

Minutes

PLUM Committee members Patty Dryden, Orrin Feldman, Danielle Mead, Luminita Roman and Matt Shichtman attended the meeting.

Richard Joludow, Area 2 Chair, attended the meeting to participate as a PLUM Committee member when both (i) 3902 N. Kentucky Drive and 3894 Fredonia Drive, and (ii) 3065 -3091 N. Cahuenga Boulevard were discussed.

There were a sufficient number of committee members present to establish a quorum.

The meeting was called to order at 6:08 p.m.

Approximately 25 stakeholders were present.

The committee voted to approve the draft minutes for the committee's January 4, 2018 meeting.

1. 3902 N. Kentucky Drive and 3894 Fredonia Drive -

Jerome Buckmelter made a presentation about the proposed project.

The comments from both committee members and other stakeholders was largely focused on the size and massing of the proposed condominium building. Some comments criticized the massing, and several comments criticized the bulk of the building where visitors would enter the garage.

Committee member Matt Shichtman and others expressed a desire to see the four story vertical wall facing the alley pulled back and reduced with more open space and landscaping at the building's base. He suggested that there could be step backs every two floors instead of after the fourth floor up from the building's base on the alley side.

Other committee members objected to the proposed roof decks on the basis that sound travels uphill, and that the Mulholland Design Review Board has rightly insisted on eliminating roof decks on proposed projects in The Mulholland Corridor.

Others wanted assurances of more affordable housing, and that the units allocated to affordable housing wouldn't be placed in any separate area of the building or stacked.

Several stakeholders expressed a desire to keep the building's residents and guests from increasing traffic on Kentucky Drive.

The PLUM Committee voted unanimously (6 to 0) to make the following recommendations to the Planning Department and the Mulholland Design Review Board:

- (i) eliminate the rooftop decks in the proposed project,
- (ii) increase the setbacks in front of the building (on the alley side), in order to decrease the building's mass, which seems too big/huge,
- (iii) improv the alley roadway and add safety features to help the alley function safely,
- (iv) add more guest parking spaces, and
- (v) include at least one three bedroom unit in the two units set aside for very low income affordable housing.

2. 3065 - 3091 N. Cahuenga Boulevard -

Greg Jackson lead the development team's presentation of the proposed project.

Mr. Jackson explained that the proposed project would demolish the existing commercial building there and replace it with a new building of approximately, 60,000 square feet and 45' high. There would be three stories of apartments over a basement and two subterranean parking levels.

The proposed project's new building has been revised to provide 42 stood apartments and 3 one bedroom units. 5 apartments still would be available for very low income tenants. Each studio would be approximately 500 square feet, and the one bedrooms would be approximately 710 square feet. The site's current flat pad would be expanded "slightly" to provide more space for the building.

The new building would include amenities for the residents, which include a pool, an outdoor seating area and a library/business center, conference room, home theater and a roof top deck. There would be no apartments on the basement level inasmuch as sunlight won't reach that level.

Traffic would enter the building from Oakcrest, which has a traffic light.

Danielle Mead raised a concern about the glass fronts on the balconies. She requested an opaque material replace the glass. The development team agreed to do so.

The development team mentioned that the site is in a commercial area (C2-IVL), and that four types of uses, including as a hotel, were prohibited under the City's rules. Orrin asked whether a conditional use permit to allow a hotel use was being applied for. The team said that no CUP was being applied for.

As the discussion went on, the development team explained that the target market for their apartments were people coming to Los Angeles who needed short term space, and possibly for as short as three (3) months. They also explained that each apartment would have a kitchenette and a wall mounted television. The studio units would be fully furnished.

The committee's members became increasingly concerned that the proposed apartment building was more like a "disguised" hotel and/or extended stay hotel facility, than an apartment building for long term neighborhood residents.

The PLUM Committee was concerned that, if the proposed building were to be an apartment building:

- (i) the balconies' glass railings should be replaced by some opaque material,
- (ii) the building should be smaller,
- (iii) the building should not resemble a hotel, but include more one bedroom and two bedroom units, and
- (iv) provide more guest parking spaces.

The PLUM Committee voted unanimously (6 to 0) to recommend that the Board vote to oppose the project out of concern the the proposed building is disguised as an apartment building, but would really be an extended stay hotel.

3. There were no public comments on non-agendized items.

4. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:58 p.m.