

WINNETKA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

**Planning & Land Use
Management Committee**

Chair **Vice Chair**
MR. Jacque Lamishaw
POPOWICH Popowich

Members
Armineh Chelebian Chris Jurgenson
Marilyn Robinson Wayne Schulte
Ted Valdez



MAILING ADDRESS

**Winnetka Neighborhood
Council**

PO Box 3692
Winnetka, CA 91396

TELEPHONE: 818-781-0016
FAX: 818-781-0929

www.winnetkaneighborhoodcouncil.org

Council Members, Public

From: J.J. Popowich, Secretary

Date: March 4, 2005

Subject: PLUM Meeting Minutes 03/02/05

1. Call to Order and Committee Members Roll Call.

JJ Popowich	Jacque Lamishaw	Ted Valdez	Marilyn Robinson
Chris Jurgenson – Excused	Armineh Chelebian – Absent	Wayne Schulte – Absent	

2. Approval of minutes from the last meeting.

2.1. Mr. Popowich asked if there were any changes to the minutes. None were requested.

3. Discussion and possible action on a presentation by Mr. Rickey Gelb or his representative about his planned development to be called the Commons At Winnetka, on the corner of Winnetka Ave & Vanowen St.

3.1. Mr. Popowich introduced Mr. Rickey Gelb.

3.2. Mr. Gelb reviewed the current property as it stands now and the location of the development he’s planning. Developing the corner of the bowling alley. Will include a water feature. The goal is to encourage businesses that the community does not have at this time. Jamba Juice, Quiznos, etc.

They are also developing the conference room in the hotel and will be calling it the Winnetka Conference Center. Mr. Gelb displayed a concept drawing of the development. The facade will be colorful and include neon lighted signs to improve the look of the area. They will also dress up the bowling alley after they have finished the Common’s project.

The front will have a granite wall with a water treatment (water falls). He will also be having a statue of a police officer or paramedic handing off a child to a fireperson. This will be to memorialize the fallen heroes that we have lost in Los Angeles. The wall will be behind the figures. The back of the wall will have names of all the fallen officers and firemen who have lost their lives.

The building will have lots of glass to make it look modern. There will be quite a bit of parking to accommodate the traffic and usage. This will minimize.

3.3. A stakeholder asked who is funding this project. He also wanted to know why we are doing this.

3.3.1. Mr. Gelb said that he has the property.

3.3.2. The stakeholder wanted to know what will happen to the large trucks.

3.3.3. Mr. Gelb said they will no longer be there and he doesn’t really like them. He announced the sign would also move into the front of the property.

- 3.3.4. Mr. Popowich also discussed the reasons the NC were created to bring City Hall to the stakeholders so they can have a comment on what happens in their neighborhood. While Mr. Gelb is not asking for a zoning change since it is zoned for commercial others do and that is can really affect a neighborhood. Mr. Popowich stated that this is a venue to hear your opinions.
- 3.3.5. Mr. Murray, from Rosenheim & Associates who are working with Mr. Gelb, announced that the zoning for this location does have to be changed and they will be asking for a conditional permit. In this case they are zoned for C2 around the building because most of the property is zoned P2 for parking. This will allow them to do the 8000 sq ft new building and then in later in phase 2 they will add about 3000 sq ft to the main building. The conditional use change is for operating a retail area across a street from the residential. The main variances are the placement of the sign pole to the corner and the hours of operation.
- 3.4. A stakeholder asked what types of businesses will be in the new structure. Will it be a franchise type of business or will it be mom and pop stores. He also asked if this project would be geared to any particular ethnic groups.
 - 3.4.1. Mr. Gelb said that he is in partnership with the current owner.
 - 3.4.2. The stakeholder clarified his question to be will it be primarily franchise.
 - 3.4.3. Mr. Gelb responded that it would be franchise because it lowers the cost to the owner because change is difficult.
- 3.5. A stakeholder asked about the phase two of the project.
 - 3.5.1. Ms. Lamishaw asked if he was changing the zoning will it affect the phase 2 section because it's part of the parking zoning currently.
 - 3.5.2. Mr. Murray explained that it's a two phase request. Once they get the approval they will have an option to expand the additional 3000 sq ft piece once they evaluate the success of the project. The other point he wanted to make was the extra space would be retail and not particularly the food operations that exist on that corner of the building.
 - 3.5.3. Ms. Lamishaw said that her concern was once they go the C2 for the entire project they could come back and do anything they want.
 - 3.5.4. Mr. Murray said that the idea is not to place additional food services there because it will compete with the other locations.
 - 3.5.5. Mr. Gelb said his goal is possibly a laundry mat.
- 3.6. Mr. Valdez asked if it was a two story.
 - 3.6.1. Mr. Gelb said no.
 - 3.6.2. Ms. Robinson asked what other types of businesses would be considered for the second phase project, other than the laundry mat as she's not too thrilled with that idea.
 - 3.6.3. Mr. Gelb is open to changing things and looking at other businesses. He also said that he had considered the laundry mat because they are useful to the neighborhood and he's lived next to them in the past with no problems.
 - 3.6.4. Mr. Murray said that he would reach out to the community.
 - 3.6.5. Ms. Lamishaw said that she is concerned about a laundry
 - 3.6.6. Mr. Popowich chimed in on his opinion on the laundry mat. Talked about the reason we have these meetings. Spoke about the goal of voting tonight and we usually don't do it until the actual application is filed with the City Planning Department.
 - 3.6.7. Mr. Murray said they usually like to get the approval prior to the filing. This helps them get the process following.
 - 3.6.8. Ms. Lamishaw said that we really shouldn't vote on the apps until we have them because we have no way we can verify what they submit.

- 3.6.9. Mr. Popowich talked about how they normally do the mailing process to the surrounding residents.
- 3.6.10. Mr. Murray asked how a mailing is paid for by the developer for the City hearing and how that really isn't fair for the developers to have to do one for the NC as well.
- 3.6.11. Mr. Popowich said that we do it because frankly we only get \$50,000.00 a year and we really don't have any money. We simply don't have the funds.
- 3.6.12. Ms. Lamishaw discussed the cost issue for developers and about possibly scaling back the area we require since it is surrounded by commercial on the other side of the streets and only by residential on three sides.
- 3.6.13. Mr. Popowich said he would like to see them come back. He then asked about the feelings of the Board.
- 3.6.14. Ms. Lamishaw said it's a good upscale project that will have a positive impact on the area. With the exception of the laundry mat she approves the concept.
- 3.6.15. Mr. Murray said that they have a stronger proposal for the changes if they have our buy in before they go to the commission. He would like to approach us with an official proposal and get the applications approved prior to the submission.
- 3.6.16. Mr. Popowich spoke about his support, and how much he likes the project. He went on to say that he loves the idea of the statue as he was discussing something like this for Runnymede park several months back. However, he pointed out that we do have procedures and we need to follow them to be fair. He then made the following motion:
- WNC-PLUM-030105: "The WNC approves the Commons at Winnetka project in concept. However, the PLUM Committee will request Mr. Gelb's representatives to return once they have the proper paperwork ready file. Furthermore, the WNC would like to go on record as in opposition to a laundry mat at this location."*
- 3.6.17. Ms. Robinson seconded the motion.
- 3.6.18. Mr. Popowich asked if there were any objections to the motion. No objections were raised and the motion passed 4-0.

4. Discussion and possible action on a presentation for the developer's plans for the property located at 20415 Runnymede St, Winnetka, CA 91306. At our last meeting we voted to deny approval for this project and rescind our support for the zone change because the developer could chose not to attend two meetings. This month we will briefly discuss any updates on this issue.

4.1. Mr. Popowich introduced the project and the developer Mr. Ensafi.

Mr. Ensafi, from Approved Plans & Permits, presented his project which is a zone change from a RA1 to an RA, and it is to change a single family property to split the project into two houses. There is an existing single family house which is being renovated. The property across the street is R1 Zone, and there are projects close by which have already gotten their subdivision. The north side is apartments. He spoke about how he feels this will help to clean up the area. He also pointed out the current owners work hard to keep their area clean despite trash that piles up.

4.2. Mr. Popowich asked for comments from the stakeholder before they committee begins its deliberation. No comments were made so Mr. Popowich opened it up to the Board for discussion.

4.3. Ms. Lamishaw asked if both projects would be single family.

4.3.1. Mr. Ensafi Confirmed that both would be single family houses.

4.3.2. Ms. Lamishaw asked if there was any street dedication.

4.3.3. Mr. Ensafi Again confirmed there was a street dedication included in this project.

4.4. Mr. Valdez asked how many square feet the project would be.

4.4.1. Mr. Ensafi said they would be about 8400 sq ft dwellings.

4.4.2. Mr. Popowich asked if there would be both of them.

4.5. Ms. Robinson asked to see the vicinity map. There was a brief sidebar about the location and the area around the project.

4.6. Ms. Lamishaw made the following motion:

WNC-PLUM-030205: "The WNC approves this project and the related requests for a parcel map change as filed."

4.7. Mr. Valdez seconded the motion.

4.8. Mr. Popowich asked if there was any opposition to this project. No board member objected and the motion was passed 4 – 0.

5. Presentation, discussion and possible action on a request by AT&T for approval of a Conditional Use permit to add additional cell phone antennae on the roof of 20061 W. Saticoy St., Winnetka, CA 91306.

5.1. Mr. Popowich introduced the next item by reading the agenda item. He asked Mr. Shin to approach and present his case.

5.2. Mr. Wally Shin introduced himself as presenting for AT&T. He went on to explain the project is for an antennae and not a tower. Currently it's a two story building and at this time it has air conditioning units on top of the building. The current structure is metal corrugated. The idea is to place them behind the structure there and it will be made to look like the current structure. He pointed out that there is an existing antenna from Sprint that the WNC approved previously.

5.3. Mr. Popowich thanked Mr. Shin and opened the topic for discussion by the stakeholders.

5.4. A stakeholder asked why AT & T wanted to place the antennae on the building.

5.4.1. Mr. Shin said that it would improve AT & T's coverage in the area.

5.5. A stakeholder asked how far the improvement would go.

5.5.1. Mr. Shin said it would be about a mile radius around the area according to their engineers.

5.6. A stakeholder asked if there were any other improvements to the service that were planned.

5.6.1. Mr. Shin said this is the only planned change he is aware of at this time.

5.7. Ms. Lamishaw asked why the map showed this project as being titled Roscoe and Hatillo.

5.7.1. Mr. Shin reassured this was for the Saticoy location and that the map designation was an internal identifier to his company.

5.8. Mr. Popowich asked if there were any other comments.

5.8.1. Ms. Lamishaw said she felt the additional coverage was needed in emergencies.

5.9. Ms. Robinson made the following motion:

WNC-PLUM-030205-3: "The WNC approves the request for permit as it was presented."

5.10. Mr. Popowich seconded the motion.

5.11. Mr. Popowich asked if there was any objection to the motion. No objections were made and the motion passes 4 -0

6. Discussion and possible actions about concerns about the sound walls along Victory Blvd portion of the MTA Orange Line.

6.1. Mr. Popowich opened up the discussion by stating that part of the WNC's reason to be here is to make the city aware of our opinions. He went on to say that the PLUM Committee felt that they had concerns about this project, but we wanted the stakeholders input before we discussed this with the MTA. He

stated the Committee was concerned about the sound walls because they are ugly, a great canvas for graffiti, and of course the large space which he felt was great for criminals and homeless to congregate. He then opened it up to the stakeholders for discussion.

- 6.2. A stakeholder said he went to the meeting they had originally when it was being discussed. The stakeholders stated he has seen all the pictures including the plants and the bike path. However, he is not aware of the bike path actually being placed there. His concern is not really homeless because it's wide enough to patrol and do maintenance. Originally they told them they could even remove their walls and use that land as their own, but not making any permanent. His major concern is graffiti and how fast are they going to clean the walls. Right now he sees his nice yard and wood fence and then the big grey wall. He is concerned about how fast will they clean it up.
- 6.3. A stakeholder said that her back yard. She was promised a sound wall so they wouldn't hear the buses. She has a very small backyard and she can see right out to the street because there is a gap in front of her yard. She will still be able to see the buses, hear the buses, and in addition it will allow access to her back yard and have people walking through there. She is also concerned about the graffiti. Noted that they did put sprinklers there. She has called the MTA and they have stated they were going to plant vines.
- 6.4. Mr. Popowich asked the stakeholder to provide her address so he can follow up for her. He also stated that we've talked about vines to control graffiti. He noted the concept picture does not include vines. He did say the front would have a high dirt mound against the front with trees in front of it.
- 6.5. A stakeholder is concerned about the same thing we've stated. The property used to have a nice view of the college. Could see the college yard and the sports teams. Now all he can see is the big huge ugly grey wall. Has spoken to the workers about the wall. He wanted to know if they were going to plant any type of greenery on the project. He has heard rumors that they will allow people to extend the yards. Currently he has a large ditch behind his wall now and he wonders how that is going to work. He is very concerned about that area being turned into an alley. Already there is a concern about trash. His particular property is angled so he has a pretty large area that is affected on both sides. Concerned about homeless and so on. Looking for the MTA to say take the property and extend it. Will it be a greenbelt (referencing to the irrigation). Would like answers to what is going on and updates as to what is happening. He has also seen electrical work there.
- 6.6. Mr. Popowich asked about their thoughts on a wall cap on the end. Also offered to be the voice and let folks to go.
- 6.7. A stakeholder is concerned that a wall would be a hiding spot for people who want to something bad. It may delay the law enforcement.
- 6.8. A stakeholder said that he agreed with the previous speaker. He was considering the walls as well. Thought about the wall with barbed wire to prevent people from jumping over.
- 6.9. A stakeholder is concerned that this will make it look even worse.
- 6.10. A stakeholder suggested poison ivy as a way to deter them.
- 6.11. Mr. Montaine said that where he lives they have cul-de-sacs and the city have placed wrought iron gates which allows visual inspection but they can't get in there.
- 6.12. A stakeholder introduced himself and he spoke about an event in January that caused damage to his back yard patio. He had a flood because the water pooled behind his fence and it came through his fence and flooded his pool and caused damaged. He has had to sand bag the area. He has lost equipment for the pool. He also complained that the construction has caused damage to his yard and patio. He doesn't support the walls on the end and he wants to have the property given to him so he can extend his yard at his cost. He was originally for the project and liked the promise that he could lease or buy that land for his own use. The best way to maintain it is to make it part of the property owner's.
- 6.13. A stakeholder commented she didn't live on that street, but lived further back in the neighborhood. She asked what is to prevent other cars from going down that road if Victory is crowded. She also is concerned that it may be used by motor bikes and so on. She wants to know who will patrol the area.
- 6.13.1. Mr. Popowich said that they are good questions and stated that it would be the laws and fines, and tickets and the LAPD that would be the ones to police it. The WNC will ask these questions.

- 6.14. A stakeholder echoed the other concerns. Concerned about crime and other unsavory activities.
- 6.15. Mr. Popowich spoke about why we are here to bring city to you. He assured the stakeholders that their comments would be rolled up and submitted to the MTA and the City Councilmember's. He also briefly addressed another non-related question about the NCs.
- 6.16. Ms. Lamishaw announced she has spoken to the MTA. They hope that no one will extend any walls until all construction is done. The area will be closed off by a green mesh screen fence that is as tall as the sound walls. Only the city will be able to use it. She also addressed the idea of the extension of the property line. She said the MTA will allow the homeowners to use the area, but they can't own it or build upon it. In regards to the landscaping she said the MTA will be placing vines on that side of the wall and this was the plan all along. She advised homeowners that she believes they can increase their privacy by raising their fences up to 8 ft fence in the backyard.
- 6.16.1. Mr. Popowich asked how they can extend their fence if they can't build on it.
- 6.16.2. Ms. Lamishaw said that they can take down their fence but they can't build it out. The city will landscape the area and maintain it.
- 6.16.3. A stakeholder said he has an additional concern if they do take down their fence, then who would be responsible for the maintaining of the water lines.
- 6.16.4. Ms. Lamishaw said that is why they have the fence and gate so they can go through. She commented that the only access to private property would be if the fence came down and then they would be able to get through. She also recommended they check the ordinances and permit rules before they decided to build in case she was not entirely correct.
- 6.16.5. A stakeholder asked if they can extend the side walls.
- 6.16.6. Ms. Lamishaw said no it would be blocked off at the ends.
- 6.16.7. A stakeholder clarified the question and said that if they take down their wall, then the neighbors could get into their backyard.
- 6.16.8. Mr. Popowich clarified the answer which is if the wall is down then anyone in that section could walk from one yard to another.
- 6.17. A stakeholder stated that if they are set that no one can own that area, then they have to maintain that area. He wants to make sure that the drain is maintained and cleaned.
- 6.17.1. Ms. Lamishaw suggested he pursue a law suit on this issue if it hasn't been addressed by the MTA.
- 6.17.2. Mr. Popowich advised that he would be happy to discuss this with the MTA.
- 6.17.3. A stakeholder stated that the same thing happened to him. He is in the middle of the area between Winnetka and Mason and it flooded his neighbor's house.
- 6.17.4. Mr. Popowich stated that it's a good thing we know about it now. We can ask the MTA to address it. He then made the following motion:
- WNC-PLUM-030305-4: "The WNC will write a letter expressing the neighbor's concerns and that they should be prepared to address these concerns at the Public Works & Transportation meeting."*
- 6.17.5. Ms. Robinson seconded the motion.
- 6.17.6. Mr. Popowich asked if there were any objections to the motion. None were made so the motion passed 4-0.
- 6.17.7. Ms. King, Councilmember Zine's Planning Deputy, said she would like the Councilmember to get a copy of the letter and it seems like something that Councilmember would get involved in asking for updates. She went on to say that the affected stakeholders really do deserve regular updates on the construction project.

7. Public Comments – Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Committee's subject matter jurisdiction.

7.1. None were raised.

8. Ms. Lamishaw asked to have a motion to add an emergency item to the agenda for tonight.

WNC-PLUM-030305-5: "The WNC will add a discussion and possible action item to the agenda to discuss the proposed Zone Change, Building Line Removal, and municipal code Adjustment for the property located at 20535 Roscoe Blvd, Winnetka, CA. This motion is made based on the late notice and the hearing date which will occur prior to the next PLUM meeting."

8.1. Mr. Valdez seconded the motion.

8.2. Mr. Popowich asked if there was any objection to the motion. No objections were made so the motion passed 4-0, and the item was added to the agenda.

9. **Discussion and possible action on the proposed Zone Change (ZA 2003-7423-ZAA), Building Line Removal, and municipal code Adjustment (APCNV 2003-7003-ZC-BL) for the property located at 20535 Roscoe Blvd, Winnetka, CA. The applicants are asking for permission to build a nine unit condominium project at this location. This motion is made based on the late notice and the hearing date which will occur prior to the next PLUM meeting.**

9.1. Mr. Montaine pointed out that there would be two single family homes at the back of this project in addition to the 9 condos.

9.2. Ms. Lamishaw pointed out that these would be on Shoenborn and they would be part of the condo CNR.

9.3. Mr. Montaine asked about the square footage of this project.

9.4. Mr. Popowich pointed out that it does not say how big the units or the houses would be

9.5. Ms. King asked if they would extend the alley.

9.6. Ms. Lamishaw said no, and she thinks that's a good idea because it will limit access and cut down on crime. She also addressed the size and said it's about 11,000 sq ft in total. We can ask for some limits but the zoning is RD3, and they have the right to add 9 units on that property based on the Community Plan.

9.7. Ms. King said if you look at the map it's not zoned for multifamily use at this time in that area.

9.8. A discussion was held on the community plan. Mr. Popowich explained the reason the discussion occurred and spoke about Community plans which govern the development and what is built or modified as well. He explained this is why developers do things like ask for variances (corrected by Ms. King that this would have been a General Plan Amendment, not a variance).

9.9. Mr. Popowich introduced Ms. King and announced she was here on Zine's behalf and that she is sharing info with Councilmember Smith's Planning Deputy. He went on to say it was wonderful to see them cooperating. He went on to ask if we can send a letter stating that we have too many questions at this point and would like the developer to explain the irregularities or questions that we have and ask for a stay in a decision or a delay in the hearing.

9.9.1. Ms. King said that the hearing will not have a decision at that point. She suggested that someone can attend that hearing and get the comments on record. She pointed out that Mr. Popowich had a good point and if they filed incorrectly and it is a General Amendment then we need to get more details.

9.10. Mr. Popowich explained he is not happy that the developers have decided to go around the WNC. He said he would like to make the following motion:

WNC-PLUM-030305-6: "The WNC PLUM Committee has discussed the proposed project at 20535 Roscoe Blvd, Winnetka, CA 91306, and we have reservations, concerns, and questions about this project and can not support it until the developer has answered them. Furthermore we would like to request any decisions be postponed until the developer has appeared before us."

9.10.1. Ms. Robinson seconded the motion.

9.10.2. Ms. Lamishaw asked if we want more details about the project. She said the meeting can only be postponed by the applicant themselves and it's only an advisory hearing anyway.

9.10.3. Mr. Popowich suggested that we make our feelings known. He went on to say we really should make it known that the developers need to come before us before anybody makes a final decision.

9.10.4. Mr. Popowich asked if there was any objections to the motion and none were raised. The motion passed 4-0.

10. Committee Business –

- A. Comments on Committee Member's own activities/ Brief announcements.
- B. Brief response to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their general public comment rights.
- C. Introduction of any new issues for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting/request that the item be placed on the next meeting's agenda.
- D. Requests for Committee Members to research issues and report back to the Committee at a future time.

Adjournment.