

URBAN DESIGN AND PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES - APPROVED

Wednesday February 10, 2016 6:30 pm

Citibank Community Room
2450 Glendale Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90039

1. CALL TO ORDER

Attending Committee Members

Scott Plante, Co-Chair
Joe Ferrell, Co-Chair
Anne-Marie Johnson
Barbara Ringuette
David Modern
Heather Carson
Jeff Wayne
Jerome Courshon
Carol Cetrone
Genelle LeVin
Liza Temple
Renee Nahum
Rusty Millar
Terry Jackson

2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS

HOME has begun their next funding cycle as their funding has been cut 50% from previous years. Survey Results from CD4 and CD13 are available for interested parties. There will be a Visions and Goals meeting on Feb. 24th from 6:30-8:30, at the Holy Virgin Mary Cathedral at 650 Micheltorena St. *TURF: A Mini-Golf Project*, has been funded and winners will be presented on March 12th. Lastly, three elephants were moved for their safety.

3. PRESENTATIONS

A. Neighborhood Integrity Initiative

Michael McClean, from Method Campaigns, spoke in opposition to the Neighborhood Integrity Initiative. The initiative is a proposed November ballot measure that is intended to prevent spot zoning.

His objections include a moratorium on development applications with variances unless they are brought before the council, increased Quimby fees, healthcare developments delays, a strengthened minimum parking requirement, and stoppage of waterfront development in San Pedro, retroactively effecting projects already approved.

Council members expressed concern that added scrutiny to a large number of projects would be beneficial, that nonprofit funds being used to lobby for personal profitable projects, the effects of parking minimums on crime rates, that healthcare effects will not be as significant as described, and overdevelopment in general.

B. SMALL LOT AMENDMENT UPDATE

Councilman Ferrell gave an update from the first meeting on the small lot amendments. The vote on the amendment will be on March 21st.

There was discussion of underline zoning and whether curb distance should be 10 or 15 ft. Roofline in small lots must have pitched roof or a usable deck. Adaptive reuse of small lots, like the Maltman Bungalows, will be encouraged. Driveway width will also be addressed, with a proposed 16ft minimum.

Small lots over 20 units will have added guidelines.

There will be a Small Lot Advisory Agency, and policies will be changed as well, but specifics are not yet known.

Concern was expressed that the added guidelines don't directly affect the main problems.

This will be discussed at the next small lot amendment meeting. The guidelines discussed are not currently part of this ordinance.

Additionally, the proposed guidelines would mandate that R1 lots abutting R3 lots must be set farther back.

There was concern expressed about import elements missing from the amendment. As they are not part of the ordinance, the guidelines can be changed by the city council.

There's concern that proportional height of buildings to their neighbors is not included in the guidelines.

There was a motion made to create a 7 person workgroup to add suggested guidelines.

The motion passed unanimously. The workgroup consists of Liza Temple, Joe Ferrell, Barbara Ringuette, Carol Cetrone, Rosa, Jerome Courshon, and David Modern.

4. MOTION & RESOLUTIONS

A. LAND USE ADAPTATION

Play Silver Lake Preschool seeks to adapt the use of a former church at 2828 N. Glendale Blvd.

Councilman Courshon lives within 500 ft. of the property at issue, so recused himself.

The school averages 60-70 students per day, year round. There are 10-11 employees on site at any one time with a parking availability of 18 spaces and few events that will use additional parking. Student pick-up and drop-off will be on site, with little effect on local traffic.

Play Silver Lake Preschool also seeks support for a 3ft. wall with a 6 ft. fence on top, reaching a total of 9ft above the sidewalk.

Council members discussed the health effects of the playground location, student subsidies, and a proposed traffic light at the intersection to address safety.

A possible safety analysis of the intersection was briefly discussed.

Councilman Plante offered a motion to support the use adaption, the fence height, and the commission of a safety analysis of the intersection. It was seconded by Millar.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. SMALL LOT PROPOSAL

A developer plans to build 4 small division homes.

He stated that the project meets or exceeds all city building code. The building height will be 34 feet from the "semi-subterranean" garage to roof. Building materials, and thus color, are not yet determined.

A Letter from William Mahoney was read into the record:

He is unable to attend this meeting, but would like to voice concern for the proposed development. The site as planned has 1 driveway, but code allows for a maximum of 2 homes per driveway. This would be a safety concern. The back 2 houses couldn't evacuate in case of emergency. He doesn't support any bending of city code to advance this proposal. Furthermore, he has prepared funds for a legal challenge to the delay project, should it be approved and the design not adapted.

Concerns about scale and perspective of proposal photos.

The structure previously at the site, a rented bungalow, burned down. The most likely cause was electrical.

3 neighbors to the property came to the meeting in opposition to the development: Tom Abraham, Mike Buch and Wayne Hightower.

Their first objection was to the obstruction of their view. They also object to the increase in living space 5 time the previous structure and significantly larger than other properties in the area. The rooftop deck creates privacy and added high issues.

The area of the units is 2,362 sq. ft. each for the two 3-bedroom units and 2,125 sq. ft. each for the two 2-bedroom units according to plans, though exact specification were disputed. The rooftop wall is 5 ft. on the front and sides of the building. Each rooftop patio is 698 sq. ft. according to the plans.

The neighbors object that the cost of this development precludes these units from aiding in the housing crisis. The developer states that property owners will treat property better than potential renters.

Councilwoman Ringuette asked about the anticipated price of the units and the specifics of a map brought by the developer.

The developer presented the map showing a mix of surrounding properties including 2, 3, and 4 bedroom houses. He expects a \$850-900k range and a \$1,000k range for 2 and 3 bedroom units, respectively.

The council had previously requested new images to show the scale but one was not presented. Neighborhood outreach was also requested but the developer admitted to not doing so.

A council member stated that neighborhood sentiment is largely against the increased development, but that these developments sell because they are desired by people interested in the neighborhood.

Councilman Courshon questioned the height of the neighboring houses on either side. The neighbors estimated them at 14 ft. and 18-22ft.

Councilman Courshon said this creates privacy issues for neighbors. Rooftop decks are a large point of contention for the neighbors for both privacy and noise concerns. He suggested that its removal would significantly enhance the neighborhood sentiment

toward the project. The decks as designed are larger than comparable decks, and maybe should be set back 5ft.

Another council member noted that the city supports rooftop decks as they increase open space for properties.

The developer explained that all the new design guidelines have been taken into account, and that rooftop decks are preferable to pitched roofs in terms of potentially blocking a neighbor's view.

It was pointed out that the front of the structure would be set back 15ft. from the street, while this was in Zone RD2, which has a minimum of 10ft.

The driveway is 12ft. wide at its entrance which is the narrowest portion. There are 23ft. of turnaround space and 16ft. of the driveway is open to the sky.

Council members suggested widening driveway to 16ft. to allow cars to pass each other. The developer agreed to consider and study the change. He pointed out the constraint would be shrinking the planter which collects rainwater, a code requirement.

The developer wanted to address the privacy concerns with plants and trees. He didn't think privacy concerns will be significant.

The council asked the neighbors present if he would be able to address their concerns if the project built.

The neighbors didn't think he has altered any plans or made the current plans more clear. The rooftop patio size was a significant issue that can be addressed. They have discussed types of plants with the developer, but nothing more. One neighbor stated his view would be eliminated and he would have 4 new units looking into his living room.

When asked, the developer said his hearing date set is for Feb. 25th.

Councilman Plante proposed a motion to support the project, on the condition that the developer considers a 16ft. driveway pending review of rainwater collection. It was seconded by councilman Ferrell.

The council polled the audience for their feelings on the motion. Four were against the motion and none were in support.

The motion failed, with 6 no votes, 1 yes vote, and 2 abstentions.

Councilwoman Carson proposed a motion to send this vote and accompanying reasoning to the hearing. It was seconded by Millar.

Councilwoman Carson argued that it would provide strength at the hearing that the neighborhood council voted against the proposal.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

November Minutes approval was tabled for next meeting to allow for public viewing.

Rachel Mintz suggested changes to the Silver Lake dog park. Currently the ground is dirt and gets muddy when wet and dusty when dry. Other parks use mulch, which solves this problem. Mulch is free and would improve the dog park.

Councilwoman Johnson noted that mulch was removed from other parks due to a lawsuit. Dogs had eaten the mulch which caused poisoning. It was suggested that the issue be taken before the Dogs and Cats Committee.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting ended at 8:50pm