



City of  
**Santa Monica**<sup>SM</sup>

# MINUTES

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 2017  
7:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
ROOM 213, CITY HALL

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**  
Planning Director David Martin led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. **ROLL CALL:** Present: Amy Anderson, Chairperson  
Mario Fonda-Bonardi  
Nina Fresco [left at 11:00 p.m.]  
Jennifer Kennedy  
Leslie Lambert  
Richard McKinnon  
Jason Parry

Also Present: Cat Callahan, Planning Intern  
Susan Cola, Deputy City Attorney  
Kyle Ferstead, Commission Secretary  
Paul Foley, Principal Planner  
Cary Fukui, Associate Planner  
Michelle Glickert, Bicycle Coordinator, Mobility Division  
Peter James, Principal Planner  
David Martin, Director, Planning & Community  
Development Department  
Grace Page, Senior Planner  
Henry Servin, City Traffic Engineer, Traffic Management  
Division  
Ariel Socarras, Associate Planner  
Roxanne Tanemori, Principal Planner  
Jing Yeo, Manager, City Planning Division

4. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**  
Mr. Martin gave the Director's Report. He announced the meeting schedule as follows: March 1, Mobility discussion and Bike Action Plan update; March 15 agenda has not been finalized nor the meeting schedule beyond that date. He announced the roll out of the Downtown Community Plan is scheduled for Wednesday, April 12, 2017 and more information will follow on that event. Mr.

Martin also announced the upcoming City Council meetings with Planning related topics as follows: February 28 for the 1440 Harvard appeal; March 7 for the Development Agreement Monitoring Report; and March 28 for an appeal on 1728 Robson Avenue and the Providence Saint John’s Development Agreement Procedural Amendment. He reported City Council approve the seismic retrofit program.

Commissioner Fresco asked Mr. Martin why the Commission never saw the Seismic Retrofit Program. Mr. Martin explained that Building and Safety ordinance changes do not ordinarily come to Planning Commission.

Commissioner Lambert asked if the Commission is finished reviewing the assessor dwelling unit (ADUs) issues. Ms. Yeo responded the City Council approved the ordinance changes on ADUs at their prior meeting, however newer changes will return to the Commission as Zoning Ordinance policy items.

Chair Anderson asked if preparation of the Development Agreement Monitoring report take a lot of staff time and how it is paid for. Ms. Yeo responded that it does take a lot of staff time and the applicants are billed for that time. Commissioner McKinnon asked if the monitoring report can be given to the Commission when it is completed. Mr. Martin stated this will be done.

**5. PLANNING COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None.

**6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None.

**7. STATEMENTS OF OFFICIAL ACTION:** *Consent Calendar*

Commissioner Lambert made a motion to approve items 7-A, 7-B and 7-C as submitted. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi seconded the motion, which was approved by unanimous voice vote.

7-A. 339 Adelaide Drive, Variance 16ENT-0080

7-B. 1530 Second Street, Conditional Use Permit 16ENT-0128

7-C. 2121 Cloverfield Boulevard, Conditional Use Permit 16ENT-0172

**8. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

Chair Anderson asked if either Consent Calendar items are requested to be removed. Commissioner McKinnon asked that 8-B be removed and a request to speak was received for 8-A. Chair Anderson suggested moving Item 9-B to Consent, but Commissioner McKinnon disagreed and said there should be a full hearing on that item.

**8-A. 122 Strand Street, Tract Map 16ENT-0211.** The applicant requests approval of a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map to create three air parcels on one land lot for residential condominium purposes. The proposed development includes a two-story

multi-family development that consists of three units over one level of subterranean parking in the OP3-BCH (Ocean Park Medium Density Residential – Beach Overlay) zoning districts. (Planner: Grace Page) Applicant/Property Owner: MAV Partners LLC.

The Commission made the following *ex parte* communication disclosures:

- Commissioner Lambert disclosed she spoke to the architect a few days prior to the meeting.
- Commissioner Fresco disclosed she ran into the architect at Starbucks recently.
- Commissioner McKinnon disclosed he also spoke briefly with the architect.

Senior Planner Grace Page gave the staff report.

The Applicant was represented by Carl Lisberger with the Law Firm of Harding, Larmore, Kutcher and Kozal. Mr. Lisberger had a brief presentation.

There were no public requests to speak from the public on this application.

Commissioner McKinnon asked Mr. Lisberger about estimated fees for the project. Mr. Lisberger stated the project is subject to the Affordable Housing Production Program (AHPP) in-lieu fee, which will be approximately \$185,000. Commissioner McKinnon asked when the last tenant was on-site. Mr. Lisberger explained that the new owner bought out the tenants a year or so ago and most of the tenants at that time were newer tenants paying close to market rate.

Commissioner McKinnon asked staff about the issue of apartment buildings being replaced by condominiums, partly because of the high land values, and asked what the City can do about this. Ms. Yeo responded that this is a policy question and tract maps are limited to what can be approved. She commented on the City Council request for a study on Ellis Act withdrawals from the rental housing market.

Commissioner Lambert made the motion to approve the Tract Map application 16ENT-0211. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: Anderson, Fonda-Bonardi, Fresco, Kennedy, Lambert, McKinnon, Parry.

- 8-B. 1035 Twenty-First Street, Tract Map 17ENT-0001.** The applicant requests approval of a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map to create three air parcels on one land lot for residential condominium purposes. The proposed development includes a two-story multi-family development that consists of three units over one level of subterranean parking in the R2 (Low Density Residential) zoning district. (Planner: Grace Page) Applicant: Harvey Goodman, C.E. Property Owner: Levy Revocable Trust.

The Commission made the following *ex parte* communication disclosures:

- Commissioner Lambert disclosed she was on the Landmarks Commission when

- the existing structure on-site was proposed for demolition and designation as a landmark. She stated there were two hearings and the structure was not designated and the demolition permit was approved.
- Commissioner Kennedy recused herself from this hearing item because she lives on the same block as the project.

Senior Planner Grace Page gave the staff report.

The Applicant, Harvey Goodman, presented his Tract Map application.

One member of the public, J.P. Brozynn, addressed the Commission with concerns regarding the proposed project, specifically the placement of the driveway which will require the removal of a City street tree.

Mr. Goodman spoke in response to the public comment and the project architect, Tom Avila, explained the placement of the driveway.

Commissioner McKinnon asked staff about the placement of the driveway in the middle of street frontage and the removal of the street palm tree, both of which he finds unacceptable. Ms. Page stated that this is a “tentative” tract map application and there is the ability to make changes to the placement of the driveway. Ms. Yeo stated that the application is for air-space rights, not building design, and the project will move through the usual review process by the Architectural Review Board and plan check before Building Permits including Mobility and other divisions. She also stated staff can work with the applicant and that the street tree is already protected.

Commissioner Lambert asked staff if a stronger statement can be made about the driveway and street palm tree. Deputy City Attorney (DCA) Cola stated it is inappropriate to impose conditions not related to the tentative map.

Chair Anderson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi made the motion to approve the Tract Map application 17ENT-0001. Commissioner Lambert seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: Anderson, Fonda-Bonardi, Fresco, Lambert, McKinnon, Parry;

ABSTAIN: Kennedy.

Commissioner Lambert asked staff to inform the Architectural Review Board about the Commission’s concerns regarding the driveway placement and retention of the street tree. Chair Anderson commented that she is not comfortable with retaining the tree at the expense of the building design that is intended to contribute to the streetscape. DCA Cola cautioned the Commission to abbreviate their discussion at this time.

## 9. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

[Commissioner Kennedy returned to the dais.]

- 9-A. 1613-37 Lincoln Boulevard, Development Review 16ENT-0036 and Tract Map 16ENT-0144.** Development Review Permit 16ENT-0036 to allow a new five-story (50-feet) 155,435 square-foot (2.25 FAR) mixed-use project consisting of 191 residential units, 11,756 square feet of ground floor commercial space, and 388 parking spaces within a three-level subterranean parking garage on a property located in the Mixed-Use Boulevard (MUB) zoning district. According to Section 9.40.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, a Development Review Permit is required for any project exceeding the maximum Tier 1 limits of 3 stories/39 feet in height and 1.5 FAR for a property in the MUB zoning district. (Planner: Ariel Socarras) **Applicant/Property Owner: FSTAR 1613 & FSTAR 1637 LLC.**

The Commission had no *ex parte* communication disclosures for this item.

Associate Planner Ariel Socarras gave the staff presentation.

The Applicant Team included Dave Rand with Armbruster Goldsmith and Delvac representing Century West Partners, and project architect Lars Johansson with Killefer Flammang Architects.

Commissioner Lambert asked Mr. Johansson if there will facilities for children in the building complex. Mr. Johansson pointed out the pool deck and green spaces. Commissioner Lambert asked how residents on the first floor eastern elevation will be protected from the adjacent Lexus automobile repair shop. Mr. Johansson responded there will be a retaining wall and materials used to reduce issues with that adjacent use.

Two members of the public submitted requests to speak, Andrew Hoyer representing Mid-City Neighbors, and Jerry Rubin, who left before his name was called.

Mr. Rand spoke in response to the public comment.

Commissioner Fresco commented on a letter received from the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA) and lack of response from that group to a question she had. Mr. Rand stated he did not attend the DNA meeting. Commissioner Fresco asked about the DNA request to reduce the size of the leasing lobby. Mr. Rand did not have an answer. Mr. Johansson stated he was at the DNA meeting and they wanted to know if the lobby area could have another purpose to which he had responded "certainly." He further stated that the current proposal does not include this requested change because the plans had already been submitted to City staff for the packet. Commissioner Fresco asked Mr. Johansson if he could explain the DNA request for an "energized" courtyard. Mr. Johansson responded that DNA was looking for the courtyard to be more like the main plaza off Lincoln Boulevard. Commissioner Fresco asked about the third floor plan with the pool and green space, but not doors or view over the space. Mr.

Johansson responded that these can be added and that he is working with a landscape architect on this “quiet space” that may include chessboards and seating. Commissioner Fresco asked about the “mysterious green border” and whether it was Fire Department access, its width, and whether it was open to the sky. Mr. Johansson stated it is ten-feet wide on average, is open to the sky, the retaining wall runs along the property line, and it will be accessible to all residents. Commissioner Fresco asked about the twenty-foot wide sidewalk and whether it was setback from the street and whether it was separated or blended with the public sidewalk. Mr. Johansson stated it will be blended and will include some bike parking. Commissioner Fresco asked if the only intrusions away from the building will be the balconies. Mr. Johansson answered in the affirmative and explained the front façade design. Commissioner Fresco asked about the bike parking area, which appears to be lower than the commercial space. Mr. Johansson explained about the grade change on the property and the desire to have the bike parking at-grade. He also explained the ramp configuration and other bike storage locations. Commissioner Fresco asked if the ground floor transformer could be relocated to make more bike parking space. Mr. Johansson explained the transformer has a requirement for seventeen feet clearance above the unit.

Commissioner Parry asked Mr. Johansson if he has any other tools to give the Commission a better understanding of the massing of this project. Mr. Johansson showed a graphic of the Lincoln Court side of the project.

Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked Mr. Johansson to walk the Commission through the parking for the project. Mr. Johansson showed the parking plans. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked the low percentage of affordable units, specifically 15 of 191 units or 18%. Mr. Rand reminded the Commission that the adopted Zoning Ordinance gave applicants the option to choose the affordability range based on the Affordable Housing Production Program (AHPP) under Section 9.64.040 (c.) and his client has chosen to build extremely low income units. He further reminded the Commission that this is a Development Review application, not a Development Agreement, and the application complies with the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that this issue could be a future policy discussion for the Commission. Chair Anderson stated the Zoning Ordinance does not say that an applicant can choose, it gives the Commission the discretion to choose what levels of affordable housing can be required. Mr. Rand respectfully disagreed. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked if the proposed front parapets are higher than required for safety. Mr. Johansson responded that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) asked for articulation in the vertical. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked about the entry courtyard, which appears large on the ground floor but is not fully open to the sky. Mr. Johansson responded that this issue is being researched and stated there is a 21-foot clear space to the overhang. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked if the residents in the rear of the project will feel “second class” to the other residents as they will have less green space, a smaller lobby and no real connection to the front common space. Mr. Johansson explained that the design treatment is for two separate buildings. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked if there are more units in the front building. Mr. Johansson answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Lambert asked Mr. Johansson if the affordable units are spread throughout the project buildings. Mr. Johansson answered in the affirmative.

Commissioner Parry asked staff to comment on the selection of affordability levels for the project. DCA Cola stated that the Commission has discretion on this matter and the applicant can appeal the decision. Commissioner Parry asked about bridges and other connections between the two buildings. Mr. Johansson explained the connections and stated they are necessary per the Building Code in-lieu of additional staircases.

Commissioner McKinnon asked Mr. Johansson if the driveway off Lincoln Boulevard is necessary. Mr. Johansson stated it is necessary for circulation. Commissioner McKinnon asked if this is primarily for the benefit of automobiles. Mr. Johansson answered in the affirmative. Commissioner McKinnon commented on circulation issues and asked if the 380 parking spaces are necessary and if the bike parking spaces could be increased. Mr. Johansson responded that the project has been designed to Code requirements. Commissioner McKinnon expressed concern that the driveway will cause back-up problems on Lincoln Boulevard. Mr. Johansson commented that without the Lincoln Boulevard driveway residents and other would need to access the site from Colorado Avenue or Olympic Boulevard. Commissioner McKinnon commented that resident access to the rear building seems "second class." Mr. Johansson responded that proposed enhancements include different pavers and enlivening the courtyard. Commissioner McKinnon asked if a solar study was done. Mr. Johansson explained that a large portion of the front façade was carved out and is open to the sky for better afternoon light and ventilation. Chair Anderson asked if the rear courtyard can be enlarged. Mr. Johansson stated this would require reduction of unit sizes. Commissioner McKinnon commented on the lack of renderings for the Lincoln Boulevard street view. Mr. Johansson stated some renderings were done for ARB review, however the design is still being refined. Commissioner McKinnon asked what is anticipated for the commercial space. Mr. Johansson responded that the ground floor retail space is flexibility and could be for one or several tenants.

Commissioner Parry asked Mr. Rand how the case management office for the low income housing will function. Mr. Rand responded that his client is working with the City's Human Services Division on how this proposal will function.

Commissioner Fresco expressed concern with the livability of the proposed buildings, particularly the retail space, the large front lobby and placement of the mailroom. Mr. Johansson responded that he is working with the Post Office with the intention of having mail boxes in both buildings. Commissioner Fresco expressed the opinion that the entrance be streamlined for people and bikes. Mr. Johansson explained the bike path entry and pedestrian access.

Chair Anderson commented on the modulation of the building along Lincoln Boulevard, asking if the upper floors are the same as the lower floors if the balconies are excluded. Mr. Johansson explained the commercial space with pop-outs over that space but not the full depth of the balconies or roughly two to two-

and-a-half feet.

Commissioner Kennedy commented on the placement of two affordable units each floor near the adjacent auto repair shop and asked whether they can be redistributed. Mr. Johansson responded in the affirmative. Commissioner Kennedy asked for the location of the leasing lobby. Mr. Johansson stated it is located off Lincoln Boulevard in 2900 square feet with circulation, mailroom and other amenities. Commissioner Kennedy asked about ground floor tenants and whether the same could accommodate a grocery store. Mr. Socarras responded that after the packet went out, some changes were made to plans based on recommendations from the Mobility Division and the loading area can no longer accommodate a semi-tractor trailer for length or height. He commented that more parking is required for a grocery store (1/250) than retail (1/300), nor is there anywhere to provide loading on the street.

Chair Anderson invited questions to staff. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked staff, based on concerns with how busy Lincoln Court will be, if Ninth Street will ever connect with Colorado Avenue. Mr. Socarras responded that this depends on the future development of certain sites. Ms. Yeo commented that this area is part of the future Pico Neighborhood Plan. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi commented on Lincoln Court going through to Colorado Avenue and asked if there will be a City easement or placement of utilities. Mr. Socarras responded that dedication of an easement would give the City the ability to add utilities, however this is not anticipated at this time. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked where this can be found in the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Socarras cited Condition #2 and #3. DCA Cola added that a formal written document will be recorded for the easement.

Commissioner Kennedy asked staff to comment on Mr. Rand's comments on limiting density. DCA Cola responded that if Commissioner Kennedy was referring to the Housing Accountability Act, then if the Commission made a condition based on a reduction in project density she could see his point, however this is not the situation. She stated that based on Section 9.40.060 and that this is a Tier 2 project, certain community benefits must be accorded or with an equivalent economic impact.

Ms. Yeo reframed the discussion by saying the permit before the Commission is a Development Review permit and the Commission has full discretion in terms of the findings. She stated she has heard the following concerns: circulation; access; the massing; the access to light and air; and the form of the building; which are all in the Commission's purview and can be treated either by conditions of approval for ARB or request to continue with direction to address certain issues. She further stated that reduction of the floor area ratio (FAR) is not an appropriate request given the perimeters in State law.

Commissioner Kennedy asked staff explain Standard Condition #36 regarding lofts and mezzanines. Mr. Socarras explained that this condition reiterates the Code section which states a mezzanine cannot exceed 33% of the room below otherwise it counts as another story of the building. Commissioner Kennedy cited a

typographical error on page 39, which uses the year 2016. Mr. Socarras stated if the project is approved at this meeting, then the plans submitted for this hearing are the ones being approved.

Chair Anderson asked staff's opinion on the Lincoln Boulevard driveway. Mr. Socarras stated his understanding that this curb cut goes against City policy, however the project proposed to remove seven other curb cuts along Lincoln Boulevard. He further stated that if an adjacent project is not built, the proposed driveway will be imperative for circulation on this site. Chair Anderson commented on the amount of proposed parking when the City is looking to reduce parking because of nearby amenities that can be walked or cycled to such as grocery stores, restaurants and other services. She also commented on the adjacency of the Expo Line and that the Downtown Community Plan area is excluded from City parking standards. Mr. Socarras responded that this is an overlap area with Downtown until the new Plan is adopted and the only other alternative would be to apply for reduced parking, but the findings for hardship could not be made.

Commissioner Parry asked staff about unbundling parking and if it would apply here should the City institute a uniform parking plan for this area. Mr. Socarras responded in the affirmative. Ms. Yeo stated this has not yet been activated in the Zoning Ordinance, but the applicant could volunteer unbundling. Commissioner Parry asked, in the event of under-utilization of parking spaces, could the owner rent out parking to adjacent businesses or offer additional public parking. Ms. Yeo stated the parking can be shared, but not for the required parking and it cannot be rented out. She also stated there is a provision in Parking Overlay 2 to request the Parking Overlay 1 rates, but it requires compliance with a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. Commissioner Parry asked if such a request could be made now or in the future. Ms. Yeo responded it could be requested only now. Mr. Socarras offered a correction that Parking Overlay 2 standards only apply to non-residential properties. Ms. Yeo cited Section 9.28.180 which applies to non-residential districts. Chair Anderson asked for clarification that the applicant could request reduced parking with a TDM plan. Ms. Yeo answered in the affirmative. Mr. Rand stated he would be pleased to work with staff on this issue and make a TDM plan and opt into Parking Overlay 2, to right-size the parking and voluntarily unbundle the parking. Commissioner Parry asked staff how the Parking Overlay 1 standards compare to the draft Downtown parking standards. Ms. Yeo responded that the parking standards for Downtown are still being refined based on public outreach and issues of mobility, so they will likely be more aggressive than Parking Overlay 1.

Commissioner Parry stated his preference to request a continuance on this project in order to sort various issues out. Commissioners McKinnon and Lambert communicated their concerns regarding the on-site parking as well as the number of affordable housing units being provided.

Mr. Rand stated that his client is not interested in a continuance and, if the project is approved at this hearing, his client will voluntarily agree to work with staff to reduce the parking per Parking Overlay 2 standards, which is already in the Code, and will

work within the TDM framework, also in the Code, and unbundle the parking. However, his client is unwilling to engage in future Downtown Community Plan scenarios or other Development Agreement type discussions. Commissioner Parry stated to Mr. Rand that he was not suggesting continuing this item until after the Downtown Community Plan hearing and that some issues still need to be resolved such as massing and making the findings. Mr. Rand responded that his client does not have to volunteer the things just offered.

Commissioner Kennedy expressed her concerns regarding making some of the findings and she would like to see a wider variety of affordable units, the driveway moved from Lincoln Boulevard to Lincoln Court, and changes in the massing. She asked for conditions to prohibit corporate rental units and to redistribute the affordable units. She also asked that the leasing lobby be reduced in square footage; that the alley function more “dumpster and less speedway” with appropriate design (ARB condition); and a condition that the sidewalk width never be reduced along Lincoln Boulevard.

Commissioner Parry commented that the plans provided did not give him a good sense of the proposal and how it would function.

Commissioner McKinnon commented on the problems with massing, the rear building, and site access. He stated this is a huge project and should be done right.

Mr. Rand agreed to the continuance. Ms. Yeo stated this item would go as first item on March 1, 2017.

Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi expressed discomfort with the project and shared the concerns raised by Commissioner Parry. He suggested the removal of fifteen units, which would not change the FAR, and the need to improve the massing. DCA Cola stated it is problematic to ask for a reduction per the Housing Accountability Act.

Chair Anderson asked the Commission to give direction to the applicant if they have specific issues with massing, open space or other issues.

Commissioner Fresco stated there are many issues to solve in order to make the findings including massing; how to address the openings; location of uses within the complex; bike access and circulation; review the court/alley; having affordable units on each floor in different locations; work on the front lobby; no corporate rentals; and changes in affordability levels and parking.

Commissioner McKinnon made the motion to continue this hearing to March 1, 2017, 6:00 p.m. Commissioner Parry seconded the motion. He questioned if two weeks would be sufficient time for the applicant. He suggested renderings include view from the sidewalks, both sides of the street, from the court and public right-of-way. Ms. Yeo stated March 15, 2017 is available. Commissioner McKinnon amended his motion to March 15, 2017, at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Rand agreed to the new date.

The motion to continue this hearing to March 15, 2017 was approved by unanimous voice vote.

[The Commission took a break from 10:31 p.m. to 10:44 p.m.]

**9-B. Development Agreement Amendment for Saint John’s Health Center, 2121 Santa Monica Boulevard.** Discussion of a proposed procedural amendment and recommendation to City Council pertaining to the Phase Two Project for Providence Saint John’s Health Center. This proposed amendment to the 1998 Saint John’s Health Center Development Agreement would authorize the following:

- Replace the Development Agreement’s current requirement for a South Campus Master Plan with a requirement for a Master Plan for all Phase Two developments proposed on the north and south campus.
- Provide that the City Council shall be the City’s decision-maker with respect to the Phase Two Master Plan after receiving a formal recommendation from the Planning Commission.
- Require that all Phase Two development be consistent with the approved Phase Two Master Plan.

This proposed procedural amendment is in response to the City Council’s direction on December 6, 2016 to proceed with a Phase Two Master Plan for Providence Saint John’s Health Center and to begin the environmental review for the project and substantive staff review of the proposed project. This amendment only provides for a modification to the review process for the Phase Two Project; public hearings for the Master Plan are anticipated to be scheduled in 2018. (Planner: Roxanne Tanemori) **Applicant: City of Santa Monica. Property Owner. Providence Health and Services, Southern California.**

[Although no *ex parte* communication disclosures are required for this quasi-legislative hearing. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi recused himself because he owns property within the thousand foot radius of the Saint John’s campuses. He left the Council Chambers.]

Principal Planner Roxanne Tanemori gave the staff presentation.

Commissioner Fresco asked staff to explain the process for this request. Ms. Tanemori explained first there is a float-up meeting, then the request moves to City Council for review. She also explained that the amendment is a language change to establish a Master Plan for Phase Two.

Two members of the public addressed the Commission: Andrew Hoyer representing Mid-City Neighbors, and Chris Harding with Harding, Larmore, Kutcher and Kozal representing Providence Saint John’s Health Center.

Commissioner Fresco made the motion to recommend approval of the amendment by City Council. Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kennedy asked about page three of the Second Amendment and

whether the Commission can add “types of uses” after “F.” DCA Cola answered in the affirmative, provided the applicant is amenable. Mr. Harding answered in the affirmative, and added that he thought this was covered elsewhere. Commissioner Kennedy asked about adding location and types of uses to the middle paragraph on page three in Agreement number one; to the top of page four, middle paragraph adding to “minimum 35% open space” the words “or greater.” DCA Cola responded “yes.” Commissioner Kennedy asked for more information on the proposed procedural amendment key issues cited on page four of the staff report. Ms. Tanemori stated narratives are being proposed. DCA Cola commented that substantive parts are yet to be negotiated.

Commissioner Kennedy made the motion to recommend approve of the procedural amendment by City Council. Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion, which was approved by voice vote.

#### 10. DISCUSSION / STUDY SESSION:

[Commissioner Fresco recused herself for this next item because she lives within a few feet of Lincoln Boulevard. She left the meeting for the evening.]

Chair Anderson asked for a motion to hear the next item after 11:00 p.m. Commissioner Kennedy so moved and Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion. The motion was approved by voice vote.

#### 10-A. Review and Discuss the Final Lincoln Neighborhood Corridor Plan Conceptual Streetscape. The Planning Commission will review and discuss the final streetscape concept for the Lincoln Neighborhood Corridor Plan (The LiNC), which provides a range of pedestrian and transit improvements to Lincoln Boulevard between the I-10 Freeway and City Limits at Ozone Avenue. In addition, the Planning Commission will discuss the proposed implementation of the streetscape plan’s first phase of work. The final streetscape plan been developed based on input from an extensive public outreach process that includes community workshops, meetings and web-based communication. (Planner: Peter D. James)

Principal Planner Peter James opened the study session by acknowledging the hard work of community members as part of the Lincoln Boulevard Task Force including Roger Swanson, Dolores Sloane ... He also acknowledged the following staff members: Cary Fukui, Cat Callahan, Michelle Glickert and Henry Servin. Mr. James gave an in-depth presentation on the Conceptual Streetscape Plan.

One member of the public, Elan Glasser, addressed the Commission regarding concerns with the proposed dedicated bus lane and cycling on Lincoln Boulevard. Chair Anderson acknowledged and thanked the people who had come earlier in the evening to participate and support this project, but had to leave. Three other members of the public, Roger Swanson, Dolores Sloane, and Jerry Rubin submitted request to speak forms, but were not present when their names were called.

Commissioner Kennedy asked Mr. James to explain the differences in the proposed medians, locations of medians and the bus lane. Mr. James explained the median widths, pedestrian curb extension locations, and stated the bus lane will stop at Pico Boulevard.

Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi expressed his appreciation for the work done by Mr. James which goes back to creation of the Ocean Park Boulevard greenway project. He asked staff about the parking utilization figure of 14% and when that is normal for a boulevard. Ms. Glickert responded that Main Street is at approximately 90% and 70% could be considered the norm. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi commented that meeting the Fire Department requirements seem high and asked if the issues have been resolved to their satisfaction. Mr. James responded that the Fire Department has signed off on the proposed plan. Commissioner Fonda-Bonardi asked if the signalization can move from Phase II to Phase 1. Mr. James stated the issue is financing and new equipment that needs to be paired with the vehicles.

Commissioner McKinnon asked Mr. James for the time frame for completion. Mr. James stated it depended on funding, political will and the funding cycles of the City and other agencies such as METRO (Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority). He noted that this is a gap year in their funding cycle, then briefly explained that process. Commissioner McKinnon asked if the gap in City tree wells will be filled by the end of 2017 or end of Phase I. Mr. James stated the gaps will be filled this year and additional tree wells are being added per the Urban Forester. He noted that the tree wells are being enlarged to ensure better survival of the street trees and the trees will be placed at regular intervals. He also stated that there will be three segments with different tree species. Commissioner McKinnon asked if the unused curb cuts will be removed. Mr. James responded that staff is working toward some closures where property owners and developers have proposed projects, however some properties may take longer to resolve. Commissioner McKinnon asked if the crashes noted on one of the graphics are predominately cyclists or pedestrians. Ms. Callahan stated they are predominately pedestrian related. Mr. James added that staff used open source data and this was not part of an in-depth analysis. Commissioner McKinnon asked if brochures are coming, then commented on a perceived conflict on Pearl Street with the bike lane and alley use. Mr. James responded that Ms. Glickert is reviewing the existing Pearl medians and options are being sought. Commissioner McKinnon commended staff for their work on this project and expressed the opinion that activity will surge on Lincoln Boulevard as the trees are replanted and businesses “spruce up” their properties.

Commissioner Lambert commented that this is her first view of the LiNC Plan and acknowledged, based on her past work with large public agencies in Los Angeles that this kind of project takes a long time. She asked if the City has grant writers on staff. Mr. James responded that the Planning staff writes the grants.

Commissioner Kennedy commented on a variety of issues including pedestrian safety, roundabouts, curb ramps and street furniture, which she wants to be removed as it impedes movement.

Chair Anderson commented on the design of streetlights and street furniture, asking that this be approached thoughtfully so it will enhance the street and be compatible. She acknowledged the great job done on this Plan and the in-depth community process revealed in e-mail from the public. She also commented on the potential conflict between the bus lanes and cyclists. Mr. James responded that Lincoln Boulevard is a transit street and parallel streets have been designated for cyclists in the Bike Action Plan. He explained the proposed street striping for vehicles, bikes and parking. Lastly, he stated that the City Attorney’s Office currently prohibits the use of bikes in dedicated bus lanes.

Commissioner McKinnon asked if the Commission will review this Plan again. Mr. James explained it now goes to City Council, but may return for a study session or for a recommendation to City Council for the project’s other components, such as tenant improvement grants or permit fee waivers.

Ms. Yeo asked that the Commission make a motion recommending approval of the Lincoln Neighborhood Corridor concept plan. Commissioner McKinnon so moved. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

- 10B. Update from Mobility Division on mobility projects and programs, including implementation of the Bicycle Action Plan and Pedestrian Action Plan.

**Continued to March 1, 2017**

**11. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:**

- 11-A. Planning Commission Caselist
- 11-B. Transmittal of Development Projects Information (January 2016)

**12. FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**13. PUBLIC INPUT:** None.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Anderson adjourned the meeting on Thursday, February 16, 2017 at 12:05 a.m.

**APPROVED: JUNE 21, 2017**