

Planning/Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee

Tuesday, August 18th, 2009, 6:00 to 7:55 PM

Mar Vista Library (Southwest corner of Venice and Inglewood Blvds.)

12006 Venice Blvd., Mar Vista, CA 90066

Co-Chairs: Steve Wallace and Sharon Commins

(Every MVCC Stakeholder present is allowed to vote on every motion introduced at this meeting)

Agenda

1. Call to Order (1 min.)
2. Volunteer to Take Minutes (1 min.)
3. Introductions and Public Announcements/Comments (2 min.)
4. Approval of Minutes (2 min.)
5. **Report on MVCC Board Actions on Urban Planning/Land Use Committee-Related Efforts: no report; no PLUM actions taken**
6. Early Notification Update: **New Planning department fees; CHC-2009-2325-MA 3508 S Moore St 90066 Ma-Mills Act**
7. Committee/Task Force Reports, with potential motions (15 min.)
 - a. Commercial Corridors Update and potential motions
 - i. Landscaping and Tree-Trimming/Planting Updates on National, Venice and other area Blvds.
 - ii. Update of Venice Blvd. Streetscape Improvement Association (Chris McKinnon, others)
 - b. Update on Concept Plan, Old Fire Station 62 and ROSE Committees, Planning Pilot Program and Correspondence from CD 11 EC Planning Committee (Sharon Commins, Rachel Swanger and others)
 - c. **Sober Living Housing Regulation Update and neighborhood monitoring**
 - d. **Medical Marijuana Regulation Update and neighborhood monitoring**
8. Old Business, with potential motions (30 min.)
 - a. **3115 Sepulveda Red Mountain ENV-2008-1461-MND, Case # VTT-70440-CN, CPC-2008-1800(ZC)(HD)(ZAA)(SPR), see Attachment 1**
 - b. **Affordable Housing and SB 1818 Update: appeal of 11933 Magnolia Blvd - DIR-2008-1178-DB-SPP by Valley Village [requesting motion of support from the MVCC]: Noel Weiss, Jennifer Reed and others; see Attachment 2**
 - c. West Washington Blvd. Corridor Update: Update on Washington/Centinela and adjacent Developments
9. New Business, with potential motions (30 min.)
 - a. Vista Del Rey Christian Church (12118 Pacific Ave.) variance
 - b. **Livable Boulevards proposed study areas in the MVCC**
10. Public Comment (1 min.)
11. Future Agenda Items (1 min.)
12. Adjournment
13. This information is being sent to all Mar Vista Stakeholder who have signed up for notices pertaining to MVCC Urban Planning and Land Use announcements including sign-ups on the ENS link on the MVCC website. You may unsubscribe by going to the MVCC website, ; and clicking on "EMAIL NOTIFICATION SYSTEM". Then simply check, or uncheck the appropriate committee box

Attachment 1

Proposed MVCC Motion for Proposed Zoning Change and Mitigated Negative Declaration at 3115 Sepulveda Blvd. site (ENV-2008-1461-MND, Case # VTT-70440-CN, CPC-2008-1800(ZC)(HD)(ZAA)(SPR))

Whereas, the MVCC concludes that the proposed mixed-use project at this site (163 residential units with a commercial ground floor component, five stories in height) is an example of "spot-zoning" that is entirely out of character with respect to the adjacent neighborhood and region, is too tall, too dense, lacking in transit-oriented development and affordable housing, and lacking in features that would prevent overreliance on automobile access and egress to a site that is too close to a busy intersection (National/Sepulveda) and would require difficult if not dangerous left-turns to/from Sepulveda Blvd., and which would dramatically increase arterial and residential/cut-through traffic in Mar Vista and Westside Village for freeway access/egress,

The MVCC Board therefore:

- 1) Recognizes the need to establish a quality project at the old Circuit City/Shoe Pavilion site (3115 Sepulveda Blvd.) that would benefit the neighborhood and region, and
- 2) Opposes the requested variance for a zoning change (RAS 4-1) there for this project, and
- 3) Opposes any Mitigated Negative Declaration in favor of a full Environmental Impact Report for this or any other project at this site
- 4) Urges all grassroots, neighborhood and governmental entities in the region (in particular, the MVCC, the Westside Neighborhood Council, the Palms Neighborhood Council, any local neighborhood and/or homeowners associations, as well as representatives from both CD5 and CD11) to create a committee representing these entities to work with Red Mountain and/or any future developers to establish a consensus/plan as to which type and/or size of a project is best suited for that site.

Attachment 2

Proposed MVCC motion of support for the appeal of 11933 Magnolia Blvd - DIR-2008-1178-DB-SPP by Valley Village to the Planning Commission

The MVCC supports the stakeholders of Valley Village in regard to their two appeals of [DIR-2008-1178-SPP] regarding the SB1818 development located at 11933 Magnolia Boulevard Valley Village: (1) Dale Neglia et al; (2) The membership of the Board of Neighborhood Council Valley Village.

We agree:

- 1) That the failure of the Director to require review by NCV prior to approval, and to consider the input of their Neighborhood Council, demonstrates a disregard for the community, and is an inappropriate use of Planning Department discretionary authority.
- 2) That development of this site does not reflect the prevailing character of the community, and will stand dramatically at odds with adjoining properties. This is a failure of the Planning department to uphold and negotiate vigorously to minimize transgressions of our General, Community and Specific Plans.
- 3) That the Planning Department did nothing to require adequate documentation relating to economic feasibility or to use any standard by which to determine this feasibility. This impacts precisely on whether the proposed affordable units could be provided with far less density and with some other different concessions that would not trample the General, Community or Specific Plans, and be acceptable to the Neighborhood Council.
- 4) That the City lacks the process to adequately evaluate either the economic feasibility or the environmental (and health and safety) component. Therefore, the project cannot and should not be approved until such procedures, processes, and protocols are in place.

- 5) That the excessive height and density of this project will, in the future, be improperly cited as a precedent for variances and exceptions, which by its very outsized presence enable opportunities for projects that are not presently entitled to density bonus and further deteriorating the character of the neighborhood.
- 6) That there appears to have been a bias within the Department to get this project approved no matter under what code of law and no matter the lack of proper documentation.
- 7) That there have been many procedural irregularities associated with this Developer's application with the Planning Department as an abettor to forward the approval.
- 8) That the project brings traffic congestion to the substandard surrounding and collector streets -- streets not even included in the "cumulative impact" investigations. Streets which for the most part that have no sidewalks or infrastructure to protect the many bicyclists, children and pedestrians. Traffic mitigations are inadequate and imperil single family neighborhoods with DOT's noted reliance on additional cut thru traffic.
- 9) That there was a failure of the Planning Department to defend our General, Community and Specific Plans in extending numerous incentives not even requested.
- 10) That there was failure of the Planning Department to defend our General, Community and Specific Plans by accepting conflicting, outdated and improper documents from the Developer at face value without any investigation as to their veracity or applicability to the current project.
- 11) That there was failure of the Planning Department in approving a project that invades neighbors rights to privacy, to the future use and enjoyment of their open space property and common areas.
- 12) That there was failure of the Planning Department to require mandated downzoning as was called for by AB283 and thereby defend our General, Community and Specific Plans.
- 13) That the cumulative impacts of this project on the street, the infrastructure, traffic, and other CEQA concerns have not been adequately addressed or mitigated. That a small 3-project inquiry cannot give an adequate picture to the extraordinary overbuilding in the area.
- 14) That the current concerns of water drought should deny additional units being built. A further strain on the infrastructure in the form of power outages, water shortages and rate heights should not be borne by the current residents of Los Angeles so that Developers can make tidy profits while the public shoulders the ultimate and continued burden.

As a Neighborhood Council, we share these grave concerns. They are matters that affect all of us. We consider them unacceptable and support the appellants. Please take this position into consideration when making a decision on this matter.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

President, _____ Neighborhood Council