



Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (“GWNC”)  
Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, January 26, 2021  
Minutes Approved February 23, 2021

In conformity with the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20 (March 17, 2020) and due to concerns over COVID-19, this duly noticed meeting was held entirely online and telephonically.

Document copies were available at <https://greaterwilshire.org/LUCdocs> and shown online.

**I. WELCOMING REMARKS**

A. Call to Order (Cathy Roberts)

A duly noticed Meeting of the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (“GWNC”) Land Use Committee was held online. Ms. Roberts noted that, in Mr. Farha’s absence, she, as Secretary, would Chair this meeting. She called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

B. Roll Call (Cathy Roberts)

Ms. Roberts called the roll. Seven of the 10 Committee Members were present online at the Roll Call: Madison Baker, Rory Cunningham, Jennifer DeVore, Karen Gilman, John Gresham, Susan O’Connell and Cathy Roberts (Secretary). Patricia Carroll arrived later. Philip Farha (Chair) and Dick Herman were/was absent. The GWNC Land Use Committee quorum (the minimum number of Committee Members needing to be present to take binding votes on Agendized Items) was 51% of the 10 filled Committee Seats, or six Members, so the Committee could take such votes. [To apply to become a Member, see [www.GreaterWilshire.org](http://www.GreaterWilshire.org)]. Also attended: at least 18 Stakeholders and guests.

**II. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Long-time tenant Cinzia Zanetti, of the 410 N. Rossmore Ave. DOMOS Co-Living Project, said “this is way too big . . . our neighborhood is really against this.” Neighbors Joy Wingard, Chris Shanley and Sarita Singh agreed.

*Committee Member Patti Carroll arrived at 6:38, making eight Committee Members present online (the Committee quorum was six).*

Neighbor Andrew Murray also brought up 617 N Rossmore. Meg Healy, Planning Deputy for L.A. City District Four Councilmember Nithya Raman, indicated that [Suin.Lee@LACity.org](mailto:Suin.Lee@LACity.org), may have information regarding the 617 N. Rossmore project.

**III. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

A. GWNC Monthly Land Use Update

Ms. Roberts indicated that there was no report.

**IV. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS** (Discussion and Action)

A. Review and Adoption of December 22, 2020 Minutes.

Ms. Roberts requested and it was agreed to TABLE this to the next meeting.

B. Review of Early Planning Report for possible future action items.

Ms. Gilman reported that neighbors of the 611 N. Manhattan project filed an appeal.

**V. OLD BUSINESS** (Discussion and Possible Action).

*[The following sub-section first paragraphs are copied from the Agenda.]*

A. **Melrose Avenue Pedestrian Improvement Project:** There will be a Virtual Community Outreach Event on January 27, 2021, to learn more about the project. Register to Attend: <https://streetsla.lacity.org/melrose>.

Ms. Roberts noted the above and believed it would “be a good project.” No Motion was made or vote taken.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS** (Discussion and Possible Action).

*[The following sub-section first paragraphs are copied from the Agenda.]*

A. **859 N. Highland Ave.** (Discussion and Possible Action) (Mary Rosas, Diana Rodriguez) Starbucks at Highland and Willoughby - Variance Request. Zoning (Q)C2-1VL-SN.

Ms. Roberts noted that documents have been available on the website. Ms. Rosas, Starbucks Government Affairs Representative; Architect Elizabeth Valerio, and Steve Coon presented. Mr. Coon explained that the Starbucks has been at Highland and Willoughby since 2015; it was designated a Historic Cultural Monument in 2002. “It has been a success” that has “generated a lot of traffic . . . we want to help find solutions.” Ms. Valerio said “we can really improve the speed” of servicing drive-through vehicles; “we are looking at . . . adding a second drive-through lane . . . This is a historical building” so they are paying close attention to the design. She presented (online) “very early stage preliminary” design renderings. They know of 15 to 16 cars queueing; they can “definitely lessen that by reconfiguring the site . . . we’ll have one of the members of the Starbucks team outside to speed up the order process.” They will work with City Council District Five; first they came to the GWNC. Mr. Gresham noted regarding the traffic back-up that “it’s made me take a different street” and was happening “before the [COVID-19] pandemic.” No Motion was made or vote taken.

B. **349 N. Citrus Ave.:** (Discussion and Possible Action) (Marinela Peneda) Demolition Pre-Application Number 20019-10000-04410. Zoning R1-1.

GWNC Administrator Shirlee Fuqua reported that the applicant did not respond to communications.

**MOTION** (by Mr. Cunningham, seconded by Ms. Roberts): The Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee recommends that the GWNC Board oppose the Demolition Pre-Application for 349 N. Citrus Ave. pending their appearance at the LUC meeting and neighborhood outreach.

*Committee Member Karen Gilman was unavailable to vote at this time, making seven Committee Members present online (this Committee quorum was six).*

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a roll call vote of the seven eligible voters present online with all seven in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Baker, Carroll, Cunningham, DeVore, Gresham, O’Connell and Roberts); zero opposed (“No” or “Nay”); zero abstained.

- C. 500 N. Larchmont Blvd.:** (Discussion and Possible Action) (Matthew Hayden). New construction, use, and maintenance of a 5-story, approximate 56 ft tall, 26,648 sq ft apartment building containing 21 units (7 one-bedroom / 14 two-bedroom), including 8% of the total project units (2 units) set aside as affordable housing for (ELI) households. At grade parking providing 21 on-site vehicular parking spaces and 24 bicycle parking spaces (21 long term with 3 short term). Existing site improvements to be removed / replaced. TOC Affordable Housing Incentives Program pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22 A 31 (e) with three additional incentives requested for a Tier 1 project setting aside 8% of its total project units / 11% of its base units (2 units) for ELI households as follows:
- A base incentive to permit up to a 50% increase in density;
  - A base incentive to permit an increase in (FAR) from 1.5:1 up to a maximum of 2.75:1 in a [Q]C2-1VL Zone;
  - A base incentive to permit a residential parking minimum requirement for residential units to have a maximum requirement of 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom;
  - An additional incentive to permit RAS3 Zone yard setbacks in the C2 Zone;
  - An additional incentive to permit a 20% reduction in Open Space to allow 1,960 sq ft in lieu of 2,450 sq ft; and
  - An additional incentive to permit an 11 ft increase in building height up to 56 ft in lieu of 45 ft. DIR-2021-559-TOC-HCA. Zoning (Q)C2-1VL.

Mr. Hayden, Land Use Consultant, showed (online) project slides, noting that “essentially, the project [at Larchmont and Rosewood] is two lots that have a mix of commercial uses on them right now . . . The goal is to save the existing trees.” There will be a pedestrian entrance at the intersection. He described more project details. “We haven’t spoken with” the neighbors yet; they wanted first to speak with the GWNC. Ms. O’Connell noted that “it’s really hard for us to support” a project without the developer having talked with the neighbors. She believed that the project does not fit the neighborhood’s “historical context . . . it doesn’t look residential . . . it doesn’t look friendly.” She believed that the project is “disproportionate,” the sidewalk setback is not large enough and that it would be difficult to save the trees with the current design. She also suggested “the entry should be on Larchmont, not Rosewood . . . and that the proposed materials will not age well and look cheap.” Ms. Carroll believed that the project would “not take advantage of the commercial” possibilities or the “walkability” of Larchmont, and that the parking would be inadequate. Resident John Welborne believed that not much commercial space is being built or would be economically feasible to build on Larchmont at this time. Mr. Hayden noted that C-2 zones [such as this] allow residential uses. Neighbor and architect Mr. Shanley wanted the developer to be “invested in the neighborhood” and believed the project’s architecture to be “pathetic.” He wanted the GWNC to “encourage developers to submit sun/shade studies when projects abut R1 zones.” Neighbor Ms. Wingard believed

that developers are “destroying everything that makes Larchmont unique.” Neighbor Ms. Zanetti believed the project to be “too big” for the site. Ms. Healy from CD4 believed that the project would create housing for “20 to 30 families.” Mr. Gresham noted that only two of the project’s units could be considered “affordable housing.” It was agreed that Mr. Hayden’s presentation was good; it was the project that was objectionable.

**MOTION** (by Ms. O’Connell, seconded by Ms. DeVore): The Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee recommends that the GWNC Board oppose the project located at 500 N. Larchmont Blvd. pending neighborhood outreach and design revisions.

*Committee Member Karen Gilman had returned by this time, making eight Committee Members present online (this Committee quorum was six).*

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a roll call vote of the eight eligible voters present online with all eight in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Baker, Carroll, Cunningham, DeVore, Gilman, Gresham, O’Connell and Roberts); zero opposed (“No” or “Nay”); zero abstained.

Neighbor and architect Ms. Singh agreed with Ms. O’Connell that the developer and architect need to appear before the Committee; “this project is inappropriate in scale for this neighborhood” and the design “needs improvement.”

**VII. REQUESTS FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS** (Discussion and possible action)

- A. **620 ½, 622 ½, 626 ½, 628 ½, 632 ½, 634 ½, 636 ½ N. Wilton Place:** (Albert Chavez) Demolition Pre-inspection Application Numbers 20019-10000-03663, 03667;03655; 03668; 03669; 03652P; 03653; 03656. Proposed 4-story 25-unit apt bldg. Zoning R3-1.
- B. **617 N. Rossmore Ave.:** (Bruce Miller) Demolition Pre-inspection Application No. 20019-10000-03270 & 20019-10000-0327. Zoning R4-2.
- C. **834 N. June St.:** (Robert Tavasci) Demolition Pre-inspection Application No. 20019-1000001475. Zoning RD1.5-XL.
- D. **743-749 S. Gramercy Pl.:** (Michelle Chen) Demolition Pre-inspection Application No. 19019-10000-03867; 19019-10000-03861; and 19019-10000-03864. Zoning RD1.5-XL.
- E. 975-987 S. Manhattan Pl.: (Kevin Read) Zoning R4-1.

Ms. Roberts noted the above.

**VIII. PROJECTS COVERED BY OTHER BOARDS** (for information only)

- A. **963 S Wilton Pl.:** (Discussion and Possible Action) (Heather Lee) Construction of a 5-story, 16-unit apartment building. Requesting TOC, Tier 2 Project with 3 incentives from 45 ft to 56 ft and side yard setback from 8 ft to 6 ft. Setting aside 2 units for ELI. R3-1 HPOZWilshire Park.
- B. **728 S. Hudson Ave.:** SPP/DRB/VTT/F for 12 Condo Units. DRB - Park Mile.

Ms. Roberts noted the above.

## **IX. REVIEW OF PENDING LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION.**

A. **SB 9:** (Discussion and Possible Action) An act to amend Section 66452.6 of, and to add Sections 65852.21 and 66411.7 to, the Government Code, relating to land use. " The Planning and Zoning Law provides for the creation of accessory dwelling units by local ordinance, or, if a local agency has not adopted an ordinance, by ministerial approval, in accordance with specified standards and conditions.

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220SB9](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB9)

Ms. Roberts noted that L.A. City District Five Councilman Paul Koretz has introduced motions to the City Council opposing State Senate Bills SB 9 and SB 10. She encouraged writing elected officials with your views.

B. **SB 10:** (Discussion and Possible Action) An act to add Section 65913.5 to the Government Code, relating to land use. This bill would, notwithstanding any local restrictions on adopting zoning ordinances, authorize a local government to pass an ordinance to zone any parcel for up to 10 units of residential density per parcel, at a height specified in the ordinance, if the parcel is located in a transit-rich area, a jobs-rich area, or an urban infill site, as those terms are defined.

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=202120220SB10](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB10)

See above Item #IX. A.

C. **Local Emergency Code Amendment** (Discussion and Possible Action).

This Item was not addressed.

D. **TOC/TNP:** Continued discussion on Transit Oriented Communities and Transit Neighborhood Plans.

This Item was not addressed.

E. **Reorganization of Administrative Provisions:** Formerly known as: Processes and Procedures Ordinance. The Processes and Procedures Ordinance (CPC-2016-3182-CA) is the initial part of a larger effort to comprehensively revise the City's Zoning Code to make it more responsive and accessible to the public. The proposed ordinance streamlines and reorganizes the rules that govern the steps involved in reviewing projects and adopting land use policy, while introducing a more user-friendly format. An earlier draft of the ordinance was previously considered and approved by the City Planning Commission in 2018. In response to continued community input after the City Planning Commission hearing, City Planning has prepared a revised draft of the ordinance, which incorporates various changes. The revised draft of the Processes and Procedures Ordinance has been released for public comment. City Planning has also prepared the following resources:

- an annotated version of the revised ordinance to aid readers who are interested in tracking changes to the Code provisions;
- a fact sheet containing an overview of the ordinance, background information, and answers to frequently-asked questions;

--and a dedicated webpage that incorporates visual aids to explain core concepts behind the ordinance and key changes. Staff will also be available during scheduled virtual office hours to answer questions. Details on how to join the information session and sign up for virtual office hours will be provided in forthcoming emails. Written comments may be submitted to [bonnie.kim@lacity.org](mailto:bonnie.kim@lacity.org). In order to be incorporated in the staff recommendation report, comments must be submitted no later than one month before the City Planning Commission considers the item. The proposed ordinance is tentatively scheduled for consideration by the City Planning Commission in Spring of 2021.

This Item was not addressed.

## **X. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

A. Next GWNC Land Use Committee Meeting will be held at 6:30pm on Tuesday, February 23, 2021, via Zoom).

There was discussion of how the GWNC might be able to post on its website photos of land use projects that it believes to be appropriate for the area; the Committee unanimously agreed to see if this could be Agendized for the Committee and/or the Board.

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** (by Mr. Gresham, seconded by Ms. O’Connell): to **ADJOURN** the Meeting.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a roll call vote of the eight eligible voters present online with all eight in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Baker, Carroll, Cunningham, DeVore, Gilman, Gresham, O’Connell and Roberts); zero opposed (“No” or “Nay”); zero abstained.

The Meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Levin  
Minutes Writer

*The first paragraph of some Items, Motions/Resolutions and other wording may have been copied from the Agenda.* Edited by the GWNC. The GWNC Minutes page is

<http://greaterwilshire.org/land-use-committee-agendas-minutes>.