

Your Community Impact Statement has been successfully submitted to City Council and Committees.

If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [NCsupport@lacity.org](mailto:NCsupport@lacity.org).

This is an automated response, please do not reply to this email.

#### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council

Name: Kyle Ellis

Phone Number: (619) 535-8122

Email: [kellis@ghnnc.org](mailto:kellis@ghnnc.org)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(14) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(1) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 11/06/2018

Type of NC Board Action: Against unless Amended

#### Impact Information

Date: 11/20/2018

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 12-0460-S4

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: Please see the attached letter.



**GRANADA HILLS NORTH  
NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL**

**Address:** 11139 Woodley Avenue  
Granada Hills, CA  
**Telephone:** (818) 923-5592  
**Website:** www.GHNNC.org

**BOARD MEMBERS**

**PRESIDENT**  
Michael Greenwald

**VICE PRESIDENT**  
Ray Pollok

**MEMBERS**

Brian Allen	Oscar Jimenez
Alfredo Castillo	Rahim Kazi
Chris Coyle	Ralph Kroy
Berj Demirjian	Dave Parikh
Kyle Ellis	Skylar Rose
Sid Gold	Andres Topete
Bill Hopkins	Joe Vitti
Wayde Hunter	Keren Waters

**To:** Los Angeles City Council  
*Sent Via Community Impact Statement*

**From:** Board of Directors  
Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council

**Date:** November 20, 2018

**Regarding:** Council File No. 12-0460-S4

Dear Los Angeles City Council:

At Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council's November 06, 2018, General Board Meeting, the Board of Directors voted 14-0 (and 1 ineligible) in favor of adopting the recommendation and report of its Planning and Land Use Committee regarding taking the position of oppose unless amended to Council File No. 12-0460-S4.

Pursuant to this motion, Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council has drafted this letter requesting that the Los Angeles City Council favorably consider the attached recommendations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kyle M. Ellis  
Secretary  
Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council

Enclosure

[*Council File No. 12-0460-54*] Motion to oppose the Department of City Planning's October 11, 2018, proposed process overhaul unless amended to include all of the following changes:

The Department of City Planning's complete dismissal of the concerns raised by community members about the notification process to Neighborhood Councils demonstrates a fundamental disregard the Department of City Planning has for Neighborhood Councils as advisory bodies. This aloofness is further demonstrated by the complete absence of Neighborhood Councils in the proposed regulations, even when the use of Neighborhood Councils in their advisory capacity would be both appropriate and beneficial to the planning process.

Specifically, GHNNC disagrees with the Department of City Planning's analysis on page 26 of their report and their determination that the early notification system and the mailed notice is sufficient to notify Neighborhood Councils of all relevant projects within their areas of responsibility. Mailed notifications almost always arrive too late for a Neighborhood Council to take action due to the fact that committee meetings and board meetings are usually held on a monthly basis, making the turn-around typically take two full months. Together with the arbitrary release schedule for early notification updates, the early notification system often hides projects relevant to communities by improperly designating the relevant neighborhood where the project is located, and by requiring Board members to read through every single project in the City in order to try to find projects that are relevant to their particular Neighborhood Council. Neighborhood Councils require substantially different notification in order to effectively communicate with their communities and seek stakeholder feedback on proposed projects. GHNNC suggests that the Department of City Planning change their notification system to Neighborhood Councils and provide additional and different notification to Neighborhood Councils than is currently provided. One suggestion would be to implement direct communications by City project managers to Planning and Land Use Committee chairs and vice chairs via phone or email, when a new project is received by the project manager as part of the ordinary bureaucratic process.

As to the other matter, GHNNC refers the City Council to pages 28-29 (Section 56), 36-37 (Section 74), 49 (Section 91), 50 (Section 93), 68 (Section 95, X., 14, b), 73 (Section 95, X., 19, b, 2), 75 (Section 95, X., 22), 109-10 (Section 154, G., 2), and 123 (Section 176, E.) as a non-exhaustive list of examples where the Department of City Planning could have incorporated the Neighborhood Council advisory function into the proposed code amendments in an appropriate and beneficial manner, but failed to do so. As the City Council is aware, the purpose of Neighborhood Councils is to "have an advisory role on issues of concern to the neighborhood" (City Charter, Art. IX, Sec. 900). The sections of the proposed amendments referred to in this paragraph all relate to considerations that the Department of City Planning has to make about the compatibility of proposed projects with the scale and character of the surrounding community. Unelected employees of the Department of City Planning have no legitimate basis for making determinations about the character of a community absent significant input from members of the community or their elected representatives, i.e. without the advice of the relevant Neighborhood Council.

Accordingly, the Department of City Planning should be required to seek the advice of the Neighborhood Council when they are obligated to consider character of the community. Specifically, they should be required to request feedback from the Neighborhood Council on the following considerations: (1) whether a project is in the substantial interest to the community; (2) whether a project is designed to match or contribute to the aesthetics of the community; (3) whether a project alters or changes the existing uses of the development site in a manner that conflicts with or divides the community; (4) whether a project is designed to meet the needs of the communities existing and future residents; (5) whether a project would accommodate a broad range of uses that serve the needs of adjacent residents and promote neighborhood activity; and (6) whether a project is adequately served by City services, including access to parks, recreation, public transportation, police, and fire services. These are all considerations that a Neighborhood Council is well placed to offer substantial and

constructive advice, and which an employee of the Department of City Planning is unable to consider in any meaningful manner absent such advice. To the extent that the straw-man argument is raised regarding how such a requirement would delay projects if the Neighborhood Council fails to respond or grant Neighborhood Councils a veto power over projects, the City Council should note that the simple solution to such a trivial problems is to give Neighborhood Councils a timeline for completing such comments – say three (3) months from when the Department solicits the Neighborhood Council’s advice – and keep the ultimate decision-making authority vested with the Department of City Planning.

In conclusion, Neighborhood Councils should play an active advisory role in the land use and development of their communities, and the proposed changes to the code do not provide Neighborhood Councils with the opportunity to exercise their obligation under the City Charter to have an advisory role in these project. Therefore, GHNNC opposes the changes to the City’s Zoning laws unless they are amended to ameliorate the concerns raised herein.