

## **DRAFT MINUTES: 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

1. Call to Order:
2. Volunteer to Take Minutes: Sharon Commins
3. Introductions and Public Announcements/Comments
4. Approval of Minutes: next meeting; both sets to be posted
5. Report on MVCC Board Actions on Urban Planning/Land Use Committee-Related Efforts: no report; no PLUM actions taken
6. Early Notification Update:
  - a. New Planning department fees ordinance noted
  - b. CHC-2009-2325-MA 3508 S Moore St 90066 Ma-Mills Act, no action needed
7. Committee/Task Force Reports
  - a. Commercial Corridors Update and potential motions
    - i. Landscaping and Tree-Trimming/Planting Updates on National, Venice and other area Blvds.
      1. New City Sidewalk Ordinance being pushed very quickly through City Departments – will require property owners to be responsible for sidewalks in front of the home even if there is root damage – Chuck Ray asked if we would be allowed to take down the street trees.
    - 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
    - i. Motion for support AB 268: Steve Wallace moved; Chris McKinnon Second – Helps assure fire code adherence in Group homes serving as licensed drug and alcohol treatment facilities to seven or more persons. PASSED: 14 aye 0 nay 0 abstentions
  - d. Medical Marijuana Regulation Update and neighborhood monitoring
    - i. Marijuana facility – Steve Wallace stated even though facilities have been denied Hardship Exemption, they continue to be openly selling product. MVCC understanding is that they need to actually be found selling product by Inspectors to be closed down.
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), Attachment 1:
    - i. They have been working with TI for many months, something they come up with from the original project was a reduction in height from 6 stories to 5 stories, they also offered MVCC \$500K to spend on Mar Vista projects as they see fit. Steve Wallace mentioned a similar size project in the Bundy Medical facility less than 1 mile away is coughing up \$4-\$5 million dollars.
    - ii. Project has not changed much from the original version; reducing traffic is the major concern. Bill asked if DOT offered any solutions – Eric indicated - some, but not a lot.
      1. It was asked how they arrived at \$500K – some kind of algorithm and wish list which is above and beyond what they are required to do by DOT.
      2. It was asked what the traffic count would be if it were to remain commercial over the new project – they could not answer.
      3. Ken Alpern felt that this project was lacking in transit orientated development
      4. Bill Pope stated that the traffic is already at capacity at the intersections around this property – the developer should consider working to add buses to ensure addition transit available to the people that will live in these apartments.
      5. Bill Pope – from a traffic prospective – this should not be approved because it violates the community plan.

- iii. Ken Alpern stated – everything is 3-4 stories on Sepulveda, why 5 stories, we do not want a Wilshire Blvd. on Sepulveda, there is no student housing, this project is totally out of character with the neighborhood. After years of dialog, it seems that they have not listened to the neighbors and have not moved forward at all.
    - 1. Height limit in this zone – is 45 feet and they want to build a project that is 70 feet – It was stated that the Negative Declaration is poorly done; this is not consistent with anything within any City policy at all.
  - iv. Neighbors and others’ comments on the project:
    - 1. A neighbor from a couple of blocks away stated that he felt this development will be 2 bus stops from the proposed Expo Line station, he felt that it was a family orientated building that is convenient to everything like UCLA, the market, CVS Etc. As resident in the area he supports this project.
    - 2. A neighbor asked - What were the approximate rents – they could not answer – it was also asked - what is specialty retail which is what the retail locations are specified for – small independent stores, not big box stores
    - 3. It was asked what size are the sidewalks – they are 12 foot sidewalks - what kind of trees are being proposed – they could not answer - is there a parkway, they replied - It is a potential green streets project sites, trees, medians, bikeways, etc.
    - 4. A West Side Village home owner and business owner spoke and supported the project.
    - 5. Another West Side Village home owner thinks the project is too high, likes the idea, just thinks it looks huge, maybe something can be done with the design so that it would not give the impression of a huge project.
    - 6. Noel Weis asked if they had thought of maybe operating a private bus line to other transit areas, he advised Red Mountain to share your economics with the community because you may get better support from the community groups.
    - 7. Ken – feels that no dialog has been made with the community; they need to work with the community.
  - v. Public Comment on Mitigated Negative Dec is on September 7th – the comments need to be filed by then.
  - vi. Call the question on the motion: PASSED: 9 aye, 3 nay, 1 abstention
  - 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; Attachment 2
    - i. Presented exec summary to the Committee
      - 1. SB1818 ends up destroying more affordable housing projects than it creates. This destroys character and scale of neighborhoods. City Council needs to revisit the law and do it right.
      - 2. Jennifer Reed talked about the project next to her property and how it does not fit the character in that neighborhood. SB1818 just allows projects here and there and busts through general plans, community plans, everything.
      - 3. They are looking for neighborhood council support on the 2 appeals DIR-2008-1178 – DB-SPP and ENV-208-1179. They have letters from 5 Neighborhood Councils already and will be looking for more.
      - 4. Appeal hearing is on September 24 in front of City Planning.
    - ii. Ken Alpern moved and Bahaa Mikhail seconded
    - iii. Call the question on the motion – 10 aye, 0 nay, 1 abstention
  - c. West Washington Blvd. Corridor Update: Update on Washington/Centinela and adjacent Developments
9. New Business, with potential motions (30 min.)
- e. Vista Del Rey Christian Church (12118 Pacific Ave.) variance
    - i. Tatsuo Hagiwara presenting– They have a program with 24 students each program for 9 weeks at a time, the building is being renovated little by little, but they need major renovation and a place to house the students in one place. They are looking for a conditional use permit to house the students.
    - ii. It was found during the presentation and discussion that they would need to re-file the project, they are happy to include a condition that if the property were sold later

it would be returned to its original use. They have asked for temporary CU, however they want to pursue permanent even though it will only be used 2 times a year by 24 students for 7 weeks. They have a hearing on August 27th; they are going to inform the ZA that they will need to re-file.

- iii. They were also asked to do some community outreach to neighbors across the street and at the upcoming Keeshan Drive Block party on Saturday
- iv. Motion to approve by Ken Alpern, second Chuck Ray: withdrawn pending outreach by the church and refilling of the application
- f. Livable Boulevards proposed study areas in the MVCC
  - i. Areas proposed are generally in Zone 2/3 along national Blvd and gateway Blvd; Venice at Centinela, too.
  - ii. A suitable date will be worked out with the Planning Department's consultants—probably in mid October

10. Public Comment: None

11. Future Agenda Items: none

12. Adjournment: 6:55 PM

---

### **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 NCVV 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