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
    o 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
    o What’s requirement to live there
    o Why parking option 1?
  • Art - supports project
    • Has questions about parking spaces
  • Tom – traffic concerns
    o Density concerns, already a dense area of Silver Lake
    o Wrote a letter to Mitch O’Farrell
  • Peter – too tall
    o Likes design
    o Not right area for this project
    o Concerned with developers history
  • Tina - wants to know the range for rent
    o Developer responds with “market rate”
    o 50% of AMI (56,000ish) so half = 26,000
  • Brendon – height and parking concerns
    o Questions about roof space and community room
Jess (consultant) responds to some questions
  o Rooftop hours are the same as any apartment in LA
  o Community room a possibility for meetings
  o Only 2 open roof top decks, one in front facing Glendale blvd, other in back
  o The developer wants to maintain courtyard heritage of LA
  o 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
  o Developer responds with “3 stories”

Amy – height concerns
  o She is a geotechnical engineer and is concerned with the soft sediment of the area combined with the weight of this building
  o Also concerned with earthquakes

Nancy – echoes all concerns that have been previously stated

Hardy – states that all the developer is asking for is legal
  o Utilizing state laws

Liza – excited to see smaller units that are affordable in Silver Lake
  o Supports less parking spaces
  o Tells the community to contact councilmember about traffic concerns

Georgene – confirms that the ZA hearing is tomorrow
  o Concerns about the fact the hearing is tomorrow and many of the surrounding community was unaware of the project
  o 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
  o Concerns with the developer and their history
  o 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
  o Rental rates?
  o Asks about the parking, is it unbundable?
  o Will you be charging every renter for parking?
  o 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?
    o 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
    o 20% EV chargers installed
  • Jerome – height concerns
    o Density bonus concerns
    o 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
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
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?
- Dominque – 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 retailing 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
  o City won’t respond to repurposing money requests
• Hardy – says there is lots of community interest
  o 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.