

PLUM Committee meeting on July 6, 2017

Minutes

PLUM Committee members Patty Dryden, Orrin Feldman, Danielle Mead and Luminita Roman attended the meeting. There were a sufficient number of committee members present to establish a quorum.

Brian Dyer, HHWNC's Area 3 chair, also was present to sit with the committee on the proposed projects in Area 3.

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m.

Approximately 25 stakeholders were present.

1. The draft minutes of prior meetings held on April 6, May 4 and June 1, 2017 were discussed. The draft minutes for the April 6 meeting were approved with a revision, and the draft minutes for the other two meetings were approved as presented. The motions to approve the minutes were passed on a 3 to 0 votes; Ms. Dryden was not yet present at the meeting.

2. 2252 Laurel Canyon Blvd - Discussion of the applicant's request to the City's Planning Department for relief from various requirements was postponed to a subsequent meeting per the applicant's request.

3. 1920 Whitley Avenue - Discussion was postponed to a subsequent meeting per Brian Dyer's suggestion. There was a brief question asking how many affordable housing units would be in the proposed apartment building; the answer was that 3 very low income units currently were included in the proposed project.

4. 1718 Whitley Avenue - Matthew Hayden, the owner's representative presented the proposed project, which would demolish six multifamily apartment buildings and result in the building of a new 10-story hotel with 156 rooms with 3 subterranean parking levels providing 122 parking spaces for the hotel's use.

Mr. Hayden said that (i) the site is zoned R-5, which a q condition allowing certain commercial uses, including a hotel, if the Planning Department uses its discretion to approve such a use, and (ii) no operator for the hotel had been chosen yet.

Mr. Hayden also mentioned that the rooftop would have a pool for hotel guests' use, and that it also would include a small food service area. No decision had been made yet on whether to request discretionary entitlements, such as a CUB, to sell beer, wine or alcohol on the roof. Similarly, the number of places in which beer, wine or alcohol would be served, had not yet been determined, and probably wouldn't be until a hotel operator was selected.

Several tenants of the apartment buildings were present to ask questions about the owner's timetable for evicting them, providing relocation assistance counseling and payments, and whether the owner owned any other apartments where the tenants might be able to relocate.

Mr. Hayden preferred to defer any discussion about evictions and relocations until after “the design review process”. He said that the owner would be likely to contract with a specialist to handle those issues after the design review process.

The PLUM Committee’s members and the stakeholders preferred that he address those issues now. Several requests were made that the owners have their relocation specialist hold a meeting with the tenants on site or nearby at a time convenient for the tenants now inasmuch as they have questions now about where they and their families will live. Orrin pointed out how unlikely it was that HHWNC’s Board would want to vote to support a proposed project if the owner didn’t agree to provide relocation counseling until after the proposed project were to be approved at the Planning Department and any Planning Commission. Mr. Hayden agreed to convey the PLUM Committee’s and stakeholders’ concerns and request(s) to the owner.

Hollywood Heritage’s representatives, Christy McAvoy and John Girodo, mentioned that Mr. Hayden and his client had prepared a draft of a report on the site’s value as a historical resource, which they’re reviewing. Ms. McAvoy mentioned the report provided some good research. Both Ms. McAvoy and Mr. Girodo asked HHWNC to support an EIR request. Orrin suggested that they should make that request initially to the Planning Dept.’s Director and City Council District 13. If the report were shared with HHWNC, HHWNC’s PLUM Committee and Board then could consider coming in afterwards with a support letter for an EIR request.

Ms. McAvoy also mentioned that the entire street/neighborhood might well turn out to be an historic site worthy of additional preservation measures/actions.

5. 6430-6440 Hollywood Blvd. AND 1624-1648 Wilcox - Renee Schillaci and Dave Rand presented The LeFrak Organization’s proposed project for a big mixed use project on the site.

6. 6675 Hollywood Boulevard - Nick Leathers of The Elizabeth Petersen Group, which is the owner’s representative, was unable to attend or send anyone else to the meeting. The PLUM Committee members decided to proceed with an initial discussion, and hope to hear from Mr. Leathers at a future meeting.

The proposed project would re-open The Vogue Supper Club Theater as a new business. What that business is wasn’t exactly clear from reading the application filed with the City’s Planning Department.

The PLUM Committee’s members had many questions about the proposed project, including:

1. Who are the partners in 812 La Cienega Partners, which is listed as the project owner?
2. Who will manage and/or operate The Vogue Theater site under it’s arrangement with Screened?
3. Do the owners and/or managers have any previous experience operating in Hollywood? If so, how much? Where? etc.
4. What is the relationship between 812 La Cienega Partners and Screenbid? Is it a joint venture, a landlord/tenant or some thing else?
5. Why would The Vogue Theater need to propose operating hours beginning at 6 a.m. daily?
6. Is this really an auction house showroom for tv show and other entertainment businesses’ memorabilia with an small auxiliary restaurant and bar operation? Or, is it really going to be a restaurant and bar with a side business as an auction house showroom?

Orrin made a motion to ask HHWNC's Board to authorize him to send a letter asking these questions to the applicant's representative for a written response in order to help assist the committee in reviewing the filed application. The PLUM Committee voted 5 to 0 to approve the motion.

7. There two public comments on non-agendized items, which were meeting announcements and reminders.

8. The meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.