



Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (“GWNC”)  
Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, February 28, 2023  
Approved March 28, 2023

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 [www.greaterwilshire.org/LUCdocs](http://www.greaterwilshire.org/LUCdocs) and shown online.

**I. WELCOMING REMARKS**

A. Call to order (Brian Curran)

A duly noticed Meeting of the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (“GWNC”) Land Use Committee was held online. Chair Brian Curran called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

B. Roll Call (Tommy Atlee)

Mr. Atlee called the roll. Eight of the 11 Committee Members were present online at the Roll Call: Tommy Atlee (Secretary), Rory Cunningham, Brian Curran (Chair), Karen Gilman, Dick Herman, Daniela Prowizor-Lacayo, David Trainer and Jane Usher. Patricia Carroll arrived later. John Gresham and Susan O’Connell were absent. The GWNC Land Use Committee quorum (the minimum number of Committee Members needing to be present to take binding votes on Agendized Items) is 51% of the 11 filled Committee Seats, or six Members, so the Committee could take such votes (see the Bylaws link at <https://greaterwilshire.org/bylaws-board-rules>). To apply to become a Member, see [www.GreaterWilshire.org](http://www.GreaterWilshire.org). Also attended: approximately 10 Stakeholders and guests.

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

There were no public comments at this time.

**III. CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT**

A. GWNC Monthly Land Use Update.

Mr. Curran noted that an Upper Larchmont presentation would be given.

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

A. Review and Adoption of January 24, 2023 Minutes.

The following correction was requested: page two, Item #V. A.: “everyone living within 500” should be “everyone living within 500 feet.”

**MOTION** (by Mr. Trainer, seconded by Ms. Usher): The Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee accepts the Minutes of its January 24, 2023 Meeting as amended.

**MOTION PASSED** by a roll call vote of the eight eligible voters present online with seven in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Atlee, Cunningham, Curran, Gilman, Prowizor-Lacayo, Trainer and Usher); zero opposed; one abstained (the GWNC counts abstentions as neither “yes” votes nor “no” votes) (Herman).

*Committee Member Patti Carroll arrived online at this time (6:43), making nine Committee Members present online (the Committee quorum was six).*

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

“New Cases Filed with Los Angeles City Planning . . . (01/15/2023 to 02/11/2023)” were reviewed. It was agreed to invite a representative(s) of the 148 S. Orange Dr. “Historic Cultural Monument nomination for Molen Flats” to present to the Committee. It may be a duplex. Mr. Trainer believed that the property looked rather unremarkable. Mr. Curran noted that a Charles S. Lee house across the street that was Mills Act petitioned by neighbors was turned down for historic preservation.

V. **Old Business** (Discussion and Possible Action).

A. None at this time.

VI. **New Business** (Discussion and Possible Action).

*[The following sub-section first paragraph(s) is/are copied from the Agenda.]*

A. 600 N. Gramercy Pl. (at Clinton): (Jordan Beroukhimco) Filing date: 12/29/22.

Construction, use, and maintenance of a 5-story, 56-ft, 23 unit apt bldg, including 3 units reserved for Very Low-Income households on an existing Vacant Residential Lot. Zoning: R3-1. TOC: Tier 2. Case no: DIR-2022-9425-TOC-WDI-VHCA. Area 9: Oakwood/Maplewood/St. Andrews.

Architect Jaime Matz gave an abridged presentation. Base incentives include parking reduction, a floor area increase of 45%; also, a 30% reduction of front yard; a setback reduction of 30% on one side yard; and a height increase. He said that setbacks align with many other buildings on the street. They are providing parking even though they are not required to. The building provides a lot of glazing; not a lot of buildings have this design feature. Applicant Jordan Beroukhim joined the discussion. The lot has been vacant for over a decade. The project has no affordable obligation; it’s a by right project of 13-14 units, they decided to put in affordable units. It was said that the developer, Mr. Adler, has a vested interest in the community and the property, and has a long-standing relationship.

Ms. Prowizor Lacayo asked about the side yard setback reduction, because she was worried that the driveway of the neighboring property would be affected. She also noted that most light and shadow impacts on lower density would be across the street. She also noted that she was sensitive to the north-facing windows of the neighbors and wondered if those windows had been taken into account.

Mr. Matz noted that the site to the north has been redeveloped into a four-plex and there is a driveway in between. They did not ask for a side-yard setback on the north side, and a number of service rooms are on the south side of the building to maximize the number of

parking spaces on the ground floor. He also noted that the lobby is on Gramercy and that there would be quite a bit of landscaping on the south side, including street trees and other items that will provide some sort of separation, and planters in between the wall and the sidewalk.

Mr. Curran asked if there was lighting at the street level, noting that any kind of flat wall with a wayward youth could incentivize graffiti; the suggestion was taken under advisement. Mr. Cunningham said that, with translucent balconies, you see ugly things on the balconies; that makes the architectural statement extremely piecemeal. Mr. Matz replied that, if the balconies become more solid, the massing of the building will look chunkier and more oppressive. Mr. Berokhim believed the tool for fixing this problem would be a provision of the lease agreement; he would bring this feedback to the land owner, and would readily agree to this provision for the support.

Guest Giulia Zammit supported the project, saying it looks nice. She doesn't own a car. She said other new developments have done a good job of maintaining the sidewalks in the area and the vacant lot does not do a good job of maintaining them. She said balcony usage is normal, and didn't really see it as a problem.

Ms. Usher asked for drawings of projects in context to the other buildings on the site. She asked GWNC Administrator Julia Christiansen to make the Committee's requirement for project drawings more apparent to project representatives.

**MOTION** (by Mr. Atlee, seconded by Mr. Trainer): The Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee recommends that the GWNC Board support the construction, use, and maintenance of a five-story, 56-foot, 23-unit apartment building, including three units reserved for Very-Low-Income households on an existing vacant residential lot. for the property located at 600 N. Gramercy Pl. as presented on February 28, 2023.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Trainer thought that the project was essentially going by the law. Mr. Cunningham believed that the project is doing the bare minimum and that there is not enough parking.

**MOTION PASSED** by a roll call vote of the nine eligible voters present online with seven in favor ("Yes" or "Aye") (Atlee, Carroll, Curran, Herman, Prowizor-Lacayo, Trainer and Usher); two opposed ("No" or "Nay") (Cunningham and Gilman); zero abstained.

#### B. Update from Upper Larchmont Working Group

Ms. Usher updated. The Group formed because the area between Beverly and Melrose may be rezoned as part of the city's Corridor Strategy for rezoning for its housing element, and because in April 2022 a by-right TOC residential project was approved at 500 N Larchmont. The Group has met twice monthly. She showed online a visualization of the rezoning of Upper Larchmont aided by the City's Livable Communities Initiative. The Group came up with a design template with harmony, walkability, size and scale within the context between buildings. Each neighborhood could pick its own design vernacular

that is consistent with the designs and goals of the neighborhood. Goals include that new development should build on the successful principles of Larchmont Boulevard; encourage design principles which are in harmony with the existing neighborhood; develop substantial affordable housing; and keep and encourage walkability. She discussed methods to achieve those goals, including design and landscaping standards; street design; parking and traffic calming standards; and establishing a consensus on goals and strategies through outreach. Ms. Usher made several recommendations, including to begin outreach over this vision, begin discussions with City Planning and the City Council Office, and consider whether a Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone is necessary to achieve the community's vision.

Ms. Prowizor-Lacayo said she grew up behind the Larchmont Medical Building and has a huge stake in this. She said that Crenshaw Blvd. was not built with any plan. Historically there were a lot of single-family residences that have now been converted to commercial uses. The experience of Upper Larchmont is going to go out the door when there is no required ground floor commercial and in the interest in retaining a common thread between the built environment. She thought that affordable housing will be difficult to sell to the people living in the units.

Mr. Cunningham thought there may be a lot less need for commercial space after the COVID pandemic is over. Ms. Usher said that someone told her they've been hoping Larchmont becomes more walkable and commercial, but there just hasn't been the demand; maybe there is a tradeoff for walkability. Ms. Carroll thought that neighborhood or commercial businesses would be supported by this area. Guest Keith Nakata thought the Group was seriously underestimating the amount of demand for retail along Larchmont. He believed upper Larchmont doesn't attract the same level of walkability as lower Larchmont, because there needs to be more work to make it more walkable.

Mr. Trainer agreed with the CPIO [Community Plan Implementation Overlay District] and thought that, if there is a mechanism in place that allows the community to build itself, then we can get close to a planned development. Ms. Prowizor-Lacayo noted that a height moratorium was placed on Larchmont after the construction of the Medical Building. Gower and Lucerne residents will not want four stories. She was 95% sure that the City owns a vacant lot on Beverly, north of the Medical building; the lot could be an exemplar property for existing owners or newcoming developers. Mr. Curran said one missed opportunity with lower Larchmont is that there's no housing above the shops. We have that opportunity with Upper Larchmont. Resident Liz Fuller suggested having Town Halls for more community input.

## **VII. REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

A. None at this time.

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

A. 148-150 S. Orange Dr. (Historic Monument Designation Proposal for "Molen Flats"): Built in 1928 by its original owner, building contractor Herman Molen, this duplex is a notable example of Spanish Colonial Revival architecture, indicative of the type of luxury multiple family housing that was being constructed in Los Angeles prior to the Great Depression. On February 3, 2023, the Director of Planning determined that an

application for the above referenced property was complete. Final determinations will be made by the Cultural Heritage Commission (CHC) and LA City Council. The CHC will hold a public meeting at City Hall on Thursday, March 2 at 10 a.m. Case no: CHC-2023-812-HCM. Area 2: Citrus Square.

Mr. Curran indicated that the above was discussed during the Item #IV. B. Early Planning Report.

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

(Discussion and Possible Action)

### **A. Permanent Al Fresco/Outdoor Dining Draft Ordinance**

- **Draft Ordinance**

In response to City Council instructions, Los Angeles City Planning has begun initial work on an ordinance to update and expand outdoor dining provisions within the Zoning Code. The proposed ordinance will provide for a transition from the current, temporary L.A. Al Fresco expanded outdoor dining program to a permanent program on private property.

- **Fact Sheet**

The proposed Permanent Al Fresco Ordinance aims to clarify and streamline Zoning Code regulations regarding outdoor dining on private property. In a separate but related effort, the Department of Transportation (LADOT) and the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) are preparing regulations to address outdoor dining in the public right-of-way. The Permanent Al Fresco Ordinance affecting private property includes components such as a definition of outdoor dining area, site design and operational standards, and criteria for replacing required parking spaces with an outdoor dining area. As proposed, outdoor dining that complies with the applicable standards would be permitted as a by-right use in any zones where restaurants are currently permitted. However, any alcohol service in outdoor dining areas would continue to require compliance with all applicable zoning regulations, including but not limited to Conditional Use Permits or Restaurant Beverage Program Administrative Clearances.

- **Al Fresco Participant Survey Results**

In Summer of 2022, Los Angeles City Planning (LACP), in conjunction with the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), released two surveys to the general public and current participants of the provisional L.A. Al Fresco program. A total of 308 unique business owners and 2,775 individual respondents of the general public participated in the surveys which provided guidance on the draft Ordinance.

Ms. Fuller reported that the comment time was extended to March 3<sup>rd</sup>. At a community meeting, 54 people spoke, all in opposition to the Ordinance. The City wants to require restaurants to re-apply for outdoor dining; restauranteurs very upset about that. Mr. Nakata said the City has different departments handling applications, depending upon exactly where the outdoor dining will be, causing many problems.

**MOTION** (by Mr. Atlee, seconded by Ms. Usher): The Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee recommends that the GWNC Board suggest to the Department of City Planning that they work with the fellow agencies the DOT, the Dept. of Public Works, the Bureau of Engineering and the General Services Dept. to craft a

cohesive, holistic Al Fresco Dining Ordinance that deals with private property, the public right-of-way and City-owned properties.

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously by a roll call vote of the nine eligible voters present online with all nine in favor (“Yes” or “Aye”) (Atlee, Carroll, Cunningham, Curran, Gilman, Herman, Prowizor-Lacayo, Trainer and Usher); zero opposed; zero abstained.

Mr. Prowizor-Lacayo believed that risk management may be the City’s main concern.

**X. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS** (Discussion and Possible Action)

A. Next GWNC Land Use Committee Meeting will be held at 6:30 pm on Tuesday, March 28, 2023, via Zoom or in-person (TBD).

Mr. Curran noted the above and that the meeting will be via Zoom, not in-person until at least April at Marlborough School.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** (by Ms. Prowizor-Lacayo): to **ADJOURN** the Meeting.

**MOTION to ADJOURN PASSED** unanimously; zero opposed; zero abstained.

The Meeting was **ADJOURNED** at 8:49 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. Possibly edited by the GWNC. The GWNC Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes page is <http://greaterwilshire.org/land-use-committee-agendas-minutes>.*