

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved

Committee: Planning and Land Use Committee

Chairperson: Patricia Lyon

Meeting Date: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 - 6:30pm

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

Attending: Don Helwig, Joan, Kimberly, Patricia, Dave Oliver, Garrett Smith, Paula Gerez

Excused Absent: Alan Quon

Unexcused Absent: David Voss

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

Intro: Mark Redick, from VP of NC Board and Head of Government Relations committee

Intro: Len Nguyen - CD 11 Planning Deputy

Item 2: Minutes Review and Approval - 20 February 2018 meeting minutes.

Move: Dave Oliver

Second: Hellwig

Voice Vote: Approved

Item 3: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Naomi Waka

Acknowledged committee's hard work.

Re: Caladan project @ 8521 S Sepulveda

Disappointed the USPS has not yet assigned an address.

Disappointed to learn the developer's presenter works for same public affairs company as the NC Board Member who had to recuse himself from voting at that level.

Disappointed re why/how CIM (La Tijera @ Sepulveda Eastway) conditions were not honored. .

Has an informal count of 1640 apartments added in the NC area to date, not counting the 775 units coming in Culver City near Sepulveda & Centinela intersection.

Not personally anti-development, but no denying the traffic and resources impact develop is/will have on the community.

Requests a more strategic approach to planning, considering the parcel's context.

"Though a project may meet the letter of the law, let's continue to engage the developer for a better product to maintain our community's quality of life."

Cathy Mertens - 84th Place

Expressed concerns re 8521 S. Sepulveda (Grinder/Caladan)

Requests becoming more aggressive re responding to proposals, changing face of the neighborhood. Won't just lose environment, but lose ability to move around.

Need to address where we are right now, start being more aggressive with the City, State.

No parking, more units (density) on pretext of small % of low income apartments not a justification.

Don't understand why you were bending over backwards to give them things.

Neighbors > don't see why they (8521 S. Sepulveda) can take over public space for loading.

Predicts an ncrease in potential for accidents

Don't think we should be encouraging these projects.

Len Nyugen - 138 Culver Blvd, statement from Mike Bonin

Strongly believes the Planning decision of 3/16/18 is wrong.

"There's likely some sort of project at this location, and this one is not it. Too tall, out of character of beach feel of PDR."

CD11 reviewing, working closely with community leaders to challenge this.

Committee Discussion

- Lyon / PLUC may have special meeting re 138 Culver; issue end up on that agenda to determine PLUC support
- Smith / Understand it's proposed that alley going to be vacated by city. Concerned and will review documents.

Item 4: Informational / Update re Sign Ordinance Revision [Council File 11-1705]

Background - The Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) committee of the LA City Council has been working since 2011 on a revision of the Sign Ordinance. The last major update was November 2006, and many things have changed since then, not the least of which is the advent of (highly profitable) digital billboards. There is concern about the outdoor advertising industry driving the new regulations, which have the potential to significantly expand permissible display advertising.

Note: if you'd like to comment on the current Sign Ordinance, send an e-mail to the PLUM assistant: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org and ask them to add your message to the public record in Council File 11-1705.

Presenter(s) - Kimberly Fox, PLUC secretary

- See Addendum file for overview report provided to Committee.

Related Documents - see the Council File for more information.

Public Comment - none.

Committee Discussion

- Noted issues of HHLA remodeling and potential for freeway signage blight
- Discussion of placing issue on future agenda and inviting a speaker to give tutorial on legislative situation.

Item 5: Action / 6711 S. Sepulveda

Background - Second presentation to PLUC. Project includes a new residential 180-unit apartment building with 210 parking spaces and 15 units reserved for Very Low Income households. Presentation will respond to questions from January 2018 meeting regarding building height and project access (ingress/egress).

Presenter(s): Dana Sayles, AICP of threeSixty (Developer's representative) and Andrew Willrodt, PE of Fuscoe Engineering (civil engineer).

Responding to previous requests from PLUC, addressing issues of traffic, egress, safety / prevention. Noted no height limit in this area.

- **LOADING, TRASH:** All contained within the project footprint
- **BUILDING HEIGHT:** relative to adjacent 6733 S. Sepulveda project (Sandstone), Hanover building is 10" higher in absolute height by grade change effects appearance, perspective. (Little visual negative impact)
- **ARIZONA IMPROVEMENTS:** Question of dedication/improvement of Arizona for second ingress/egress: Actual slope 17-19% (greater than the max slope allowable of 15%). Also, per City case from 1971, prohibited to improve Arizona; ruled as "no access allowed"
- **TRAFFIC:** memo of understanding ok'd by LADOT and Culver City. Studied impacts across 15 intersections (some in LA, some in Culver City). Greatest impact @ Centinela and Sepulveda. Developer paying Culver City \$50K to improve intersection functionality via signals, re-striping, detection equipment). Noted Culver City is 2x "more stringent" on traffic requirements than Los Angeles.

IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED

- **DRIVEWAY ISLAND:** added to further inhibit dangerous Left-Out, Left-In turns. Project limited to Right-In, Right-Out only.
- **DELINEATORS:** in discussion with DOT re getting delineators installed all the way down Sepulveda towards Centinela.

ENTITLEMENT REQUESTS

- 33% increased density (180 apartments total; 15 units dedicated to
- Floor Area Ratio of 3:1 in lieu of 1.5:1
- 20% decrease in open space allowance
- Waiver of Dedication / Improvements along Arizona (in any case, not allowed, but still technically on the books as a street).

Public Comment

Stacy Travis - Against.

- Significant concern re traffic impacts; cited problems with current traffic back-ups and dangerous ingress/egress turns into various businesses already along Sepulveda to Centinela.
- Current traffic conditions do not yet reflect additional burden of both Sandstone project not yet broken ground (6733) plus this project.
- Traffic flow difficulties at 76th currently, before these two 6700-block buildings come online.

Dana Grey - Against.

- As a homeowner in Westchester, traffic has become ridiculous going down.
- Intersections will be F after this project.
- 76th and Sepulveda intersection very difficult now.
- Westchester has "done its fair share" re new housing on La Tijera and at Howard Hughes.

Committee Discussion

- Hellwig / Where are residents going to turn around to go North on Sepulveda? **Presenter:** U turn at Teal at Doubletree. Or exit property, right into Center drive and go north, or onto HH on-ramp for N or S 405.
- Fox / Can accessory “boxes” on the roof be minimized, to keep total effective height down? **Presenter:** stairwells can be done. “We can’t figure out how Sandstone can legally be doing elevator sheds for roof access that are not taller than the parapet.” Confirmed mechanical on the roof. Stated must have elevator go to the top floor with slight over-run = 5” above the roof line; parapet is at 3’. Can agree to keep stair well over-runs on roof down below parapet height. Can agree to elevator shafts kept to minimum height possible.
- Oliver / Against project. Current traffic conditions highly impacted, without new buildings. Density bonus - no. Traffic implication - no.
- Len Nyugen (CD11) Comment / DOT reviews each project on a case by case basis. The way LADOC review is designed: the traffic expected to be generated by this project is mitigated. LADOT does not require applicant to solve all the pre-existing traffic issues. Possible to implement delineators separately from this project.
- Lyon / Noted future Committee action: invite DOT to present at Committee on methodology.
- Lyon / DOT’s position: intersection is already an F so “can’t get any better.” Also, is SB1818 project so density bonus incentives are eligible. Owner has stakeholder rights, project likely to win City approval. Committee’s work: trying to balance how we make it right for *all* stakeholders.
- Smith / Pass on commenting.
- Gerez / Against. Agree with Oliver. Also: systemic question re when system of LADOT traffic analysis was last reviewed? Not engaging with real impacts. [Len Nyugen committed to investigate answer.]

Committee Action

Motion by Fox:

Support with conditions:

- Agree to Entitlements requested.
- Developer minimizes roof top accessory structures to as close to parapet height as is legally possible.
- Developer works with other stakeholders and LADOT on installing delineators between two signals (Center Drive to Centinela)
- Installation of driveway “porkchop” island as illustrated to protect against illegal ingress/egress.

Second: Joan Trimble

Trimble / Community experiencing the crash of transportation and housing issues. Developer’s by-right build has same traffic impact and they can build by-right. Hear people’s concerns; doesn’t believe in context this project makes a huge difference on traffic. No growth isn’t possible.

Vote:

In Favor: Trimble, Fox (2)

Against: Hellwig, Oliver, Smith, Gerez (4)

Motion denied.

Item 6: Informational / 6601 & 6603 Ocean Front Walk

Background - First presentation to PLUC. Property owners propose Removal of existing 2-story 2-unit residential structure with attached garage and construction of new 3-story plus basement and roof deck (no roof access structure) 2-unit residential structure with attached garage. Property owners currently occupying the top unit as a second home and as future occupants.

Presenter(s): Austin Peters, architect and Ramesh & Seema Arora, property owners

- Have applied for both LA Coastal Development and Housing permits.
- Application deemed complete.
- Not yet applied to State for State Coastal Development permit. (Happens once LA Coastal Development permit is closed.)
- Proposal: building in compliance with code and parking requirements.
- Ownership of the property for 10 years, aim to convert it for purposes of retirement for themselves plus second unit for family member.

Related Documents - Provided at meeting: see Addendum (Plan overview including photo-realistic exterior rendering.)

Public Comment

Kathy Schwertfeger - For Project

- Cited owner/developers investment in design that “respects the quaintness of community.”
- Reviewed relative to line-by-line compliance requirements with Del Rey Plan.
- Exceeds City’s municipal coastal beach requirements on parking.
- Noted owner’s request for variance on side yard and supports this request

Committee Discussion

- Lyon / If hearing date to be confirmed, asked that applicant comply with NC process before start hearing process.
- Smith / For. Relief re project’s focus on Specific Plan compliance. Any intention for AirBnB? Owner: No - keeping the lower unit for family use.
- Gerez / Beautiful project. For.
- Oliver / For. “Wish I could visit!”
- Fox / This application a case history in working within community requirements.
- Lyon / Applicant has been responsive to compliance and PLUC.
- Hellwig / Like it.
- Trimble / “Welcome to Playa Del Rey”

Committee Action

- Lyon / No committee action this meeting. Next presentation: provide a timeline for construction and specific request for easement variance. Peters / 100% compliant with City of LA. Requesting two actions: side yard reduction and change in set-back. Specifically: Southern side matches the existing building (no change requested.) 3 story set-back would be 4’ and requesting kept at 3’. North side: requesting 2’ setback, 10” from the code setback.

- Lyon / Any call outs from LA Housing Dept re compliance on lose of 2 duplex units? Peters / “Monumental challenge getting through.” The challenge: providing the kind of documentation “that almost doesn’t exist.” Were issued a determination letter that neither unit was determined to be not affordable.

Item 7: Action / 5711 W 74th Street - Creative Explorers Conditional Use Permit Request

Background - Fifth presentation to PLUC. Seeking support to obtain CUP for full-time daycare in R1 home.

Presenter(s): Christopher Burt of Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP - pro bono attorney representing applicants Mary and Stephen De La Rosa

- For details of presentation points, refer to Legal Counsel’s points in favor of project approval in ADDENDUM
- Presentation Summary: proposal provides important benefits, little to no impact, overwhelming support from immediate neighbors.

Related Documents: Presented at meeting. (To review, see meeting Addendum file.)

- Legal Counsel Letter to Committee (7.1)
- Community Support Map (7.2)
- Letters / Emails of Support (7.3)
- Neighborhood Contact Sheet Signatures (7.4)
- USPS Parking Agreement (7/5)

Public Comment

Naomi Trotter / Supports proposal.

Lives on 74th and Airport Blvd. Visited the child care program. Doesn’t see negative impact.

Margie Hanson / Supports proposal.

Ran a pre-school mentoring program for 10 years; quality pre-school experience has significant developmental benefits. Not enough pre-school in Westchester. Proposal possibly a model for Westchester re important family services.

Jenny DePaulo / Supports proposal.

Immediate neighbor across the street. “Having a couple more spots is fabulous” for children, local families.

Sale Lilly / Supports proposal.

Considers current school “a real treasure.” Legal requirements are met. Significant issues with long waiting lists for quality child care.

Naiomi Waka / Against proposal.

Appreciates difficulty finding quality day care and “no question their daycare is excellent.” However, primary concern is R1 zoning, introducing larger program, operating family leaves the home, and this changes nature of the area. Not comfortable with proposal “in light of other development going on.”

Stacy Travis / Against proposal.

Concerned re pick-up and drop-off issues with increased child care center enrollment. Worried about approval of this case leading to “flood gates opening” re new businesses in R1 zone.

Teresa Ohanlon / Against proposal.

Was not surveyed, concerned her house is marked as “approve” on consensus map. Concern about children outdoors so close to freeway (health implications.)

Grace Yao / Supports proposal.

Disclosure: member of Board of Directors of NC. Permitting this use for one house won't “plunge us into housing crisis.” Stakeholders and neighbors are supportive. Asks committee to “look beyond hypothetical.” Focus on real impacts (if any) and assess how change will practically, realistically impact neighbors.

Committee Discussion

- Gerez / Passed on commenting.
- Smith / Is the lease signed for the parking? Applicant: Have the agreement, hasn't been officially signed.
- Smith / How long is the agreement for? Applicant: Year-to-year lease. Mary. Discussed that this could be a condition of the CUP.
- Smith / If we agree to go forward, what happens to the agreement on the land?
- Lyon / CUP stays with the land. The title of the land holds the CUP to allow another operator come in.
- Len Nyugen (CD11) Comment: there are some cases, where conditions can be added to limit a grant for review. “If you have doubt about long term, do a review and limit the grant.”
- Smith / If we give the ok and Planning gives the ok, not sure.
- Applicant's Attorney / CUP attaches to the land; will expire within 1 year window if new owner doesn't open daycare.
- Smith / Reservations re asking for entitlements so owner can turn around and sell.
- Applicant's Attorney / This is not a development project like 6711 S. Sepulveda. Not a hot market for child care units. If applicant turned around and sold the home, she'd no longer have a CUP to do it in other property.
- Smith / Not a person in the room that doesn't love the De La Rosa's. It's a land use issue.
- Oliver / Lives on 74th. Feels R1 under attack from all sides. “Has nothing to do with whether the De La Rosas runs a good shop or not. They're going to almost double the # of kids.” Concerned re traffic, “kids getting hurt.” Prefer operation stay as currently structured as does not create additional impact. Position: no on CUP request.
- Fox / Operator placed under stringent requirements. Community has expressed support. Agree with Oliver feels like community is under attack with multi-family dwellings development explosion. But see this as a “tiny, incremental good.”
- Trimble / Negative impact comes from not allowing more children into the program. Driveway allows safe drop off and pick-up. Doesn't view this as problematic precedent.
- Joan / See negative impact = she's not allowed to add kids. There's a driveway and the kids are dropped in the driveway. Doesn't see “huge safety issue.” Re question of setting precedent: every application requires analysis of adverse effect; Committee can always say no, due to impact on adjacent properties. barrier for additional allowances for other businesses would be a decision re adverse impact to adjacent neighbors. There's overwhelming support.
- Hellwig / Safety concerns re traffic, drop-off and pick-up. Can see the real community need for the service. However, R1 with family in residence. Don't anticipate this type of proposal replicated all over the community. (Too hard to get space and qualify.) Can see both sides of the argument.
- Lyon / Concerns re airport Post Office closing, increased activity coming at La Tijera Post Office. so La Tijera PO will be the main facility. Worried about security of parking in this case. Requests to see signed contract.
- Lyon / Some confusion re realtor claimed by Applicant as still working on finding alternative space. Applicant: confirmed this person remains engagement because they require a “plan B” for space if the CUP is not granted.
- Gerez / Post Office has 30-day notice terms. What's the parking Back-up plan? Applicant: will have to find alternative parking.

- Lyons / Unusual case, land use issue. R1 zone, CUP for fulltime daycare business where owner-operators would no longer be residing in the home. CUP sits with title of the property. No question that they don't run a great operation, there's a need for the service. 95% letters about good program and high need.

Committee Action

Motion from Smith

Support the project with conditions:

- If Post Office parking is revoked, the CUP permit is removed.
- Confirm 5 places for the 5 employees re Post Office parking agreement.

Second: Trimble

Applicant Attorney / Noted if operation loses its offsite parking agreement, they automatically lose their right to operate.

Lyon / Add the condition: applicant amends Post Office parking agreement to 90 days notice.

Vote on Motion:

Yes - Trimble, Fox, Smith (3)

No - Oliver (1)

Abstain - Hellwig, Gerez (2)

Outcome: Split decision.

Item 10: Announcements

Special PLUC meeting - Legislative Review

Ethics training (1x every 2 years)

Next PLUC meeting: April 17, 2018

Note: Chair skipped this item as meeting was running long.

Item 11: Meeting Adjourned

###