



[WestsideCouncils.com](https://www.westsidecouncils.com)

Land Use and Planning Committee Meeting Agenda

Chairs: Mary Hruska, Kathryn Wheeler, WRAC.LUPC@gmail.com

Monday, August 8, 2022, 6:30pm-8pm

Remote Conferencing by Device: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89821743340> | Passcode: 242415

Remote Conferencing by Phone: 720-707-2699 | Meeting ID: 898 2174 3340 | Use *9 to raise hand.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Welcome & Announcements
4. Approval of the Minutes (5 minutes)
 - 4.1. May 9, 2022 (draft attached)
 - 4.2. July 11, 2022 (draft attached)
5. Special Orders - None
6. Standard Order of Business (total 70 minutes) - *SEE ATTACHED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS*
 - 6.1. Old Business (10 minutes)
 - 6.1.1. Required October 2022 Due Date for the Westside Community Plan - Discussion and possible action based on Michelle Bisnoff's (Brentwood) communication with state representatives regarding the October due date. NOTE: On July 1, 2022, an email from DCP was received: "Rather than having October 2022 to complete its new rezoning [(i.e., up zoning)] the City of Los Angeles now has until 2025."
 - 6.1.2. Review WRAC LUPC Guidelines - Discussion and possible action regarding an addition (in blue) to Guideline #3 which reads:

Each WRAC-member Council may designate one (1) Representative and one (1) Alternate member to serve on the LUPC, however only one (1) vote may be cast by each Council for each agenda item. All Representatives and Alternates present at a meeting shall be permitted to participate in the discussion of every agenda item considered by the LUPC. [Any WRAC-member Council that has not](#)

been represented by a voting member for at least one LUPC meeting per quarter will be removed from quorum count.

6.2. New Business (60 minutes)

6.2.1.[Ross] Template for NC's Regarding Housing Element - Discussion and possible action for an NC template to the Department of City Planning requesting halting of the Housing element's proposed upzoning until a detailed justification, based on Dwelling Unit Capacity, is presented.

6.2.2.[Ross] Template for NC's Proposed Revisions to LAMC/Zoning - Discussion and possible action for an NC template to the Department of City Planning regarding the Westside Transit Neighborhood Plans and TOC/Density Bonus ordinances.

6.2.3.[Bhagat] - Discussion and possible action regarding "other WRAC NC PLUM committee's roles and bylaws writing, adding, articulation, circulation, and sustainability to land use committee's roles and responsibilities in addition to land use and planning matters and what if any other WRAC NC bylaws state to reflect the same."

7. Open Forum/Round Table (10 minutes) - Informal period for questions, future agenda items, and getting to know one another.

8. Adjournment (no later than 8pm)



[WestsideCouncils.com](https://www.westsidecouncils.com)

Land Use and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Chairs: Mary Hruska, Kathryn Wheeler, WRAC.LUPC@gmail.com

Monday, May 9, 2022, 6:30pm-8pm

Remote Conferencing by Device: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89821743340> | Passcode: 242415

Remote Conferencing by Phone: 720-707-2699 | Meeting ID: 898 2174 3340. Use *9 to raise hand.

1. **Call to Order - 6:46pm** a quorum was reached [meeting began at 6:30pm]
2. **Roll Call** - Travis Longcore (Bel Air-Beverly Crest), Julie Ross (Westchester/Playa), Chris Spitz (Pacific Palisades), Joanna Spak (Pacific Palisades), Kay Hartman (Palms), Jay Ross (West LA-Sawtelle), Barbara Broide (Westside), Steve Sann (Westwood CC), Stephen Resnick (Westwood NC), [Co-Chairs, Mary Hruska and Kathryn Wheeler]
3. **Welcome & Announcements** - Michelle Bisnoff has taken ill and will be absent.
4. **Approval of the Minutes (5 minutes)**
 - 4.1. **April 11, 2022** - Moved by Spitz, seconded by Ross, approved without objection; 1 abstention (Hartman), abstentions do not count in the vote tally.
5. **Special Orders** - None
6. **Standard Order of Business (30 minutes)** - See Supporting Documents after Agenda.
 - 6.1. **State Required October 2022 Due Date for the Westside Community Plan** - Discussion and possible action based on Michelle Bisnoff's (Brentwood) communication with state representatives regarding the October due date. - Bisnoff taken ill and could not attend; but provided the following Report:

No State Rep from either house who represents any portion of Los Angeles was willing to put forth a Bill or request to extend the City's revised Housing Element deadline, we need to go straight to Governor Newsom - attempts to reach Housing Secretary Lourdes Ramirez were not successful.
 - 6.2. **Revisions to TOC and Expo CTN Plans** - Discussion and possible action regarding TOC and Expo CTN Plans. - Discussion included additions which led the motion

authors to form a working group to expand and send a draft for all LUPC members to read, make additions and edits before final presentation at June LUPC meeting.

6.3. WRAC LUPC Guidelines - Review with discussion and possible action. - 7:27pm, a quorum was lost; however, no changes were proposed.

7. Open Forum - Informal period for questions, future agenda items, and getting to know one another. - Agenda item, "Open Forum" will add the words "Round Table" to conform with LUPC guidelines. Longcore and Broide provided new information for discussion. Both agreed to email LUPC with the information they wish to be included in the minutes.

8. Adjournment (no later than 8pm) - 8pm, moved by Sann, seconded by Spitz.

DRAFT



WestsideCouncils.com

Land Use and Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Chairs: Mary Hruska, Kathryn Wheeler, WRAC.LUPC@gmail.com

Monday, July 11, 2022, 6:30pm-8pm

Remote Conferencing by Device: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89821743340> | Passcode: 242415

Remote Conferencing by Phone: 720-707-2699 | Meeting ID: 898 2174 3340 | Use *9 to raise hand.

1. Call to Order - 6:41pm
2. Roll Call - Members - 6 attending, insufficient for a quorum.
Co-Chairs: Hruska, Wheeler
Public: Mihal (Del Rey NA), Reiff (Del Rey NC), Caller #1 (7:20-7:29pm)
3. Welcome & Announcements
4. Approval of the Minutes (5 minutes) - Postponed till next meeting, no quorum
 - 4.1. May 9, 2022 (draft attached)
5. Special Orders - **LA's Revised Housing Element and How It Impacts Community Plans, part one** - Presentation (approx. 10 minutes) with specifics of newly approved targeted amendments to the Housing Element and their ramifications. Q&A afterwards (approx. 45 minutes) **Supporting Documents on LUPC Google Drive, visit: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1r8Othb3Y25OSe23fJ0odnMlmbiKuAhHa?usp=sharing>**
 - 1) *What to Know about: RHNA, Site Selection, and Rezoning*
 - 2) *Housing Element 2021-2029 DRAFT Target Amendments (approved 6/14/22)*
 - 3) *DCP Rezoning/Upzoning Program Example (MVCC Area)*
 - 4) *Inventory of Adequate Sites for Housing (Table A) or use [City's Link](#)*
 - 5) *Inventory of Candidate Sites for Rezoning (Table B) or use [City's Link](#)*
 - 6) *Jay Ross Suggested Amendments to LA Zoning Code*

Presentation and Q&A by Hruska. Discussion regarding parts 2 & 3: DCP attending a Q&A, LUPC motion. Interactive map reviewed: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/housing-element-update#maps>; Request for motion from 6) Jay Ross Suggested Amendments to LA Zoning Code next meeting.

6. Standard Order of Business (20 minutes) - No quorum

6.1.State Required October 2022 Due Date for the Westside Community Plan - Discussion and possible action based on Michelle Bisnoff's (Brentwood) communication with state representatives regarding the October due date. NOTE: On July 1, 2022, an email from DCP was received: "Rather than having October 2022 to complete its new rezoning [(i.e., up zoning)] the City of Los Angeles now has until 2025." - Bisnoff absent

6.2.Review WRAC LUPC Guidelines, part one - Review, with discussion and possible action, of guidelines 1 through 4: - Request not to review all of the Guidelines as they were recently updated; yet, a request regarding making a quorum was given.

1. The Land Use & Planning Committee (LUPC) of the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC) is a standing committee whose purpose shall be to serve as a forum for the discussion and review of major land use and planning matters that are of a "regional" interest or concern, as defined in paragraphs 4 and 5 below.
2. The LUPC generally shall meet on the second Monday of each month, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
3. Each WRAC-member Council may designate one (1) Representative and one (1) Alternate member to serve on the LUPC, however only one (1) vote may be cast by each Council for each agenda item. All Representatives and Alternates present at a meeting shall be permitted to participate in the discussion of every agenda item considered by the LUPC.
4. A "regional" land use or planning matter shall be defined as a City, County, State, or Federal proposal, statute, amendment, bill, code, ordinance, rule, policy, public infrastructure project, transportation project, or other matter that directly or indirectly may have a significant impact on land use, planning, traffic, or other environmental concern in (2) or more WRAC-member Council areas.

7. Open Forum/Round Table (10 minutes) - Informal period for questions, future agenda items, and getting to know one another. Broide provided new information for discussion. Agreed to email LUPC with the information to be included in the minutes.

8. Adjournment (no later than 8pm) - 8:07pm

July 2022 Land Use Report – Updated 7-14-22

NOTE: The PLUM meetings of July 5 and 19 were cancelled while Council was on recess.

A. City Measures re: State and/or Federal Legislation

CF 22-0002-S99 Position on SB 1425 (Stern and Hertzberg), which would require every city and county to review and update its local open-space plan by Jan. 1, 2026. Referred to Rules, Elections, Intergovernmental Relations Committee to adopt position on SB 1425 in the City’s State legislative program. Referred 6/24 to Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee. Council File is located at: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0002-S99>

MOTION: ____ Neighborhood Council urges the LA City Council to adopt the proposed resolution in CF 22-0002-099 supporting SB 1425 to require updating of all cities’ open space plans (including the City’s Open Space Element of the General Plan) by Jan. 1, 2026.

RATIONALE: The City of LA began revisions of its Open Space Element a number of years ago and abandoned the effort not long after it began. The existing Open Space Element, nearly 50 years old, was adopted in 1973. The City needs to address Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-82-20 issued in 2020 outlining the State’s commitment to conserving at least 30 percent of California’s land and coastal waters by 2030 to combat the biodiversity and climate crises, as well as the Mayor’s Green New Deal goals. The City Council resolution in support of SB 1425 further notes that LA lies within one of only 36 “global biodiversity hotspots” in the world providing home to more than 37 plant and animal species listed as threatened or endangered. The need to both preserve and create open space is critical as the City increases density and infill development guidelines allow for structures to be built lot line to lot line with little to no open space – for people, wildlife, tree planting or percolation of water into the groundwater table. Many of LA’s neighborhoods are recognized as being “park poor” with little access to open space.

Council File 22-0001-S98 Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act referred 6/24 to Rules, Elections and Intergovernmental Relations Committee relative to including in the City’s 2021-22 Federal Legislative Program its position on H.R. 698, the San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act, and H.R. 1075 and S. 1769, the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act, which would increase protections of federal lands and expand their respective boundaries in the LA region. The Council File can be found at: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0002-S98>

MOTION: ____ NC supports CF 22-0002-S98 and its resolution which provides support for H.R. 698, H.R. 1075, and S. 1769 that will preserve and protect federal open space land in the LA region.

RATIONALE: Currently pending in Congress, are several bills, the San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act (H.R.693), the PUBLIC Lands Act (S.1459), and the Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act (H.R.1075 and S.1769); and WHEREAS, together, the San Gabriel Mountains Foothills and Rivers Protection Act and the PUBLIC Lands Act, would set forth provisions concerning the restoration, economic development, and conservation of, and recreational access to, certain public lands throughout California, as well as in the Los Angeles area, would expand the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument by over 109,000 acres to include the western Angeles National Forest. The Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act would expand the boundaries of the Santa Monica Mountains National

Recreation Area by roughly 191,100 acres, increasing public land access for 47% of Californians who live within two hours of this area. Mountain areas surrounding Los Angeles provide needed open space and habitat for both humans and wildlife so needed as our metropolitan region increases population and density and faces challenges associated with global warming and climate change.

CF 22-0002-S93 Cohousing Density Bonus. Resolution to support Assemblymember Bloom’s State bill AB682 was referred to the Rules, Elections, and Intergovernmental Relations Committee on 6/8/22. The bill would add ‘cohousing’ as a category of development eligible for a density bonus; and further defines ‘cohousing unit’ to mean one or more habitable rooms, not contained within another dwelling unit, that includes a bathroom, sink, refrigerator, and microwave, that is used for permanent residence. The bill further defines a ‘cohousing building’ to be a residential or mixed- use structure, with five or more cohousing units and one or more common kitchens and dining areas designed for permanent residence of more than 30 days by its tenants. The bill automatically requires that a building would qualify for the density bonus if at least 10 percent of the total square footage of the co-housing building is set aside for low-income households; or 5 percent of the total square footage of the co-housing building is set aside for very low-income households.

MOTION: _____ Neighborhood Council opposes CF 22-0002-S93, the subject of the Council’s proposed resolution in support of AB 682.

RATIONALE: Co-housing developments are a relatively new land use (although many of them resemble boarding houses that have not been permitted in LA for many years). LA City is still exploring a regulatory framework for them. While co-living presents an opportunity to provide lower cost housing alternatives, early projects in LA have been anything but affordable and resemble high-priced dormitories that pack a large number of residents into a single location/project. The impact of such projects, particularly if in close proximity to one another, could have serious negative impacts on the neighborhoods where they are located. Further, creating a “by right” land use that requires only 5 or 10 percent affordable housing in exchange for generous bonus densities, will not meet the City’s affordable housing needs and may use up land with more luxury-priced housing that might otherwise be used for affordable housing projects that better meet the City’s needs. Land use regulations such as those in AB 682 are an overreach by the State to govern land use best left to local municipalities. This proposed measure also undercuts LA’s TOC guidelines which require higher affordable housing levels to obtain bonus densities.

22-0002-S82 – Expanding the territory of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy: Relative to Resolution to support in the City’s State Legislative 21-22 program, AB 2897 and SB 1122 (Allen) and the CLA report 22-05-0306 (dated 6/7/22). Adopted by Council 6/29/22 and forwarded to Mayor 6/30. Signed by Mayor 7/5/22. The bills specifically seek to expand the territory of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy by including the Dominguez Channel watershed, the coastal watersheds of Manhattan Beach to the Palos Verdes Peninsula, and Santa Catalina Island and to update the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Parkway and Open Space Plan in order to preserve their unique open space and wildlife habitat. Council file: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0002-S82>

B. Local Measures

CF 22-0736: Reforming and increasing transparency in the land use approval process. City Planning Dept. report dated 6/17/22 referred to Council 6/20/22 and referred to PLUM 6/21/22. The 7 page report written in response to three Council motions introduced 8/19/22 that sought to address “concerns over corruption and undue influence in the legislative process.” The CF 22-0736 motion can be reviewed at: [https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2022/22-0736_rpt_PLAN_06-20-22%20\(1\).pdf](https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2022/22-0736_rpt_PLAN_06-20-22%20(1).pdf)

The report’s recommendations to advance the three Council motions are summarized as follows:

1. *INSTRUCT City Planning, with the assistance of the the City Attorney, to prepare and present an ordinance to amend Section 11.5.12 of the Municipal Code to limit the delegation of Council’s authority to consent to extensions of time for Council to act on high value development projects, inclusive of a definition of such projects as proposed in this report. The ordinance would require that such projects be agendized for consideration at the next Council meeting that occurs following a maximum of two-time extensions of 180 days.*
2. *INSTRUCT City Planning to report to Council one year following the effective date of the Processes and Procedures Ordinance, on the effectiveness of the new procedures in promoting the public interest, particularly when legislative actions and other land use entitlements are granted. In addition, the report is to include an evaluation of how transparency has increased and provide recommendations with any potential amendments to further increase transparency in the development review process.*
3. *REQUEST the Ethics Commission, in consultation with the City Attorney, to prepare a report with recommendations and guidelines on communication protocols between project applicants and elected officials.*

A) RE: CF 20-1044:

The Planning Report proposes the criteria for “high value projects” which they state should be:

1. 500 dwelling units or guest rooms;
2. 250,000 square feet of commercial office floor area;
3. 500,000 square feet of floor area of any other non-residential use;
4. An equivalent combination of the above.

The report concludes that the Council consider limiting the ability to approve mutually agreed upon time extensions for the consideration of projects even though those extensions are often sought to address concerns raised during public comment at PLUM. How does limiting time extensions increase transparency? Instead, it would appear to expedite projects and remove the opportunity for additional public hearings if needed. The Planning Dept. notes that removing the PLUM Committee from hearing large value projects would remove a level of opportunity for public participation and would charge the full Council with the task of presiding over often lengthy public hearings.

B) RE: CF 20-1045

The Planning Dept. report addresses the stated two-part Council aim to increase transparency to the public. It asked the Dept to update the proposed Processes and Procedures Ordinance (which has not yet been adopted by the Council but instead appears to be in the process of being implemented in a piecemeal manner by being inserted into new community plan documents before its adoption by Council. (Is that legal?). The CPC approved the P&P Ordinance 3/25/21, it was approved by PLUM on 6/1/21 and the full Council on June 23, 2021 and is currently undergoing form and legality review by the City Attorney's Office – expected to be returned to Council prior to year's end. The report concludes that the P & P ordinance has “potential for increasing transparency in the development review process” which has been questioned by the public in earlier hearings as a result of reduced public comment periods, and the removal of certain approvals from the Council with decision-making being transferred to staff without the

The Planning Dept. report notes that the new Processes and Procedures Ordinance was to *create “clearer administrative rules and the table of contents for the City's new Zoning Code. It was not intended to comprehensively revise the thresholds that require a project to pursue a specific entitlement path. Once the Processes and Procedures Ordinance is adopted, the Council and the public can more easily have policy discussions about revising entitlement paths, thresholds, and ministerial or discretionary actions, etc. given that all existing processes and procedures will have a standard convention by which they can be compared.”* The report discusses the process currently used to grant land use entitlements and the process of making findings consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives in City documents including the General Plan and its elements which is designed to address the public's interest.

The second part of the Motion *“centers around when entitlements should be denied or approved contingent upon whether or not a proposed project is in the public interest or otherwise adheres to established City policies.”* The report then refers to the recommendation above which recommends that the Ethics Commission, with the City Attorney be directed to report on communication protocols between developers and Council offices that occur outside official meetings or hearings.

BACKGROUND INFO: The three motions were: **CF 20-1042** (<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=20-1042>) (a city zoning code update ballot measure -which seemed to ignore the ReCodeLA program and for which there was a follow-up Planning Dept. report issued 6/6/21), **CF 20-1044** (https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2020/20-1044_mot_08-19-2020.pdf) (a measure increase transparency by having “high value projects” bypass the PLUM Committee and go directly to the Council for consideration, and **CF 20-1045** (https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2020/20-1045_mot_08-19-2020.pdf) related to “providing more clarity on the development process focusing on transparency and providing a faster path to development of much needed housing within the City.” The motion instructs Planning Dept. to report back with additional criteria “on when entitlements such as legislative actions and CUPs will be granted and should restrict actions from moving forward unless it can be established that they are in the public interest or otherwise adhere to established policies of the city.” It is also meant to establish “new protocols around communication between developers and council offices that takes place outside official meetings or hearings, these protocols should ensure that discussions between developers and council offices take place transparently and with appropriate disclosures.”

While community members might assume that measures that promote transparency are meant to increase the public's ability to participate in the land use entitlement process and provide opportunities for input, it appears that the intended measures seek to remove impediments to streamlining development. No doubt that members of the PLUM Committee now either found to be guilty or currently under indictment abused their leadership

positions on PLUM and on the Council, but it would seem that this would suggest the need for higher ethical standards and more public disclosure of the contacts between developers and councilmembers – neither of which has been the focus of the current reporting requests. (Yes, there are new rules that just went into effect on campaign donations from developers.)

CF 22-0797: Illegal dumping on multi-jurisdictional locations in LA City. Referred 7/1/22 to Energy, Climate Change, Environmental Justice, and River Committee. Motion relative to instructing the Bureau of Sanitation to report on challenges to and strategies to coordinate efforts with LA County and CalTrans when cleaning public spaces and when addressing illegal dumping on multi-jurisdictional locations in the City. Report to include evaluation of the feasibility of entering into an MOU with LA County and CalTrans to expedite responses to CARE, CARE Plus, and illegal dumping locations, including funding options available to the City such as full cost recovery for services completed outside City jurisdiction. Council File: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0797>

MOTION: The ___NC supports CF 22-0797 to expedite the clean-up of multi-jurisdictional land adjacent to LA City.

CF 22-0798: Responsible Beverage Service Training Program (RBSTP) online and/or in person to businesses at each of the City's BusinessSource Centers. Referred 7/1 to Economic Development and Jobs Committee. Relative to instructing the Economic and Workforce Development Dept, with assistance from the CAO and CLA, to report on a plan for providing the RBSTP online and/or in person to businesses at each of the City's BusinessSource Centers to enable compliance with SB 1221 (passed in 2017) that goes into effect 8/31/22 and that requires all alcohol servers in bars, restaurants, breweries, wineries, stadiums, etc. be properly certified by 8/31/22. CF at: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0798>

Wildlife District Ordinance: This ordinance proposes new development standards for lot coverage, landscaping, and setbacks, as well as grading and height limitations for properties within the Wildlife District. Additional regulations are defined for lots where natural resources, such as water features, open space, or ridgelines, are present. The proposed WLD District lies approximately between the 405 and 101 freeways, Ventura and Sunset Blvds. A link to the recording of the recent virtual information session held 6/28 can be found at: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/wildlife-pilot-study#outreach-&-events> as is an informational video and information about the upcoming Wildlife Ordinance Public hearing to be held 7/13/22 at 5 pm. The hearing is being held to provide the public with the opportunity to offer public testimony regarding the Wildlife District Supplemental Use District and Zone Change.

An interactive map of the Wildlife District and draft ordinance are available at the project webpage: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/wildlife-pilot-study#about>

The original motion leading to this measure was CF 14-0518: http://clkrep.lacity.org/online/docs/2014/14-0518_mot_04-23-14.pdf

ACTION: Letter of comment from NC to support recommendations made and the creation of the Wildlife District Supplemental Use District.

The file for written comments has been extended until August 22nd. Written comments should include the case number information: CPC-2022-3413-CA, CPC-2022-3712-ZC and be sent to: ourla2040@lacity.org

Mobility Plan Implementation Ordinance (Council File _____): In response to a threat that a citizen initiative by the Healthy Streets LA Coalition and Streets for All could be placed on the ballot to force the City to implement street modifications that implement roadway changes to implement the long range Mobility Plan 2035, the City Council approved a motion to direct the City Attorney to create an ordinance to “ensure that the city installs improvements listed in the Mobility Plan 2035 (https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/523f2a95-9d72-41d7-aba5-1972f84c1d36/Mobility_Plan_2035.pdf) when performing street resurfacing and [slurry seal](#) projects.” (Councilmembers Joe Buscaino, Gil Cedillo and Paul Koretz were absent from the meeting.) The full motion: The motion, co-authored by Council President Nury Martinez and councilmembers Monica Rodriguez, Curren Price Jr., Marqueece Harris-Dawson and Kevin de León, also directs the city to take several steps to study and eventually implement the Mobility Plan with scale and equity in mind, including:

---Creating a “Unified Project Coordination Office” that will report to the Board of Public Works. This office will coordinate work across various city departments “to ensure that maximum mobility and environmental benefits are provided when any city project is constructed within the public right of way”

---Tasking the City Administrative Officer to develop a funding plan across departments to ensure projects are prioritized based on improving “regional accessibility and overall health and economic outcomes for people who have historically been disadvantaged by race, class, physical ability, gender, age, or other discriminatory conditions”

---Building and publishing a dashboard that “allows the public to easily see all projects that the city intends to implement”

Amendments made to the motion “exclude routine maintenance” — like filling in potholes, repairs related to utility services and tree planting — from triggering required improvements.

The Mobility Plan Implementation Ordinance is expected to be drafted within 15 days. Under its guidelines, the general managers of LADOT and City Planning, along with the Board of Public Works, must work together to create both citywide and neighborhood mobility corridors— after consulting with emergency responders. Councilmembers also requested a comprehensive report to examine how much of Mobility Plan 2035 has been installed on city streets so far — indicating it has not been adequately tracked to date. That report is expected to include the share of upgrades in each council district and in specific neighborhoods. The City Council motion acknowledges that — despite the mobility plan being on the books since August 2015 — the city “has implemented less than 3%” of it.

Initiative circulators are continuing their efforts to qualify the measure for the ballot despite the Council’s action to move forward. They prefer to see their petition presented to the voters because the petition version could not be changed without another ballot measure, whereas the City’s ordinance could leave the door open to a future Council vote (by eight councilmembers). In addition, the City’s version includes the Board of Public Works and Fire and Police Depts. In the decision making. The ballot measure does not and would thus remove concerns they might raise related to emergency response times.

CONCERNS: As paving and slurry sealing work are often done on a fairly piecemeal basis, the installation of, for example, bike lanes that do not connect with any further routes with bike improvements, may fail to reflect installation of bike lanes based upon need, use patterns, rider safety, emergency response times, etc. It is also unclear whether improvements defined in 2015 should be implemented as envisioned at that time or should be subject to additional review before automatically being constructed/installed. Land use policies have changed since that time and development patterns in some areas may also have changed changing commute patterns. Changes in public transit routes have also been implemented (along with construction of new routes). Concerns voiced by public safety providers are important factors in determining roadway changes.

ACTION/MOTION: What if anything would an NC want to say about the proposed motion/ ordinance? LETTER to Council file that points out the language in the Mobility Plan that specifically says that “The plan is not intended as a recipe book that must be followed to the letter but simply a preliminary roadmap to guide the City in making future multi-modal improvements that improve the overall safety of the City’s streets while increasing Angelenos’ access to multiple modal choices.” Page 134 (or 153 in the online digital version) specifically calls out the Westwood Blvd. bike lane and says the following: “The street segments indicated on the Networks represent potential opportunities to connect major destinations, but they are not intended to represent the full range of street options that may be considered during the implementation phase. For example, while Westwood Boulevard is identified on the BEN as a plausible north-south means of connecting UCLA with designations to the south, parallel north-south corridors may be substituted to implement Westwood bicycle enhancements and provide an alternative connection to the citywide network, based upon more detailed operational studies and community engagement.” However, if the new ordinance is adopted (or the initiative is passed), more detailed operational studies and community engagement would not occur. In short, the Council’s reaction to the proposed initiative was to craft a measure that attempts to address the concerns of initiative promoters while ignoring the language and scope of the original Mobility Plan. The fact that implementation has lagged should not translate into the adoption of measures that removes community participation in the process. (Or, as in the case of the initiative, also removes public safety participation in the process.)

Council File 22-0392: Metro Transit Communications Network of digital billboards: The PLUM Committee approved the drafting of an ordinance on June 21 to allow the Metro program to move forward on their consent calendar last month without a word of discussion amongst the committee members. The full Council approved PLUM’s recommendation the following week on June 28.

To see locations of planned digital billboards (street-facing and freeway-facing) in your community if this program is approved, go to the recorded presentation of the NOP session which is at: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/7l3vazv99twwyo2/AAAXitSopDb5O1LlKhFU2p3Ya/05212022?dl=0&preview=GMT20220521-165835_Recording_1326x720.mp4&subfolder_nav_tracking=1 The maps can be seen if you go to 8 minutes 54 second in the presentation. A map of each area of the City can be seen between 8:54 and 10:03. Look to see where there are freeway

facing and non-freeway facing billboards proposed in your community. There was such poor public outreach for the NOP sessions that the NOP online session lasted a short time with the balance of time featuring a screen that said that questions could be submitted / asked as the staff were still available. But there was no one there to ask questions! The program proposes these billboards which could be just the start as the Metro TCN program approved by the Metro Board consisted of 300 digital billboards in total! Some will be outside of LA City, but the final plans related to sign distribution are not known (and communities will have no voice in opposing these or any future locations identified by Metro).

MOTION: The ____ Neighborhood Council opposes CF 22-0392 and the furtherance of an ordinance that will result in the placement of dangerous, driver-distracting digital billboards on our streets whether they be freeway or non-freeway facing billboards as part of the Metro Transit Communications Program.

We question the City's approval of the program prior to the completion of the program's CEQA Environmental Impact Report (now underway by Metro). We protest the fact that our community has been given no voice in challenging the future placement of digital billboards in or near to our community and neighborhood council neighborhoods. We do not understand why or how the City can advance this program without considering all the associated issues including driver distraction and roadway safety (and particularly pedestrian and bicyclist vulnerability), environmental impacts, how to minimize ad faces while maximizing revenues, whether approval of this program will open the City up to future litigation that could undermine the City's ability to regulate off-site signage.

ACTION ITEM: Write to Metro at tcn@metro.net and litvakj@metro.net and JacksonM@metro.net (Metro Board secretary) and LA City Council Metro Board members: Bonin (mike.bonin@lacity.org), Krekorian (councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org) and Mayor Garcetti (mayor.garcetti@lacity.org) to tell them that the public comment period for the scoping period for the Metro TCN must be re-opened with public outreach to inform affected communities of the process and opportunity to submit comments. Let them know that there was inadequate outreach for the scoping period that ended June 1.

The names: tcn@metro.net, Litvakj@metro.net, jacksonM@metro.net, mike.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

CF 20-1536 STAP: The Board of Public Works approved the contract with Tranzito for STAP and forwarded the program on to the Council for its review. It is set to be heard before the Council's Public Works, Finance and Personnel Committees. The Dept. of Public Works has still not released the promised comparison of the two final bidders or the criteria that was used to evaluate and score the bidders. The recommended contract does not reflect the program that was presented to the public during outreach. Program elements that were presented as part of the program are noted as "secondary" and there are no budget dollars included to either purchase or language that would assure their maintenance if purchased. There are inaccuracies in the budget projections that may have led to a failure to do a fair evaluation/comparison of bids. There was never any discussion related to driver distraction and roadway safety (and there appears to have been an arbitrary decision to assign a 10-second rotation rate for the digital ads on structures. Furthermore, there has never been an open statement as to the

numbers of advertising faces that communities will have installed on their streets. It appears that the Tranzito program will bring over 6,000 (up to 6,500) advertising panels to our streets with 2,000 of those digital changing panels. The Decaux program appears to present significantly fewer exposures to advertising panels – thousands fewer.

The CAO is analyzing the recommended contract and as soon as that review is complete, expect to see a Council Public Works Committee meeting to consider the program. Be prepared to speak! Sign up to get notices of meetings on the Council file page:

It is critical that the Public Works Dept's comparison charts be shared so that numbers can be validated and reviewed. The public should have information about the criteria that was used to select the recommended bidder.

Financial projections in the contract appear to be unrealistic. We had been told that the current structures were to be repurposed without ads and yet the contract projects ad revenues from those shelters. (The current shelters cannot be used for advertising for the first five years after the current contract ends if a new vendor is granted the new contract.) Revenue projections appear to be overly optimistic. Projections as to the costs of operating the program and for purchasing the required equipment are questionable. Have supply chain issues been reviewed to determine whether shelters can be put in place to generate the revenues stated? What has the staff done to evaluate the life expectancy of the shelters and replacement costs (when?). Under the current contract the vendor prepares the sidewalks and surrounding area for shelter placement at their expense. Where is that expense to be born and how is it being budgeted by the City? Where is the money coming from to purchase the shelters and associated street furniture? What is the cost of using that money for STAP, and will it negatively affect the availability of funds for other City priority projects? What is the likelihood that the STAP program will be able to repay the monies in a timely manner?

One of the bidders Decaux (not selected) has been visiting NCs to present info about the process and their concerns. They have provided NCs with a follow-up summary chart of information that has been requested of Public Works but has not been made available by the City:

LOS ANGELES STAP COMPARISON

	Outfront Decaux Street Furniture LLC	Tranzito -Vector, LLC	BENEFITS
Experience Program Build / Management Bus shelter, street furniture Smart Cities innovations Bus Shelter Ad in the Top 10 US Markets At Los Angeles scale	YES	NO	NO Relevant Experience
Bus Stop Amenities Bus shelter + Shade Structures	4,500	3,000	1,500 FEWER Bus Stop Amenities
Including without advertising	3,736	0	3,736 MORE advertising locations
Covers % of the 7,500 LA bus stops	60%	40%	1/3 FEWER coverage
Public Toilets Existing units (for 1 year +)	14	NO	NOT Offered/Expertise
Number of ad panels	1,679	6,634	4,955 MORE advertising panels
Number of Digital screens	810	1,952	1,142 MORE Digital Screens
Minimum Annual Guarantee to City Average Annual Payment to the City	\$115m \$11.5m	\$79m \$7.9m	\$36m LESS MAG payment to the City \$3.6m LESS MAG per year
Guarantee % of projected revenue to the City	70%	20%	Guarantee only 20% of projected revenue

IMPORTANT FACT: The STAP also includes a proposed amendment to the LAMC that would allow an unlimited quantity of advertising panels/digital screens of any size, at any locations within the City rights of way as approved solely by the Board of Public Works. Interestingly, that proposed LAMC change is not required for the installation of new STAP bus shelters which are already allowed by the LAMC, but is proposed to facilitate thousands of ads (in addition to the 6,600+ STAP ad panels) for other City ventures.

CIS/MOTION: The _____ NC, while recognizing the need for and strongly supporting the creation of a new citywide program to provide shade and shelter to our transit riders, is equally strongly opposed to the current proposed STAP Program. The program has moved forward for Council review having been mis-represented to the public and without addressing critical concerns and questions raised during public outreach. The further failure to produce an EIR and perform a full CEQA review is extremely problematic and the introduction (hidden) of a new LAMC within the STAP Mitigated Negative Declaration is completely inappropriate as there already is a dedicated LAMC to allow for advertising on the public right-of-way for transit shelters. The failure to incorporate any formal avenues for input and consideration from neighborhood councils or from the local City Council District Offices on the future placement of structures (in this program or in any new programs resulting from the new LAMC) is unacceptable.

We urge the Council to question and reject the proposed program and to listen to your communities who believe a better program can and should be crafted. There must be ways to have the new program provide more shade and shelter to more riders of transit across LA. STAP must be STOPPED now.

Optional: Our Neighborhood Council's additional concerns are reflected in the attached letter.

CF 17-0981-S6: This motion adopts the new streamlined permitting land use regulatory process for the Restaurant Beverage Program specifically for CD 13. Individual CDs have introduced motions specific to their geographic boundaries to enable the streamlined program. Council approved 6/28/22. CF can be found at: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=22-0798>

The motions to enable the streamlined program have already been adopted for CDs 4, 5, and 12. The Restaurant Beverage Program (RBP) was adopted by the Council 2/9/22 and creates two versions: a general and an Alcohol Sensitive Use Zone (ASUZ) version, for sit-down restaurants to serve alcohol if they meet more than 50 eligibility criteria performance standards, and enforcement procedures. The ASUZ version contains additional standards, including a one-year provisional period with a complaint portal review. The RBP Ordinance became effective 3/31/22. To participate in either version, a qualifying restaurant must be located in a neighborhood that has been identified as eligible by the City Council. The RBP Ordinance requires the City Council to designate specific geographic areas by Council Resolution in order to activate either the general or sensitive use provisions of the ordinance. More info re: RBP Ordinance can be found at: <https://planning.lacity.org/restaurant-beverage-program>. The CF for the adopted Ordinance No. 187,402 is at: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=17-0981>

Staff contact for RBP program is Roberto Luna at: Roberto.luna@lacity.org.

Transit Demand Management (TDM) Program Update - CPC-2021-3141-CA: The Planning Dept. has released the revised drafts for the proposed TDM Program update for public review and comment. **A public hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, August 2, 2022 at 4 pm.** Virtual presentation to take place from 4-4:45 pm. Virtual public hearing 4:45-6:30. Join Zoom Webinar: <https://planning-lacity-org.zoom.us/j/81067836037> Webinar ID: 810 6783 6037 | Password: 694094 Dial by Phone: US: +1 213 338 8477 or +1 669 900 9128 Meeting ID: 810 6783 6037. Written comments will be taken through August 15, 5 pm to: planning.mobility@lacity.org. Include case number CPC-2021-3141-CA.

“The proposed TDM Program update aims to reduce the need for drive-alone vehicle trips by increasing transportation options and accessibility throughout the City, providing benefits to the environment and public health. It would require new development projects over a certain size to implement strategies such as supporting transit, telecommuting, walking, carshare, and other sustainable travel options that reduce vehicle trips.”

The revised draft of the TDM Ordinance: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/bb9114b3-29e3-423f-8b91-027afb242e63/Revised_DRAFT_TDMOrdinance_June2022.pdf
The TDM Program guidelines: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/c3c9b320-4431-49ff-99d2-15b479c06074/Revised_DRAFT_TDMProgramGuidelines_June2022.pdf
TDM Fact Sheet: https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/ee9c120e-5181-4c0d-8bc0-c0cb07a765b9/TDM_Fact_Sheet_updated_6.2022.pdf

CF 22-0392

Developer Contribution Ban in Effect: On June 8th a ban on political contributions from restricted developers went into effect. In Dec. 2019, the City Council adopted an ordinance that limits the ability of persons involved in certain development projects in the City to make City campaign contributions. That ordinance was to take effect with the regular 2022 general elections.

LA City Al Fresco Dining Survey: The Planning Dept. has created two surveys to gather feedback on the LA Al Fresco outdoor dining program. This is being done as part of the effort to create a permanent al fresco program by amending the Zoning Code to allow for expanded outdoor dining and streamline existing outdoor dining provisions in the Zoning Code as it pertains to private property. (Concurrent efforts are underway by LADOT to draft regulations to permit in-street and curbside dining, and by the Bureau of Engineering to permit expanded sidewalk dining.)

One survey is for restaurant participants in the current (still temporary) program and the second is for the general public and interested parties. The link to the short surveys can be found here: <https://planning.lacity.org/plans-policies/outdoor-dining> along with additional info about the current program and work underway.

CF 21-1200-S5: RE: Reappointment of Jenna Hornstock (of CD 13) to the LA City Planning Commission for a term ending 6/30/27. Originally approved 2/17/21 for a term that expired 6/30/22 due to the resignation of V. Khorsand. Now being nominated for a full term. Mayor document dated 6/15/22 submitted to Council and referred to PLUM 6/21/22. She is Deputy Director of Planning, Land Use Special Initiatives for SCAG focusing on Housing and Economic Development. From 2011-2019 she worked for Metro's Countywide Planning and Development Dept. with her last position there as Executive Officer for Transit Oriented Development, First/Last Mile Planning and Systemwide Design programs as well as the development of the Union Station Master Plan. Her prior position was with LA's Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). Last day to act on the file is 8/5/22. <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=21-1200-S5>

STATE MEASURES OF INTEREST (with Livable California recommendations)

AB 1771 – The California Housing Speculation Act: income taxes: capital gains: sale or exchange of qualified asset: housing

Support – **Not Likely to Move**

Location [Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation](#) (3/3/22) – Not likely to move

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

AB 1910 – Publicly owned golf courses: conversion: affordable housing

Opposed – **Died in first house**

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

AB 2011 – Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act of 2022

Strongly Oppose – Location Senate Appropriations

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

AB 2050 – Residential real property: withdrawal of accommodations

Support – **Dead**

Location Senate Inactive File

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

AB 2053 – The Social Housing Act

Dead

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

AB 2097 – Residential and commercial development: remodeling, renovations, and additions: parking requirements

Oppose – Location Senate Appropriations

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

SB 15 – Housing development: incentives: rezoning of idle retail sites

Support – Dead

Location [Assembly Committee on Local Government](#)

[Link to Position Letter](#)

SB 897 – Accessory dwelling units: junior accessory dwelling units

Oppose – Location Senate Appropriations

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

SB 922 – California Environmental Quality Act: exemptions: transportation-related projects

Oppose – Assembly Floor #rd Reading file

Location Assembly Appropriations Committee

[Link to Bill Text](#)

SB 1457 – Housing: California Family Home Construction and Homeownership Bond Act of 2022

Support

Location [Assembly Committee on Housing and Community Development](#) – No Hearing Set

[Link to Bill Text](#)

ACA 14 – Homelessness and affordable housing

Strongly Support

Location Assembly Committee on Appropriations

[Link to Bill Text](#) / [Link to Position Letter](#)

Livable California Position Letters to Date

[AB 682 Support if Amended](#) – Location Senate Appropriations

[AB 1445 Support](#) – Location Senate Appropriations Suspense File

[AB 1771 Support](#) – Location [Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation](#) – Hearing not set

[AB 1795 Support](#) – Dead

[AB 1910 Oppose](#) – Dead

[AB 1976 Oppose](#) – Dead

[AB 2011- Oppose](#) – Location Senate Appropriations

[AB 2050 Support](#) – Dead

[AB 2063 Support with Amendments](#) – Dead

[AB 2166 Oppose](#) – Dead

[AB 2170 Support](#) – Location Senate Appropriations

[AB 2211 Oppose](#) – Dead

[AB 2334 Oppose](#) – Location Senate Appropriations

[AB 2469 Oppose](#) – Dead

[AB 2547](#) No Longer of Interest – Gutted 6/13/22

[AB 2620 Support](#) – Dead

[AB 2713 Support](#) – Dead

[AB 2749 Support](#) – **Location Senate Appropriations Committee**

[ACA 14 Support](#) – Location [Assembly Committee on Appropriations](#)

[SB 843 Support](#) – Location Assembly Appropriations

[SB 897 Oppose](#) – Location Assembly Appropriations

[SB 930](#) No Longer of Interest – Gutted 6/2/22

[SB 1067 Oppose](#) – Location Assembly Appropriations

From United Neighbors:

AB 2053, the social housing bill will reappear as a gut and amend bill in the August session. Legislators are working on new wording for this bill. Not knowing what that wording will look like United Neighbors is submitting to you a template to consider should the new bill be problematic. We know that once introduced this bill will be moved through the legislature quickly so be prepared for a last minute alert to submit to the portal. Adapt the letter as desired. Just be sure to add onto your letterhead and use the first paragraph to identify your organization. The number of the bill has been omitted throughout the letter because we have no idea what this bill will be introduced as. Get ready but don't send yet.

Oppose AB

Dear Senator ,

Although countless housing bills have been introduced since 2008, the affordable housing crisis in California continues. The only winner to date has been the private developer who receives substantial incentives like density bonuses and minimum parking criteria that grant them the right to overbuild market rate housing, in exchange for building a minimal amount of affordable housing units (10-15% per project). The State is, therefore, unable to meet the growing demand for affordable housing. This bill is not the answer. It uses the same for-profit developer model that has failed countless times to produce enough needed affordable housing.

As a concept, AB is a continuation of the state's policy of not directly subsidizing affordable housing. Each project is envisioned to be economically self-supporting. The only difference between this bill and the current developer model of overbuilding market rate housing to subsidize a few affordable units, is the state's involvement in ownership and execution. Just like the current system more market rate units will need to be built to offset the affordable units. We can't keep overbuilding. We do not have the infrastructure or the water to continue doing this.

The Vienna model, which this bill is supposedly following, works primarily because most of the land is owned by the state and as housing is needed the state makes land available. Land is the single largest cost component of development. In addition, it has a dependable annual funding stream, strong environmental, social, and architectural criteria controlling what gets built and complete local control. The combination of these factors makes this housing model work for the nearly 80% of the population that lives in social housing. The city grows outward as needed with public transit already available before development starts. California possesses none of these preconditions. As such, AB can never be more than the existing over-development model currently in use by the private sector, with all the attendant downsides this model currently imposes on communities.

We respectfully submit our concerns regarding this bill.

1.) The State of California currently has 63 local/county Public Housing Agencies that have the local know-how and connections to create lots of affordable housing. These agencies all lack proper funding. Rather than funding these local existing

agencies this bill creates a new mega agency which has neither the experience nor the know how to build affordable housing. This seems fiscally irresponsible.

3.) The goal of this bill is to create significant amounts of affordable housing but to reach that objective and to honor the self-supporting criteria an inordinate amount of market rate housing must be built to offset the affordable units. This is the model currently being used and it has failed to produce the housing we need. Overbuilding market rate housing is unsustainable.

4.) Property owners' protections need to be explicitly stated to avoid effective "takings" by the state. While we were told eminent domain will not be considered, it must be specifically stated in the bill. The process for acquisition of existing properties needs to be clarified.

5.) This bill fails to explain in detail how this huge agency will fund its internal structural needs. The huge sums of money needed for salaries, health care, pensions can be better spent on actual housing rather than administrative needs.

We don't need a new agency. We need to attract private capital money to build 100% affordable housing and we need to fund our existing housing agencies.

AB 2097 the bill that removes parking criteria in new developments is going to Appropriations first week in August. United Neighbors has submitted a template for your consideration. We are addressing this to Senator Portantino, Chair of the Appropriations Committee. Again use the first paragraph to introduce your organization. You can submit this right now, please.

The legislative portal:

<https://calegislation.lc.ca.gov/Advocates/>

Be sure to remember to send to your own Senator any position papers you submit to the portal so they know where you stand on the bills.

Sample comments:

We vehemently oppose AB 2097.

Reduction in parking criteria has always been offered as a Density Bonus Incentive to developers in return for providing more affordable housing in a project. AB 2097 offers a cost savings without affordable units in return. We have an affordable housing crisis, why would we offer this cost savings to developers and ask nothing in return?

AB 2097:

- Offers cost savings to a developer with no mandate to add affordable units in developments of 40 units or less. None of the cost savings from eliminating parking will be passed on as lower rents for residents. This is simply a developer benefit.
- Unduly burdens residents who need a car to access a job. An individual's future job potential should not be limited to where a public transit system can take them. It has been proven that one can reach 30-times more jobs with a car. Why support a bill that makes it harder for people to own cars and prosper in California?
- Raises safety concerns for people leaving work or going home in late hours of the night who must walk to and from remote street parking to their residences. It burdens residents that carry equipment or due to health or age cannot walk the distance to their car. It also creates a burden on charging electric vehicles. As more people own electric cars where do they park to charge their cars overnight. As more electric cars are purchased will parking be added back to developments.


Before we take away parking, we need a realistic alternative, like public parking structures with shuttles throughout a community. Only then can you limit parking in developments.

--

OF INTEREST:

R.I.P. Los Angeles is a blog chronicling the escalating losses of significant local buildings through demolition notices filed with the Department of Building and Safety. It is written by Nathan Marsak in association with Kim Cooper & Richard Schave. Read it and weep <https://riplosangeles.com/>

CityWatch article on the Council's vote to put a parcel tax measure for parks / recreation on the November ballot: https://www.citywatchla.com/index.php/la-watchdog/25070-just-say-no-to-recreation-parks-parcel-tax?fbclid=IwAR0gkq2A9jHGn-KAZG2hAe8_miQR4Eeorksp6rE68LGoSFTTbzQ5bRIIZiU



LUPC August 8, 2022 - Agenda Item 6.2.1

Motion: The [Insert name of Neighborhood Council] shall recommend that ~~the Board request that the~~ Department of City Planning halt the Housing Element's proposed upzoning of our neighborhoods until the citywide zoning capacity is fully disclosed. ~~and authorize the Chair to submit Community Impact Statements in the future. and a~~ detailed justification for said upzoning based on Dwelling Unit Capacity is presented by the Dept of City Planning (DCP).

Maps of upzones: <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/59a896a0931346a7a94acbf9917f90b7>

Facts and background:

1. The City, in order to comply with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation (RHNA) of 456,643 units, mandated by the state Housing and Community Development Dept (HCA), proposes extensive upzoning of R1, R2 and multi-family neighborhoods, and commercial corridors.
2. The areas which had been proposed to be preserved in the Draft community plans issued by DCP thus far (Palms-Mar-Vista_DelRey/ Venice/Westchester/ West LA) will be overridden.
3. ~~The Community Plan's proposal to preserve the R1 neighborhoods near Stoner Park, along Ayres Ave. and Pearl Ave. south of Pico Blvd., and west of Centinela Ave. to the north of Nebraska Ave. will be overridden.~~

Findings and justifications:

1. The Dept of City Planning, in its What To Know About RHNA, Site Selection and Rezoning fact sheet has stated that "the City has an anticipated unit capacity of 230,947 units". This would appear to confirm that DCP has performed DUC.
2. The [insert name of Neighborhood Council] requests that DCP confirm that it has in fact performed a DUC which includes density created by Density Bonus and ADU legislation and SB9 and issue its estimates by Neighborhood Council.
3. The City must then demonstrate that it actually needs to upzone properties in order to meet its RHNA allocation
4. In the 1990 General Plan, the zoning capacity was 7,900,000, and that did not include any affordable housing incentives, C zones, or ADUs. Its DUC should be substantially increased with the addition of Density Bonus, ADU and SB9 units.

LUPC August 8, 2022 - Agenda Item 6.2.2

Proposed revisions to LAMC/Zoning to be implemented in Community Plan updates, Westside Transit Neighborhood Plans, and TOC/Density Bonus ordinances:

The Motion:

The [Insert name of WRAC Neighborhood Council] shall recommend that the Dept of City Planning, as part of the Community Plan Update process in the West Los Angeles Community Plans [Insert the name of WRAC NCs], integrate the following elements into any and all Density Bonus ordinances as they apply therein.

Infrastructure Planning/Monitoring:

In order to accommodate changes in anticipated population growth, the Community Plan has a theoretical maximum land use and population capacity greater than the projected development likely to occur during the Community Plan period. The Framework Element of the General Plan commits the Department of City Planning to develop a monitoring system and prepare an annual report on growth and infrastructure, to be submitted to the City Planning Commission, Mayor, and City Council.

In the 5th year following plan adoption (and every five years thereafter), the Planning Dept. shall report to the City Planning Commission on the relationship between population, employment, housing growth, and plan capacities. If growth has occurred faster than projected, a revised environmental impact analysis will be prepared and appropriate changes recommended to the Community Plan. These plan and zoning changes shall be submitted to the Planning Commission, Mayor, and City Council, as specified in the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

· Policies 16-2.1 No increase in density shall be effected by zone change, plan amendment, subdivision, or any other discretionary action, unless the decision-makers . . .adopt findings with regard to infrastructure adequacy as part of their action on discretionary approvals of projects which could result in increased density or intensity.

· Policy IV-4: Coordinate a program for locating and phasing public facilities to meet existing and future needs.

Population:

1. Include SB9 units in zoning capacity for RHNA purposes.

Incentives:

1. Incentives for front and back setback reductions cannot be combined as 1 incentive (it is allowed now). Each setback shall be a separate incentive. The setbacks shall be expanded/ lengthened in areas to accommodate trees (i.e. notches). Or setback reduction is for only 75% of the building length, so trees can be planted.

2. Incentives for each side yard reduction must be separate (cannot be combined as 1 incentive). Each setback shall be a separate incentive.

Landscape ordinance:

No part of the front yard may be paved over for parking spaces. The only pavement may be for a 5 ft walkway to the front door, and a driveway that is as wide as a 2-car garage (it may not be as wide as a 3-car garage, that must be flared). 50% of the front yard may paved only for a circular driveway (this is to correct the DBS's wrong interpretation that 50% of the entire front yard may be paved over for any reason, especially an extra parking spot).

Land use:

1. Co-Living: Only in C zones.
 - a. 1 kitchen for every 4 units/rooms.
 - b. Minimum unit/room size: 144 sf.
 - c. No density bonuses.
 - d. Open space: 100 sf/ unit (less than 3 habitable rooms).

Development standards/zoning:

1. General: Development standards are maximums, and the design of the building may cause the project to be less than the maximum.
 - a. The city shall not be mandated to issue development waivers so that a project can achieve maximum density, height, shortest setbacks, etc. just so more units can be stuffed onto a site.
 - b. If a project must have shorter setbacks to accommodate trees, then the standard must be reduced.
 - c. If a building is entitled to 100 units, they may build 100 studios. If they choose to build 4,000 sf apartments that required a higher FAR and shorter setbacks and reduced open space via development waivers, those waivers shall not be issued. The developer may reduce the size of individual units in order to comply with development standards.
2. Setbacks/ yards:
 - a. Front yard: Must be 50% flat and usable open space.
 - i. Front yard must comply with underlying zone in all cases. No shortened 5-ft. building line for apartments along large streets (as Expo Plan allows).
 - b. Parking is prohibited in all setbacks, only driveways that provide direct access to garage and right-of-way are allowed.
 - c. Rear setback shall be measured from rear property line for all parcels (including alleys).
 - i. Justification:
 1. A USC study determined that Los Angeles has lost 30-50% of its tree canopy in recent years because these large projects replace smaller projects.

- a. <https://news.usc.edu/120872/mass-produced-dwellings-home-expansion-reduce-l-a-areas-residential-green-cover/>
 - 2. City's new Resilience Plan: Increase equitable tree canopy coverage by 2028.
- 3. Street/ right-of-way:
 - a. 1 tree every 30 linear ft. of frontage.
 - b. Landscaped parkway of 4 ft. minimum size.
 - i. Justification:
 - 1. A USC study determined that Los Angeles has lost 30-50% of its tree canopy in recent years because these large projects replace smaller projects.
 - 2. City's new Resilience Plan: Increase equitable tree canopy coverage by 2028.
- 4. Landscaping:
 - a. 4 trees must be planted on for each 5,000 sf of land (or 1 tree / 2,000 sf for larger sites). They must be planted in a 7 x 7 x 7 ft area of soil so roots can grow, and the canopy can grow sufficiently to provide real shade. The canopy must have a 15 x 15 x 15 ft area to grow.
 - i. The trees cannot be planted on top of parking garages, because the roots cannot grow down.
 - ii. The trees cannot be planted in planters with stormwater filtering aggregate (not soil, but charcoal and other materials that are not organic and do not nourish root growth).
 - iii. If setbacks must increase to allow this, so be it. Transformers, stormwater filtering planters, and other equipment must be built around them, and shown on site plans at the first stage of Planning or DBS review.
 - b. Removal of trees with 6-8-inch caliper or larger shall be replaced at 2 to 1 ratio to encourage developers to preserve mature trees (especially fruit trees, which often die when transplanted).
 - i. Dept. of Urban Forestry shall publicize fruit trees that are proposed for removal, so neighbors can transplant them.
 - c. Trees must be planted in the ground and have :
 - i. 8 cubic yards of soil (7 x 7 x 7 ft.) for root growth.
 - ii. 10 x 10 ft. open to the sky for canopy growth.
 - 1. Justification: Most new apartments have 80-90% lot coverage with little or no usable, flat open space for recreation, as the Community Plan requires. The yards are either tall planters, in which trees cannot grow because of the poor and shallow soil (for stormwater retention) or small concrete areas with limited greenery. Trees can barely grow in planters, and must have realistically have 10 x 10 ft. surface areas and 7 ft. soil depth to grow a decent canopy and height.

5. Open space:
 - a. Minimum of 75% of open space must be flat and usable for recreation, and maximum of 25% space may be for planters (15% must be landscape planters with maximum wall height of 2.5 ft.).
 - i. Stormwater planters (which have walls of 4 ft.) cannot fill up open space and make it un-usable. Only shorter landscape planters can count as open space.
 - ii. Justification:
 1. Maximum landscape planter height of 2.5 ft. will allow seating.
 2. Drywells and cisterns can be used for stormwater collection.
 - b. Open space in R3 zones and higher shall be at ground level or podium level.
 - i. Rooftop decks are allowed, but may not substitute for ground level or podium level open space.
 1. Justification: Roof decks are poor substitutes, because children cannot be supervised, and elderly or handicapped persons have difficulty in climbing up to the roof, when yards can be placed at ground-level or podium-level.
6. Stepbacks:
 - a. Stepbacks of 15 ft. shall be required for the 3rd level and above [from Westside Multifamily Q Conditions].
7. Massing:
 - a. For buildings with 150 ft. length along the frontage, 1 courtyard/break open to the front and open the sky is required of 20 ft. width and 40 ft. depth (starting at ground or 1st level) [from Westside Multifamily Q Conditions].
 - b. Active land uses on the ground-level frontage with direct connection to sidewalks (instead of parking garages that create dead space).
 - i. Justification: Active uses, especially apartments with direct access via front doors and a real yard, are integral elements of “defensive design” and “natural surveillance” that deter crime (per LAPD Design Out Crime Manual).
8. Zoning:
 - a. C2 development standards may not blend into adjacent R2 parcels (repeal section of LAMC).
 - i. Justification: When C2 projects and their high density encroach into R2 zones, 5-story apartments can be built next to 2-3-story duplexes, which ruins the character of the neighborhood.
 - b. FAR and Height Districts shall be on a sliding scale (whichever is lower) and be in relation to each other (i.e. taller height has more FAR, and lower height has less FAR – currently high FARs are allowed for both short and tall heights). Dnd developers can add affordable housing to increase:
 - i. RD 1.5 = 1.75.
 - ii. R3, RAS3 = 2.0.
 - iii. R4, RAS4 = 2.2.

- iv. HD-1: 6.0, no height limit.
- v. HD-1L: 3.0, 6 levels for commercial, 75 ft.
- vi. HD-1VL: 2.25, 3 levels for commercial, 45 ft.
- vii. HD-1XL: 2.0, 2 levels for commercial, 30 ft.
- viii. Justification: 3.0 FAR allows for a 6-8-story to be built and results in no open space at ground- or podium-level. A 4-5-story building needs only 2.2-2.4 FAR. A 4- or 5-story building with 3.0 FAR increases to 3.35 FAR and results in a stucco cube with no open space.

9. :
