



Mar Vista Community Council



MAR VISTA COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Planning Land Use and Management Committee

WINDWARD SCHOOL, Conference Room, Room 1030

11350 Palms Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90066 (SW corner of Palms and Sawtelle Blvds.)

Co-Chairs: Steve Wallace and Mitchell Rishe

Vice Chair: Michael Millman

Tuesday, May 19, 2015, 7:00 – 9:00pm

Minutes

1. **Call to Order. 7.00pm**
2. **Introductions and Public Comment** for items not on the agenda (5 min).
3. **Approval of Minutes** from February 2015 Meeting (2 min). **Sharon Made the Motion – Mitch Second, Motion passed. 5-0-0.**
4. **Report on MVCC Board Actions** (2 min).
5. **Early Notification System ['ENS'] Update** (1 min).
6. **New Business** (90 min):
 - A. **Discussion with Option for Possible Motion to Support or Deny:**
 - i. **7-Eleven (12403 W. Venice Blvd.)**. Case No. ZA 2009-3132-CUB-CU-PA1. Project Description: **Sherrie Olson - PLRC, Application to Expand the operation of Alcohol Sales to from 1am to 2am, and open 24 hours instead of 6am – 1am. Added extra cameras, they have a total of 4 outside and 12 inside, LAPD can access on site cameras, No LAPD Issues, Consistent with the nationwide 7-11 model opening these hours. Motion to support the application as presented, Ken proposed, Michelle 2nd, Motion passes 10-1-1**

Application for a conditional use permit to allow the continued sale of beer and wine for off-site consumption only, in conjunction with an existing 7-Eleven convenience market; hours of operation: 24 hours daily with alcohol sales from 6am - 2am daily.
 - ii. **Rustic Kitchen (3523 S. Centinela Ave.)**. Case No. ZA-2015-1818-CUB. Project Description: Application to obtain a conditional use permit to allow the sale and dispensing of beer and wine beverages for consumption on and off premises, in conjunction with a new gourmet market and cafe that provides catering. **Steve Williams Affordable Expeditors, Noelle and John Fanaris. Steve described the project, no LAPD Complaints, meet and greet done with neighbors already, John presented their vision of the project, lived in the neighborhood since the 80's. Many questions, share parking with some businesses on the same block. Opening times 10am – 8pm, maybe expanding from 7am-11pm. Before was a surfboard shop, Baby Proofing Store. Looking for street parking increase hours, working with the City to see if they will increase Parking time? Need 18 Spaces, there is 40 spaces current, shared with all the businesses. 6-8 employees, they expect them to park on Centinela. Motion to approve the application as presented to the City, Sharon 2nd, 10-0-0 – Motion passes.**
 - iii. **3658 and 3660 S. Beethoven St.** Case No. AA-2015-642-PMLA. Project Description: **Karig McCloskey made the presentation. 5760sq feet Project RD2-1 allows 1 dwelling for every 2000sq feet, 45 feet height. New Building height is 36 feet, 3 story in a number of sections. 2 Story in front with a roof deck above. 3018 sq feet for each of the New Units. Motion to put over, Ken, Sharon 2nd, 7-1-0 motion passes.**

Application for a small lot subdivision and construction of two 40' tall 3-story houses.
 - B. **Discussion Only:**
 - i. **3277 S. Barrington Ave.** Project Description:

Proposed small lot subdivision. **Presented by Aaron Belliston, R3 Zone, By Right they can build 9 units at 45 feet – SB1818 would allow 12 units, proposing 4 units small lot sub, 4 Single Family Homes, Tiered Height, 2000, sq feet each home. Reduction in density per code allowed, all access to Garage from the back. Community discussion based on the drawings, feedback was to tweak the designs to be more in line with Trousdale Housing around the neighborhood so that they fit in more design wise rather than standing out. This will change the dynamic of this neighborhood in a big way. Developer to tweak the designs and come back to MVCC PLUM.**

C. **Director Resolution.** Proposed by Ken Halpern:

**RESOLUTION
SOFT STORY APARTMENT CONSTRUCTION
TUCK UNDER PARKING
EARTHQUAKE RETROFIT/SEISMIC MEASURES**

WHEREAS, the Los Angeles City Council adopted approximately 20 years ago a Regulation wherein, in the event the Council passes any Emergency/Safety ordinance pertaining to Older Apartments under the jurisdiction of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO), then the **Costs** of the Safety Measure or Program shall be the responsibility of the **TENANTS**;

The Tenants shall reimburse the Apartment Owner 100% for the municipally ordered Safety Measures; however, the costs will be amortized over seven years, repayable each and every month in an amount not to exceed \$75 per month until paid in full;

WHEREAS, the Mayor's Office has proposed that certain older tuck under parking type buildings and soft story construction buildings be eligible to install seismic retrofitting arrangements;

RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, the Mar Vista Community Council supports the Existing City Council Ordinance as it promotes and ensures that Responsible Apartment Owners will promptly embrace the Mayor's Program and install safety and earthquake retrofit appliances. **Discussion - Motion by Ken and a second by Sharon for discussion purposes only, Ken has an alternative motion to offer and would like to also offer that, Michael Millman spoke to the need for Earthquake Retrofitting the buildings, There is an existing Law, but the City has not acted on it. There was Tenant Response, A statement mentioned that there was no accountability, there were also many other questions, the resolution is too narrow, cost burden is too high, Landlords getting tax deductions, is this a windfall for Landlords, are they being paid twice? Mar Vista is 60.6% rentals, more than anywhere else in the City, Renter asked that the Council represent 60.6% of the neighborhood. The rental community in the room mentioned a Bond, which is a Tax, and they feel that everyone should be taxed to fix the issue.**

This submitted for the minutes buy a stakeholder:

1. The Resolution is a **blanket response** to earthquake retrofit remediation. The Resolution doesn't take into account:
 - Income disparities among tenants
 - Tenants (like seniors) who live on fixed incomes, etc.
 - Possibility of sliding scale for the costs of repairs according to ability to pay.
2. The Resolution lacks **Accountability**:
 - How will improvements be documented and to whom?
 - Who/how will oversight of the costs be managed?
 - How will accounting of improvements be made available to tenants (if tenants are the ones paying for said improvements)? Will tenants receive reports on expenditure of their funds?
 - What happens when there is a change of tenants during the 7 year repair/payment period -- are already completed repairs deducted from the total costs?
 - How do allowable rent increases calculate with this additional burden for tenants to pay for repairs?
 - What happens when the work is completed?
 1. Will rents go down by that \$75?
 2. What happens if the work is completed at a lower than estimated cost?

3. What guarantees will renters have that proper oversight of funds is administered? Landlords should only recoup the actual amount of the retrofit and not continue additional payments with a userous 7 year end date.
3. The Resolution is **too narrow**. Have other financing options been explored?
 - What about Garcetti's proposal for a statewide bond? (<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/09/us/earthquake-program-would-require-retrofitting-of-los-angeles-buildings.html>)
 - What about exploring various share of costs options such as the attractive bridge financing that banks like, where 50/50 share of costs are split between landlord/tenants?
 - Have FEMA options been explored?
4. The Resolution is **Inequitable**:
 - Only landlords benefit financially from the repairs. Should tenants have to pay for the costs of repairs on buildings in which they have no equity?
 1. What benefit could tenants receive who leave before the repairs have been completed? Tax rebates or deductions?
 2. Would tenants who enter into new leases halfway through the 7 year period receive the same benefits?
 - Nationwide, rents went up six percent between 2000 and 2012, **while renters' income fell 13 percent. Almost 50% of Los Angeles** renters spend more than the recommended 30 percent of their income on their lease; one in four spend more than half their income on rent. On the Westside, where rents are higher, these figures also rise.
5. **Mar Vista has a clear majority of renters: 60.6%. (Los Angeles Times)** The Community Council should represent us accordingly.

On the basis of the reasons presented above, we respectfully request a vote **against** the Resolution as presented by the PLUM Committee. We also request that renters be included in future discussions of this issue.

Motion Withdrawn by Ken.

7. **Old Business/Open Issues** (5 min).
 - A. CITYWIDE ORDINANCES.
8. **Public Comment** (5 min).
9. **Future Agenda Items** (1 min).
10. **Adjournment. Motion to adjourn**