

OFFICIAL MINUTES
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, February 9, 2016
200 North Spring Street, City Hall
Los Angeles, California 90012

MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION HEREIN ARE REPORTED IN ACTION FORMAT. COMPLETE DETAILS, INCLUDING THE DISCUSSION, RELATING TO EACH ITEM ARE CONTAINED IN THE HEARING RECORDINGS FOR THIS MEETING. COPIES OF COMPACT DISCS RECORDINGS ARE AVAILABLE BY CONTACTING CENTRAL PUBLICATIONS, AT (213) 978-1255 AND ARE ALSO ACCESSIBLE THROUGH THE WORLD WIDE WEB AT **www.planning.lacity.org**.

The meeting was called to order by Commission President Kimberly Chemerinsky at 4:40p.m.

Commissioners present: Daphne Brogdon, Jennifer Chung-Kim and Bricia Lopez
Commissioner absent: Christina Oh

The following agenda item no. 1 was called out of order by Commission President Chemerinsky, and the meeting proceeded as follows.

2. COMMISSION BUSINESS

A. Advanced Calendar

No changes to the advance calendar.

B. Commission Requests

Commissioner Brogdon announced that she will not be available for the March 22, 2016, regular Area Planning Commission meeting.

C. Approval of the Minutes - January 26, 2016

Motion:

To approve the **January 26, 2016** minutes:

Moved: Chung-Kim

Seconded: Brogdon

Ayes: Lopez, and Chemerinsky

Absent: Oh

Vote: 4 - 0

3. **DIR-2015-1350-SPP-SPPA-1A**
CEQA: ENV-2015-1351-CE
Community Plan: Hollywood
Council District No.: 13 – O'Farrell

Expiration Date February 16, 2016
Appeal Status: Not Further Appealable
under the Los Angeles
Municipal Code

PUBLIC HEARING

LOCATION: 4618 West Maubert Avenue

Proposed Project:

Project Permit Compliance Review for an after-the fact demolition of an existing two-story, four-unit apartment building, and the construction of a new two-story modular building to be used as temporary offices for ongoing construction projects for the Children's Hospital; and Project Permit Adjustment from the Transparent Building Elements Development Standard to allow approximately six-percent of the ground floor façade on the westerly side elevation, and zero-percent on the front and easterly side elevations to be transparent, in lieu of the required 50-percent of the ground floor facades on the front and side elevations to be transparent.

Requested Action:

Appeal of the Director of Planning's conditional approval of a Project Permit Compliance pursuant to Section 11.5.7C, and Project Permit Adjustment pursuant to Section 11.5.7E of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

APPLICANT: Rodney Hanners, Children's Hospital Los Angeles
Representative: Darlene Kuba, Kuba and Associates

APPELLANT: George Abrahams

Recommended Action:

1. **Grant in part and Deny in part** the appeal of the Director of Planning's conditional approval of a Project Permit Compliance Review and Project Permit Adjustment.
2. **Modify** the Staff Findings relating to Height and Floor Area; Rooftop Appurtenances, Roof Lines, Building Materials and Façade Relief Development Standards; Building Color Design Guidelines; and the environmental clearance.
3. **Approve** revised "Exhibit A".
4. **Modify** Conditions of Approval No. 2 to clarify that the design of the building shall also be reevaluated; Condition of Approval No. 4 to modify the overall height of the building; and Condition Of Approval No. 8 to require that the proposed metal screen, shown on the revised "Exhibit A", wrap around the north, west and east elevations of the building.
5. **Sustain** the remainder of the Determination of the Director of Planning in approving a Project Permit Compliance and Project Permit Adjustment.
6. **Add** Class 1, Category 5 (Existing Facilities) and Class 32 (Urban Infill) as Categorical Exemptions.
7. **Find** that Class 21, Category 2; Class 1, Category 5 and Class 32 (Case No. **ENV-2015-2616-CE**) are adequate environmental clearances.

Staff: Mindy Nguyen (213) 978-1241

Blake Lamb (213) 978-1167

Discussion:

Mindy Nguyen described the Permit Compliance Review and Project Permit Adjustment relating to this project in detail which included the appellant's viewpoints with counter response by the planning staff. Commission asked detail questions of the Senior Planner. Commission gave the appellant an opportunity to speak on the subject site.

The applicant's representative gave a presentation in support of the case project site. The Commission asked clarifying question to the applicant's representative.

The Commission called for a short recess at 5.35p.m. The commission meeting reconvened at 5:40p.m.

The Commission opened meeting with the public comment period. Several persons spoke for the appeal as well as those who spoke against the appeal. The commission heard rebuttals from the appellant and the applicant's representative. The public comment period was closed and the deliberation began to form a motion.

Motion:

1. **Grant** the appeal of the Director of Planning's conditional approval of a Project Permit Compliance Review and Project Permit Adjustment.
2. **Do Not Modify** the Staff Findings relating to Height and Floor Area; Rooftop Appurtenances, Roof Lines, Building Materials and Façade Relief Development Standards; Building Color Design Guidelines; and the environmental clearance.
3. **Do Not Approve** revised "Exhibit A".
4. **Do Not Modify** Conditions of Approval No. 2 to clarify that the design of the building shall also be reevaluated; Condition of Approval No. 4 to modify the overall height of the building; and Condition Of Approval No. 8 to require that the proposed metal screen, shown on the revised "Exhibit A", wrap around the north, west and east elevations of the building.
5. **Do Not Sustain** the remainder of the Determination of the Director of Planning in approving a Project Permit Compliance and Project Permit Adjustment.
6. **Do Not Add** Class 1, Category 5 (Existing Facilities) and Class 32 (Urban Infill) as Categorical Exemptions.
7. **Do Not Find** that Class 21, Category 2; Class 1, Category 5 and Class 32 (Case No. **ENV-2015-2616-CE**) are adequate environmental clearances.

Motion

Moved: Brogdon
Seconded: Chemerinsky
Ayes: Chung-Kim
Nays: Lopez
Absent: Oh

Vote: 3 - 1

The Commission called for a second recess at 6:31p.m. The commission meeting reconvened at 6:36p.m.

4. **ZA-2014-955-CUB-1A**

CEQA: ENV-2014-956-CE

Community Plan: Hollywood

Council District No.: 5 – Koretz

Expiration Date: February 9, 2016 Ext.

Appeal Status: Not Further Appealable

RECONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – HELD ON DECEMBER 8, 2015

LOCATION: 7111 West Melrose Avenue

Requested Action:

An **appeal** of Condition No. 7 of the Zoning Administrator's decision to **Approve**, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W,1, a Conditional Use to allow the sale and dispensing of beer and wine for on-site consumption in an existing restaurant in the C4-1XL Zone; and to adopt the Lead Agency's action in issuing Categorical Exemption ENV-2014-956-CE as the environmental clearance for this action.

APPLICANT: Tatsu Ramen, LLC

Representative: Danny Aleshire, Liner LLP

APPELLANT: Same

Representative: Jerry Neuman / Noel Fleming, Liner LLP

Recommended Action:

1. **Adopt** the Findings of the Zoning Administrator.
2. **Deny** the appeal of Condition No 7.
3. **Sustain** the Zoning Administrator's decision to **Approve**, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W,1, a Conditional Use to allow the sale and dispensing of beer and wine for on-site consumption in an existing restaurant in the C4-1XL Zone.
4. **Adopt** the Lead Agency's action in issuing Categorical Exemption **ENV-2014-956-CE** as the environmental clearance for this action.

Staff: Maya Zaitzevsky (213) 978-1416

Commissioner Brogdon stated that she listened to the previous hearing tape of December 8, 2016, and she is ready to proceed with the case.

Discussion:

Zoning Administrator, Maya Zaitzevsky, presented the case by giving a recap of the previous zone hearing that was heard and the area planning commission meeting that was held on December 8, 2015, in regards to this case. The applicant's representative, and those who were against the appeal spoke. The commission opened the public comment period. One person spoke for the appeal.

A Council Representative from Council District No. 5, spoke on behalf of Paul Koretz in support of the Zoning Administration's decision. The commission asked specific questions regarding the site

Rebuttal time was provided to the applicant's representative. The commission opened and closed the public comment period. The deliberation began with clarifying questions to Planning Staff, City Attorney, and with applicant's representative. A motion was formed.

Motion:

1. **Adopt** the modified Findings of the Zoning Administrator.
2. **Deny** the appeal of Condition No 7 and **Granted in Part** and modified Condition No. 9.
3. **Sustain** the Zoning Administrator's decision to **approve**, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W,1, a Conditional Use to allow the sale and dispensing of beer and wine for on-site consumption in an existing restaurant in the C4-1XL Zone.
4. **Adopt** the Lead Agency's action in issuing Categorical Exemption **ENV-2014-956-CE** as the environmental clearance for this action.

Moved: Brogdon
Seconded: Chung-Kim
Nays: Chemerinsky
Abstain: Lopez*
Absent: Oh

Vote: 3 – 1

* Per the Central Area Planning Commission Bylaws, Rule No. 28, (In the event a member who is present fails to vote either "yes" or "no",...shall be deemed to have voted "yes.")

1. **DEPARTMENTAL REPORT**
No departmental report was given.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**
There were no speakers for the public comment period.

There being no further business to come before the Central Area Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:03p.m.



Kimberly Chemerinsky, Commission President
Central Area Planning Commission



Renee Glasco, Commission Executive Assistant I
Central Los Angeles Area Planning Commission

Adopted on: **MAR 8, 2016**