for a more cohesive look with the main building. The design draws from
44 midcentury and Route 66 styles, creating something functional and visually interesting.

45
46 This is the new one-story commercial building. It contains two separate tenant spaces, as I
47 mentioned, one for the convenience store and one for the cafe. They will operate independently
48 but share a pedestrian walkway that runs in front of both spaces. The building is located along

1 the front property line and there's added landscaping throughout the southern edge to help screen
2 it from the residential building next door.

3
4 The project meets all development standards that were in place when the application was deemed
5 complete, including heights, setbacks, floor areas, parking and landscaping. No variances or
6 special exceptions are being requested. The project fits within the requirements of the CC1 zone
7 and the previous service station regulations in place, again, when the application was deemed
8 complete.

9
10 The applicant is proposing 24 hours of operation for the service station and the convenience
11 store. Any activities between 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. will require a separate extended hours
12 business license from the Business License Commission. The cafe is expected to operate within
13 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. and the outdoor dining would close by 11:00 p.m. each night.

14
15 The project includes conditions to minimize any impacts on nearby neighbors. For noise, no
16 outdoor speakers or music are allowed, just an intercom at the fuel pumps for communication.
17 There's also a 6-foot wall along the back of the property with landscaping added to help provide
18 a buffer for the residential building next door.

19
20 For alcohol sales, beer and wine can be sold from the convenience store only. The convenience
21 store staff will need to verify IDs, follow alcohol display rules and refuse service to anyone who
22 appears intoxicated. No alcohol is allowed to be consumed on site or in the outdoor seating area
23 with this entitlement.

24
25 And for outdoor dining, the patio is located along Santa Monica Boulevard, more than 100 feet
26 away from the nearest home. It's separated from the rest of the site by landscaping and a raised
27 curb. Alcohol, again, is not served in that area.

28
29 Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. PC 25-1605,
30 which approves the project permits and finds it exempt from CEQA under the Class 32 infill
31 development exemption.

32
33 This concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions. And the applicant team
34 also has a presentation that they would like to share. Thank you.

35
36 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. Do my colleagues have any disclosures to make?
37 Commissioner Jones?

38
39 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yeah. I had a call with the applicant's representative and we
40 discussed items contained in the Staff report. Specifically, I had questions for him about some of
41 the condition requests for ours. Thanks.

42
43 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Solomon?

44
45 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I also spoke with the applicant's representative on the phone
46 and spoke about items in the staff report, mainly as it relates to the vesting of what was the
47 ordinance and what is the ordinance now.

48

1 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Thank you. Design Review or SAASC
2 -- in this case Design Review Subcommittee update, there were items included within the Staff
3 report. So I don't know if any of my colleagues that are on the Design Review Subcommittee
4 wanted to add anything at this time. Commissioner Hoopingarner?

5
6 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I think the staff report did a pretty good job of covering
7 all of the things that we discussed, and it appears that the applicant has taken on board almost
8 every one of our recommendations in discussion. I'm not sure if there was anything that we
9 missed.

10
11 CHAIR LOMBARDI: That's how I feel too. Okay, sounds like we all agree. Great. So now we
12 can move on to the applicant's presentation. Please approach the podium. And you have 10
13 minutes to present. And please state your name and city of residence. Thank you.

14
15 DJ MOORE: Good evening, Chair Lombardi, commissioners, DJ Moore, resident of the City of
16 Los Angeles here on behalf of the applicant. And my understanding is that there's a little bit of
17 an internet lag today, so if you bear with us, hopefully it will work. But we will try our best.

18
19 To begin, we support Staff's recommendation for approval tonight and would like to thank Staff
20 very much for your thorough report as well as the Design Review Subcommittee for its feedback
21 several months ago. Tonight we'd like to spend just a few minutes walking you through some
22 key elements of the project. Next slide.

23
24 The existing service station has been in operation since at least 1983, before the city was
25 incorporated. The applicant acquired the site and the existing structures in 1986. Since then,
26 various tenants have occupied the site. As Staff mentioned, it's currently a Shell. Our client
27 started exploring options about redeveloping the site actually way back in 2021 with Staff. So
28 tonight is really a culmination of a very long-term planning effort and a lot of close collaboration
29 with City Staff. Next slide.

30
31 Staff walked you through the vicinity, so I won't repeat that again. But here is the site on the
32 corner of Santa Monica and Laurel. Next slide.

33
34 And here's a view of the existing structures on the site. The pumping stations are located under a
35 canopy in approximately the center of the site. And as Staff mentioned, there's a small walk-up
36 kiosk space. It's toward the southeastern edge of the property, which is not easily accessible for
37 pedestrians if any of you have been there. Next slide.

38
39 This is another view from Santa Monica. As you can see and Staff mentioned, there's minimal
40 landscaping. Primarily, the site is paved to the property line on all sides. Next slide.

41
42 The applicant proposes to modernize these facilities, provide for more pedestrian activation
43 along Santa Monica and provide substantial additional landscaping that will meaningfully
44 improve the site compared to existing conditions. Do you guys -- Tech, do you need something?
45 David? Sorry. Is it working? It's working? Okay, great.

46
47 So I'd like to now walk you through several goals that drive the proposal, first, providing a
48 reconfigured and upgraded station experience; second, providing expanded fuel offerings,

1 including by installing EV charging stations that will help the site transition to the EV future;
2 third, activating the pedestrian realm around the site; and fourth, providing additional shade and
3 enhancing aesthetics by increasing landscaping on and around the site. Next slide.

4
5 To orient you, here's the site in plan view. Note the four driveway entrances and exits. They're
6 all shaded in red. The fuel canopy is outlined in yellow and the kiosk space in blue.

7
8 And here is our proposed site plan on the next slide. We'll examine each of these components in
9 detail, but want to point out a few key features. First, the customer space has been substantially
10 expanded to include both an indoor convenience store area with substantially more offerings than
11 exists in the space today that is really -- only provides enough room for one person if you've
12 been in there; and then an adjacent cafe and retail area with outdoor dining that will help activate
13 the pedestrian realm on Santa Monica and provide a neighborhood food offering like a deli at an
14 accessible price point.

15
16 The building has been located along the western edge of the site with direct access from Santa
17 Monica that makes the rest of the site able to be used by vehicles and reduces potential safety
18 conflicts. You'll notice that the fuel canopy is slightly larger and unifies the site. And finally, the
19 driveways have been reduced from four to two to minimize pedestrian conflicts. Next slide.

20
21 Starting with the customer space. As you can see here, this is the 240-square foot kiosk that only
22 offers limited services to patrons in the neighborhood and does today offer off-site alcohol sales.
23 As I mentioned, you have to walk through the site to access the kiosk, which is not pedestrian-
24 friendly. Next slide.

25
26 The proposal would develop an expanded facility to better serve the neighborhood. The
27 convenience store component would be 1,000 square feet, over 3x the current size with expanded
28 offerings. Next slide.

29
30 Here's another view of the building facade, incorporating a rusted metal cladding that extends
31 from the facade itself and is also now reflected in the service station canopy. Next slide.

32
33 The facility totals 2,000 square feet in size divided between the 1,000-square foot convenience
34 store area and, as I mentioned, the 1,000-square foot cafe space that includes outdoor dining on
35 the Santa Monica Boulevard frontage. Next slide.

36
37 Here's a rendering of that outdoor seating area. All seating is proposed to be located within the
38 property line to help activate the pedestrian realm. Next slide.

39
40 Based on feedback from the subcommittee, the applicant has redesigned the planter and bollard
41 area to increase visual interest while providing protection and minimizing potential tripping
42 hazards from the seating areas to the sidewalk. Next slide.

43
44 And here is an image of the existing fuel canopy with a fairly plain, familiar roof. Next slide.

45
46 The applicant had first proposed this redesign of the canopy, which featured more modernized
47 materials and a sleeker shape. But the Design Review Subcommittee requested the canopy be
48 revised to enhance architectural interest and provide a more cohesive design with the building.

1 Next slide.

2
3 So we responded to this feedback by substantially revising the proposal and incorporating unique
4 architectural elements that are reminiscent of a ship's bow that projects towards the Santa
5 Monica Laurel intersection, both increasing visual interest and creating continuity in materials
6 and shape with the proposed building facade. Next slide.

7
8 And here's just a better view of the revised proposal, which is, again, a modernized upgrade,
9 using contemporary glazing and materials while incorporating the same rusted metal cladding on
10 the building. Next slide.

11
12 The height of the canopy is 26 feet at its highest point. The building itself is 21 feet. These are
13 both well within the 35-foot maximum of the community commercial zoning. Next slide.

14
15 As I mentioned, we are incorporating two EV charging spaces into the facility. These will have
16 dedicated parking spaces on site, and one will be ADA accessible as shown here. The charging
17 stations are in the rear of the site to comply with safety standards. Next slide.

18
19 As I mentioned, we are enhancing the pedestrian realm here. Shown here is the sidewalk when
20 viewed from Santa Monica looking south. There are large concrete aprons on both Santa Monica
21 and Laurel with four driveway entrances. We've reduced them to reduce potential conflicts with
22 pedestrians. Next slide.

23
24 And here's the revised proposal. The two driveways closest to the intersection have been
25 eliminated, allowing for a substantially enhanced and a safer sidewalk experience with new
26 landscaping.

27
28 Turning to landscaping. Next slide. As we saw before, there's very little landscaping on the site.
29 Next slide.

30
31 Under the proposal, significant new landscaping would be provided along both sides of the
32 sidewalk as well as along the southern boundary to provide important screening for the
33 residential building located to the south on Laurel. Next slide.

34
35 Drake elms will be incorporated along Santa Monica Boulevard while Australian flame trees will
36 be on Laurel, consistent with the existing streetscape plans provided to us by Public Works.
37 Desert willows and coastal live Oaks will be located at the southern edge of the site in native soil
38 to create a green buffer between the site and the residential building, something that does not
39 exist today. Next slide.

40
41 This rendering is looking back at the southern property line more closely. There's an existing
42 concrete masonry wall that will remain in place, and we will add creeping fig vine and Boston
43 ivy to enhance the appearance and plant trees on the inside, station side, of the wall to provide
44 the screening that I mentioned. Next slide.

45
46 And now we're going to give you a fly-through animation, hopefully it works with the Internet,
47 and show you how these components fit together. Great. Next slide, please. Oh, still chopping.
48 There we go.

1
2 City Staff has recommended you find the project is exempt from further environmental review
3 under CEQA's Class 32 Categorical Exemption, which applies to infill development projects.
4 Construction will be between nine to 12 months and involves substantially less construction than
5 typical projects in the city that require subterranean development and associated excavation and
6 hauling. Minimal excavation is required, and there's nothing unique about the development of
7 this site that would cause adverse impacts to neighbors. As the Staff report explains, the project
8 meets each of the requisite criteria to qualify for the exemption. Next slide.

9
10 In summary, we're seeking a development permit, a demolition permit and a conditional use
11 permit to continue operating the expanded service station, a conditional use permit for the
12 continued off-site sale of alcohol and an administrative permit for the cafe space on the Santa
13 Monica Boulevard frontage. Last slide.

14
15 The applicant is very excited about the opportunity to upgrade this existing station site to
16 continue to serve the neighborhood and the community with improved offerings. We thank you
17 very much for your time this evening. We have a team here to answer any questions that you
18 may have. Thank you very much.

19
20 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Do we have any questions for the applicant or Staff, or do
21 we want to hear public comment first? Commissioner Jones?

22
23 COMMISSIONER JONES: I don't care. It's fine. I don't care either way. I just wanted to ask a
24 clarifying question.

25
26 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. How many -- do we have people here for public comment?

27
28 DAVID GILLIG: Chair, I have one public comment signed up in chambers and one in Zoom.

29
30 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. So I'll open the public comment portion of the hearing.
31 All questions and comments on this matter are to be directed to the Commission, not to the
32 audience. And are we beginning in Zoom or --

33
34 DAVID GILLIG: We're starting here in chambers. Our first public speaker will be Victor
35 Omelczenko. Victor, you'll have three minutes. And if there is anybody on the Zoom platform
36 that would like to speak on this item, just Star 9 for me at this time and we'll give you three
37 minutes at the next station.

38
39 VICTOR OMELCZENKO: I'm Victor Omelczenko, longtime West Hollywood resident, and
40 speaking on behalf of the West Hollywood Preservation Alliance.

41
42 The WHPA is pleased to support the innovative design of the 8020 Santa Monica property. It's a
43 site that has long been an integral part of our city's history along its iconic two-mile stretch of
44 historic U.S. Route 66, otherwise also known as California State Route 2.

45
46 As our community eagerly anticipates the centennial celebration of the "mother road" in 2026,
47 this project stands as a timely tribute to the legacy and enduring influence of Route 66, a
48 celebrated symbol of American freedom, innovation and adventure and, and may I add, gas

1 stations, motels and restaurants over the years.

2
3 This project reimagines a traditional gas station and tiny convenience store into a new
4 destination. And you know, the developers have embraced the insightful recommendations of
5 the Planning Commission's design review subcommittee, ensuring the design reflects not only
6 modern sensibilities but also responds to -- pays respect for West Hollywood's historic character.

7
8 Inspired by the bold and playful Googie-style architecture of the 1960s, the design intelligently
9 marries nostalgia with modern functionality, and especially the redesigned service station canopy
10 that curves outward, like the previous gentleman described, at the corner to evoke a ship bow
11 effect.

12
13 With Mayor Chelsea Byers' recent participation at the meeting of the National Route 66
14 Centennial Commission and the city's commitment to commemorative activities, the project
15 aligns with West Hollywood's official endeavors to honor and celebrate our shared past. The
16 project unites the historic charm of the mother road with cutting-edge design, and the West
17 Hollywood Preservation Alliance looks forward to its contributions to our community's evolving
18 narrative.

19
20 And now let me take my alliance hat off and talk as a nearby resident, but beyond the 500-foot
21 notice. I am so grateful to a neighbor of mine who provided with me this notice, which he is
22 within the 500 notice area. And I know you've been having a lot of discussions about the 1,000-
23 foot possible notice for development agreements.

24
25 I realize this is not a development agreement. But for a city that prides itself in its general plan
26 to encourage government transparency, I would hope that projects like this, whether requiring a
27 development agreement or just regular commercial projects, that the noticing be extended
28 beyond the 500-foot area. I think that's important for more people to be involved. I think you
29 would have more public participation. And now overall, though, this is a fine project, and I look
30 forward to seeing it and I know the alliance does too. Thank you.

31
32 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you, Victor. And Chair, we're going to turn it over to the Zoom
33 platform where we do have one speaker, I believe.

34
35 NICOLE RATHBONE: Yes, hi. My name is Nicole. I'm going to keep my camera off for the
36 sake of how bad the Internet connection has been. But I'm a resident in West Hollywood living
37 within 500 feet of the proposed project, and unfortunately, I have a very different take from the
38 prior speaker.

39
40 I did send a probably better, more long email last night urging you to deny the permit for this
41 project. I feel strongly that this project does not serve a public need. The current gas station is
42 fully functional, well-maintained and poses no issues for the community. To me, this feels like
43 an absolute private money grab. There's no reason to be tearing down a fully functioning gas
44 station to be more aesthetically pleasing.

45
46 I can tell you that I frequent this area. I live around the corner. I walk these sidewalks all the
47 time to walk to local businesses, work out, studios. I have major concerns for the small
48 businesses that are next door to this gas station. I go to that flower shop every week. The way

1 these small businesses are going to be impacted by nine to 12 months of construction is just
2 going to be unimaginable for them as well as the construction on Santa Monica Boulevard,
3 which is one of the most major streets within the West Hollywood City. I commute on this
4 multiple times a week. The absolute gridlock this is going to cause at one of the busiest
5 intersections in the city is going to create absolute chaos.

6
7 This just feels like a project that is being sold as this aesthetically pleasing, new, modern gas
8 station and liquor store, cafe, whatever it is that's going to fill this empty unit. West Hollywood
9 is already crawling with these things. We have liquor stores. We have grocery stores. We have
10 cafes within walking distance of this exact area. This feels completely unnecessary.

11
12 And my biggest concern for the residents, including myself, of this area is just the absolute noise
13 and disruption a project of this scale is going to cause for months to even years if this gets
14 delayed based on other similar projects I've seen in West Hollywood and the greater city of Los
15 Angeles. There are people in this area that work from home, people who are caretakers. I have a
16 neighbor that is a night nurse and relies on sleeping during the day to function with her work
17 schedule at the hospital. This type of noise within these residential streets is just going to be
18 completely disruptive to everyone's routine.

19
20 People moved here, including myself, to find a quiet, quaint neighborhood. And a project like
21 this just completely disrupts everyone's day-to-day life. And I want, I urge, the commissioners to
22 consider this strongly. It's unfortunate that other residents in this area haven't shown up, but I
23 want to speak on their behalf and urge the commission to consider this strongly.

24
25 This is a residential area at the end of the day. All of these neighboring streets that are
26 perpendicular to this gas station are going to be completely disrupted as well as the small
27 businesses that neighbor this exact site. Thank you.

28
29 JENNY IVANOVA: Thank you, Nicole. If there's any other attendees in the room that would
30 like to do a public comment, please press Star 9 and you'll have three minutes to speak. Thank
31 you.

32
33 DAVID GILLIG: And chair, I will just state for the record, I believe Victor already did during
34 his public comment. But we did receive additional correspondence from the West Hollywood
35 Preservation Alliance after the deadline. But it's basically, they are in support of the innovative
36 redesign of the 8020 Santa Monica Boulevard property.

37
38 And Chair, that is our -- we are finished with the public comment section.

39
40 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. Does our applicant wish to speak in rebuttal? And as
41 you approach, you have up to five minutes for your rebuttal. Thank you.

42
43 DJ MOORE: Thank you again, Chair Lombardi. DJ Moore on behalf of the applicant. As I
44 mentioned earlier, and with all due respect to the speaker who was opposed to the construction
45 impacts associated with this project, certainly in relative comparison to most projects that happen
46 in the city, including residential projects on residential streets, the construction timeline for this
47 project is very short. And obviously, we're subject to, I think, the five pages of conditions that
48 are included in the Staff's recommendation to ensure that construction noise, construction air

1 quality and impacts on businesses and traffic are minimized to the maximum extent feasible.
2 And of course, the applicant intends to abide by all of those conditions.

3
4 I thank you very much for your time again, and we respectfully request for your support of these
5 entitlements. And if you have any questions, our team's here to answer them. Thank you.

6
7 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. I'll now close the public comment portion of this
8 hearing. Are there any questions for the applicant or Staff? Commissioner Jones?
9 Commissioner Hoopingarner, do you have questions?

10
11 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes, thank you.

12
13 So just a quick question about the existing gas station sign. And I don't think this was addressed
14 in the Staff report. I read it and reread it and then did a word search and I don't think it's in there.
15 It looked from your presentation and from what we received that it would remain as is. Is that
16 accurate?

17
18 DJ MOORE: That's correct. That's the proposal. We're certainly happy to discuss the signage.
19 But yes, the proposal was to maintain, essentially, the existing signage. I mean, it'll be new, but
20 the same sort of shape and general location of the signage.

21
22 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. Okay, that's it. Thank you.

23
24 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I actually had the same question because it looked like it said Exxon on
25 one page.

26
27 DJ MOORE: Oh, did --

28
29 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Yeah, on Sheet A 1.2. But it's the existing sign?

30
31 DJ MOORE: Yeah.

32
33 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay.

34
35 DJ MOORE: It is the existing sign. And there's no -- I mean, tenants come and go. Gas station
36 flags come and go, but I don't -- there's not a current plan to swap Shell for Exxon.

37
38 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you.

39
40 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: That sounds like a survey problem. Yes. This is a
41 question more for Staff. The two coast live oaks that are proposed to be planted in the southwest
42 corner are canopy trees planted in native soil, yay, but what is the requirement for -- refresh my
43 memory in terms of canopy tree requirements for a project like this.

44
45 ROGER RATH: Sure. Let me just pull up the canopy standards in the code. But the canopy tree
46 standards are based off of square footage. Let me just -- give me one second. I'm going to just
47 pull that section up.

48

1 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: The reason I'm asking is because a coast live oak
2 becomes a very, very large tree. It's a wonderful tree in that respect. It's drought tolerant, it does
3 a great job of observing rain runoff, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. But you're planting two very
4 close together, and that could actually impair both trees.

5
6 And so you all may not believe what I'm about to say, but it really should only be one tree. I
7 know. Don't faint, anybody.

8
9 DJ MOORE: Well, Commissioner, I can tell you while Staff's looking, but I did memorize this
10 requirement. So I believe that the code requirement is that we provide three canopy trees on site
11 given the square footage, and we're providing eight. So yes, there's room to take one down
12 without cutting into the --

13
14 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I mean, I would rather, actually, that -- you've got the
15 willows, those are great, that the coast live oak maybe go someplace else. But I just -- in that
16 space, I don't think it's -- that tree, it's going to be huge. They get to be 100 feet tall. Inshallah it
17 does become 100 feet tall.

18
19 ROGER RATH: Yeah, so the code standard says that there's a requirement of a canopy tree for
20 every 6,000 square feet. So with the lot size, it's three that's required.

21
22 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. Yeah, that would just be the one minor change I
23 would recommend just because of the size of those trees. That was my only question.

24
25 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Commissioner Solomon?

26
27 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Thank you. Question for Staff. It's mentioned in the Staff
28 report and also in the resolution that due to the floor area ratio on this project, you ran it through
29 the city's VMT calculator tool. It rendered a less-than-significant impact, so no further analysis
30 was required.

31
32 I know we did this once before maybe about a year ago, but can you maybe shed some light on
33 what the VMT calculator tool is that you all use? And is that something -- when I hear tool, is it
34 something that's generally publicly available or is it just something that exists in the Staff
35 planning world?

36
37 ROGER RATH: Yeah. So it's a Staff tool, so we keep it internal. But I can have our Assistant
38 Director explain more about how the VMT tool works.

39
40 JENNIFER ALKIRE: I think Roger has oversold my ability to explain how the VMT tool works
41 per se, but I can explain what the VMT calculation means and what it's looking for if you'd like.

42
43 But the tool itself uses the square footage of the use, the type of use and estimates what the
44 vehicle miles traveled would be related to that based on the specific area where we are. So it's
45 more complicated than what I can explain personally.

46
47 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Okay. The other question -- two more questions, one for Staff.
48 The extended hours license, so the current hours of operation for this site as it currently exists is

1 24 hours. Is that right?

2

3 ROGER RATH: That is correct.

4

5 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: And does it currently have an extended hours license to be able
6 to do that?

7

8 ROGER RATH: So they were legal nonconforming, so they were able to kind of continue what
9 they were doing before. But since now that they are coming to conformance with the current
10 code standards, they'll have to follow the legal process of what is required.

11

12 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: And we're unable as a body to grant that license. That goes
13 through the Business License Commission. Do we even opine as to whether or not they should
14 grant it, or we can only just do it until 2:00 a.m. and we should not weigh in?

15

16 ROGER RATH: That's correct. So the municipal code does cover that the Business License
17 Commission has the authority to review extended business license from 2:00 to 6:00. It's not
18 within the purview of the Planning Commission.

19

20 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Okay. Last question on the alcohol sales. It's mentioned
21 several times, beer and wine. I assume that there are no off-site sales for spirits.

22

23 ROGER RATH: That's correct. So --

24

25 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I don't know how all the alcohol licensing exactly works, so
26 maybe shed some light on it.

27

28 ROGER RATH: Right. Yeah, so there are different types of ABC license that allow for beer and
29 wine sales, and then there's other licenses that allow for beer, wine and spirits.

30

31 For convenience store uses, per code, they're only allowed to do beer and wine. They're not
32 allowed to do spirits for off-site sales.

33

34 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Okay. Those were all of my questions. Thank you.

35

36 ROGER RATH: Sure.

37

38 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Matos?

39

40 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Thank you, Chair Lombardi. I have a quick question for the
41 applicant and then another question for Staff.

42

43 First of all, thank you for the thorough presentation. We appreciate it. Noticed that there's EV
44 charging stations that are going to be included on the site. Absolutely vital for future planning in
45 the city. I heard you say that the signage wouldn't be changing very much. I'm wondering how
46 the applicant intends on advertising the presence of the EV charging stations so that folks with
47 EV cars actually can access them given that they'll be in the rear of the property.

48

1 DJ MOORE: I'm looking back at my client because that's a very good question. And I'm
2 assuming that we will be amenable to adding a block to that signage to advertise the availability
3 of EV charging spaces. And he is nodding in vehement agreement, yes.
4

5 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Okay. Yeah, I think that that would be really useful just as a public
6 resource and a public good, for the community to be aware of that presence.
7

8 My next question is actually similar. I noticed in the Staff report, this is for Staff, that there was
9 mention of bicycle racks being installed. However, when I looked at the resolution, PC 25-1605
10 on Page 13, specifically Chapter 2, the bicycle racks were not listed in the project description
11 despite the EV charging being listed in there. Is that something that we would normally put in a
12 project description to ensure that that public resource would be available?
13

14 ROGER RATH: So when the project gets approved, it would be approved according to plan. So
15 that would ensure that there would be the bicycle parking on site.
16

17 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Okay. So is it mentioned in the resolution or in the plans?
18

19 ROGER RATH: It's not, but it is --
20

21 COMMISSIONER MATOS: I wasn't able to see it, so I'm wondering if we needed to add it to
22 the project description resolution.
23

24 ROGER RATH: Right. If that's what the commissioner wishes to move forward with, yeah, we
25 can do that. But it's not in the condition. It could have been an oversight, but we are covered in
26 terms of having it on the set of plans and they would have to build according to plan.
27

28 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Okay, so it's on the plans.
29

30 ROGER RATH: It is on the site plan.
31

32 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Okay, perfect. And then just a quick question, follow-up on the
33 applicant. Would you be agreeable to including the bicycle racks as part of the project
34 description in the resolution?
35

36 DJ MOORE: Certainly, that would be fine.
37

38 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Wonderful. That's all my questions. Thank you, Chair.
39

40 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Carvalho?
41

42 COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Thank you, Chair Lombardi.
43

44 Since design review, I found out that California now has more EV charging stations than we do
45 have gas pumps. And I'm now surprised to look at the proposal and see the opposite proportion.
46

47 DJ MOORE: Commissioner, I don't know if your microphone is working because I'm having
48 trouble hearing you, and I want to make sure I hear you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Okay. So since design review, it was announced that California now has more EV charging stations than we do have gas pumps. And so I'm looking at this project slightly differently now. It's like it's the old proportion or a different proportion than what we hope to achieve in California. Would you ever consider having more EV charging stations?

And in light of that, there was no modification done to the two pumps closest to Santa Monica Boulevard. And I know I've been thinking, how would I solve this issue? And if you turn those two to EV charging stations, the issue of car collisions or trying to back up might be resolved. That would bring four charging stations to the site, which would almost make it equal to gas. So that's my question. Would something like that be considered?

DJ MOORE: So the issue with that, Commissioner, is that there are actually safety standards related to having the fuel pumps in proximity to the charging stations. And I think there's just the -- state regulators out there are worried that you might get some kind of spark from an EV charging station that could potentially ignite a fuel station.

So there are actually minimum distance requirements associated with the charging stations, and we had a very difficult time orienting the station canopy in order to ensure that there was going to be adequate distance on the site between the EV charging stations and the fuel dispensers. And so unfortunately, the only location on the site that's outside of that critical radius is where the two spaces are located now. So unfortunately, at least the way that the safety standards are today, we've maxed out what we can do given the physical limitations of the site and the distance that we have to maintain from the fuel dispensing stations.

COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: That's clear. Thank you. I understand. The other question, will you be touching the gas tanks on the site? Will you be changing them out?

DJ MOORE: The underground storage tanks?

COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Yeah.

DJ MOORE: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: They will be changed?

DJ MOORE: They'll be, yeah, modernized or -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: So likely, that will be the most disruptive part of construction?

DJ MOORE: That will be the most disruptive part. That's the only major excavation that's required, and it's not -- I mean, they're not -- it's not that major of an excavation. It's only in a portion of the site.

COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Okay, thank you.

1 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Any other questions? Shall we move on to deliberation? Okay. Who'd
2 like to go first? Commissioner Matos?

3
4 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Thank you, Chair Lombardi. So I think that when we look at this
5 project, I was looking into the resolution around some of the things that address some of the
6 public comments that were raised this evening, specifically heartened by Section 5, which
7 requires a neighborhood meeting prior to demolition or construction; Section 8, which has
8 landscape maintenance requirements and cleanliness requirements; Section 9 requires public
9 safety plan and enhanced safety measures submitted to the city in advance before the certificate
10 of occupancy is issued; And Section 9, which requires noise -- which requires compliance with
11 noise standards outlined in the West Hollywood Municipal Code.

12
13 So I think that a lot of the things that have been raised have actually already been addressed in
14 the resolution, which I found to be very thorough. I want to thank the applicant for a very
15 thorough presentation and Staff for a thorough Staff report and resolution.

16
17 I think that this is a very good opportunity for us to revitalize an existing site in a meaningful
18 way, and it provides additional opportunities for public realm enhancements, EV charging and
19 such. The only two things that I would ask for consideration by the body would be including the
20 bicycle racks in the project description on the resolution, Page 13, Section 2. Under Project
21 Description, the EV charging is mentioned there, but I didn't see the bicycle racks mentioned
22 there. I think it would be great just to note it for the record.

23
24 And the other part is we heard from the applicant that they are willing to entertain EV signage
25 just so that the public is aware of this incredible public good. And I want to applaud the
26 applicant for including that, just to have that EV signage so that people know that those charging
27 opportunities are available in the rear of the property.

28
29 Other than that, I think that this opportunity, this item, makes sense. And I plan to support it, and
30 I hope to have the support from the body on those two common sense items that have been
31 agreed to by the applicant. Thank you.

32
33 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Vice Chair Gregoire?

34
35 VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: I support the two suggestions that Commissioner Matos made. I do
36 believe -- I appreciate the public speaker earlier, the concern about the disruption caused by the
37 project. But as noted, this is a lot less disruptive than a four or five-story residential building.
38 And I do believe the project will be built quickly and the disruption will be minimal.

39
40 I do believe that this is going to improve the site, and it will be an enhancement to the
41 neighborhood and raise people's property values. I don't think there's going to be any increased
42 adverse problems caused by this. And once there's an opportunity, I will support approval of
43 Staff recommendation.

44
45 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Anyone else? Commissioner Jones? And then Commissioner Solomon.

46
47 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yes, thank you.

48

1 I know this is my preferred gas station by where I live. I live a couple of blocks up Laurel. I've
2 lived on Laurel now for 14 years, and this has been my preferred gas station since I moved in. I
3 will literally drive down Laurel and take a left and then circle around the block just to be able to
4 go to this gas station. That is how much I prefer it. So I know it well.

5
6 I also walk a lot in this area. I know and patronize, I'd say, most of the businesses on the block
7 where this is, the dry cleaner, the tailor, the flower shop. There's also a nail salon there with a
8 very cute dog if you ever happen to walk by on a weekend day.

9
10 But I think, just to back up, this gas station actually underwent a little bit of renovation, I want to
11 say, about six months ago. It might have been longer than that. I'm sorry, my sense of time is a
12 little warped since the pandemic, so bear with me. But I felt a strong sense of consternation
13 because I didn't want it to go away, and I was very happy that it was not there.

14
15 I think some of my primary complaints about the site as it is currently configured is, one, there's
16 four different ways to enter and exit into this gas station, which if you've ever been to this gas
17 station, it is regularly every single pump is full. I've literally had to leave sometimes because
18 there are so many people there. So again, I know it well and I'm very happy about the fact that
19 they'll be removing two of those curb cuts to kind of help with the flow of traffic.

20
21 I'm also very happy about the fact that the proposed structure, the convenience store and cafe,
22 will be abutting the flower shop right there. Much respect to our phone-in -- or Zoom caller
23 earlier, but I actually think this is going to be a really good thing for this area.

24
25 There are a number of businesses that are open during the day that have become real destinations
26 for people, especially pedestrians. There's lots of Door Dash and stuff. There's Irv's, which has
27 really opened up the streetscape. I walked down there with my husband and our son. There's
28 Ggiata next door. There also are some things happening down at Fairfax and Santa Monica that
29 have really, I think, activated the pedestrian experience and made things a destination in a way
30 that they were not before, except maybe for people who are relying on public transportation to
31 run errands and get to work and things like that.

32
33 So I'm very much in favor of the project. I'm also in favor of Commissioner Matos' proposed
34 changes. I think that they're small, and it sounds like the applicant is very much open to
35 incorporating those. So I'm fully in support of this project. I do think it will be an improvement.
36 And again, I think that it really makes a better use of the space. I appreciate the electric charging
37 stations.

38
39 I do think -- look, this part of town in West Hollywood, we do not have a lot of options for
40 electric charging, and in fact, so much so that it has -- I have seriously had to rethink whether or
41 not I can have an electric vehicle because I don't have a place to charge it. So having an option
42 like this is a real -- I live in an apartment and I can't charge it there, an older apartment. So I'm
43 very happy about the electric charging stations being added.

44
45 I also recognize that while EVs are very popular and plug-in hybrids are very popular, lots of
46 people still drive gas-fueled vehicles. And I don't want to sound so [availing] about this
47 because yes, it is going to benefit me, but it will benefit all of us because we are all residents of
48 the city of West Hollywood up here.

1
2 So I'm very much in support of this. I could wax on, but I won't. Thank you, and happy to
3 entertain further discussion if the need arises. Thanks.

4
5 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Commissioner Solomon?

6
7 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Thank you. I'll be brief.

8
9 I support Staff's recommendation of approval of the project. I support Commissioner Matos' two
10 small additions to it. I want to thank the applicant for a really thorough presentation. Especially
11 want to thank Staff for probably one of the more thorough resolutions that I've seen, including all
12 the conditions.

13
14 I will say I do hate to see a 17,000-square foot parcel dead center in prime West Hollywood go
15 and there not be a single unit of housing on there as the state has tried to push things like AB
16 2011 to put housing in mixed use places with a ministerial permitting process on it. But I get
17 that people in the gas station business are not in the housing business, and that probably presents
18 a lot of problems to approach it that way.

19
20 But I do think that this project as presented will be an enhancement to the public realm. It will
21 help to activate the street in that area. Probably, you couldn't propose anything that would be
22 worse than the current street activation of the current site, no offense to the owner who's here.
23 So I am glad to see that it is going forward with a well thought through project.

24
25 And I especially want to give a big shout-out to Design Review, who gave the recommendation
26 to please not use palm trees. They are not trees, they are weeds. So I think that the landscaping
27 plan will be a huge improvement to that, what is otherwise just a barren concrete island right
28 now. So I will vote for this whenever someone presents a motion to do so.

29
30 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Hoopingarner?

31
32 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Yes. I would like to say that this Design Review
33 meeting was one of our best I think we've ever had in many respects. It was exactly as Design
34 Review was intended. It had a thorough conversation about the opportunities of the project and
35 resulted in a lot of creative ideas. And the applicant took them on board, and not only that, they
36 took up a notch. So you not only said, yeah, that Googie idea is kind of cool, and you
37 incorporated it in the canopy, but then you added the metal cladding that was in the cafe building
38 to incorporate it and bring it together.

39
40 So to me, that's exactly what design review is about and why we want to do it and why it's
41 important to our process. And I want to, again, thank the applicant for really engaging and
42 participating and taking on board and being creative with the ideas.

43
44 This project dramatically activates the space from what it is. It makes it more neighborhood-
45 friendly. I was literally there today picking up a pair of shoes from the shoe repair guy, and one
46 of the things we're losing is our neighborhood-serving businesses. So this is introducing two --
47 one and a half new neighborhood-serving businesses, and that's exactly what we need in this
48 space in this time. It adds considerable green space and the EV and it will be a nice addition and

1 a destination addition to Route 66. It would be very interesting to see if we can have it done in
2 time for the anniversary, and that would even address the caller's concerns. And yes, thank you
3 for removing the palms and putting in canopy trees.

4
5 I would like to say, yes, I absolutely agree with Commissioner Matos's recommendations, and if I
6 were to move this forward I would say to do that, plus simply take an X through the
7 northernmost coast live oak and replace it with a chilopsis. So you're not getting rid of the
8 number of trees, you're just replacing it with a smaller tree that would be more compatible. So if
9 I were to make the motion, I would add that third item.

10
11 And with that, I want to say thank you to all the parties for making this, I think, a better part of
12 WeHo.

13
14 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Carvalheiro?

15
16 COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Yeah. Everything's been said, but I'll just say that I truly
17 appreciate the applicant's response to Design Review. It really took all the comments into
18 consideration and did up it up a notch, so I'm very excited about that.

19
20 That one issue that I mentioned of the two pumps next to Santa Monica Boulevard, that will end
21 up being a management sort of situation. So now that you've explained the distance
22 requirements between the pumps and the EV, I get why the pumps are oriented the way they are.
23 I didn't know that before.

24
25 Yeah, and I live up the street. I am an EV -- I do own an electric car, and I go to the chargers at
26 Sunset and Laurel, so hence I just want more electric chargers in the neighborhood. So that was
27 the reason that I made the comment before. And as we transition further, hopefully more of
28 those parking spaces on the south side of the lot might be able to be converted to EV chargers.

29
30 Yeah, walking down the street, it's always interesting because the minute you hit this part of the
31 block, you're blinded by sunlight, there's no shade. It feels like a hole along Santa Monica
32 Boulevard. And this landscaping will definitely deal with that issue and just make the pedestrian
33 experience so much better.

34
35 So I'm in support of the project. I'm in support of all the comments that have been made. So
36 yeah, thank you.

37
38 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. And I see that Commissioner Matos has made a motion. Did
39 you have anything you wanted to say before that?

40
41 COMMISSIONER MATOS: No, thank you, Chair Lombardi. I mean, I would just move the
42 Staff recommendation with the two changes plus Commissioner Hoopingarner's, which has been
43 outlined, the first change being the addition of EV signage, indicating that there is EV charging
44 present for public good on the site; and the other is to include the bicycle racks in the resolution's
45 project description, specifically Page 13, Section 2.1; and then also Commissioner
46 Hoopingarner's recommendation pertaining to the tree addendum.

47
48 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. It looks like Legal has to say something. Just because I don't want

1 to vote blindly here, I really appreciated the design review process. And everything everyone
2 said up here, I would just reiterate. But the reduction of the curb cuts, the overall site and
3 landscaping improvements, the metal cladding and the incorporation of that into the design, the
4 dialogue between the canopy and the building, all of that was really amazing to see it come
5 through. So I commend the applicant for that, and I'm generally in support of both the project
6 and the comments that came from Commissioner Matos and Hoopingarner as well.

7
8 And I know we've got a motion, and Legal would like to say something.

9
10 ISAAC ROSEN: I would, yes. Okay. So with our pending motion, and just for what
11 Commissioner Matos read into the record and in advance of a second, what we may suggest for
12 that pending motion, and this is a rearticulation in some ways to what Commissioner Matos said,
13 is that under the project description, under Section 2.1 of the resolution, to add reference to the
14 bike racks under a new Subsection G of that condition 2.1, we would state that the motion
15 reflects the applicant's intent to create signage for the two EV charging stations on the project
16 site available for the public; and finally amend the approved project materials and submitted
17 plans to allow that of the two coastal live oak canopy trees that may include a single live oak
18 canopy tree and discretion of a second city-approved different species of tree. And all other
19 references and obligations with respect to canopy trees would remain the same.

20
21 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Sorry, that was not my motion. My motion was to do a
22 chilopsis, just like the other chilopsis along the south border and not a city-approved tree because
23 that would -- aesthetically, that would introduce a third thing that wouldn't work in that space;
24 and to be specific, that the tree to be replaced would be the one to the northwest because it's the
25 one closest to the sidewalk.

26
27 ISAAC ROSEN: So I would suggest -- and I know we have a pending motion, but no second. I
28 would just ask the applicant to confirm they're okay with a chilopsis.

29
30 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: chilopsis.

31
32 ISAAC ROSEN: chilopsis, yes. It's not my native tongue. chilopsis.

33
34 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: If you look on L1.1, it's the best place for everybody to
35 see it.

36
37 ISAAC ROSEN: L1.1. So yeah, I would just ask. And we've got a confirmation from the
38 audience -- or applicant.

39
40 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: As long as it's not a palm tree.

41
42 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: It's a desert willow.

43
44 ISAAC ROSEN: Okay. So with that confirmation from the applicant, the first two points
45 attached to Commissioner Matos' motion about Section 2.1 and new Subsection G, that the
46 motion reflects applicant's intent to create signage for the two EV charging stations on the project
47 site for the public and amend the approved project materials and submitted plans so that the live
48 oak canopy tree that's on the most north -- I'm looking at you, Commissioner Hoopingarner.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: The northwest tree. There's two trees. One's here, one's here. The northwest tree would be replaced with a chilopsis.

ISAAC ROSEN: The northwest coastal live oak would be replaced with a chilopsis tree. And that would be the third condition.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Common name, desert willow.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Is the motion maker okay with the clarifications from Legal?

COMMISSIONER MATOS: Yes. Yes, yes.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Do we have a second? Commissioner Carvalho has seconded the motion. And are we --

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: [Indiscernible].

DAVID GILLIG: Chair the --

CHAIR LOMBARDI: No, I never saw it. I never saw it. I'm sorry. I was wondering.

Yeah, we continue to have issues up here because mine says Matos.

DAVID GILLIG: And the motion passes unanimously with seven ayes. We do have an appeal process for this item. The resolution number PC25-1605 the Planning Commission just approved for the property located at 8020 Santa Monica Boulevard memorializes the Commission's final action on this matter. This action is subject to appeal to the City Council.

Appeals must be submitted within 10 calendar days from this date to the city clerk's office. Appeals must be in writing and accompanied by the required fees. The city clerk's office can provide appeal forms and information about waiver of fees. And the appeal deadline will be Monday, June 16, 2025 at 5:00 p.m.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Do my colleagues -- I was going to ask if my colleagues would like a brief break.

DAVID GILLIG: Chair, Staff would request a break. We need to test a public hearing item for the next presentation to make sure it's legal. So a break would be --

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Let's aim for seven minutes. Okay.

(Break)

CHAIR LOMBARDI: -- to begin our second public hearing of the evening. This is Item 10A, 8300 Sunset Boulevard. 10B, sorry, Item 10B, 8300 Sunset Boulevard. This is a public hearing to consider proposed request to renovate the designated local cultural resource with a new rooftop deck and increase the total outdoor area where the accessory sales service and

1 consumption of alcohol is permitted for the hotel use. And we will begin with a Staff report.

2
3 DOUG VU: Great. Good evening, Commissioners, Doug Vu with Department Staff. So okay,
4 looks like VPN is going in and out. All right. Okay.

5
6 So the item before you is a request to construct alterations to the exterior of the building that
7 includes a new rooftop deck and a permit to expand the outdoor area for the accessory sales
8 service and consumption of alcohol at the hotel located at 8300 Sunset Boulevard. There we go.

9
10 Okay. So the subject property is located at the southeast corner of Sunset Boulevard and
11 Sweetzer Avenue. It is within the Sunset specific plan and is surrounded by commercial uses to
12 the north, commercial and high-density residential to the east, high-density residential to the
13 south and William S. Hart Park to the west. And my internet keeps going in and out. I
14 apologize. Okay. Let's try it again.

15
16 So the property is [improved] with a U-shaped three-story hotel building that was constructed in
17 1962 as the Thunderbird Inn, but was converted to a senior care facility in 1968. It was
18 eventually converted back to a hotel. That opened as the Standard Hotel in 1999, and it operated
19 until it was permanently closed in early 2021.

20
21 So in addition to the guest rooms, the building contains a restaurant, a nightclub, an outdoor pool
22 and deck area and a two-level subterranean garage. And more recently in 2022, the property was
23 designated as a West Hollywood local cultural resource.

24
25 So in preparation for reopening of the hotel use, the new owner initiated a multiphase renovation
26 plan that included the reconstruction of the interior guest rooms beginning in 2023 as part of
27 Phase I, which was then followed by the reconstruction of the interior lobby, restaurant,
28 nightclub and bar. And that work began in mid-2024 as Phase II, which brings us to the final and
29 third phase of the project being proposed tonight, which includes the construction of a rooftop
30 deck, other minor exterior alterations to the building and a conditional use permit amendment to
31 allow the accessory sales and service of alcohol on the deck as part of the hotel's daily
32 operations.

33
34 So the new 14,000-square foot deck would include approximately 9,388 square feet of amenity
35 space; elevator bulkheads and stairwell extensions to provide rooftop access; and six-foot tall
36 glass sound barriers along the east, south and west perimeters of the building and, obviously, the
37 associated mechanical equipment and screening that would be required for the operation of the
38 building.

39
40 So as part of the hotel's normal operations, the deck would be available only to people staying at
41 the hotel and their guests. They would be permitted to consume alcohol on the rooftop that is
42 purchased at the bar downstairs or through room service, and so there will not be a permanent
43 bar on the rooftop. Ambient music would be provided using speakers installed on the deck to
44 produce amplified sound that would be positioned to limit noise spillover and comply with the
45 city's noise ordinance.

46
47 So as currently conditioned for the existing outdoor pool deck at the ground floor, the operating
48 hours for the roof deck would remain the same. And that would be between 9:00 a.m. and

1 midnight Sunday through Wednesday and 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. between Thursday through
2 Saturday.

3
4 As part of the hotel's normal operations, the rooftop deck can also be booked for private
5 gatherings and events that may use a temporary roll-out bar for alcohol sales and service, and the
6 maximum occupancy would be 399 people. However, these private events cannot include live
7 entertainment without a special events permit. And the hotel can receive up to 16 of these
8 special events permits per calendar year, which are approved by the city's Neighborhood and
9 Business Safety Division.

10
11 So to ensure the potential noise impacts from human activity and the use of amplified speakers
12 on the rooftop would not create a nuisance, a noise analysis was conducted using a three-
13 dimensional model to determine the maximum sound levels that the rooftop deck could generate
14 that would not be considered annoying or described in our ordinance as plainly audible at the
15 nearest residential properties on Sweetzer and De Longpre between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and
16 8:00 a.m. in accordance with the city's noise control ordinance.

17
18 So these thresholds are 71 decibels during daytime hours daily and 57 decibels during nighttime
19 hours beginning at midnight Sunday through Wednesday and beginning at 2:00 a.m. Thursday
20 through Saturday. So operation of the deck at these maximum noise levels would not be plainly
21 audible at the neighboring residential properties, where the sound level limit is 36 decibels.

22
23 So the hotel will operate with a full valet service for guests arriving and departing in private
24 vehicles, and guests using rideshare services for pickup and drop off would utilize the on-street
25 curb space on Sunset Boulevard. So to assess the additional parking demand that would be
26 generated by private events and the hotel operating at full capacity, a queuing analysis for the
27 valet operations was conducted, which determined that under the highest demand conditions on a
28 typical Saturday during the beginning of an event at 7:00 p.m. and the hotel at 100% occupancy,
29 a total of 97 vehicles would utilize valet service that would require seven attendants to avoid
30 queues extending onto Sunset Boulevard. So to ensure that valet service will always
31 accommodate the parking demand and the queue does not extend beyond the onsite valet service
32 area, a condition of approval in the draft resolution requires that the parking operations plan
33 always have the necessary number of valet attendants on duty.

34
35 So moving back to the other physical improvements to the building. They include the addition
36 of new steps and metal railing at the entry platform for the relocated main entrance and the
37 adjacent exit door. There's going to be the demolition of nonhistoric glass screens that are
38 adjacent to the entrance. The porte-cochere entrance of the hotel, the roof of that would be faux-
39 planted. And along the secondary and rear elevations of the building, the project will add painted
40 metal screens at the basement levels.

41
42 And so as a cultural resource, these proposed exterior alterations, including the rooftop deck,
43 require the approval of a certificate of appropriateness under the city's preservation ordinance.
44 And one of the required findings for C of A includes the project's conformance to the Secretary
45 of Interior's standards and guidelines for rehabilitation. So these proposed alterations do
46 conform to all of those required findings. And last month, the Historic Preservation Commission
47 recommended unanimously that the Planning Commission approve this C of A.

1 So in summary, this proposed final phase for the renovation of the existing hotel to add a new
2 rooftop deck, construct the minor exterior alterations and increase the outdoor area where the
3 accessory sales and service and consumption of alcohol is permitted will reestablish a long-time
4 use of this property that contributes to the character of the Sunset Strip while also preserving the
5 historic integrity of the building.

6
7 So as conditioned, the operation of this hotel would be consistent with the intent and objective
8 standards of the zoning ordinance and the general plan. And Staff recommends that the Planning
9 Commission approve this project and adopt the draft resolution.

10
11 So this concludes Staff's presentation, and I am available for questions.

12
13 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Are there any disclosures? No disclosures? Any questions
14 for Staff, clarification type questions? No? Okay. Oh, Commissioner Hoopingarner?

15
16 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. My first question is about the studies. For all of
17 our CEQA analysis, the consultants must be selected by the city. Were these consultants selected
18 by the city?

19
20 DOUG VU: So these studies weren't done to satisfy CEQA.

21
22 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I understand that, but I'm just --

23
24 DOUG VU: No, these consultants were selected by the applicant.

25
26 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: By the applicant, okay.

27
28 DOUG VU: Correct.

29
30 JENNIFER ALKIRE: And I would just add that that is standard practice for a noise study for
31 this type of thing. Most CEQA studies we do contract. But for these types of things, the
32 applicant can.

33
34 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. So the same threshold for independence does
35 not pertain to this as it does to a CEQA project. Thank you.

36
37 I'd like to start with asking questions about the valet queue study. And on Page 4, there's an
38 assumption that of the 399 guests, 160 are going to arrive by vehicle, and those will all be two
39 people per car. I'd like to understand the basis for that assumption. And how is that shown to be
40 true in other events in other hotels along the strip?

41
42 I mean, this conversation came up actually, believe it or not, when the House of Blues was
43 approved, and the assumption was made that people were going to come two to a car and it
44 proved to be categorically false. So the reason I'm asking is we've got history of this not being
45 true. So what was the basis for this assumption?

46
47 DOUG VU: Commissioner Hoopingarner, since this is a pretty detailed technical question, the
48 applicant's traffic consultant is here this evening and will be able to answer your question.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, good. But I'm assuming that Staff reviewed the assumptions and is in agreement with the assumptions?

DOUG VU: Staff reviewed the assumptions, yes, --

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: And is in --

DOUG VU: -- and is in general agreement with them.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

DOUG VU: But then again, I am not a traffic consultant.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, thank you. Given that in that assumption on Page 4 it is that 120 of the 399 guests are going to be already guests of the hotel and therefore not have a car, does this assumption apply to all of the events? And is there any anticipation of a requirement that if you're going to book an event, there should be an X percentage of a hotel rooms booked for the guests of that event in order to somehow come in agreement with this assumption?

JENNIFER ALKIRE: I think a lot of these questions are technical and can be answered by the applicant's consultant, but I would say that most of these assumptions are just that. They're assumptions, and they're based for generalities and they're not for very specific types of events. Some events will have more cars and some events will have fewer cars, and we can't really anticipate every single nuance of that. But they're trying to base assumptions on what they see in the field and create a situation that's going to function for the majority of the time.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. So the fact that the study assumed that all the events would end at 10:00 p.m. even though the applicant's asking for 2:00 a.m. hours, so there was no disconnect there?

DOUG VU: Can you identify where that sentence is, Commissioner Hoopingarner, so I can take a look at it?

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Oh, goodness. I mean, you've got it online, Google, 10:00 p.m. Yeah, right there in the scenario, right on the cover page. Oh, excuse me, Page 3, the scenario, "and the event's conclusion at 10:00 p.m." So that's under the assumptions, scenario, and it's the last sentence.

It's saying that the assumption is that all the events will end at 10:00 p.m., and yet the conditions you're proposing is that the events would be able to run until 2:00 a.m. So again, I'm trying to understand that, especially given that 2:00 a.m. is when all the bars close and when the traffic changes on the boulevard, and therefore my question.

DOUG VU: Correct. I think that it's just based upon the applicant's experience with their existing hotels that typically special events generally start at 7:00 p.m. and the majority of them

1 conclude at 10:00 p.m. But that's not to say that there won't be events that continue beyond
2 10:00 p.m.

3
4 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

5
6 ISAAC ROSEN: And Commissioner Hoopingarner, and I would add, I think just based on the
7 way the hearing will be structured, to the extent that applicant has their own technical experts, it
8 may -- some of those questions that are less clarification questions may be answered as part of
9 the applicant's presentation.

10
11 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Sure. There's just kind of the Staff's understanding
12 component and then the actual technical side of it, so I'm trying to get both parts of it here. So
13 moving along.

14
15 How many metered spaces on Sunset is Staff proposing to dedicate to this project?

16
17 DOUG VU: So this would be at the option of the applicant based upon the demand. They would
18 be able to request the use of those meters from the city and would be charged the appropriate fee
19 to do so.

20
21 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: But throughout the Staff report, I couldn't see a count of
22 the number of meters that they would be allowed.

23
24 DOUG VU: I believe it's up to three.

25
26 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, thank you. So there was a queuing study for the
27 valet, but there was no parking study. So we're talking about an additional 399 people. I
28 understand there is, depending on how you pencil it, now an excess number of parking spaces in
29 the garage given the hotel's original approval and what's needed now, et cetera.

30
31 But we're talking 400 people in addition. If you have a full hotel full of guests, is there adequate
32 parking? Because that would impact the queuing if all of a sudden there's no place to put the
33 cars. And is there any plan for overflow parking? Because I couldn't find that anywhere in the
34 Staff report or the resolutions.

35
36 DOUG VU: So the applicant performed this queuing analysis based upon the existing number of
37 parking spaces that the hotel has. It took into account how many of those spaces would be used
38 by hotel guests in addition to how many spaces would be needed to accommodate these special
39 events. And that was -- those numbers were used to determine that based upon the anticipated
40 demand at the most highest level, which is Saturday at 7:00 p.m., that if there were seven valet
41 attendants on duty, that that would provide the sufficient amount of service to accommodate
42 those vehicles on site without having to have the vehicles queue onto Sunset Boulevard.

43
44 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So if 250 vehicles show up for a 400-people event,
45 where will the cars go?

46
47 DOUG VU: I think that if there is demand for additional parking that is not available on site, the
48 applicant would need to make other plans to provide that parking, whether it's through a parking

1 use permit or through some other means.

2
3 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: But it's not addressed in these --

4
5 DOUG VU: No, it's not.

6
7 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, thank you.

8
9 DOUG VU: -- because this is an existing use.

10
11 CHAIR LOMBARDI: This seems like something the applicant would know their property and
12 be better equipped to answer.

13
14 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Well, but we also have ordinances about parking, so I
15 want to make sure that we're covering those. Thank you.

16
17 So quickly, I'm trying to move through this, the noise study. It shows that between the hours of
18 10:00 and 2:00, the noise levels will exceed the code maximum, including an unusual spike at
19 2:00 a.m. What other rooftop venues have been granted a variance to exceed code maximum
20 noise ordinances?

21
22 DOUG VU: Commissioner Hoopingarner, to my understanding, the proposed use would not
23 exceed noise levels.

24
25 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Page 2 of the exhibit to the summary on the noise
26 shows at 10:00 that the code maximum is 43 decibels, and yet both measurements of background
27 and ambient noise are 48 and 53 respectively. So that is in excess of the code maximum. And if
28 you look down the page, 10:00, 11:00, 12:00, 1:00 and 2:00, they're all in excess of the code
29 maximum.

30
31 So hence my question, when have we, in other instances similar to this, granted a variance
32 against the code maximum?

33
34 DOUG VU: To my knowledge, Commissioner Hoopingarner, the city has not. But if I may
35 clarify, the sound levels that you identify on Page 2, those are the ambient sound levels measured
36 at the residences, not the sound levels that the roof deck would be permitted to emit.

37
38 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I'm sorry, I'm lost in a couple of ways. What document are we looking
39 at?

40
41 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I'm looking at the attachment --

42
43 CHAIR LOMBARDI: That's what I have.

44
45 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So it's --

46
47 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Not Page 2, Page 4?

48

1 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: -- Exhibit E. It's Exhibit E. And so Kimley-Horn did a
2 summary, and then they have attached the actual original study.

3
4 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Sorry, what page number?

5
6 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: It's Page 4 -- 2.

7
8 CHAIR LOMBARDI: 4? Page 4? Okay.

9
10 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Well the, yeah, Document #2, Page 2, sorry, of the
11 Trinity Consultants document. There's a chart right at the top of the page. So you're saying that
12 those decibel levels are the decibels being heard at the residences?

13
14 DOUG VU: Correct.

15
16 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: And those exceed the code maximum and that's okay?

17
18 DOUG VU: They do not. Commissioner Hoopingarner, if you look at the very last page of that
19 exhibit, there is a table that identifies what the maximum ambient sound levels at the residential
20 properties would be during the day and in the evening. And then next to it in green would be the
21 ambient sound levels at those residential properties when the roof is operating at the maximum
22 sound levels.

23
24 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So you're talking about the chart at the bottom of Page
25 4?

26
27 DOUG VU: No, I'm talking about the table on the very last page of the exhibit, the very last
28 page, so past all of the diagrams and the drawings on the very last page.

29
30 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. So --

31
32 DOUG VU: So the two columns on the left identify what the maximum sound level limits are,
33 and the two columns on the right identify what those sound levels would be when the roof deck
34 is operating at those maximum decibels that are identified in the Staff report, which is 71
35 decibels during the day and 57 decibels in the evening.

36
37 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I think I'm -- you're talking about this right here?

38
39 DOUG VU: Yes. Yes.

40
41 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I don't see 71 on this page at all.

42
43 DOUG VU: I'm sorry, it's a little bit confusing. So those numbers are the ambient noise levels
44 measured at the sensitive receptors. However, the rooftop with its sound equipment can operate
45 with sound levels that are much higher, where the source is.

46
47 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Understood.

48

1 DOUG VU: So at the source, it's 71 decibels. Then you have sound walls that mitigate some of
2 that, you've got the topography, the downhill topography that reduces some of that. So by the
3 time that 71 decibels reaches the residential properties on Sweetzer and De Longpre, those noise
4 levels will be reduced down to between 48 decibels during the day and 36 decibels in the
5 evening, which fall under the thresholds that have been established.

6
7 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

8
9 CHAIR LOMBARDI: If I may, I'm sorry, but I just want to --

10
11 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I'll save the rest of my questions for the applicant.

12
13 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I really don't want this to turn into a lesson in acoustics today. I wouldn't
14 want lighting design to be the topic either.

15
16 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Well, I think it's going to be one of the --

17
18 CHAIR LOMBARDI: So if there's technical questions, we can proceed with the meeting and
19 then we can delve into those when we have time. But I want to be cognizant of how many
20 people we have here today.

21
22 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Yes.

23
24 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you.

25
26 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: My last two questions relate to the landscaping of the
27 roof and Page L400. Why does it cite LA City Municipal Code? And what would be the
28 appropriate code for it to cite for West Hollywood?

29
30 DOUG VU: I imagine, Commissioner Hoopingarner, that is an error on the applicant's part. We
31 are obviously not in the City of LA, so this project would not be subject to LA's code.

32
33 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: And so when Staff reviewed this, there wasn't any
34 appropriate West Hollywood code that would address the same issues?

35
36 DOUG VU: So the West Hollywood Municipal Code states that landscaping will be provided
37 for projects at the entitlement stage. The applicant is required to provide preliminary landscape
38 plans. And when the project goes through plan review check, that's when the landscape plans
39 would need to be stamped by a landscape architect and would be reviewed for consistency with
40 any other regulatory requirements.

41
42 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. In our emails, you mentioned that the
43 landscaping is not, in fact, sod, but is being proposed to be plastic turf?

44
45 DOUG VU: Correct. The walking surface of the deck is going to be artificial turf.

46
47 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. Has that been reviewed by the urban designer to
48 make sure that it complies with the city's sustainability goals?

1
2 DOUG VU: I did not have this project reviewed by the city's urban designer. But in terms of the
3 city's sustainability goals, I think that since these areas will be heavily traversed, the applicant
4 believed, and Staff agrees, that the use of artificial turf would be a much preferable material than
5 actual grass.

6
7 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. That's it for now. Thank you.

8
9 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Any other questions for Staff? Okay, then we'll move on to the
10 applicant presentation. Please state your name and city of residence. And you will have 10
11 minutes to speak.

12
13 ANDREW BRADY: Good evening, Commissioners, Andrew Brady, resident of the City of Los
14 Angeles here representing the applicant for the project, 8300 Sunset Development LLC.

15
16 First I'd like to say we fully concur with the Staff report and just want to have a show of
17 appreciation for Staff. We work in a lot of cities, and West Hollywood has one of the best
18 planning Staffs around, so you should be very proud.

19
20 Here on behalf of Ian Schrager Company, that's the developer of this project, as you may know,
21 Ian is a pioneer of the boutique hotel movement, starting in the mid-1980s and has since
22 continued to create dozens of the highest quality hotels around the globe. Simply put, Ian is one
23 of the world's great hoteliers. His minimalist aesthetic and tasteful modern design and touches
24 have been widely celebrated. He's also led the way with including greater amenity spaces with
25 beautiful common areas and places for guests to gather and recreate, and these trends have
26 caught on industry-wide.

27
28 Ian Schrager Company has proven itself to be a thought leader in continually reinventing the
29 hospitality industry. The brand here is -- the newest brand of the Ian Schrager Company is
30 Public. The hotel here will fly the Public flag. And again, Ian Schrager's inventing a new type of
31 hotel experience. This is for grownups who want to experience great spaces, a quiet, peaceful,
32 thoughtful environment. The brand is oriented towards a true luxury experience for business
33 travelers and other boutique hotel customers, but the point here is to really deliver that
34 experience with a more reasonable price point than standard luxury offerings.

35
36 When it comes to this property at 8300 Sunset, Ian Schrager's plan from day one was to utilize
37 the existing building. At no point was a demo and rebuild part of the plan. And this is a building
38 with a long history in the city. It was originally constructed as the Thunderbird Inn in 1962, it
39 was a senior living facility between 1968 and 1995, it was reopened as a hotel in 1999 and that
40 hotel shut down in 2020. So it's been almost five years since this building has been vacant.

41
42 This building is a designated historic resource. Ian Schrager Company was a big supporter of the
43 local historic designation of the building. There was a community-led effort in 2022 to designate
44 the building as a city cultural resource. At that time, Ian Schrager Company was in the process
45 of purchasing the building, but had not yet purchased it. Ian Schrager Company made it a
46 condition of closing that the owner at the time not oppose the designation.

47
48 So from the start, Ian Schrager's intention was to rehabilitate and revive this building, which as

1 noted in the prior slide, has been closed and shut down for nearly five years. And when Ian
2 Schragger purchased the hotel, there were choices to make. One of the choices was adding new
3 rooms by adding an extra floor to the building. But ultimately, the decision was made to not add
4 height, but instead to maintain the building's original form.

5
6 But this decision came at a cost, literally entailed giving up revenue. And as this restoration
7 work has continued, as Staff mentioned, this is an ongoing project, the cost of doing the work has
8 continued to increase beyond the original projections. And I do want to emphasize that the work
9 includes significant structural upgrades to the building to ensure its long-term viability.

10
11 Since there was no room anywhere else in the building or on the lot, adding amenity space to the
12 roof became the chosen means by which value could be added without altering the historic look
13 and feel of the building. The building has no open amenity or conference room space, so this
14 rooftop is a critical part of the business plan of ensuring the financial success of the hotel and its
15 competitiveness in the marketplace, which includes several newer larger hotels along the Sunset
16 Strip with significant gathering conference spaces and roof decks.

17
18 So the roof provides a quiet space for guests to do yoga, walk, read a book, recreate in our
19 famously great weather. And activating the rooftop space is critical to ensuring the financial
20 success of the hotel restoration endeavor.

21
22 And beyond that, this hotel is going to be a huge draw and a means of maintaining and yet again
23 revitalizing the area as an economic and cultural hub.

24
25 Did I get kicked off the Zoom? I think I got kicked off the Zoom. Let's try that -- okay, let's try
26 that again. Okay, back on? Okay.

27
28 So as Staff alluded to, the work on the hotel is ongoing. The building is already authorized to
29 operate as a hotel with alcohol service under CUPs issued in the mid-'90s. It is currently
30 undergoing a gut renovation. We were here before this commission one year ago on the
31 modification of the alcohol CUP on the reconfiguration of the ground floor. And as noted just
32 last month, the Historic Preservation Commission recommended approval of a certificate of
33 appropriateness for the hotel roof activation and the minor facade and other design changes
34 before the commission today as noted. And here you see, this is the plan for the rooftop. This
35 thing's got a bit of a lag on it.

36
37 Staff showed you this. This is the activation of the space. So the total squarage is of the
38 landscaped area on the roof is 1,406 square feet. There's 9,388 feet are traversable by people.
39 This is, as mentioned, a guest amenity. It's not going to be open to the public generally. Key
40 card access will be required.

41
42 The use of alcohol will generally entail guests bringing up drinks from downstairs if they so
43 choose, but alcohol sales are also requested. There is no permanent bar proposed, but there will
44 be a roll-out bar that can be used for guest events. For instance, if a conference is in town, a
45 company that buys a block of rooms at the hotel may want to have a meeting or host an event on
46 the roof, and a rollout bar would be available for that as mentioned.

47
48 And we do have good answers for all of the questions that you asked, but the noise levels on the

1 roof are controlled by a condition of approval with maximum noise levels based on a technical
2 noise analysis that demonstrated what noise levels can occur on the roof that will fully comply
3 with the city's general plan and noise ordinance standards. And they do comply, and we will
4 explain exactly how and why.

5
6 So finally, in addition to the CUP amendment, one of the requests here is for a certificate of
7 appropriateness. As noted, the Historic Preservation Commission has recommended approval of
8 the certificate of appropriateness based on their determination that the work here is consistent
9 with the Secretary of Interior standards. We also note that the National Park Service has
10 determined that the project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards as part of their
11 approval of historic tax credits for the building. They are, of course, the agency that drafts and
12 enforces the Secretary's standards. They are the authoritative source.

13
14 The changes to the building are ultimately minor and cosmetic. The basic form of the building
15 and its character-defining features are maintained and in many ways enhanced by the design.
16 The work, as mentioned, consists of a new roof, extending existing stairs and elevators up to
17 access the new roof, minor modifications to the sunset entry that preserves the existing
18 fenestration, new mechanical and screening, a faux green roof on the portcouchere and new
19 landscaping and irrigation. Again, these changes preserve and enhance the overall form and key
20 character-defining features of the building as determined by both the Historic Preservation
21 Commission and the National Parks Department.

22
23 This project is validly exempt from CEQA. There are two different exemptions that apply as
24 indicated by Staff, which is the Class 1 exemption, which are minor changes to existing
25 buildings; and the Class 31 exemption, which applies to the rehabilitation of historic buildings.
26 Both apply, so the request is that both be adopted.

27
28 And that ends our main presentation, but we did hear the Commissioner's questions. And we do
29 have our noise consultant, we have our traffic consultant, we have our landscape consultant and
30 we have our architect here. And we are happy to answer each and every one of your technical
31 questions.

32
33 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Are there any questions for the applicant? I actually have
34 one or two just that may be a benefit in case it influences what the public wants to note. Does
35 anyone want to go before me, though? No? Okay.

36
37 Can you just remind me, how many keys is the hotel room?

38
39 ANDREW BRADY: The total number? 137.

40
41 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I remember it changed, but --

42
43 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah.

44
45 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, 137. And then I guess I'm wondering, since it seemed in the Staff
46 report that only visitors and their guests will be using the roof, is that correct?

47
48 ANDREW BRADY: For the most part, although --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Other than events?

ANDREW BRADY: If they have an event and there's invitees of guests who want to come to the event, they all have to be sort of -- they have to be part of an event. Even for an event, it's not open to the public.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: How is that monitored in a day-to-day? There's no event -- if it's hotel visitors and their guests, is there --

ANDREW BRADY: It's key card entry to get in there most of the time.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Key card entry, okay.

ANDREW BRADY: So the public will not be able to access it. Key card entry at the elevator and at -- yeah.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. And then what is the typical use case scenario where someone is using the roof, they're a hotel guest or they brought a friend over, and they're consuming alcohol as well? Can you help me understand since there's no bar up there?

ANDREW BRADY: There's a bar downstairs. And there's no -- this is all onsite consumption. So what we would anticipate would be there's a bar downstairs, guests would buy drinks. They'd be able to take those drinks up to the roof the same way they'd be able to take them anywhere else on the premises.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: And they wouldn't be -- no one would be taking orders and bringing them upstairs to them?

ANDREW BRADY: Like with room service?

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Room service or whatever you want to call it, someone that's on staff that would be asking them if they want a drink order and then bringing the drink up. There are other properties that do that.

ANDREW BRADY: Yeah. I don't know that that's been ruled out, but it's not currently part of the operational plan. But I don't think it's been ruled out as an option.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Anyone else have questions before public comment?
Commissioner Hoopingarner?

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Yes, thank you. Just for the numbers, it's 137 rooms and how many parking spaces?

ANDREW BRADY: 139, but it is 100% valet, so they can pack the spaces in there.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: They can block it, yeah.

1 ANDREW BRADY: And just so you -- we do have our parking consultant. LAZ is our parking
2 consultant and parking operator, and they're here as well to answer questions. And we do have
3 thoughtful answers on overflow parking, on staffing and how that's going to be managed and
4 handled within the condition of approval. And the condition of approval requires no queuing,
5 and we have a plan for ensuring no queuing across just about any eventuality that might actually
6 come up.

7
8 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. To Chair Lombardi's question about who's
9 hosting events, and so if someone wanted to have a birthday party and they rented a hotel room
10 and they could have a birthday party for 400 people, it would be required, though, that at least
11 one of those persons be a hotel guest?

12
13 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, the only people who can hold events would be guests.

14
15 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Guests.

16
17 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah.

18
19 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

20
21 ANDREW BRADY: And it would be hotel managed. There's not going to be third-party
22 promoters or anything like that. It's all managed through the hotel.

23
24 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, thank you. So back to the queuing. What is the
25 basis for the assumption that 30% of all the event guests will already be in the hotel? Because
26 that dramatically impacts the number of vehicles you're not including in the queuing analysis.
27 So I'm trying to understand what's the genesis of that.

28
29 ANDREW BRADY: It's a data-backed approach based on data that's provided by the Urban
30 Land Institute. So it's just -- everything in the study is based on -- it's all data-based.

31
32 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: But is it generic hotel or is it Sunset Strip Hotel data?
33 Because they are very different.

34
35 ANDREW BRADY: I think the ULI data is generic data. We didn't go and go around to the
36 different hotels and do any data collection at the hotels. We're relying on the ULI data.

37
38 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. I mean, because Mr. Schragger does own a hotel
39 just a few feet down the road. That was my question.

40
41 ANDREW BRADY: They don't operate it though.

42
43 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. All right. The noise study is based upon there
44 being sod on the roof. And now we know that it's not going to be sod, it's going to be plastic turf.
45 So my question for the noise expert is, what does that do to the analysis? Because sod has a
46 considerably different absorptive factor than a plastic grass.

47
48 ANDREW BRADY: It doesn't make a difference. It's the concrete underneath that absorbs the

1 sound. So if you were to have an inch of sod versus AstroTurf, which does have sublayers and is
2 multilayered, it's not going to impact.

3
4 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: It's not? None? Okay.

5
6 ANDREW BRADY: Not at all, no.

7
8 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

9
10 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Are you sure?

11
12 ANDREW BRADY: Yes.

13
14 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: It sounds a little suspect to me. I mean, sod is
15 considerably more sound absorptive.

16
17 ANDREW BRADY: I don't know that the sod was even taken -- the sod's not taken into account
18 in the actual modeling. It takes into account the existence of the concrete.

19
20 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Well, it said so in the memo. That's why I asked.

21
22 ANDREW BRADY: It's assumed in the memo, I think, but it would not make any difference
23 whatsoever with the ultimate analysis. It's the noise barrier, the concrete building and the
24 distance between that ultimately determines the noise dampening. No noise dampening credit is
25 given for grass or sod.

26
27 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Is this best addressed by the noise consultant?

28
29 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah --

30
31 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: It says here, the materiality is that the rooftop floor is
32 defined as grass as shown in the design presentation, and that's why I asked the question, that it's
33 defined as grass and that's part of their assumption in their methodology and now it's not grass.
34 So that's why I'm asking the question.

35
36 ANDREW BRADY: It doesn't change the outcome of the analysis.

37
38 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. And the noise consultant agrees with you?

39
40 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, and she -- if you want to have her come up, she's -- and you want to
41 hear it directly? Don't take it from me.

42
43 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Well, you know, that's the expert, so I'd like to hear it
44 from the expert. So okay, fine.

45
46 ANDREW BRADY: She's here to answer questions if needed.

47
48 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Are you proposing the use of any pergolas, umbrellas,

1 tents, et cetera, on the roof?

2

3 ANDREW BRADY: Not at this time, no.

4

5 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Really?

6

7 ANDREW BRADY: I mean, if there's seating and umbrellas -- I think we'd have to come back if
8 we're going to propose anything that's going to be any kind of permanent cover.

9

10 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I ask because I actually used to live at the White House,
11 which is kitty corner from this project on De Longpre. My unit had a balcony that looked out to
12 the south. I couldn't use my balcony a large chunk of the year. It was either too cold and windy
13 or too hot, and I had an overhang.

14

15 So that space is going to be, at night, cold and windy, and during the day, especially with
16 AstroTurf, is going to be hot. So I ask because I just see in the future a request for some sort of
17 covering material. And that's why I'm asking, should it be addressed now?

18

19 ANDREW BRADY: It's a fair question, and I think it's something we'd give some thought to. I
20 think we'd come back if there was a request for covering.

21

22 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. What rooftop construction is currently in
23 process? Because one of the letters we received said that it's already in construction.

24

25 ANDREW BRADY: So there is permitted work occurring on some of the electrical systems, but
26 none of the work that is associated with the activation is occurring right now. But there's
27 mechanical equipment. There's the need to extend the elevator. So there is certain work that is
28 occurring, but most of the work is interior. And all of the work that's been permitted is below the
29 parapet.

30

31 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. Your noise study says that you met with the
32 stakeholders, that the consultants met with the stakeholders. Who are the stakeholders that they
33 met with?

34

35 ANDREW BRADY: Can you point me to where in the study you're talking about?

36

37 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: The introductory paragraph on the Trinity memo. Right
38 at the beginning, it says, "This report was submitted to stakeholders, and a meeting took place on
39 11/6/24 to discuss. Based upon these discussions, edits were made to the acoustic model and
40 analysis of hourly ambient noises." So my question is --

41

42 ANDREW BRADY: I believe when we were here last, some neighbors had reached out when
43 we were here for the interior CUP. And there were some meetings with some of the individuals
44 who had reached out who live in the neighborhood.

45

46 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, so they were -- the stakeholders were neighbors?
47 That's my question.

48

1 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, yeah. So the stakeholders were neighbors who live across the street
2 down the way. And there was a couple individuals, I don't know if you remember when here a
3 year ago, who came and spoke. We got their contact information and had discussions with them
4 just about what their experience is, and that informed the analysis that Longman Lindsey did on
5 the noise.

6
7 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Great. That was my concern, is that when you said
8 stakeholders, it included the neighbors. That's all.

9
10 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah. It was neighbors and it was business people as well.

11
12 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Sure.

13
14 ANDREW BRADY: I think there was -- yeah.

15
16 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, thank you. My next noise question is that based
17 upon the imagery provided in Page 8 of the Trinity document, it looks like a couple dozen
18 people, but we're talking about 399 people. So did the study model include 399 people?

19
20 ANDREW BRADY: It did, yeah, included the full occupancy. And that's indicated in the report.

21
22 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, because it didn't seem to look like that.

23
24 ANDREW BRADY: I don't know that each one of these little dots represents an individual
25 person. It was the locations based on the occupancy limits in each of those areas.

26
27 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: In each of the -- okay, because I'm personally having a
28 difficult time understanding how 400 people, that's three times more people than fit in here, are
29 going to only have a decibel level across the street at the same -- 57 is normal conversation. And
30 when you have, let's say, 200 conversations going on at the same time at 1:00 in the morning in
31 our very quiet neighborhoods, where sound carries -- that's why I'm trying to really understand
32 the impact to the neighborhood of the 300 people -- or, excuse me, 400 people.

33
34 ANDREW BRADY: Understood.

35
36 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: And so you're saying that that does address the 400
37 people?

38
39 ANDREW BRADY: It does, yes. That's what the analysis showed, yeah.

40
41 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

42
43 ANDREW BRADY: There's a building in between, there's a noise barrier. And as you know, the
44 adjacent buildings, there's a large grade separation. So it accounts for distance, it accounts for
45 the grade separation, it accounts for the noise barrier, it accounts for the building. And when you
46 consider all those factors, what the modeling showed was that those levels, that that maintained
47 that -- and this is -- again, we're talking about the 57, we're talking about after 10:00 p.m.
48 because the standard changes.

1
2 Before 10:00 p.m., it's five over ambient. After 10:00 p.m., it's not plainly audible. And the
3 study actually took a very conservative approach to plainly audible because it's five below
4 ambient. And it showed that with that number of people, that that noise level of 57 was
5 achievable and would result in no plainly audible impact on the near sensitive receptor, which is
6 the building on the other side of Sweetzer, is actually the closest.

7
8 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Again, I used to live right there, and what used to be the
9 St. James, now the Tower Hotel has that back patio, just very similar to yours, in fact it's the
10 same elevation, and the noise was unbelievable. I was fortunate I lived on the other side of the
11 building, but my neighbors never slept. So this is the reason I'm asking these questions.

12
13 ANDREW BRADY: And this is an enforceable limit that we're agreeing to. So were there to be
14 issues, Code Enforcement would be fully empowered to come and address those issues.

15
16 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. I think that's it for now. Thank you.

17
18 ANDREW BRADY: Of course.

19
20 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I'm sorry, I have just one question. I saw the memo with the section
21 which includes the sound barrier, the glass sound barrier. So that's calling out the roof deck at 34
22 feet 8 in the Detail #1 on the plan. But the elevation I saw in the Staff report and then I think
23 also in the drawings doesn't actually show the sound barrier as part of the building elevation. So
24 I'm curious what HPC looked at, and did they review and improve it without that elevation?

25
26 ANDREW BRADY: The technical drawings in your package were provided to HPC, and it is
27 depicted in the renderings.

28
29 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I don't see it in this rendering.

30
31 ANDREW BRADY: So I'm not sure which one you're looking at. Hold on, let me --

32
33 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Well, there's no page number so I probably can't help you, but --

34
35 ANDREW BRADY: It's this --

36
37 CHAIR LOMBARDI: It's not in the main rendering. But I was wondering about the elevation
38 more than the rendering.

39
40 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: 19 and 20 are the renderings, I think.

41
42 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I don't know where --

43
44 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Or the page is between 20 and 21.

45
46 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I was going to say, I have no idea where you got your page numbers
47 from.

48

1 ANDREW BRADY: So if you look at 17, showing the exterior elevations, you can see the glass
2 opaque noise wall there. So it is depicted in the elevations. It was depicted -- we also included
3 that detail. The detailed construction drawings were included in the package that was provided
4 to Historic Preservation.

5

6 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, it's just not on the enlarged elevation. I see. Thank you.

7

8 ANDREW BRADY: Of course.

9

10 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I'm sorry, Chair, there was one more question regarding
11 the newest drawings that were given to us today. If you could pull it up, it would probably be
12 helpful. Page 10-29 with the proposed roof deck sound barriers and the overall deck section
13 detail, I don't know if you can put it on the screen so everybody can see.

14

15 ANDREW BRADY: Oh, let me ask Staff. I don't know if we have that in our set.

16

17 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So my question is, your landscape design is proposing
18 to have common myrtle planted all around all the edges of the AstroTurf, right up against the
19 glass wall. And I'm trying to understand practically how that's going to work. You're putting soil
20 and plants right up against the glass barriers all the way around the building.

21

22 ANDREW BRADY: There's a separation between the edge of the landscaping. It doesn't go up
23 to the barrier.

24

25 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: It's not in the rendering. That's why I'm asking, or in
26 the section detail, that's why I'm asking.

27

28 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, and these are taken from the project's construction set of drawings.
29 Because as you know, there were detailed construction drawings submitted, so we weren't asked
30 to provide a plan set. But no, it doesn't -- you couldn't put the soil and sod up against a noise
31 wall. You couldn't do that, and this project doesn't do that.

32

33 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Hence my question. That's not what's here, so that's
34 why I'm asking.

35

36 ANDREW BRADY: Well, no, the landscaping's not depicted on this. This is just showing the
37 construction.

38

39 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So Doug, if you zoom in in the bottom-right corner.
40 Off to the left, you've got your geofoam, you've got your rigid foam, et cetera, et cetera, but on
41 the -- whoops. Okay, so if you zoom on the right corner over there -- well, that whole section.
42 We've got a terrible lag here. Is that it?

43

44 Because you've rendered all of the other -- in your section, you've got all of the drawings of all
45 the other barriers. But you're saying there's an additional barrier in front of the glass wall?

46

47 ANDREW BRADY: I'm not sure what -- my point is that the landscaping doesn't go right up to
48 the glass wall. There's a separation between where the landscaping is and the construction of the

1 wall.

2

3 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: And how tall and what is it?

4

5 ANDREW BRADY: How tall is the landscaping at that point?

6

7 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Well, the barrier. It's not on the drawings.

8

9 ANDREW BRADY: The barrier is six feet tall.

10

11 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: For the landscaping?

12

13 ANDREW BRADY: No. We're talking about the noise barrier, aren't we?

14

15 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: No. I'm talking about -- if you look at that glass wall
16 all the way to the right. Sorry, Doug, go the other way. The other way? Yeah, right. So there's
17 your glass wall.

18

19 ANDREW BRADY: Yes.

20

21 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: In your drawings, you have plantings all the way
22 around all the lawns and all the way along all of the glass wall. But there's nothing on these
23 plans that shows how that's being done vis-a-vis the glass wall. It just says there's the pediment
24 and then, bam, there's glass. There's nothing there.

25

26 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah. This particular drawing does not show the landscaping relative to
27 the glass wall. And if the question is how --

28

29 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: But it's not about the landscaping. It's about the
30 barriers that are part of the construction that aren't here.

31

32 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, and we have our landscape artist up here who might be able to
33 answer the question, because maybe I'm just not picking up on -- yeah.

34

35 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: If you look right here where Doug has got this, you see
36 you've got these elevations under your mechanical screen walls. You've got these walls where
37 you're having protection of the soil on the backside. But my question is, on the glass side, what
38 is there? Because there's nothing in these section details.

39

40 TIM GRUBBS: First of all, I want to apologize for having the City of Los Angeles listed in my
41 drawings for the City of West Hollywood, so I apologize for that.

42

43 My name is Tim Grubbs, and my company is Communitas Design, and so we're the landscape
44 architects of record. For the application of the planters adjacent to the wall, we have steel edges
45 from Tile Tech that frame all of our planters. On the one side, it's going to be curvilinear. On
46 this side, it's just going to be a straight edge, it's eight inches tall. And the mounding of the soil
47 goes up with the geofoam and back down to the edge, so there's that separation between the
48 sound barrier wall and the planters.

1
2 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay, so the eight-inch steel is X inches away from the
3 glass wall?

4
5 TIM GRUBBS: Yes.

6
7 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: That was my question.

8
9 TIM GRUBBS: Yes.

10
11 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Thank you.

12
13 TIM GRUBBS: You're welcome.

14
15 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I have one more question because this all came in so late, so I had no
16 time to react until today. In the lighting fixture schedule, what is the color temperature of the
17 lighting? It's very hard to read, but I see some ordering codes.

18
19 ANDREW BRADY: [Indiscernible]. Yeah, let me --

20
21 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Well, I'll say I see 2,700 on some, but not others. If you don't
22 have an answer, that's okay.

23
24 ANDREW BRADY: There's a fixture schedule there, so all of the different --

25
26 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Yeah, it doesn't say what it is. You can guess from some of the codes.
27 Okay.

28
29 ANDREW BRADY: We can follow up on that point.

30
31 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Any other questions? Okay, so then we will move on to public
32 comments. So I will open the public comment portion of the hearing. All questions and
33 comments on this matter are to be directed to the Commission and not to the audience. And are
34 we going to start in the room?

35
36 DAVID GILLIG: Yeah, we're going to start in the Zoom room. If there is anybody else in Zoom
37 that would like to participate, please Star 9 for us or use the raise hand feature. And we'll take
38 our first caller.

39
40 JENNY IVANOVA: Good evening. Our first public speaker is Jordan. If you'd like to press
41 Star 6 to unmute, you have three minutes. Thank you.

42
43 JORDAN SISSON: Good evening, commissioners. Can you hear me okay?

44
45 JENNY IVANOVA: Yes.

46
47 JORDAN SISSON: Great. My name is Jordan Sessom. I'm a CEQA Attorney representing
48 [indiscernible]. My [indiscernible] has some concerns regarding the noise impacts from dunk

1 crowds partying on the rooftop.

2
3 Alcohol on the rooftop is very different from alcohol on the ground floor, which already includes
4 the nightclub, bar and pool year-round. Noise issues with the former Standard Hotel were not
5 uncommon. Here, this new hotel, which has not even opened, has already got changes to its
6 prior alcohol permits and [indiscernible] --

7
8 JENNY IVANOVA: Jordan, I'm so sorry, we're having a hard time hearing you. If you could
9 just put your phone a little bit away from the speaker so we can hear you clearly, thank you.

10
11 JORDAN SISSON: Is this better?

12
13 JENNY IVANOVA: Can you speak for a few seconds so I could evaluate?

14
15 JORDAN SISSON: Yes. Check one, check two. Sound okay?

16
17 JENNY IVANOVA: Maybe a little bit further away from the telephone. Let's try again.

18
19 JORDAN SISSON: Hello?

20
21 JENNY IVANOVA: Are you using a headset?

22
23 JORDAN SISSON: No, I am not. How about now? Is it too loud, or [indiscernible]?

24
25 JENNY IVANOVA: We're getting an echo, so it's a little difficult to understand and you're
26 speaking really fast. Can we try one more time, please?

27
28 JORDAN SISSON: Yes. Is this better?

29
30 JENNY IVANOVA: Yes.

31
32 JORDAN SISSON: Great. In my limited time, I want to make just three quick points. One, we
33 question the assumption that the rooftop will not become open to the public or have regular
34 alcohol service for [indiscernible]. None of the conditions prevent access to the public, such as
35 nightclub guests wanting to take the party upstairs to the rooftop. Nothing prevents a keyed
36 entrance from being unlocked or the hotel providing access to other guests.

37
38 Even without a permanent bar, the rooftop still can easily become a hotspot for drunk crowds.
39 It's not unreasonable to assume that crowds will get drinks not from just downstairs, but also
40 through the hotel service, which you heard is not ruled out.

41
42 So too, what stops a rolled-out bar claiming to be temporary for events become routinely
43 [indiscernible]? Here, the real possibility is that there could be 400 [indiscernible] drinking and
44 partying on the roof as part of the hotel's activation.

45
46 Second, we question the accuracy of the noise study. Specifically, it is unclear if the noise study
47 -- speaking at louder levels due to Lombard effects. This is well documented, and crowds that
48 are drunk, young and at nightclubs tend to speak louder. CEQA documents typically address

1 this. Unfortunately, the noise study does not clearly identify what speech levels, whether or not
2 they considered they are drunk, whether or not there was [indiscernible].

3
4 Lastly, we wanted to question the effectiveness of the enforcement condition. As you heard,
5 there is a Condition 5.2 regarding a decibel level. However, there is no active noise monitoring.
6 And as the city knows, just like Hollywood and downtown L.A., party hotels and rooftop areas
7 are legion about noise complaints.

8
9 In the end, we respectfully request you to consider these issues before approving the project. For
10 example, you may want to consider a revised noise level that accounts for large party crowds,
11 including Lombard effects, as well as base frequency, which is not uncommon from amplified
12 music. Second, you may want to consider other --

13
14 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I'm sorry, but whoever's -- the light over there is really, really making it
15 hard for me right now. I'm sorry to interrupt, but whoever's over there, please turn off that light.
16 It's disrupting us over here.

17
18 JORDAN SISSON: -- [indiscernible] actually operationally, so that they have an established
19 track record to see how well they handle noise. Furthermore, you may want to consider noise
20 complaints from the other -- Mr. Schragger's hotel properties. I thank you for your time and hope
21 you consider this.

22
23 JENNY IVANOVA: Thank you, Jordan. If there's anybody on Zoom who would like to make a
24 public comment, please raise your hand by pressing Star 9. Thank you.

25
26 DAVID GILLIG: Okay, we'll move to chambers for our next public comment. Our first public
27 speaker will be Keaton J. Ross, who will be followed by David Stookey. And you will have
28 three minutes. No Keaton? David Stookey? You'll have three minutes. Please state your name
29 and city of residence.

30
31 DAVID STOOKEY: Good evening, commissioners, my name is David Stookie. I am both a
32 resident and worker here in West Hollywood. I'm concerned about potential noise impacts from
33 this project, which would allow more than 9,000 square feet of alcohol service to the proposed
34 rooftop lawn.

35
36 Hotel rooftop noise is a common problem, especially where you have large crowds of young
37 adults, amplified music and regular alcohol service in the late evenings. These types of groups
38 can be very loud, much louder than your typical crowds. I suggest you take a walk down Sunset
39 Boulevard near the Mondrian on a Thursday, Friday or Saturday evening to experience that
40 yourself.

41
42 It seems pretty reasonable that some folks partying downstairs at the nightclub or pool bar may
43 wish to take the party to the rooftop. I think the city should fully consider the possible noise
44 impacts of nearly 400 young adults partying on the rooftop, which is so close to the residents and
45 other businesses.

46
47 The city may also want to consider other conditions that help improve response to any future
48 noise complaints. Thank you for your time, but before approving a project, I think the city

1 should consider a worst case scenario where you may have close to 400 young adults partying
2 loudly on the rooftop. Similarly, the city may want to consider adding real-time noise monitors
3 to help code enforcement. Thank you.

4
5 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Cathy Blaivas. Cathy will be followed
6 by Stephanie Harker.

7
8 CATHY BLAIVAS: Good evening. Cathy Blaivas, City of West Hollywood.

9
10 First of all, I was particularly impressed during the presentation to the Historic Preservation
11 Commission when it was noted that the Ian Schrager Company made the hotel's purchase
12 contingent upon securing its historic designation. If only more developers showed that level of
13 foresight and respect for preservation. The proposed renovations themselves are thoughtful and
14 respectful to the character and the historic hotel reinforcing the architectural and cultural
15 significance.

16
17 Additionally, the fact that Steve Luftman, the individual who played a pivotal role in saving the
18 hotel, is in full support of this project speaks volumes about its integrity and the alignment of the
19 preservation values.

20
21 That being said, regarding various concerns with the rooftop in particular and the noise, I have
22 confidence that a thoughtful compromise can be reached, one that respects the needs of the
23 owner, enhances the experience for the hotel guests and is considerate of the surrounding
24 neighbors.

25
26 I'm in support of this project. And this won't be the first project rooftop on Sunset Boulevard that
27 creates noise. I don't know why they should be singled out to not at least find ways to mediate
28 that.

29
30 And on a personal note, I just want to thank Commissioner Hoopingarner for your thoughtful,
31 thorough questions you posed during this meeting. Your attention to detail and genuine interest
32 in understanding the nuances of the project were not only evident but also deeply appreciated by
33 this stakeholder. Thank you.

34
35 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you. Stephanie Harker, and that will be followed by our last speaker,
36 Victor Omelczenko.

37
38 STEPHANIE HARKER: Good evening again. Stephanie Harker, City of West Hollywood.

39
40 I definitely want to applaud the developer, or redeveloper, of the Standard, the original
41 Thunderbird. I was just recently reading the section of the municipal code that pertains to
42 historic preservation and how encroaching development is taking away our heritage and those
43 wonderful historical sites.

44
45 This project obviously is continuing on trying to preserve that look. And as we're having such
46 trouble along Sunset now, and now the recently abandoned Viper Room project, but it's just so
47 refreshing to feel like there are many in the community who wish to retain the charm and the
48 culture and the history of Sunset Strip. It's famous throughout the world, and the fact that this

1 particular developer and Steve Luftman at the head of trying to save this, it really bodes well for
2 us as a community and for us as residents to have these things preserved with such care.

3
4 And I'm sure you can work out the other issues with the noise and the rooftop sounds and things.
5 Just have quiet parties or have pot parties. They can all mellow out.

6
7 Anyway, I did want to step up and say thank you to the developers, and I hope the commission
8 will move this forward. Thank you.

9
10 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you. Our last speaker will be Victor Omelczenko.

11
12 VICTOR OMELCZENKO: Victor Omelczenko, long time West Hollywood resident. This little
13 stretch, this one block on the south side of Sunset Boulevard, we have three historic buildings in
14 a row. I'm just going to do a quick thing on this. We have what was called the former St. James
15 Hotel. Now it's the Sunset Tower. That's a historic resource in our city. We have the William S.
16 Hart Park Colonial Revival Home in Hart Park. That's a historic resource. And we have this, the
17 Standard Hotel, which had started as the Thunderbird Inn, as a historic resource.

18
19 Three in a row. It's wonderful. Wouldn't it be wonderful if across the street the Shore family,
20 who's going to make a lot of money with the billboard that it's getting, wouldn't it have been
21 wonderful if that family of the Comedy Store, they own the Comedy Store, if only they could
22 have joined the litany, the grouping of historic buildings along our iconic Sunset Boulevard?

23
24 That said, speaking on behalf of the West Hollywood Preservation Alliance, we're so pleased to
25 support the renovation of the Standard Hotel. It is a landmark of midcentury architectural
26 excellence. This extensive update will preserve the building's distinctive character while
27 breathing new life into its historic space.

28
29 As a designated cultural resource, the Standard Hotel has undergone careful review by the city's
30 Historic Preservation Commission, which unanimously recommended approval of a certificate of
31 appropriateness for the renovation. Now the WHPA urges you, our Planning Commission, to
32 grant its final approval ensuring that this iconic property will continue to serve the community
33 while maintaining its architectural integrity.

34
35 When the property was designated as a local cultural resource in 2022, it was recognized for
36 retaining all seven aspects of historic integrity as defined by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior
37 Standards for Historic Preservation. It was already considered a historic resource by the state,
38 and the new owners have now expressed their intent to seek federal recognition on the National
39 Register of Historic Places.

40
41 If that's successful, this would make the Standard Hotel a rare historic trifecta in our city. It
42 would be acknowledged at the local, state and federal levels, and it would be eligible for those
43 delicious, valuable tax credits to maintain it.

44
45 The WHPA commends the owners' commitment to preserving West Hollywood's architectural
46 heritage and looks forward to seeing the Standard Hotel reopen its doors, continuing its legacy as
47 a cultural and historical landmark and contributing to West Hollywood's economy, because it is
48 about jobs, and it's about the dinheiro, the dengi, the [pieniadze], the money. Thank you very

1 much.

2

3 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you, Victor. And Chair, before I send it back to you, we did receive one
4 correspondence that came in after the deadline. It was from the West Hollywood Preservation
5 Alliance, and they are pleased to support the renovation of the Standard Hotel at 8300 Sunset
6 Boulevard. So this correspondence will be placed into the permanent file for the record.

7

8 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Would the applicant like to make a rebuttal? And if so, you
9 have five minutes.

10

11 ANDREW BRADY: Thank you so much. Andrew Brady on behalf of the project applicant. We
12 do appreciate the positive remarks from the Historic Community. This is a great labor of love on
13 the part of you and Schrage Corporation, preserving this historic building, like I said,
14 maintaining its historic form.

15

16 We are appreciative and understand the concerns about noise. We just want to be very clear.
17 Every detail, everything down to the design, the function, this is a boutique hotel. This is not
18 going to be a party hotel. There's enough party hotels on the Strip. This is a Public -- and this is
19 not the Standard. This is a Public grand hotel oriented towards business travelers and
20 professionals.

21

22 Everything down to the design of the roof, the way it's set up, the way that it is controlled entry,
23 not just anybody from downstairs can go up there, this is not going to be a party roof. It's not
24 going to be a party hotel. That's not part of the design. That's not part of the function. That is
25 not going to be how this hotel operates.

26

27 Nonetheless, as indicated before, we have committed ourselves to a very strict and enforceable
28 condition of approval that we believe with the thoughtful design, with the work with some of the
29 preeminent noise consultants in the field, we are going to comply with the standards and we will
30 continue to work with the city and partner with the city in ensuring that those standards are met
31 over time and that the legitimate concerns of the community are addressed. So thank you.

32

33 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. I'll now close the public comment portion of this hearing. Any
34 more questions of Staff or deliberations? Questions?

35

36 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I have a question.

37

38 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Commissioner Solomon.

39

40 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: For Staff and then maybe one for the applicant. One of the
41 written public comments mentions that at the Andaz Hotel, Andaz, I never know how to
42 pronounce it, they receive a written notification of events that take place on the roof. Was that a
43 condition of approval for that? Does that happen because of any sort of condition or code?

44

45 JENNIFER ALKIRE: I'm sorry, who receives a written notice?

46

47 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Nearby residents, or at least that's what I infer from the
48 comment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

JENNIFER ALKIRE: I see. I am not aware of that being a condition on that CUP, but it certainly might be. I don't know.

COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Okay. And then my second question is for Staff, but possibly for the applicant as well. Is this property subject to -- is there a Mills Act agreement in place for it?

DOUG VU: There currently is not a Mills Act agreement with this property.

COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Okay. And if the applicant is willing, do you know if there's any plans to pursue one?

ANDREW BRADY: Not at this time. The projector has pursued federal tax credits. It has preliminarily been awarded those credits, so it is getting tax relief from the federal government. There's not a plan at this time to go under the Mills Act, which, as you know, is a local property tax. But who knows what the future will bring with that?

COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Thanks. That's all my questions.

CHAIR LOMBARDI: Commissioner Jones and then -- oh, Commissioner Hoopingarner.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I just want to clarify that as written, events will be allowed 365 days, special events only 16 days, but regular events could be held every night, correct?

DOUG VU: As part of the normal operations of the hotel, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. And all of those events could have up to 399 people? Because the 399 is not in any way specific to a special event permit. It's just the load --

DOUG VU: That is the maximum occupancy.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: -- rating for the roof, correct?

DOUG VU: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. Condition 5.2, Noise Generated, "Use of amplified sound, da-da-da, not to exceed 71 dBAs, 57 dBAs." It doesn't say as measured where. Back to our conversation about what's the noise level at the receptor sites versus the noise being generated from the site itself. Based on what you said to me, this 71 and 57 is from the roof -- the noise on the roof itself. Is that correct?

DOUG VU: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Because that's not stated here. And when it comes to code enforcement, I think they need specificity about where it's measured, correct?

1 DOUG VU: That is correct. So if I can clarify, this condition -- let me back up. The purpose of
2 the sound study was really to benefit the applicant in determining what the maximum noise
3 levels would be because the city's noise control ordinance does not establish a numerical
4 threshold.

5
6 The noise ordinance just basically states that noise generated by a source cannot be plainly
7 audible within 25 feet of a residential property. And so to help the applicant have a better
8 understanding of what does plainly audible mean, they conducted this noise study to help them
9 make that determination so that they would have a better idea of how loud the speakers and the
10 human activity generated at the roof, how loud that can be in order to meet the definition of not
11 being plainly audible at the residential properties.

12
13 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Agreed, and hence you need a measurement in order to
14 enforce it. Otherwise, it's just a subjective, "Hey, it's loud to me, but it's not to you." I mean,
15 that all depends on your hearing capabilities.

16
17 CHAIR LOMBARDI: So I realize that this could be slipping into deliberation, but I just want to
18 point out that it says, "The noise generated by the use of amplified sound or music and human
19 activity on the rooftop deck shall not exceed." So I read that as anywhere, anytime, anywhere on
20 that deck, nothing goes above that level if someone were to go and check it. So it seems like a
21 sound requirement. I understand it, I guess is what I'm saying.

22
23 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I'm just really concerned that that's very clear to
24 everybody that that's where it's measured and not at some receptor site.

25
26 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Yeah. I mean, it says, "Human activity on the rooftop deck shall not
27 exceed."

28
29 JENNIFER ALKIRE: We can add language to that condition if it makes it more clear to you that
30 as measured, say instead of, "On the rooftop deck," "As measured on the rooftop deck."

31
32 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I love it.

33
34 JENNIFER ALKIRE: Something like that.

35
36 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay. Thank you. And I'm sorry, 5.4, back to
37 enforceability. And this just says, "Precautions shall be taken." It doesn't really say anything in
38 terms of what is allowed and what isn't allowed.

39
40 I mean, if someone called Code Enforcement and pointed to this 5.4, what would Code
41 Enforcement read and what would they have to do? I mean, it says, "Precautions shall be taken."
42 It doesn't really say anything.

43
44 DOUG VU: This is sort of an additive condition to what the project is currently proposing as
45 mitigation measures to contain sound. But I think the important requirement in 5.4 is that this
46 project and its operation has to comply with the noise ordinance.

47
48 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: That's kind of a given. I mean, everybody has to

1 comply with the ordinances. So I'm not sure what this adds. I guess --

2
3 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I think it's pointing at something to point to at least as a point of
4 reference.

5
6 JENNIFER ALKIRE: It ties that requirement back to the CUP. So if it becomes problematic, it
7 can be grounds for revocation. That's why it's there.

8
9 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: And hence 5.5. Okay, thank you.

10
11 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Are we moving into deliberation or do we have questions? Okay. Would
12 anyone like to speak first? Okay, the applicant would like to say something. We're about to start
13 deliberation. What would you like to add?

14
15 ANDREW BRADY: Andrew Brady, I'm with the applicant. With respect to the technical
16 change, I think we'd request that any measurements be taken on the project side of the noise
17 barrier, the interior side, because if there's two people talking on the opposite side and you hold
18 up a sound barrier to their mouth, that's going to be different than -- it is measured on the roof.
19 But for the sake of meeting the standard, we request that if there is a location of measurement, it
20 be on the roof side of the noise barrier.

21
22 CHAIR LOMBARDI: On the roof side?

23
24 ANDREW BRADY: On the edge of the --

25
26 CHAIR LOMBARDI: On the edge?

27
28 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, where the noise wall is on the project, the roof deck side of that. Not
29 on the opposite side of the noise barrier, but on the side of the noise barrier where the gathering
30 area is located.

31
32 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I'm confused. Where?

33
34 ANDREW BRADY: The location at the perimeter, at the edge, on the project side of the noise
35 barrier would be the request for -- just for clarity and specificity, if there's going to be a location
36 where you have to measure it to be on the roof, but at the perimeter.

37
38 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: You mean up against the sound wall?

39
40 ANDREW BRADY: Up against the sound wall, yeah. On the interior side, though, so you're not
41 getting the advantage of the sound wall, yeah.

42
43 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Yeah, that would be the -- I mean, because that's what
44 we're saying here, that it's -- on the roof, the noise is not to exceed X.

45
46 ANDREW BRADY: Yeah, exactly.

47
48 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Yeah.

1
2 ANDREW BRADY: Okay. That'd be the request for the modification. All right, thank you.

3
4 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I'd be curious historically what we've done, but I know that might not be
5 easy information. I always look for, are we setting a new precedent here or are we being
6 consistent?

7
8 JENNIFER ALKIRE: If you're asking me, --

9
10 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Maybe.

11
12 JENNIFER ALKIRE: -- we typically don't have a condition such as this. Usually we rely on the
13 noise ordinance, which has the plainly audible standard. This, again, like Doug mentioned, is
14 really just to provide guardrails so that the applicant knows what would -- so that they have a
15 way to gauge that from the source as to what was deemed acceptable in the modeling.

16
17 Even with that, if it's plainly audible, we will still be out there regulating it. But yeah, I don't
18 think that there's a really set precedent for this type of condition or where that measurement is
19 taken. But I think it's perfectly acceptable to do it at the perimeter as requested.

20
21 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Okay, Commissioner
22 Hoopingarner?

23
24 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Just one. Did you have a question? One of the, I think,
25 the public speakers mentioned something about having an onsite measuring device. I don't think
26 we've ever done that, at least not in my tenure, we've never done that before. I don't know what
27 the cost of that would be.

28
29 I know that in the past we've had a lot of problems with code enforcement. With Catch and
30 everything, they would call and by the time Code Enforcement got there, and then da-da-da.
31 Whereas if there was a device that said, "Here's what it is," the applicant would have a thing that
32 said, "Hey, it's getting too loud. Go do something." And Code Enforcement would have a thing
33 that said, "Hey, it was too loud."

34
35 I'm just wondering, is that -- I don't think we've ever done it before. And is it financially
36 feasible? Is it technically feasible? Just asking.

37
38 JENNIFER ALKIRE: It is not consistent with the noise ordinance. So I think in order to start
39 doing that kind of enforcement or that kind of measurement, we would need to revisit what the
40 noise ordinance is, which is not in the Planning Commission's purview, I will just advise.

41
42 But yeah, I understand what you're saying, and I know that the subjective nature of how we
43 enforce it has --

44
45 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Suboptimal.

46
47 JENNIFER ALKIRE: -- raised questions. However, I will say that over time, most of the areas
48 that we've talked about over the years here in this room have been able to get a handle on the

1 situation. So I think that at the end of the day, it generally works, even if it isn't as prescriptive or
2 as objective as we might want to see.

3
4 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I guess the reason I'm asking my question is that you
5 used the right words, "over time." And it's what the neighbors will be subjected to. It's during
6 that over time period that is concerning to me.

7
8 JENNIFER ALKIRE: Right, and we'll be able to gauge that because we have a condition that it
9 will come back for review. And the applicant knows that, so I think it's in everybody's interest
10 that they make sure that they keep -- if it does happen, that they are able to fix that issue right
11 away.

12
13 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

14
15 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Commissioner Jones, would you like to speak?

16
17 COMMISSIONER JONES: Are we moving into deliberation?

18
19 CHAIR LOMBARDI: And we're going to move into deliberation now.

20
21 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. Yeah, sure. So first of all, I want to say that it is rare that an
22 applicant is as well prepared as this team was. I think Commissioner Hoopingarner asked some
23 very fair questions, and I am -- it is pretty anomalous that you would have won the team that you
24 have here, landscape architect, someone, a noise consultant, all on hand to answer those
25 questions. I think it speaks to my confidence in Ian Schrager as, I know he's the owner, but as
26 the operators of the property and the affiliations that it has.

27
28 I'm very much in support of the project. I'm really happy it's going to be activated again as a
29 space. I'm very glad that it was designated. I'm also glad that it's not -- there was some talk of
30 this being a five-story building at one point, and I'm just going to say that I'm personally happy
31 that it's not. I think it pays a great homage to the space and the original spirit of the building.

32
33 And I also -- we need people in hotels on Sunset Boulevard right now. It's just a fact. I mean,
34 there are parts of the strip that are suffering right now. And the sooner we can get people there,
35 in my opinion, the better.

36
37 I do have concerns, a little bit of concern about the noise. And I want to say too, to the
38 community, that I as a person with misophonia definitely understand not wanting to hear loud
39 noise. I also want to temper that with the fact that we live off the Sunset Strip. I mean, I do. I
40 live off of -- I live three buildings down on Laurel. It's not technically the strip, but Laugh
41 Factory, there's lots of things happening up there at the time.

42
43 I can hear Hyde Nightclub, which is a five-minute walk from my apartment on weekend nights.
44 It's just part of living on the Sunset Strip. There are going to be ambulances and helicopters and
45 rock bands and loud young people. That's what it is.

46
47 That being said, and again, given how prepared the applicant was and how thorough the
48 presentation was, again, I don't want to assume, but my guess is that there is a way that you have

1 for handling complaints in the neighborhood, and you clearly have been communicating with
2 people in the neighborhood and took it upon yourself to contact people who were at the meeting
3 who expressed concerns. Most people don't do that. So again, I think it reflects well on you.
4

5 I'm in support of the project. I'm in support of the change proposed for the measurement if the
6 rest of the commission feels that it's necessary and is in agreement, but I am inclined to support
7 the project. Those are my comments.
8

9 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Vice Chair Gregoire?
10

11 VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: Yeah, I support Staff's recommendation. I don't have any changes
12 to propose. Obviously, the big concern of the neighbors to the north, up the hill and to the south
13 is the noise. But I was pleased to see Condition 5.5 as pointed out by the director. That does say
14 that the Commission will review this three, six and nine months following the commencement of
15 the rooftop deck use to determine if any modifications need to be made.
16

17 My instinct says it will be fine, but if there are events up there and there are complaints, we have
18 a mechanism here to address them at the time. And I think that's a great condition. With that, I
19 would fully support Staff's recommendation.
20

21 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Commissioner Hoopingarner?
22

23 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So again, I used to live right here. I love this part of the
24 strip. It's wonderful that we're going to keep this hotel in its original condition and activate it and
25 bring excitement back to the space. I love all those things. Okay?
26

27 My only concern is the noise and the sound carrying. And so I guess I do have kind of a question
28 for the applicant because you said that Mr. Schragger doesn't operate the Edition. Is the intention
29 that this building would be operated by Mr. Schragger? Okay, yes, because we're all making that
30 assumption, that you are going to be operating it and with these understandings and these
31 guidelines and you're not going to be turning it over to someone who doesn't have the same
32 understandings. So I think that's important to me in terms of how this is going to be operated.
33

34 We are a neighborhood. And yes, it is the Sunset Strip. We all have lived and do live within
35 waving distance of the Sunset Strip. And that's great until it becomes just excessive all night,
36 every night. And that's my personal concern and, I think, the neighbors' concern. And it only
37 takes a couple nights in a row until you've got an unhappy neighborhood, and that's not really
38 what anybody wants. And that would be my biggest concern.
39

40 If I were to make any changes to the resolution, and yes, Vice Chair Gregoire, I agree that
41 Condition 5.5 with the review periods is great. But I'm wondering, because we've done this in
42 the past, if we shouldn't insert the word, "rooftop deck events," because I can see a situation
43 where the rooftop deck is activated and guests are showing up, but no events have been held.
44 And then we have our three-month review, but there haven't been any events, which are really, I
45 think, the concern that everybody has.
46

47 So I don't know what my colleagues think about that, because we had a -- I think it was even on
48 this project with the pool deck. It was about it being activated before the reviews happened. I

1 don't know if it was this project or another one. So that would be my only, maybe, suggestion in
2 terms of -- that that three-month clock starts after events.

3
4 COMMISSIONER JONES: Can I ask a question, just a clarifying question about that? Is there
5 a reason why we wouldn't keep the language as is? Because if just people on the roof is too loud,
6 --

7
8 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: No, you're right. I agree.

9
10 COMMISSIONER JONES: -- that that would be the baseline threshold?

11
12 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: No, I think both conditions apply. So I'm just
13 brainstorming about ways to address both situations. You're right that we could just have a
14 whole bunch of rowdy hotel guests that are a problem and the three-month review would be
15 appropriate.

16
17 COMMISSIONER JONES: Right, right.

18
19 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So just trying to figure out how to address the fact that
20 they may not kick off their first events until we're halfway through the review period and then we
21 don't have a review period for it. So that was my only concern.

22
23 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay. Okay, understood.

24
25 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: So again, I think this is a great improvement to the
26 property, to the strip. I think it's a great way to activate it and I'm looking forward to it. I just
27 hope that the applicant can really work on the sound. Thank you.

28
29 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay. Commissioner Carvalho?

30
31 COMMISSIONER CARVALHEIRO: Thank you, Chair. I feel like this building comes with a
32 bit of a bad history when it was the Standard. I mean, I remember those pool parties. They were
33 noisy, but this new iteration of the hotel presented as a business hotel, and given what the
34 applicant has presented, kind of tempers my fear that it will become the Standard again.

35
36 And I see the guardrails in place that we've issued to all other hotels with rooftop situations in
37 West Hollywood. So I hear it, but I think it -- I hear the fear. I understand it, but I think that it
38 seems to be on the wake of what it used to be. And we need to give this operator a chance.

39
40 It's a great -- like everyone said, an amazing a building on Sunset Boulevard with its own history,
41 the new landscaping, et cetera. This regency approach gives the building a beautiful setting. I
42 think the rooftop -- I understand, 399 people, it's a lot. And we have the sound tests in place over
43 three, six, nine months. Maybe we could extend it to a year to make sure we capture some
44 special events. But I'm in favor of this project as it's presented by Staff report.

45
46 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Solomon?

47
48 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Thank you. It seems like in the last few years, the strategy to

1 ensure the longevity of historic buildings on Sunset, whether they're designated historic or not, to
2 Victor's earlier point, has just been put a billboard on it. And that's a strategy, and it's a revenue-
3 generating strategy. But I am encouraged to see an applicant come forward that has a different,
4 more tasteful strategy to activate a new space in the building to ensure its commercial success so
5 that it can stay and remain a vibrant business and a cultural resource.

6
7 To Commissioner Jones' earlier point, I do appreciate the all-hands-on-deck approach that the
8 applicant has taken and that the whole team is here. I think that everyone is, I don't know if
9 concerned is the right word, but everyone is aware of the potential of a noise issue. And the
10 applicant has gone above and beyond to hold themselves accountable to a higher and more
11 defined standard than what the West Hollywood noise ordinance is. And with Condition 5.5, that
12 it comes back to us three times, three months, six months, nine months, I would hope that if there
13 is anything that isn't working, we do have a chance to right the ship on it.

14
15 So I appreciate, again, the time that the applicant has put forward in this project. I appreciate -- I
16 mean, Commissioner Hoopingarner gave it to you as well as I've ever seen on the technical
17 analysis, and I think the project's better for it.

18
19 I agree with your one point of having a specific designation about where they should measure the
20 sound from. To your second point, I think that roof space use is a broad and encompassing
21 enough term that I would use the word use rather than events. If they haven't had events by six
22 and nine months, I would think that their events manager would probably be looking for a new
23 position soon.

24
25 So I will support this project whenever someone makes a motion to do so. Thanks.

26
27 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Commissioner Matos?

28
29 COMMISSIONER MATOS: Yeah, I'll keep my remarks brief. Thank you, Chair. I just want to
30 thank the applicant for a thorough presentation and thank each and every member of the public
31 that came out to voice an opinion and to be part of the public process on this item. I am a
32 resident of the Sunset Strip. It does routinely get noisy. I don't live a waving distance. I live on
33 it. It does get noisy. It's part of the character of the neighborhood, in my opinion. If it gets too
34 noisy, I shut my windows and it's just fine.

35
36 I do understand the concerns. I think that the resolution addresses a lot of the concerns that have
37 been raised and so does the municipal code. If you look at the municipal code, it's very
38 thorough. It gives the city an avenue to take decisive administrative action against a bad
39 operator. So for those reasons, while I understand and appreciate the concerns that have been
40 raised by members of the public, I will be supporting this item tonight. Thank you.

41
42 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Anyone else? No? Okay. Well, I'll just give a couple of
43 really quick thoughts. I'll be brief here.

44
45 I am really excited to see this project move forward and to see a considerate restoration of this
46 historic property. Honestly, I did have some questions and concerns about the operations, just
47 the ability to answer some of my questions. I understand a lot of it's still in the work,
48 functionality of the premise as described for the rooftop, and I do hope the applicants sort that

1 out. Obviously, there's a full team here working on that, and I know that it's still early on. So as
2 a brand and a project, I have full confidence that you all will do that.

3
4 Maintaining Sunset Strip and ensuring that there's vitality there, that we have hotels, we have
5 activity, I think is very important. I always like to look at projects and consider what else could
6 be there, and there potentially is a scenario where this historic building had extra hotel uses
7 higher up, and Maybe that had a rooftop on it too.

8
9 All being said, I think this is manageable. There's measures in place. And I think it's in
10 everyone's interest, both the applicant's and the community, to find a way to make it work, and I
11 think that that's handled in the conditions.

12
13 So I'm prepared to support this item. I know there may be some nuance to the resolution, but I'd
14 be ready if someone were to make a motion. And now everyone goes quiet.

15
16 COMMISSIONER JONES: Guys, when you make a motion, say out loud, "I want to make a
17 motion," because everyone's screen is a little bit different.

18
19 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Oh, mine says my name, and that's it.

20
21 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Mine says my name.

22
23 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay.

24
25 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I'm ready to --

26
27 DAVID GILLIG: I'm actually showing Commissioner Hoopingarnier has the electronic vote, if
28 someone wants to make a second, if it shows.

29
30 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Yeah, would you like to state the motion?

31
32 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I move to approve the Staff report. And I would ask
33 my colleagues if there's an interest, as was discussed, about putting the applicant's request that
34 the sound measurement be at the sound wall.

35
36 CHAIR LOMBARDI: I'm okay with it, but I know we do a straw poll.

37
38 COMMISSIONER MATOS: There was agreement from the applicant on that item?

39
40 ISAAC ROSEN: If you give us a second, we can read that into the record. And Commissioner
41 Hoopingarnier said that was the one change, is the applicant's request based on Staff's
42 recommendation on 5.2?

43
44 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: 5.2 would read, "As measured at the interior of the
45 sound wall."

46
47 CHAIR LOMBARDI: That's what I was thinking.

48

1 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Okay.

2

3 ISAAC ROSEN: Yep.

4

5 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Lovely. That is my motion.

6

7 VICE CHAIR GREGOIRE: I will second.

8

9 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, seconded by the Vice Chair. My screen doesn't say much here, so
10 I'm taking the verbal.

11

12 DAVID GILLIG: And the motion passes unanimous with seven ayes. We do have an appeal
13 process for this item. The resolution number PC251606 the Planning Commission just approved
14 for the property located at 8300 Sunset Boulevard memorializes the Commission's final action on
15 this matter. This action is subject to appeal to the City Council. Appeals must be submitted
16 within 10 calendar days from this date to the City Clerk's office. Appeals must be in writing and
17 accompanied by the required fees. The City Clerk's Office can provide appeal forms and
18 information about waiver of fees. The appeal deadline is Monday, June 16, 2025 at 5:00 p.m.

19

20 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. Item #11, New Business. We have no items. 12,
21 Unfinished Business, no items. Also Item #13, Excluded Consent Calendar. We have none.

22

23 That brings us to Item #14. And if everyone could please exit quietly, we would appreciate that
24 because now we have an item that we're actually going to talk about. So when we're ready, 14A,
25 Planning Manager's Update. Please, if you can all exit quietly. Thank you.

26

27 SAIMA QURESHY: Good evening, Commissioners and Chair Lombardi. Simon Qureshy, as I
28 was just introduced, new Planning Manager for the Current and Historic Preservation. Glad to
29 be here for the first meeting here. So I'll go through the upcoming agenda -- or the items that are
30 listed for the Planning Commission.

31

32 Okay. So for the Planning Commission, the next meeting scheduled is for July 17. And we have
33 -- sorry about that. So we have one public hearing item, 8948 Santa Monica Boulevard; and then
34 an appeal item, which is also a public hearing, 8451 Melrose Avenue. Those are the two items
35 for July 17 meeting.

36

37 And then for August 7, that would be the follow-up meeting of the Planning Commission, there
38 will be special business of election of Chair and Vice Chair. We will also have swearing in of
39 new Commissioner Jesse Harris.

40

41 And then we also have a few public hearings listed. The one is 9255 Sunset Boulevard. It's a
42 conditional use permit for a restaurant, bar and nightclub. Second public hearing is for a
43 billboard on 9200 Sunset Boulevard. And then we have a consent item as well, 1130 North La
44 Brea Avenue. And that's the Staff's update on Total Wines and More project. And one more
45 public hearing for 1238 North Formosa Avenue, which is a subdivision.

46

47 So those are the seven items currently scheduled for August 7.

48

1 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. I have a question. I was trying to hear, July 17, the 8948
2 Santa Monica Boulevard and 9450 Melrose Avenue. It's getting late. I don't remember where
3 those are. Are those housing projects, or what are those?
4

5 JENNIFER ALKIRE: The 8948 Santa Monica Boulevard is Roosterfish at Santa Monica and
6 Robertson. And 8451 Melrose is a restaurant, and it's an appeal of a use of a rooftop.
7

8 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: Can I ask, I saw David's email and it said that that was
9 a Housing Accountability Act item on Roosterfish, so I was a little confused.
10

11 JENNIFER ALKIRE: I think that was probably just an error in the order, yes.
12

13 COMMISSIONER HOOPINGARNER: I was like, "You're going to get your housing."
14

15 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: Yeah, I don't know if I want to live in a bar.
16

17 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you.
18

19 SAIMA QURESHY: Sure.
20

21 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Any other -- I guess there's also subcommittees.
22

23 SAIMA QURESHY: Yes, any other questions on the Planning Commission? Yes?
24

25 COMMISSIONER SOLOMON: I was just going to say, I think that I'll be absent on September
26 18. I have a company retreat. And I see it's not on David's calendar yet, but I wanted to kind of
27 put it out there.
28

29 SAIMA QURESHY: Okay. Okay, moving on to subcommittees. So the Long Range Planning
30 Project Subcommittee, the next meeting is July 17. It's for a zone tax amendment for parking
31 regulations, which is because of the Agenda Bill 894 and AB 1317. So that one is scheduled for
32 July 17. And no items currently are identified for the August meeting, which is August 21.
33

34 For the Design Review Subcommittee, the next project going to that body is on June 12. It's for
35 the 1000 North La Brea Project, which is a mixed-use project. And then after that, the meeting
36 on June 26, there are no items identified at this time.
37

38 And then Sunset Arts and Advertising Subcommittee, their July 24 meeting has 9101 Sunset
39 Boulevard billboard project listed for that project -- I'm sorry, for that date. And that's all I have.
40 Thank you.
41

42 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you very much. Any questions? Okay. Item 15, Public
43 Comment. Everyone has left. Almost everyone has left.
44

45 DAVID GILLIG: We do have one public comment for General, Victor Omelczenko. Victor, you
46 will have three minutes.
47

48 VICTOR OMELCZENKO: Good evening again. Victor Omelczenko. Chair Lombardi, at the

1 last Planning Commission meeting, I watched it, I haven't been able to attend many of them, you
2 sort of plaintively said, "Oh, maybe we'll have some public comment at the next meeting." And I
3 guess you did have enough public comment tonight. And I think it was a very vigorous,
4 interesting discussion.

5
6 I did notice that you talked about an update to the housing element, that housing element which
7 by 2019, got to have 3,933 units. Well, we are on our way to that with over 400, I understand.
8 And as I understand the process, we do have a housing element approved by the state in which
9 we have identified the parcels of land where we could put 3,933 units, but it is not a requirement
10 that if we don't meet the 3,933, that we will lose our incorporation or our city or our jobs or our
11 lives. So I'm happy that there is progress in that housing element.

12
13 I am distressed with what happened with the Melrose Triangle Project. Kind of sold a bill of
14 goods. The owner there is in jail. It's being refilled. And I'm really upset now, after all these
15 years of what you all worked on and the community worked on, the 8850 Sunset Boulevard
16 Project, which is now going into foreclosure and the city entered into a development agreement
17 for billboards and everything, it was a source of controversy over the years, it's interesting that
18 the city approved the development agreement last August and just nine months later, oy vey [zu
19 vey], it's in foreclosure.

20
21 This makes me ask, what kind of due diligence is the city involved in with these developers like
22 Silver Creek Investments, who bought up that whole Viper Room block that threw out a lot of
23 neighborhood-serving businesses, only leaving a residue of the Viper Room and some others? It
24 just makes me wonder, how did these things happen behind the scenes? What actually
25 happened? The city approved it. The legal department looked at everything in August. And
26 then by last month, it's in foreclosure. Are we all being schnookered?

27
28 And then let's just go a little bit further west to the Hustler Building, where we were promised
29 the world-famous arts club by Gwyneth Paltrow, Charles Dickens and all that kind of stuff. They
30 have a new 10-year development agreement. And I remember that last year you were saying,
31 "Well, maybe they could fix up the joint." It's all boarded up. Where is the artwork that the
32 developer and owner of that Hustler Building promised us? That west side of the Sunset Strip is
33 looking like just monstrous, so close to Beverly Hills.

34
35 But I want to end on a happy note to say that it looks like the eastern side of our iconic Sunset
36 Strip is coming back to life, especially with what you decided tonight with the Standard Hotel
37 joining the other two buildings on that block as historic resources. So I think we should look
38 closely at who we go into bed with and ask whether these developers have financial stability
39 before we enter into long-term development agreements. Thank you.

40
41 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you.

42
43 DAVID GILLIG: Thank you. And that is our last public speaker, Chair.

44
45 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Okay, thank you. Any items from commissioners? Commissioner
46 Jones?

47
48 COMMISSIONER JONES: Yeah, thank you. First, I just want to apologize for missing the last

1 meeting. I don't like missing them. I got really sick and I lost my voice, so didn't want to spread
2 disease and wouldn't have been of much use to anybody anyway. So that is why I had to miss
3 the last meeting. I was in bed and voiceless, I'm sure much to the delight of the people around
4 me.

5
6 In any case, I also wanted to -- and also I know I've been sounding like I'm hacking up a lung.
7 I'm fine. I think I have an allergy, but I promise none of you will be sick. I just want to set your
8 mind at ease.

9
10 I also just wanted to -- he's not here. The applicant's representative for our first project tonight,
11 DJ Moore's father passed away earlier this week, and I just wanted to put it on the record. He
12 actually flew back from the East Coast for this hearing tonight, so I just wanted to extend my
13 condolences to his family on the record. DJ's presented lots of projects to us before. I just
14 wanted to wish him and his family the best. That's it.

15
16 CHAIR LOMBARDI: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Then I will adjourn this meeting. And
17 our next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be held on Thursday, July 17,
18 2025 here at Council Chambers at 6:30 p.m. Just to be clear, I said Thursday, July 17. That
19 means that the June 19 and the July 3 meetings are canceled.

20
21 DAVID GILLIG: Yes, thank you.

22
23 CHAIR LOMBARDI: So that is true, it is Thursday. July 17 is our next meeting, 6:30 p.m.
24 Thank you.

(End)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49


PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of West Hollywood at a regular meeting held on this 7th day of August 2025 by the following vote:

AYES: Commissioner: Carvalheiro, Hoopingarner, Jones, Solomon, Vice Chair Gregoire, Chair Lombardi.

NOES: Commissioner: None.

ABSENT: Commissioner: None.

ABSTAIN: Commissioner: Harris.



MICHAEL A. LOMBARDI, MIES LC LEED AP BD+C
CHAIRPERSON, PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTEST:



DAVID K. GILLIG, COMMISSION SECRETARY

Transcription Certification

A Transcription 2000 Services, Inc., (T2K), certifies that the above transcript has been transcribed from audio files supplied to it for transcription. T2K certifies that, to the best of its ability, it correctly transcribed all conversations on the provided audio files truly and accurately.

T2K also certifies that none of its workers are related to nor an interested party to any individuals in this matter.

A Transcription 2000 Services, Inc.
www.transcription2000