A) Call to Order:
Ms. Tippit, WNC Chair, 7:13 PM

Attendance:
Jae Wu (Seat 1)
Lisa Morocco (Seat 2)
Steve Spector (Seat 4)
Barbara Broide (Seat 7)
Terri Tippit (Seat 8)
Sean McMillan (Seat 9)
Stacey Antler (Seat 10)
Mary Kusnic (Seat 11)
Colleen Mason-Heller (Seat 12)
Shannon Burns (Seat 14)
Eric Shabsis (Seat 15)
Wendy Dox (Seat 16)
Aaron Rosenfield (Seat 17)

Seated After Start:
Brendan Kotler (Seat 5)

Not in Attendance:
Lisa Tabor (Seat 3)
Sarah Shaw (Seat 6)
Francesca Beale-Rosano (Seat 13)

Ms. Tippit – The update on the Century Plaza Hotel is rescheduled for next month. I will read what Planning sent me on the Value Captured Ordinance. The Council Office is not coming, and wanted me to read an update, but did not send an attachment.

B) Approval of the May 11, 2017 Minutes: The minutes were reviewed and discussed.
One change was made clarifying the presenters of the 2600 Sepulveda Blvd Project.
Motion by Mr. Spector to approve the May 11, 2017 minutes.
Second: Ms. Kusnic
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,7,8,10,11,12,14,16
Abstentions: 9,15,17
Not in attendance: 3,5,6,13
10-0-3
Passed
Simon Roth, 2951 Midvale. I understand people are familiar with the project. It has been controversial. 2957 Midvale was recently approved for a small lot subdivision. Again, a lot of controversy. A medium to low density change has been submitted to the City. We were never informed of happenings and are concerned about our familial needs. We have a large family. Our request is to let us speak about what we would like to do with the property. The person north of us who initiated the opposition recently sold his house last week. A developer purchased the house and will be developing a single family, 2700 sqft home by right. The person who lived there previously, the address of which is 2945 Midvale, has left. The interest is for you to hear our family circumstance because we are a large family. We would love to work with everyone in congruence with our needs and the City’s needs.

Ms. Tippit – I am putting you on next month’s agenda. My suggestion is to meet with homeowner’s group first before coming to the Westside Neighborhood Council (WNC) meeting.

C) Senior Lead Officer Lavenson, LAPD – I am here instead of several other people. I am the newest Senior Lead Officer (SLO) in West LA. We had our crime control meeting yesterday and crime is down. Hide it, lock it, keep it. Cut your shrubbery down. Cut down the opportunity. Our crime for the last week is way down. We preach community based policing. This community is a hidden gem. People do not know it’s here. Nice homes and quite streets. Send Officer Ballesteros an email about transient issues. Transients have rights and you have rights. Our transient unit is growing; 8 officers cover West LA. I worked Skid Row before coming here; it’s eye opening. A high majority ended up on the canvass and never got up. A lot of mental illness, drugs and alcohol is behind many people’s stories. I am seeing more people under the influence of “legal” substances. We are dealing with high school kids saying marijuana is legal; they say it’s like drinking a beer. I got off on a little tangent. Don’t leave things on the front seat. Lock your property.

_Brendan Kotler is seated._

Ms. Broide – Can you report on the West LA Homeless forum at Paul Revere?

SLO Lavenson – It was good to see a lot of people there and passionate. The homeless problems in the Palisades, beach area is different than here. We talked about how we are bound by laws and restrictions and what people can do.

Ms. Dox – I don’t think people know who to call or what to do. Someone is building an encampment near us and people do not know what to do.

Mr. McMillan – We need to create a protocol on who to call. Develop a phone tree; it is in the works.

SLO Lavenson – We need to hear about what is happening to cite people and when it starts to come back the next time it escalates and a warrant can be issued. In my eight months here, I have been able to get 12 people help from outreach. Before there is a sweep to clean up an encampment, we do outreach including offering help for mental illness. I have said to people:
you don’t want to sleep on the sidewalk and telling them all the things they used to have…for some people it is what they need to put things back together. Sometimes it works; sometimes it doesn’t. Some got to the shelters and I see them out on the corner a week later. But we keep trying. If we keep trying, it is a win-win. It’s a win for the homeless, it’s a win for the taxpayers and it’s a win for the businesses.

Ms. Broide – Is LAPD looking at a Marijuana DUI tool?

SLO Lavenson – They are trying to make a device to test for THC. The problem is it is stored in the fat cells. We don’t know when the drug was consumed. We test for things we can see, slurred speech, having trouble walking, etc. Then we issue a DUI. Still those arrests are hard to prove. If people have a good lawyer, they often get off. The dispensaries are worrying; they have a lot of cash on-hand and there are cartels involved; it’s dangerous. My email is: 30627@lapd.online.

Ms. Tippit – Thank you very much.

D) Backhouse, 10913-10915 W. Pico Blvd. case ZA2016-4898-CUB, ENV 2016-4899-CE. Pursuant to Section 12.24-w, 1 of LA Municipal Code conditional use permit to continue sale and dispensary of full line alcoholic beverages for onsite consumption in conjunction with existing 2,260 sqft restaurant, 60 seats indoor and 8 seats outdoor patio located on public right of way. Present hours are Sunday-Thursday 4pm to 12 am and Friday-Saturday 4 pm to 12 am. Proposed hours of operation are from 11 am to 12:00am daily.

Will Nieves – I am the applicant’s representative. We presented our renewal a few months ago to the City. We want to change the hours to 11am-12am daily. We did meet with Barbara’s group about the longer operating hours. We were previously violating the allowed hours. A previous manager had allowed the venue to stay open until 2am…and then it continued. We did make an agreement with Planning to keep the same hours currently allowed to 12 am. We want patio hours from 11am – 10 pm, but no alcohol will be served. We will have umbrellas on the patio to have a more pedestrian friendly look. There will be no heaters on the patio and no advertising. These are the limits we have placed on ourselves in conjunction with the neighbors. I want to say even though we were operating outside the CUP, I don’t think there has been any complaints about our operation. We are a bona-fide full service restaurant; not a bar. We are expecting to bring the sidewalk out about 4 feet. We want four tabletops of two. There will be planters. The kitchen is open throughout our hours of operation. Last call for food is 15-20 minutes before closing. Just so you know, there is a Senate bill asking cities to make up their own minds on having bars open until 4 am.

Ms. Morocco – As one of the business seats, I welcome activity. I want to make a motion to support the application.

Ms. Morocco made the following motion: “The WNC supports the application brought forth by Backhouse as presented:
• hours of operation 11 am to 12 am daily
• outdoor patio open 11 am to 10 pm with no alcoholic beverage permitted
• planters in the outdoor patio area
• umbrellas without advertising on them in the outdoor patio area
• no heaters in the outdoor patio area.

Second: Ms. Antler

Votes in Favor: 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17

Abstentions: 5, 7

Not in attendance: 3, 6, 13

12-0-2

Passed

E) Coalition to Preserve LA presentation on the need for transparency of the Work Group on the Open Space Element and request for WNC support:

Ms. Ileana Wachtel, 310-702-4240, wachtelileana@gmail.com – We had a meeting with Planning and they were very open to discussion and receiving suggestions. Planning was open to the comments on adding open space. The General Plan has not been updated in 20 years and open space has not been evaluated since 1973. Planning has laid out four chapters on open space: (1) Parks and Recreation, (2) Beaches and Rivers, (3) Wildlands, (4) Connections (walking paths, stairways). We are suggesting also adding a fifth chapter on Urban Forests, because our urban canopy is disappearing before our eyes. Because of Americans With Disability lawsuit, the City is fixing sidewalks, but they are also removing trees. There is supposed to be a 2-1 replacement of removed trees, but there is only the budget for a one-to-one replacement. This motion is asking to have Planning have more meetings. We are behind other cities in doing our updates to our General Plan, but we also don’t want to do it too fast; so that we get it right. This is an opportunity for the citizens to engage and give their vision for what the General Plan elements will be. The City says they are open to the public, but I had to submit a California Public Records Act request to get them to have open meetings. I can say I think they are trying, but they are all new. They have not done this before. The people are smart, articulate, etc, but they don’t know the process, and we should give them guidance. We are presenting this motion to Neighborhood Councils (NCs) to give guidance. They are saying maybe we will do something in September. September is too late. We are willing to help them host a major forum in July and to include all the NCs. We feel July is enough time to prepare, yet not too far down the road where things have been formulated.

Ms. Broide – Should we suggest WRAC host?

Ms. Tippit/Ms. Wachtel – That would be great.

Todd Berson – The City made the poor decision of planting the wrong types of trees.

Mr. Kotler – Has there been any discussion of a public private partnership to work on the implementation?

Ms. Wachtel – They are not opening this process up to the public, so we don’t know what has been talked about. I do not know if they are there yet.
Mr. Kotler – Once this gets into the General Plan and permeates, then what?

Ms. Broide – Do you link in certain requirements? Say, if you build so much, you get so much open space? There is an online tool people can use to show their vision for open space.

Ms. Wachtel – We want more open space and we want them to publicize meetings, so people can share their vision.

Ms. Tippit – Barbara can you share the link to the open space tool?

Ms. Wachtel – The link has only been out a short time.

Mr. Shabsis – There is a practical piece to this. If there is a list of projects, then we can have the conversation when people come and ask for support for a project. That requires work and to come up with a menu of alternatives. 90% of people with projects are willing to provide a community benefit. But we must have project lists to be able to create public private partnerships.

Mr. Kotler – If the concern is sidewalks, it incentivizes smaller trees. Often times the two-tree replacement does not equate to one old growth tree that is taken down. If you plan ahead of time and part of the urban forestry gets relaxed a bit, then you can engage the Neighborhood Councils and say where do trees need to go?

Ms. Wachtel – Urban forestry has to be a chapter in the General Plan, so that ideas like this can blossom. Planning is very mechanical about the removal and replacement of trees. That is one reason we are 74th on the latest parks list.

Ms. Wu – Maybe through this process we can have some innovation and out of the box thinking, which is what we need.

Ms. Wachtel – In the last meeting, we saw the Planning Department kind of going okay, we need to be a little more open and transparent.

Ms. Mason Heller – When developers come in and you have a 70-year-old tree in place, then there are new rules that don’t provide for adequate replacement. Codes on how far this needs to be from this and that, etc. It would be great to establish a protocol on where else trees can go, so there is shared landscaping.

Mr. Kotler – Watering and maintenance is really the key. We know Urban Forestry and Public Works has not done a great job with maintenance. They do all they can, there is just a lot to do. There does have to be a tail to it. Maintenance needs to be covered whether it is two years or five years.

Ms. Morocco – It is typically two years of maintenance.
Ms. Mason Heller – People also think it is more expensive to water trees than it actually is. It is not very costly.

Ms. Broide made the following motion: WNC request that now-underway, and upcoming, Planning Department Work Group meetings about our shared ideas and ideals for the Los Angeles General Plan and its many Elements be made fully transparent, be set at evening and weekend hours; be open to the public as of now; invite a representative from each neighborhood alliance; and in the case of the nearly completed Open Space Work Group, be expanded from the four meetings completed in closed-door sessions, to four extra meetings that follow the prescription in this paragraph. We further request, in the same vein, that the Mayor's Planning Task Force and Transportation Infrastructure Steering Committee for the General Plan both be made fully transparent, be set at evening and weekend hours; be open to the public as of now; and expand their closed-door meetings to several additional meetings that follow the prescription in this paragraph.

Second: Ms. Wu
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
14-0-0
Passed

F) Ms. Tippit, Century Plaza Hotel – The update on the Century Plaza Hotel is rescheduled for next month.

G) Ms. Tippit, Value Capture Ordinance – Ms. Tippit read the following email sent by Matthew Glesne from the Los Angeles Department of City Planning.

There seems to be a lot of confusion regarding this ordinance, which tells me our materials are not clear enough. To be clear, please know this ordinance does not create any new ways for projects to increase their density. All it does is put clear and consistent affordable housing requirements on projects that utilize any of these 5 existing entitlement pathways in the zoning code. We are seeing developers trying to go around things like density bonus or now Measure JJJ zone change projects because they don't want to do affordable housing. This would shut down those loopholes and create consistency in terms of what will be required, if in fact they are able to get approved using one of these existing entitlement pathways.

When you look at the draft ordinance, the only things being added are in the underline (and we are removing some things that are crossed out). I regret any confusion. We plan to re-issue the FAQ to be more clear.

You can technically build an Eldercare Facility on almost any zone using the Eldercare code in 13.3.1. However, it is quite difficult to make the required findings to approve such a thing. We deny them all the time because it is almost like a Variance. I've copied the required findings below. It is the first introductory sentence below that is hardest (practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships...).

The Zoning Administrator shall not grant the approval unless he or she finds that the strict application of the land use regulations on the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations. The Zoning Administrator must also find:
1. that the project's location, size, height, operations and other significant features shall be compatible with and shall not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety;

2. that the project shall provide services to the elderly such as housing, medical services, social services, or long term care to meet citywide demand;

3. that the project shall not create an adverse impact on street access or circulation in the surrounding neighborhood;

4. that the project provides for an arrangement of uses, buildings, structures, open spaces and other improvements that are compatible with the scale and character of the adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood; and

5. that the project is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the General Plan, applicable community plan, and with any applicable specific plan.

There will be a revision before June 8th WNC mtng. People might think we're increasing density. We are actually making it harder and more costly...

Ms. Broide – I think we need to look at Transportation Oriented Districts (TODs) and how it affects this area. People from Abundant Housing say there should be no exemptions and we should know what they are doing. If there are issues, let’s agendize.

Ms. Tippit – I did want to address this ordinance because so many people contacted me wondering what it was all about.

Ms. Morocco recuses herself and leaves the room.

H) Presentation on ZA-2017-992-ZAA, ENV-2017-993-EAF, 10522 Cheviot Dr. Los Angeles, 90064. The project proposes the construction of a single story addition of 714 square feet to an existing two-story single family residence of 1,990 square feet of which 91 square feet is being demolished. The demolished square footage is approximately 4.6% of the existing structure. The addition square footage is approximately 35.9% of the existing structure. The proposed total residential floor area is 2,613 square feet which is less than the maximum allowed. The portion of the existing site where the addition is located has an existing grade of approximately 50.3%. The overall site has a grade of 29%. Height increase of 3'-1 1/2" to a total of 36'-1 1/2" from the allowable 33'-0" is due to the total building height being measured at a lower elevation than the existing natural grade. The existing roof height is not increased.

Crystal Wang, (818) 640-1738, crystal@real-arch.com – I am the applicant’s representative. We submitted to the zoning administrator for an adjustment. The new project increases the height 3 feet as we are measuring the building at a lower point than currently. But the roof is not being raised. The project is located between Manning and Patricia. The project will be two stories with a garage at grade level. The addition is going between the current house and current garage over the garage.

Ms. Mason-Heller – The height is higher closer to the street than previously.
Ms. Wang presented the following on the project:

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT ADDRESS:</th>
<th>APPLICABLE CODES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10522 W CHEVITON DRIVE CHEVIOT HILLS, CA 90204</td>
<td>2016 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 CALIFORNIA GREEN CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 CALIFORNIA ENERGY CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 CITY OF LOS ANGELES ZONING CODE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING INFORMATION:</th>
<th>LEGAL DESCRIPTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>LOT 9 BLOCK 47, TR. 7564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER: 4395368003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUILDING STATISTICS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</th>
<th>FLOOR AREA</th>
<th>% OF HELD</th>
<th>% OF ADDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1ST FLOOR: 1,950 SF</td>
<td>1,950 SF</td>
<td>1,950 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2ND FLOOR: 774 SF</td>
<td>774 SF</td>
<td>774 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,950 SF</td>
<td>2,424 SF</td>
<td>2,424 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION OF WORK:**

The project involves the construction of a 2-story single family residence on a 3,790 square feet lot. The existing house includes a garage, a family room, a living room, a dining room, a kitchen, a powder room, an indoor laundry, and two bathrooms. The proposed residence will include a garage, a family room, a living room, a dining room, a kitchen, a powder room, and an indoor laundry. The proposed house will also include a full bathroom and an interior laundry. The existing house has a grade of 0.50 feet, whereas the proposed house has a grade of 0.00 feet. The existing house has a setback of 9 feet, whereas the proposed house has a setback of 11 feet. The existing house has a height of 10 feet, whereas the proposed house has a height of 13 feet. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof slope of 4/12. The existing house has a roof pitch of 9/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12. The existing house has a roof slope of 6/12, whereas the proposed house has a roof pitch of 12/12.
Ms. Mason Heller – They have not come to the HOA. I still have some questions that I would like to ask. One of the issues is given the setback on the eastside is reduced in part, for you to give us the engineering specifications on how the second story would work. It was said interior beams for support in the garage was being looked at? Is that what is going to be done?

Ms. Wang – We will put interior columns within the existing walls of the garage and add a support beam. It will meet the City regulations. All the footings and beam will be done within
the inside of the garage and it will still provide for regular parking. We have received signatures from all six of the surrounding neighbors to do the work. I also wanted to mention that my client is also active in the community.

Ms. Mason-Heller – Are you able to create a reduction in the height? We are concerned of massing.

Ms. Wang – We have considered it. We asked the neighbors about our proposal and they agree with what we plan on doing.

Ms. Mason- Heller – What about balcony redesigns?

Ms. Wang – Without the balcony you have a big blank wall and it looks like an apartment without the balcony. The balcony breaks up the massing. *Ms. Wang showed a picture of what the house would look like without the balcony.* The covered passage way is included in the floor to area ratio.

Ms. Mason-Heller – It looks like you have made good progress. I don’t think you must present this to the HOA. You have met the thresholds and talked to neighbors. You have done your best to comply. I think to go to Cheviot HOA would be nice to establish communication, but I have no objections. If there is any way to reduce the mass or the height going forward for the street, please think about that.

Ms. Wang – We will plant some drought tolerant plants. I think this is a good scheme for what the clients want.

Ms. Dox makes a motion to support the project, ZA-2017-992-ZAA, ENV-2017-993-EAF, located at 10522 Cheviot Dr. Los Angeles, 90064 as presented.
Second: Mr. Shabsis
Votes in Favor: 1,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 2,3,6,13
13-0-0
Passed

Additional information submitted with regard to the project:

1. Describe what site characteristics or existing improvements make strict adherence to the zoning regulations impractical or infeasible; and explain why the project nonetheless conforms with the intent of those regulations; and The subject property is zone R1-1 and the permitted maximum height is 33’-0”. Such regulations, however, are written on a citywide basis and cannot take into account individual unique characteristics which a specific parcel may have. The subject has a varying topography with an upslope of approximately 29% slope. The property was developed with a single family dwelling in 1951. The addition does not maximize the allowable residential floor area with only adding a 714 square feet in for a total of 2,631 square feet which is in conforming to the existing other properties in the neighborhood. The addition conforms to the existing roof line. The addition does not raise the existing roof line but where the new natural grade is being measured is located at a lower elevation than the existing elevation. The addition conforms to the existing characteristics of the house and the neighborhood with two story residences over garages. The requested increase in height allowed is 10% of the allowable.
2. Describe how (in light of the project as a whole, including any mitigation measures imposed) the project’s location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety; and

The neighborhood has a varying topography and it is not uncommon for property owners to ask for an adjustment either in height increase or reduction in side yard setbacks. The properties in the neighborhood have two story houses over existing garage and the proposed project conforms to the characteristics of the neighborhood. The adjoining property has a higher roof line than the subject property. The existing roof line conforms to the general height of the neighborhood characteristics.

3. Explain why the project is in substantial conformance with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan and any applicable specific plan.

The West Los Angeles Community Plan designates the property R1-1-O Zone and a corresponding land use of Low Residential with corresponding zones of RE-9, RS, R1, RD6, RD5 and RU, and height limited to District No. 1. The project site is not located in any specific plan. The Community Plan text does not address increase in height. The basic use of the property is consistent with the plan designation and the zone. The grant as approved is substantial conformance with the purpose and intent of the General Plan, which encourages the development that is compatible with the surrounding properties.

Please see link below to the drawings submitted and the description of work is listed on the first page.

Ms. Morocco is reseated.

I) Ms. Tippit – I have talked to Karen Bass’s Office many times about the mail not getting to our houses. I have asked her office to come talk about these issues next month on our next agenda. There was one mail ring that was caught, but the problem persists.

J) Treasurer, Shannon Burns - Monthly Treasurer’s report on WNC’s Funding Program account, including review and approval of Purchase Card’s monthly statement—MER. Ms. Burns presented the MER as follows:
# Monthly Expenditure Report

**Department of Neighborhood Empowerment**

**Reporting Month:** MAY 2016

**NC Name:** Westside

**Submitted:** 07/2017: 11:13:23

**EMPOWER LA**

**Monthly Expenditure Report**

**Monthly Expenditure Report**

**FILL IN ALL THE UNSHADED (WHITE) FIELDS (Must be submitted to the Department within 10 days of Board Approval along with documentation and hard copy).**

**EXCEPTIONS TO THE WHT Field:**

- For more than 5 expenditures, you may submit additional pages of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>INVOICE NUMBER</th>
<th>APPROVAL CODE</th>
<th>DATE / DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>BUDGET CATEGORY</th>
<th>OUT-OF-STATE VENDOR</th>
<th>099 Reportable</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>5/9/17 - Pick Pico Parking</td>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Friends of Parks</td>
<td>5/10/2016 - Library</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>5/2/2017 - Cart Liner</td>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frontier Comm</td>
<td>5/1/2017 - Telephone</td>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>5/2/2017 - Cart for Supplies</td>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>$43.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>5/9/17 - Office Supplies</td>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>$345.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Debitas</td>
<td>5/2/2017 - Pick Pico Food</td>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ralphs</td>
<td>5/3/2017 - Feed for Emergency Prep Mtg</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>$75.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Printing S</td>
<td>5/10/2017 - Copies for Emergency Prep Mtg</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>$151.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JAN Tech</td>
<td>5/10/2017 - Whistles for Emergency Prep Mtg</td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>$175.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Frontier Comm</td>
<td>5/1/2017 - Telephone</td>
<td>OPERATIONS</td>
<td>$45.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUM TOTALS: expenditures by line item (May include totals on page 2, if desired):**

- **Department:** $2,200.00

**CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES FROM PREVIOUS MONTH (CURRENT FISCAL YEAR):**

- **Department:** $2,200.00

**OUTSTANDING COMMITMENTS (CALCULATION):**

1. **FOWA**
   - Officer Uniforms
   - PRIOR YR NPG
   - $1,495.90
2. **CASH Reconciliation**
   - Beginning Balance
   - $17,088.49
   - Funds Deposited
   - $0.00
   - Total Available
   - $17,088.49
   - Cash Spent This Month
   - $2,200.00
   - Remaining Balance
   - $14,888.49

**MONTHLY CASHFLOW ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Identifier</th>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2015-16 Expenses</th>
<th>Unspent Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$450.48</td>
<td>$1,549.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$300.82</td>
<td>$1,699.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$405.78</td>
<td>$2,594.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>NPG</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
<td>$2,200.08</td>
<td>$39,799.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance of Budget 2016-2017:**

- **Department:** $11,000.42

**NIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL DECLARATION**

We, the Treasurer and Signer of the above indicated Council, declare that the information presented on this form is accurate and complete, and will furnish additional documentation to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment upon request.

**Treasurer Signature:**

**Signer's Signature:**

**Print Name:**

**Date:**

**Additional Comments:**

**Revision Date:** 06/05/16
Motion by Ms. Burns to approve the Purchase Card’s monthly statement MER for May 2017 as presented.
Second: Ms. Kusnic
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,11,12,14,15,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
Ineligible: 10,16
12-0-0
Passed

Mr. Kotler – I wanted to apologize Westfield was not at Pick Pico due to a miscommunication.

K) Outreach, Lisa Morocco – Pick Pico was different than last year. The crowd came and they stayed. Pitfire Pizza had a line after 3 o’clock. I think we had the same amount of people, but people stayed. It was like a destination and I think it’s a good sign we are permeating. 128 vendors attended and we had great entertainment thanks to Jae. We got some awesome feedback from the vendors. Most thought it was better than last year. Pitfire sold over 500 pizzas and 300 salads. Stalking Horse ran out of food. This could not have happened without our platinum sponsors – Macerich, Westfield, JMB, FOX and FOWLA. I also want to thank all of you. We could not have done it without all hands-on deck. We stepped up our game with the WNC tent and banners. We had the best Pick Pico team this year. We have a $31.08 balance in the Pick Pico account for next year.

Ms. Morocco presented the following transaction breakdown.
Ms. Wu – I am hopeful that next year we will get more school involvement. The Pushbroom Patrol really stepped up. Thank you Lisa for all the little things you do; you are a superstar.

Ms. Mason-Heller – I think you upgraded the brand with the visuals.

Ms. Morocco – David Anderson, my alternate, came up with the posters in the WNC booth to showcase who we are and made it happen.

Ms. Mason- Heller – It was great for brand awareness.

Ms. Broide – On Captain Neito’s Twitter page, there is a video of her at Pick Pico. Check it out.
L) Budgetary Reallocations

Motion by Mr. Spector to make the following budgetary changes:
• Reallocate from Outstanding Commitments:
  • $991.14 to #100 funds
  • $918.74 to #200 funds
  • $231.55 to #300 funds
• Reallocate from #400 funds to #300 funds $9,272.00
Second: Ms. Mason-Heller
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,11,12,14,15,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
Ineligible: 10,16
12-0-0
Passed

Ms. Morocco made a motion that any remaining funds (approximately $150) be used for office supplies at Staples with city credit card.
Second: Ms. Burns
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,11,12,14,15,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
Ineligible: 10,16
12-0-0
Passed

M) Report by Ms. Morocco and Mr. Spector who represented the WNC at the Grievance Hearing held on May 30, 2017.

Jasmine Elbarbary, DONE Representative – The Regional Grievance Panel meeting was held and the report has not yet been issued.

Mr. Spector – Lisa and I represented the WNC. The grievant did not attend (Mr. Silverman). Three panelists and Jasmine also attended. Lisa outlined the WNC’s outreach in general and then I outlined the WNC involvement in the “Mansionization” regulation issues from late 2014 through early 2017. Then the panel asked questions that Lisa and I answered on behalf of the WNC, and Jasmine answered on behalf of DONE.

The panel indicated it would give a formal response within two weeks, but did let us know the following:

1) The panel would not recommend any sanctions against the WNC based on the grievance. *Ms. Elbarbary clarified that the panel was not going to grant the remedies to the grievance requested by the grievant.*
2) The panel mentioned that the WNC’s outreach exceeds the expected amount (great job Lisa!).
3) The WNC actions relating to the Mansionization issue were appropriate.

4) A panelist noted that the WNC website link to get on WNC email list was not operating at the time of the hearing. *This has since been corrected and email signup can be found at: [http://wncla.org/sign-up-for-emails/]*. 

5) Another panelist gave suggestion that the WNC take more action to assure its e-mail communications go directly to stakeholders, rather than purely relying on board members to relay those materials. After discussion that HOAs may not be able or willing to give their lists to the WNC, I understood the suggestion to be that we ask HOAs to recommend their stakeholders sign up for e-mails from WNC directly, as well as the WNC improve our website’s ability to take such requests.

6) A substantial part of the Panel’s decision was that the City Attorney’s advice may have been incorrect in some points, including that stakeholders owning residences in the Neighborhood should recuse themselves on the mansionization ordinance agenda item. The panel indicated it would visit with the City Attorney’s Office on these issues.

We started the hearing by saying we can always do better. Having gone through this now, I feel pretty good about what we did and how we handled this issue, even though it may be inevitable that some stakeholders often don’t like the outcome.

Ms. Broide – Thank you for doing this and representing us. Was there any discussion about us not being able to hear the stakeholder’s comments because many from the Board were recused?

Ms. Burns – That was wrong advice.

Mr. Spector – We have such good records about what people said. If you are a stakeholder, your statement is on the record by name. The minutes are very long and people can correct them if they think the account is different, but we do have that record. Also, Shawn Bayliss from the City Council Office was there to hear what was said. We could have had the public comment before WNC Board Members were recused.

Ms. Tippit – But Carmen (City Attorney Hawkins) said we could not do that.

Mr. Spector – The panelists felt like we did a pretty good job making judgments on the fly. They also felt like our bylaws went into great detail.

Ms. Elbarbary– We caution Boards about being specific in bylaws because in a grievance, one criteria is violating your own bylaws. If elections get moved up, the opportunity will come up again to revise your bylaws.

Mr. Shabsis – I think the City goes overboard and we are bound by the same ethics training as other bodies and our Board does not fit as well as other boards that the State Law covers. I have other concerns; that I have to leave the room when there is a request for a grant for an elementary school my daughter goes to. It does not make a lot of sense that business representatives have to recuse themselves on business related matters. Having gone to the meetings of other NCs, it is informative and useful for land use committees to meet with projects and do work before coming to the NC. I am happy to provide some insight into the process of dealing with land use matters
in a real committee structure. The City is coming up with a lot of planning and land use issues that we have a duty to engage the public with and to not just leave it to the HOAs to take the lead.

Ms. Broide – Previously we had old guidelines pertaining to committees. We could see if we can find those?

Mr. Shabsis – Developers want to have clear guidelines about what they need to do to have certainty. I think this NC does well with developers; this NC gives developers the time of day to give their presentation. But some NCs also give precise guidelines, which feels tighter.

Ms. Tippit – Over the years, we found by doing that we were adding an extra layer that did not need to happen because the full Board still needs to hear the matter.

Mr. Shabsis – As an applicant if you have to come before a subcommittee and then the full Board as a whole, that is the price of doing business. Planning is changing drastically.

Ms. Burns – The laws have also changed. Now, if you have more than a certain number of Board Members on a committee, you could be in violation of the Brown Act. It has become overly cumbersome.

Ms. Broide – Maybe we need workgroups to work on policy issues?

Ms. Tippit – I think we need to review the bylaws.

Ms. Elbarbary – When you make changes, try to keep inclusivity in mind as much as possible. Because things that are perceived as being less inclusive will not be approved.

N) Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC) report, Barbara Broide, Support for WRAC Motions:

The following motion was made by Ms. Broide: WNC calls upon the Planning Dept. to immediately outline concrete steps it will take to ensure that going forward, in making decisions on discretionary land use applications, the Planning dept. will meet all deadlines required under Permit Streamlining Act.
Second: Mr. Kotler
Votes in Favor: 1,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Abstain: 2
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
13-0-1
Passed

The following motion was made by Ms. Broide: The WNC supports the creation of a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Neighborhood/Community Councils and the Los Angeles Department of Public Works.
Second: Mr. Rosenfield
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
14-0-0
Passed

The following motion was made by Ms. Broide: The WNC supports extending Neighborhood Council notices for City Measures:
• Once a measure under consideration has accumulated five Community Impact Statements (CIS) NC must be given a minimum of 14 days notice a public hearing or other legislation action on that item might occur.
• Neighborhood Councils who have filed CISs must be notified within 72 hours if substantive changes to a measure occur in a Council committee or Commission hearing.
• In the event Council files are renumbered or combined, extant CISs must be transferred to the new file.
Second: Ms. Burns
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
14-0-0
Passed

For more details on motions, see http://westsidecouncils.com/pending.

O) Commercial Cannabis Restriction

Ms. Broide – An email came out today on the Commercial Cannabis Restriction Ordinance. There is a meeting June 29 with the Planning Commission. We will not be meeting until July in case we want to do an emergency motion. Comments are due July 12.

Ms. Tippit – I will put it on July’s agenda.

P) Sign Ordinance

Ms. Broide – The day after Memorial Day PLUM looked at the sign ordinance. They are gutting the sign ordinance. I think it would be great for us to go on record to reiterate our support for the sign ordinance and to oppose the PLUM committee’s effort to gut it.

Mr. Shabsis – It probably goes back to PLUM in August.

Ms. Broide – This is all done from what I can tell; it is in writing.

Mr. Shabsis – I was at the hearing. What the Chair requested was the City Attorney make amendments and it be brought back to PLUM for one final meeting before it goes off to Council. My sense is it might not come back as quickly as they want from a practical viewpoint.
Ms. Broide – We should request a notice of 60 days to review before PLUM hears the revisions, so there is a chance for communities to know what is going on.

Mr. Shabis – Or what about 45 days of notice?

Mr. Spector: To take action on an item not on the agenda, there has to be a 2/3 vote, there has to be a need to take action before our next meeting and the need to take action had to come to our attention after the agenda was out.

Ms. Mason Heller – Can’t you attach an old motion?

Mr. Rosenfield – If there is a City Council file and there should be on this item, we can reattach a motion we previously passed if it is relevant. We would have to put the date the motion was passed when we file a Community Impact Statement (CIS).

Ms. Mason-Heller makes a motion for emergency consideration of the Sign Ordinance moving through Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee.
Second: Ms. Broide
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
14-0-0
Passed

The following motion was made by Ms. Broide: The WNC requests that PLUM and the Council be required to provide a minimum 45 day review period of any proposed recommendations/changes or action on the draft Sign Ordinance.
Second: Ms. Dox
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,14,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13
14-0-0
Passed


Ms. Burns leaves the meeting.

Q) Honoring Firefighter Kelly Wong

Mr. Shabsis makes a motion for emergency consideration of a motion surrounding the recent loss of Firefighter Kelly Wong.
Second: Ms. Dox
Votes in Favor: 1,2,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,15,16,17
Not in attendance: 3,6,13,14
13-0-0
Passed


Mr. Shabsis – Kelly Wong, a firefighter at Fire Station 92 died on the job during training.

Ms. Broide – Can we give City money to a memorial fund?

Mr. Shabsis – We give money for Baker to Vegas and we can’t give to a memorial?

Ms. Dox – Can we send a meal?

Ms. Elbarbary – NC money that you give has to be for the benefit of the entire community. You may want to give money to the Fire Department in honor of the person.

Mr. Shabsis – Can we give money to FOWLA to organize something?

Mr. Rosenfield – We just earmarked our last remaining funds today.

Ms. Elbarbary – Any event you fund, would have to be open to the public.

Ms. Dox – On Monday June 12, there will be a Candlelight Vigil at Fire Station 92 at 7:00 pm.

Ms. Tippit – I sent along the information of what happened to my email list for my HOA. Several people have given donations and my HOA is giving a donation to the family. Each seat should take this to their boards and make a donation.

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Wu, 9:50 pm.
Unanimous

Submitted: By Aaron Rosenfield, Secretary

Voting note regarding how abstentions are counted: Section 3 of the WNCs By-Laws state: “Except as otherwise specifically provided, an affirmative vote of a majority of those voting, not including abstentions, shall be required to pass motions.” http://wncla.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Westside-nc-approved-bylawsamendments-2014.pdf.