

CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA

PLANNING & LAND USE  
MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

CHAIR                      VICE CHAIR  
Suzie Grinley              TBD

MEMBERS

Jacque Lamishaw  
Armineh Chelebian  
Wayne Schulte  
Chris Jurgenson  
JJ Popowich



WINNETKA  
NEIGHBORHOOD  
COUNCIL

Mailing Address:  
C/O Jacque H. Lamishaw  
6263 Van Nuys Blvd.  
Van Nuys, CA 91401-2711  
TELEPHONE: 818-781-0016  
FAX: 818-781-0929

[www.winnetkaneighborhoodcouncil.org](http://www.winnetkaneighborhoodcouncil.org)

To: Council Members, Public

From: J.J. Popowich, Secretary

Date: June 4, 2004

Subject: PLUM Meeting Minutes 06/02/04

---

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:45 PM, with Suzie Grinley acting as chair.

*SECRETARY'S NOTE: The meeting was delayed because we didn't have items copied and prepared. This error has been addressed and should not be a factor in future meetings.*

2. **Roll Call:** The following PLUM members were in attendance.

Suzie Grinley	Jacque Lamishaw	JJ Popowich	Armineh Chelebian
Wayne Schulte	Chris Jurgenson		

3. **Presentation by JPL Zoning regarding the request for a Zone Change from RA-1 (Suburban Zone) and (T)RS-1 (Suburban Zone) to RS-1 (Suburban Zone), a variance to allow early construction of 3 single family dwellings, and a Building Line Removal from the City Planning Department for the property located at 20709 W. Parthenia St, Winnetka. Discussion and development of recommendation to the WNC Board regarding the JPL's request for these changes.**

3.1. Ms. Grinley introduced Mr. Lamishaw who presented his project to the committee.

3.1.1. The committee asked a few pertinent questions:

3.1.1.1. Ms. Chelebian asked if this was in character with the surrounding community. She also inquired if the city normally offers the early construction variance.

3.1.1.1.1. Mr. Lamishaw advised that the project is in line with the community which is primarily single family residences. He also explained the early construction variance and that it was common.

3.1.1.2. A motion was made (Schulte-Chelebian) that we send a recommendation to the Board to support this project. Mr. Popowich called roll for the committee and the motion was passed 4 – 0 (Mr. Jurgenson was not in attendance at the time, and Ms. Lamishaw had recused herself from the voting).

4. **Presentation by Delta Group Engineering on behalf of Sprint PCS Assets regarding the request for a conditional use permit from the City Planning Department for the property located at 20847 Sherman Way that will allow the placement of an unmanned wireless antenna on top of the commercial building located at this site. Discussion and development of recommendation to the WNC Board regarding the Sprint's request for a conditional use permit.**

4.1. Ms. Grinley introduced Mr. Kalli who was representing Delta Group and Sprint. Mr. Kalli explained the project and provided pictures to show the current view as well as the simulated view of the finalized project. Mr. Kalli explained the project would add a

structure to the roof rising about 8 feet above the current penthouse and building outline. He stated that there was no variance request within this proposal since it does not exceed the maximum ceiling for this property and zoning.

4.1.1. Ms. Chelebian asked if the picture is what would be seen from the street.

4.1.1.1. Mr. Kalli confirmed it was.

4.1.2. Ms. Chelebian was also concerned about the emissions from this cellular tower.

4.1.2.1. Mr. Kalli assured her that no scientific proof was available that any damage can be caused by this type of tower. He said that if there was any danger it would be greater from the cell phone held next to the body.

4.1.3. Ms. Chelebian asked what plan B would be if this did not pass.

4.1.3.1. Mr. Kalli said the alternative would be a palm (a pole disguised to look like a palm tree) or mono pole.

4.1.4. Ms. Lamishaw asked if this additional coverage would help in emergencies.

4.1.4.1. Mr. Kalli said that in the 1994 earthquake cell phones were a major form of communications. Some companies even handed out cell phones to emergency personnel for use.

4.1.5. A stakeholder asked if they had done due diligence as the city ordinance requires these facilities to be co-located if possible. He also asked about the noise from the unit.

4.1.5.1. Mr. Kalli responded that they had tried this option. However all the current sites were outside the specific coverage area that they needed? He also advised the power cabinet would be on the ground and hidden behind a stairwell that is not visible from the streets or alley.

4.1.6. A stakeholder inquired if the signal would interfere with radio and TV transmissions.

4.1.6.1.1. Mr. Kalli assured him that they operate on higher frequencies and wouldn't interfere.

4.1.7. A motion (Schulte-Lamishaw) was made to send a recommendation to the Board to support this project. The motion passed 5 – 0 (Mr. Jurgenson was not present for the vote).

**5. Presentation by Patrick Panzarello regarding the request for a conditional use permit from the City Planning Department for the property located at 20154 W. Saticoy St., for the sale and dispensing of beer and wine for on-site only consumption at the existing 56 patron restaurant. Discussion and development of recommendation to the WNC Board regarding Mr. Panzarello's request for a conditional use permit.**

5.1. Ms. Grinley introduced Mr. Panzarello who presented his project to the committee. Mr. Panzarello stressed this was a restaurant and not a bar or nightclub. He stressed that the current owners have been operating this restaurant for over 10 years (the restaurant is 15 years old) with no history of problems.

5.1.1. Ms. Lamishaw stated she felt it was a good project. She stated that it's common to serve alcohol with Mexican food.

5.1.2. Mr. Popowich asked if there was any outdoor seating and if take out with alcohol would be allowed.

5.1.2.1. Mr. Panzarello said there is no outdoor seating and take out is allowed but would not include alcohol sales.

5.1.3. A stakeholder asked what would happen if the business was sold and the new owners wanted to open a bar.

5.1.3.1. Mr. Panzarello assured the stakeholder that if it was sold a new permit would be needed.

5.1.4. A stakeholder inquired if there were any schools or churches nearby.

5.1.4.1. Mr. Panzarello confirmed there was a church down the block. He also advised that there were no schools within 1000 feet.

5.2. A motion was made (Schulte-Lamishaw) to send a recommendation to the full Board in favor of this project. The motion was passed 5-0 (Mr. Jurgenson was not present for voting).

**6. Presentation by Theodore Valdez, on an appeal of a zoning change denial. The zoning change was for a Conditional Use Permit to permit a storage building unit for household goods on the property located at 20202 W. Roscoe Blvd. Discussion and development of recommendation to the WNC Board regarding Mr. Valdez's appeal.**

6.1. Ms. Grinley introduced Mr. Valdez who presented his project. Mr. Valdez informed the committee that he was appealing the denial of a zoning change for this property so that he could move forward with building a public storage facility. He said that in the past there was no objection to the storage facility itself, but that the zoning change was denied due to a problem with the zoning history and a technical detail in the City's Master Plan for the area.

The project is located across from Jon's on Roscoe near Roscoe and Winnetka. It is surrounded by an old mini mall on the east side and a condominium on the west side. Currently the property is a single family residence and the dirt lot behind it is used for a tractor trailer parking area.

The project would be about 3000 sq ft, and include 72 parking spaces (more than the required 27 parking spaces). Only house hold goods would be stored and it would be secured by a fence and coded security. All units would be inside.

6.2. Mr. Schulte asked why he wanted to place a storage unit here.

6.2.1. Mr. Valdez said that the location was not suited for housing. His choice was due to the bar located next door. The storage facility would be very benign. Access would be controlled by security code.

6.3. Ms. Chelebian stated she was concerned about the traffic in the area and about introducing the possibility of transients or strangers to the area.

6.3.1. Mr. Valdez said that his research shows most storage users live within a 2 mile radiance. He also stated that his consultants have done studies that show other facilities in the area are 90-95% full.

6.4. Mr. Popowich asked about soundproofing.

6.4.1. Mr. Valdez said the building would be cinderblock and very quiet.

6.5. Mr. Schulte inquired how many units would be available.

6.6. Ms. Lamishaw commented that she has a storage unit that she visits only 2-3 times a year. It is very secure. This would be a good project.

6.7. Mr. Popowich stated he was concerned that it's just a big block building and the area is already overdeveloped.

6.8. A stakeholder commented they are concerned about the same thing.

6.9. A stakeholder commented they are concerned about the parking.

6.10. Ms. Lamishaw commented that the apartments around this property would be some of his best customers.

6.11. Mr. Schulte requested details on the technical reason for denial.

6.11.1. Mr. Valdez commented that the problem was the ratio of building to the square feet of the property. He claims there was an error when the Master Plan was completed which called for .5 instead of a 1.5 ratio.

6.12. A stakeholder stated they were concerned about U-Haul trucks coming and going.

6.12.1. Mr. Valdez assured everyone that the structure was enclosed. They would have to enter the building to get to the units.

6.13. Another stakeholder expressed concern about the look of the building from Roscoe and asked if he would make some extra improvements.

6.13.1. Mr. Valdez said he would.

6.14. Ms. Lamishaw advised that the project had been previously approved by an advisory group set up by Laura Chick when she was the City Council representative for the area.

6.15. A motion (Popowich-Jurgenson) was made to deny Mr. Valdez's request for support of the appeal. The motion was passed 4 (aye) 1 (nay) 1(abstain).

## **7. Presentation by Stephen Gregorchuk on his request for WNC support to place a mixed use apartment / commercial building on the corner of Mason & Roscoe.**

7.1. Ms. Grinley introduced Mr. Gregorchuk. Mr. Popowich advised everyone that the full Board had heard Mr. Gregorchuk at a prior meeting and had referred the matter to this committee with reservations. Mr. Gregorchuk explained his project and that he had listened to the Board's suggestions. He pointed out the changes he has made to the plan (lowered the project from 60 units to 48 units). He also stressed that this type of project is increasing in popularity all over the world (the mixed use concept). He also mentioned that he has the right to build an apartment building on the site as it is zoned, but not the mixed use concept.

7.2. Ms. Lamishaw asked for clarification on how many units there were.

7.2.1. Mr. Gregorchuk stated that he had lowered it to 48 and it was no longer at the maximum 60 units he is allowed.

7.3. Ms. Chelebian asked for clarification on what he was asking for support on this time around, and asked what if we are opposed to this type of project at that location in any form.

7.3.1. Mr. Gregorchuk said he was asking for the Council's support on the zoning change. He reiterated he has the right to build apartment buildings as the property is zoned today.

7.4. Mr. Schulte pointed out that he had lowered the units but upped the number of bedrooms on several to 3.

7.5. Ms. Chelebian asked how many people could be residents at this location.

7.5.1. Mr. Gregorchuk stated he has no way of knowing. Several estimates were offered by the committee members.

7.6. Mr. Popowich stated his original concerns still stand. He is concerned about the project being too big for the area since the other buildings are all two story and it's primarily residential and about the possibility of the storefronts remaining vacant causing problems.

7.6.1. Mr. Gregorchuk assured everyone they would not be vacant.

- 7.7. Ms. Lamishaw pointed out the area is residential. She said it would be surrounded by single family home and two story properties. She said it was originally zoned for a gas station and this is not what it was meant for.
- 7.8. Mr. Schulte asked if the plan could be made a two story.
  - 7.8.1. Mr. Gregorchuk said that parking was the issue.
- 7.9. Mr. Jurgenson said he was a business man himself and wanted to see Mr. Gregorchuk succeed. However he has spoken to area residents and no one wants another large project. They are already concerned about pollution, traffic, and crime. This would just increase all of that and the area residents are tired of it.
- 7.10. Mr. Popowich noted that the stakeholders in attendance had seemed to make their preference for this project known. He asked if any in the audience would object to forgoing the public comment on this issue if he made a motion to not support this project. There was general agreement with one stakeholder requesting to read a statement he had prepared. The young boy read the statement against the project and how he is concerned with crime in the area and the possibility of an apartment building leading to more crime. Further public comment was waived in favor of the motion.
- 7.11. A motion was made (Popowich-Schulte) to send a recommendation to the full Board that support for this project be denied. The motion passed 6-0.

## **8. Public Comments – Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Committee’s subject matter jurisdiction.**

- 8.1. A stakeholder asked where these meetings were posted.
- 8.2. A stakeholder asked what the next step in the process with the full Board was handled.
  - 8.2.1. Mr. Popowich explained that a recommendation would be made and the full Board could either approve/deny them all as a slate, consider them individually.
- 8.3. A stakeholder asked how much effect this Board really had.
  - 8.3.1. Several committee members expressed how much the two City Councilmen Mr. Zine & Mr. Smith supported the Neighborhood Councils and how they had directed developers to the Councils first.
- 8.4. A stakeholder raised the issue of drums stored on the property located at Mason & Roscoe.
  - 8.4.1. Ms. Lamishaw stated that it’s possible they are storage and that it’s ok for temporary storage of that type due to the zoning. However she said that if pictures could be provided we can raise the issue with Building and Safety to determine if they are legal.
- 8.5. A stakeholder asked if Mr. Gregorchuk could still build apartments.
  - 8.5.1. Ms. Lamishaw gave a very detailed explanation of the zoning layout of the property and the restrictions that would be required. The setbacks from the roads and the zoning for parking would limit him to about 15-20 units and probably would not be profitable.
  - 8.5.2. Ms. Chelebian asked what about the fact that it was a former gas station.
  - 8.5.3. Ms. Lamishaw confirmed that an environmental study would have to be completed first.

## **9. Committee Business: A discussion and action was taken on the election of a permanent Chair (for a one year term) and a Vice Chair, as well as a regular meeting date and time.**

- 9.1. A motion was made (Lamishaw-Grinley) to elect Mr. Popowich as Chair for the one year term. Roll was called and it was passed 5-0 (Mr. Schulte was absent for the vote).

9.2. A motion was made (Popowich-Grinley) to elect Ms. Lamishaw as Vice Chair. Roll was called and it was passed 5-0 (Mr. Schulte was absent for the vote).

9.3. The committee agreed that the first Wednesday of the month would be a good meeting date. The next meeting was set as July 7, 2004 at 6:30 PM.

**10. Meeting adjourned.**