JOHN A. HENNING, ESQ. West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission **Regular Meeting** April 20, 2011

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 2
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	[START 04ZA06-5028_PART 1]
3	FEMALE VOICE 1: Moving onto item number
4	four, ZA-2006-5028-CUB-PA1-1A CEQA Environmental
5	2010-1043-CE, project location, 147 and 1I'm
6	sorry, 1427 and 1429 Abbot Kinney Boulevard
7	
8	MR. FERNANDO TOVAR: Good afternoon, Members
9	of the Commission. Fernando Tovar, I was the
10	Hearing Officer that conducted the case on
11	behalf of the chief zoning administrator, Ms.
12	Lynn Wyatt. Um, yes, the case before you is a
13	zoning administrator determination, uh, to
14	review the applicant's compliance to the
15	conditions of approval, as well as to review the
16	effectiveness of the conditions of approval for
17	a conditional use permit that was issued on the
18	site on May 4th, 2007, to permit the onsite sale
19	of a full line of alcoholic beverages, in
20	connection with, uh, Gjelina Restaurant, which
21	was a new restaurant at the time of approval.
22	Uh, the filing of the plan approval was required
23	by condition number 29 of the grant, and just a
24	brief little description of the building. Uh,
	Uhigus Poporting

this is an older, non-conforming building, um,
that currently has a retail tenant on one side,
andon the ground floor. And there's two, two
tenants on the ground floor, the restaurant
being one, the, uh, retail tenant being the
other. On the second floor, it's not a full
second floor, but it's a partial second story,
which contains a dwelling unit. There's a
detached one car garage, which isthis is a
corner lot, at the corner of Milwood Avenue and
Abbot Kinney, and you have a one car garage
that's accessible off of Milwood Avenue. Uh,
the ZA's, uh, jurisdiction in this case is
limited simply to determining whether or not the
restaurant is in full compliance to the
conditions of approval. This is the first and
only plan approval that's been filed since the,
um, uh, use was established. Um, and
Commissioners, as you're aware, if a use is
found to be in full compliance, then a zoning
administrator may determine that no further
review is required, and may eliminate the
requirement for any future plan approvals On

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

the other hand, if a use is found not to be in compliance, then the zoning administrator may impose corrective conditions, as appropriate, and may require the finding of a subsequent, subsequent plan approval, in order to review compliance with the, uh, and effectiveness of any revised, uh, conditions. Um, and prior to moving to the level of revocation, uh, we're required to follow due process, um, and typically, that requires, uh, allowing the, uh, existing use an opportunity to come into compliance, and the typical steps is that, uh, we impose corrective conditions and, as I mentioned, set up for a subsequent plan approval. I mention that because that's one of the items on appeal is that the zoning administrator should have revoked the use, uh, but again, I want to just outline that that's a process to, to get to that stage. Uh, in this case, the zoning administrator has found that the use, uh, was not in full compliance, uh, to the -- to the conditions of approval, and has imposed corrective conditions and modified or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

eliminated certain conditions and has added two new conditions of approval. Uh, the, the, the zoning administrator considered, uh, adding a requirement to make the applicant file a, a subsequent plan approval. Uh, the problem is that this grant is going to expire in May of 2012, a year from today, so it seemed, you know, the, the--pointless to make the applicant file a plan approval, when the grant's going to expire, uh, in a year from--a year from now. And if the applicant wishes to continue the onsite sale of alcoholic beverages, then at that time, the applicant will have to file a new application, uh, to establish the - - brand, you know, as a brand new application. Um, with that, I do want to say that there seems to be some misunderstanding, uh, as to what this plan approval determination does and what it doesn't Uh, and part of the reason, I think, is because the site is located within the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan, and was also issued a project permit compliance, uh, which was actually approved on October 12th, 2006, seven

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

months prior to the zoning administrator's action, uh, in approving the conditional use for the sale of alcoholic beverages. So these were two separate entitlements that were processed separately. They were not filed concurrently. Uh, the zoning administrator's office only has jurisdiction over the conditional use permit. Uh, and so, there seems to be a conflict between the two entitlements. The original plans that were approved under the project permit compliance included, um, a fixed bar that was next to an indoor dining area and, uh, there was limited outdoor dining area, as well. Um, there's no explicit condition in the project permit determination that limits the maximum service floor area, as you know, under the Venice Specific Plan. Um, there's a definition of service floor area, and that de--and that determines the amount of parking that re--that's required, and what have you. So in any event, the plans were approved and subsequent to that project permit determination, the ZA's action, seven months later, uh, the--apparently, at that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

time, there was concerns about the bar, so the fixed bar was eliminated. And the plans, the, the, the, the action of the zoning administrator required that revised plans be submitted, eliminating the bar, uh, but again, those plans were not submitted prior to issuing the determination and became a condition of approval. And subsequent to the issuance of the determination letter, plans were then submitted, showing that there was no bar, and the zoning administrator signed off, and they moved on. The problem is that, from day one, at the outset, you had two different plans that were approved because there was a set of plans approved by the zoning administrator that did not include a fixed bar within the restaurant, and there was a set of plans that were approved under the project permit compliance that did include a fixed bar. Moving forward, uh, the restaurants gets to establish itself, uh, and goes into operation, and we held the hearing for the plan approval a year ago. Uh, I, I don't want to go into the, the details of the issues

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

that were raised at the hearing 'cause I'm sure that you're going to hear them for yourself But I will just briefly state that the issues that were raised at the hearing pertained to the fact that, um, the restaurant was exceeding the allowable service floor area, as approved by the, uh, project permit compliance, uh, that there was loud noise or music emanating from the site, that, uh, the use was, uh, uh, causing the, the displacement of residential parking in the adjacent residential neighborhood, that the detached one car garage, which was supposed to be used for parking, was being used for storage, that the upstairs dwelling unit was, uh, being used for dining at the time, uh, rather than as a dwelling unit, and finally, that the, uh, curb in front of the restaurant was, uh, being reserved for loading or parking without the approval of the Department of Transportation. The case was taken under advisement, and subsequent to the hearing, uh, the applicant did submit a set of revised plans, seeking and requesting approval

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

to increase the service floor area, but I want to be very clear, that that request was neither considered, nor granted, by the chief zoning administrator, as part of this determination. Uh, it was determined that that request is, is, is under the jurisdiction of the specific plan, and would be more appropriately handled by the-what is now the plan implementation unit, uh, which was formerly known as the community pla -uh, community planning section. Um, so with that, I'm going to say that there was enough information furnished to substantiate some of the issues that were raised at the hearing, and to that -- and to that end, the zoning administrator determined that there was not full compliance, and basically, added corrective conditions and new conditions. Uh, new condition number 31 expressly prohibits use of the upstairs for dining, and requires that the garage be used for parking only. Condition number 32 prohibits use of the curb in front of the restaurant to be used for loading, or to be designated as parking for exclusive use of the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

restaurant, without the approval of DOT. more importantly, in order to eliminate conflict and confusion between the two entitlements, the ZA plan approval determination has deleted any conditions that limited seating capacity, and instead, required conformance to plans on file in the related project com--permit compliance case, rather than those on file in the ZA case. I do want to say, and I don't know if I mentioned this earlier, that the zoning administrator's determination had included a condition that limited, uh, the seating capacity to 44 indoor seats, and 16 outdoor seats. Um, in limiting the seating capacity, the record is not clear, uh, what that number is based on, whether it was based on the proposed plans at the time, the revised plans that were not seen until after the determination was issued, so that would be difficult, or whether it was intended as a mitigation, in which case, the findings in the original, uh, determination don't really address that. Uh, so again, and that, that seating capacity may or may not be

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 13
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: Does anywas
3	MR. TOVAR: [Interposing] 'Cause I did
4	review the findings and Iand again, I, I
5	didn't see where, where, where that number had
6	come from, so I wasn't clear, and the zoning
7	administrator who acted on it
8	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: [Interposing] No, I
9	know that
10	MR. TOVAR:wasn't
11	COMMISSIONER FOSTER:I, I do remember. I
12	don't know. Do you remember that, Commissioner
13	Martinez?
14	MR. TOVAR: But, but to answer your
15	question, no, I mean, this action does not
16	really remedy or solve the discrepancy between
17	this approval and what was approved by the
18	project permit compliance, so that remains
19	outstanding.
20	FEMALE VOICE 1: Okay. Well, so what would
21	be the effect of, of agreeing to remove those
22	conditions? Um, I'm, I'm having a hard time
23	following here.
24	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: I am, too. I, I don't

Ubiqus Reporting2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 14
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	understand why you would
3	MALE VOICE 1: [Interposing] a different
4	restaurant.
5	COMMISSIONER FOSTER:why you wouldit
6	isn't a different restaurant. It's the same
7	one.
8	MR. TOVAR: Yeah. Yeah, I was going to say,
9	I don't think this case has ever been before you
10	before, so you might be thinking of a different
11	restaurant.
12	COMMISSIONER THOMAS M. DONOVAN:
13	Commissioner Donovan. I think that you might be
14	thinking of, uh, 1305 Abbot Kinney. That, that
15	was something that we, um
16	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: [Interposing] Oh, I
17	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN:decided about a
18	year ago, um.
19	MR. TOVAR: Yeah, this is some
20	COMMISSIONER FOSTER:
21	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: This is the corner of
22	Milwood Avenue. It was, uh, the sameperhaps
23	the same applicant, and there was some
24	discussion about, uh, Gjelina Restaurant and
	Ubiqus Reporting

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Ubiqus Reporting
2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

area.

Ubiqus Reporting

ground floor that was being utilized as dining

Uh, the garage, as I mentioned, was

Ubiqus Reporting

a, a determination, rather than a finding.

24

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

just trying to - - if--did you make a finding that there was a violation regarding the noise

in this case are more general, and there's only two findings to be made, um, and we basically kind of summarize and say that we found that,

you know, and I can go back to look at the findings are. No, we don't go point by point, to, to be clear.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: And, and is it true that the, uh, uh, the owner remodeled the second floor, without obtaining appropriate building and safety permits?

MR. TOVAR: Uh, I can say that, uh, that there was an order to comply that was apparently issued on the site. Uh, I don't recall that being furnished to me at, at the Hearing Officer's hearing. Uh, it was included with your package, as part of the appeal, um, but I don't ever recall receiving that, but you know, what was furnished was there, there wasn't any doubt about it. There, there, there was, um, uh, somebody submitted a, a business card or something on there. I'm not sure if it was their website or their business card, but there was something that indicated, you know, for inquiries about upstairs, call this number. So there seemed to be, like I said, enough evidence to support that.

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 23
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: And my, my last
3	question, you said you haven't put down a, a new
4	fixed time for comcompliance review because
5	there's already one scheduled in one year.
6	MR. TOVAR: No, because the grant's going to
7	expire a year from, from now.
8	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: When you say the
9	grant will expire, then their
10	MR. TOVAR: [Interposing] only talking
11	about the alcohol.
12	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Yeah, their ability
13	to sell alcohol
14	MR. TOVAR: [Interposing] That's correct.
15	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN:will expire in one
16	year.
17	MR. TOVAR: That's correct.
18	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Thank you.
19	MR. TOVAR: And they'll have to reapply if
20	they want to continue.
21	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Okay. Thank you. I,
22	I don't have any more questions.
23	FEMALE VOICE 1: Thank you. Any other
24	questions?

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 24
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	COMMISSIONER CHRISTOPHER D. LEE: I have a
3	question. Do they provide valet service?
4	MR. TOVAR: No.
5	COMMISSIONER LEE: Uh, you said the patio
6	was converted to dining. How many seats was
7	that? It's like four tables, one table, do you
8	know?
9	MR. TOVAR: Depending on which set of plans
10	you're looking at, uh, there was anywhere from
11	between about eight seats shown on one set of
12	plans, to 16 on another set of plans, um, easily
13	double or more than double of what was
14	originally approved.
15	COMMISSIONER LEE: So the business picked
16	up, and they needed more business space. Is
17	that what it is?
18	MR. TOVAR: That's what it seems like.
19	COMMISSIONER LEE: Basically. Do theyhow
20	many employees do they have?
21	MR. TOVAR: Uh, that, I couldn't tell you.
22	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: There's 10 or 12, I
23	think, as I recall reading through the report.
24	FEMALE VOICE 1: Thank you.

Ubiqus Reporting2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

a few conuh, errors of the zoning
administrator, which are conditions 26 and 27,
as stated in my appeal. These are technical
changes and should be corrected, so as to avoid
any confusion. Number two is the modification
to condition number two and number six. DIR-
2006-6829 has expired, and pursuant to the
Municipal Code, no change is permitted on a
brand new director's determination. Deferring
to it would, uh, coum, would only confuse the
CUB procprocess, and the protections
established for the community and the proposed
alcohol use, with compliance with the specific
plan regulations, again, creating further
confusion. Uh, number one is, um, the abuse of
discretion by the ZA's office. Um, the hearing
notice on, on modifications of conditions
numbers six and seven, the public hearing, as
stated in the hearing notice for September 20th,
2010, was to, and I quote, review the
effectiveness and compliance of the conditions
of approval, for the continued operation, use,
and maintenance of an existing restaurant,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

serving beer and wine, for onsite consumption, as an accessory use. Nothing in the public notice acknowledged that the applicant saw any changes in the existing conditional use permit. The applicant did not even request a modification until December 1st, 2010, when the representative sent an e-mail to Fernando Tovar, first suggesting that the zoning administrator had the authority to make certain changes and modifications, and then, providing language for some of the modifications shown in the final approval. The community was never made aware that changes to the original approval were thought -- were sought. In fact, even the zoning investigator's report, which is in the file, states that, quote, unquote, no expansion or development is requested. Now, the community should have an opportunity to provide input to the initial decision maker, in regards to any changes, so it may adverse--adversely affect our neighborhood, so as to appropriate conditions could be imposed, not through my appeal as a corrective measure to the ZA's abuse of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

discretion, but certainly, you Commissioners are qualified to make such, uh, uh, corrective conditions. Uh, but it would be most appropriate to have these changes heard at the initial hearing, um, so the public could weigh in on the project. In any case, the ZA stated that, quote, unquote, the record is not clear whether, in limiting the seat capacity, the ZA also intended to limit the intensity of the use, or was it simply a reflection of the applicant's And the question of seating capacity proposal? and associated parking is a technical issue governed by the Venice Coastal Zone Specific First the question of seating capacity is not governed by the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan, which places limit only on service floor. Limitations in seating capacity, on the other hand, are traditionally one of the primary tools that the zoning administrator uses in considering whether to grant discretionally conditional use permits for serving alcohol. Ser--seating limitations help to make sure that impacts to the neighborhood from alcohol serving

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

restaurants use are minimized. Such impacts are not limited only to parking, but also include late night noise, which we have, litter, public intoxication, etcetera. Such impacts are not limited only to parking, but also include, um, oh, sorry. I already read that. Here, the seating in the outdoor dining area is at least 40, where originally, it was approved for 16, and so, it's more than twice what was allowed by the CUB. Um, and the, you know, the, the ZA found that the area, the outdoor patio, is routinely used past 11:00, which is another, um, condition and -- of the CUB, and noise can be heard in the nearby residential areas. So--and, and the ZA, um, also acknowledged that a video was submitted showing that music can be heard emanating, uh, from the restaurant onto the sidewalk adjacent to the premises, um, uh, to the residences on Milwood Avenue. Second, the ZA's original approval was able to make necessary findings in the affirmative that, because it -- the small si--quote, unquote, the small size of the restaurant, and that it was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

limited to 44 seats within the building, and an additional 16 seats within the rear outdoor It was also stated that, quote, unquote, a review of letters to the file and testimony given at a public hearing have led to the fashioning of a number of conditions, the intent of which is to - - to protector -- the protection of the community. These conditions include number six and number seven, which limit the floor area, strictly, and I don't mean service floor area, just restaurant area, you know, that includes the kitchen, uh, to 2,619 square feet, and the seating to a maximum of 44 indoor seats and 16 outdoor seats, for a total of 60 seats. To suggest that the zoning administrator's only intent in imposing certain conditions was simply a reflection of the applicant's proposal is not reasonable, not so--nor does it fairly reflect the deliberative process performed by the applicant, the community, which include over 40 communications from the public and the zoning administrator. Third, and most important, Section 1224-W-1, which governs the original

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

conditional use permit states that, quote, unquote, establishments dispensing alcohol beverages may not be continued without a conditional use, if there is a substantial change in the establishment, including any expansion by more than 20% of the floor area, seating, or only if the expansion is the -- or only if the expansion is less than 20% of the floor area, seating, or occupancy can the plan approval process be used. So there's no discretion in this interpretation allowed, and I provided, uh, a section of the Code. I also provided, um, the zoning administrator memo 78, which, uh, the Department uses to help clarify certain ambiguities in the code, and that states that, in no event, quote, unquote, uh, quote unquote, plan approval shall be used to expand the site or to change an explicit condition or language of the grant of the original authorization, period. Now on compliance, the zoning administrator found, quote, unquote, the operation is not in full compliance to all its conditions, which he's already said, yet, grants

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

relief from various operational conditions. First and most importantly, the applicant was cited by Department of Building and Safety for remodeling the upstairs dwelling, which we've already talked about, um, and we still, um, contend that it is being used, even though the applicant, um, says that, you know, it's a residence and they have parties there. Um, other violations include the expansion of the service floor area, which is a violation of DIR-2006-6829-SPP, which is included in number 26, the use of the patio after 11:00 p.m., noise heard beyond the property, the lack of STAR training by all employees serving alcohol, and the delay of the applicant filing for a request plan approval. So ultimately, these violations are willful intent of the applicant to disregard the conditions imposed by the zoning administrator, which were designed to protect the best interests in the neighborhood, and granting these, the instant request in its current form would be rewarding this behavior. Um, and by the way, having--the restaurant was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

never meant to have 105 employees. I mean, uh, the, you know, the size was 60 seats and, um, the fact that they have over exceeded their, their capacity, it's, it's really unreasonable, for us, the people who live adjacent to the restaurant. And with that, I would ask the Commission to please grant my appeal, in part, number one, by making the corrections to the various conditions discussed at the outset, uh, the mistakes that are mentioned in my appeal, including the changes made regarding DIR-2006-6829, number two, to maintain the original conditions of the zoning administrator, in regards to a maximum of 2,619 square foot floor area, and a maximum of 44 indoor seats and 16 outdoor seats, for a total of 60 seats, number three, to require another public hearing at the time of the applicant's attempt to renew the conditional use permit. This would provide the applicant one more opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the conditions set forth. by the way, it's been very hard to get Building and Safety to go out and, and file an order to

Ubiqus Reporting

Delvac, 11611 San Vicente Boulevard, Los

24

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

compliance, I should say, uh, with conditions.

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

2 The upstairs is not used for a dining room. That's been checked. Mr. Tovar checked it, 3 himself and, and, uh, you know, Building and 4 5 Safety has been there. It is not used for 6 dining. It's, it's, uh, Fran's apartment that he has upstairs. Uh, there's not an office on 7 the ground floor. Um, the, uh, patio was always 8 9 allowed to be used for dining, um, and it continues to be. There is no amplified music. 10 There is light -- there is background music, um, 11 as if allowed, and if, in fact, there is any 12 leakage of music outside the property, uh, that 13 shouldn't happen, and I've talked the owner 14 15 about that, and he will try to make sure, uh, 16 that that does not happen. Um, with regard to the number of employees, which I, by the way, 17 think employees are a wonderful thing to have, 18 19 especially in today's economy, um, you know, most of the--most restaurants that are 20 21 successful, most restaurants aren't successful. Those that are successful, uh, you know, have a 22 lot of various type of employees, from the, you 23 know, the service employees, to the waiters and 24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

the captains and it takes a -- to the people that buy the food and, you know, it takes a lot of people to run the restaurant. A lot of those people also, a good part of them, come to the restaurant on public transportation, so they're not all people that drive there, uh, to use But anyway, I just wanted to give you cars. that sort of overview. I do not see this, in any way, and especially--and a matter of fact, I'd be glad to go down every single one of the conditions of approval and let's see whether we have a, a situation where lots of conditions have been violated. I don't think so. Um, now, you know, I'll be happy to, you know, run through that, uh, that exercise if, if we would Um, Mr. Tovar, I think, did a good job like to. of, of running through some of the background and a little bit of a confusing background of this case. You know, it was--originally, there's a project permit compliance in 2006, where the space used to be retail and a--and lab--laboratory space, approved for a change of use to a restaurant, and then, in addition, a

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

application was filed for a conditional use permit for service of alcoholic beverages. The owner wanted to do--have a bar and a full line of alcoholic beverages and live entertainment. The zoning administrator, Al Landini, at the time, uh, was opposed to that, and he was in favor of the beer and wine, but he did not want a bar, did not want live entertainment, and he did not want a full line of alcoholic beverages which is why, by the way, uh, the plan that was submitted by the applicant at the time, which was the -- was this plan, and I have copies if you would like, but it clearly says the plan was to be revised. The reason it was to be revi--and this is the plan assoc--that had 60 seats, and it was to be revised because the bar was going to be removed, and in the bar's place, would be additional seats, and furthermore, in this area, the specific plan deals with service floor area, as opposed to seating. Service floor area is determined, in this case, by the, um, grandfathered parking spaces, and the service floor area is actually 1,300 square feet, which

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

one of the conditions of Mr. Tovar's approval is to submit a revised plan showing that, and, and that is, is then subject to the director's, uh, approval or the director's assignee approval of that plan. Um, we plan to immediately, uh, do that, even though the restaurant has been operating in compliance with that plan, uh, for some time. So, you know, talking about compliance, again, you know, we can go through each and every one of the I don't know how many conditions of approval there are, and we can see whether they're being complied with or not. the intent is to comply with, with everything. Um, so one, one of the things we plan to do is immediately, upon, hopeful--hopefully, the effectiveness of this, uh, plan approval is to submit the revised plan to the director of planning, showing the revised service floor area, which is ve--consistent with the Venice Coastal Specific Plan, and that'll also, um, that'll include the removal of that bar from the plan that's been on the records, but which

But

clearly has not--it's not been operated with a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

bar, so the plan will confirm that. Uh, it will show the -- that the noise barrier that has been referred to is, in fact, in place, on the eastern and southern edges of the patio, and we'll submit photographs showing, uh, that that is and has been in place. There is full compliance on that. Um, the, uh, patio, uh, is not supposed to be used past 11:00 p.m., and my understanding is that that is the way it has been operated. Uh, if, if there has been an instance where that has not happened, the owner must comply with that, and, uh, and he knows that. We've had a, a talk about that, and he says that, uh, uh, that is being complied with. Uh, also, there's the existing one car garage space behind the facility. I know, at times, that has been used as storage, um, and that is one of the areas that need--needs to be made sure that that is parking at all times. Um, but again, these are--these are minimal instances of possibly being outside the conditions of approval, but, you know, again, there are 50 conditions, all of which are being complied

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

Um, also, as I said, the maximum seating, with. according to Mr. Tovar's decision, will be determined by the director of planning, in conformance with the Venice Coastal Specific Plan, uh, and we will be submitting the plan, uh, to show that. Uh, I also talked--also talked about the indoor background music, um, whatever, you know, proof we need to show of that, but again, the, the sound is not to be, uh, audible beyond the boundaries, uh, of the property. Uh, one other statement that was made was that, uh, and, and as a condition of approval, is that all employees involved in the sale of alcoholic beverages have STAR training, and it was alleged in the appeal that that has That has absolutely been been violated. complied with. All employees serving alcoholic beverages, uh, have--are--have had STAR training, and, uh, evidence of that, uh, from, uh, the LAPD to the zoning administrator, uh, were provided, and any future employees will also, uh, fully comply with that. So I don't know how much time I've used, but, uh, again, I,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I, I, I think I would rather, at this time, uh, say that we're open to answer any questions, with regard to, uh, uh, Commissioner Donovan, you asked about uh, uh, alleged violations. And again, I'm saying this is not a facility that has gone out and free willing, you know, uh, in violation of conditions of approval. matter of fact, it's, it's just the opposite. There is the question, uh, with it because it's a confusing record, with regard to, uh, the amount of seating and the floor area, but we believe the floor area and the seating is governed by the -- or the seating is governed by the, um, by the, uh, service floor area, as provided in the Venice Specific Plan. That's in Mr. Tovar's decision, which we intend to fully comply with. And if, when we submit that plan, they disagree, then, you know, well, um, then, then, they disagree and, and we comply with whatever their determination is. So with that, um, again, I'd be happy to answer any questions now or later, but again, I think this is a, um, a--and it's a wonderful restaurant. It's a

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 47
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	MR. ARMBRUSTER: I, Ithere's no upstai
3	there's no use of the upstairs for dining, so
4	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: [Interposing] Uh, at
5	noat no time has the restaurant served food in
6	the upstairs?
7	MR. ARMBRUSTER: Theas far as I know, the
8	restaurant does not serve food in the upstairs.
9	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: And how
10	MR. ARMBRUSTER: [Interposing] And
11	absolutely. I mean, the answer is never.
12	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Okay.
13	MR. ARMBRUSTER: The answer is yes, never.
14	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: And the upstairs is,
15	is occupied as a dwelling unit?
16	MR. ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: And was it remodeled
18	without permits?
19	MR. ARMBRUSTER: Um, I haven't been involved
20	in that part of it. Was it?
21	MALE VOICE 1: It started. It started
22	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Well, we can't
23	you're not in front of a mic, so
24	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: [Interposing] Yeah,
	Ubiqus Reporting

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 48
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	weyeah, we need you to
3	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN:you could step up,
4	uh, uh, later.
5	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: Yeah.
6	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Uh, so I getI get
7	the picture.
8	MR. ARMBRUSTER: Yeah, it, it, was being
9	remodeled. Now, I think the apartment unit is
10	not part of the restaurant
11	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: [Interposing] Okay.
12	And
13	MR. ARMBRUSTER:some decision.
14	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN:hahave you
15	applied for any changes to the conditions that
16	were previously imposed, as we standsit here
17	stand here today?
18	MR. ARMBRUSTER: No, we have not, uh,
19	compliedwe, we have not done that. I know one
20	of the issues that was raised by the appellant
21	was, um, she said that the, uh, zoning
22	administrator did not have the authority to
23	change any condition, um, such as seating, to
24	comply with service floor area, uh, for example,

Ubiqus Reporting2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Ubiqus Reporting
2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Ubiqus Reporting2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 60
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	COMMISSIONER FOSTER: Okay. Thank you.
3	FEMALE VOICE 1: Thank you.
4	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Commissioner Donovan,
5	one, one, one last question. Uh, the, uh,
6	upstairs dwelling unit, is that a full and
7	regular dwelling unit, with kitchen facilities,
8	showers, bathrooms?
9	MR. ARMBRUSTER: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Okay. 'Cause I did
11	we did receive a letter here that says that the,
12	uh, um, the upstairs existing shower room was
13	remodeled as a men and women's restrooms. Is
14	that true?
15	MR. ARMBRUSTER: No.
16	COMMISSIONER DONOVAN: Okay. Thanks.
17	FEMALE VOICE 1: Thank you.
18	COMMISSIONER LEE: May I ask a five minute
19	break?
20	FEMALE VOICE 1: Yes. We'll take a
21	COMMISSIONER LEE: [Interposing] minute
22	break?
23	FEMALE VOICE 1:a
24	COMMISSIONER LEE: [Interposing] Two minute
	Ubiqus Reporting

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 61
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	break?
3	FEMALE VOICE 1:a quick two minute break.
4	COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you.
5	FEMALE VOICE 1: And we'll be right back.
6	Well, Okay. We're back on the record.
7	COMMISSIONER LEE: Thank you.
8	FEMALE VOICE 1: We have a lot of speakers.
9	Um, so if everyone will have two minutes. Um,
10	don't forget to give your name and address for
11	the record. And if someone else has already
12	made the same point, you can just say that you
13	agree, and we would really appreciate it, so we
14	can move this along. Um, Mark Rieves
15	[phonetic], I'm sorry. I can't read your last
16	name. You're with the Venice
17	MR. MARK RYAVEC: My name is Mark Ryavec.
18	FEMALE VOICE 1: Ryavec.
19	MR. RYAVEC: Uh, I'm the president of the
20	Venice Stakeholders Association. My address is
21	453 Rialto Avenue, Venice, California. I live
22	about three blocks away from this restaurant.
23	Um, I'd like to, um, well, just briefly, the
24	Venice Stakeholders Association is concerned

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

with civic improvement in Venice. Uh, we've been--appeared before you on several other We are very concerned about parking, projects. um, in Venice, uh, and I'd like to give you my brief overview of the parking problem in Venice, just to reacquaint you one more time because you're, you're focused on minutia here. You're focused on whether or not one dwelling unit has been used for food serving, whether there's some noise being heard over on Milwood, or over on Electric. The issue here is that Venice was built without sufficient parking. This area, um, just off of Abbot Kinney was all canals. There was no requirement for off street parking. The only parking that many residents have in this area is street parking. When you allow the, uh, them to have 40 more seats than they are required--than they are allowed to, that means, what, another 20 cars in our neighborhood? Then, you have the employees' cars in our neighborhood. The reason there are limits on this grant, uh, the CUB and in the project permit, to those number of seats, of 60

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

seats, is because of the fact that this building was grandfathered. They do not provide -- didn't provide any parking, so you've got 60 seats generating cars, the employees serving them generating cars, and they provided zip, and all of that parking goes into our neighborhood, their neighborhood, other people's neighborhood, and that's the point--the reason that you should--I would urge you to ho--they have been exceeding and violating their grant, by their own admission, for at least three years, if they opened in 2008. I would urge you to re--put those numbers, the 44 and the 16 back in, and let them come in with a formal public process to make an -- a change in that, and not use this process as a way to get out of it. Lovely restaurant, but they really need to be--they need to comply and we'd really ask you to help us out, to protect the community, um, because it's become intolerable, um, because people coming home cannot find--you come home at 10:00 at night and you can't find a place to park. And so, you've got people having to walk three

also lives at 448 Rialto. I have lived in

24

the restaurant to increase seating without the

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

amount of seats they were allowed. Arminda drew

up these extensive plans, and only because of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

been able to park on my block, until this restaurant was allowed to open and take over all

our parking. She now parks blocks and blocks

oh, so these people opened this restaurant.

They saw that our neighborhood was right for

away. You heard of the dangers. What we ask--

abusing, that they could snap up our residential parking and save big on the normal cost of opening a restaurant, the extra space that one must buy or lease for customers and employees to park their cars. My favorite was at one of the

Venice meetings where one of their employees said, "All of you residents just want a place to park your automobiles." Well, yes, it is untenable for me to drive up and down Lincoln

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

until 2 o'clock in the morning. I mean, I need to, yes, park safely. We ask that you not decide this on the popularity of Gjelina or in pity for their employees. They should have opened somewhere else. We in my neighborhood initially didn't like this deal where they were allowed to open a 60-seat restaurant with zero parking spaces, spaces grandfathered in on I don't know about you, but I cannot park on a sheet of paper. It's terrible, terrible now. Now, if they had stuck with the seats they were given, and not had loud music playing outside, and not done all these other lack of compliance type activities, we wouldn't be complaining. Is that the end of my time?

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Yes.

MS. AMY ALKIN: Okay. I just--can I just say one other thing to finish up? If Gjelina is allowed to ignore the law, no business will need to stick to it, and we'll all be--no one will ever be able to live there again, on Abbot Kinney, near Abbot Kinney, or park, or have a safe time. It'll just be a big business street

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

a ticket. And this business has been breaking the rules and they're not being fined or there's no--nothing happens to them. And to me it's kind of like--I mean, I'm a mom, I mean, I'm with kids all the time, and with children, if there's not--if there's not a consequence, then there's no reason to change your actions. there's no reason for this business to change their actions because there's no consequence for them to break the rules. I also feel like this isn't the only business doing this on Abbot Kinney, it's just the most obvious one. And I-as a last statement, I'd just like to say if the City is not going to force these businesses to follow the law, then I think that they need to provide the additional services that those businesses require, the additional parking, the public restrooms, that you find near the promenade and near Rodeo Drive. I mean, those are big city draws. Abbot Kinney is becoming a big city draw. It's not a neighborhood anymore. So that hurts us, the neighbor--you know, the neighborhood a lot, and so we just would request

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Thank you. You can give it to the executive assistant.

Ubiqus Reporting

MR. ROBERT SCHWAN: Okay, you can see that.
And I just want to say, we're a restaurant,
we're a family restaurant owned by Venice
residents, and we serve beer and wine only, only
with dinner. That's what we're doing. That's
what this is about. Family-run business by
Venice residents, serving dinner with beer and
wine. That's what we're doing there. And I
manage the restaurant. I'm there almost every
day, every night of my life. I've never had the
police come and complain to me about noise,
unless a certain individual sent them
specifically to do that. That's not what's
happening there. That's not the case. Weyou
know, you're not looking at a list of violations
of people saying, oh, there's drunken people or
there's noise, or there'sit's just not what's
going on at Gjelina. It's a family dining
experience. At any given time you go in
Gjelina, I guarantee you at least half the
people in there are locals. I also guarantee
you that at least half my staff live and work in
Venice, so that's what I wanted to share with

talking about what is good for the community as

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

a whole, I would ask the appellants if they're glad that their properties are retaining value well above the national average because of the popularity of Abbot Kinney, and because of the popularity of Venice. This is the kind of thing that cities want to create in order to keep the city thriving. And I would just say that it's also good for the overall health of the community. We talk--people were talking about the danger that exists because of the displacement of parking. Gjelina is a participant in the growth of a much safer overall community, because Venice is not what it was when I first moved there 13 years ago. Venice is no longer gang land violence. Venice has become a thriving commercial entity, and we want that to continue. It is changing, and that is going to change some of the dynamics of the community, and we're all having to live with that. We're all having to live that it isn't the just outland place that it was, and that's for the better. It does require some adjustment, but it is for the best, ultimately.

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

week and they eat dinner there. And this is how welcoming it is. 'Cause I hear people using the word danger, floating rules, and profits, and like it's this bad oner. And if it was so bad, believe me, the people who were working there would not come back after shift to have dinner with their family, their mother, or they sure wouldn't be bringing their kids up as well. So I just definitely support Gjelina and giving them the opportunity, 'cause that's the spirit of the law here, I mean, giving them the opportunity to come into compliance, and maybe with a couple of things that they might not be in. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Thank you.

MR. SAM MARSHALL: Hello, my name is Sam

Marshall and I am here today speaking in support

of Gjelina. I am a direct neighbor of Gjelina,

as my offices are located just next door at 1425

Abbot Kinney. In many ways I do feel it is

regrettable that we are all here today. Gjelina

has been nothing but a grass roots success

story. We are all aware of the unchained Venice

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

initiative which seeks to prohibit the establishment of chain restaurants and stores in As a supporter of this initiative, a Venice. local resident, Fran Camaj, purchased the building at Millwood and Abbot Kinney, and spent the next five years permitting and constructing Gjelina. Five years is a long time, and what was created in that five years is completely It is a neighborhood owned and operated farmers market fresh restaurant that serves the community and employs over 100 people in doing To Mr. Armbruster's point, one of the reasons it took five years is because the owner had to completely change his business model to move from a bar to a restaurant at the request of the zoning administrator. He did this to move within the wishes of both not only the zoning administrator, but also the community, and it became successful. Just so that we do not lose perspective today, what we are talking about is a restaurant created out of the community's concerns and wishes. What we are talking about is a place that serves dinner,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

lunch, and on the weekends, breakfast. And I've read both the appeal and the ZA report, and I should take this opportunity to say that I'm particularly impressed with the efforts and diligence of Mr. Tovar. The fact that a city employee would visit Gjelina at 10:30 on a Saturday night shows the amount of dedication and service to this issue. And after spending ample time both inside, outside, and around Gjelina, Mr. Tovar came to a conclusion that negates the entirety of the insertions -- of the assertions of the appeal. Assertions in this case is the operative word, as I am still confused about what exactly is being appealed. I suppose the thing could be, if you throw the kitchen sink at an issue, something may stick. In reading the appeal, however, it is very clear that the goal in this case is to use the commission to close down Gjelina, or reduce it in a way that it is forced to close. How awful. What a tragedy it is that we cannot support our neighbors in not only providing jobs at such a critical time, but also making such a unique,

22

23

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

or my studio, because there is activity now and I think that that is a benefit. I see Gjelina

24 as having been a magnet to bring people to

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

Venice, to explain Venice to the outer world, so that now the street had become alive in a way that it was not in the past. I agree with the things that people have said on the positive side. I would like to bring attention to the fact that there is a very large, tall wall around the rear patio. I have never had any problem with noise whatsoever. I have been past Gjelina day and night at all hours, 'cause I come and go all hours, and I fully am against the appeal. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Thank you.

MS. ANGELINA BERNAT: Hello, thanks for your time today. I'm here on behalf of my entire family. We've been residents of the Ocean Park/Venice area for quite some time, and patrons of Gjelina since it opened. Now, obviously, we keep going back because the food is incredible. But I don't think we would be there, frankly, every day, collectively, amongst all of us, if it weren't for this really wonderful sense of purpose and community that this restaurant—that surrounds this restaurant.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The proprietors have made a clear effort to contribute positively to the world outside their Whether that's by hiring members from walls. the neighborhood, or supporting sustainable and local farmers, this is all a boon to our community. And as somebody who worked on Abbot Kinney before Gjelina opened, I can assure you there have always been parking problems. are not--they are not--the genesis is not Gjelina, I can assure you. I want to echo the points everybody else has made. continuation of what I had to say would be a repetition, but I want to say that this is the sort of business that local government, especially one as forward thinking as Los Angeles, should really reach out and support. Curtailing efforts of a business like this is not what a local government should do, and I have to make the point that the notion that Fran and Travis and Robert are some sort of nefarious vampiric folk coming in to suck life out of Venice is one of the most absurd notions I've ever heard. It's actually quite laughable.

Ubiqus Reporting

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

get that street, which is within one block of the restaurant, in fact, half a block, to have nine parking spaces put in where no other parking used to exist. That's one. Worked also with the businesses in conjunction -- pardon me. Within half a block, we count eight bike racks that exist within the area of the restaurant at the corner of Millwood and Abbot Kinney. then third, something that we're very proud of, we worked with Metro in order to implement a 40% of our staff now have bus commuter program. passes that are provided by Fran Camaj, under his dime, in order to allow those employees to take the bus to work, which is greatly appreciated as an employee benefit. And then, when we conducted our own personal survey of our staff, another 35% declined a bus option because they ride their skateboards, they ride their bikes, and they walk to work. So when we talk about the impact of 105 employees, I think there's a couple of things to take note of. is the 105 employees never show up at work at We're talking about multiple shifts one time.

Ubiqus Reporting

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

throughout the day, throughout the week, and we're also talking about the fact that over half, in fact, close to 70% of those employees, take an alternate form of transportation into the neighborhood. And for Mr. Ryvek, if you have any questions about how to get those bus programs implemented for other businesses in the area, I'd be so pleased to offer you the contact information at Metro.

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Thank you.

MR. KENNETH HEPBURN: My name is Kenneth Hepburn. I live on 654 San Juan Avenue. moved to Venice about 12 years ago, when it was pretty darn sketchy, but I saw the -- what I thought Venice could bloom into becoming, and that it has. And it's done so in great--due in great part to people like Fran, who is a local business person who exposed himself to enormous personal risk to put together a business like this. And as a person who also had a business that I launched in Venice years ago, and which was a victim of the financial crisis of 2008, I would like to ask the applicant to propose what

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

she would like to say to the roughly 40 people that I would imagine would lose their jobs due to what she's proposing. And I also would say that there needs to be creative solutions for parking here in Venice. Because, I tell you what, if you don't come up with it and encourage people like Fran Camaj to build the kind of businesses that he has, there's a very simple solution, and it'll be done for you. the real estate developer that'll come in and build single family residences on Abbot Kinney Boulevard that don't have to comply with anything, other than set-back and height restrictions. And they put in a two- or fourcar parking garage, whatever they need, and Abbot Kinney is over. It's done. It is no longer the thriving community that it is, that we all cherish. It becomes walls on Abbot And we already saw this a few years ago Kinney. during the building boom. And as the economy comes back around, that'll happen again. you won't have to worry about parking; you won't have to have these issues. We won't have to

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

have hearings like this, because people like

Fran Camaj won't even have a chance, because

that parking issue will be taken care of for

you. And there is a huge amount of acreage

right over on Westminster. I don't understand

why the City isn't looking at that as a resource

to solve this problem and to help encourage

Venice to remain the vibrant community that it

is, that we all love. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Thank you.

General comments, Michael Rosen and Jory

Tremblay.

MR. MICHAEL ROSEN: Thank you for hearing me. My name is Michael Rosen. I live at 554 Westminster Avenue in Venice. I also have a retail store on Abbot Kinney Boulevard. Yes, Venice has changed. It is absolutely not the same place that it was 15 years ago when I came here, but I can only say that I know Fran Camaj, long before he opened or there even was a Gjelina. And I can tell you, as a human being and somebody as a family person, the amount of time, effort and thought process he put into the

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

formation of his business and how much he cared
about the community and continues to care about
the community, basically 365 days a year. He is
not somebody that is in business strictly for
profit. Like anybody else that starts a
business, ultimately that's hopefully what
you're going to attain, which he has in very
tough times. But I can tell you, as a friend,
as a business supporter, as, quite frankly,
somebody that has absolutely helped my business
and many others on Abbot Kinney, Gjelina is a
major asset, not just for the people that they
employ, not just for the food growers in the
surrounding communities that he purchases from,
but also just as a human situation, in regard to
transportation efforts that you have heard in
the past, and he will now, and continue
throughout the process, to do whatever he can to
maintain. I am sure that if there are
compliance issues, Fran Camaj will do whatever
he has to do for both the Venice community as
well as the City of Los Angeles. Thank you.

Ubiqus Reporting

COMMISSIONER JOYCE FOSTER: Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

added that the Board is requesting that the ZA keep the file open to give Gjelina eight months to come into compliance before any action is taken to remove its license. And so while we agree with the applicant that the business owner needs to come into compliance, we thought that it was reasonable to give him some time to do so, as opposed to shutting down the business or penalizing people who are working there who are affected by this indirectly. The second thing that I want to make a mention of is that there was a mention of the nine parking spaces by one of the people who previously spoke, and there has been some debate about that. Both Robert Aaronson and I verified that those parking spaces are--were--there was a red line removed on Electric solely do to the efforts of Fran. And so there are some people debating on whether that was done by the City or not, and we independently verified that. I just wanted to clarify that for the record. I think he's done that as a part of being a good member of the community, but I thought it was important to

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

mentioned, because it is in the code, more than

Ubiqus Reporting

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612

Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

illegal to change conditions of approval as I

23

24

five for the retail and fourteen for the restaurant. The fourteen is based on 720 square feet of floor area. That is in the plan that I gave you. And I think that's it. Thank you. I

23

24

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302 MR. AMBRUSTER: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. TOVAR: If an applicant received an approval of entitlement and he wishes to modify that entitlement then the appropriate process would be to file for a plan approval and they can request a modification and Ms. Diaz is correct, up to 20% deviation, whether it's floor area, intensity of use. I'm not going to get into the specifics of that, but yes, you can increase the entitlement by 20%. If it exceeds that then it requires a brand new application. This plan approval was filed. It wasn't initiated -- it was initiated by the applicant obviously but it was in compliance to a condition that was required as a condition of the grant. As part of this application, the applicant could request a deviation to increase or modify the grant. And it's true that at the time they filed the application they didn't request that. However, staff also has the authority to modify the grant and probably has the latitude to go within 20%, you know, whether it's asked for or not and I can't speak to the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

fact of whether or not it was included in the notice based on the code where the staff still has that latitude. I believe that staff does have the latitude to do that as long as it doesn't exceed 20%. So subsequent to the hearing the applicant did--like I said, there was no request to modify the seating or anything else when the application was filed. simply filed to review compliance of the conditions. Subsequent to the hearing when the case was under advisement, the applicant did request that and by the way, the applicant's representative that's here today, he was not--I don't believe he was representing the applicant at the time of the hearing. So the applicant represented himself at the hearing and subsequent to that, now the applicant's representative did request that and we lifted We basically did nothing with that request because the fact that you have a related case, because this happens to be within the specific plan area and the specific plan area establishes its own requirements to evaluate a change of use

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

that differ from what we would normally do under the code, we would look at a change of use and we would build in a safety and basically look at the flow area typically to determine whether or not there was a change in the type of use, the intensity of the use, the occupancy or whatever the case is and if it's the same type of use, whether there's a change in the floor area that would trigger additional parking and they come up with credits to figure out whether or not the site is -- and in this case there is only one parking space on the entire site. It's an old nonconforming building. So you go back and look at, you know, whatever C of O there is and you compare it to what they're proposing and you figure out credits for parking and what have So again, because this was previously used as retail -- now, under the specific plan, I want to take a step back. I'm not sure to what extent, I'm not--I've never implemented the specific plans, I'm not sure to what extent you go back and you look at the certificate of occupancy to compare it to what was previously--

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

what was approved, which the use could have changed ten times but nobody ever filed for a change of use with the certificate of occupancy or whether you just go on whatever the last tenant was, whether they have a certificate of occupancy or not and then you kind of go back and look at the proposed use and you look at the floor area, but now you're looking at service floor area, which I'm going to read to you, the definition of service floor area under the specific plan. It's right here. I was trying to avoid getting technical to avoid confusion, but here is the definition of a change in intensity of use which then triggers a project permit compliance regardless of whether another--it may not be considered a change of use but under the specific plan it could. Change in intensity of use is defined as a change of intensity of use includes but is not limited to any addition, expansion or change in use on a site that involves A, a change in the total number of dwelling units; or B, a change in the amount of service floor capital to a commercial

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

or industrial use. I won't read the rest of it because--well, D is or a change in the number of provided or required parking spaces as calculated in Section 12 D of E in the specific plan. Then you go to the definition of service floor and that is all areas where the customer can be served, except the restroom but including the indoor and outdoor dining area, bar and waiting room and tavern. A patio normally wouldn't be considered floor area and so you wouldn't count that toward parking. Under the -- specific plan you would include service floor area but you would exclude the bathrooms and whatever is not being used for service floor area and if there is dining in the patio then you include the amount of service floor. Now whether it's the entire patio or half or a quarter of the patio, you know, so I suspect that somewhere along the line when they tried to establish this use they met with the community planning people and they figured out, you know, what was the maximum allowable service floor area that then would not trigger any additional

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

parking because that's what the determination was in 2006, that this was a change of use but no additional parking was going to be required because based on the proposed floor plan and layout and based on the service area, floor area that was proposed there would be no required parking. Okay. Now, whatever that service floor area that was approved, it could be a combined total of about 810 square feet or so, how many seats that translates to I can't tell you, but there is probably a seating arrangement that corresponds to that. So that's what I'm saying, that's what should be driving the seating area, not whatever the zoning administrator indicated. In theory the forty four seats and the sixteen seats, sixty, could exceed or be less than whatever the specific plan allows. Do you want to be more restrictive or more permissive than the Venice specific plan I don't know. But from our [phonetic]? perspective the best thing to do is allow the specific plan to govern and if the contents are not in compliance to those that were approved in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

2006 under the specific plan, then that needs to be remedied, but again I don't have the jurisdiction and the ZA's office, as I mentioned earlier, to remedy that, but if we left the seating capacity, if we put in the maximum seating capacity that could theoretically conflict with whatever they're entitled to under the specific plan. Whether they want to use it as it was originally - - or whether they want to come back and seek an increase, at that time then staff from the plan implementation section would have to look at it and say no, this is going to trigger additional parking. So you If you want to do this you have can't do this. to file for a specific plan exception as well. So depending on what the applicant chooses to do you may see this again in a year, not just the conditional use because it's going to expire and they're going to have to come back and file for a new entitlement for - - for the alcohol. they want to modify the current layout then they're going to have to go back and file a modification or a brand new application to the

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2	specific plan if indeed it does require a
3	specific plan exception, unless they can
4	the parking onsite, which they can't beca

hey can provide the parking onsite, which they can't because there is no parking onsite. And that's it. So you might see both of these entitlements sometime in the future and I'm sure that whatever the action is of the zoning administrator it'll be appealed and it will come before you again. So again, we're just trying to - -. We're not trying to circumvent anything by doing that, but you have the option certainly to go back on this and again and just to keep in mind, our first option really isn't to close down a business and revoke it. You have to go through due process. We have to impose corrective conditions if they're violating any conditions and then we set it for a subsequent plan approval hearing. If this entitlement on the alcohol had no expiration date then we probably would set the matter for hearing within

a year or six months, whatever makes sense and have them come back to review compliance for the But because it's going to expire conditions.

Ubiqus Reporting

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

anyway, they're going to have to file a brand
new application and at that time whoever the
decision maker is at the zoning administrator's
level could go back and they're going to hear
the testimony and take into consideration the
extent to which they werehave complied with
these revised conditions that are part of this
plan approval now and take that into
consideration in evaluating that request.
Separately the whole issue about the floor area
and the service floor area, depending on what
the applicant opts to do, they might just decide
to say hey, you know what, we're just going to
use it consistent with what was approved under
the project permit and they'll never have to
come back on that issue again because that
entitlement does not expire. But if they want
to expand beyond what they were approved for
under the project permit, then they do need to
also file a separate application for that as
well.

MS. DIAZ: I have a question. What was approved under the project permit?

Ubiqus Reporting

MS. FOSTER: Commissioner Foster, my question is should it be that--

23

24

COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: I'm sorry,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

approval case may quote, impose conditions on the same basis as provided for in this section for the establishment of a new conditional uses, period, close quote. So the 20% rule sort of has a different application but the municipal code fully allows the zoning administrator to craft and provide conditions as he or she sees Finally, I'd like to say that we, the direction that Mr. Tovar was just going in, in his explanation to you and to Mr. Rausch with regard to the seating and service floor area, it's obviously fairly confusing, and I think that the restaurant has been operating based upon the service floor are which is determined by the twenty six grandfathered parking spaces which are undisputed that that exists; and so because of the twenty six grandfathered parking spaces you get fifty feet of service floor area for every space. That gives you 1300 square feet of service area. So that's the way he's been operating. I would suggest and I would ask that -- and especially in light of look what he's done that other people in the Venice community

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

set of plans. The problem is that those plans, as I mentioned earlier, include a bar and those plans were never revised to be consistent with the zoning administrator's action; but at the end of the day, since--and I think someone started to mention this earlier, if you had a bar and that was part of the service floor area and that was denied by the zoning administrator so now what was previously a bar became all dining area does it come out to the same amount of seating capacity? Probably not. Is it more or is it less? I couldn't tell you at this point but I really think this requires review by the plan implementation section and because of the fact that from day one, as I mentioned, there was a disconnect between both of the approved plans because one has a bar and one doesn't, the applicant -- it would behoove the applicant to go back and submit to the plan implementation section for a modification or a new entitlement whatever the case may be. Now, that said, to answer your question, if he doesn't do it we can't compel him but in a year

it.

Okay.

MALE VOICE: And that's not totally illegal under this thing--

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. FOSTER: No.

Ubiqus Reporting

MALE VOICE: --because when you look at that project permit and I might say the appellant in her package, it shows the last page, page A.02, if you look very closely at the bar it shows approximately twelve to fourteen seats at the bar. So they weren't included as part of the bar but you can always say he always applied that he'd have those fourteen seats if the bar wasn't approved. So those are what the problems are.

MS. FOSTER: But my question--I understand about the bar. I understand all that and by the way, no one on this commission wants to put your restaurant out of business; but what I don't understand is it rocket science to measure the serving floor area? Couldn't that have been done before this hearing? The bar is not there. It hasn't been there since they opened the restaurant. Isn't--is that--shouldn't we have that information in front of us tonight? I mean it would help me.

MR. TOVAR: I don't think we need to measure because I don't think there is a question as to

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 118
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	bar you're
3	MS. FOSTER: The bar is included in that 720
4	square feet.
5	MR. TOVAR: Right. So if you take out the
6	bar you still do 720 square feet.
7	MS. FOSTER: Okay. So what is the formula
8	that
9	MR. TOVAR: But I can't say how many seats
10	that translates to.
11	MS. FOSTER: That's what I'm saying. Now
12	somewhere there is a specific plan that tells
13	you, right?
14	MR. TOVAR: It just says service floor area
15	and it's going back to the definition that
16	MS. FOSTER: And does it say how many seats
17	per service floor area?
18	MR. ARMBRUSTER: No.
19	COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: No. It just
20	tells you how many parking you need for that
21	service floor area.
22	MR. TOVAR: Based on floor area, right.
23	MALE VOICE: The service floor area does not
24	in any way does the specific plan mention the

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 119
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	number of seats that can be accommodated in the-
3	_
4	MS. FOSTER: Okay. So the zoning
5	administrator came up with sixty seats inside
6	forty four seats inside, sixteen seats outside.
7	MR. TOVAR: And was blind as to the service
8	floor area. I'm sorry. Yes.
9	MS. FOSTER: Okay. But she saw that, you
LO	knowwell, if you say the bar is part of the
L1	service floor area whether it's a bar or not I'm
L2	justI think it's more confusing the more I
L3	hear about it. I mean it seems to me
L4	MR. TOVAR: Probably the best thing that
L5	should have happened was that the zoning
L6	administrator determination, the very first one,
L7	instead of saying maximum seating should be
L8	forty four and sixteen, it should be maximum
L9	seating shall be based on 720 square feet of
20	service floor area as approved under the related
21	project permit compliance.
22	MS. FOSTER: But I have a concern as well as
23	Commissioner Martinez that I don't want to see
24	someone in the planning office, no matter who it

24 MR. DONOVAN: Commissioner Donovan.

and so I don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I just

2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612 Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Venice community. We have to consider parking

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

can modify an entitlement. Let's just say you had a thousand square feet of commercial space approved by conditional use. It was commercial corner review and you had to go through a conditional use permit and you had a thousand square feet. And then you come back and say we want to add a 200 square feet. So now you've got 1200 square feet. You're at that 20% threshold. You can do that with a plan

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 122
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	approval. The conditions
3	MR. DONOVAN: Let's just deal specifically
4	with the condition that was made by the ZA in
5	May of 2007, forty four seats and what was the
6	other one? Eighteen
7	MS. FOSTER: Sixteen on the patio.
8	MR. DONOVAN: Sixteen on the patio. Can you
9	change that condition by more than 20% without a
10	new CUB application?
11	MR. TOVAR: That's a question for the city
12	attorney. I'm not
13	MR. DONOVAN: Okay. So we don't
14	necessarilywe heard that from the applicant.
15	The appellant says you can't. The applicant says
16	you can and you're not sure about that and we
17	don't have the city attorney here. Okay.
18	MR. TOVAR: Correct.
19	MR. DONOVAN: Okay. We know that the
20	applicant has not made a new CUB application.
21	That's correct?
22	MR. TOVAR: Correct.
23	MR. DONOVAN: Okay. Now if the applicant
24	were to make a new CUB application and filed it
	III. danna Dannandon a

Ubiqus Reporting2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

tomorrow, when would it be heard?

MR. TOVAR: It would probably take about nine months, six months to a year. I mean if we had a back log it would have taken a year. I think we've gotten better so about nine months let's say.

MR. DONOVAN: Okav. Because I also heard the mayor's office say give them six to eight So I'm thinking, if they want more seating in this restaurant and that's the issue and they think they deserve it, I mean I'll go When we had this hearing on April 21, back. 2010 about 1305 Abbott Kenney [phonetic] and it was the same owner and I can't remember if it was the owner or his representative but I wrote it down with my green pen as they said it, they're working to get city approval of more seats at Jalina. And now it's a year later and there's still no application filed to ask for more seats. They may get more seats if they apply for it. There may be good reason for it. I don't know but I don't like the idea of someone just putting the seats and saying we're

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

going to ask for more and then not doing it and coming in here and we're supposed to rubber I agree with everyone else. stamp it. stipulate it's probably a great restaurant. Some day maybe I'd like to go there. But you have to follow the process here so there can be a hearing. So I'm thinking if the mayor's office wants to give them six to eight months to come into compliance, to me coming into compliance means applying for more seats. don't--at the same time I don't want to wait for seven months and twenty nine days and then have them apply so they can bump the whole process even longer than that. I don't see any reason why they've got counsel here and they can't apply within thirty days and get it in the system and if it comes up within a year or before fine and maybe it can be expedited. I don't know. And we go through the whole process the way it should be and the neighborhood can weigh in, pro and con for it. Maybe there will be an order you can have more seats but you have to have valet parking or you may have to provide

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

off site parking or something like that. Maybe they'll work it out between the neighborhood end and we don't have to hear it again here. don't like the idea of sitting here and just saying well, let's just wipe out a condition that was decided in May of 2007 and nobody objected to it and the restaurateur just violated that condition. Because whatever I've heard today and maybe I'm nuts but the condition said forty four indoor seats and sixteen in the That seems really clear to me. If they don't like it, if the business got better, you make a new application, you know, and you go through the normal process and you don't have the neighbors all upset and we're not sitting here at quarter after 7:00 still talking about this after a couple hours. So that's what I'm thinking. I'm willing to give--I'm not interested in closing them down. I'm willing to give them time to get in compliance but I want to see them do what needs to be done to be in compliance.

[END 04ZA06-5028 PART 4]

Ubiqus Reporting

people and they have 100 people if there is a fire 100 people can go out safely. In terms of the number of seats, I don't know what that means. It doesn't talk about number of human beings. So I'm a little like kind of confused forty four seats, sixteen seats. It doesn't really matter to me because it's just a variable

20

21

22

23

24

on the math but I'm more concerned about people

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

that's going to be there at a certain time and are they safe and is it prudent for them to be there? If it is I'm totally in support of the business owners that kind of don't know the system where he needs to file for X, Y and Z but he went out of his way to the Department of Transportation--

COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: Excuse me.

If you don't keep decorum I'm going to have to ask people to leave.

So if he went out of his way to MR. LEE: the Department of Transportation and made nine parking spaces out of his time and effort and if he knew a little bit of tricks maybe he spent that time to file properly and bike racks and he had 40% of the employees participate in the This is a great entrepreneur metro program. that's built a good business. For him to be penalized for something he doesn't know? he doesn't have enough counsel and what have you but the thing is the fact that he's got counsel he knows what he needs to do. If he's here spending time, brought people that love the

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

restaurant. So for us to penalize on a
technical terms of how many number of seats I
think it's kind of like we're focusing on the
wrong thing. I think we need to be focusing on
how many number of people that can be at this
place safely. So for my recommendation is to
figure out how we can make a motion to put an
end to this and they have a fiduciary duty to do
what's right for the city and they have a
fiduciary duty to do what's for everything else.
So I would like to make a motion if everyone is
kind of done to basically deny the appeal,
sustain the zoning administrator and give these
guys nine months to comply and if they decide to
change because of Commissioner Donovan I think
that's a great strategy, great recommendation
too. So that's my motion. I make a motion to
deny the appeal, sustain the zoning
administration decision and give them nine
months to comply.

COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: Is there a second? The motion dies. Can I make a statement? I think from everything we've heard

Ubiqus Reporting

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

entrepreneur. He's doing great things in the community. But the issue here for me is when a CUB is approved one of the things that is looked into is the impact that it's going to have in the community and the limitations on seats are to address those issues. The parking issues, the impact in the community and I feel very uncomfortable going with a motion, approving a motion where we are eliminating some of those conditions which were part of the grant and were considered as part of the grant. That's where I'm having a hard time here.

MR. LEE: On that, you know, I totally agree with you. I think the neighborhood watch, they're not pinpointing this restaurant. I think they're here for every other business or commercial use where they want—they have a very good point. But on this one I think it's kind of like you got to have an exception. This is an exceptional business creating a lot of jobs and the owner is going out of his way to make parking spaces. If it was any other

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

establishment that doesn't live and contribute to the community then you're absolutely right. But to come after every other business and say Venice has a parking problem parking problem, maybe we can kind of use another win win Maybe you guys can go around and strategy. collect some donations from the business, collect some donations from the residence and maybe have a shuttle service and someone recommended some place in Westminster where there is empty lots and the city is not doing anything. Maybe we can kind of use our efforts, money and time to figure out how we can allocate a parking space, raise some money, build a parking lot and have free shuttle service for people that needs to park after midnight or something like that, you know, but to penalize a person that's worked hard, put his blood, sweat and tears, created jobs and went out of his way for parking spaces and even required his employees to take metro? You know this is maybe one business that you can just kind of give an exception and they're not only great for the

the use is in compliance or not and if it's not

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

in compliance then the question is what can you do with the conditions in terms of adding corrective conditions to try to raise the level of accountability or to try to mitigate the problems that are on the site. To a certain extent we try to do that. If there is—the commission is uncomfortable with the whole idea of eliminating the maximum number of seats because probably some limit is better than no limit, then certainly you can go back and modify condition six and reinclude the limit that was previously established.

MR. DONOVAN: Can we make a condition that the restaurant has to apply for a modification of the May CUB conditions within thirty days from today and get that application in the pipeline?

MR. TOVAR: I want to say that I think you could require the applicant to file an application, but let's be clear. You want him to file an application to either modify—to obtain a new approval under the specific plan to make sure that the existing floor area or what

a maximum but that number can be lowered based

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ubiqus Reporting

it takes a while to get cases to the zoning

administration, I'm in charge of paper flow

there, I can tell you we've got two hundred

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

cases ahead of you. So guess how long it's		
going to take to process those. You should file		
within the thirty days as you had suggested to		
get the new conditional use permit filed and he		
should also file for a project permit		
modification to the existing project permit to		
clean up this problem with the service floor		
area, because that's also a problem with this		
particular case and it's also been mentioned by		
the appellant in this case, who did a very fine		
job of showing some of the problems with this		
restaurant.		

MR. DONOVAN: Right. And the service floor area issue, say you had--pick a number--

MR. RAUSCH: That's something the zoning administrator could take care.

MR. DONOVAN: Right. But what I'm trying to elucidate here is that if you've got a service floor area of X amount that ordinarily would allow so many seats in an area then it comes from the CUB. The zoning administrator and this planning commissioner can impose conditions that would lower that number of maximum number of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)

how many people are going to be in this And the question is going to be restaurant. what happens until then because on one hand, the restaurant is popular and I want to see it stay in business. On the other hand I find it a problem that they restaurant hasn't done its homework and done this a long time ago so we're not in this situation. So on one hand, just bumping up the seating to a hundred when you've got one condition that says only forty four and sixteen, that's a problem for me. It's also a problem having a lot more people on that patio than sixteen people and I don't know if we need to find some middle ground on this until this new application is done and maybe that would be appropriate.

MS. FOSTER: One thought for a middle ground would be to allow them at least until the CUB is heard, the 20% they're allowed, which would be another twelve seats. I would have no problem with that. So if we say until--I mean if they get it filed within thirty days then we say because you have the ability to grant them a 20%

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 144
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	seats inside that would be
3	MR. LEE: How about outside?
4	MS. FOSTER: Sixteen
5	MR. LEE: Plus another twenty percent?
6	MS. FOSTER: No. Twenty percent for the
7	whole seating.
8	MR. LEE: Total.
9	MR. DONOVAN: Total.
10	MR. TOVAR: Total. Inside or outside I
11	wouldn't even break it down by
12	MS. FOSTER: Okay.
13	MR. LEE: Okay. So total what is that?
14	MR. TOVAR: I mean you could do that but
15	MS. FOSTER: So they could get another
16	twelve seats. So they would get seventy two
17	seats, which is
18	MR. LEE: So you knock the business by 30%?
19	Thirty percent is going to cost 30% in jobs. I
20	mean we are busting their business then.
21	MS. FOSTER: No, we're not.
22	MR. LEE: Yes, we are. Thirty percent loss
23	of any business is a loss.
24	MS. FOSTER: Excuse me.

Ubiqus Reporting2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Ubiqus Reporting
2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvine, CA 92612
Phone: 949-477-4972 FAX 949-553-1302

Ubiqus Reporting 2222 Martin Street Suite 212, Irvin

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 152
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	MR. DONOVAN: Why the 10 th ? Make it January
3	5 th .
4	MR. LEE: I already said the 10 th . After the
5	3 rd is fine with me.
6	MR. DONOVAN: All right. So they have until
7	January 5 th to get this heard and get the
8	conditions modified, the CUB conditions modified
9	or else they're getting bumped down to 72 seats
10	and then they can still when the process goes on
11	after that. They have to file within thirty
12	days and
13	MR. LEE: Make that motion and I'll second
14	it.
15	MS. FOSTER: Why don't you make the motion?
16	MR. LEE: Yeah.
17	MS. FOSTER: You didn't get a second for
18	your motion.
19	MR. LEE: Yeah.
20	COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: Your motion
21	is dead. Mr. Donovan make the motion.
22	MR. LEE: All right.
23	MR. DONOVAN: Grant in part and deny in
24	part. We're adding additional conditions to the
	Ubiqus Reporting

1	WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION 156
	REGULAR MEETING (4/20/11)
2	MR. LEE: Aye.
3	MS. LINNICK: Commissioner Foster?
4	MS. FOSTER: This one is for you.
5	MR. LEE: Thank you.
6	MS. FOSTER: Aye.
7	MR. LEE: I owe you one.
8	MS. LINNICK: Commissioner Martinez?
9	COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: Aye.
10	MS. LINNICK: The motion is carried.
11	MR. LEE: Thank you.
12	COMMISSIONER GLENDA MARTINEZ: The next item
13	on the agenda is the public comment period. Do
14	we have any public comment? No? No public
15	comment. So this meeting is adjourned at 7:45.

[END 04ZA06-5028_PART 5]

16

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Teresa Salazar, Heidi Porter, and Julie Davids certify that the foregoing transcript of West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission Regular Meeting was prepared using standard electronic transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record.

Signature

Hrisa Salayan

Teresa Salazar

Date <u>April 29, 2011</u>

Signature

Date _____April 29, 2011_____

Heidi Hoter

Signature Alle Davids

Date <u>April 29, 2011</u>