

**Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa
NCWP Planning and Land Use Committee
Approved Minutes**

Meeting Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2017 - 6:30pm

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

Present: Patricia Lyon, Joan Trimble, Don Hellwig, Alan Quon, Kimberly Fox

Absent / Excused: David Oliver, Garrett Smith, David Voss, Janine Ying

Call to order: 6:34pm

1: Welcome and Introduction

2: Review and Approval - Minutes from 17 October 2017 Meeting

MOTION to Approve as written

- Moved: Joan Trimble. Seconded: Alan Quon.
- Passed by unanimous voice vote

3: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Topic: Land Use Appeal Fee Increase

Presenter: Naomi Waka, on behalf of Stacy Travis

Presenter points: Request PLUC take a position on issue of hiking fees on those filing land use appeals. Current fee to appeal is \$89 and they want to raise it to as much as \$13K+. Outrageous amount, especially considering many of these appeals are made by community members. Planning department is arguing cost recover, but reality is that common citizens don't have the resources of developers. Fee increase hurts a community's ability to object to undesirable development.

Committee Discussion: Given the issue is specifically about government-required fees, PLUC chair confirmed—through Committee informal polling—a redirect of the issue to NCPW Government Affairs Committee (specifically Mark Reddick, chair). Requested presenter propose the Government Affairs Committee take this issue up as item to bring to the NC Board.

4: Information & Discussion Item - 7366 Osage (aka Mortuary)

Background - First presentation to PLUC. New property owner/developer proposing replacement of current mortuary with public storage building. 45,000 sq ft. 45' height. Possible to build "by-right" without community input, but developer interested in collaborative process.

Presenter(s):

Bruce Ehrlich, AIA & Attorney 213.787.0340; behrlich@behrlichlaw.com

Cardiff Mason Developers - John Mason, President and Shane Mason, Director of Development

Arne Emerson - Principal, Morphosis (architecture firm) 424-258.6208; a.emerson@morphosis.com

Documents Presented: see attached: PDF of Presentation PowerPoint

Presenter Comments:

- Here to engage committee, try and work together to be good neighbors. Project Name: Self Storage 1. Understand it will generate a typical view (negative) from people re this sort of project. Want everyone to keep an open mind because I believe we're taking a very different approach than is normally done with this type of use.
- Site in question mainly C2, with a portion zoned R1. Noted the adjacent church property also splits its zoning between R1 and Commercial.

- Family-run operation, 25 years old. Principal is father John Mason. Son Shane Mason is director of development. Daughter Jennique manages operations. Two previous projects present to show company's philosophy of community engagement: West LA > project designed to look like office building, per community input. Chicago > 1914 building, restored. Cited long term retention of employees. Full benefits provided, not a minimum-wage company.
- This project: aiming for something more conceptual, high design. Hired leading architecture firm Morphosis this goal. Pritzker-award winning firm does not specialize in any one form of business-type or building-type. Focus on projects that are unique, provide community benefit. Question their firm is pursuing: How do you take a very prosaic building type--self storage--and reimagine that?
- Assessment of traffic flows, future customer loading and unloading, pedestrian experience of the building, considering 2 scales: heavy vehicular traffic on La Tijera and more pedestrian pattern on Osage.
- Design solution (see presentation documents for detail): 45K sq. ft. Three floors, one underground to reduce scale of total building ("more scaled to the neighborhood"). Creating 3 living units for staff who would operate the business (characterized as affordable housing for employees.) Lifting the building up, carving out interior for off-street load and unload. Pulled back from sidewalk further than required. Lobby designed to feel like office space—glass, no storage advertising signs. Focus on greenscape and greenery "walls" on 3 sides of the property to soften design. Here rear parking is now on R1 portion, maintain this as parking area in new design. Façade material: satin or matte, non-reflective and perforated to make a more sculptural effect for the building.
- Additional operational points: low impact on neighborhood due to small scale, limited traffic generation (compared to adjacent gas stations) and operating hours restricted to office hours of 9am to 6pm with tenant key card access from 7am to 10pm. Developer considers the strong architectural design can serve as a gateway to the community (better than gas stations).

Preview of Developer "asks" of the community:

1. Permission to retain parking function of R1 portion of the property; no truck rental or truck parking in this area. Strictly for use of building employees or customers.
2. Permission to extend basement level into the subterranean area under the R1 parking lot.
3. Permission to create 3 staff living units within the building.
4. To calculate floor-area-ratio, asking to use combined C2-R1 zoning.

Public Comment - None.

Committee Discussion

Don Helwig: how many storage units?

Shane Mason: 900 total; avg. size is about 90 sq. ft., 80K sq. ft. of that for actual storage.

Joan Trimble: support the excellent design aesthetic. Appreciate addition of housing units. Given community lack-of-benefit in public storage in general, appreciate's the developer's approach. Some concern about signage calculation; understanding it's by-right. Committee's view: the less signage the better.

Bruce Ehrlich: is a conditional by-right. Does require conditional use permit, but CUP for C2 does not "appear to be a particularly difficult hurdle to overcome." However, design is to keep ID signage very discrete, in scale with the total project.

Arne Emerson: intent is for the writing in the perforated screen of upper level to not be legible; thinking of is as texture, not a sign. Do not want it to read "Self Storage."

Kimberly Fox: Why is the massing of the design pushed to the street front, rather than pushed into the back, for a lower building height at the sidewalk?

Bruce Ehrlich: It's a transitional height issue. The building in total, as C2, is a long way from being a single family home.

Arne Emerson: given function of the building, makes more sense to push the commercial to the street front.

Kimberly Fox: Complemented developer on inclusion of affordable staff residential units. Question re the rendering showing a set of roof decks for the residential units. What's the detail here?

Bruce Ehrlich: design plan is to have small deck areas, not to use the whole roof of the second story as deck area. City will require hand rail so deck space is smaller and clearly delineated from the rest of the roof-top.

John Mason: having a residence in self-storage is a long tradition. Started with this in the 1970s you'd hire a couple, usually retired couple, apartment above the office. We've continued this practice as it results in better customer service. Their average employee tenure is 10 years. Cites they pay well, but typically employees would not be able to afford to live in neighborhood of this building. Also, primary salary is paid even if employees opt not to live on-site. Employees not forced to live on-site.

Alan Quon: Site is a mortuary now. What about toxic waste on the site?

Bruce Ehrlich: wouldn't be any associated with mortuary. The proximity to the gas station is the bigger concern, so will do some precautionary boring tests to confirm site is environmentally clean.

John Mason: Bank won't loan on property that has environmental hazard risks.

Alan Quon: Lighting plans? On the structure?

Arne Emerson: Will cover basic minimum code with a little bit of low level lighting on the perimeter. In additional, some lighting behind the screen that would shut down at night.

Alan Quon: Trash collection happens where: rear of the property or on the street? Trash in rear back. Trash done on the street.

Arne Emerson: trash comes out to the street

Alan Quon: Concerned about AC units on the roof. How would it look from the street?

Arne Emerson: considering putting low units on the roof that don't show.

Patricia Lyon: What was your community outreach prior to tonight?

Bruce Ehrlich: based on your recommendation, this is our initial presentation. Are reaching out to everyone in 500 ft radius. Intend to do immediate neighbor meeting in chapel of the existing mortuary. (Meeting confirmed for 12/18/2017 @ 6:30pm.) Have also briefed CD11 staff Tricia Keane and Anna Kozma by phone.

Patricia Lyon: given the Committee does not feel public storage in general offers community benefit, how does this project really benefit our neighborhood?

Arne Emerson: Taking something that's fairly utilitarian and see what we could do with it from a progressive design stand-point. Most people in the business of public storage would not be interested in that question. Our willingness to work with John and Shane Mason was their commitment to listen to our firm's counsel. Architecture is part of it, but equally important to use was how they operate their business. Housing for tenants is a compelling story. It's an interesting approach, as architecture and as a way of doing business.

Bruce Ehrlich: would also cite the passive benefit. Based on what other kinds of businesses could open at this site, the design of the building plus low impact of public storage use, is a very benign project and see that as a benefit. Our hope: the neighborhood will be proud of the building.

Patricia Lyon: considering any LEED, solar, green elements to the building?

Arne Emerson: great thing about public storage building, much easier to do heating and cooling because of well insulated perimeter. Very limited car and traffic circulation, relative to other projects. Water is minimal. Our façade would be highly insulated, roof as well. In terms of materials, even if not LEED certified, we're constantly exploring interesting materials. AC is required for part of the year in Los Angeles as storage temperatures must be kept in high 70s to 89-degrees. LA climate means can insulate well to support low energy use to maintain interior temperatures.

Patricia Lyon closing: Safety and security > please present re this topic in your next presentation. How clients, employees, pedestrians are protected. Kudos to the developer for being willing to invest in a firm like Morphosis to create the design.

5: Information & Possible Action Item - Red Mountain Group re La Cienega-Centinel-La Tijera Triangle Commercial Redevelopment Project

Background - Second presentation to PLUC. Project: Red Mountain Group's rehabilitation and redevelopment project in commercial area at the intersection streets named above. Site area totaling approximately 7 acres.

Presenter(s):

Alton M. Klein of the Red Mountain Group, Project Developer, responsible for entitlements)
Lori Gast, Red Mountain Group in charge of development.

Related Documents: see attached: PDF of design documents + Smart & Final letter.

Presenter Comments:

Lori Gast re Community Outreach

1. Met with owner-manager of adjacent apartments, who has similar concerns as NC-PLUC (operating hours, security, trash, deliveries, lighting, etc.)
2. North and West of project is commercial, so concentrated in outreach to residential to the South of the project. Have handed out info packets, personally delivered to the neighbors. Interaction with community has been very informative, as far as neighborhood history.
3. In discussion with community members re collaboration on median improvements; aiming for positive outcome on that project.
4. Have set up a private phone line for questions and concerns from the community; to date, no calls.
5. Providing a letter from Smart & Final confirming their hours of operation; they have agreed to PLUC request to close at 11pm rather than 12midnight. Also providing plans that shows foot print for liquor stock inside the store and deliveries information.
6. Met with lead officer from LAPD responsible for the area; he requested 24 hour security and security cameras; we have agreed to these requests.

Alton Klein re Design Updates

1. Re buildings fronting on La Tijera; heard requests for landscaping buffer and have added this to updated plan. Dense landscaping runs entire length of Marshal's building. Entire length of S&F. This will be broken up with sidewalks for emergency exits, TBD.
2. Re request to help bring pedestrian appeal of buildings, bring energy off the streets, have updated design with lifestyle graphics. On Marshall's building replacement solid white wall by continuing store-front glass around the corner, plus 45-degree signage at the corner which becomes big focal point to entrance to center.
3. 4-5' of landscaping to our property line. Small section between building and side walk and we're going to load it up with landscaping.
4. Already some landscaping in front of Drollinger; probably work with them to make landscaping contiguous.
5. Did reach out to Drollingers again. They have this updated design package; working with to Sr VP of project management for Drollingers; both sides (Red Mountain and Drollinger) in favor of this project.
6. Liquor store situation with owner; still working on this. Hoping to meet with family ownership after Holidays.

Public Comment

Dorothy Harris: from Ladera Heights, representing the Ladera Heights Civic Association. Speaking on behalf of the Board and "thousands of resident members" in larger Ladera community. Met with Lori Gast, had a good talk; Red Mountain knows the problem re "dreadful" medians. Appreciate the more extensive landscaping in updated plan. Our intention: form a 501c3, a non-profit to which anyone

can donate and work median improvements through that organization over time. Will relieve Red Mountain of the issue, leave it with the community where it belongs. We're hopeful Red Mountain will come up with a hard- and soft-scape plan for La Cienega. Can also report Ladera Center is very interested and there might be the will to do something at long last.

Laurie Len Leonard > representing IRC and Associations; own the adjacent property (Knowlton Manor Apartments). In favor of the development. Had some concerns as far as alley-way traffic and hope they will be addressed by Red Mountain. Also discussed with Red Mountain concerns about off-site loading, lighting as well. Red Mountain property has been a blight area for a number of years, has needed some type of improvement.

Committee Discussion

Alan Quon: Smart & Final design update in November has vertical lines, and new design switches those lines to horizontal. Why?

Alton Klein: light board...so material can be changed out.

Alan Quon: repaving?

Alton Klein: yes, a lot of trenching, will probably have to grind the whole property. City seems very ready for us to do the repairs for them.

Kimberly Fox: Thanks for addressing PLUC concerns from previous meeting. Any news on other tenants?

Lori Gast: a couple of other hard and soft goods vendors. Nothing we can say for sure at this point.

Joan Trimble: very exciting having groups like yours investing in our community. Follow-up on trash issue re when it will be dealt with because adjacent to apartment buildings.

Alton Klein: looked for ordinances for noise. Trash to be from 6am-9pm. Vehicle loading and unloading is 7am to 10pm. Smart & Final has accepted these restrictions.

Lori Gast responding to questions by Don Hellwig:

- Marshall's is signed and will be closing its Fox Hills location.
- Re liquor start not part of overall site: Looking to do meeting with the daughter of family that owns liquor store after the holidays.
- Working with Drollinger not to buy their building (fronts on La Tijera) but to re-wrap the exterior so it blends with the Red Mountain overall site design.
- Burger King and KFY have lots with 5-year options, so probably 30 years total.
- KFC is working with the city asking for a near-tear-down remodel, similar to the one just completed by MacDonald's just down the street on La Tijera.

Lori Gast responding to questions from Patricia Lyon:

- Community accepts 6am start time for trash pick-up; not different than the 99-cent store's operations.
- 24-hour security in line with police and PLUC requests
- Agreed that during construction, will provide PLUC an email update on the kinds of questions and issues coming from neighbors. Red Mountain conducts internal monthly project development check-in; will ship report to PLUC after these meetings. And community call-in phone line will be kept up during construction.

Recap of discussion re median improvements:

- Cost per Dorothy Harris, Ladera Civic Association: if we do minimum plan without in-ground pipes; using rocks and other kind of hardscape as a design basis. Can put a very minimum plants, watered by trucks to get started, and then they live on their own. Low maintenance. Actual figure I don't know. However, if the construction and ultimately up-keep through 501c3 it will be a lot less expensive than if built and cared for by City of LA. Probably talking in the area of several thousand dollars for the whole process.
- Per Red Mountain, 501c3 is better organizational structure re possible donation.

MOTION to support Red Mountain project, with additional comment that Red Mountain make a good faith effort to improvement public areas in collaboration with other property owners.

- Motion to Approve: Alan Quon
- Seconded: Joan Trimble
- Passed by unanimous voice vote

Motion and Letter of Support to be drafted for presentation at 12/5/17 NC Board Meeting.

6: Information & Discussion Item - 8521 S Sepulveda Boulevard (aka Grinder property)

Background - Second presentation to PLUC. Presentation on the proposed 87-unit apartment building with 1,000 square feet of commercial retail at 8521 S. Sepulveda Boulevard (former Grinder restaurant). Density bonus incentives requested. Total of 8 units (11%) set aside for very low income occupants in exchange for a.) increase in FAR to 3:1 in lieu of 1.5:1 FAR and b.) 20% decrease in required amount of open space (6900 in lieu of 8625). Developer is also request Section 13.08-based Community Design Overlay (CDO) variance for 75' height, 5-stories.

City of LA Planning Department Case # ENV-2017-1736-EAF

City Planning File: <http://planning.lacity.org/pdiscaseinfo/Caseld/MjEzNzk30>

Presenter(s): Tanner Blackman - Kindel Gagen (Public Affairs Advocacy Firm) on behalf of Caladan Investments

Presenter Comments

- Quick recap: Difficult to develop, L-shaped lot. 25K sq. ft. total; 87 units total, 8 for lower income. Activated Density Bonus; Project designed to the CDO, not requesting variances. Sepulveda frontage is 10' higher than Manchester frontage. 1K sq ft of retail in 2 spaces. Entrance to lobby on Sepulveda. Parking requirement: 46 spaces; 44 for residential and 2 for commercial. Only car entrance on Manchester.
- Traffic study not yet complete; will present again to PLUC as soon as it's available. (Aiming for December 2017 PLUC meeting.)
- Community Outreach Update
 - Two meetings with Kentwood Home Guardians; don't have their full approval until traffic study is in.
 - More significant outreach in the neighborhood surrounding, knocking on doors.
 - Round one in July: 133 door knocking; Left flyers; Only 10 direct interactions that time.
 - Round two (1.5 weeks before this PLUC presentation. Hit round one houses + expanded area. 133 doors, 19 more interactions with neighbors, a couple phone calls and emails too.
 - Didn't get into adjacent apartment buildings to knock on those doors; talking with managers to set up meetings for those residents.
- Parking update
 - City / density bonus only requiring 46 spots.
 - Developer wanted more; worked with City re parking layout and emergency turn-around radius allowances.
 - Confirmed City approval of 82 total parking spaces for 87 units.
 - Inquired with medical high-rise across the street about leased parking for residents. Non-negotiable no for overnight parking.
 - Willing to support, explore preferential parking district application re R1 streets behind the project to help keep 8521 S. Sepulveda residents from parking in the neighborhood.
 - Question about informal breeze-way that connects 85th Street to Manchester. Supposed to be locked (preventing residents from parking in the neighborhood and walking through to the building on S. Sepulveda). However, repeated checks found the gate open. Developer talking to building associated with this breeze-way about a self-locking gate to control re parking on 85th.
 - Re Load-in, Load-out for residents plus package delivery update: Working on trying to get loading zone approved on Manchester, just west of parking entrance. Difficult due to bike lane allowance. Trying to find out where loading zones exist with bike lanes. There doesn't seem to be code, seems more like an interpretation of staff. Will talk to CD11 office for help gaining clarity, relief, conclusion re this issue.
- Visual Study / Rendering Results (Drone imaging + photo realistic site and building renderings, including Jiffy Lube)
 - View of building looking from 85th Street; 2 stories higher than the neighboring apartment building. Feels proposed building "doesn't tower over it too much." And location on the roof (elbow of the L-shaped building) is not accessible, not part of roof deck design; therefore residents not easily about to view into adjacent R1 properties on 85th.
 - Photo realistic rendering > no balconies with people sitting outside. Windows recessed. Happy to take comments re color scheme, etc.
 - Photos taken by drone to capture views from roof decks of proposed building.
 - Manchester roof deck / SOUTH > CVS parking lot.
 - Manchester roof deck / WEST > solar panels on the other apartment roof.
 - Sepulveda deck / NORTH > neighbor apartment building's solar panels.
 - Sepulveda Deck / EAST > neighboring apartment building's roof.

Related Documents - see attached: PDF of images shared during meeting.

Committee Discussion

Alan Quon: what about doing some community outreach to residents in R1 across Sepulveda, next to the Medical Building?

Tanner Blackman: will consider.

Don Hellwig: urge you to pursue more parking spaces; can't imagine renting and not being able to park the car.

Tanner Blackman: several points of view re the de-coupling of housing and parking allowed in TOC and Density Bonus programs. Lived in the city for 5 years without a car and resented having to pay for parking in the building he wasn't using.

Joan Trimble: same comment from last time: how are emergency services going to access the building with just one entrance? Concern about good access from Sepulveda side (lobby). Oddly shaped building when considering emergency access.

Tanner Blackman: completed review of access with public agencies; LAFD has signed off. Not 100% sure where LAFD would stage and will try to prepare an exhibit of this for next presentation. But assuming they'd park in Jiffy Lube lot.

Responses to questions from Patricia Lyon

- Retail dedicated spaces = 2.
- Code does not require parking spaces be dedicated for leasing office visitors; none dedicated for this purpose.
- In compliance with requirements for handicap parking spaces.

Patricia Lyon: Kentwood Home Guardians has a requirement for a pitched roof. This came up with the previous application who was also trying to buy and build. They were asked to redesign the structure with a pitched roof. Are you prepared to re-design to comply with HOA? I checked with KHG and asked if they were ok with flat roof. Answer was no. We comply with city requirements and we don't disrespect the HOA requests. Please address in next presentation.

Tanner Blackman: Roof line issue did come up in planning committee but it didn't come up on the full board. Implied it didn't come up at Board because it's commercial. But believe it will come up again. We'd prefer not to add gable roof, but if we have to we will.

Patricia Lyon: Concerned about 85th St access and your building's impact on R1 residents. In ad hoc checks we did, the cat walk gate was wide open.

- Noted Garrett Smith went by 3 times, gate was open on Manchester side. Patricia Lyon went by 3 times, gate was open on 85th.
- The local lore: people thought it was supposed to be unlocked so the previous new building (apartment) wouldn't inhibit neighbors from walking through. We should assume your residents will park on 85th and that's a problem. Right now the neighborhood thinks they get to walk through. Concerned the neighbors will be in your face if there's parking on 85th.
- Preferential parking is a priority at the developer's expense until there's a cooling off.

Tanner Blackman: we are hearing feedback both ways. If people can walk through, guests of residents in our proposed building will park and come through. Then hear from residents on 85th they want to keep the gate open.

Patricia Lyon: please nail it down with neighbors: what do they want? If cat walk open = yes, then the developer needs to pursue preferential parking. If cat walk open = no, then get gates with pass key or code.

Patricia Lyon: Roof decks: for aesthetics or marketing?

Tanner Blackman: given how tight the site is, have a little bit of set-back from residential, and no space to put required open space. Roof desks are included to meeting the bulk of the requirement for open space on the project.

7: Discussion & Possible Action Item - 5529 Manchester (aka Public Storage)

Background - Second discussion by PLUC. Proposal for project to demolish 4,150 sq ft of existing retail due to lost visibility, resulting from concrete block wall built for Metro Extension. Proposed project would retain approximately 24,041 sq ft of retail and will add approximately 73,674 of self-storage in a 7-story building adjacent to Metro Extension. Total land area is approximately 65,171.

Presenter(s) - None.

Related Documents - None.

Public Comment - None.

Committee Discussion

Patricia Lyons

- Recap of situation: Shopping center with 4 retail buildings. One building the developer wants to demo and wants to contract with storage operator to build large building. In addition, its' a new property adjacent to Metro stop, this is great opportunity to do something good in terms of mixed use with residential. Would require a zone change.
- Meeting with CD11: Councilman confirmed his opinion that public storage is not community serving and usually not aesthetically pleasing. However, Councilman would consider the potential zone change so as time goes by the developer could work through getting to mixed use, get better tenants. (Currently not prime retail. Issues of illegal operating practices, etc.)
- Westchester Neighborhood Association outreached to Patricia Lyon, saying "this needs to be something else."
- Developer outreach: have gone back to the developer and his rep 3-5 times. Applicant said he couldn't pursue the trade of approval for public storage in exchange for support with zoning change and mixed use residential development. Said he could not afford to do it. Asked developer to come back to talk to Committee. Applicant declined. Also asked the developer to outreach to adjacent owners (Drollinger and ANR). No outreach was done, per reps from both companies.
- Can't in good conscious put this use on that site so close to transit. Real disappointment.
- Looking for Committee input and possible motion.

Added to the record for reference, email report from committee member Kimberly Fox to the chair:

Michael Gonzales Call Notes

On Tue, Nov 21, 2017 at 10:13 AM, Kimberly Fox wrote:

Hi Pat – Michael G called me this a.m. and said the following. Just wanted to report it in, so there's a record of this.

His client is out of town and Michael himself has a conflicting CD meeting, so can't attend. But to the larger questions:

Rezoning the rest of the land to R-X

- They can't do it themselves, because if they do, it makes them subject to JJJ which allows for certain affordable units.
- How he sees that playing out: they go for zone + general plan change. Triggers JJJ which already specifies a set-aside allowance for density. But it's unclear (because no one has tried this yet since JJJ came in) whether they would be allowed to ask for more density than that per the TOC ordinance or other planning options for density.
- Also, could "get the accused under CEQA (?) of piece-mealing" (I guess that's a bad thing?) and they don't want to trigger that possible liability either.
- Better path (per Michael): CD11 leads the charge on getting the land rezoned, as part of a larger Council district push to proactively encourage residential near the new Metro stop.

(He cited another district where this is happening...I didn't get the note on who.) [Although I don't like his client, I can see the value of this...]

- If CD11 wanted to lead the charge in converting some of the "M" stuff around Metro stop to "R" his client would publicly support this. He's just not willing to state publicly at this time (in a PLUC meeting) that they're committed to residential. Too many risk variables.

I asked him a technical question about the TOC rules vs JJJ...specifically the TOC's language about allowing an underlying Public Utility easement to be grandfathered in to an adjacent zone category.

- He hadn't looked at it.
- In real time on the call, he pulled up the TOC ordinance and traced the referenced code back.
- Ends up that the sewer line doesn't qualify for this, per the TOC language (so maybe we don't need Tricia to answer that any more?) As a sewer main doesn't fall into the right public facility category as indicated in the TOC language.
- But he did say (again in the call as he has said before) that the client is open to creative space planning around that.
- In general the big gotcha for the client is can they get enough density to make the project pencil out financially? And since the JJJ vs TOC situation hasn't been tested, the client isn't willing to go on record with a housing commitment.

MOTION to deny support for this project. Confirm in motion that:

1. The Planning and Land Use Committee is open to collaboration with the developer for future use of the property as Transit-Oriented-Community housing.
 2. The Committee wants the developer to be successful in his business venture, but do not see the proposed public storage project as doing anything positive for the community.
- Moved by: Alan Quon. Seconded: Joan Trimble
 - Motion to deny support passed unanimously.

8: Discussion & Action Item - Ballona Wetlands pending Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Background - Second discussion by PLUC. Placed on agenda to put together an NC response to the DEIR. The Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve Restoration Draft Environmental Review public review process is currently underway and deadline for comment has been extended to February 5, 2018. Discussion re options for supporting this community review process.

Presenter(s) - None.

Related Documents - None.

Public Comment

Marcia Hanscom: resident of Playa Del Rel, plus part of Ballona Institute and Sierra Club. Questioned validity of presenting organization for DEIR in previous PLUC meeting. Confirmed her groups been following the process for 5 years, attending all the technical meetings. Asked the NC to request an extension to March 24th, a full 180 days since draft came out. Confirmed Janice Han's CD and City of Santa Monica also pushing for this extension. Believes the proposal provides no good alternative, will create "as much heart-ache" as the safe streets project in terms of impact, and is not restoration project but huge construction project.

Mel Light: Homeowner in MDR. Supports extended time to review DEIR. Agrees as restoration, it's actually a construction project with significant impact for many years.

Marianne Tyler: lives on W 81st in PDR; lived in the community for 20 years. Very familiar with Ballona wetlands, finds proposed plan deeply disturbing. Many concern about impact on animal life at the site and

referenced mass animal displacement during construction of Playa Vista. Agrees with and repeats request to advocate for extended review to full 180 days (March 24th).

Bruce Campbell: Been commenting on wetlands since 1985. Knew the main founder of Heal the Bay Dorothy Greene (org that chose to stay out of the wetlands restoration project.) Notes Greene would “turn in her grave” before supporting this “bulldozer disturbance project.” Noted threats to native species, site disturbance, herbicide usage and potential for natural gas storage facility negative impact.

Robert Roy Van De Hoek: Resident than PDR since 2003 and biologist. Notes the volume of information in DEIR and calls out concern re inaccuracies. Concerned about keeping the eco-system intact and disturbance of bulldozing and losing habitat. Supports request to CD11 and NC to ask for more time to review.

Jim Kennedy: Has lived in PDR for several years and part of a coalition of 15 environmental groups looking at option 1 or 2 in terms of supporting action. Notes the scientific process over many decades to evaluate site condition and options. Notes any decision will be fraught and likelihood no decision will be perfect. But believes the site needs restoration. Strategy needs to be informed by science and take into account the urban surrounding areas. Notes the site is a “state treasure” which plays a part in supporting a whole chain of coastal wetlands and “needs work.”

Committee Discussion

Points by Patricia Lyon

- On the PLUC agenda because this is a land use question. Community responsibility on vetting this is critical. Every single organization has an opportunity to write their comments. And NC needs to evaluate and take a position. Critically important and complicated. But important thing is preservation of life, quality of life in the community.
- Question of how to operationalist this process; create small working group?
- Does this Committee want to write a letter for an extension?

No motion; possible actions discussed:

1. Working group members: Confirmed thus far, Kimberly Fox would participate but not lead. Patricia herself will participate. Joan Trimble to check to see if she can participate, given personal work load.
2. Support adding NC to list of community organizations requesting further extension to March 24th.
3. Check with Councilman re his office’s position re project; then push to get letter from NC Board in December.

9: Previous Committee Action Updates

- **Home Sharing Ordinance > WRAC committee / UPDATE:** confirmed the NCPW position on this draft ordinance is posted on WRAC website, along with NCPW Community Impact Statement. Noted PLUM is pushing for further study, and there’s tremendous “systems” pressure for closure on this controversial draft ordinance.
- **Sidewalk Improvement Requirement tied to Building Permitting / UPDATE:** Committee schedule to pursue follow-up with Building and Safety Dept as of Dec 1, 2017.
- **Planning Inquiry: NCWP - where in queue re Community Plan / UPDATE:** no action; awaiting copy of NC Board letter from PLUC motion to use as part of follow-up.

10: Announcements

- Confirmation PLUC’s December meeting will happen as scheduled on 12/19/17.

11: Meeting Adjourned - 9:52pm

[end]