The meeting was called to order by President Matthew Rodman at 4:45 p.m. Commissioners present: Flora Gil Krisiloff and Jonathan Lopez. Absent: Dwayne Hall and Candida Mobley Wright

1. **DEPARTMENTAL REPORT-ITEMS OF INTEREST**

2. **COMMISSION BUSINESS**

   A. Advance Calendar.

   B. Commission Request

   C. A Motion was made to reconsider APCW 2000-424 SPE.

      Commissioner Krisiloff made the Motion to reconsider, Commissioner Lopez seconded. The item was approved by consent.

      The case APCW 2000-424 SPE will be agendized for reconsideration at the next scheduled meeting, February 21, 2001.
**Item #7 was taken out of order by President Rodman**

7. **DIR 2000-3115-DRB-SPP-A**

APPEAL requested by Westwood Homeowners Association (Richard Agay) of a Design Review and Project Permit Compliance Determination.

Staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Discussion: Staff conducted an overview of the project. Staff contends there is no open space on the roof. The ordinance does not permit side yards for open space, the side yards are greater than permitted.

The Appellant testified that before the Specific Plans there were required yards. The appeal challenges the Department’s interpretation.

Several spoke in opposition of the project. Concerns were, it did not adhere to the Specific Plans of Westwood, laws and the local codes. There was no notification of the process for this project, the rules were modified to agree with the developer.

The Applicant’s representative testified the project complies with the Specific Plans. The roof area is the 3rd floor of the building, it is not the roof. There are setbacks cut into the building. The adjacent building has four stories.

The Applicant gave a brief history on how the project came into existence. The applicant stated there had been a lot of effort in the design of each unit.

The Council representative stated, if there is a violation of the Specific Plan they are in support of the appeal, if not deny the appeal.

Deliberation: Commissioner Krisiloff was concerned about the open space. Commissioner Lopez and Krisiloff were inclined to deny the appeal.

Commissioner Krisiloff made a motion to Deny the Appeal and Sustain the Director’s determination, Adopt the modified findings.

**MOTION:** Krisiloff moved, Lopez seconded
3. **DIR 2000-4080-DRB-SPP-A**  
**APPEAL of a Director’s Design Review and Project Permit Compliance Determination.**

Request by the Applicant and the Appellant to extend the 75 day limit in which the Area Planning Commission can act on an appeal.

Commissioner Lopez made a motion to grant the extension, Commissioner Krisiloff seconded. The item will rescheduled for March 7, 2001

**MOTION:** Lopez moved, Krisiloff seconded  
**VOTE:** Consent

4. **APCW 2000-2608 SPE-CDP-PP-ZV**  
(Continued from January 3, 2001)  
**SPECIFIC PLAN EXCEPTION** requested by Don Elster from Section 8.C.3. (front setbacks) to permit a 12 ½ foot to 14 ½ foot yard setback in lieu of the required 20-feet, and to allow balconies to project 10-feet into the required setbacks from the canal as required in the Venice Specific Plan (ordinance No. 172,897) and a **SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE**, pursuant to Section 11.5.7.C. of the L.A.M.C. In addition, the applicant is seeking a **VARIANCE**, per Section 12.27 from Section 12.09.5 of the Municipal Code to reduce the side yard setbacks from 4-feet 6 inches to 3-feet 6 inches in the RW2 zone and a **COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT**, pursuant to Section 12.20.2 of the Municipal Code. All these requests are in connection to the construction of a one single-family home.

Staff recommends disapproval in part.

**Discussion:** Staff conducted an overview of the project.

The Applicant’s representative responded to the 5 negative findings for the 20-foot setback, which he made in the affirmative.

The Applicant testified that his lot is the smallest and narrowest on the block, to remove an additional 13% in terms of the front setback dramatically
comprise the floor plan of the house. The applicant stated he would end up with a house less than scale and scope of the neighborhood.

The architect for the project testified in support of the project/appeal.

Several spoke in support of the appeal.

No one spoke in opposition.

The Council representative stated the council office was in support of the appeal. The Land Use Plan adopted by the Coastal Commission has provisions on the setback and buffers on the east banks of the canal. The provisions addressed an average of 15 feet, but not less than 10 feet shall be maintained in the front yards adjacent to the canal property line.

Deliberation: Commissioner Krisiloff made motion to Disapprove the exception, that it remain at 20 feet, Approve the side yard variance, Approve the Specific Plan Compliance, Approve the Coastal Development Permit, adopt the MND and Adopt the findings. Commissioner Lopez seconded, however would have also approved the front yard reduction.

MOTION: Krisiloff moved, Lopez seconded
VOTE: 3-0

6. **ZA 2000-0975 (CUB)**
APPEAL requested by Brentwood Village Chamber of Commerce from the entire determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator’s approval pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24.W.1 of a conditional use permit modification of the operation of an existing restaurant currently authorized to sell and dispense beer and wine so as to now permit the sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages, on a site in the C2-1XL-D Zone.

Staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Discussion: Staff conducted an overview of the project. The subject project is an existing restaurant, which dispenses beer and wine. The applicant is requesting an expansion for the sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages.
Doing the public hearing traffic and congestion were major issues brought forth.
Commissioner Rodman believed, he had transacted business with one of the owners, the applicant at arms length. He did not receive any compensation in the course of that business.

The Appellant’s concerns were parking and traffic congestion.

A speaker in support of the appeal testified his opposition was due to traffic and parking. He stated he was not opposed to the request for a liquor license. The owner and applicant were trying to work on a parking solution. The speaker stated it should be equitable for everyone.

Several spoke in support of the appeal due to the parking constraints in the Brentwood Village area.

A speaker in opposition of the appeal testified that the applicant has to go through extraordinary steps to address the parking issues. Everyone should adhere to the same conditions and commands as the applicant. The applicant is determine to adhere to the spirit and the letter of the conditional use permits.

Another speaker against the appeal stated the business is an asset to the community. Parking is difficulty for everyone, however the applicant should be treated fairly. He has done more to mitigate the parking problem than any other restaurants.

Council represented testified the office support the applicant and the Commission should, deny the appeal.

The applicant stated they request a beverage upgrade.

Deliberation: Commissioner Rodman stated he was inclined to Deny the Appeal in its entirety.

Commissioner Krisiloff made a clarification on letters referencing a case before them previous, that the restaurant involved residential impacts and this involves traffic impact.

Commissioner Lopez made a motion to deny the appeal, Commissioner Krisiloff seconded.

**MOTION:** Lopez moved, Krisiloff seconded

**VOTE:** 3-0
BREAK: 10 minutes was called by President Rodman


APPEALS (A1) requested by Jay Patel from conditions, elements or parts of an Associate Zoning Administrator’s approval and (A2) requested by Presidents Row Neighborhood Association/Michael Bear from the entire determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator’s approval pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W,24, of a conditional use permit, to permit the construction use and maintenance of a three-story, 42-unit motel with 39 subterranean parking spaces; and, pursuant to the provisions of Section 7, F of Ordinance No. 172,897, approval of a project permit to permit the construction, use and maintenance of a three-story, 42-unit motel with 39 subterranean parking spaces.

Staff recommends denial of the appeals.

Discussion: Staff conducted overview of the project. Appellant (1) is appealing Condition #9 regarding the street dedication. It was written in general terms for the Bureau of Engineering final approval.

The Applicant/Appellant (1) stated they were moving forward with the project. Prior to starting this venture, they received in writing a memo from the City advising there would be no street dedication required. Therefore they hired geologist, engineers, etc. They later received from the Department of Public Works later sent a letter stating there would be a street dedication. The appellant is asking that Condition #9 be changed and the 18 foot street dedication be rescinded.

The Appellant (2), concerns the project is not in scale of the area, there are negative effects, such as drugs and prostitution. The appellant was also concerned about the height being 3-stories. There is an unimproved alley to the rear of 7 homes. The appellant stated there was no problem with the development as long as conditions are in place to mitigate the negative impact on the neighborhood.

Deliberation: Commissioner Krisiloff commented that the Zoning allows the FAR and allows the massing and by right the applicant is allowed. She supports the compliance of the 18ft dedication. Commissioner Rodman stated he supports Bureau of
engineer, request for 18 ft dedication. If the appeal
would add conditions 1) improvement of the unimproved alley
2) 6'00 masonry wall; 3) trash bins should be locked.

Commissioner Krisiloff made a motion to Deny the appeal, add
additional conditions, 1) applicant improve the alley from the southerly most
rear property line to the street going north bound; 2) 6'00 masonry wall be
erected at rear of the property line adjacent to the alley. Commissioner Lopez
seconded.

MOTION: Krisiloff moved, Lopez seconded
VOTE: 3-0

8. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - No speakers

There being no further business to come before the West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission, the
meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

ATTEST:

____________________________________________
Matthew Rodman, President

____________________________________________
Carla Crayton, Commission Executive Assistant
West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission