

Unofficial Transcript – Part Two

# **1045 OLIVE PROJECT**

VTT-74531-CN

CPC-2017-3251-TDR-MCUP-SPR

ZA-2017-4845-ZAI

ENV-2016-4630-EIR (SCH No. 2017121047)

Joint Advisory Agency/Zoning Administrator Hearing  
January 15, 2020

---

## **Holland & Knight**

[www.hklaw.com](http://www.hklaw.com)

**Unofficial Transcript – 1045 Olive Project**

**Joint Agency Advisory Zoning Administrator Hearing**

**Part Two**

**January 15, 2020**

Speaker Name	
Elliott Kahn: Developer	<p>I am very humbled and proud to present a project like 1045 Olive.</p> <p>So Crescent Heights was built on a belief that we are long term value investors of any market that we're in. We focus that belief in some of the greatest cities in America, from Boston to Seattle, Chicago to San Francisco. I like to think we're Dodgers fans at heart. And the basic principles really are built on - are twofold: We're built on one, that great design is how you lead, design that embraces and enhances the neighborhood aesthetic, paying homage to the local heritage, and two; we believe that people will thrive in walkable urban communities that are adjacent to transit and jobs. And 1045 Olive project is exactly that. 794 homes in the heart of the downtown L.A. Renaissance, 12,500 square feet of retail adjacent to a brand new public plaza and a truly unique tower design that I'll allow the founder of ODA, our designer architect to explore and show you guys shortly.</p> <p>Finally, the most important feature of the project is it is an Environmental Leadership Development Project. So it'll be the first certified by the state in downtown L.A. I think maybe one of the first to be built- hopefully- in the City of Los Angeles.</p> <p>And with that, we are 100% carbon neutral. We have a commitment to prevailing-wage labor. And I think we have some members of the trade here so if we and now they can attest that it will be a fully union job.</p> <p>And with that, I'd like to turn it over to our Lead counsel, Ryan Leaderman. Thank you.</p>
Ryan Leaderman: Counsel	<p>Great, thank you very much. My name is Ryan Leaderman from the law firm Holland &amp; Knight, 400 South Hope Street.</p> <p>I do want to thank staff, especially Milena for the hard work going into this project over the past three and a half, almost four years. I believe, Milena, you are the third planner on this project. But you</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>were stuck with having to do probably the most amount of work on it.</p> <p>Today we have the full team over here. We have ESA Gary Schalman, who, actually, this is his last week, he'll be retiring so – sorry for revealing that. So he put in a lot of hard work into the environmental review for this project. We have Eran Chen from ODA, the architects, and he'll be speaking a little bit later this morning, Alex Irvine and Tim Moran, Michael Bates from Mobility, and of course, our civil engineer, Alex Moore from DEA.</p> <p>So, I believe some of the project details have already been discussed. So – 794 units, 751,777 square feet of floor area, 13 to one. So I'm not going to belabor those points, but what I do really want to go ahead and address at the outset, especially in light of BOE's comments is the application was deemed complete in January of 2017. That is three years ago? And so this project is subject to the Housing Accountability Act and that imposes strict restrictions on the City in imposing conditions after a project has been deemed complete. The revised map is submitted to the city as part of the EIR. The City has had it for a few years now and so there has been plenty of opportunity for the City to review it. But under California Government Code 65589.5(j)(1), the City's hands are tied in imposing conditions on a project after a project is deemed complete. And certain findings would have to be made in order to deny a project or impose conditions that would lower the density of the project. So we do take quite a bit of exception to the late comments when the city has had this revised map for over two years and the only thing that we did not do – because no one asked – was to pay an additional \$2,000 dollar fee until a few days ago.</p> <p>So, we do take quite an exception, we would invoke all our rights under the Housing Accountability Act and the City is not going to be able to make findings either to deny the project or condition in such a way to lower the density.</p> <p>Those mergers that were in the map have been there for the last several years. They have been analyzed, they've been looked at in the EIR and so there is a little bit of disconnect here – we shouldn't be responsible if maybe someone at the City didn't review this, but this map was delivered to the City, to the Bureau of Engineering several years ago, so we do take quite a bit of exception to the surprise, planning by surprise. And the Housing Accountability Act, with the housing crisis we have right now, protects projects and</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>developers from the imposition of conditions by surprise – like this – that would result in the denial of a project as proposed.</p> <p>So, we just want to make that clear, we understand about the concerns about the haul route and needing to understand the implications for the slight increase in the hauling amount, so we understand that and appreciate that, but to the extent that there are potential additional conditions that are inconsistent with the map that we have submitted, that the City has deemed complete, we will exercise our rights fully with regard to that.</p> <p>That said, many of the benefits of the project Elliott addressed, so – very briefly – I’ll go over some of the entitlement requests.</p> <p>First, there seems to be quite a bit of discussion about the tract map, so we are requesting a subdivision of airspace and mergers. We’ve requested modifications which are reasonable, which reflect the map that was proposed and so we just added, we propose to add conditions that are consistent with the map that we proposed. We also are requesting Site Plan Review. We are also requesting a transfer of floor-area ratio and we appreciate the zoning administrator’s detailed description about the the property or the TFAR going out to the center lines of the surrounding streets and your floor area is based upon that, so because it is within 1,500 feet of transit, we are just a few blocks away from the Pico Station, so the municipal code gives us that ability to go ahead and do it. We’ve also requested a master conditional use permit for the sale of alcohol within the project, and we’ve also requested a site-specific Zoning Administrator’s Interpretation to allow, one, the wrap-around balconies as well as covered exterior open space to not count as floor area, and then in the alternative, if the outdoor area, the covered open space area is not granted, then we have requested that those building amenity areas qualify as recreation rooms. But the first, and strong preference would be to have those areas not considered floor area, and in light of that, we would be very amenable to conditions of approval that would the prohibit enclosure of those areas to prevent it from being enclosed area which would then constitute them being floor area.</p> <p>And what’s really significant about the ZAI that we’re requesting is that the height and the volume and the intent of that space to operate as open space and when you travel the world and go to cities like Mexico City or Miami you really do see interesting designs and open-space amenity areas, and so this kind of reflects that vision.</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>And also, there's support for it, even though it is in draft form, in the DTLA 2040 Plan.</p> <p>With that, unless there are questions for me, I'll turn it over to the architect to go over the design, thank you.</p>
<p>Eran Chen: Architect</p>	<p>Thank you very much for having me, my name is Eran Chen, owner of ODA New York. We are a New York based design firm that works nationally and internationally and the bulk of our work is actually in complex, mixed-use projects in high-density places and cities around the world. This is our first project in L.A. and we are very humble and very proud to work with Crescent Heights and the entire team on that.</p> <p>One of the main goals of the design was to express an architectural - [...] give architectural expression of a building that is a residential tower alongside increasing residential density in downtown and more towers coming up, it is clear that the neighborhood is transforming to a mixed-use, walkable neighborhood and it was very important that the building, in its design would express that to the city and to the buildings surrounding it. The other important aspect is how the building lands, the tower lands within its context. It was very important that it becomes a contribution to the neighborhood, to the streetscape and a good neighbor to our already-built neighbors.</p> <p>Next. So essentially the form is extremely simple and elegant, in its rectangular forms, that we you know feel is going to be timeless. What you see in those rectangles or cubes is the upper one at the two-thirds height of the tower is the amenities space, the communal house for the future 1,500 tenants and the base houses the lobbies, the retail and that these are the pieces that – architecturally – we wanted to elaborate on.</p> <p>It's quite common when we look at the skyline of existing towers, in L.A. and in other places as well, that the body, the shaft of the tower does not bring a human scale, necessarily or in the glass extrusion, it does necessarily add an articulation that expresses a vertical village or housing project and we wanted to create something that becomes an iconic visual element for the City to know the transition of that neighborhood, and at the base, you know the contribution of a building beyond the sidewalk and the way that we activate the sidewalk is in places of community engagement and public gathering which is very hard to find in downtown.</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>So, if you look at the base of the building, one of the first moves that we thought was, in efforts to be a good neighbor to our condo building next door, which you see here on the left, was to create a language of voids, or deductions if you will, in the mass to create open space that would be green and communal spaces that would also allow the neighboring building to have open views, and we set back to the extent that we could and set back the tower positioning away from our neighbor in order to respect their light and air and to make sure that what they are looking down into is a beautiful green space.</p> <p>At the corner of the two streets, we have deducted a 40x40 plaza that's about 60 feet tall and that's a privately owned open space that we feel would tremendously contribute to the life of the street, would allow for people to gather, to be in the shade, to eat or have a break and also a viewing place, an opportunity for placements of art.</p> <p>The rest of the bulk is wrapped with apartments with balconies that are facing the street and on the right you see the recessed area for the lobby, again to create some air-space from the sidewalk and extend the experience and lastly on the left side, the retail faces the street with a recessed area as well to allow for outdoor seating.</p> <p>We made sure that the areas that we call communal areas are heavily landscaped, we are using more than ten local species of trees at the terraces and both gardens as you see. And the idea is that at the pedestrian level, the eye would be drawn from the landscape at the street and the plaza, to the elevated plaza then to the roof of the podiums so there is some sort of continuous green space as you travel from the street.</p> <p>And here, you can see how that kind of comes to life, this is a pretty significant, I think, community, neighborhood type of gathering space. We are envisioning a food market surrounding it so people will not only be able to buy groceries, but to have breakfast, lunch or dinner in this area, for kids to play, and we are working with artists to create an arts presentation that is site-specific to this occasion.</p> <p>You also see that the cladding of the cantilever balconies is done in a wood-printed texture on aluminum, that is true through the entire tower and as you will see as I continue, brings a very kind of human, warm feeling to the entire composition.</p> <p>The amenities space, or what I sort of call the community house, is made out of similar huge gaps. What you see here on the left is a 60</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>foot tall void that would house the pool and will be surrounded by a gym and lounges and dining areas, etcetera. And that kind of volume will be seen by everywhere in the city as a communal sort of gathering space, a warm place and I think my colleagues have discussed the FAR issue, nobody has any intention to close this, the idea is to really express something different at the skyline of L.A.</p> <p>You also see, - it's hard to see with the resolution- the cladding of the wood texture everywhere we have a cantilever, so that in perspective is seen as a warm, beautiful material.</p> <p>The typical railing on the balconies is three-foot-six, but the railing around the amenity space would be higher, it would be glass-ready at five feet both for safety and for transparency, and also it helps with the wind.</p> <p>So, overall, we are hoping that this tower brings additional density to the neighborhood, would become a center or gathering place, sort of iconic place for people to meet at the street level, but also will be seen from far away as an element that represents the new life of this neighborhood as a mixed use and as a residential neighborhood.</p> <p>Here you can see the landscaped area on the eighth floor and on the seventh floor, adjacent to our condo neighbors and how we are clearing their base in order to maximize openness for those windows and that's it, unless you have any other questions.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Milena Zasadzien: Department of City Planning	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>One second, would you mind filling out a speaker card, just so we have it for the record.</p>
Eran Chen:	Sure.
Milena Zasadzien:	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>So now we'll begin the public comment period of our meeting today. Can I please have Ron Miller come up?</p>
Ron Miller:	<p>Good morning, I'm Ron Miller, Executive Secretary of the L.A. - Orange County Building and Construction Trades Council. We represent about 140,000 hard working men and women, hopefully a lot of them will get to work on this project.</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>We think the design and architect have done a great job with the open space element that's going to add to this community that is transforming now as we sit here and it is a walkable community and that's what we're in the business of building nowadays. Walkable communities close to transit, they want us all out of our cars, so that's what we're building.</p> <p>We have over a thirty year history with this developer, we have partnered with this developer all over the country on different projects and we've built many successful projects, so we would look forward to moving this project forward so we can get a shovel in the ground.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Charlie Rausch: Department of City Planning</p>	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Ron, You do have a Labor-Management Agreement?</p>
<p>Ron Miller:</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Charlie Rausch:</p>	<p>Okay.</p>
<p>Milena Zasadzien:</p>	<p>Next will be John Nilsson.</p>
<p>John Nilsson:</p>	<p>Good morning, my name is John Nilsson, I am a resident of the building directly behind this project, 1050 is the name of the project and I'm an owner there. It's a 150-unit project and we purchased it about five years ago - as soon as it was available and we're very happy there.</p> <p>Let me just state, first of all, that I am not here in opposition to the project. I am a developer, a retired developer of a very small volume, of a very small town, and so I have been sitting across the table on the other side many times and I know what we have to go through to get a project developed.</p> <p>I am highly in favor of the project, but I am a little bit caught flat-footed here when I hear that all the zoning issues are moot and the cat is out of the bag that we can't discuss the zoning approval, which is a great deal more than what it should be, I believe, on the site. I brought this up about 3 years ago when I was first asked by the developer. I am sure nobody listened to me and I am sure nobody will listen to me now, but I wanted to get this out.</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>This project is going to create some real impacts to our neighborhood – as any project would – I’m not pointing a finger at this and I am entirely in favor of adding a property to this corner. However, the problems that are being proposed here for us as residents, are strictly a result of the size of this project. This is a massive project, 70 stories, I think-If you don’t mind, so I can be more concise and quicker in my presentation, I will ready my letter to Milena some time ago:</p> <p>“I’ve just completed my review of the subject property and Draft EIR and have the following comments to submit for consideration:</p> <p>The project as proposed is just too big. A massive structure housing 795 residential units will exceed the height of all but two or perhaps three existing buildings in downtown Los Angeles. The building will tower above all of the buildings in the surrounding six block area and promises to more than double the population of the block on which it will sit, with resulting negative impacts on traffic congestion, air quality and quality of life in the neighborhood.</p> <p>The proposed design of 70 stories pushes the envelope on practically all aspects of design and living criteria.</p> <p>An example – this is a small side example as I am the owner of two dogs, the number of pets in this building could exceed 500 new dogs based on the number of pets in the surrounding rental and residential properties. I hope that that impact is being considered and taken care of, I’ve never heard that it was.</p> <p>The proposed use of the alleyway as a major access to parking is untenable, having lived in this building since new, I know that the proposed building plan provides for two entry/exit access points in the alleyway behind the building as well as a loading area for move-ins and move outs and only one access point from Hill Street.</p> <p>There are currently two apartment buildings and a 22-story condominium complex, which total approximately 650 units on the block, and all three of these currently use that alleyway. I’ll admit that our building was poorly designed with no access off the street. Our only access is through that alleyway and we have five levels of parking that use it.</p> <p>Currently, this alleyway is impassible in many instances throughout the day. The doubling of traffic in this alleyway – it would be more than doubling the traffic with this building with the adding of 795</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>units to the mix, will cause extreme problems for all residents on the block. It will make it even uncomfortable to live in these units due to conflicts of exit and entrance to the buildings.</p> <p>There should be at least two entrance and exit portals at Hill and 12<sup>th</sup> Street in this plan. I know the city does not like to see entrances and exits off the main thoroughfares, but I'm sorry, we are going to be in a real traffic mess back there and I am just bringing this up now because it's gonna be - people are going to be screaming about it.</p> <p>This traffic disaster will result from the proposed 70-story design will negatively affect tenants of the new building as much as the surrounding neighbors, everyone, neighbors and tenants of the new building will be unhappy and they are already unhappy in there, we have situations where we can't get in from either side, so I don't think this has been properly thought out, frankly.</p> <p>A more viable design alternative would be either alternatives 2 or 3 in the EIR. A mid-rise residential of 300-325 units respectively and one level of parking.”</p> <p>Basically, to summarize this idea, I believe – personally- as a developer of successful projects in the past that you have to really give it a thought as to what your project is going to do over the next 10 to 15-year period, and I'm asking – we have a number of high-end rental properties that are proposed and are being built now. The ones that have been completed have been relatively empty for a year to two years, they haven't been full, The price ranges that are offered in these properties due to the cost of construction and believe me, I understand, but this is gonna have to be a luxury apartment, there is no other way it can be developed unless it has significant city input, or a dollar input from the community.</p> <p>Isn't it better to have 300 to 400 units on this block that are fully occupied and are not causing extreme hardship for the balance of the area? Isn't it better to have that than a 70-story project that is vacant or mostly vacant for the next five to ten years?</p> <p>I don't see where the demand is going to come from to fill this project. I know that's not for me to decide, it's for the developer, but I hope they are giving it a lot of consideration because I don't see it.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	Thank you. Next is Clara Karger.

Speaker Name	
Clara Karger:	<p>Good morning, my name is Clara Karger, with Central City Association, we represent more than 400 businesses, non-profits and trade associations in downtown Los Angeles. We're strongly supportive of projects that bring more housing units online, activate the public realm and create jobs, we are here to voice our strong support for the 1045 Olive Project consisting of a 70-story mixed-use high-rise development which includes 793 units and a ground-floor public plaza.</p> <p>We believe this project will meaningfully contribute to the vibrant downtown community for residents; visitors and employees and would be a welcome addition to the central city. We encourage you to support this project.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Next is Wallis Locke.</p>
Wallis Locke:	<p>Hi, Wallis Locke, South Park Business Improvement District. As part of our mission to keep South Park clean, safe, and vibrant, the BID often acts as a liaison between developers and the community at large. In preparation for this project, City Center has been proactive in engaging with the community, starting their outreach early, presenting at public board meetings and staying in close contact with our team, in addition to bringing much-needed housing units a very short walk from Pico Station, this project will activate a currently quiet corner with new retail, a public plaza and adding interest to our growing skyline with a bold design. SPBID supports the growth of housing and the neighbors that follow, ground floor activation, especially the possibility of a market that would sell groceries and the diverse skyline that this project would bring.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	<p>Thanks.</p> <p>Next, may we please have Steve Ridgway.</p>
Steve Ridgway:	<p>Steve Ridgway, I reside at 1050 South Grand. I am also on the board of directors for the HOA. I would like to thank all of you for your time, I'd like to thank the developers and the architects.</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>I echo a lot of the previous speaker, John's comments, that resides here at 1050. I wrote down a few notes:</p> <p>One of the biggest aspects, obviously is the height. A 70-story building would be a - an eyesore in the South Park region. All the buildings out there, I think the largest to date that is being built right now is the Park Hyatt from the Oceanwide Project. The next biggest would be the USC building.</p> <p>When you look at the skyline this is going to stand out and just be aesthetically - I don't think it's going to be good for downtown.</p> <p>Now to the volume side, John had a very good point. The ingress and egress is in the alleyway in the current proposal. The ingress and egress for the 1050 building is also in that alleyway.</p> <p>The alleyway is very narrow and again, just the sheer volume of , again, 794 units combined with the 151 units of the 1050 building waiting at the stop-light to get traffic going, it's going to be gridlocked.</p> <p>The other aspect is the moving-in/moving out, the shipping trucks and then the noise associated with all of that. So that's a major concern of mine, and as John also mentioned, the alleyway for the entrance from the Olympic cross street is extremely narrow so any of the trucks that go into that alleyway block the remaining residents trying to get to the ingress/egress for the 1050 building. The only other alternative is via the 11<sup>th</sup> Street one-way, so big concern there.</p> <p>The other concern is obviously, for me personally, is I'm on the 20<sup>th</sup> floor, so the view that I paid seven figures plus as an investment is being taken away. The other aspect I have is, we're not Miami, to all due respect to the designer, we're not Miami, we're Los Angeles. That building design, it is unique and, yeah, unique and it doesn't really fit to the skyline, so again, I am highly against the height. I like the development, again, I am pro-development, I like the development of that area, it's a little rundown these days and growth is good for the city.</p> <p>I'll take also another aspect which is the Metropolis construction which has been going on for quite some time, they still haven't filled up all the units, so adding another 794 units to an already surplus inventory doesn't really seem like a good idea for the City. Also, is the City bringing in the jobs to the downtown region to support this? I do know Universal Music has moved to the Arts District area, but</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>that's the Arts District area. So how do you support this large of a project? So a concern there.</p> <p>Another aspect is, I used to live- I've spent eleven years in downtown now, I was living at 5<sup>th</sup> and Hill and there was construction there for a long time, so my concern again is the noise for the construction. Obviously digging the subterranean parking and obviously the development of the 70 stories, so of concern to me that is the noise and you guys were talking about the haul routes and then the time frame for the haul routes, it just goes on and on and on.</p> <p>So again, as an investor with a seven figure plus condo with my view of the mountains being taken away, again these are all my personal problems, snow-capped mountains are pretty beautiful, development is going to take that away which, also, I paid a pretty penny for at this point. And that goes back then to the skyline and the sore thumb aspect of having a 70-story building in South Park that doesn't really fit, so that's a concern of mine.</p> <p>The other aspect is the changing of the design. So from the first design I believe that the podium height was going to go to seven stories, now it's going to nine stories. I don't believe that that was ever discussed for an architectural change or how that would affect the 1050 building or the residents, so I have to report back to the Homeowner's Association, and they're going to say "we were told it was seven floors" so the people on the seventh floor and above were going to be able to have and retain their view to the eastern side over the podium. Now from my understanding, the design has gone to nine floors, so again, that is going to have a material effect on the resale value at 1050, so I want to make sure that that's known to the council as well.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>Next is Negar Nayeri</p>
Negar Nayeri:	<p>Good morning, or rather good afternoon, I don't know! My name is Negari Nayeri, I am a resident of 1050.</p> <p>We actually purchased at 1050 three years ago, specifically in Unit 710 which is on the northeast corner of our building, which is directly looking into this project.</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>About a year and a half ago, the developers had a meeting for the 1050 residents to in order to discuss the plans and how it was not going to impact our views, etcetera, at Prank, which is a local restaurant about a block away. We were specifically told that the deck was going to be on the seventh floor and therefore wouldn't affect the views and take the light away for the residents and that the building was going to be on the northern part of the lot so that again, it would not affect the views and the light for those residents who had spent, as both John and Steve mentioned, quite a bit of money to purchase.</p> <p>Outside of the fact that our views are now going to be blocked as a result of this project, I don't want to reiterate the same things that were – I mean I don't want to repeat what John and Steve already said, but I do want to reiterate, again, that it's 70 stories. I don't think any of us we signed up for living in South Park we signed up for living in Downtown. We understand that it's been zoned for high density projects, but 70 stories is a lot. That is the same size as the US Bank Building and the Wilshire Grand. 794 units is a lot, especially considering that most of the projects that have been recently developed and have gone on-market over the past year are 50 percent unfilled.</p> <p>If you go to the new projects on Ninth and Hope, if you go to Circa which just came online last year, if you go to Metropolis, these are all buildings that are half empty. So how does that add to the community of downtown L.A. and specifically South Park?</p> <p>Other issues that have already been brought up – traffic. At 1050 we have only one way in and out of our garage, which is through the alley. And we're not the only ones who use that alley, it is also used by 1000 Grand, it is also used by the other project that's on Olive and Olympic, so those things need to be considered and I understand that the City doesn't want to give an entrance or exit through Olive because it is going to impact the traffic on Olive, but what about the traffic it is going to create on - in the alley with 794 units from this building and also, I am sure people coming in and out from the commercial, and then 151 units at 1050, and the other probably hundred or 200 at 1000, and the Olive and Olympic Project that live in this area and go in and out of their buildings through this alley.</p> <p>Other things that haven't maybe been thought out is, you know, you talk about more units and it's in order to help the housing issue in L.A.. There are 50,000 people sleeping on the streets in L.A. County</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>right now. Let's not kid ourselves, these are high-end units that are going to be at minimum \$3,000 to \$4,500 a month in rent.</p> <p>And who can afford that? Not the people who are sleeping in tents or out on the streets right now.</p> <p>Let's not kid ourselves, this is not going to fix the housing issue in downtown or in Los Angeles County. It's not affordable housing. And I think everything else I wanted to touch on has already been spoken about by John and Steve, so I don't want to belabor the point.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Charlie Rausch:	Thank you.
Negar Nayeri:	Thank you.
Milena Zasadzien:	<p>Are there any members of the public who wish to speak?</p> <p>So, now the Applicant has the opportunity to respond to the public comments that were presented.</p>
Ryan Leaderman:	<p>Great, thank you. And Ryan Leaderman again, from Holland &amp; Knight and I want to thank members of the public, especially the neighbors for coming out today and having their voices heard and I would like to respond to a number of the comments.</p> <p>First, just going back to the Housing Accountability Act, I just want to read to you Government Code Section 65589.5(j)(1)(A) and (B). And A is: findings in order to deny the project or to condition it in a way that makes it infeasible, the City would have to make a specific adverse – would have to make a finding that the housing development project would have a specific adverse impact upon public health or safety unless the project is disapproved. Specific adverse impact means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards policies or conditions as they existed on the day the application was deemed complete and that there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact identified pursuant to that previous paragraph.</p> <p>With regards to Mr. Nillson, thank you for your comments. I remember a few years ago when you lived at the Eastern Columbia and you also opposed the neighboring project as well. So, I understand you are not in opposition so we do really take into account your comments and the Final EIR pages 2-16 to 2-21 directly addressed every single comment</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>that was in your letter. That's thoroughly been responded to. In specific, with regard to the dog run, or issues with dogs, part of our TFAR Public Benefit payment would be a contribution to the South Park BID of \$200,000 for a dog run in the neighborhood. The BID actually has an identified site that needs funding and so the funding for that would help provide a public dog park that anyone could go ahead and use. In addition, there is a dog run on the project site as well for the residents and guests to go ahead utilize that for their pets. And then also the project does provide a number of streetscape improvements and trees and so forth would improve the streetscape.</p> <p>With regards to the loading and the alley issues, as previously identified in the Final EIR on pages 2-16 to 2-21, there are no access – there's no unlawful queuing, there's no significant amount of queuing that would be caused by the project. A point of clarification, some of the residents were concerned – mentioned that there is no Olive access and I know that wasn't Mr. Nillson's comment, but there is through access. So there is an entrance on Olive as well to dissipate and distribute some of the traffic. And then we situated our driveways and the loading area somewhat opposite the 1050 area as well to provide a larger area for trucks and so forth when backing up and having that access as well.</p>
Charlie Rausch:	Did you say you offset?
Ryan Leaderman:	It's directly, it's directly across. So there are two-
Unidentified Male and Female	[Inaudible chatter]
Milena Zasadzien:	So it is lined up?
Ryan Leaderman:	Yeah, right. So I don't think there are – so the one all the way to the north is not adjacent to the 1050, it is farther to the north but the southerly one where the loading is set across from the 1050 driveway. Yeah. So-
Milena Zasadzien:	People could exit from the alley way through your property to Olive Street?
Ryan Leaderman:	Correct.
Milena Zasadzien:	It would be public access?

Speaker Name	
Elliott Kahn:	Correct, so we have maintained a porte cochere sort of pass through to Olive to help shoulder some of that load from the building. You can enter the parking garage from Olive Street so you're not required. We've kept both options and we've offset the entrances so that we are not going to be having conditions ...[inaudible/laughter] ...loading will be simultaneous and we're backing into this drive-way [inaudible] truck having any concerns. And I want to just point out, as we have engaged with the neighbors in the past, as one of the residents mentioned, our plan is to continue to do so. But I wanted to just want to end - we will follow up with this with further meetings with the Owner's Association and with the individuals here undoubtedly, but I just wanted to point out this condition that we are not solely using the alley. We were aware and we heard loud and clear, really from day one this has been on our plans and similarly there has never been a change to our podium heights. So I'm not - I wanted to clarify that with them and I will follow up with them. But the plans that they have seen and have always been submitted have been exactly the same, so there has never been any change in our podium heights. So I will work to clarify that with the neighbors as well, where the miscommunication was.
Charlie Rausch:	Although it looks like you have seven stories on side, on their side, and then it goes up to nine on the Olive Street side?
Elliott Kahn:	Correct. Right and that has always been the design.
Ryan Leaderman:	That hasn't changed, that hasn't changed.
Charlie Rausch:	I realize that, I just said you have to watch what you say. It sounds like seven stories all the across to them.
Ryan Leaderman:	And so – for that area along the 11th Street does provide that cut out area as well.
Charlie Rausch:	Okay, that's alright.
Ryan Leaderman:	And then also just a point of clarification there are certain portions of that alley that are substandard, and so we would widen that alley to make it the standard City width as well of 20 feet. So it is an existing condition in certain portions of that alley where it isn't that wide. So the project would widen it to City standards at least for the portion abutting the project site.

Speaker Name	
	And then with regard to the concerns about view-blockage, CEQA... Well, first off as a transit area project aesthetic impacts are exempt from analysis and...
Charlie Rausch:	Ryan, we all know that...[inaudible]...sorry.
Ryan Leaderman:	Well, even with CEQA, even if it wasn't exempt, it was never protected...
Charlie Rausch:	That is just general law.
Ryan Leaderman:	But it never protected private views.
Charlie Rausch:	I realize that.
Ryan Leaderman:	<p>If we could go to the image of the skyline? I think that will be really helpful. So yeah. This picture was actually taken a few years ago and since this time Aven has opened a thirty-seven-story tower just a little bit to the left. Mack Urban has two projects, I think one's fifty-one stories that's in entitlements right now at the corner of 11<sup>th</sup> and Olive and then just across the street from 11<sup>th</sup> and Olive is I believe a sixty-story building. I know I am working on a project that is fifty-two-stories right at 11<sup>th</sup> and Hill. And then you know, some of the new projects that– I believe that's Circa over there, that Fig Central might not be depicted over there. So this not a current representation of what is here. This neighborhood already has the high-rise towers and as point of clarification when the 1050 project was entitled you know we only had Evo, Luma, Elleven over there and that project it was before prior to the Greater Downtown Housing Incentive Area Ordinance, and it needed a number of entitlements and a number of variances, so I wanted to point that out, whereas we are code compliant project. We are not seeking any variances for the project, for the height. So I just wanted to point that out.</p> <p>Elliott, really addressed the design. It hasn't changed at least with respect to the podium height, that has always been consistent. And I also wanted to emphasize this concern about housing and how much they are going to cost. I don't have a pro forma as to what the rents are going to be. But this project does propose a variety of units, including studio units, one-bedrooms, two-bedrooms. So they are not going to be all astronomically priced.</p> <p>And then to the comment that there are jobs in the Arts District, this is exactly the sort of project that the City wants to address that how that jobs housing imbalance as the art's district is a mile away – a mile and</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>a half away, and we demonstrated with our VMT analysis that we do not have a significant traffic impact because there is dire need for housing in this area.</p> <p>And just to address the affordability, as part of the project, the project is providing \$11,000,000 in public benefit payment in addition to over \$2,000,000 transfer payment that gets paid into the City's Public Benefit Payment Fund. And we specifically requested millions of dollars to go to the City's Affordable Housing Trust Fund, as well as the CD14 Public Benefits Fund that's earmarked for affordable housing as well. So we are addressing affordable housing through our public benefit payment as well. I don't know, Mike, do you want to address any-</p>
Charlie Rausch:	I have a quickie question, you made it a point of your public plaza near the corner of 11 <sup>th</sup> and Olive – it is privately owned but open to the public?
Ryan Leaderman:	That is correct.
Charlie Rausch:	Okay.
Ryan Leaderman:	Not that different from the Wilshire Grand as well.
Charlie Rausch:	That will be - I just wanted to tell that is going to be stated because that is always the consideration at the Planning Commission.
Ryan Leaderman:	Thank you. Mike, why don't you address some of the access?
Mike Bates: Traffic Consultant	<p>Good morning, Mike Bates from the Mobility Group, Transportation Consultant for the project.</p> <p>I just wanted to address some of the comments on the alley. Obviously, we understand the concerns. We did analyze the alley fully in the traffic study in the EIR. I will just reiterate that there is a driveway on Olive which is the main street adjacent to the project and would be the front door to the project. So the alley access is there but it also, in a way, a secondary access, and as the previous speakers have said it connects directly through from the alley to Olive. The two projects also on this block to the north, at the corner of Olive and Olympic, and Olympic and Grand also both access to the alley and the adjacent street. One goes to Olive and one goes to Grand. So they have the option also, just like this project has, of either using the alley or using the access to the primary street that goes by the project. We are consistent with City policy for residential projects wanting to access</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>the alley. We did analyze the alley in full, we went out there, we observed, we took traffic counts, we did the analysis according to LADOT methodology, LADOT approved the analysis. We found that while it would add a small amount of queueing to the alley, it would not be a significant increase in queueing because of the different access points that exist on the alley, and all of that was addressed in the EIR, including the responses to the public comments on the EIR. I think that's just the points that I wanted to make to clarify.</p>
Charlie Rausch:	<p>Anyone else? Did CD 14 want to say anything?</p>
Shawn Kuk:	<p>We're here to monitor, thank you.</p>
Charlie Rausch:	<p>Okay.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	<p>So we will now close the public hearing portion and we will now open up for deliberation by the Advisory Agency.</p>
<p>Georgic Avenesian: Board of Engineering (BOE)</p>	<p>I would like to ask the counsel to approach the desk again, please.</p> <p>Let's continue the discussion about your revised map. And this revised map stamp-dated November 20, 2017 is approved, without Engineering input you will not be able to record a final map, it has nothing to do with the Government Code Housing Act anymore because your title does show different measurements than you're showing on your revised map. Then you have to file your revised map. Zoning will not be able to clear for a number of units based on your FAR, Engineering won't be able to record your final map because you're not showing your current property line and the distances. So basically what I was trying to tell you, to file a revised map to create deficiencies is in your favor. If you want to go ahead and ask the advisory agency to just overrule Engineering to get it done today, then you get paid— fine. But whoever takes over the project is going to have a hell of a problem with this revised map to have it recorded to have a final map. You will be going to be heading after the decision letter, then you're going to have to file modification, after modification, after modification, and that's going to cost the applicant delay and after delay until right now we are here to clear up all the deficiencies, number one. Number two, I don't agree with you when you say the project was deemed complete. Deemed completed, fine. Deemed complete and deemed approved are two different words. You are here to get approval and you're requesting the changes. Actually, you're imposing conditions on yourself. We didn't impose anything on you and you're telling we're imposed conditions, no. You can still get the numbering of housing you want per the housing code but you have to</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>fit it in what you have, that's going to be your issue. But if you want to fit it into what your you showing – as a matter of fact, I would like to bring up– this to your attention.</p> <p>In your letter that you submitted to Planning, I'm reading from record Holland &amp; Knight, January 14, 2020, page three, "because of the additional Bureau of Engineering condition for the Olive to have a merger above and below," you're agreeing that your center line is forty-five foot but on your map it is showing forty. You're showing here forty-five, you're saying you want to keep that forty-five center line when you're going above or below, but your map does not show that. Your map shows forty. That's five-feet, that's a lot of discrepancy as far as the FAR and number of units that you are allowed to do. And so you need to correct that. And as the revised map you are showing total of four feet of merger on the sidewalk areas but in your letter you are asking only for two feet above the two dedication and inside the three-foot easement per standard City standards to have a merger. So you're letter basically, your request here is totally different than what your revised map you're showing. So you have an option to take the old map, or put this under advisement, revise your map to - according to your letter, your request, because your request is totally different than what your map is showing right now.</p>
Alex Moore:	<p>Good morning, this is Alex Moore with David Evans our address is 201 South Figueroa, Suite 240, and we prepared the revised tentative tract map and just to your point on the Olive Street center line, that we're showing forty-five feet from center line to the property line, on the map we are showing that it is 40 feet and then a five-foot easement – [inaudible].</p>
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>There's no easement, it is all dedication.</p>
Alex Moore:	<p>Right, well on the map it is showing a five-foot easement for street purposes.</p>
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>It's not the easement, it is all dedication. Because that was done under Highway Dedication, the only time, they call that – it's kind of a strange fruit because it still shows the dash line in our maps but your property line is back. I have a copy of that. I brought it with me.</p>
Ryan Leaderman:	<p>The dedication, the grant deed calls it an easement.</p>
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>Yes, because it's not the regular type of easement. You can argue with me with it but I'm telling you when you go to file it for a final map then going to agree to that because our maps show your property line</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>is on 45 feet. These are local maps and when you bring your title, and also on Highway Dedication. The reason they call it easement because the description hasn't changed yet number one. Number two, it is not a regular easement that you're still have underlying right that you're paying taxes on, you're not, because essentially takes off all of your property. That's the difference type of easement, that's what they call the easement and you're not liable for that. On the regular configuration of... let's give us additional public sidewalk easement that is actually part of your property, you pay taxes over it and it is a part of your net area. Not this one, it is a special easement that created in 60's that with the entire overhaul of the entire the LAMC and did you want people after giving the land to the public to be liable or to pay taxes, that's why. You can come and look at your property line, I have a map here. You can have a problem in your final, I'm just trying to tell you are going to have a problem! I want to ask you go solve your problems so we can have everything clean at this point. Before we have all these additional comments clear this, condition that, correct this, clarify this, it is going to be extra work and for you. So, and for you not to come back here not to talking about the public hearing agreed to terms that we are going to agree to right now under advisement that you're are going to submit as soon as you can to correct these deficiencies because they are going to be the same, you're going to have forty-five foot center line and you're going to have a merger above and below according to your request. So the centerline is not an issue for you because you said you are agreeing to- that it 45 feet from the centerline.</p>
Alex Moore:	<p>Our request is to merge that five feet back to provide 45-feet from centerline at the ground level up to 40 feet. That's why the map is showing 45 feet on the other sheets because that's what our proposal is-</p>
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>Yeah, so...here's the issue. Your grant property line is in the correct spot. It's 45 feet from the centerline and under LA Mobility Plan, Olive is considered a Modified Avenue One, which means you need to have 45 feet from centerline to the property line, so you have that. If you move that, it will be substandard, [inaudible] which means you can merge above or below it as long as you keep the property lines 45 feet from the centerline.</p>
Ryan Leaderman:	<p>And basically, that's the intent.</p>
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>But you're not showing it correctly here.</p>

Speaker Name	
Ryan Leaderman:	Okay, so, so... maybe we can have a subsequent meeting because clearly the review hasn't happened that BOE, even though we submitted the plans over two years ago, so somehow something slipped through the cracks over here. We've done our job, Planning has been processing this and there's been no surprise. So I don't know what happened, I don't process this stuff at that happens at the City. I don't know why...
Georgic Avenesian:	...the thing is my intention is that I don't want to play the blame game. Who was to blame, who should've known and not have known. That's not going to serve any purpose, that's not going to benefit anyone. We can throw lava at each other all day but you're not gonna solve your issue. Your issue is you want to show the correct property line and you want to show your correct request on your revised map than what you're asking, which is different than your revised map is here.
Alex Moore:	It sounds like what you're saying is incorrect is that we are showing it as a five-foot easement and not 45 feet from the centerline to the property line as the existing condition.
Georgic Avenesian:	Correct.
Alex Moore:	But is there anywhere else that you are saying is incorrect? Or is it just -
Georgic Avenesian:	Yes, that one is incorrect and also you're requesting a limited dedication for the corner cut. You're not showing it on the revised map.
Alex Moore:	That is correct.
Georgic Avenesian:	Right, and you're asking for four feet of merger into the sidewalk but you're actually asking for two feet over here the two foot dedication area. You only need to go up to forty-feet and then inside, three foot easement that comes from downtown street standards you are asking that to be limited, you're not even mentioning these four feet you are asking on your revised map here. So under the State Map Act law the revised – the approved - the final map should be consistent with the approved tentative map or you cannot not record the map. That's going to be your problem. We're trying to solve your problem. I'm not trying to be an obstacle. I'm trying to say if you want clear sailing from this point on, correct these deficiencies. Now, the only thing we may not agree with you is five foot below, it is going to be ten foot and below.

Speaker Name	
Ryan Leaderman:	And we can live with the ten feet and below.
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>Okay, so if you can give us another revised map - you already have paid the fee - in under a week or so, showing the correct centerline and revised map should be exactly what you are requesting here, except that the five foot below should be ten foot below. I would say on this, unless there is a problem, ninety-nine percent guaranteed that's how it going down in that decision for that. Because 40 foot and above is fine with us, but you are asking for more than four feet of encroachment into the sidewalk area, correct?</p> <p>And sidewalk area right now is about fifteen feet?</p>
Alex Moore:	Yes.
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>So our policy is that you can overhang about 30 percent of the sidewalk, which is five feet so you have four feet you are within the policy. And our policy is forty feet and above is fine, ten feet below is fine. Cut corner, I have no problem, being one way and for the forty feet and above no problem but you need to show those correctly on the revised map when they say this map is approved according to the revised stamped dated, "blah blah blah," you're done. Your FAR is correct because your FAR will still is based on 45 foot center line. However, your additional merger will be only and above, so you will have it. So I don't know why you are trying to bring up all this other stuff. I don't care whose fault it is or who did what. All I'm saying is you want to fix it, this is the time to fix it.</p>
Ryan Leaderman:	Anything else for us?
	[Laughter/inaudible]
Georgic Avenesian:	Do you have any reply? Are you going to respond to this or prepare a revised map? What is your response?
Ryan Leaderman:	<p>We need to discuss. I can't speak for the decision makers here today. But I imagine this case will be taken under advisement and so we are going to have to listen to your valuable input and we will also have to look to see what the law says and handle the grant deed that calls it a street easement and we are going to figure how to respond. And, you know, our intent is- we are almost there. I mean, we-</p>
Georgic Avenesian:	<p>Fine, so basically you're leaving the decision to us, the committee, that I would recommend the decision for you, that to be under advisement until the applicant can file the revised map showing the latest changes</p>

Speaker Name	
	according to their request letter here and, and then discussion about the sum of the details before you render a decision, that would be my, my recommendation of Engineering to you, and then if they file their revised map, and in time before the Commission, we will do our best to, to have it ready for you to issue a decision letter before the Commission and the whole case goes over there.
Unidentified Male Speaker:	Yeah, this South Park area is subject to the Downtown Design Guidelines requirement. One of which is the pedestrian light. So our street lighting conditions have been incorporated in the staff report. So basically we are asking for a pedestrian light on Olive and 11th.
Ryan Leaderman:	Okay. Thank you.
Charlie Rausch:	My turn. Yeah, it's always been good so far.  Okay. First of all, I will certify the Environmental Impact Report.
Milena Zasadzien:	Just to talk about the, there was a request to increase the amount of excavation on the site and so just to recommend that we have time to prepare an Errata to address that if -
Charlie Rausch:	Yes. There needs to be an errata because as from, you're increasing the amount, you want to make sure that that does not create any additional impacts.
Charlie Rausch:	Was there also a request done, the haul route trucks and hours?
Milena Zasadzien:	Yes, there were some requested changes from the Applicant regarding the haul route, so DOT recommends that the haul route hours be maintained from 9:00 to 3:30. The applicant requested that be extended until 7:00, to allow for our haul trucks from 7:00 a.m., and there was some other requests for defining the number of days of hauling and making some changes to the haul truck type and those were okay. And the only thing the DOT disagreed on was the hours.
Charlie Rausch	And I, unfortunately for you, I agree with the Department of Transportation having once had the joy of driving down North Broadway Street in Chinatown while they were doing excavation with haul trucks being through rush-hour traffic, it was insane, and this is an even a more congested area than North Broadway in that particular area, so I will go with the Department of Transportation, the hours for the haul route. We should not be having haul trucks being driven through downtown Los Angeles in the middle of rush hour. I know we all want to get rid of cars and that's the policy of the Department of

Speaker Name	
	Transportation and they City Planning Department but reality is people drive. Anything else on thing that?
Milena Zasadzien:	No, that's it.
Charlie Rausch:	<p>Okay. Again, certifying the Environmental Impact Report with the addendum, I mean, not the Addendum but the Errata to take care of the haul route numbers. I'm going to make a decision on the Zoning Administrator's Interpretation first because that's important to the rest of the subdivision in order to make that legal under the City Community Plan and the City Charter which limits development in the City of Los Angeles to a 13 to 1 floor area ratio, which I believe this project at the moment comes in a little bit over 13 to 1. And that was one of the requests for the Zoning Administrator's Interpretation. The Interpretation was requested of me a few years ago when I was the Chief Zoning Administrator. I just basically didn't have the time to write it up so now it's gone back to where it was originally which was for this particular project.</p> <p>I am going to recommend approval. Well, it's not recommend approval, I am going to approve the Zoning Administrator's Interpretation for the particular structure.</p> <p>It revolves around open space and the Department of Building and Safety's interpretation of what an enclosed building is, we have a Zoning Administrator's Interpretation already on what are called, I don't what it is, but it's on the balconies that go around the surface. For some reason that interpretation, though it allowed building's balconies to go around the surface of the building, it only showed on its diagrams those at the corners of the building. I believe that should have shown the balconies all the way around it. These are especially, because these balconies are being used for private open space which is allowed under the open space conditions of the code. We will have language in the TFAR Conditions of Approval which do not permit any construction on those balconies which would enclose those, because that does become FAR at that time, and that would be in violation not to the downtown plan but of the City Charter and there is no such thing as a Variance from the City Charter.</p> <p>As far as the cutouts on the side of the building, these are being used for open space for, general open space for the entire building not for private open space. When the open space ordinance was promulgated in the 1980's it was done because apartment buildings, usually smaller apartments out in the middle of the San Fernando Valley, did not propose open space for a child, children to play in, for a father and a</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>son to play catch, or a father and a son and a mother to play catch. In downtown, it's a different situation. You usually don't have large families living downtown. There are high-rise buildings that fully occupy the lots so that there is no open land on them to have it and necessarily you either have open space on your roof of your building which is proposed to be 70 stories high or on your podium decks even then they did not have enough open space for the proposed number of units and I might add that the number of units though it seems to be excessive for the size of the building, the number of units in the downtown Los Angeles area are not determined by the R5 Zoning but the FAR of the structure and it's basically to fit as many units as you can as long as you have the average unit size that's in the code.</p> <p>So, unfortunately, though it may be difficult to fill up all those units, they are legal, and they are legal under the code. So that is their right to do that is they so if they so desire. I will, however, put in a condition of approval because of the problems that we have with are called, transit oriented occupancy units, that these may not be turned into a TORS because these were done to be residential units. These are not to be rented out as hotel-like units as a TORS. It's happened on a number of projects downtown and I have put conditions on other projects in Hollywood and the like that these may not be used a TORS, they have to be rented and/or sold as individual residential units.</p> <p>That being said, the open space, I got distracted there, the open space, I will allow the open space areas as shown to be not counted against the Floor Area Ratio for those buildings because again open space in the downtown Los Angeles is very difficult in the buildings and this is the, one of the few ways that we can get open space into these buildings.</p> <p>Also, architecturally it makes the building more interesting. Our Planning Commission, especially a couple of the members are against flattop buildings. However, in this particular case, the only way you can get your open space for your units is to have the top of the building flat so that you can use it for open space and also open space on the sides. This is some architectural interest to the building that you put at an architectural treatments on the roof of the building which you can't do, now you're doing them on the side of the building and that creates interest and is in accordance with Downtown Guidelines for high-rise buildings.</p> <p>I will put in more language. I'm a better writer than I am a speaker. This does not count against FAR and it will count as open space even though it is not open to the sky. Again, the same problem. When open</p>

Speaker Name	
	<p>space was promulgated in the 1980's, it was basically people could declare a park on the surface parking in the rear yards of apartment buildings and the idea was to put these structures underground so that the, the rear yards could be used as open space and as a real yard for the apartment buildings.</p> <p>The last point, not knowing what the FAR of the building is and the fact that it could change especially with the problems Mr. Avenasian is perhaps pointed-</p>
Unidentified Male Speaker:	That's all right.
Charlie Rausch:	<p>-and I don't quite agree with you on the Housing Accountability Act because this is a Subdivision Map Act problem and not something of the City of Los Angeles.</p> <p>In any case, the building has to be at a 13 to 1 FAR, period, nothing above. So I have a condition that you two are used to that the building shall be built at a 13 to 1 FAR. If anything must come off of the building in order to meet that 13 to 1 FAR, it's going to have to come off the top of the building. It may not come off of the building of the units that wrap the parking. So that is FAR and those units may not be reduced in order to make up any problems that you have with your Floor Area Ratio, which basically will be determined by the Department of Building and Safety at the times you come into construct, so we don't know what that's going to be at the moment. So anything that comes off, comes from the top.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	Thank you.
Ryan Leaderman:	If, if I could just clarify. Ryan Leaderman again. Because the centerline goes out to the street, normally this would be an issue, but because the floor area is determined by the centerline of the surrounding streets, whether the five feet is part of the property lines or not, that's not going to change the 13 to 1 issue, and I just wanted to clarify that that's all right.
Charlie Rausch:	<p>You're at the limit, guys. I know you. With that-</p> <p>We also have the map and I believe Milena asked me to hold it under advisement.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	Uh-huh.

Speaker Name	
Charlie Rausch:	Yeah, we're going to hold the map under advisement. I would advise you to get them the information into Mr. Avenesian as soon as you can because I don't think you want to delay this case beyond the 15 <sup>th</sup> . I think you've been in the process for about four years now. So the best for you is to get that map in as soon as you can.
Unidentified Male Speaker:	The revised map?
Charlie Rausch:	<p>The revised map. So we will under, hold it under advisement. If Georgic does not have the information that he needs, then we're going to have to, since you want the 15<sup>th</sup> to be your date, we will have to approve the map and it has to be done in such a manner that we have an appeal period so both cases go together to the Planning Commission at once. I will also put on the Zoning Administrator's Interpretation. This would normally go to the Area Planning Commission and I am going to put language in there stating that it goes to the City Planning Commission so that everything arrives there at once if there is an appeal on this case, I can't guarantee it, but one never knows.</p> <p>So we're going to hold the under advisement, however, if Mr. Avenesian is not satisfied, then we will approve the map as submitted four years ago and then you'll have to go through the modification process and that too is appealable. So I would advise you to get everything done quickly.</p> <p>And that concludes the hearing. Thank you all for your attendance today and for your testimony. I do listen to the testimony and even if I don't come to something that you agree with at least you will know why we in the department did not go along with it. We do listen to what you have to say. Thank you very much.</p>
Milena Zasadzien:	Thank you.