

**SILVER LAKE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
URBAN DESIGN & PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES - APPROVED
Wednesday, March 8, 2017
7:00 pm
Citibank Community Room
2450 Glendale Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90039**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting began at 7:00 pm.

Attending Committee Members:

Joe Ferrell, Co-Chair
Scott Plante, Co-Chair
Carol Cetrone
Jerome Courshon
Mark Duncan
Genelle LeVin
Bob Lisauskas
Rosa Max
Barbara Ringuette
Georgene Smith-Gooden
Liza Temple
Cliff Towne
David Wheatley

2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Comments from the public on non-agenda items – up to 2 minutes per speaker

3. MOTIONS & RESOLUTIONS – Discussion and Possible Action

A. 2619 Sunset / Freedman's

Case Number ZA-2017-600-CUB

CUP for a full line of alcohol sales for on-site consumption in conjunction with 1,590 SF restaurant with 56 seats. Former La Caridad location.

Applicant (Nick)

- Concept for restaurant is modern Jewish deli
- full line of alcohol
- hours
 - sun – thurs: 7am-12am
 - wed – sat: 7am-2am
- no live entertainment
- no happy hour
- already approved for building permit
- hearing scheduled for mid June
- will meet with North East Vice
- 15ft service counter/bar
 - Not main focus of the restaurant
 - Restaurant first, bar secondary
- 7-10 employees working at a time
- 23-26 parking spaces in strip mall

- Head chef will park onsite
- Will encourage employees to use alternative means of transportation
- Has noticed during the day majority of spaces are open
- Restaurant will add value to the neighborhood

Public/Committee Comments

- Georgene – mistake on application about existing establishment having a full line of alcohol
 - Neighbors concerned with parking, however she has not seen any
 - Usually ample meter parking on Sunset
 - Scott Crawford – has concerns with parking, has been issues with parking and the neighborhood in general
- Concerned with menu, no food he would eat there
- Overall not in favor of the proposed restaurant
- Hardy Wronske – supports project
 - Will have possible impact on the neighborhood, more eyes on the street
 - Bertha – concerned with traffic and parking in the area, especially on Benson during the day
 - Also concerned with menu
- Beatrice – concerns with parking in illegal areas (red curbs)
- Norma – concerned with safety on Benton and traffic/parking in the surrounding neighborhood
- Julie Jones – noise concerns
 - Safety concerns about the proposed hours of operation
 - Encourages the applicant to talk to the hotel across the street for parking for employees
- Consultant responds
 - Acknowledge that Benton is narrow
 - The former establishment was already operating as a restaurant
 - Around same number of seats
 - Applicant is not intensifying the space
 - New restaurant will accommodate later crowd in the neighborhood
 - Will use noise insulation, have already installed interior noise insulation
 - The alley behind the building will be gated and garbage in from to minimize activity in the back alley
 - Trying to address concerns with rear neighbors
- Amber – parking concerns on Coronado and Benton
- Michael – where will employees park?
- Barbara – all nearby restaurants/businesses are only open till 11pm
 - Has concerns with hours and parking in the neighborhood
- Bob – supports restaurant
 - Underutilized area of Sunset
 - Lots of people on foot
 - Always parking on Sunset
 - Wants applicant to encourage using parking lot and not on adjacent streets
- Rosa – supports project
 - No Jewish delis in area, good addition to neighborhood
 - Acknowledges that there are parking issues in Silver Lake but that is the city's issue
- Liza – supports project
 - States that there is no restaurant nearby
 - Needed addition to neighborhood
- Daniel – supports restaurant

- States that no one is ever happy with parking
- Mark – concerns with patrons smoking outside
 - Wants signs posted about no smoking near restaurant

Scott makes motion to support/ Second by Cliff

- Scott: the applicant to look into hours/parking solutions
- Also look into an employee parking incentive plan
- Also look into hotel parking spaces across the street

Straw poll = 32 yes / 7 no

Vote = 7 yes / 0 no / 2 abstain

YES Duncan, Ferrell, Lisauskas, Max, Plante, Temple, Towne

NO

ABSTAIN Cetrone, Ringuette

B. 2468 Glendale

Case Number ZA-2016-2864-CE

50-unit residential building utilizing parking option 1 to include 11% very low income housing units with 2 off-menu incentives, including increased FAR and height.

Applicant Presentation:

- The project will provide housing options
- Contributes to the walkable community
- Near existing amenities
- Base density 38
- Asking for 52 units under density bonus
- Height = 56ft
- 100% residential units
- Providing flexible open space / community room and fitness studio
- Total of 5,033 sq ft total open space
- Can't speak to the history of the applicant
- Not marketing specifically to Silver Lake residents

Public/Committee Comments:

- John – supports the project
 - What's requirement to live there
 - Why parking option 1?
- Art - supports project
 - Has questions about parking spaces
- Tom – traffic concerns
 - Density concerns, already a dense area of Silver Lake
 - Wrote a letter to Mitch O'Farrell
- Peter – too tall
 - Likes design
 - Not right area for this project
 - Concerned with developers history
- Tina - wants to know the range for rent
 - Developer responds with "market rate"
 - 50% of AMI (56,000ish) so half = 26,000
- Brendon – height and parking concerns
 - Questions about roof space and community room

- Jess (consultant) responds to some questions
 - Rooftop hours are the same as any apartment in LA
 - Community room a possibility for meetings
 - Only 2 open roof top decks, one in front facing Glendale blvd, other in back
 - The developer wants to maintain courtyard heritage of LA
 - States that Urban Blox is an investor in the project
- Dave – height and traffic concerns
- Ricardo – wants to know how much taller than the buildings across the street
 - Developer responds with “3 stories”
- Amy – height concerns
 - She is a geotechnical engineer and is concerned with the soft sediment of the area combined with the weight of this building
 - Also concerned with earthquakes
- Nancy – echoes all concerns that have been previously stated
- Hardy – states that all the developer is asking for is legal
 - Utilizing state laws
- Liza – excited to see smaller units that are affordable in Silver Lake
 - Supports less parking spaces
 - Tells the community to contact councilmember about traffic concerns
- Georgene – confirms that the ZA hearing is tomorrow
 - Concerns about the fact the hearing is tomorrow and many of the surrounding community was unaware of the project
 - Wants the Zoning Administrator to take the project under advisement for more community input
- Carol – wants to see the building in context with the surrounding neighborhood
 - Concerns with the developer and their history
 - Says that the Urban Blox has a history of entitling properties then dumping it onto someone else
- Barbara – wants to know how often buses go by
 - Rental rates?
 - Asks about the parking, is it unbundable?
 - Will you be charging every renter for parking?
 - Also has traffic concerns

Jess (consultant) responds:

- Can't speak about unbundling parking with units
- The city wants a 10ft dedication
- Should take about 14-16 months to build
- Mark – wants to know what the effect on Glendale will be?
 - Also, effect on pedestrian traffic
- Bob – asks the applicant if what they are doing is above and beyond green building code
- Steve(architect) responds – the building will be LEED silver
 - 20% EV chargers installed
- Jerome – height concerns
 - Density bonus concerns
 - 5% density bonus doesn't affect “shit”

Scott makes a motion to recommend that the ZA take the project under advisement and hold a community meeting in the meantime to address community's concerns / Georgene
Seconds

Vote = 13 yes / 0 no / 0 abstain

YES Cetrone, Courshon, Duncan, Ferrell, LeVin, Lisauskas, Max, Plante,
Ringuette, Smith-Goodin, Temple, Towne, Wheatley

NO

ABSTAIN

C. 716 N. Lucile

Case Number AA-2016-4276-PMLA-SL

Three small lot homes.

- Andrew (applicant) speaks –
 - States that the project is above new small lot guidelines that are not enforced yet
 - Wants to work with the community
 - Willing to change design
 - Has 21 signatures of support from neighbors
 - Built more than 40 projects
 - Already in construction, project was already approved March 1st

Comments from public/committee

- Carol – commend the outreach the applicant did
 - Supports project
- Tina – wants to know price?
- Robin – will the applicant be buying neighboring properties?
- Jerome – why is the project already in construction?
- Georgene – is there a pedestrian entry on the left of the building?
- Barbara – wants to know the size of the rooftop decks?
 - Questions about the back units
 - Does project meet new amendments?
- Bob – good outreach, states that that is rare
 - Supports project
- Liza – likes the level of outreach
- David – opposed to project
 - Is the developer willing to be bound by the new small lot rules?
- Mark – asks about the “dog house” on the roof
- Cathy – doesn’t support bigger units
 - Runs counter to small lots

Andrew responds to questions –

- Yes, there is a dog house for the staircases leading up to the rooftop decks
 - Hard to waterproof exterior staircases
- Yes, there is an entry way on the left side of the front structure
- Will not be buying adjacent homes to develop

Scott makes a motion to support / Second by Georgene

Straw Poll = 3 yes / 11 no / 1 abstain

Vote = 5 yes / 2 no / 6 abstain

Motion fails

YES Cetrone, Courshon, Duncan, Ferrell, LeVin, Lisauskas, Max, Plante,
Ringuette, Smith-Goodin, Temple, Towne, Wheatley

NO

ABSTAIN

D. 1347 N. Lucile
Case Number AA-2016-3793-PMLA-SL
Three small lot homes.

- No hearing date yet
- 15 foot front setback
- Construction will follow City laws

Comments from community/committee

- Andrea – what’s the zoning on the street?
 - Wants the project to be setback more from the street
 - Why separate units?
- Dominique – concerns with size
 - Wants to know construction timeline
 - Noise/dust abatement?
- Hardy – says it’s difficult to build small lots under 14 months
 - Wants to project to be subject to the new guidelines
 - Says that he is a small lot developer and he subjects his projects to the new guidelines and recommends this developer should too
- Bruce – wants to know the feedback from community
- Tim – is this the original design?
 - Is it from scratch?
- Catherine – concerned with look/design
 - Urges members that the design is not in character with the community
- Michael – concerns with design
- Peter – says that this project is taking advantage of the neighborhood
 - Too dense
 - Unappealing
 - Does not like the 3 foot projection over the driveway
 - Project not about affordability
- Mark – concerned with lack of trees
 - Concerns with design
 - Developer not being a good neighbor by cutting down the mature trees
- Bob – concerns with design
 - Would like more info about the project and being able to see it in context with the surrounding neighborhood
- Barbara – concerns with design
 - Least attractive small lot she’s ever seen
 - Windows all the same, too monotonous
- Danielle – says the project is plain ugly
 - Needs mature trees
- Carole – wants the developer to preserve the mature trees already on the lot
 - Looks like the front door of the first unit is for your car, not appealing design
- Georgene – issues with driveway
 - Looks like a 10ft driveway, too small
 - Possibly 4 bedrooms with the space on the entry level floor
 - Not enough living space, seems like all bedroom/bathrooms
 - Would like to see more detailed plans
- Liza – encourages the developer to read the committee guidelines
 - Would like smaller units
 - Values creative reflective design
- David – agrees with Liza about design

- Says the sides of the building look like rock walls
- Would like to see more details
- Brady – says this project will have a high impact on the neighborhood
- Annette – concerns with parking, traffic, and safety
- Construction concerns
- Concerns with back retaining wall
- Jerome – no open space
- Would like the project to adhere to the new guidelines
- Concerns with outreach
- Would like temporary sound barriers for construction
- Joe – this is the most basic small lot this committee has ever seen
- Design is unimaginative
- However, there are some good qualities to it
- Likes the cut outs on the front unit 3rd story and back unit, but the beam over it negates its purpose
- Seems like the developer intentionally presenting a subpar project so when they come back next month with improvements, the committee can only like it more because the bar was set so low.

Scott makes a motion to table for next month to address the comments made and follows the committee's guidelines / Second by Joe

Vote = unanimous

E. Closure - Sunset Blvd. Pedestrian Tunnel Carson

- O'Farrell wants to close off the tunnel, fill it up with cement by end of March/ early April
- Heather Carson has ideas and would like to repurpose it to maybe an art walk

Questions and comments from Committee/community –

- Genelle – 2 years ago, a plan was to be established with funding from O'Farrell's office, but no one submitted anything
- Georgene – says that it will cost the city \$200,000 to fill it
 - City won't respond to repurposing money requests
- Hardy – says there is lots of community interest
 - Recommends survey LA and require an MND to slow down the city in filling it up

Scott makes a motion to send a letter to Mitch O'Farrell about new information and idea / Second by Georgene

Vote = 13 yes / 0 no / 0 abstain

YES Cetrone, Courshon, Duncan, Ferrell, LeVin, Lisauskas, Max, Plante, Ringuette, Smith-Goodin, Temple, Towne, Wheatley

NO

ABSTAIN

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- Barbara – comments on February minutes

Approved Feb minutes = Jerome abstains

Approved January minutes = Cliff, Rose, Mark, David abstain

5. ADJOURNMENT at 9:00 p.m.