

**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, August 21, 2018 - 6:30pm

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

In Attendance: Quon, Voss, Hellwig, Smith, Trimble, Fox, Lyon, Gerez, Hensch

Excused: Oliver

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

Item 2: Minutes Review and Approval - 17 July 2018 meeting minutes

Discussion: Directed secretary to amend draft prior to finalizing > correct Helwig attendance detail (not a late arrival).

M/S: Trimble/Smith

Vote: Passed as amended - Unanimous Voice Vote

Item 3: Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speaker: Mike Davison / 8033 Denrock Ave, 90045

Presentation Highlights:

- Concerned about Lot 87, 6514 Kentwood Bluffs Drive.
- Community Plan designates location as a viewpoint.
- Permit applications submitted: 2006 and 2011 to build pool at that location. 2009 permit to grade the lot.
- Same City building inspector—Frank Lara—and no enforcement of Community Plan.
- Asking PLUC to take action.

Related documents

- Davison's letter re history of Lot 87 and current concerns
- Site photos
- Copy of CF-89-0549
- LADBS Customer Service Requests 370424, 347795

Committee discussion:

Issue being referred to CD11 Westchester Office Field Deputy Matt Teclé. Issue of concern is a City Council-level issue, not dealt with at the NC level.

Also recommended getting in touch with Debbie Dyner Harris, formerly a CD11 staff member who would have history on the issue, and is currently working in CD5.

Committee Action: None required.

Item 4: Informational / Traffic Studies; how are they developed and evaluated?

Background - Mr. Hirsch will join us to discuss Traffic Studies and how the City and the Developers look at the impact to communities. We will review and discuss the parameters that define the rating of an intersection and where, when and how accommodations are made to projects and traffic.

Presenter(s): Ron Hirsch, Principal Partner, Hirsch/Green Transportation Consulting, Inc.

Introduction by Committee Chair (highlights)

- Both Chair and CD11 staff have worked for 5 months to secure DOT staff presentation on topic without success (no staff available for after-hours meeting presentation).
- Presenter invited to help educate community, answer the larger question: "How did they approve that?!"
- Presenter's firm has presented to CD11 and other NC groups on traffic studies for years; is long-time Westchester resident, also a stakeholder in the NC community.

Presenter Highlights (30 minutes)

- Licensed traffic engineering in State of California for "almost 30 years"
- Purpose of study: triggered by proposed project, review existing and projected conditions in the area re circulate and roadways.
- Perception that developer fees paid skew results; actually, tightly controlled process.
- Other cities: contract traffic consultants. Los Angeles: developer-paid studies prepared in consultation with City DOT.

Traffic studies themselves

- What is it? Designed to look at existing and forecast conditions in an area, usually triggered by a proposed project. Evaluate impacts on area circulate and roadways.
- Key point: perception – because the City of LA, developers hire traffic consultants to do the study. Perception that because the developer has \$\$ in it, so those studies are squewed in the developers favor.
- In fact, tightly controlled process.

Process

- Developer initiates, traffic consultant gathers info (project specs), develop preliminary scope of study
- Meet with DOT, share info, collaborative ID the actual scope of the study and what kinds of assumptions and methodologies to use for the process.
- Basis of assumptions: DOT Transportation Study Policies and Procedures: very specific about methodology.
- Back to DOT as draft; page-by-page, worksheet-by-worksheet review.
- DOT can sign-off or ask for revisions.

Other Points

- When significant impacts are ID'd by study, developer is required to install some sort of mitigation. Unfortunately, most of the streets and intersections are fully developed – no room to add a lane, etc. Signals also tend to be maximized to their efficiency.
- A few years ago, DOT completed implementation of Automated Traffic Signal and Control system. And they have a software update to that: Adaptive Traffic Control, real-time signalization control and variation on all intersections within the LADOT geography. "So not a lot of things we can do to improve an intersection."

Note: More complete tough transcript available upon request from Committee Secretary.

Committee Discussion Points

- Previous credits on Project A applied to new project (B)
- Are other municipalities (e.g., Culver City) are more aggressive re mitigation demands
- When reading traffic study, top 3-4 items to “zero in” on?
- How often parameters / standards change, per SAG and LA-DOT requirements.
- Timing for closing date on traffic study relative to new project applications filed in same traffic zone.
- LAX future development: factored in to today’s studies?
- Under-parked (density bonus) projects: is there a correlation between the missing spaces (under parked) and trip generation formula?
- Ambient traffic standard and how it’s formulated, factoring in new infill types, like accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

Committee Action: none required.

Item 5: Informational / Community Plan Update; what is the Community Plan Update process (CPU)?

Background - Westchester Playa Community Plan Update Team assigned to CD11 from the Los Angeles City Planning Department will join us for an in depth presentation on the CPU process, timeline and outreach strategies for development of a broad based Community Committee to involve Stakeholders from all areas and interests of our Community.

Presenter(s): Jonathan Hershey, Senior City Planner
Melissa Alofaituli, Comm Plan Update Process Facilitator
Emily Gable, Project Manager for Westchester-Playa

Presenter Highlights

- Importance of community participation: success or failure of the plan hinges on broadest, most comprehensive participation by the community.
- Key deliverables by the end: Plan text, land use map, zone in for each property, environmental review.
- Review main components, timeline of update process.
- Target completion by 2020.
- Wish to include post-mortem analysis of projects that went well or went wrong as community looks ahead.
- Zoning an important (and difficult) working process, important to the updated plan. Provides mechanism for “base and bonus” terms re incentives allowed for affordable / density projects so community creates parameters.
- Community definition of “over-development.” (Density, traffic, form, etc.)
- Definition of policies: Residential (single & multi-family), commercial (types of uses to encourage, discourage), industrial (negative or positive impact).

Related Documents: Planning Process Promotional Flyers

Public Comment: none.

Committee Discussion

Community outreach brainstorming

- Organizations (many)

- Annual events
- Newsletters, local papers.

Process Points / Concerns

- Expecting planning team to listen to community: resumption of policy of “planning for more” as an assumption versus truly listening to the
- Height an important issue in community as well re “sculpting” new planning.
- Issue of “future proofing” to protect the community from intervention of state law trumping local plan. SB1818 impact discussion: incentives as presumed *necessary* versus *given* on developer demonstration of economic need.
- Resolution of un-intentional policy conflicts: e.g., mandate for affordable housing versus AirBnB / short term rental policy.
- Question of goals / forecasts re what communities need to absorb re additional / affordable housing.
- Issues of rent control, and where it’s applied (e.g., older buildings versus newer ADUs).
- Request someone in from re:codeLA to provide tutorial re their process, timeline, etc (e.g., Sharon Comings)
- Request for initiating a community meeting to review 2004 Community Plan, review what didn’t work and what we want to look forward.

Possible Committee Action: Motion to detail approach to develop a Community Committee in coordination with the Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa which will work with the LA City Planning team.

Item 6: Discussion / Community Plan Update; Next Steps to move forward on Community Plan Update

Background - Review 2004 Community Plan Update (CPU) and dialogue with Stakeholders who were involved in the past to understand criteria and approach

- Public Comment: None
- Committee Discussion: Referred next steps to NC Board President

Item 7: Announcements

Next PLUC meeting: September 13, 2018

Item 8: Meeting Adjourned