



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Community Impact Statement - Submission Details

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org

Tue, May 16, 2023 at 10:49 AM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Reseda

Name: Jamie York

Email: jamiey@resedacouncil.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(9) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 05/15/2023

Type of NC Board Action: Against unless Amended

Impact Information

Date: 05/16/2023

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 23-0360

Agenda Date: 05/15/2023

Item Number: V.G.

Summary: The Reseda Neighborhood Council absolutely opposes this motion unless crucial changes are made. It has significant flaws which would be extremely detrimental to the community of Reseda, possibly to other communities in the City of LA, and codifies special treatment for special interest groups and lobbyists at the expense of the citizens and business owners of the city that are supposed to be represented by their elected officials, but certainly aren't here. This motion attempts to correct a perceived problem with an MOU executed in 2019 that requires replacement parking for any public parking transferred to the Housing and Community Investment Department (LAHD). However, it commits as grievous a sin as that it believes the MOU does by rendering the LA Department of Transportation (LADOT) completely

impotent in regards to protecting the development, transportation, and parking needs of individual Los Angeles communities by painting with far too broad a brush. Please see attached pdf for full statement.

Ref:MSG8341393



CIS Council File 23-0360 Motion Replacement Parking final.pdf

153K



Reseda Neighborhood Council

DJ FRANK
PRESIDENT

KARLA ESCOBAR
VICE-PRESIDENT

JAMIE YORK
SECRETARY

ANGELA SABORIO
TREASURER

MICHELLE GALLAGHER
PARLIAMENTARIAN

VICTOR SABORIO
SERGEANT-AT ARMS

SHARON BREWER
KARLA ESCOBAR

JENNIFER HUNT GUDERNATCH
GUILLERMO MORALES-

VITOLA
ANDRES PERKINS

JOE PHILLIPS
JIMMY REYES

GOLZAR SEPHRI
MARIA SKELTON
SOPHIA ZAMBRANO

Council File 23-0360

Eliminate Considering Parking Space Replacement/ Department of Transportation Parking Facilities / 25 Spaces or Greater / Transfer / Housing Department / Affordable or Supportive Housing / Los Angeles Administrative Code Sections 22.482(a) and 22.602/Notification of Lobbyists and Special Interest Groups

Position: Oppose unless Amended

The Reseda Neighborhood Council absolutely opposes this motion unless crucial changes are made. It has significant flaws which would be extremely detrimental to the community of Reseda, possibly to other communities in the City of LA, and codifies special treatment for special interest groups and lobbyists at the expense of the citizens and business owners of the city that are supposed to be represented by their elected officials, but certainly aren't here.

This motion attempts to correct a perceived problem with an MOU executed in 2019 that requires replacement parking for any public parking transferred to the Housing and Community Investment Department (LAHD). However, it commits as grievous a sin as that it believes the MOU does by rendering the LA Department of Transportation (LADOT) completely impotent in regards to protecting the development,

transportation, and parking needs of individual Los Angeles communities by painting with far too broad a brush.

As we have seen in Reseda, were our Public Parking lots to be irrevocably converted to another use, even WITH the caveat of replacement (but not equivalent) parking as a requirement, it would decimate our business center, a center comprised almost entirely of minority owned Mom and Pop businesses, including the largest concentration of Vietnamese owned businesses in the West Valley. This aggregation of businesses currently serves as the cultural hub of the Vietnamese community in our area. Without the caveat, Reseda, as a community with the current potential to revitalize into a model walkable and cyclable vibrant community would cease to exist, and become just another highly densely populated ghetto suffering from limited shopping opportunities, inadequate public transportation and oppressive traffic congestion.

A policy such as that promulgated in this motion is yet another example of how tone-deaf the LA City Council, a council plagued by corruption and cowering to special interests, is. In its effort to stripmine communities of their Public Assets to benefit special interest developers, it completely ignores, which perhaps is its goal, how communities evolved to their current status, and robs them of their agency to use their Public Assets to improve that status. For example, the community of Reseda is one of the original three LA communities of the San Fernando Valley, founded first as Marian in 1912, morphing into Reseda in 1922. The central business district formed at the intersection of Sherman Way and Reseda Boulevard in 1915, and rapidly grew through the 1930s. With a uniform zoning code a long way off, and formal urban planning even further away, these commercial properties were developed with no consideration of parking in mind. At that time, cars were not plentiful, and in any event, there was plenty of empty land to park on near the commercial center. The Reseda Theatre, a use which certainly is parking intensive, was built in the 1940s with not a single parking space on the property. This arrangement worked fine until the explosion of the car culture in the 1950s and the economic boom which saw all the previously vacant land near the center developed into shopping centers with expansive, privately owned parking, or other uses that didn't need much parking like housing. With only limited adjacent street parking available, the tenants of the commercial properties in the town center found moving into these new centers with their convenient ample parking would be more profitable for them. The owners of the commercial properties then found, when they tried to find new tenants, that the highest and best uses of their properties had been reduced by the parking requirements the new LA City zoning Codes required. To restore the commercial center, local community leaders realized it needed Public Parking lots to provide the parking it currently lacked. This was accomplished through both eminent domain actions, and donations by civic minded individuals, and this is how the LADOT lots in Reseda came into being. This restored and even increased the highest and best use of the lots and revitalized the center. Since then, many, if not most, of the properties

located on the four corners of the Sherman Way/Reseda Boulevard intersection are only viable for intensive commercial uses because of the existence of these lots, as they do not have enough parking spots on site to meet typical parking demands that present day businesses require. By not making even the slightest effort to understand this history, indeed, by requiring it be ignored as this motion does, the LA City Council only shows how little they actually care about the people they are supposed to represent.

To make matters worse, this motion is extremely short-sighted in that it ignores the significant impact recent state legislation will have in high density working class communities like Reseda, particularly AB2097 and SB9. We are already seeing the effects of SB9 as more and more homeowners take advantage of the legislation to convert garages into Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), thereby removing one to two units of their off-street parking, and building separate ADU with no parking added, thereby adding one to three cars to the current parking load. Reseda's surface streets have far more parking congestion than they had even three years ago. AB2097 will allow construction of 6 story, perhaps higher, apartment buildings with no parking required along the Reseda Boulevard and Sherman Way corridors. Obviously, if the commercial property owners lose their tenants because the Public Parking Lots are eliminated, their best recourse would be to simply take advantage of AB2097 to build such structures. The problem is, where will all these residential tenants then park? Normally, the adjacent residential zones could act as a buffer, absorbing these extra parking demands, but they're jammed up because of the overflow generated by SB9. This motion, which will almost certainly lead to the elimination of Reseda's Public Parking assets, will create a perfect storm along with AB2097 and SB9 that will consign Reseda's commercial center to a future of dense residential development which would only be warehousing people and providing them with a poor quality of life. Is this what the elites of the LA City Council want? Do they even care about the quality of life of the people in LA's working class neighbourhoods? On the other hand, by preserving these assets from the greed of developers and special interests, they could be used to create the parking solutions needed to allow the development of mixed use developments that will create the economic and housing opportunities that create a healthy and revitalized Reseda.

Finally, the blatant manner in which this motion curries favour with the housing developers of the city by codifying that THEY get notified of this policy change, while keeping it secret from the stakeholders whose livelihoods may very well DEPEND on these Public Assets is a slap in the face to every Angeleno Entrepreneur who works 24/7/365 to keep their Small Business alive while our city officials with their generous salaries and benefits pass down their edicts from their high seats over in the city council chambers, all the while totally oblivious to what it takes to actually make a living in the real world. It looked bad enough when the stakeholders of Reseda recently saw our Councilperson apparently reward a Non-Profit for the support its officers gave his biased and unbalanced study regarding the Public Parking lots in

Reseda. But it could have just been a coincidence that shortly after the officers supplied public comment in support of renewing his long-expired study, Councilmember Blumenfield proffered a motion to sell the non-profit a Ford E250 van from the city inventory for one measly buck. A van that, according to Kelley Blue Book had a value at the time of \$4300 on the low end, possibly as high as \$5900, but the Councilmember stated in his motion as only being \$1800. Actions like this where the timing and underestimation of value is suspicious do nothing to bolster public trust in our officials. Codifying special treatment to lobbyists and developers is miles beyond that.

We in the Reseda Council agree that the blanket replacement policy stipulated in the LAHD/ LADOT /City Administrative Officer (CAO) MOU is problematic on its face. We do not agree that codifying a knee-jerk motion that creates an even worse situation with a blanket refusal to even consider replacement parking, or, indeed other alternate uses that most certainly would do more to solve the unhoused crisis than liquidating Public Assets to Private Developers will do, is the solution. Our community currently suffers from many issues, from an economic depression significantly escalated by poor past governmental decisions, to high unemployment, to unsafe streets for pedestrians and bicyclists, to severe shortage of open park space, to ineffective public transportation, to air quality standards, to unhoused encampments. Our community has repeatedly expressed uses for our Public Assets that would help alleviate many of these issues, not just one as this motion would do, and inadequately, at that. But it seems our Councilmembers are more interested in their political careers than in actually listening to their constituents and delivering what their communities really need.

This motion needs to be limited to simply nullifying the MOU as a blanket policy, and the entire section that prevents either LADOT or LAHD from requiring replacement parking as a condition of development be removed. Instead it should be altered to state that if any of the lots identified by the CAO are subsequently targeted by the City or a City Councilmember to be utilized as interim, supportive, or affordable housing, an objective study shall be done to determine if replacement parking would be needed, if such parking would be equitable to what it is replacing, or if the properties might be better used to economically revitalize the area, which would inevitably create more jobs and housing, or provide other amenities for the Public Good, such as a park or community garden, that the community might need. In addition, every commercial property owner, and commercial property tenant within a half mile radius of the Public Parking Asset, as well as any Chamber of Commerce with the Asset in its jurisdiction, shall be notified it has been identified for conversion from Public Parking to another use.

In summary, the Reseda Community and its representative the Reseda Neighbourhood Council demand this motion be rejected unless it is amended to place the power on

what to do with the Public Assets located in a community in the hands of the local communities, and takes it out of the hands of the centralized power base of the out of touch and indifferent LA City Council.

This motion passed in a meeting held in accordance with the Brown Act on May 15, 2023 with a vote of 9 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, and 0 ineligible.