Minutes for Approval

Committee: Planning and Land Use Committee  
Chairperson: Patricia Lyon  
Meeting Date: Tuesday, February 19, 2018 - 6:30pm  
Meeting Place: Westchester Municipal Building Community Room / 7166 W Manchester Avenue, Westchester, CA 90045

Attendance  
Present / Quon, Oliver, Smith, Trimble, Fox, Gerez, Lyon  
Absent / Excused: Voss, Hellwig

Item 1: Welcome and Introduction

Item 2: Minutes Review and Approval – for meeting on 29 November 2019  
M/S Trimble / Gerez  
Vote: passed, unanimous voice vote.

Item 3: Action / 6080 W. Center Drive (Hughes Café) [ZA-2018-6665-CUB]

Background – First presentation to PLUC. A Conditional Use Permit to allow the sale and dispensing of a full line of alcoholic beverages for on-site consumption in conjunction with the operation of a 6,050 square-foot restaurant with 178 seats (including interior and patio dining area). Hours of operation from 6 am – 2 am, daily.

Presenters:
• Margaret Taylor, Apex LA, representing the restauranteur  
• Nick Browne – EQ Office, owner of Howard Hughes Office Buildings on Center Drive (rebranded “Playa District”)  
• Med Abrous – Restauranteur (three other operations: Winsome, Genghis Cohen, Spare Room (cocktail bar) in Roosevelt Hotel.

Related Documents: Project overview including map, sample menu, restaurant floor plan.  
(Provided at meeting)

Public Comment
Cord Thomas – 90045 / Buffalo Wild Wings, Dave and Buster seem to close at 1am. Conceived a business open until 2am would be attractive as a “last port of call “for patrons coming out of Wild Wings or Dave and Busters.

Presentation Highlights
• Howard Hughes Campus Center (office buildings opposite remodeled HHLA) upgrading in general to have strong proposal for tenants. Therefore, looking to upgrade hospitality element of total office campus environment.
• Campus Center owners selected this particular restauranteur as proven partner they believe can succeed.
• Restaurant format: self-service plus “quick serve” (counter order, food brought to the table). Indoor and outdoor seating. Emphasis on fine quality, farm-to-table food offerings.
• Restauranteur stated the operation is “food quality first” with the intent to work with local farm suppliers. In addition, a wine program that’s unique (“curated”) to emphasize natural wines, biodynamic wines, matched carefully to the food program.
• Hours requested for 2am daily closing. Restauranteur stated late night bar is not the character of use. Will likely be closing at 7pm, that closing time will be dedicated by presence of office professionals and/or students. Applying for late hour so they don’t have to re-apply for CUB if operating terms change to respond to changing needs of student population attending late-closing courses.

Committee Discussion

Q: see you’re asking for early morning hours (6am) What time does the mall open, everyone else?
   Browne / If our tenants aren’t showing up at 6am then they won’t open that early.
   Probably more like 7am.

Q: Since construction began on new housing and HHLA, have both night school students and construction workers avoiding paying for parking, using 74th street instead. Very disrespectful behavior: arriving at 6am, gathering to talk and disturb residents, changing clothes in the street, blocking driveways. So difficult, neighbors working on securing permitted parking on 74th at Sepulveda. Want to confirm there’s a caveat, a commitment that employees, construction workers must park on campus.
   Browne / Own the 6 office buildings, apartments and retail separately owned so can’t control for that. However, wasn’t aware there’s a parking issue in the neighborhood.
   Abrous / Our goal: to be an amenity to the campus.
   Browne / will take to GM re what they’re going to do re parking.

Q: Security plan?
   Browne / Office building campus has 24/7 security. At least 3 guards on at night.
   Spending significantly to renovate the campus. Possible people—especially students—will begin staying later at night, so will be upgrading security staff as needed. Also hoping HHLA will be doing the same.
   Taylor/ Will follow up on parking issue concerns.
   Browne / campus ownership committed to following up on the parking in neighborhood issue, for construction workers, office occupants, professional school students.

Q: Expectations re what % of restaurant patrons come from the office building campus versus other locations (HHLA? New adjacent apartments?)
   Abrous / Expectation: 100% campus, given there are approx. 4000 people there on a daily basis. Initially will be closed on Saturday and Sunday, until there’s demand for weekend service. Restaurant floor plan is designed to be efficient in serving patrons during compressed times (breakfast and lunch for office campus occupants.) Also hoping to cater special meetings, events in the office towers. Will study possibility of delivery as well: to neighborhood, to apartment residents.
Q: If patron is not working on the campus, what’s the plan to accommodate them? E.g., phone order pickup (individuals or services like GrubHub.) Or someone from the neighborhood driving over to dine? Advice: if reputation is good, expect neighbors to walk over and/or park and dine.
   Abrous / If it becomes an issue, will work out a validation system. But haven’t anticipated this issue, very focused now on serving the on-campus population. Would love for sales to go through the roof. But trying to be realistic, focus on role as a campus amenity.

Q: Anticipated staff headcount?
   Abrous / Yet to be determined. Anticipate 2 shifts, morning and afternoon. Most people behind the counter with a few runners. Probably 10-12 people, split into 2 shifts.

Q: What kind of staff training?
   Abrous / All staff go through Safe Serve training. All Bar tenders are BAR Certifieid (highest level). Cited fact that his bar (Spare Room) in Roosevelt Hotel nominated 7 years in a row for excellence and bev erage director named bartender of the year in 2018. Been operating in the beverage industry for a long time, take training very seriously.

Q: Any ABC violations?
   Abrous / Never.

Q: Has Health Department reviewed plan for separate kitchen down the hall? Have they approved?
   Taylor / Yes. Plan has been cleared.

**Committee Action**

Quon / Motion to approve, contingent upon applicant modifying hours to 1am closing time
Second / Smith

Fox / Requesting motion also include requirement for staff training re parking requirements (on-site) and prohibiting employee parking on 74th and including consequences for disregarding this requirement.

Vote: Motion passes as amended.
- For / unanimous voice vote.
- Against / None.
Item 4: Informational / Section 8 Updates [CF 18-0462]

Background – On 8/8/18, the City Council directed the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles to report “in 60 days” regarding options for adjusting the Housing Choice Voucher Program (aka Section 8 vouchers), addressing the issue of 2700 voucher holders who cannot find a place to rent. On 11/16/18 the Housing Authority submitted a report to the Council laying out its study and recommendations regarding amendments to the ordinance for the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Since that time, the report has been sent “back down” to the Council’s Housing Committee for review. And that committee voted to continue the issue at their 1/23/18 meeting. Therefore, to date no Committee or Council action has been taken on the Housing Authority report.

To date, Community Impact Statements and Public Comment have been filed by:
- Los Feliz NC CIS - Whereas it is currently legal in the City of Los Angeles to discriminate against voucher users in the rental market, we of the LFNC support action by the LA City Council, HACLA, and HCID to implement policy and law to rectify that.
- Public Filing by BizFed – Against CF-18-0462 with detailed feedback.
- Public Filing by Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles - Against CF-18-0462 with detailed feedback.

Related Documents:
- Housing Authority Report to City Council 11/16/2018
- BizFed Council File Letter (Public comment 10/23/18)
- AAGLA Council File Letter (Public comment 1/23/19)

Public Comment: None

Presenter: Committee Discussion
- Noted any multi-family residential building with units 2 or greater are subject to LA Housing dept code. Homes that build Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are also subject to LA Housing code – permits, fees, etc.
- Concerned these compliance issues aren’t clear to homeowners adding ADUs.
- Discussion of homeless and minimum wage LAX workers (for example) who’ve qualified for Section 8 vouchers but end up living 40 miles away due to lack of Section 8 housing availability closer to place of employment.
- Discussion of Committee getting educated, and play leadership role in clarifying the issues to stakeholders, especially where ADU administrative details and Section 8 program options.
- Question called: does the Committee wish to have someone come in and present on the issues related to this topic?
Committee Action:
- Agreed (without formal motion) to pursue presentation for near-term future meeting or special workshop to educate the community on implications of proposed Section 8 changes plus workshop ADU-related issues.
- Discussion of working to confirm advertising funds in April via Budget and Finance Committee to support promoting community special event.

Item 5: Informational / Report on Westchester Bluffs and Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Eligibility

Background – Review of bluff parcel hillside designations relative to ADU ordinance. Question: per draft ADU ordinance, do our community’s bluff parcels fall under the hillside zoning proposed for prohibition.

Presenter: Kimberly Fox, Committee Member
- Presented documentation regarding hillside restrictions on ADU development.
- Demonstrated that local bluff properties do not carry the hillside restriction as indicated in draft ADU ordinance.
- Therefore, no specific hillside zoning prohibitions against ADUs in Westchester Bluffs area. However, those parcels still may not qualify for ADU construction based on parcel size, set-backs, etc.

Related Document: CPC-2016-4346_Draft ADU Ordinance_Hillside Restriction Pages Only.pdf (Provided at meeting)
Public Comment: None
Committee Discussion: None
Committee Action: None required.

Item 6: Discussion / Community Impact Statements

Proposal: To review every motion approved and consider whether PLUC should also draft a Community Impact Statement.

Presenter: Committee Discussion
- There’s an opportunity to more frequently issue Community Impact Statements (CIS) to further document and institutionalize certain positions taken.
- Functional difference > motions from NCWP are attached to Planning files, but a CIS becomes part of a legislative issues’s legal file.
- Proposal: as a routine, once motion has been voted on by PLUC, review whether the Committee should also proposal a CIS for NC Board review/vote.

Related Document: None
Public Comment: None
Committee Discussion
- For example: questions about parking re ADUs. Have the option to attach a Committee opinion / point of view on vote related to such an issue.
Committee Action: Agreement (without formal motion) to adopt the routine of considering CIS as a routine with Committee Action.
Item 7: Discussion / Project Screening Check List

Proposal: To ensure consistent assessment of developer projects, proposal to develop a master project check list.

Presenter: Kimberly Fox, Committee Member
- Secretary noted PLUC inquiries on proposed projects often cover an informal “master” list of issues of interest to the committee.
- Therefore, proposed the Committee development a master check list based on committee’s informal “best practices” so every development project is reviewed with consistency.
- Further discussed that this Screening List could be sent to developer at the time they’re being confirmed on the PLUC agenda, requesting it be completed in advance so developer is informed in advance re key issues for PLUC.

Related Documents: NCWP PLUC Project Qualification List_v1 (Provided at meeting)
Public Comment:
Cord Thomas 90045 / Requests Committee confirm an operational process so that if new questions are added to the master list, there’s a way to go back to previous development projects still in process and confirm this new information.

Committee Discussion:
- Agreement in concept.
- Members took a few minutes to review draft and add additional questions.

Committee Action: Agreement (without formal motion) to continue discussion and updated draft review at 19 March 2018 PLUC meeting.

Item 8: Discussion / Certificate of Occupancy PLUC Notification

Proposal: For every project approved, when Certificate of Occupancy is ready to be issued, PLUC chair receives notification, and PLUC chair or member tours the property and reports back on how the project came out, lessons learned, etc.

Related Documents: none.
Public Comment: none.
Presenter: Committee Discussion
- Concern that the Committee doesn’t have a “wrap-around” process where prior to Certificate of Occupancy, some kind of notification is giving to NC PLUC for a walk through, final product post mortem.
- The provocation: the Sepulveda Eastway CIM project issue re what was build was not what was approved by NC. That NC conditions for the project were not carried through via Planning process.
- General support for the concept of developer/project accountability after NC vote.
- Discussion of possibility to grade outcomes based on developer adherence to their commitment.
Motion

- Fox / That PLUC develop a process with LADBS to notify NC when building Certificate of Occupancy is about to be issued, so NC can review the as-built project for compliance to NC expectations, conditions.
- Quon / second

Committee Discussion

- Worried about notification process that means NC is only looking at the project at the end, when recourse for non-compliance is difficult, impossible.
- Possibility of monthly walk through? However, this becomes difficult re scheduling, Committee member time commitment.
- Concern about defining metrics to judge project compliance. Don’t want to create legal issues.
- Discussion of milestones approach: after it has left NC and goes forward with Planning Dept. The again after Planning issues approval (cross check to see what exactly was approved). Then again at time for Certificate of Occupancy.
- Discussion of in-process changes on projects and assessing compliance.
- Discussion of motions and their specificity, possibility to just check those points, verification on specific motion conditions.
- Concern that such cross checking might be beyond scope of advisory nature of PLUC / NC.
- Agreement with the idea in principle but requires more discussion re details.

Committee Action: Motion not formulated for vote. Continued item for further review.

Item 9: Announcements

- Next PLUC meeting: March 19, 2019 / Tom Rothman presentation – re:codeLA going over the most current rendition of R1 code.

- April meeting / Chair has invited Urban Design Dept from the City to talk about “the face of new designs” – what does it mean “in keeping with your community.”

- May meeting / Hoping to book a presentation by Eric Strauss from LMU, Head of Environmental Sciences regarding Ballona Wetlands rehabilitation.

Item 10: Meeting Adjourned
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