



Mar Vista Community Council



Minutes Community Plan Sub-Committee

Tuesday July 23, 2019

St Andrew's Lutheran Church

11555 National Blvd

LA, CA 90064

1. **Call to order**-Meeting called to order by Mary Hruska at 7:38 PM
2. **In Attendance:**

Mary Hruska, Co-Chair, Ashley Zeldin , 1st Vice Chair- Outreach, Kathryn Wheeler-Chair, Outreach, Martin Rubin, Zone 2 Director and NWNA, Holly Tilson, Zone 6 Director, Andrea Ambriz, At Large Director, Michelle Krupkin, Zone 5 Director (arrived 9:21), Selena Inouye, At Large Director, Kent Alves, Zone 3 stakeholder, Marilyn Culbertson, Zone 2 stakeholder, Donna Skrull, Zone 2 stakeholder, Vic Pacheco, West LA/Sawtelle stakeholder, Kalani Whittington, stakeholder, Vanessa Colosio-Diaz (arrived 8:15)

3. **Announcements:**

Holly: mentioned that Hannah (CD11) and TJ Hill (DCRC Executive Director) will be presenting an update on the Permanent Supportive Housing being planned for the DCRC location at Venice & Beethoven at the July 25 WMVNA meeting

Mary: mentioned that, in previous discussions, Kathryn W had discovered that the current Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Land Use map does not correspond to the area boundaries of the MVCC. Will bring this discrepancy to the attention of DCP

4. **Public Comment for Items NOT on This Agenda:**

Marty: Thanked Mary for her coverage of the recent Abundant Housing event at UCLA. Her update was well-written and seemed to hit a chord that one could accept as factual. Mary stated that she will follow up with the 3 guest speakers with additional questions that time did not permit at the event

Kalani: Mentioned that she's taken an informal poll of friends who live in MV regarding development and found that they seem to feel it was inevitable and would allow for it along major corridors but not elsewhere. Suggested it might be useful to also poll businesses, renters and homeowners. Mary asked if the person she'd spoken to understood that development would bring escalating rents. Kalani also mentioned that many are simply moving out of Los Angeles. Kathryn: felt that those who don't care about the neighborhoods are the ones who move.

Marilyn: retired homeowner. Very upset about potential traffic increase in the area. Is not against additional housing, however felt that the city has done a poor job of mitigating traffic generated by new development. Mary mentioned that the current philosophy of situating density near transit had, per a SCAG-sponsored UCLA/ITS study, not produce the desired effect. This is because the density was mostly in the form of market rate units, and those occupants can and do drive, regardless of proximity to transit. Felt that the jobs-based approach presented by stakeholder Bill Pope last meeting was a better alternative to reducing VMTs.

Marilyn mentioned ADUs, and how they have not, thus far been used to create low income housing, as the city has incentivized, but rather, as an additional income to the property owner. Mary mentioned that she would like to see a Controller's audit of this incentive in a year.

Holly: added that an audit probably wasn't even necessary as most ADUs seem to be rented to students, relatives or friends. State legislation now allows for ADUs to be up to 1200 sq ft and thus allows the creation of, essentially 2 homes on one lot. Mentioned that she heard from an irate Z6 stakeholder that he would like R1 lots to be rezoned as multifamily as opposed to the expansion of existing multi-family units. Holly felt that densification would dissuade families from locating here.

Selena mentioned that transportation improvements seem to be directing (preceeding/encouraging) development, and we (especially the MVCC T&I committee) need to follow those closely. They are often rolled out without adequate environmental analysis. Mentioned that there are currently 2 lawsuits regarding the Road Diet that was implemented on Venice Blvd. Mary mentioned that the report that was issued at the time that the Road Diet was deemed final by CD11, was laughable in its amateurish and inaccurate statistics.

Kathryn: felt that CD11 had a tourism agenda in its promulgation of, first the Great Streets Road Diet and subsequently, the Arts District Designation for Venice Blvd in MV presented at the June 22 DCP Workshop.

Marilyn: felt that Google, Yahoo and other companies moving to the Westside bringing 6 figure incomes to the area will drive up rents and increase traffic. Need to decrease numbers of cars on the road but feels that scooters are not the answer.

Marty: felt that public transportation is archaic and dangerous and so not attractive to commuters. And the term "affordable housing" is not a constant but is variable, and so difficult to legislate.

Kalani: mentioned that, as a person who has been forced, by illness, out of the workforce, she is the face of someone who needs affordable housing, and city has, thus far, failed her. Mary mentioned that the Controller's 2017 Audit of SB1818-generated affordable units revealed that the city has, essentially no ability to monitor and enforce the creation and awarding of affordable units.

Selena mentioned there being a problem with the income level tiers in the affordable housing algorithms and that they often left loopholes that caused folks needing these units to be excluded. Stated the lowest income level needed to be lowered.

Marty: stated that there's hypocrisy in the use of the word "sustainable" when applied to development. That increasing density creates larger energy demands and adds to our carbon footprint.

Marilyn mentioned a meeting in Culver City on Aug 12 on the topic of rent control

Mary: mentioned that Culver City is going to be increasing in density rapidly in the near future and cited 4 very large projects recently announced along Washington Blvd.

Marty: felt that that sort of density would surely affect air quality

Mary suggested the need to invoke CEQA for these issues and that legislation currently coming out of Sacramento seeks to loosen CEQA requirements.

Kathryn: mentioned that the Wellbrook project on Venice Blvd seems to have bypassed public CEQA process.

5. Reading and Approval of Minutes – Mary made one correction to pg 3, changing LW to HI.

Motion to approve (Kathryn), Seconded (Ashley). Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

6. Unfinished Business – Discussion and Dissemination of materials from 6/22 DCP workshop.

Mary announced that the materials had not yet been made available. Will present as soon as they are. Disseminated an LADOT/DCP survey that has been made available during the event

7. New Business – Motion[POLICY] Co-initiative to Address Commercial, Public and Open Space in MV:

Mary stating that she'd received quite a bit of input on this since the posting of the agenda, moved to table the motion pending further research, until next meeting. Second by Kathryn.

8. Public comment:

Selena: mentioned that she and other stakeholders had seen numerous references to an arts district on Venice Blvd and were concerned about where this was coming from. Asked who had requested one, and mentioned that the folks she'd discussed this with were concerned about the lack of public process.

Marty: asked what the full picture is. How would such a district affect neighborhoods?

Mary stated that this is one of the reasons she wants to table the motion. Has done considerable research thus far and has found no evidence of LA ever having Zoned for a true Arts District. Those that exist seems to be such only as far as the Real Estate and Tourist Industries call them such. That whenever artists create spaces for themselves it is usually on land that has been abandoned and is not valuable. After they settle there, and create something special, the land becomes gentrified and they are pushed out. Cited Downtown LA and NoHo "arts districts". If MV chooses to create such a district, we first have to define what an Arts District is and then mandate specific zoning requirements such as density, use and affordability. LANC Sec 13.06 allows for some of this. The remainder would need a special ordinance. Mentioned that DCP had attempted to create a Live/Work Arts District Downtown, but it seems to have become a Hybrid Industrial Zone

Holly mentioned that she'd communicated with Jonathan Hershey of DCP and his response was that an Arts District was only one of the suggestions they'd received, and that she felt that DCP has not hitherto, been forthright in their communications with the community.

Marilyn, while stating that she supports the arts, felt that it was unwise to locate what would become a tourist attraction on the Westside, with all the traffic that would ensue.

Mary: concurred with the idea that, without careful regulation and arts district would become a Business Improvement District, and that it was necessary to engage the community on this and get more feedback.

Selena: mentioned that she'd visited the business along the stretch of Venice Blvd that the proposed Arts District covered and found that 4 had closed. This did not include those displaced by the new development at 12444 Venice Blvd. A new Arts Zone could push out more existing business and that is not a good look for MV

Mary: suggested doing something unique: creating zoning for a new Small Business /Artists in Residence, which would mandate specific uses, affordability and covenants. It could be a new way to direct development, something that's never been done before.

Ashley: asked if we can look at other cities' attempts, such as Burlington VT and Pittsburg PA. Mary added San Antonio TX and mentioned that, once collated, she could post info online.

Andrea: asked if community feedback received so far could be posted online. Mary responded that perhaps a survey regarding this matter would be more efficacious. Ashley volunteered to help with it.

Andrea mentioned that she remembered only Lenore French attending Comm Plan and mentioning her group's advocacy for an Arts District. Asked if there were any "official" documents issued on the creation of an Arts District in MV.

Several members of the group mentioned that an Arts District was described on one of the Poster boards presented on 6/22 by DCP and that this workshop was the "share" phase of the Community Plan process, in which stakeholder feedback submitted earlier was reflected in the concepts presented. Per DCP: the "Did We Get It Right?" phase. Since no reference to an arts district was made in MVCC's Initial Input Document submitted on March 13, there was quite a bit of concern on the art of the community with regard to transparency in the process.

Selena stated that the only public references to an arts district she's seen have been by a new local nonprofit called Venice Mar Vista Arts District, who are collaborating with Lenore French and Sunny Mak

Kalani mentioned that the Art Walk seemed like a success

Kathryn: pointed out that there were no kiosks there for DCP. Mary confirmed that DCP had not attended as they'd said they would. Liked the un-slick feel of the Art Walk and hoped it would remain so.

Motion to table re-made by Kathryn, seconded by Holly. Approved without objection.

Motion to move 9.3 up by Kathryn, Seconded by Kalani. Vote: 7Y/2N. Motion passes

9.3 Stakeholder [POLICY] Motion Regarding June 22, 2019 Dept of City Planning Workshop:

Kathryn introduced letter written by her husband, Wayne Wheeler. Ashley requested reading of the letter. Letter was read and Kathryn explained that Wayne, who works in aerospace, was aghast at how little of the input contained in the March 13 2019 MVCC Initial Input Document was reflected in the June 22 presentation by DCP. This letter is a manifestation of his frustration and desire to understand what transpired between March 13 and June 22.

Kent Alves: stated that the same scenario played out a year prior with regard to the Road Diet on Venice Blvd

Kathryn stated that she had more than the 10 signatures required of a stakeholder motion.

Mary asked to whom the motion should be addressed.

Kathryn : upper echelon of DCP. Mary suggested Vince Bertoni, the Director of DCP

Kent made motion to add Bertoni, seconded by Kathryn.

Holly: suggested adding the Mayor, since he appoints Director of DCP.

Kathryn asked if anyone else should be included.

Mary suggested CD11 and 3 DCP representatives working on the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan

Selena : suggested the City PLUM committee as well.

Kalani complemented Wayne on his control and suggested amending motion to include the word "impact" to the second sentence of the third paragraph.

Andrea: stated that this is "placing the cart before the horse", is premature. That DCP heard these comments at the workshop and community should wait and see what they come back with before sending a letter.

Kathryn responded that this letter is in response to the DCP's disregard of MVCC's Initial Input Doc, and that she will make it a Director's motion if need be

Andrea: stated that it's important to share input from stakeholders in this process and that she's aware that DCP has made strides in collecting input. Wants to give them time to present to MVCC, perhaps at next meeting, before we send request for action from them

Kent: In March we asked them to review our ideas, they didn't do it, and feels the same will happen now

Mary: stated that the purpose of the June 22 workshop was precisely to reflect ideas that came out of the stakeholder input DCP had received. If one looks at the timeline presented by DCP at the beginning of the process, this was the "Did we get it right?", sharing phase. What they presented was them getting back to us.

Ashley: asked if we can find a compromise: send email informally, and if no response, this stringy worded email

Andrea: asked when DCP was supposed to get back to us. Mary responded that this process has not set up specific dates for exchanges with the community. In fact, the outreach to the community is quite ill-defined other than the Workshops that are planned. They are also, running a bit behind schedule.

Vanessa: agreed with informal email proposal and asked “take tensions down a notch”

Kalani: stated that there’s a disconnect with regard to some folks coming in later in this process. Stated that while those who’d been involved from the beginning welcomed new ideas, there needs to be cognizance that much effort has already been done. Mentioned that she felt the community had not received much positive feedback from agency involved. Felt sending informal email and then letter if necessary was good idea. Commented on slowness of process.

Mary: stated she can send email, and we can hope for a meeting with them. As to larger process, DCP is overwhelmed with all the Plans currently being updated. They haven’t even uploaded the June 22 materials yet.

Selena: felt that we should document any issues we have with DCP now. Unsure if this is premature. Felt it’s important to put things in writing as often as possible. Stated that there is a disconnect between input that came to DCP and the subsequent 6/22 workshop presentation. Asked whose input was included and how are the relative inputs weighed.?

Holly: mentioned that key element to letter is simply to ask what went into the 6/22 presentation. It’s not pejorative.

Mary: concurred. This is about transparency.

Ashley: maybe ask that input be uploaded by DCP?

Holly suggested streamlining the letter (removing the background information) and presenting to BOD, and send to Bertoni and CC PLUM but not Mayor

Selena: asked if there was a council file yet. Mary responded probably not yet, but will inquire.

Vote to amend recipients: 6Y/2N. Motion passes

Vote on Kalani’s amendment to add “impact” Passes without objection

Vote on last paragraph, per Kalani to add “stakeholder review” explicitly. Motion passes without objection.

Kathryn: Move to Call the Question, Seconded by Selena.

Andrea: asked what the use is of the background information. Holly responded that this is mostly for the Chair, to use in writing the letter. The motion is to send a letter. It will not necessarily be the motion verbatim.

Kent: felt that the background information is important in explain why we want the meeting

Kathryn: stated that it is up to Elliot to agendize. Motion is to pass the letter. Mary will contact DCP. What is course if DCP schedules and then cancels?

Vanessa: what is the way forward?

Mary: that we ask for a meeting and have the letter ready if needed. Can schedule special meeting of Comm Plan if necessary

Kalani: Moved to Call the Question. Kathryn Seconded. 5Y/2N/2A, Motion passes

Mary will contact DCP for a meeting to discuss materials presented at 6/22 workshop. If no response, letter will be sent.

9.2 Presentation and discussion of newly released Dept of City Planning Generalized Zoning Summary of Zoning Regulations-tabled until Aug meeting

9. Meeting adjourned at 9:36 PM

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. **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.