WEST LOS ANGELES SAWTELLE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
Planning and Land Use Committee -- Regular Meeting MINUTES
Wed., Apr. 11, 2018 -- 7:00 PM
Felicia Mahood Senior Center (11338 Santa Monica Blvd. - Los Angeles, Calif. 90025)

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by calling the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at (213) 978-1551 or by emailing NCSupport@lacity.org.

All items on the agenda are subject to discussion, possible action and filing of a Community Impact Statement to the Office of the City Clerk.

1. Call to Order (7:00): Jay Ross, Karim Wataghani, Tim Sweeney, Galen Pindell (absent: Jian Keredian, Partho Kalyani, Max Sherman).
   a. Quorum achieved (requirement is 1 member, per absence of requirement in NC By-Laws and absence of approved general committee Standing Rules).
   b. Motion: Approval of Minutes from Mar. meeting - Approved 4-0.

2. Public Comment:
   a. Vic Pacheco: Concern about group homes with large number of residents.

3. Ex parte communications : Jay Ross:
   a. 11272 W. Nebraska Ave. (apartment): PLUM scheduling.
   b. 12300-12328 W. Pico Blvd. (mixed-use apartment and retail): PLUM scheduling.
   c. 11512-11516 Mississippi Ave. (small lot subdivision): PLUM scheduling.
   d. 11588 W. Pico Blvd. (mixed-use apartment and retail): PLUM scheduling.
   e. 1702 Granville Ave. (small lot subdivision): PLUM scheduling.

4. Administrative:
   a. Boardmember seat on PLUM: Board requested that all interested candidates submit out the application form.
   b. Board’s motion to censure and remove Jay Ross as chair of PLUM: Not on agenda for Mar. 28 Board meeting.
   c. Date of PLUM meetings: May be moved to 2nd Tues. (instead of Wed.).

5. Non-project issues:
   a. Student planning project:
      i. UCLA: Larger group project requires contribution for stipend ($5,000 to $10,000), and applications are due in Apr. 30 (this month). GP will get more information on what tasks the contribution funds. Single student project applications are due in August. JR will place funding item on Board agenda.

6. New business:
   a. Motion: Support for a Short-Term Rentals Ordinance if the following specific conditions--based upon WRAC membership votes and the preceding WRAC letter on STRs--are included [LUPC vote 8-0-0]
i. Any City of Los Angeles Short-Term Rentals Ordinance shall include the following:
   1. A cap on the number of nights that a room can be rented each year, and with no provision for a CUP or other process for individual hosts to receive permission to exceed the annual cap.
   2. Requirement of proof of primary residence and liability insurance for the specific use.
      a. No self-certification.
   3. Short-term rental tax revenues shall not go into the General Fund. The highest priority for use of revenues shall be enforcement of the ordinance, and after that, revenues shall go to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
   4. WRAC notes that Many NCs prefer a full prohibition on short-term rentals in R zones, for reasons that include tranquil neighborhoods, impossibility of enforcement, and loss of hotel revenue and jobs. However, many Councilors support short-term rentals in R zones, and full opposition may not be feasible.

ii. CD11 proposal for 180 days per year, fee for enforcement, primary residence only. WRAC proposal for primary residence only, 60 days maximum per year, register with city, public review process and public notification, payment of transit occupancy tax. CF-14-1635-S2.

iii. Public comment:
   1. Vic Pacheco - concern with unknown persons coming and going from the neighborhood.
   2. Norma Bracco - concern with loss of affordable units.

iv. Motions failed: PLUM determined that it should not opine on the issue, and forward to Board with no opinion.
   1. JR: Opposes proposed ordinance and short-term rentals.
   2. GS: Supportive, enjoys using them in other cities, useful for groups of visitors to Los Angeles.
   3. TS: Supportive, PLUM should not opine.

7. Project reviews:
   a. 11272 W. Nebraska Ave.: Demolition of 1 house and new construction of 6-story, 24-unit apartment (3 affordable) with 70% density increase and 5 Transit Oriented Communities (Tier 3) incentives for increased 22-ft. height / 2 stories, increased FAR to 3.75, reduced setbacks to 5 ft., reduced open space by 20%, and reduced parking to 0.5 spaces per unit. Near 405 freeway to east. DIR-2017-5551-TOC. ENV-2017-5552-EAF.
      i. No motions - general discussion of design / entitlements.
      1. One of the first Transit Oriented Communities submittal, concern about air quality on site next to freeway, architecture is modern / futuristic in traditional Japanese area, need for flashing crosswalk on Sawtelle.
   b. 12300-12328 W. Pico Blvd.: Demolition of 1-story commercial and new construction of 6-story apartment with 65-units, 1,740 sf commercial (15% very low income housing- 10 units). Uses Transit Oriented Communities Tier 3
incentives for affordable housing – 70% density increase, 3.75 FAR, 0.5 parking spaces/unit, height increase of 2 stories/ 22 ft., reduced side setbacks of 5 ft., reduced transitional height. Adjacent to I-10 freeway in rear. DIR-2017-5254.

i. No motions - general discussion of design / entitlements.
   1. Discussion that retail often is not leased, provision to convert it to residential in the future, open space next to freeway, incentives that reduce setbacks and reduce landscaping, NC limits height at this location to 3 stories plus density bonus per its Expo Station Plan Resolution.

ii. Community status: TBD.


iv. NC status: First presentation for PLUM to be scheduled in May/Jun.

v. Owner: Suresh Jain, Pico 12300 LLC.

vi. Representative: Michael Ko, KSK Design.

c. 11512-11516 Mississippi Ave.: Demolition of 2 1-story houses with 50% lot coverage and new construction of 4-units (2 sets of 4-story condominium duplexes) with 70% lot coverage in R2 zone. Removal of 7 ficus trees. AA-2017-5222-PMLA.

i. No motions - general discussion of design / entitlements.
   1. Discussion that surrounding buildings are short houses.

   1. Planner: Zuriel Espinosa (213) 978-1249
   Zuriel.Espinosa@LACity.org

iii. Community status: TBD.

iv. NC status: First presentation for PLUM to be scheduled in May/Jun.

v. Owner: Fred Larian, Focus Line, LLC.

vi. Representative: Kamran Kazemi, Tala Associates.

d. 11588 W. Pico Blvd.: Demolition of 1-2-story commercial and new construction of 21-unit (2 very low-income), 4-story apartment and ___sf with 2 incentives for 1-story/ 11-ft. increase in height and 35% increase in FAR. DIR-2018-239-DB-CDO, ENV-2018-240-EAF.

i. No motions - general discussion of design / entitlements.
   1. Discussion that minimal landscaping is onsite, and none in rear setback yard.


iii. Community status: TBD.

iv. NC status: First presentation for PLUM to be scheduled in May/Jun.

v. Owner: Kayvan Naimi, 1590 Pico Blvd LLC.

vi. Representative: Shahab Ghods, Plus Architects; Daniel Ahadian, NUR-Development Consulting.

The following items were tabled:

8. Administrative:
   a. Role of NC involvement: Desire of land owner vs. desire of community. NC is one of several community groups who can influence city.
   b. What does it mean when developers say “The Council Office supports it”?
      i. Examples of 1735 Westgate Ave. small lot subdivision and 1702 Granville Ave. small lot subdivision.
c. What does it mean when developers say “The Planning Dept. supports it” for small lot subdivisions?
   i. Consequential items (height, FAR, setbacks, open space) vs. non-consequential items (design, articulation, color).

d. Philosophy of PLUM and basis of decisions: Rubber stamp for Planning Dept., defer to developers for design decisions, vs. push back for better projects for community?
   i. Facts vs. speculation (i.e. hearsay).
   ii. City prohibition on decisions based on financial impact on owner, developer and neighbors.
   iii. Minutiae of Planning/Zoning Code vs. concept/vision of best way to integrate with existing neighborhood.

e. Items of consideration:
   i. Condominiums vs. apartments.
   ii. Sales prices and rents.
   iii. Types of retail.

9. New business (8:30 pm):
   a. Discussion: Design guidelines (see exhibit).
   b. Motion: PLUM shall recommend that the NC require commercial uses within 200 ft. of residences to reduce nighttime noise after 10:00 pm to 35 decibels.
   c. Santa Monica Boulevard Overlay Plan: Discussion of sub-committee with stakeholders and academics - Max Sherman.
   d. Motion: The city HCID or a state-certified property management company shall manage the leasing of income-restricted affordable housing units that are created by the density bonus. Developers shall register affordable units with CD11, document the leasing process for the public, and notify CD11 when vacancies are available (see exhibit).
   e. Motion: CD11 shall request leasing/new vacancy information from developers for their affordable units, and serve as a clearinghouse to notify residents of West L.A. and the WLASNC.
   f. Motion: Sign Ordinance (see exhibit).
   g. Motion: Housing Committee proposal for addition of a “penalty of perjury” clause to forms required for demolition, giving the city the ability to punish developers who mislead planners about the project’s compliance with the rent stabilization ordinance. Prohibit condominium conversions unless neighborhood vacancy rate is 5% or more (see exhibit).
   h. Motion: Transparency in General Plan Update process (see exhibit).
   i. Motion: Request status of Quimby/Parks funds available for NC district and possible uses (pocket parks, playground equipment, sports fields, Civic Center).
   j. Motion: Planning Dept. shall provide population, current zoning capacity and proposed zoning capacity of all Community Plan areas (per current General Plan updates).
   k. Motion: CD11 and DOT shall audit parking meter revenue and designate traffic-calming and other projects to fund.
   l. Motion: Ban on campaign contributions by developers to City Councilmembers (see exhibit).
   m. Motion: Planning Commissions appointees shall have defined terms (e.g. 5 years).
   n. Motion: CD11 shall notify the NC of all meetings with developers and invite an NC member to attend.
o. Motion: Planning Dept. staff reports shall list all meetings between the developer and Planning Dept., Planning Commissioners and Council District, and shall list all campaign contributions from developer employees and their spouses/domestic partners to elected officials.

p. Motion: The city shall require builders/owners to post health warnings due to excessive air pollution on all residential units within 1,000 ft. of a freeway (see exhibit).

q. WLASNC Design guidelines: Discussion.

r. Subdivisions: Discussion of subdivision after planning approval/permit issuance.

s. Tree replacements in rights-of-way: Sanitation Dept. site, Fire Dept. site, Sawtelle (old Satsuma and Giant Robot sites).

t. Alcohol licenses: Discussion.

u. Affordable housing linkage fees/inclusionary requirements: Discussion (see exhibit).

v. Parking ratios: Discussion of ratios for suburban, urban, and transit-oriented locations, leadership by government versus desires of drivers, increase in traffic caused by free parking, increase in global warming from car pollution (see exhibit).

w. Open Space Element (General Plan): Discussion and possible answers to city’s questions.

x. Sawtelle Corridor Overlay Plan: Discussion.

   i. Housing supply/demand/affordability and jobs/housing imbalance.
   ii. Begin work on areas to preserve and change, types of R1 housing, commercial/pedestrian districts, opportunity sites for open space/new development.

z. Link: Mobility vs. place-making - http://curatingla.com/2017/07/31/la-needs-to-focus-on-place-not-movement/
for a baseball field in an ecologically sensitive area, and the city and the community can find other sites and fund them as an alternative).

v. No parking garage shall be built.

vi. Bike path shall remain in operation.

vii. Public access shall be limited – wildlife needs peace and quiet to breed and thrive.

viii. Runoff debris and trash – how will it be prevented and collected?

ix. Additional stormwater analysis to ensure no flooding during grading and final finished use.

x. Eliminate the gas storage facility.

xi. How will the finished use be managed?

c. Resolution: Sepulveda/Pico/Exposition station mixed-use project (approved 7-0-0): The City (Planning Dept. and/or DBS) shall provide the site plan in order to provide stakeholders an opportunity to comment on the design.

d. Resolution: Temporary offsite advertising signs on construction sites (approved 7-0-0): With regard to Council file CPC-2017-455-CA, WRAC believes no temporary offsite advertising signs should be allowed on construction fencing and that other regulations should be imposed including paint color; openings provided every 50 ft. for police to peer in and deter crime; limiting signage to fences that face/front C zones; signs be allowed only on active construction sites (not on vacant sites that are being leased for car storage or construction staging for another site); maximum amount of signage limited to 6 sf of signage for every 50 ft.; and stringent graffiti cleanup. WRAC believes there is no public benefit to allow such signs all over the city when billboards are limited.

e. Resolution: Open Space Element update of General Plan (approved 7-0-0): The Planning Dept. shall open all advisory group meetings, provide agendas and minutes, include public comment and release the membership and composition of the General Plan Elements updates’ advisory working groups.

f. Resolution: Permit Streamlining Act compliance with deadlines (approved 7-0-0): The City shall take proactive, definitive measures to comply with State laws that establish time limits for entitlement approvals and shall advise Neighborhood and Community Councils.

g. Cannibas Locations (approved 7-0-0): The city shall analyze the potential of overconcentration of marijuana dispensaries and growing facilities in M zones, and possible loss of land for needed neighborhood services.

h. Resolution: Small Lot Subdivision Amendment approved 7-0-0): The City shall revise the SLS amendment as follows, and complete the on-going planning process in the near future: Retain all of the setbacks for the underlying zone; no fake grass; green landscaping (trees) must be planted in dirt (not pots); rear stepback of 10 ft. required for the 3rd floor and above; rear stepback of 15 ft. required for 3rd floor and above when abuts low-density zone (R1, R2); roof decks shall not substitute for ground-floor open space with grass in high-density zones; roof deck shall be set back at least 5 ft. from edge of roof to increase safety and reduce privacy intrusion on neighbors; guest parking of 1 space per 4 units (or minimum of 1 space if fewer than 4 units).

i. Resolution: Westside Multi-Family Q Conditions (approved 7-0-0): The City shall amend the draft with the following revisions: The boundary in the West L.A. and Brentwood area shall be extended south to I-10 freeway to cover any R3/R4 or RAS3/RAS4 parcels and multi-family buildings that are constructed in C zones; the plan boundary shall be extended to include the following community plan areas: West L.A. (east of 405 in CD5 district), Venice, Westchester/Playa del...
11. Old business:
   a. Leasing for affordable units: Discussion of NC policy to request developers to fill out notification form and notify CD11 and NC of vacancies (see exhibit).
   c. 11460-11488 W. Gateway (5-story apartment): Appeal extended to Oct. 31 or Nov 30.
      i. City status: Oliver Netburn, Planning Dept.
   d. Santa Monica/Granville mixed-use (Buerge Ford site): Construction in progress, discussion of closure of Granville Ave.

12. Future projects:
   a. 1947 Sawtelle (YMCA site): Re-submitted under Transit-Oriented Communities.
   b. 11950 W. Missouri Ave. (Bundy-Missouri affordable apartment): Re-submitted under Transit-Oriented Communities.

13. Board action on previous PLUM motions:
   a. Lumen project (Trident Center-Manatt Building - 11355 W. Olympic Blvd.): Renovation of 2 existing office towers and expansion of 3-story 100,000-sf retail/office addition in front (in open space area along Olympic Blvd.). ENV-2016-1463-EIR.
      i. Community status: Open house on Oct. 17.
      ii. City status: Draft EIR released and comments due Feb. 5.
      iii. NC status: Board may consider at Apr. meeting, tabled at Jan. meeting.
      iv. Plans posted: www.WestLASawtelle.org (TBD)
   b. Trader Joe’s market #215 (11755 W. Olympic Blvd.): Board voted to support CUB to allow sales of full line of alcohol for offsite consumption and onsite tasting room area of 72 sf as part of 14,893-sf grocery market in M2-1 zone. Hours of operation are 8:00 am to 10:00 pm. ZA-2011-2580-CUB, ENV-2011-2051-MND.
   c. Walgreen’s #12149 (11795 W. Olympic Blvd.): Board declined to consider PLUM motion to support CUB to allow continued onsite sales of beer and wine for offsite consumption as part of 13,220-sf drug store/market. Hours of operation are 8:00 am to 10:00 pm. ZA-2017-4335-CUB. ENV-2017-4336-CE.
   a. 1225 S. Wellesley Ave: Board voted to support PLUM resolution for revisions to entitlements and design of project. Demolition of 2 duplexes (4 units) and new construction of 10-unit, 4-story apartment. Zoning adjustment to increase density by 1 unit. ZA-2017-4306, ENV-2017-4307.
   d. Nomination of Arman Ghorbani for Boardmember seat on PLUM: Board tabled PLUM resolution, and requested application form to be made available to interested Boardmembers.
   e. Westside Multi-Family Q Conditions revisions: Board voted to support PLUM resolution.
   f. Small Lot Subdivision Amendment revisions: Board voted to support PLUM resolution.

14. Status of previous decisions:
a. Neighborhood Transit Plan - Bundy Exposition Line Station: Board approval of proposed new zoning for upzones and preservation.
b. 1735 Westgate Ave.: Proposal for discretionary approval for 8 units (1 additional unit).
   i. City approved revised plan with 6 units.

15. Public Comment - Items not on the Agenda: 1 minute minimum per speaker.
16. Member announcements.
17. Adjournment.

Members:  Jay Ross, Chair (310) 979-9255  JRoss@WLANC.com
          Max Sherman, Vice Chair Max.Charles.Sherman@Gmail.com
          Partho Kalyani PKalyani@WLANC.com
          Jian Keredian, Boardmember representative JKeredian@WLANC.com
          Galen Pindell GPindell@Gmail.com
          Timothy Sweeney SweeneyTimothy@Gmail.com
          Karim Wataghani Wataghani@AOL.com

PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS – In compliance with Government Code Section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board in advance of a meeting, may be reviewed at a scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the Agenda, please contact the PLUM Chair Jay Ross (JRoss@WLANC.com) or (310) 979-9255.

The PLUM Committee will hold its meetings on the 2nd Wednesday of every month, and may also call any additional required special meetings in accordance with its Bylaws and the Brown Act. The NC complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and does not discriminate on the basis of any disability.

RECORDING MEETINGS – Meetings may be sound or video recorded.

LOCATION – For questions, contact Zel Limenih (310) 479-4119 or Zel.Limenih@LACity.org.

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION – Si require servicios de traduccion, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 dias de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte a Jamie Keeton al jkeeton@wlanc.com para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.
Exhibits on next page →
#4 Urban Design report

Urban Studio: John Kaliski, Martin Leitner, architects

Report: Community Design Overlay plans can be used to encourage / mandate attractive and functional urban design on the main streets in many neighborhoods of urbanized Los Angeles, including West L.A. (Wilshire, Santa Monica, Olympic, Pico).

Design of Toluca Lake CDO plan was funded by the NC.

Design elements:
1. Buildings that face the street.
2. Density that is designed well (architectural aesthetics, massing/ articulation, varied setbacks by floor, window/doors, awnings).
4. Residential, if per code parking.
5. Townhouses are buffer/transition to houses.

Lessons:
1. Cannot use CDO to change Zoning/Land uses, best used for design-only issues.
2. Use as part of Specific Plan, which is a legally binding document that codifies land uses.
3. Must explicitly preserve R1 houses in order to implement the CDOs that introduce Residential and higher densities.
4. No transitions between Residential land uses are in code.
5. CD offices prefer business-like and constructive collaboration.
6. Defensive design works, and it can be part of a comprehensive plan to reduce crime.
   a. Elements include placing windows/doors/entrances at ground level to allow for “natural surveillance” and promote activity along the street frontage.
   b. Parking should be “wrapped” by residential uses on the ground floor.
      Ground floor parking along the frontage creates dead spaces and allows criminals to loiter and burglarize cars and buildings.
7. Wide sidewalks are important to stimulate pedestrian activity, and should be at least 12 ft., preferably 15 ft. wide.
**Motion: Noise mitigation for commercial uses near residences**

**Motion:** PLUM shall recommend that the NC require commercial uses within 200 ft. of residences to reduce nighttime noise after 10:00 pm to 35 decibels.

**Facts and background:**
1. Some commercial uses create noise up to 75-85 decibels, such as restaurants, bars and entertainment.
2. Noise only can be mitigated by full barriers.
   a. Acoustical ceiling tiles and low, partial barriers provide negligible noise reduction.

**Findings and justifications:**
1. Residences are peoples’ homes, and they should be protected from noise from the open patios and patrons.
2. Restaurant can change to a bar without a new CUP and public hearing, so new noise mitigation conditions must be memorialized in advance and cannot be added later.
3. Acoustic engineers determined that a short wall/ barrier and acoustic ceiling tiles provide barely any noise reduction, and that only that a fully-enclosed wall/ barrier will decrease the noise significantly.

**Report from Eilar Associates:**

Generally, noise generated by patrons in a bar or restaurant would be measured in decibels, and would be related to noise limits contained within a Municipal Code of a jurisdiction. The CNEL metric would not typically be applied to this type of noise source (CNEL is geared more towards transportation noise sources) and is usually part of the Noise Element to the General Plan.

Often, noise levels associated with patrons of restaurants are in the 75-85 dBA range inside the restaurant, which is typically in line with noise from passing cars on the street, although there are occasionally noisier patrons than this (this is just a general observation). As for noise reduction, it is really hard to say, as there are standard height tables, high tops, varying distances between the sources and barrier, etc. but below is a general rough estimate:

1. With a **40-inch tall glass barrier**, you could expect a reduction of a couple of decibels (mouths are generally located at a height of about 45 inches in the seated position, so this height of barrier will provide only a small amount of sound attenuation).

2. **Absorptive ceiling panels** will likely offer a reduction of a couple of decibels as well. They don't reduce the noise from the direct path of sound travel, but rather, they reduce the amount of noise building up in the space, which serves to reduce overall noise levels by a few decibels (depending on the amount of absorption installed)
3. **A full glass enclosure** (with no open windows or doors, and no cracks or gaps in the assembly) would generally reduce noise levels by about 20-30 decibels. If there are any cracks or gaps in the windows assembly, it would be closer to a reduction of 10-20 dBA.

Jonathan Brothers, INCE  
Principal Acoustical Consultant  
Eilar Associates, Inc.  
Acoustical and Environmental Consulting  
210 South Juniper Street, Suite 100  
Escondido, California 92025  
Phone: 760-738-5570 ext. 101  
Fax: 760-738-5227  
jbrothers@eilarassociates.com  
www.eilarassociates.com  
WBENC National Certification Number: WBE1701672

**Ex parte communications:** Jay Ross talked to Jonathan Brothers of Eilar Associates.

**Disclosures and conflicts of interest:** Jay Ross’s company works with Eilar Associates.

---

**#7-e: Motion:** The city or a state-certified property management company shall manage the leasing of income-restricted affordable housing units that are created by the density bonus. The Housing and Community Investment Dept. likely would be the city departments to manage advertising, applications and qualification.

**Facts and background:**
1. Individual owners/developers manage the leasing for their own projects, and they all have different advertising, qualification and leasing processes.
2. No list of available apartments is readily available, and the units are located at disparate locations.
3. For 100% affordable projects funded by tax credits, the State of California requires that a State-certified property management company manage the leasing.

**Findings and justification:**
1. Audits are insufficient in determining which units are available for stakeholders, and if residents are actually qualified low-income tenants.
2. A single point of contact and a standard and understandable process would better serve low-income residents, who may not have time or knowledge to find and navigate numerous separate systems for leasing applications and qualifications.
3. Numerous qualified State-certified management companies have experience in Los Angeles, and are available for owners/developers of projects with affordable units.
#7-f: Motion: The WLASNC supports the Planning Commission’s recommendation for a revised Sign Ordinance, version B+ (Council file 11-1705).

This includes prohibition of digital billboards outside of current pre-2009 Sign Districts, no new Sign Districts, no billboards in public parks or facilities, a high takedown ratio for new billboards, and the removal of all unpermitted billboards.

The WLASNC opposes the City Council PLUM Committee’s amendments that revert more power to advertising companies.

1. Billboards, especially digital billboards, shall be prohibited from outside existing sign districts.
2. Billboards or signs should be prohibited from public parks and facilities.
3. No Sign Districts created since 2009 should be “grandfathered” into the original pre-2009 Sign Districts.
4. Existing, illegal / unpermitted (or altered from original permit) billboards should be removed, and no “amnesty” granted.
5. A high takedown ratio (5 to 1 or more) should be mandated for installation of new billboards.

#7-g: Motion: Motion: Housing Committee proposal for addition of a “penalty of perjury” clause to forms required for demolition, giving the city the ability to punish developers who mislead planners about the project’s compliance with the rent stabilization ordinance. Prohibit condominium conversions unless neighborhood vacancy rate is 5% or more.

LA is mulling new rules to prevent the demolition of rent-controlled apartments

*Tenant activists say stricter measures are needed*

by Elijah Chiland Sep 28, 2017, 11:54am PDT

As Los Angeles rents keep surging upward and the number of homeless residents climbs higher, city officials are considering new policies that would make it harder for landlords to demolish rent-controlled properties.

On Wednesday, the city council’s Housing Committee received a report from the planning department recommending the addition of a “penalty of perjury” clause to forms required for demolition, giving the city the ability to punish developers who mislead planners about the project’s compliance with the rent stabilization ordinance.

Tenant advocates have long complained that, under current rules, landlords can easily dodge the terms of LA’s rent control laws, whether by changing the scope of a project after tenants have already been evicted or by demolishing properties before potential violations can be investigated.
The planning department also recommended updating the review process for projects that require demolition permits, allowing for better coordination among different city departments and ensuring that properties are only razed once a developer has entitlements to begin construction on new housing. That way, the loss of demolished units affects the city’s overall housing stock for as short a time as possible.

But activists and community members at the meeting Wednesday argued these proposals didn’t go far enough to prevent evictions under California’s Ellis Act, which allows landlords to mass-evict tenants when demolishing buildings or leaving the rental business. Last year, more than 1,370 rent-controlled units were taken off the market through Ellis Act evictions.

Jennifer Ganata, a land use advocate with Inner City Law Center, told the committee that a cap or moratorium on Ellis Act evictions was necessary to preserve the city’s affordable housing stock. She also argued for a tax on vacant units that would encourage landlords to more proactively seek out new tenants.

To do that, the city would first need to establish a new system for tracking vacancies. On Wednesday, planning department staff told the city they were reviewing options, since the old system relied on Los Angeles Department of Water and Power data that’s no longer available.

In May, Councilmember Paul Koretz proposed a new rule blocking condo conversions if the vacancy rate has not been updated within the last year. His motion came amid an appeal from tenants over a condo conversion in Beverly Grove approved using vacancy rate numbers the appellants claimed were out of date. (Under current rules, the vacancy rate in the project area must be over 5 percent before condo conversions are allowed.)

On Wednesday, planner Claire Bowin told the committee that, based on the most recent Census data available, all but two neighborhoods in Los Angeles have a vacancy rate below 5 percent.


#7-h: Motion: Transparency in General Plan Update process: All Planning Dept. meetings, including work groups, for the General Plan and its Elements shall be open to the public and allow for public comment.

We request that the city schedule meetings during evening or weekend hours; and invite a representative from each NC or alliance.

In addition, we request that Open Space Element working group meetings be re-implemented with public input as soon as possible, and the Mayor's Planning Task Force and Transportation Infrastructure Steering Committee for the General Plan be made fully transparent.

Facts and background:

1. The original Open Space Element meetings were comprised of a working group, but its members were not disclosed to the public, nor was the process about how they were selected.
Justification:
1. The Brown Act and city ordinances promote and require transparency.
   a. Mayor Garcetti said residents must have "a sense of ownership over the development of our communities," and Councilman Jose Huizar, chair of the PLUM committee, pledged to bring "accountability and transparency back into our General Plan and Community Plan processes"
2. As an example of transparency by other city agencies, all Recode LA meetings are open to the public, and public comment is accepted.

#7-l: Motion: The city shall enact a ban on campaign contributions from real estate developers, construction firms, architects and engineers, and planning/entitlement consultants to City Council members, as proposed by Councilman Ryu.

Facts and background:
1. Council president Herb Wesson has scheduled no Rules and Elections Committee or Council hearings in the 8 months since the proposal was announced (Jan. 2017).
2. The Los Angeles Times editorialized in favor of the ban:

Findings and justification:
1. Mayor Garcetti promised this reform in exchange for residents voting against Measure S.
2. No conflicts of interest should exist between developers and Councilmembers.

#7-q: Motion: The city shall require builders/owners to post health warnings due to excessive air pollution on all residential units within 1,000 ft. of a freeway:

Facts and background:
1. Scientific studies determined that living within 500-1,000 ft. of freeways causes numerous health problems, because of the high levels of air pollution that cars produce, and increases public healthcare costs.
2. The Planning Commission rejected a proposed notice to residents of these units.
3. Developers, building contractors and the Building Industry Association lobbied against these health protections for the public.
4. Los Angeles Times articles:
   a. L.A. warns homebuilders, but not residents, of traffic pollution health risks:
   b. L.A. keeps building near freeways, even though living there makes people sick:
      http://www.latimes.com/projects/la-me-freeway-pollution/

Findings and justification:
1. Opposition to this notification is driven by profits and false speculation. Public health is more important.
2. The supply of new housing will not be affected by these notices.
3. The tax-paying public ends up paying for healthcare for persons harmed by air pollution.
4. Potential tenants deserve to be properly notified, so they can make housing decisions based on fully informed decisions.

**L.A. warns homebuilders, but not residents, of traffic pollution health risks**

For five years, Los Angeles has been issuing health advisories to housing developers, warning of the dangers of building near freeways. But when the city moved to alert residents as well, officials rejected it.

Planning commissioners axed a provision in an environmental ordinance that would have required traffic pollution warning signs on some new, multifamily developments on the grounds that it would burden developers and hurt market values. Critics say the 2015 decision illustrates city officials’ reluctance to take even incremental action to protect public health if they believe it will discourage homebuilding.

Marta Segura, who served on the planning commission at the time, said scrapping the sign mandate was a mistake. “It could have been a first step toward dis-incentivizing building near freeways,” she said. “Isn’t that what we want?”

Los Angeles and other California cities have permitted tens of thousands of homes near freeways in recent years — flouting the recommendations of state air quality officials who since 2005 have advised that dwellings should not be built within 500 feet of heavy traffic. Since then, the science linking traffic pollution to asthma, heart attacks, strokes, reduced lung function, cancer, pre-term births and other health problems has grown stronger.

And some politicians, including Mayor Eric Garcetti, think more can be done. The Los Angeles City Council commissioned a report this year on potential new measures to reduce residents’ exposure to freeway pollution — such as buffer zones and other development restrictions, zoning changes and stricter design standards. "Notifications should be accessible to all parties," Councilman José Huizar said. "How we do that should be part of any recommendations that come out of our report."

Differing views of progress

Local politicians and builders have largely opposed limiting how many homes can be constructed near traffic pollution, arguing it would only worsen skyrocketing home prices and rents.
But in 2012, the city began warning developers of the strong links between living near harmful pollutants in vehicle exhaust and asthma and other serious illnesses. The advisories flag residential development proposals within 1,000 feet of a freeway, and inform applicants that the city may in some cases impose anti-pollution design features, such as thick vegetation, windows that cannot be opened and balconies that do not face traffic.

Three years later, planning officials moved to require 8.5-by-11-inch health advisory signs be posted in residential developments of three units or more within 1,000 feet of a freeway. Because the effort was part of a pilot program, the rules would have applied only to some of the city’s worst-polluted neighborhoods: Boyle Heights, Wilmington, Pacoima and Sun Valley.

City staff promoted the advisories as a modest step that would alert the public without prohibiting development. They would represent “incremental progress toward disclosure, transparency, and sharing epidemiological evidence and increasing education,” a staff report said.

Environmentalists also backed the approach, saying renters and homeowners had a right to be informed of threats to their health. “We have notices on so many things, from cleaning products to [soda] cans,” said Yvette Lopez-Ledesma, deputy director of Pacoima Beautiful. “Why not have it on the place where you will be living, spending the vast majority of your income on?”

But developers and some planning commissioners did not see it that way. Tim Piasky of the Building Industry Assn. Los Angeles/Ventura Chapter wrote in a July 14, 2015, letter to the city that the ordinance “will only serve to aggravate the housing crisis.” “Of particular concern is a proposal to label — selectively — all new multifamily housing within 1,000 feet of a freeway as potentially hazardous to human health,” Piasky wrote. “Such labeling is completely unnecessary.”

Several city planning commissioners voiced similar concerns at a meeting a few weeks later, saying the signs would burden developers, hurt market values and unfairly suggest that air pollution at new homes is worse than at existing units.

Commission President David Ambroz disagreed. He supported the signage requirements but moved the legislation forward without them after it became clear there were not enough votes. “The more disclosure the better … but I don’t know that these signs are terribly effective,” Ambroz said in a recent interview. “I don’t want to infantilize Angelenos, as if they don’t know sitting next to a freeway is bad for them.”

But other commissioners argued against the health advisories because they would be effective. “I, for one, would not want to live there unless the rents are so low that it balances out the potential health impacts,” Robert Lee Ahn said during the 2015 hearing. “For a developer, I can see how that would be a hurdle for them when they’re making a decision to build or not build in that community.”
In a recent interview, Ahn said he was not opposed to notifying residents as long as it was done for all homes near freeways, new and existing. “It had to do with piecemeal implementation,” he said. “It’s not about developer profits.”

But Segura said recently that it was clear some of her fellow commissioners were most concerned about financial burdens on builders. “They weren’t thinking about the people that were suffering from asthma,” Segura said, “they were thinking about the developers.”

The Planning Commission approved the ordinance on a 6-2 vote. The measure went to the City Council with revised language that removed the signage requirements for homes. Instead, warnings would be posted only at newly built municipal buildings open to the public.

The value of a warning

Businesses in California long have complained that environmental label requirements for an array of products can result in “warning fatigue,” causing consumers to tune them out. But legal experts say public disclosures — like the ones required for known carcinogens under Proposition 65 — have also been shown to spur reductions in air pollution, product reformulations and other environmental improvements.

Carl Cranor, a professor at UC Riverside who has studied public policy on toxic chemicals, said requiring labels on buildings near freeways would prompt many potential renters and buyers to seek health information. “They will discover that there are risks, so there is legitimate worry that could reduce the value of those properties,” he said. “The industry’s reaction suggests to me that they know there’s a problem there and they’re worried about it.”

The signs might have dissuaded Cristobal Anaya, 35, from moving into a Boyle Heights apartment building next to the 5 Freeway, where he opens his front door to an off-ramp, smells the brake dust and exhaust fumes and battles a “near constant infiltration of black dust and soot.” “I like having the windows open when it's nice out, but at the same time I don't want to breathe in what's outside,” Anaya said. “If I saw a city-sanctioned sign that said living here is hazardous to your health, I would have looked for somewhere else.”

In April 2016, Garcetti signed the Clean Up Green Up ordinance, aimed at protecting people in the city’s poorest, most polluted neighborhoods from environmental hazards. Even though there would be no warning signs on housing, the measure did require high-efficiency air filters in new units within 1,000 feet of a freeway. Asked whether people moving into new homes near freeways should be notified of the health risks, Garcetti spokesman Alex Comisar said: “The mayor believes we can do even more to protect residents … he is open to new ideas in support of that effort.”
#7-v: Report: Affordable housing linkage fee

A key Los Angeles City Council committee Tuesday backed a plan for a new fee on the construction of single-family homes, offices, apartments and other developments, with the funds going to pay for affordable housing.

The linkage fee backed by the Planning and Land Use Management Committee would range from $1 to $15 a square foot, depending on the type of project and neighborhood.

The committee voted 5 to 0 to support the fee, which supporters say will help raise millions of dollars. L.A. faces a crippling housing shortage and homelessness crisis, putting pressure on lawmakers to find solutions.

“We’re out of choices,” Councilman Marqueece Harris-Dawson said at Tuesday’s hearing. “It’s a disastrous choice to do nothing.”

The fee applies to new construction and varies by real estate market. For instance, home builders on the Westside — considered a high market — would pay higher fees, while developers in San Pedro would have lower fees.

The three market areas for commercial development have fees ranging from $3 to $5 a square foot, while the four residential development area have fees ranging from $8 to $15. Developers of smaller, multiunit residential buildings would face a $1-a-square-foot charge in lower markets.

The market areas are defined within the city’s Community Plan Areas, boundaries that help guide development.

Council members made several amendments to the ordinance during Tuesday’s hearing, including a longer phase-in period. The full fee will not go into effect until a year after the council passes the ordinance.

Councilman Curren Price also sought a three-year exemption to the fee for commercial and industrial projects in a poverty-stricken area of his South L.A. district.

Hundreds of people packed into a downtown hearing, with both supporters and opponents jeering and clapping during the meeting.

Tim Piasky, chief executive of the Building Industry Assn. Los Angeles/Ventura Chapter, told council members the fee would “lower housing production, intensify L.A.’s already sky-high costs, push more Angelenos into poverty and increase homelessness on our streets.”

Doug Smith, an attorney at pro bono law firm Public Counsel urged passage of the fee, telling the panel, “Our crisis requires it.”

Officials say the fee is an attempt to help ease the strain on the rental market for lower-income people brought about by the construction of market-rate housing and other development.
Mayor Eric Garcetti introduced the proposal several years ago, and his appointees on the city Planning Commission this year backed a citywide fee of $12 a square foot for residential development and $5 a square foot for commercial development.

Amid council members’ concerns about a “flat” citywide linkage fee and its effects on Los Angeles’ poorer areas, new options for a geographic-based fee were introduced in a city report.

The report, released last week, also suggested the linkage fees wouldn’t be passed on to renters and buyers. Instead, “costs associated with housing impact fees are either absorbed into land prices or reductions in developer profits, or some combination of the two,” the report found.

Some developers dispute that assertion and argue housing costs will rise if the council passes the fee.

Following Tuesday’s vote, the draft ordinance will return to the planning committee before going to the City Council. The proposal may also be heard before the city’s Housing Committee, officials said.

In a statement after the vote, Garcetti called the linkage fee “a critical piece of our comprehensive strategy to combat the housing crisis.”


#7-w: Report: Parking ratios

Changing the Way Downtown Parks

Stalls in Residential Buildings Cost Developers Tens of Thousands of Dollars Each. The System May Change in the Future

DTLA - Cranes may be the most visible signifier of change in Downtown Los Angeles, but from the street, another feature in the landscape looms large: parking podiums.

Thousands of parking stalls are being built amid the residential boom. Sometimes they are tucked away underground. More often the cars are stored above the street, in multi-story garages that often create an unsightly buffer between pedestrians and the residents above.

Unbeknownst to many people, those flat slabs of concrete are extremely expensive, regularly costing developers tens of thousands of dollars per stall. That is passed on to anyone renting an apartment or buying a condominium, regardless of whether you need two stalls or none at all.

How Parking Raises Housing Prices
City zoning rules demand that apartment buildings have minimum amounts of parking: A studio requires one space, one-bedrooms need 1.5 spaces, and two-bedrooms get two spots. These standards have shaped development across the city, and especially in dense Downtown.

While a parking stall is a sliver of space, the need to build ramps, entrances and exits, maintenance spaces and more means that the average parking stall actually is worth around 400 square feet of space, according to architect Simon Ha, a partner at the firm Steinberg. This means that an 800-square-foot apartment with a parking space effectively becomes a 1,200-square-foot rental.

“The most expensive part of a unit is the bathroom and kitchen, but parking is not far behind,” Ha said. “Building parking for an apartment can sometimes be as much as half the cost of building the unit itself.”

Based on recent projects, Ha estimates that above-grade parking (such as in a podium) can run about $100 per square foot, while subterranean parking costs around $180 per square foot because of the pricey excavation and shoring process. That adds up to $30,000-$40,000 a stall in a bigger complex. The price rises on more expensive projects built on tighter parcels of land.

These costs impact residents regardless of how many cars they have, or whether or not they even drive.

What Fuels Parking Construction?

Zoning rules have been used across the country to mandate parking development, and that mindset hasn’t shifted much, despite new studies suggesting the parking minimums are “typically very overestimated,” said Marlon Boarnet, chair of the Department of Urban Planning and Spatial Analysis at the University of Southern California.

“The minimums are especially too high in transit-oriented neighborhoods. You’re essentially charging everyone for parking,” Boarnet noted. “In a city with a serious affordable housing crisis, building a lot of parking that people have to pay for whether or not they need it is not a great idea.”

Ironically, while many developers bemoan the costs incurred by parking requirements, others actually push parking as part of a project’s bottom line.

Downtown’s growth into a residential hub was kicked off by an adaptive reuse policy that allowed old office buildings to be transformed into lofts by easing many requirements, including relaxing the burden of adding dozens of parking stalls. Today, however, major national developers are building big Downtown complexes with the goal of luring residents from around the city — and those people bring their cars, Ha noted.

“They don’t want to have to turn away any renters because they want two parking stalls,” he said.
That may not make sense in a future with fewer cars, but many developers aren’t in the long game — they’re focused on the short-term, and market studies suggest that renters still want parking, Ha added. That means parking can be valuable when it comes time for a developer to flip a new project for a big profit.

The development community is slowly changing its mind about how much parking is needed in reality versus on paper — but “it’s not quite there yet,” said Jim Andersen, senior vice president at Trammell Crow Company, which is working on Downtown projects including La Plaza Cultura Village near Olvera Street.

“Investors, renters, lenders and everyone, including us as a developer, believes there is demand for that private, secure parking. That demand will never go away for good,” Andersen said. “But in the old days, that meant building one stall per bedroom and sufficient visitor parking. The ratio is starting to contract in a meaningful way, to less than one stall per bedroom.”

The Impact on Project Proposals

Sometimes, the perceived need for parking can kill a project. Andersen recalled a proposal for an apartment building in Santa Monica with no parking included.

“They couldn’t find an investor and partner. That was around three years ago. Today, it’s right next to the light rail [Expo Line]. Would it be built today? I think yes,” he said.

Los Angeles’ parking requirements have also imperiled projects designed to have very little or no parking. Small lots remain scattered around Downtown, but existing code makes those sites unfeasible for more modest developments, Ha said.

“If you take away the parking requirement, you’re going to see a lot more small-lot development with four or five stories,” Ha said.

The parking parameters may be shifting as the city pursues changes to the antiquated zoning code and the Downtown Community Plan. Currently, there is a proposal to remove parking requirements altogether in Downtown, and the feedback has generally been positive, said City Planner Bryan Eck. He anticipates requirements will at least be loosened in Downtown.

“We want to better manage resources, and open them up so parking can be better shared. An individual building with parking for uses in just that building, well, it’s parking that’s not being used,” Eck said. “Opening that up and creating new pricing schemes can change this problem.”

Another idea is centralizing parking, including by building or funding dense parking structures off-site rather than incorporating them into a residential project, as one garage could serve the inhabitants of several buildings. This may chafe residents used to having close and private access to their vehicle, but they can help people adapt to a more multi-modal urban lifestyle, USC’s Boarnet said.
“There’s a myth of L.A. people being hopelessly tied to their car that is fueling current trends to build parking, but we observe they’re very adaptive,” he said. “The biggest predictor of how much a household will drive is how many cars they own. If people move from two cars per household to one, there would simply be a large reduction in driving.”

Beyond removing parking minimums, a next step may be to push developers to “unbundle” the cost of parking from housing. Pricing it based on demand and showing people the true cost of car ownership could incentivize lifestyle changes, Boarnet said.

Trammel Crow Company’s Andersen is eager to see these shifts, and can picture a future Downtown with a high concentration of housing and a parking stock that’s “liberated,” with fewer private stalls and even building owners selling surplus parking to the public.

“It could be that, 5 or 10 years from now, we realize that we may have all the parking we need,” he remarked.


#7-z: General Plan update (LA2040): Open Space Element

https://www.ourla2040.org/survey
https://ourla.typeform.com/to/pLQ7XC

• What do you value most about open space in Los Angeles and why?
• What is your vision for open space in Los Angeles in the year 2040?
• How would you describe your favorite open space area in the City of Los Angeles?
• What criteria should we use in determining open space needs?
• What criteria should we use in determining social / environmental justice for determining open space needs?

#7-z: Report: Decrease in demand for office space.


Colliers U.S. Brokerage President Gives His Outlook For CRE

Colliers International President of U.S. Brokerage Marty Pupil has seen the ups and downs of the industry. While he sees challenges ahead in areas such as recruitment, he also sees a lot of opportunity arising through technology and retail disruption.

Pupil said there has been a big shift in office. There is less demand for office than 10 or 15 years
"Every job created in this cycle is generating almost 250 SF less of office demand, so in other words, the trend among all office users, traditional and tech, is do more with less," he said.

Office is using more tech, including becoming paperless in a lot of cases. Tech is also having an impact on industrial, with the impact of e-commerce helping lead to the birth of 1M SF distribution centers, according to Pupil. Amazon and e-commerce are driving the need for same-day delivery and food delivery options. "So technology has crept into being the big driver on the industrial side indirectly," Pupil said.

Los Angeles City Planning Needs to Focus on Place, Not Movement

July 31, 2017 10:50 am By Jim Gilbert Leave a Comment

I recently read an interview in Los Angeles Magazine with Vince Bertoni, L.A.’s new City Planning Director, and was disappointed by his comments on the five major changes coming to Los Angeles. One in particular caught my attention. He said: “Naturally, a lot of the rethinking revolves around transportation.” In fact, three out of the five changes Bertoni identified as shaping Los Angeles were transportation related. None dealt with walking or place-based planning.

Rather than define community, neighborhoods, or places, the City’s priorities are always based on how we move around. Residents of cities need transportation to survive, but it is always secondary to place. People don’t visit New York to ride the subway or San Francisco to ride BART, but instead visit the many neighborhoods, districts, places, and buildings in those cities.

L.A.’s historic obsession with mobility has created a mass of perpetual movement. Throughout its brief history Los Angeles has spent billions on mobility, beginning with railroads, Henry Huntington’s streetcar lines, and the freeways. We have spent even more resources on sustaining this infrastructure by expanding the amount of real estate required to accommodate cars (i.e. with parking lots and structures, road widening projects, left hand turn lanes, street dedication, signal synchronization, one-way streets, etc). We can no longer continue down this path.

As a native Angeleno I have seen the city’s built environment deteriorate because of transportation infrastructure. When I was five years old I used to walk a mile home from school everyday using street trees to find my way. One day L.A. County decided to widen all the streets in East Los Angeles and remove all the parkways and street trees. Overnight the neighborhood became ugly – dominated by asphalt and cars.

As Angelenos we know traffic is going to get worse and the fixes are going to destroy our cherished landscape. I recently drove on the 405 Freeway through Westwood and the Sepulveda Pass and almost started to cry because the recently completed widening project butchered the
hills. By scarifying our once bucolic landscapes, we’ve created a city of no there “there”. The intersection of Vermont and Santa Monica looks and feels like the intersection of Moorpark and Laurel Canyon.

Angelenos are always looking for the panacea to solve congestion, and taxing themselves to fund solutions, such as with Measures M and R, and Propositions A and C. But with all this money we just create more congestion. We fight over parking, bike lanes, rail lines, and other transportation infrastructure rather than the shape, or experience, of our city. We’re the ultimate nomads because our idea of good urban design is a food truck parked in a parking lot.

Los Angeles is full of designers, artists, architects, and landscape architects who could enhance the experience of place in our city. Unfortunately, the power brokers have pushed them aside in favor of the engineers, forcing L.A. creative talents to develop fancy homes and gardens, and on occasion go after a few public projects.

How do the engineers shape the city? They dictate the function, shape, form, and experience of our public spaces, streets, and buildings. This process is similar to having an engineer design the interior of your home. The structure would be functional, but lacking in any special design sense that would distinguish it from a dorm room. Can you imagine the San Francisco Planning Department giving all its power to shape the city to SFMTA? That will never happen because San Franciscan’s value place, and the planning department actively works to strengthen and create a sense of place in the city.

Placed-Based Planning

As a trained urban planner I always think about how the human body relates to physical spaces to find comfort and a sense of belonging, which are critical for cities. My MIT research focused on how Latinos use their bodies to define and create urban design in their community. The Latino landscape is defined by designing for activities and flows from both interior and exterior spaces. The human body becomes the texture and form that defines the public space in these communities and creates the experience.

Not that L.A. should feel like Mexico City or East Los Angeles, but it should be planned, designed and built as a city with experience of place rather than a perpetual merry-go-round of movement. Cities like Portland, Minneapolis, San Francisco and even San Diego have developed better neighborhoods, districts, and buildings because the priority is on place – not movement.

One day I was waiting at a bus stop on Hennepin Street in uptown Minneapolis, admiring an old one story neo-classic library across the street. Then I realized the newly constructed five or six story mixed use building behind it used the same color and texture. Similarly, the nearby transit center had that same color. This attention to context created a harmonious, relaxing place to be on the street and demonstrated that someone thought about the neighborhood’s overall look and feel. In L.A. these buildings would have competing facades.
As we construct more multi-family buildings, enhance public transit infrastructure and develop a denser urban fabric it’s time to reimagine our streets. We need to create an experience, a buzz of human activity and nature intertwined into a healing city for all.

Angelenos have to think outside their own personal spaces and create that same experience in the public sphere. L.A. is not a cozy, northern city. Rather, it’s physically and socially a southern city like Rome, Madrid or Barcelona. We have to recognize that reality, embrace our place in the world and build a sustainable environment in which all those who live and work in Los Angeles can thrive.

#8: Motions: WRAC Land Use and Planning Committee

A. Sepulveda/Pico/Exposition station mixed-use project (approved 7-0-0): The City (Planning Dept. and/or DBS) shall provide the site plan in order to provide stakeholders an opportunity to comment on the design.
   a. WRAC is concerned that area stakeholders have received no site plan for review, and no opportunity for community input has been provided as part of development of the site plan, even though construction sitework has begun. The City promised that stakeholders would have a chance to collaborate on design of the site plan, as part of its decision to allow the Planning Commission rush approval without a final site plan, prior to Mayor Villaraigosa leaving office.

B. Temporary offsite advertising signs on construction sites (approved 7-0-0): With regard to Council file CPC-2017-455-CA, no temporary offsite advertising signs shall be allowed on construction fencing and that other regulations should be imposed including paint color; openings provided every 50 ft. for police to peer in and deter crime; limiting signage to fences that face/front C zones; signs be allowed only on active construction sites (not on vacant sites that are being leased for car storage or construction staging for another site); maximum amount of signage limited to 6 sf of signage for every 50 ft.; and stringent graffiti cleanup. WRAC believes there is no public benefit to allow such signs all over the city when billboards are limited.

C. Open Space Element update of General Plan (approved 7-0-0): The Planning Dept. shall open all advisory group meetings, provide agendas and minutes, include public comment and release the membership and composition of the General Plan Elements updates’ advisory working groups.
   a. ReCodeLA Citizen’s Zoning Advisory Committee should be the example used for the General Plan Elements updates. ReCodeLA’s review work is a transparent process, and agendas and minutes are available. Meetings are open, and public comment is included when time permits.

D. Permit Streamlining Act compliance with deadlines (approved 7-0-0): The City shall take proactive, definitive measures to comply with State laws that establish time limits for entitlement approvals and shall advise Neighborhood and Community Councils. This includes, but is not limited to:
   a. Creation of a new tracking/tagging system with deadline alerts.
b. The date of the CEQA determination shall be aligned with the entitlement determination.
c. The City shall ask all applicants to voluntarily extend the time line at time of application submittal.

E. Cannibas location (approved 7-0-0): The City shall analyze the potential of overconcentration of marijuana dispensaries and growing facilities in M zones, and possible loss of land for needed neighborhood services.
   a. Facts and background:
      i. If demand for locally-produced marijuana increases significantly, the demand for M zoned land may increase significantly.
      ii. Only a small portion of M zoned land is in the westside.
   b. Findings and justification:
      i. The community needs land in the local vicinity for sale of goods and services like car repair, veterinaries, lumber/hardware, etc. Otherwise residents will have to make long drives to shop.

WEST LOS ANGELES SAWTELLE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
Leasing/application information for affordable units

Project: __________________________
Address: _________________________
Total units: ___
Construction begins/ends: ______________

Affordable units:
Date owner will mail applications: ______________
Deadline for residents to return applications: ______________
Date units will be available for occupancy: ______________

Studio
   ____ Very low income (30-50% AMI) – Rent $____
   ____ Low income (60% AMI) – Rent $____
1-bedroom
   ____ Very low income (30-50% AMI) – Rent $____
   ____ Low income (60% AMI) – Rent $____
2-bedroom
   ____ Very low income (30-50% AMI) – Rent $____
   ____ Low income (60% AMI) – Rent $____
3-bedroom
____ Very low income (30-50% AMI) – Rent $_____
____ Low income (60% AMI) – Rent $_____ 

Owner: ___ (company)
  Name: _______________
  Phone/email: _____________

Property manager: ________ (company)
  Name: _______________
  Phone/email: _____________

Submit application to:
  Name: _______________
  Address: _______________
  Phone/email: _____________

Documents required for application?
  1. Tax return? Income history (pay stubs)?
  2. Personal identification?
  3. _______?

Please notify CD11 and the West LA Sawtelle NC when any vacancy occurs and units become available for leasing.