



Mar Vista Community Council



Community Plan Sub-Committee

Minutes

Tuesday, July 28, 2020, at 7:00pm

Zoom Electronic Meeting

Meeting ID : 978 7032 9234

1. **Call to order**-meeting called to order at 7:04 by Chair, Mary Hruska. Introduced new Vice Chair, Ashley Zeldin.
2. **Announcements**-Hruska announced that LA Dept of City Planning (DCP) would be attending the August Community Plan meeting for Q&A.
3. **Public Comment for items NOT on this agenda**- Michelle Krupkin (Transportation & Infrastructure Vice-Chair) announced T&I presentation by Tree People (WaterTalks) at the August 5 2020 T&I meeting
Ken Alpern (T&I Co-Chair) mentioned the Millennium Project, which was approved despite it being on an earthquake fault
4. **Adoption of the Agenda**-agenda adopted without objection
5. **Reading and Approval of Minutes**-Motion to approve (Wheeler/Zeldin). June 23 2020 Minutes approved without objection
6. **Special Orders**- Report and discussion on the July 14, 16 and 21 Dept of City Planning Concepts Workshops
Hruska presented overview of Community Plan process thus far.
Zeldin presented report on specific land use (zoning) changes for each Mar Vista Community Council Zone (1-7)
65 participants engaged in feedback on the presentation.
Numerous objections from Zones 1,2,5,6 7 to upzoning of single family parcels to Duplexes, Triplexes, Fourplexes and Medium Residential.
Stacy Shure (PLUM Chair) mentioned that many of the upzoned tracts were not along major corridors, as had been communicated previously by DCP. Moreover the single family parcels that are slated for upzoning in Zone 1 are the oldest in Westside Village, and this was not based on any input sent to DCP by the MVCC Community Plan Update Committee. This is single family homes being upzoned to allow 6-8 story buildings (due To proximity to TOC area)
Zeldin stated that this undermines the work that Shure has been doing with developers to preserve and enhance the neighborhood.
Need for preservation of single family homes for seniors to age in place was a concern
Stakeholder Wayne Wheeler read a draft CIS he's prepared (see supplemental materials)
Gentrification and loss of existing affordable housing a major concern
Infrastructure capacity to sustain such increased density and traffic impacts also major concerns
Alix Gucovsky (Venice Neighborhood Council, Land Use and Planning Chair) mentioned that upzoning along Venice Blvd is something that Venice & Mar Vista should work together on as it affects both neighborhoods

Selena Inouye (MVCC At Large Director) stated that she lived near some of the upzoned areas in Zone 5 and had worked extensively on pushing back against the Road Diet in 2017 and that the current proposed changes are a consequence of this. Asked that anyone else in Zone 5 affected contact her to work together on a response.

April Peterson pointed out that the upzoned single family parcels along the west side of Sawtelle would allow 6-8 story buildings hard up against single family homes.

Inouye asked if Mc Laughlin has been labelled a High Quality Transit corridor. Stated that there a lot of future plans for Venice Blvd that would tie into this and that the community needed to follow aspects of bus lines etc and how they are being labelled. Inouye stated that she was unaware of any proposed bus route along Mc Laughlin, but that Venice Blvd has been assigned to be a Bicycle enhanced Nork and asked if that would confer any TOC designation to developments along it. Added that, per Mobility Plan 2035, Venice Blvd is slated for a Bus Rapid Transit Lane.

Ken Alpern (T&I Chair) stated that it might be of use to build an argument against TOCs along Venice Blvd as the proposed routes would not serve high numbers.

Michelle Krupkin (T&I Co-Chair) stated that Inglewood Blvd could not handle a bus line due to weigh restrictions imposed by subterranean oil pipeline. Also suggested review of Infrastructure maps (grids) to see if any of the proposed changes would impact those.

Jamia Bigelow asked how the North Oval Historic street was defined. Stated that the North side of Pacific was not included in the Historic Oval District, as it is stylistically a part of it. Hruska stated that it was probably not a part of the original SurveyLA report, but that it is certainly a case MVCC could make.

Gucovsky mentioned that buses along Venice/Washington do not actually meet the schedules assumed by TOCs.

Krishna Curry (from Zone 7) mentioned that tech businesses in Santa Monica are are closed and employees will probably continue to work at home after the Covid restrictions are lifted. Stated that, most folks in her area (renters who don't, own many cars) use Uber rather than public transit. Stated that all the parking lots for businesses along Venice Blvd in the area are full. No one seems to be biking to them. Suggested it might be useful to get data on this from the local businesses.

Hruska stated that she and Zeldin have been attempting to determine the logic for the proposed upzoning along Mc Laughlin in Zone 5. Suggested possibly due to proposed bike lane along Mc Laughlin.

Inouye mentioned that the area is largely smaller starter homes and homes used by downsizing seniors. Stated that the proposed bike lane was originally part of a proposal that came before MVCC in 2017 which sought to create a bike lane system throughout the area.

Discussed upzoning along Beethoven and between Venice Blvd and Mc Cune. Zeldin suggested that this might be under the justification for "Neighborhood Serving" near schools.

Discussion of upzoning along Mitchell Ave in Zone 7, in the shadow of Venice High School.

Krishna Curry stated that new apartments in her zone have a very high turnover. Also stated that there are numerous additional cars. And the units are quite unaffordable. Shure stated that these are Co-Living developments and this kind of density does not enhance the community. Hruska stated that the Community Plan Subcommittee submitted a motion on regulation of Co-Living projects which was sent to DCP.

Stakeholder Joe stated that it appeared that on the east side of Lyceum is being Upzoned but not the west. Zeldin/Shure stated that although the area is part of Mar Vista it is actually part of the Venice Community Plan. Zeldin added that, although the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan mostly coincides with their respective Neighborhood Council Boundaries, it is not exact and this may be one of the quirks in the process.

Stakeholder Roberta Hamovitz inquired regarding the multifamily building going up at Barrington and Indianapolis. Shure/Hruska mentioned this is a small lot subdivision. Which had been previously approved. Stated that all the lots along Barrington between Indianapolis and National are zoned R3. Roberta asked if a traffic study will be done on it. Shure answered no. Hruska stated that, no traffic study is required in this case. Added that DCP has confirmed with her that the decision to mandate a traffic study on a project is the purview of the planner reviewing the application and they generally don't require them in anything but very large projects. Added that the only other way a traffic study would be instituted for such a project would be an Appeal being filed on it.

Steve stated that he lives on Lyceum Ave also mentioned how one side of it is being Upzoned extensively with no step downs.

Other (unidentified) Zone 7 stakeholder stated that she would be glad to work with others on the area on a petition and/or other communication to DCP on this matter. Inouye stated that all the commercial properties on Venice Blvd are being rezoned for mixed use and suggested the community focus on how much residential that will create before the city is allowed to upzone single family homes. Shure responded yes, because what is being proposed is not what DCP had previously communicated they would focus on. Stated that she could ask Neil Kritzing to estimate the theoretical amount of housing that could be built along Venice. Hruska stated that the Comm Plan Committee had already calculated Dwelling Unit Capacity for Mar Vista which showed that existing zoning could accommodate future projected housing needs.

Hruska asked for wording of a motion. Tilson suggested it be written using points already made

Shure encouraged every community to start a petition.

Stakeholder Ledean who stated she lived on Wasatch, and asked what the upzoning mean for them. Shure/Zeldin/Hruska responded duplexes, which would max out at 4 units per parcel. Ledean asked if it was a "done deal". Response from Chairs was : not if the community pushes back.

April Petersen asked that the motion include a clause regarding no high residential Adjacent to single family residences. Shure mentioned that the TOC ordinance already allows this. April asked about certain stretches of Sawtelle in Zone 4.

Wheeler stated that she could work with her on a communication to DCP.

Karen Goldman asked about areas near Mark Twain High School, and asked if She should send objections to her Zone Director, Tilson. Shure suggested that any Letters should be copied to the Council Member and Mayor. Karen asked for a form letter. Zeldin suggested that she would prepare a slideshow with the highlights being covered this evening.

Wheeler suggested creating a link on the MVCC Community Plan page for the Draft Presentation. Hruska stated that there was a Comment form link at the end of the presentation. Wheeler suggested that stakeholders copy the Comm Plan Committee with the input to DCP.

Wayne Wheeler asked that transitional housing between high and low density be addressed as well as Dwelling Unit Capacity. Read a statement (See Supplemental material)

Hruska suggested that a motion be written with attachments specifying what areas are being referenced.

Shure suggested tentatively scheduling another Community Plan meeting at the end of the first week of August and PLUM could have an additional meeting after that to review any additional input and possibly a Special Board meeting.

Hruska mentioned that DCP would be coming to the Aug 25 Community Plan and any additional comments could be submitted to them at that time. Added that DCP had, in response to her request, extended the Aug 31 deadline for comments to Sept 9, 2020. Shure added that there would also be opportunities for input at the next stage: the Environmental Impact report (EIR)

Wheeler suggested providing an option for submitting comments through the MVCC Website. Shure stated that she would agendaize this for the next PLUM.

Shure invited all participants to discuss a development on Venice Blvd for 12 small lot homes for 144 residents and 22 parking spaces.

Krupkin mentioned the vacancies for a Zone 7 and At Large Director.

Stakeholder Keri Hansen mentioned the Opportunity Sites at the Santa Monica Airport. Hruska responded that this was an important thing to address. These 2 are owned by the City of Santa Monica but fall within the Mar Vista Boundaries. Stacy stated that the FAA will not completely decommission the airport and The City of LA hasn't responded to this. The runway will be kept for emergency Purpose. Hruska mentioned that the 2017 Consent Agreement allows the City of Santa Monica jurisdiction over the airport (the runway notwithstanding) By 2028. Added that there has been a strong effort to convert the airport to a park, but that the parcels in question are not included in that proposal. Moreover one of them is currently zoned R1, though currently being used as open space. When one considers that Centinela is currently being considered for the Westside alignment of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor it would open the area for a TOC.

Hruska summarized: motion of opposition would be written, a link for comments posted to the website and a possible additional meeting would be held to discuss the Airport Parcels and additional comments.

Zeldin asked members of each zone to identify themselves. All 7 zones were represented. Urged all attendees to engage with this project as it will impact all. Hruska concurred that the strongest impact the community can make is in numbers. We will work as a team to bring the voice of Mar Vista to DCP.

7. Old Business-

- a. Continued discussion of Prop X, presented in 2007 by cityLAB at UCLA, and related concepts
Deferred to future meeting

8. Future Agenda Items-

- 8.1- Dept of City Planning attendance and Q&A
- 8.2- Discussion of SB375 and Sustainable Communities Project CEQA Exemptions
- 8.3- Discussion of Affordable Housing algorithms

9. Adjournment-motion to adjourn (Hamovitz/Krupkin). Meeting adjourned at 9:43PM

VIRTUAL MEETING ACCESS FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION- In conformity with the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 (March 17, 2020), and due to concerns over COVID-19, all Mar Vista Community Council meetings will be conducted entirely remotely and are open to the public by phone and/or device. Visit the 'Join Our Remote Meetings' page on MarVista.org for more information.

* **PUBLIC INPUT AT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS** – . Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Board's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Instructions on how to provide comment/input will be given at the start of the meeting.

Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer of the Board.

* **PUBLIC POSTING OF AGENDAS** - MVCC agendas are posted for public review at Mar Vista Recreation Center, 11430 Woodbine Street, Mar Vista, CA 90066. Subscribe to our agendas via email through L.A. City's Early Notification System at <http://www.lacity.org/subscriptions> or via our website, <http://www.marvista.org>

* **THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT** - 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, including sign

language interpreters, assistive listening devices and other auxiliary aids and/or services. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting chair@marvista.org.

- * **PUBLIC OBSERVATION AND COMMENT** – Any member of the public may observe all or part of the meeting by following the link toward the top of this agenda. Members of the public may participate during general "Public Comment" or during the public comment period on any agenda item. Participants may signal their intent to speak and will be recognized by the Chair.
- * **SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION** - Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Por favor contacte a chair@marvista.org para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.
- * **PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS** – 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 our website, <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.
- * **RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCESS** - For information on MVCC's process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the MVCC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website, <http://www.marvista.org>.