

**MAR VISTA COMMUNITY COUNCIL**  
**Joint Meeting of the PLUM and Transportation/Infrastructure Committee**  
Thursday, March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015, 7:15 PM to 9:00 PM  
COFFEE CONNECTION, 3838 S. Centinela Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90066  
(Corner of Venice and Centinela)  
PLUM Committee Co-Chairs: Mitchell Rishe and Steve Wallace  
T/I Committee Co-Chairs: Michelle Krupkin and Ken Alpern

**AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order—Mitchell Rishe and Michelle Krupkin presiding.
- II. Introductions and Discussion of Items Not on Agenda
- III. MVCC Liaison to Bi-Monthly CD11/LADOT/LAPD Traffic Committee Meeting – Linda Guagliano
- IV. New Motions:

**1) POLICY MOTION (to be forwarded to, if approved by the MVCC Board, the offices of Mike Bonin, Paul Koretz, Eric Garcetti, the City Attorney's office, and the LAPD):**

The Mar Vista Community Council strongly supports:

- a) An immediate Citywide legal and enforcement policy that prevents any illegal accumulation and/or parking of recreational vehicles and campers, and
- b) Strongly supports any and all immediate City Council and/or Mayoral efforts to provide the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles City Attorney's office the tools necessary to reduce (if not eliminate) any inappropriate and/or illegal parking and waste dumping on the part of the aforementioned recreational vehicles and campers, and
- c) A City homeless policy that does not allow for any illegal parking or accumulation of recreational vehicles and campers as accepted or tolerated by the City of Los Angeles.

**2) POLICY MOTION (to be forwarded to, if approved by the MVCC Board, to the Planning Department, and to the relevant City Councilmembers of the Transportation and Planning Committees):**

The Mar Vista Community Council supports increased development along the Expo Line/Pico Blvd. Transit-Oriented Corridor of commercial and/or residential nature of no greater than 40 feet, and/or three stories above ground.

**3) POLICY MOTION (to be forwarded to State Assembly members and State Senators):**

The Mar Vista Community Council opposes SB 608 (The Right to Rest Act, which would prohibit the enforcement of any local laws that violate the rights of anyone to move freely, rest, sleep, pray, and be protected in public spaces without discrimination, as well as the right to occupy a legally parked vehicle and the right to share food and eat in public), because:

- a) There are already laws in place to ensure the rights of all individuals, including the homeless, to perform all of the above activities in daily life
- b) There is considerable risk to public health, mobility and rights of all citizens if local city laws are not allowed to be enforced with respect to illegal parking, illegal occupancy, and waste dumping

**4) POLICY MOTION [WRAC LEADERSHIP]: Cost of building permit appeals:** City shall revise appeals process for Building Permits. Appeals of DBS determinations shall be done via the same simple process as appeals of Planning Dept. and Planning Commission determinations with similar fees. DBS "appeals" shall not be treated as a new case with public notification and CEQA requirements, because it is an appeal. An appeal is not a new proposed development project; it is an appeal of an already filed development project. **Justification:** The current 2-step process is long, onerous and expensive for regular citizens. The first DBS administrative review takes 6 weeks and costs \$470. An appeal of that DBS determination requires public notification (\$20 for adjacent addresses from Assessor, \$165 for labels and sign postings) and a new case submittal (\$700). The total fee for a regular citizen to appeal DBS permits comes to \$1,400. (Planning appeals cost \$200, which is \$1,200 less). Approved in committee 7-0-0 and approved in WRAC Leadership unanimously.

**5) POLICY MOTION [WRAC LEADERSHIP]: Support for Council Files 15-0020 [Collecting Fees Related to Condition Compliance] and 15-0135 [Planning's CCU Fee Ordinance to support MVIP Monitoring, Verification & Inspection Program]**

WRAC supports Council File 15-0020 and 15-

0135 (<http://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=15-0020> and 15-0135) asking that the Planning Department to report back in 45 days on the best practices of other jurisdictions, including the County of Los Angeles, to ensure proper resource allocation for condition inspections and enforcement AND further asks that the Council instruct the Planning Department, in consultation with the City Attorney, and any other appropriate City

department, bureau, or agency, to work cooperatively to propose a method by which inspection fees related to condition compliance are required and collected by the City prior to the release of any final approval of a projects.

**Justification:** Additional requirements are frequently placed on development projects through conditions of approval.

"...often these conditions go overlooked because of the City's lack of resources to enforce its own conditions. On 01/06/2015, the Los Angeles Times published an article, "In L.A., Conditions Placed on Developers Go Unheeded

(<http://www.latimes.com/local/cityhall/la-me-development-ignored-20150105-story.html#page=1>) " that spoke to the need for additional fees to cover the expense of allocating more staff to inspect and enforce the conditions of approval on the City's many projects. In other jurisdictions, such as Los Angeles County, conditions of approval specify the number of inspections required over the duration of the grant term necessary to ensure proper compliance with the conditions of approval. The conditions also obligate an applicant to cover the cost of such inspections. This approach ensures that the City has the resources it needs to enforce commitments made to the community, and helps to keep neighborhoods first. approved unanimously.

**6) POLICY MOTION [WRAC LEADERSHIP]: Streamlining community improvement projects Council File 14-1624:**

MVCC requests the Department of Public Works, with the assistance and cooperation of the Department of Transportation, City Planning, City Attorney, Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, City Administrative Officer and the Chief Legislative Analyst, be instructed to prepare and present a report setting forth ways and means by which the City of Los Angeles may best serve community organizations seeking to undertake community improvement projects. The report should include but not be limited to a discussion of the following key elements: establishing a single point of contact for inquires and technical assistance, identifying efficiencies and streamlining of all existing processes and permits, resolution of liability responsibilities which can hinder volunteer efforts, and outreach strategy for stakeholder input.

**Justification:** "Throughout the City, non-profits, homeowner associations, neighborhood councils, local schools and other community groups undertake community improvement projects and make significant investments in their local neighborhoods. These community groups are important partners in the City's ongoing efforts to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality of life. Community participation in the planning and implementation of neighborhood improvement projects should be fostered and encouraged, and not hampered by City policies and processes that create inordinate burdens on such efforts. However, depending on the location, and scope of the project, the process, permit and fee structure can vary and are sometimes inconsistent. And sometimes, depending on the complexity of the project, community beautification efforts are discouraged or hindered solely based upon the "red tape" that exists within the City. For example, when Council District 12 partnered with Northridge South Neighborhood Council, Napa Elementary School, local neighbors and businesses to clean up an unimproved parcel of land, which was a magnet for illegal dumping and an area of blight (photos attached), navigating the different jurisdictions, departments, points of contact, and applications was a feat that required significant effort and time. Additionally, neighborhood council funding is limited to the fiscal year, and the red tape associated with community projects often makes it difficult to properly budget or encumber funds within the given timeframe. City departments, bureaus and agencies need to be responsive and willing to assist community groups seeking to improve their neighborhoods and City staff should serve as a meaningful resource to resolve problems and find solutions. City policy, rules, regulations and processes should enhance and foster these community improvement activities, and not become a barrier." approved unanimously.

Discussion of Items Not On the Agenda

Adjournment.

---

*\*in compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at <http://www.marvista.org> or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact [secretary@marvista.org](mailto:secretary@marvista.org).*

*\*\*As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or any auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting [chair@marvista.org](mailto:chair@marvista.org).*