

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Studio City Neighborhood Council

Name: Lisa Sarkin

Phone Number: 818-980-1010

Email: lsarkin@scnc.info

Date of NC Board Action: 10/20/2010

Type of NC Board Action: General Comments

Impact Information

Date: 10/30/2010

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 09-2199

Agenda Date: 11/02/2010

Item Number: 2

Brief Summary: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council has reviewed the proposed Community Design Overlay) Streamlining Ordinance (CDO) of August 2010. Please place our comments below in your formal record on this matter.

Additional Information:

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Josh Gelfat
Victor Helo
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Todd Royal
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Rita C. Villa
John T. Walker



4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
Phone (818) 655-5400

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker
VICE PRESIDENT
Todd Royal

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
Lana Shackelford

www.scnc.info

October 2, 2010

The City Planning Commission
Los Angeles City Planning Department
200 N. Spring St., Room 621
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Commissioners:

The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council has reviewed the proposed Community Design Overlay) Streamlining Ordinance (CDO) of August 2010. Please place our comments below in your formal record on this matter.

General Comments on Q & A:

The "CDOs" should be mandatory not voluntary.

#1 Question: What is being proposed?

Answer: The Department of City Planning is proposing an ordinance that would allow for administrative review of projects when they are fully compliant with design guidelines and standards contained in Community Design Overlay Districts.

Response: We contend that any determination over 10% is unacceptable without a public hearing. An administrative clearance (ministerial approval) shall be limited to a 10% change. A director's determination of any amount over a 10% change shall not be allowed without a public hearing. The neighborhood councils shall be made aware of any application and the time for response shall be sufficient to accommodate the neighborhood council review process.

#2 Question: What does that actually mean?

Answer: The purpose of these changes is to reduce the process length of time for projects that meet CDOs. Basically, if a project complies with all a CDO's guidelines and standards, applicants would get a meeting and approval relatively quickly instead of waiting for Planning to issue a determination letter that authorizes the approval. If a project doesn't meet all the standards, but still generally meets the intent of the CDO by meeting the guidelines, a determination letter will be written up detailing what is in compliance and how.

Response: Based on the answer above, a letter of approval still needs to be issued. The words "Still generally meets the intent of the CDO" do not mean that the project meets all the standards of the CDO. This does not seem to be in compliance with the requirement for a project to be "fully compliant with design guidelines and standards contained in Community Design Overlay Districts" as

cited for administrative review in the first Q & A. This attempt to expedite the approval of projects at the expense of community input and compliance with guidelines specifically constructed to insure that the scale and character of an area is maintained is unacceptable. Again, Neighborhood Council and public input are necessary.

#3 Question: Does this take away regulations? (Read: Does this make it easier to build uglier buildings?)

Answer: No! All adopted CDO standards remain as is! Projects in CDO districts are still subject to CDO provisions. In fact, CDO standards are technically not regulations or law, which is why we are focusing streamlining on the process. If anything, streamlining the process provides an incentive for property owners and developers to meet the guidelines and save time in the permit process.

Response: Fully complying with the CDO standards and guidelines is the only way to save time in the permit process.

#4 Question: Why is this being proposed?

Answer: With Planning Department staffing levels at almost half of what they were five years ago, and continuous additions of special zoning overlays and plans that require staff's attention, we have fewer Planners and more work (with legally-mandate deadlines!). We must prioritize and focus our limited resources. The proposed ordinance reduces timelines and staff expenditures, while not changing or undermining the guidelines or standards that apply to projects.

Response: Reducing timelines and saving staff time is not acceptable when it is accomplished at the expense of the community. It changes and undermines the standards and guidelines that are to apply to projects. The Neighborhood Council shall be added to the review process and sufficient time allowed for them to review and comment. The Planning Department shall prioritize those projects that have legally mandated deadlines.

#5 Question: Why am I just hearing about it now?

Answer: This is the perfect time to hear about it! These public information meetings are just an initial step in reaching out; the goal is to explain what we are proposing so that we can receive your input. Your comments are welcome throughout September (in order to be incorporated in to the staff report), and beyond; you can continue participating at the City Planning Commission Hearing (yet to be scheduled) and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of Council (PLUM) and City Council. Please sign in to be on the mailing list of future meetings.

Response: The initial time allowed for formal input from Neighborhood Councils and the public was too short. Neighborhood Councils need a minimum of 60 days to research and hold Committee and Board meetings before reaching a formal opinion. The advisory opinions of the neighborhood councils are essential and they are mandated by the Los Angeles City Charter.

6 Question: Wasn't this already proposed?

Answer: Yes! In 2007 the Planning Department proposed CDO streamlining, which was approved by the City Planning Commission without much fanfare. The ordinance at the time defined types of projects that could receive sign-offs (also known as administrative clearances). Given further budgetary restrictions in recent times, and because the City Attorney had concerns about defining signs as minor projects, we decided that a more comprehensive version of the CDO streamlining ordinance would be most effective. We are now bringing it back through public review

Response: The Studio City Neighborhood Council expects the CDO Streamlining Ordinance to uphold the Billboard Ordinance in its entirety as instructed by the City Attorney, with no exceptions. Supergraphics, digital, and oversized signs and billboards, as well as an excessive number of signs, shall not be allowed unless they are located in the few previously approved Sign Districts. Nothing is "Minor" about Signs.

#7 Question: Is this the same thing as the "Core Findings" Code Amendment?

Answer: No! The CDO streamlining ordinance is coming from the Community Planning Bureau, a portion of the Planning Department that is responsible for creating and "implementing" the CDOs (that means reviewing projects and making sure the plans are followed). The Core Findings and Code Simplification efforts are being done by a different section of the Planning Department, the Code Studies unit, in order to make findings consistent throughout the Los Angeles Municipal Code

Response: The Community Planning Bureau creates and implements the CDOs. Provisions for continuing enforcement are necessary. The tools for enforcement must be in place before any changes are implemented.

#8 Question: Why is the CDO Streamlining and Citywide Design Guidelines meeting combined:

Answer: We devised a combined meeting as an innovative way to maximize attendance and draw in people who may have heard about one but not the other. A combined meeting also conserves resources (for example shared staffing cuts down on costs) and helps staff coordinate and learn from each other.

Response: Combining presentations is a sensible way to save both staff and attendees time and to save the City money. Stakeholders shall receive earlier notification of proposed workshops and meetings. They shall take place over a longer time span to enable greater participation and their locations shall be spread-out over more areas of the City.

Comments on Community Design Overlay Streamlining:

p.1 Section 1. (d):

This Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process.

p.1 Section 1. (d) (3):

This Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process.

p.1 Section 2.2. Project:

All signs or billboards including but not limited to pole signs and/or monument signs shall comply with the Billboard Ordinance as instructed by the City Attorney with no exceptions. Supergraphics, digital, and oversized signs and billboards shall not be allowed unless they are located in the few previously approved Sign Districts.

p. 2 Section 3. E.2. (b):

An Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process. An Administrative Clearance (ministerial approval) shall be limited to a 10% change. A Director's Determination of any amount over a 10% change shall not be allowed without a public hearing.

p.3 Section 3. E 3. (a) and (b):

A Director's Determination of any amount over 10% shall not be allowed without a public hearing. "Substantially" is a subjective and not measurable. The standard shall be objective with measurable criteria. The meaning of the phrase "scale and design" is not the same as the meaning of the phrase "scale and character." This constitutes a significant change in the provisions of the CDO.

p.3 Section 3. E 4:

The Notice and approved plans shall also be mailed to the Neighborhood Council. Additionally, we reiterate that any determination over 10% shall not be allowed without a public hearing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John T. Walker". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

John Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council

Cc: Michael LoGrande, Alan Bell, Michelle Sorkin, Areen Ibranossian, Matt Hale

JTW/rcv

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Joshua Gelfat
Victor Helo
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Todd Royal
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Rita Villa
John T. Walker



BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES

Wednesday, October 20, 2010,
7:00pm
at

**CBS Studio Center, Building 8, MPR-3,
4024 Radford, Studio City CA, 91604**

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
TODD ROYAL

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
Lana Shackelford

4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
Phone (818) 655-5400
www.scnc.info

The public is requested to fill out a "Comment Card" to address the Board on any item of the agenda prior to the Board taking action on an item. Comments from the public on Agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the Agenda that is within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction will be heard during the Public Comment period. **Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker, unless directed otherwise by the presiding officer of the Board.** The agenda is posted for public review at: Studio City Neighborhood Council website (www.scnc.info); as well as CBS Studio Center, Radford and Colfax gates; the Studio City Library, 12511 Moorpark St.; the Studio City Recreation Center, 12621 Rye Ave. and at Carpenter Avenue Elementary School, 3909 Carpenter Avenue, Studio City, CA 91604. 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 other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting the Neighborhood Council Project Coordinator (213) 473-5391 or by e-mail to Thomas.Soong@lacity.org. In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at our website by clicking on the following link: www.scnc.info 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 office@scnc.info.

Agenda

1. Call to Order & Roll Call - Jeffrey Carter - present, Ben Di Benedetto - present; Josh Gelfat - present, Victor Helo - excused, Wayne Kartin - present, Remy Kessler - present, Ben Neumann - excused, Richard Niederberg - present, Todd Royal - present, Lisa Sarkin - present, Lana Shackelford - excused, Gail Steinberg - present, Ron Taylor - present, Rita Villa - present, John Walker - present, 11 voting members present. 6 votes required to pass a motion. 39 people present.
2. Approval of September 22, 2010 Minutes. **Moved:** Richard Niederberg; **Second:** Jeffrey Carter. Approval of September 22, 2010 Special Meeting Minutes. **Moved:** Richard Niederberg; **Second:** Jeffrey Carter.
3. Comments by the President Time turned over to Geoffrey Yazzetta of CD2. Presentation of certificate of recognition to Christine From for her efforts on the Republic Pictures Event.
4. Appointment of **Richard Niederberg** as Chair of Cultural Affairs Committee. John appointed Richard Niederberg as the chair of the cultural affairs committee. He also thanked Christine From for her service on the Cultural Affairs Committee and said she would be missed.
5. Presentation by **Battalion Chief Peter Benesch, for LAFD Battalion 14** (Studio City). The Chief spoke on evacuation due to brush fires. He discussed the difference between brush fires with and without wind. Without wind the fire department can get a handle on a fire rather quickly. With Santa Anna's it is hard to stop fires as they form their own climate and develop a life of their own. The Station Fire formed its own weather pattern. Laurel Canyon has the lowest fuel moisture rating in the entire LA County. The Chief is very concerned about Laurel Canyon and Coldwater Canyon during red flag conditions. Stakeholders need to help. The fire department will have significantly fewer resources than needed when that fire that starts south of the boulevard. If a gardener starts a fire while filling his lawn mower with gas while smoking on Rose Avenue a vegetation fire will start

which will get into the topography behind the home and get into the dry brush. There will be significant smoke and the fire will take on a life of its own. They will try to protect structures and get air resources on it. Their main focus is to save lives. Homes will be lost. People must be evacuated. That is his main concern. He will have very few resources with which to effect the evacuation. Ready Set Go is a new program to reinforce the evacuation. They do not want to have to shelter people in place within the fire zone. There are two types of evacuation. There is voluntary and ordered evacuation. There is no such term as mandatory evacuation. LAPD is the one that goes through the streets and announces the evacuation. By law, you can stay and protect your home but the Chief does not advise that. Most important part of the program is the ready component. He discussed a booklet that was available and brush clearance programs. People are doing a good job of that so there has not been a tragedy. Development of the hills has been done in such a way that they are highly defensible. He asked stakeholders to clear brush and comply with the no parking regulations on red flag days. He recommended that everyone have a plan for getting your children from school in an emergency. The canyons will be closed. If you are at work and your kids are at school you need a plan for that and for your pets. He recommended that you prepare your home for the scenario for a brush fire coming through. Ornamental vegetation near roof is not required to be removed but it should be. "Set" is the part of the program for a red flag day when there is potential for the fire to happen. The media is advised and the fire department brings additional resources in to help them. Stakeholders should be sure that the road ways are clear. The "Go" part of the program means "Go" early. Do not wait for the fire department or police to tell you to go. If you wait there will be pandemonium. The evacuation component of a brush fire is the ILDH (immediate life and danger hierarchy). Evacuation routes are predetermined. The maps are not distributed because stakeholders may focus on one route and head right into the fire. Everyone needs to plan two ways out. Molhuland should be avoided it will be a very dangerous place to be. You can go either north or south. Do not drive through the fire to get out. Go the other way.

The City is going through a budget crisis. The department is feeling the pain. Resources will not be as plentiful for significant fires. The command teams are being cut in half. This means it is more incumbent on stakeholders to be ready.

Wayne Kartin said that the Chief is one of the top experts on brush fires in the entire state. We are lucky to have him. Tomorrow will be the California Shakeout. Earthquake preparedness is important as well as fire preparedness. This has been going on for about 10 years. Tomorrow at 10:21 AM a simulated earthquake will take place. Practice "duck, cover and hold." Division Chief Matram arrived. He recommended that everyone should have a go bag. There are three backpacks ready at all times one for each member of his family. He has all important papers and clothes and food and medications in one of them. He said that we must plan for pets and we need to have food for them. Pets are not allowed in an evacuation center. Everyone should know what you are going to take including anything that may not be readily available. Plan your route. Plan a place to go, to a friend's house or somewhere else. Plan somewhere to take your pet. Everyone in a family needs to have the out of state phone number of a family member. Everyone should call an out of state person and they will know where everyone else in the family is located. Have a mini backpack in your car in case you are not home when the earthquake hits. Shoes, heavy pants, hat, glasses, medicines, cash in small denominations and water should be in the mini backpack. There could be 4 feet of glass on the ground in areas where there are high rise buildings. Keep your tank at least half full of gas at all times. Text message will almost always work. CERT class – he recommends that everyone attend one. Learn how to take care of yourself and your neighbors in an emergency.

Chief Matram gave statistics on the impacts of budget cuts on the fire department in the San Fernando Valley. He will have no staff later this week when the cuts go into effect. The City budget is adversely impacting our fire department. You need a hierarchical order on the street when emergency incidents take place. They will not be in place due to the cuts. He needs us to let everyone know what is happening. **John Walker** asked what a stakeholder can do to help. We need to advise the City Council that we do not agree with these cuts. **Ben Di Benedetto** asked what is happening to those whose jobs are being eliminated. **Chief Matram** explained that their work has not gone away but they have been sent back to fire trucks with less pay. He will not have anyone to take the information for him in an emergency. **Ron Taylor** asked if the fire department could recruit and train reserve officers. **Chief Matram** responded, no, because they have to be able to be trained for working in a hazardous environment. **Richard Adams** asked how perishable their skills are. **Chief Matram** explained that is not a major problem because he has developed the skill set. However, it is hard to go back to a fire truck and those skills need to be refreshed.

6. Presentation by **Paul Darrigo**, Volunteer Marketing Coordinator, LA Animal Services. They are revitalizing the volunteer program in the City of Los Angeles. There are only one to two officers to cover for any animal needs after regular business hours. It is not easy. First participants need to spend 280 hours volunteering at a shelter and then they go to an academy class. He is requesting that we participate in the program. They are asking for \$1,500. **Richard Niederberg** said he went through the reserve officer training and it was very interesting. **Ben Di Benedetto** asked where the training is done. Penal training is done at the police academy. **Rita Villa** asked what penal training is. **Response** - Laws that govern animal control.
7. Public Comments on non-agenda items within the Boards jurisdiction. **Nicholas Dalton-Pawle** said he is with the Sun Valley NC but he is here representing the LA Clean Sweep Committee. That Committee is dedicated to representing the grass roots candidates in an effort to take back city hall. They are supporting candidates that will make decisions based on what is best for the city. Their goals are to reactivate debate and compromise and to reestablish social ethical and moral principles. Self-interest and greed in Bell and other cities is also happening here. You can affect change; there is a window of opportunity. He needs help to forge an alliance to make this happen. **Scott Ouellette** said best way to protect city services is by increasing taxes. The most profitable business is apartment development. In this community there was a promise about preventing overdevelopment. Nothing is protecting us from the 40 Apartments being developed. Are we focusing on the right thing with the RFA? We need to think about the overlay. **Marilyn White-Sidel** thanked everyone on board that took care of volunteers at the Republic Pictures Event. She also stated that the house that is on Laurel Canyon that fell down is still there. She asked what is happening to that property. She reported that she spoke to the principal at Carpenter this week. She is going to speak to the Home Hospital School. That school needs computers which must be purchased from LAUSD because they must be programmed a certain way. She is also working on a grid of Studio City to determine where there are stumps of trees that need to be removed. **Arlene Samek** stated that she sent out a report to the board. She asked how many board members have taken ethics training. BONC is cracking down on those that have not taken the training. The City Clerk reported that there were very few problems with the NC elections. She asked everyone to go to the City website and send in something if that is not correct based on your experience. She asked for someone to be assigned to do this on behalf of the SCNC. The report on the restructure of DONE was distributed to the board and she said we should complete our survey. **Richard Adams** thanked board members for working during the Republic Pictures events. He asked the audience to applaud the board members that helped: John Walker, Jeffrey Carter, Remy

Kessler, Ron Taylor, Rita Villa, Richard Niederberg, and Wayne Kartin. **John Walker** stated that there are certificates of appreciation for them.

8. Responses to comments from the Board. **Richard Niederberg** said that last year the SCNC had 100% compliance with ethics training completion and reminded new board members that it can be taken on line. **Lisa Sarkin** said the City and the owner of the Laurel Canyon property are suing each other. With regard to the overlay said that there is already zoning in place to protect us from multi-family overdevelopment. **Ben Di Benedetto** said we should still talk to the City again about multifamily property.
9. Treasurer's report by Remy Kessler. **Remy Kessler** reported that there is \$47,732 left in the budget. As to the funding requests they total \$8,700 so there is about 20% of the budget remaining unspent. **John Walker** read the motion.

MOTION: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council has reviewed the October 2010 financial statement and the September bank statements and hereby accepts and approves them.

Moved: Remy Kessler; **Second:** Ben Di Benedetto;

Board Discussion: **Jeffrey Carter** asked when the fiscal year ends. **John Walker** responded that the fiscal year end is June 30. **Vote:** Unanimous. **Motion Carries.**

10. Budget Committee report by Remy Kessler. **Remy Kessler** gave a brief report on budget matters. **John Walker** read the motion.
 - a) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request of \$2,500 for the Cultural Affairs Committee of the SCNC for additional sponsorship of the 75th Anniversary of Republic Pictures event held on the CBS Studio Center.**

Board Discussion: **Ron Taylor** asked if this was just making up a budget shortfall. **Remy Kessler** responded – Yes, the money will go to CBS for expenses incurred. **John Walker** said it was a hugely successful event. **Vote:** Unanimous. **Motion Carries.**

- b) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request of up to \$200 towards the expenses of the Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils (VANC) Planning Seminar currently scheduled for November 11, 2010 at the CBS Studio Center.**

John Walker read the motion. **Remy Kessler** reported that the budget committee felt this was a small expenditure. **Scott Ouellette** asked if this is a group certified by the City and he said if it was to go directly to expenses he does not object. **Vote:** Unanimous. **Motion Carries.**

- c) **The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request from the Studio City Beautification Association (SCBA) for \$5000 towards the annual maintenance of trees and landscaping under the jurisdiction of the SCBA including, but not limited to, the trees on Ventura Blvd., the welcoming signs on Laurel Canyon and Coldwater, the Moorpark Median, and the Studio City Library.**

John Walker read the motion. **Remy Kessler** reported that we do this annually. This is one of the most important funding requests we get each year. It is slightly higher than last year because the impact of this association is greater than most things we fund.

Beth Dymond and Alan Dymond were both available to answer questions on behalf of the SCBA. **Jeff Carter** asked where the organization gets the rest of its funding. **Beth Dymond** responded that the information is on the hand out she provided the board. The total cost for the year is \$25,300. The SCBA does more than 50% of the maintenance. **Jeff Carter** asked which companies we use and why this is considered a way to have a broad impact on the community. **Richard Niederberg** said when he was budget chair they look at this and felt it was important then and is still important now. Funds are spent the way described in the handout. **Ron Taylor** asked why the budget is up. **Beth Dymond** responded that there have been additional capital improvements that will require additional maintenance. **Vote:** unanimous. **Motion Carries.**

- d) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request of \$1,000 from the Reserve Animal Control Officer's Program to join other neighborhood councils in sponsoring the training of volunteer animal control officers with the condition that the SCNC receives appropriate credit along with the other participating organizations.**

John Walker read the motion. **Remy Kessler** referred to the fact that Paul had mentioned the request was for \$1,500, however, the Budget Committee felt that we could only contribute \$1,000 given our budget constraints. **Ron Taylor** asked if this would be a dedicated officer for Studio City. **Remy Kessler** said no. **Ron Taylor** said if we fund one candidate then there will be 10 throughout the city. **Richard Niederberg** said he paid for course himself when he took it. **Lisa Sarkin** asked if there was anyone lined up to take the course. **Response-** Yes there are 35 people lined up and waiting. **Ben Di Benedetto** said we should fund the full \$1,500. **Marilyn White-Sidel.** Said the SCNC is bombarded with good causes. She believes that schools have greater needs for specific items and she is against this funding request. **Richard Niederberg** said that the individual people involved will get a firearms certification. **Remy Kessler** said funding requests are addressed on a first come first serve basis. **Lisa Sarkin** said that is how the City Council does it all the time **Todd Royal** said he is on the budget committee and they had a very spirited debate on this matter. **Jeff Carter said he has been convinced by Marilyn that he should oppose this. Vote: 3: 4:3. Motion fails.**

Ben Di Benedetto offered a motion to increase the funding request to \$1,500. Second: Ron Taylor. Ron Taylor said he is seconding this motion because he thinks this council has a demonstrated history of supporting the schools. He said he trusts the statistics given about this program are correct. **Remy Kessler** said we have always funded the school requests. However, we do request that there are other sources of funds as well. We are 100% behind every school request at the full amount necessary to get the schools what they need. This is a unique program and needs to be seriously considered. **Richard Adams** would like to point out that public safety is a primary purpose of city government. Despite this when there is a budget cut it comes from safety such as fire, police and animals. **Richard Niederberg** said that this is a citywide motion. This is more than our fair share. **Jeffrey Carter** indicated that he opposes the motion. **Remy Kessler** explained that this is just the first program. There will be two

different classes with 30 people. **Jeffrey Carter** called the question. **Vote: 6:4:1. Motion Carries.**

11. Land Use Committee Report by Lisa Sarkin. **Lisa Sarkin** reported that there are no significant changes since last month. No progress on the sidewalks. They have been informed that there has been no money drawn from the trust fund specifically for that. The DWP refund information will be mailed to us soon. The RFA process is going forward. City Council has no desire to help us with the overlay which would help us with multifamily and commercial. The medical marijuana ruling is still pending. The judge will not rule until the Prop 19 vote is in. Campbell Hall demolition is going on and trucks were in middle of road but they were moved. The Colfax Bridge will be opened something after activity. 1 rain day causes a 2 day delay. The Design Guidelines ordinance deadline was extended. Planning understands that NC's need 90 days to respond. **John Walker** read the motion.

- a) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports TT-71380 located at 4342-44 Babcock Avenue, Studio City, with the attached agreed upon recommendations.**

Studio City Land Use Recommendations for 4342-44 Babcock Avenue

Construction contact information including emergency phone numbers to be posted on outside fencing and maintained.

Basic Site and Landscaping

1. Tree Plan to be reviewed by Studio City Neighborhood Council before demo begins.
2. Landscaping plan to be reviewed by Studio City Neighborhood Council.
3. Parkway landscaping to be reviewed by Urban Forestry Division.

Design, Open Space, and Utility

1. Balcony railings will be 30" solid wall with 12" railing.
2. Articulation or design element on all exterior walls of buildings (front, sides and rear) conforming with the neighborhood.

Parking and Roads

1. Minimum 2 ½ parking spaces per unit
2. At least, ½ parking space dedicated for guests with an intercom from parking entrance to each unit with a sign notifying public of guest parking spaces.

Scott Ouellette indicated that he is not for or against this motion. However, he said that the NC is not a building and safety department. He asked about what standards the trees will be reviewed under. This is what building and safety does. This is too subjective. **Richard Adams** responded that he was at the meeting where the conditions were developed and that the land owner and his representatives did not have a problem with this. **Alan Dymond** said this board has the right to give advice to City

Council. The SCNC does not enforce the board is elected to give advice. If the NC does not give advice, who will? On the design of open space utility he wondered what exactly that means. He said the SCRA believes that these are a good set of criteria. **Lisa Sarkin** said the deadline is Friday for these comments. This project is asking for a tract map. These conditions were passed by this board last year. The recommendations that applied to this building were incorporated below. The recommendations go to the planning department and they will add it to the planning department file. We are trying to have a say on the style and number of parking places per units. Building and Safety makes sure the conditions are met. **Richard Niederberg** said it is important for us to deal with this. Three of the four sides of the building face public right of ways. **Remy Kessler** stated that he is impressed with the detail study and recommendations of the LUC. He inquired what it means to have the tree plan reviewed by the NC and who makes the determination on the landscaping. **Lisa Sarkin** explained that there is a tree map that is put out before a project is begun. We know which trees are protected and the LUC reviews it. Trees can be misrepresented in the developer's submission as to size and we need to be sure that trees are properly replaced. The LUC goes to the property to view all of this before the matter is discussed at their meeting. **Gail Steinberg** responded as to conformity to the neighborhood. There is no look to this building. She stated that the LUC asked them to look at the homes in the neighborhood and conform rather than making a contemporary box style building. The owner understood and will come back to LUC. **Ben Di Benedetto** asked if approval was required on any of these items. **Lisa Sarkin** responded that all the LUC does is review and report back to the planning department. **Ben Di Benedetto** clarified that the builder agreed to the conditions. **Lisa Sarkin** stated that approval of the plan by the NC is not needed. We support or oppose the project. **Ben Di Benedetto** said his main concern is that we do not hold someone up. **Lisa Sarkin** said we just make a recommendation. **Ron Taylor** said the support of the NC helps the developer get his project approved. The City agency looks to NC for support and help in these matters. **Richard Niederberg** said the LUC spends a lot of time with the minutia. **Vote: Unanimous. Motion Carries.**

- b) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council opposes the MND (DIR-2010-1000-SPP-SAPA) regarding the proposed Equinox Fitness Club on the Sportsmen's Lodge lot. A careful review of the MND regarding the proposed Equinox Fitness Club on the Sportsmen's Lodge lot has failed to adequately address an extensive number of topics listed in the MND, including subjects such as, but not limited to, parking, traffic, building design, and utilities. Furthermore, the MND failed to address items such as construction traffic, air quality, presentation of a tree report, or the provision of the LA River access, Specific Plan requirements, etc. The report of the advisory committee is attached.**

Comments related to Equinox at Sportsman's Lodge Project

DIR-2010-1000-SPP-SAPA 12825/12833 Ventura Blvd. Studio City

Parking: The parking plan, as presented is flawed, and based on questionable data. The Specific Plan requires 1,025 spaces for the property, including 300 for the gym alone. Currently, there are 567 parking spaces on the property, including 71 spaces located on an easement projecting out over the Los Angeles River that can potentially be lost to the Revitalization Program as the river is restored. Thus there are effectively 496 parking spaces for planning purposes.

Construction of the Equinox building will eliminate 78 current spaces, which are to be reclaimed by re-striping the remaining paved surface of the property, adding spaces wherever possible, including numerous double parking spaces which will require permanent valet services in order for them to be utilized.

There is also the issue of differing numbers for projected parking requirements being submitted for review on different documents. The MND shows expected peak usage of the gym combined with expected hotel demand for that time as needing 484 spots, 180 for the gym and 304 for the hotel and banquet facility. Without the easement spaces, that is only 12 more spots than maximum capacity. The MND also shows maximum projected demand for the Lodge facilities to be 351 spaces, which, when combined with a worst case scenario of that demand coinciding with peak gym use, means a parking demand of 531 spots.

However, the numbers shown in the MND differ from those in the Master Land Use Permit Application, which shows a peak weekday demand of 524 spots at 6PM and a weekend peak of 544 spots at 5PM. Thus, it would appear that the numbers have been artificially driven down to what spaces can be found rather than what the parking needs are likely to be. As such, there is some question as to the validity of the findings presented for review.

Furthermore, none of these numbers reflect the perfectly understandable efforts by the Lodge management to increase their business. The banner currently displayed on Coldwater Canyon Ave. advertises banquet facilities for parties of up to 1000 people, a customer flow that, if combined with employees, hotel guests, and Equinox members would completely overwhelm available parking on the lot.

The parking plan also uses the spaces available on three different lots, but does not contain any guarantees that these spots can not later be withdrawn from use, either by their current owner(s), or a new one that might come into possession of one or more of the properties in the future. The spaces that will be available on the lot where the gym is proposed would be completely inadequate to provide parking even at the given projected usage, let alone what would be required if the building use reaches the maximum capacity allowed by law. As such, any plan relying on shared parking for these properties without ironclad written agreements guaranteeing their premise is unreliable, and therefore no plan at all.

One more parking issue is the ongoing Lodge practice of renting lot space to movie and television shoots in the area, and the extra space required for large vehicles driven by guests staying in the Lodge. Any parking plan that doesn't specifically address guest bus and RV parking as a separate space requirement and that doesn't ban the rental of spaces to outside users is doomed to failure.

Traffic: Ventura Blvd. and Coldwater Canyon Ave. are both chronically busy throughout the business day, and approach gridlock during projected peak gym use hours in the morning and evening. The current proposal does not address in any manner the additional traffic the gym will bring to the area at any time, nor the additional slowing and blockage of traffic flow by cars slowing to ingress the property, either from the side of the street where the gym will be, or from vehicles trying to turn across traffic from the opposite side. Additionally, the customers will cause the same sort of delays and hindrances to vehicle flow when they egress the property after visiting the gym. Inevitably, these additional trips and their unavoidable disruptions will cause an increase in vehicle collisions. The increase in traffic will also make the area that much more hazardous for pedestrians.

The current Metro bus stop and lay over point at the Goodland Ave. entrance will likely need to be relocated, as the current practice of leaving buses there creates a blind spot for anyone looking to travel east on Ventura from the gym. Since Ventura also curves to the south just east of this location, westbound Ventura traffic is also difficult to see, both from the curve and the street parking along the north side east of the exit. Unless the intersection is controlled with a signal, or a physical barrier is installed making said driveway a right turn only exit, it is a given that people will attempt left hand turns out of the driveway and thus they will be

involved in accidents with drivers traveling in both directions on Ventura, an event for which this area is already too well known.

The Alcove Ave. entrance to the west has similar issues with sight lines and traffic flow, with the a Metro stop being located just west of it, as well as parked vehicles in both directions and the additional issue of traffic maneuvering to turn north on Coldwater potentially creating a third lane of westbound traffic for drivers to cross during their ingress or egress. There are actually two driveways at this location, but one is blocked with a chain and used for permanent parking spaces.

Restricting the southern exits to right turn only for safety reasons causes further traffic problems in the area, since there is no easy way for patrons to reverse their path and travel east, should that be their destination. The first two options are to go south on Coldwater and then left on Hallkirk to come back through the residential neighborhood there, or north on Coldwater either to Moorpark, which is one lane each way at that intersection and already heavily traveled, or to take Woodbridge through the residential area between Moorpark and the river. The third option is to continue west on Ventura, and turn around at the Valley Vista/Ethel intersection, either by a u-turn at that intersection, by turning left onto "Little Ventura", rejoining Ventura at Van Noord, or by turning right onto Ethel, then right onto Valleyheart at the river and then right onto Coldwater and then turning left at Ventura. The popularity of any of these routes with the area residents affected by them or the drivers having to use them is predictable.

The effects of the sun shining into the eyes of drivers as they attempt to ingress or egress via Ventura Blvd cannot be overstated during the times it is an issue, the same morning and evening times when peak customer use is expected and peak traffic flow occurs on Ventura. Nor can the additional hazard caused by glare from the metal and glass surfaces proposed for the building's exterior design affecting drivers on Ventura Blvd, both at the gym entrances, but as far up and down Ventura as the light will travel. Although the MND says this will be remediated by the use of non-reflective materials, we have the recent examples of the Disney Hall downtown and the Vdara Hotel in Las Vegas to show plans are not the same as reality. As such, the current design for the exterior of the proposed building is itself a traffic hazard, above and beyond the traffic issues it will cause by drawing customers to its services.

The western entrance to the property, located on Coldwater Canyon at the LA River Bridge, across the street from the south side of Valleyheart Drive presents similar issues as the others, possessing a bus stop located between the 76 station and the corner and the site of the former fire station albeit without the parked vehicles or sun glare. However the problems with traffic flow and cross traffic turns are the same, with the addition of traffic entering the street from the service station, which gives little warning to the drivers exiting the Lodge property.

Another impact that the additional traffic the gym will bring and the inevitable congestion that will result because of it will be the increased travel time and the thereby delayed response for the vehicles of Fire Station 78, which uses Ventura at least three to five times a business day to respond to calls in the western portion of its area of operations. These delays will undoubtedly result in literally being a matter of life and death for someone they are responding to, the only question being when and how often such an event will occur.

Additionally, all vehicle traffic from vendors bringing supplies and services to the gym must be required to occur only during off peak traffic hours on Coldwater and Ventura, as a condition of doing business at the location, should the project proceed.

Construction Traffic: Beyond the burden of daily traffic that the gym will bring, the issue of construction traffic has not been addressed. Besides the flow of vehicles bringing building materials, the current plan calls for the removal of approximately 7000 cubic yards of excavated material. At a nominal 10 cubic yards per truckload, this will require 700 round trips to and from the building site. Even a generous, but unrealistic, estimate of 10 loads a day means at least fourteen weeks of increased truck usage on Coldwater, with the resulting impact on traffic, and causing further damage to a street already in horrible repair. The creation of a hauling plan, with a designated route, hours of use and an attendant public hearing are required for such activities, yet there is no plan available for review.

Another problem with the excavation is the nature of the material being removed and the potential for health risks to the public because of it. Besides the additional particulate and other pollution emitted into the area by the trucks and excavation equipment moving the soils, the likely hood that the soil in question, being so close to the river, is sandy and thus a source for silica inhalation exposure to members of the community needs to be addressed before the first scoop is moved. The possible presence of mold spores in the soil that could be released is also a health concern that needs to be evaluated and discussed prior to any construction activity occurring at the site.

Additionally, the DWP is expected to begin work on the Coldwater portion of its ongoing trunk line replacement project in the near future, which will bring both the loss of traffic lanes, and the attendant truck traffic bringing supplies to the site and hauling away soil and debris from it. The difficulties that would be caused if these two construction events coincide should be obvious. Numerous procedural delays internal to the city have already caused serious disruption in the water main project, hampering the completion of sections currently under construction locally and should therefore be expected to have a similar effect on both the trunk line project and the proposed building under discussion here.

Building Design: The most obvious flaw in the building design is the extension of the second floor over the driveway area. This will likely reduce the maximum height clearance below that of most delivery vehicles and, more importantly, that required for emergency vehicles such as fire trucks. In fact, from a review of an aerial view of the property, it appears that these sort of trucks, as well as guests with oversize vehicles, will be forced to enter the property from the Coldwater entrance only, and exit from there also, and then only if they possess a sufficiently short wheel base as to be able to maneuver in the restricted lot space available. As such the present design needs to be reviewed with an eye for resolving this issue, both for the building design itself and the obvious problems it causes to the parking plan as presented.

Furthermore, the proposed design does not fit into the style of the existing Lodge buildings, nor does it fit into the general style sense of Studio City in general. Besides the aesthetic issues it raises, the slab sided metal and glass surfaces of its exterior are the potential source of dangerous effects on traffic as discussed in that section of this report. Any redesign must address the issue of glare by removing design elements that can cause it, and the exterior of the building must substantially reflect the style and appearance of the main Lodge building in order to be acceptable to the community.

Utilities: The additional burden the gym will place on the local sewage system is inadequately addressed. There is talk of building a “gray water” landscape irrigation system, but no information on where or how this will be implemented, or even any assurances that doing so is acceptable to the various City agencies that review such things. Nor is the issue of additional permissions from other agencies outside of the City who may have a say in such things addressed. Thus this mediation is unsubstantiated in its current form.

The issue of raw sewage, as opposed to “gray water” from sinks, showers, floor drains, etc, is also not discussed thoroughly. There is mention of a “wastewater tank” that would store up to three days projected generation of “wastewater”, allowing it to be pumped into the sewer during periods of reduced flow. Since the term “wastewater” is used instead of the previous term “gray water”, there is some question as to whether this tank will contain human waste from toilets and urinals, or if it is part of the proposed irrigation system. Regardless, the presence of this tank creates the potential for a large spill of contaminated liquid almost directly into the LA River channel, with the attendant pollution, health issues and ecological damage that would necessarily result from such a spill. Furthermore, no evidence is presented that there are any periods of reduced flow in the main sewage line locally. Since the entire Valley area drains through it, the possibility readily exists that the line is either at or near maximum capacity at all times; certainly the presence of a scrubber station in Studio City that is operating at a higher than projected use indicates that the area systems are already dangerously near maximum capacity.

Water usage is also not discussed in an acceptable fashion. There is no certification from the DWP that they can provide the water demands this facility will create, nor is there any such calculation available for review or study. The additional burden on the current water supply capacity of the area is supposedly addressed by the use of self-closing faucets in sinks. Although the use of low flow toilets and urinals is required, nothing is said in regards of water use for showers. Unless the facility is somehow equipped to limit shower use by patrons to a short period of time, say three to five minutes, with no additional use after that time, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of water use in the building will be from post work out showers. Even if such usage is partially addressed by the presence of low flow showerheads, any projected reduction in demand from their use will likely be offset by the time of flow for each user. Since the cost of such water usage is transparent to the individuals, unlike their home use where the bill comes to them, there is no impetus for them to be conservative in their use there. Since the Equinox is marketed to a high-end customer base, it is unlikely that they will wish to curtail their client’s shower use, and therefore there is no mediation of the facilities water use or sewer discharge.

Rainwater and runoff management are also not specifically addressed in the applications, but need to be prior to any approval of this project, as does the requirement for the creation of a dedicated public access to the LA River.

Conclusion: This report, while covering a large number of major problems with the Equinox development as currently proposed should not be considered a complete listing of all shortcomings with the proposal, but rather a synopsis of the most egregious ones discovered during the short period of time available for the subcommittee’s review of the submissions. Undoubtedly, further research and discussion will reveal more items that are not in compliance with the established requirements for property development in Studio City.

John Walker read the motion. **Lisa Sarkin** said that Richard Adams is the chair of the advisory committee. Issues that are problems are that parking would be shared and all spaces would have to be repainted. Traffic would be much worse and the construction traffic plan would need to be revised. The design does not agree with the specific plan. The utilities and infrastructure will be taxed excessively. We want a nice thing like this in Studio City but the traffic on this corner will be adversely impacted. **John Walker** opened this for discussion. **J.J. O’Brien** stated that he was there to answer any questions that the board may have. **Todd Royal** he said this is near where he lives. He would like this item to be tabled. He asked if the owner will reconsider the timing of the project and come back to land use later. **Ben Di Benedetto** said he agrees with Todd. He thanked Mr. Adams for his report and said there were many traffic questions. Additionally, the DWP will be working on the trunk line. He would like to work with them to coordinate the traffic issues. **Lisa Sarkin said we are**

only commenting on the MND at this time and that has a deadline. **Ron Taylor** said he disagrees with Ben and Todd. We are better to be early with our comments rather than late to be a help to the city. **Richard Adams** stated that we must respond to the MDN in a timely fashion. As a local resident he wants them to succeed and they are being cooperative. First we must pass this so the MND does not just sail through. **Rita Villa** said must do this now and submit the report on time. **Richard Niederberg** said the parking problem will not go away. **John Walker** commended the report preparers. **Gail Steinberg** commented that things that come to LUC are sometimes adversarial. In this case it is a partnership and they are working with us. This is a positive thing. **Vote: Unanimous. Motion Carries.** Todd Royal left the meeting.

12. Government Affairs Committee report by Barbara Monahan Burke. **Barbara Monahan Burke** reported that the 6th DWP meeting took place in Valley this week. Ratepayers advocate issues were discussed. Rudeness and stonewalling has taken place both to the City Council and MOU Committee. There will be another meeting in a couple of weeks and we are continuing to follow this. Additionally she and Lisa Sarkin met with a representative of the Sierra Club and the National Resource Council. They would like to coordinate matters of common interest with our NC. They are interested in rebates for energy efficiency as this is how we have helped to conserve. **Barbara Monahan Burke** reported that she spoke at the CPC meeting about the fact that the NC's are not given sufficient time to respond to issues. Michael La Grand of the City Planning Department is working on a proposal to be sure that the time clock does not start until all parts of the motion and related documents are released to the public. Please remember this Sunday Paul Krekorian will head an Education and Neighborhood Committee meeting on the west side of LA similar to the one held in the Valley a few weeks ago. Paul Krekorian is listening and it is going well.

John Walker read the following motion:

Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council authorizes the issuance of a letter, substantially in the form attached hereto transmitting our comments on the Community Design Overlay Streamlining Ordinance to the City Planning Department, the City Planning Commission and the City Council.

On SCNC Letterhead

October 2, 2010

Los Angeles City Planning Department
Attn: Michelle Sorkin (michelle.sorkin@lacity.org)
Alan Bell (Alan.Bell@lacity.org)
Michael J. Lo Grande (michael.logrande@lacity.org)
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St., Room 621
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The City Planning Commission:

The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council has reviewed the proposed CDO (Community Design Overlay) Streamlining Ordinance of August 2010. Please place our comments below in your formal record on this matter.

General Comments on Q & A:

The “CDOs” should be mandatory not voluntary.

#1 Question: What is being proposed?

Answer: The Department of City Planning is proposing an ordinance that would allow for administrative review of projects when they are fully compliant with design guidelines and standards contained in Community Design Overlay Districts.

Response: We contend that any determination over 10% is unacceptable without a public hearing. An administrative clearance (ministerial approval) shall be limited to a 10% change. A director’s determination of any amount over a 10% change shall not be allowed without a public hearing. The neighborhood councils shall be made aware of any application and the time for response shall be sufficient to accommodate the neighborhood council review process.

#2 Question: What does that actually mean?

Answer: The purpose of these changes is to reduce the process length of time for projects that meet CDOs. Basically, if a project complies with all a CDO’s guidelines and standards, applicants would get a meeting and approval relatively quickly instead of waiting for Planning to issue a determination letter that authorizes the approval. If a project doesn’t meet all the standards, but still generally meets the intent of the CDO by meeting the guidelines, a determination letter will be written up detailing what is in compliance and how.

Response: Based on the answer above, a letter of approval still needs to be issued. The words “Still generally meets the intent of the CDO” do not mean that the project meets all the standards of the CDO. This does not seem to be in compliance with the requirement for a project to be “fully compliant with design guidelines and standards contained in Community Design Overlay Districts” as cited for administrative review in the first Q & A. This attempt to expedite the approval of projects at the expense of community input and compliance with guidelines specifically constructed to insure that the scale and character of an area is maintained is unacceptable. Again, Neighborhood Council and public input are necessary.

#3 Question: Does this take away regulations? (Read: Does this make it easier to build uglier buildings?)

Answer: No! All adopted CDO standards remain as is! Projects in CDO districts are still subject to CDO provisions. In fact, CDO standards are technically not regulations or law, which is why we are focusing streamlining on the process. If anything, streamlining the process provides an incentive for property owners and developers to meet the guidelines and save time in the permit process.

Response: Fully complying with the CDO standards and guidelines is the only way to save time in the permit process.

#4 Question: Why is this being proposed?

Answer: With Planning Department staffing levels at almost half of what they were five years ago, and continuous additions of special zoning overlays and plans that require staff’s attention, we have fewer Planners and more work (with legally-mandate deadlines!). We must prioritize and focus our limited resources. The proposed ordinance reduces timelines and staff expenditures, while not changing or undermining the guidelines or standards that apply to projects.

Response: Reducing timelines and saving staff time is not acceptable when it is accomplished at the expense of the community. It changes and undermines the standards and guidelines that are to apply to projects. The Neighborhood Council shall be added to the review process and sufficient time allowed for them to review and comment. The Planning Department shall prioritize those projects that have legally mandated deadlines.

#5 Question: Why am I just hearing about it now?

Answer: This is the perfect time to hear about it! These public information meetings are just an initial step in reaching out; the goal is to explain what we are proposing so that we can receive your input. Your comments are welcome throughout September (in order to be incorporated in to the staff report), and beyond; you can continue participating at the City Planning Commission Hearing (yet to be scheduled) and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of Council (PLUM) and City Council. Please sign in to be on the mailing list of future meetings.

Response: The initial time allowed for formal input from Neighborhood Councils and the public was too short. Neighborhood Councils need a minimum of 60 days to research and hold Committee and Board meetings before reaching a formal opinion. The advisory opinions of the neighborhood councils are essential and they are mandated by the Los Angeles City Charter.

6 Question: Wasn't this already proposed?

Answer: Yes! In 2007 the Planning Department proposed CDO streamlining, which was approved by the City Planning Commission without much fanfare. The ordinance at the time defined types of projects that could receive sign-offs (also known as administrative clearances). Given further budgetary restrictions in recent times, and because the City Attorney had concerns about defining signs as minor projects, we decided that a more comprehensive version of the CDO streamlining ordinance would be most effective. We are now bringing it back though public review

Response: The Studio City Neighborhood Council expects the CDO Streamlining Ordinance to uphold the Billboard Ordinance in its entirety as instructed by the City Attorney, with no exceptions. Supergraphics, digital, and oversized signs and billboards, as well as an excessive number of signs, shall not be allowed unless they are located in the few previously approved Sign Districts. Nothing is "Minor" about Signs.

#7 Question: Is this the same thing as the "Core Findings" Code Amendment?

Answer: No! The CDO streamlining ordinance is coming from the Community Planning Bureau, a portion of the Planning Department that is responsible for creating and "implementing" the CDOs (that means reviewing projects and making sure the plans are followed). The Core Findings and Code Simplification efforts are being done by a different section of the Planning Department, the Code Studies unit, in order to make findings consistent throughout the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

Response: The Community Planning Bureau creates and implements the CDOs. Provisions for continuing enforcement are necessary. The tools for enforcement must be in place before any changes are implemented.

#8 Question: Why is the CDO Streamlining and Citywide Design Guidelines meeting combined:

Answer: We devised a combined meeting as an innovative way to maximize attendance and draw in people who may have heard about one but not the other. A combined meeting also conserves resources (for example shared staffing cuts down on costs) and helps staff coordinate and learn from each other.

Response: Combining presentations is a sensible way to save both staff and attendees time and to save the City money. Stakeholders shall receive earlier notification of proposed workshops and meetings. They shall take place over a longer time span to enable greater participation and their locations shall be spread-out over more areas of the City.

Comments on Community Design Overlay Streamlining:

p.1 Section 1. (d):

This Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process.

p.1 Section 1. (d) (3):

This Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process.

p.1 Section 2.2. Project:

All signs or billboards including but not limited to pole signs and/or monument signs shall comply with the Billboard Ordinance as instructed by the City Attorney with no exceptions. Supergraphics, digital, and oversized signs and billboards shall not be allowed unless they are located in the few previously approved Sign Districts.

p. 2 Section 3. E.2. (b):

An Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process. An Administrative Clearance (ministerial approval) shall be limited to a 10% change. A Director's Determination of any amount over a 10% change shall not be allowed without a public hearing.

p.3 Section 3. E 3. (a) and (b):

A Director's Determination of any amount over 10% shall not be allowed without a public hearing. "Substantially" is a subjective and not measurable. The standard shall be objective with measurable criteria. The meaning of the phrase "scale and design" is not the same as the meaning of the phrase "scale and character." This constitutes a significant change in the provisions of the CDO.

p.3 Section 3. E 4:

The Notice and approved plans shall also be mailed to the Neighborhood Council. Additionally, we reiterate that any determination over 10% shall not be allowed without a public hearing.

Sincerely,

John Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council

Ben Di Benedetto asked why this has been presented in question and answer format. **Rita Villa** responded by showing the document we received from the planning department and explaining that is how the planning dept released it. **Vote:** 10:0:0 – Unanimous. **Motion Carries.**

12. Cultural Affairs Committee report by Richard Niederberg. **Richard Niederberg** referred to the Republic Pictures event program he distributed to all board members before the meeting and briefly reported on concluding items related to the event.

13. Outreach Committee report by Lisa Cahan-Davis. **Lisa Cahan-Davis** stated that she would like to have meeting with Remy Kessler so she can understand the budget and how it is projected to be spent. She reported that the SCNC has received approval for 4 free Sundays at the Studio City Farmers Market. She would like to present a calendar at the next meeting with a proposal for those dates to see if they are in accord with our NC's objectives and efforts. With respect to Region C – she has reached out to DONE and the 11 other NC's in region C to discuss best practices and bundling funds as to what NC's do and how people can get involved. She indicated that Richard Adams is working on website/blog which can be manipulated for free. She stated that the existing website does not meet our needs. **John Walker** acknowledged Lee Davis for his work on the Republic Pictures event. **Remy Kessler** said she should coordinate with Todd Royal on the website matters as he has done a lot of work on this already and we should not duplicate effort.

14. Transportation Committee report by Ben Di Benedetto/Scott Ouellette. **Ben Di Benedetto** reported that their meeting is tomorrow night and it will be permanently the third Thursday of the month. They are appointing a couple of more members. **Lisa Sarkin** asked if they could appoint an additional member to the advisory committee for Equinox.

15. Bylaws Committee report by Ron Taylor. **Ron Taylor** stated that the next meeting will be Monday and there could be either zero or 4 motions that come out of that meeting. **Arlene Samek** said that Ron should keep in mind the standardization of the table of contents recommendation from VANC. That recommendation may go to BONC.

16. Crime & Safety Committee report by Wayne Kartin. **Wayne Kartin** reported that due to a scheduling error there was no meeting.

17. Comments from Board Members on subject matters within the Board's jurisdiction. John Walker stated that as Lana is out of town, Rita Villa will generate the letters that are time sensitive. **Rita Villa** asked about the Animal welfare committee. **John Walker** responded that it is in process.

18. Adjournment. **Moved:** Ben Di Benedetto; **Second:** Wayne Kartin; **Vote:** Unanimous.

