

Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa
NCWP Planning and Land Use Committee Agenda
www.ncwpdr.org

Meeting Minutes for Approval

Committee: Planning and Land Use Committee

Chairperson: Julie Ross

Meeting Date: Tuesday, November 19, 2019 - 6:30pm

Meeting Place: Westchester Municipal Building Community Room / 7166 W Manchester Avenue,
Westchester, CA 90045

Attendance:

- Present: Ross, Smith, Watkins + visiting NC Board members Paula Gerez, President; and Naomi Waka, Cord Thomas.
- Absent: Lyon, Quon, Miller (arrived later)

Item 1: Meeting Opening

1.1: Welcome and Introduction

1.2: Minutes Review and Approval – 10/19/19 PLUC meeting minutes

M/S – Watkins / Smith

Vote: 4/0/0, minutes approved.

THIS WAS DONE AFTER SMITH ARRIVED AT 7PM, FOLLOWING PLANNING 101 PRESENTATION

1.3: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items: Email from Tommy Rays re: LMU Master Plan meetings.

Item 2: Committee Administration / Operations Items

2.1: Stakeholder Education: Planning 101

Background: Councilman Mike Bonin's lead staff person for planning-related issues in the NCWP geography Len Nguyen - Senior Planning Deputy, Council District 11, presented a step-by-step tutorial on the planning process, and review the departments involved (Planning, Transportation, Building & Safety). He also explained how CD11 interfaces with the Planning Department and how to use important stakeholder access tools available online (Zimas for self-serve property info discovery, the Planning Department's case files databases, etc.)

3.1: Proactive Stakeholder Input - NCWP Eastside Districts re Planning Issues

Background: CD11 staff has requested PLUC investigate methods for gathering direct community input (canvassing, online surveys, etc) on concerns and suggestions related to planning-related topics from stakeholders (residents, workers, businesses) in Eastside NCWP districts, specifically #9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Ross read Kimberly Fox email:

=====

Public Comment

Submitted for the record re PLUC Meeting of 2019-11-19, Agenda Item 5.

=====

I strongly support building new methods of communication and input from stakeholders in the NCWP “Eastside” districts of 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Our micro-community has many unique issues, not the least of which is taking the direct hit for the entire NCWP geography re 405-related impacts:

- * Traffic congestion and non-stakeholder high usage, driven largely by LAX.
- * Non-stakeholder-generated noise pollution.
- * Particulate matter pollution, a documented health risk for residents within 500’ of the freeway.

On this point, I would also note, in addition to Eastside housing present before 2015, new residential development around HHLA has radically increased the number of NC stakeholders exposed to this type of pollution

Our combined proximity to LAX and relatively affordable land purchase prices (when compared to the NCWP districts west of Sepulveda) guarantees various unique planning-related “hot spot” issues:

- * The Reading+Ramsgate TOC conversion, which could result in 100+ parcels activating Ellis act evictions of RSO tenants in favor of super-high density housing with zero overall community quality-of-life planning. (The ultimate density hellscape.)
- * Strong City ordinance support + commercial value appeal regarding densification around La Tijera,
- * Manchester and Airport as key arterials feeding LAX.

However, I fear PLUC’s focus on Eastside planning input will be hijacked by our NC’s parliamentary process.

Let’s say PLUC formulates a motion specifically focused on Eastside stakeholder planning input. (Which I hope you do.) We can predict—based on previous behavior—that the NC Board’s discussion will ID such a PLUC motion as a “spear tip” proposal. Meaning Board members will argue that this type of canvassing for input should:

- * Happen throughout all 14 NCWP districts (“But every area has issues...”)
- * And it should cover topics wider than just planning and development. (“..that go way past just planning.”)
- * Because that’s “the right thing to do.”

This line of debate forces an overlay of false equivalency of need between the unique sub-geographies of our NCWP territory. And that false equivalency threatens to un-necessarily complicate the project, resulting in a big stakeholder zero, because nothing moves forward due to the Board’s lack of resources to actualize a more complex input gathering operation.

I am arguing—in the strongest possible terms—that the NCWP Eastside needs and deserves special attention. Please fight for better planning and development communication specifically between the NCWP Eastside and our PLUC, our NC Board, and our partners at CD11.

Sincerely,
 Kimberly Fox
 5856 W 74th Street - 90045

Item 5: Meeting Wrap-Up

5.1 - Announcements

Next PLUC meeting: December 17, 2019.

5.2 - Meeting Adjourned

M/S – Miller / Smith

#