

ENC - PLU DRAFT MINUTES 5/14/19

Present:

Eliot Cohen (Chair)*, Gerald Silver, MD*, Carol Levin*, Greg Zeisler (Secretary), Lee Blumenfeld*, Steven Turner**

*Indicates ENC Board Member/Alternate, ** Indicates Alternate Board member

1. Call to Order 7:02 P.M., Roll Call, Determination of a Quorum

- A. Eliot Cohen announced that Jodee Becker has resigned from the Encino PLU committee and thanked her for her service.

2. Approval of Minutes from Prior Committee Meetings

- A. Minutes from the previous meeting were not submitted for review. Minutes will be reviewed and approved at the next committee meeting.

3. Action Items/Discussion Items

- A. **Briefing from the City Planning Department on the South West Valley Plan Update** - Case Number: CPC-2019-1741-CPU; CPC-2019-1742-CPU; CPC-2019-1745-CPU; ENV-2019-1743-EIR Ref. Number: 2019039154

Presentation by Claudia Rodriguez (City Planner), Blake Lamb (City Planning Associate), John Muggridge (traffic consultant), Adrineh Melkonian (City Planner)

The Encino-Tarzana community plan area is located in the south San Fernando Valley, just north of the Santa Monica Mountains. Its boundaries are, roughly, Oxnard Street/Metro Orange Line to the north, Interstate 405 (also known as the San Diego Freeway) to the east, Mulholland Drive to the south, and Corbin Avenue to the west. It borders the community plan area of Reseda-West Van Nuys to the north, Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass to the east, Brentwood-Pacific Palisades to the south, and Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills to the west. The Community Plan has not been updated since 1998.

The plan area includes two communities:

- Encino makes up about half of the plan area, with boundaries south of the Sepulveda Basin and generally east of Lindley Avenue. Encino has two distinct areas: the flats north of Ventura Boulevard, and the hilly areas to the south of the Boulevard. Some of the neighborhoods in the southeast, adjacent to the Sepulveda Pass through the Santa Monica Mountains, have historically identified as part of the Sherman Oaks neighborhood.
- Tarzana makes up the western half of the plan area, with boundaries generally west of Lindley Avenue. Similar to Encino, Tarzana features two distinct areas: the flats to the north of Ventura Boulevard and the hills to the south.

- The plan area also includes the Sepulveda Basin, which is a flood control basin and public recreation area created in the 1940s.

The plan is under revision for the following reasons:

- Fix inconsistent land use designations and zones which allow for incompatible development
- Evaluate existing conditions and potential environmental impacts of future growth
- Establish a new vision, goals, policies, and implementation programs
- Establish consistency with the adopted 2035 Mobility Plan and the proposed 2040 General Plan update
- Integrate the proposed Reseda Station Orange Line Transit Neighborhood Plan (TNP) into the Community Plan
- Support a greater mix of uses and increased density near transit
- Ensure new projects provide better transitions to residential neighborhoods through new development standards

The presenters shared information for public comments as the draft EIR is being dev. The presentation outlined efforts to study traffic-mitigation options, parking requirements, building density and heights, square footage of new buildings, setbacks, floor to area ratios (FAR) whether building heights will be allowed to increase further off the Ventura Blvd. corridor. The presenters

Traffic

- State is shifting to a vehicle miles traveled method (vmt) instead of level of service methodology
- Study will look at transportation network (supply) and land use (demand)
- Try to determine what is right for the neighborhood by identified metrics and fill in the gaps with alternative means of mobility. If the study shows impact, mitigation efforts are developed.
- Solutions to be studied include sidewalks, bike lanes, transit service, etc.

Encino Tarzana Community Plan

- Allows for transit-oriented development around the Reseda Metro Station
- MRCA land owned changed to open space helps enforce Mulholland specific plan
- There was a discussion on population density and a recommendation that any zone changes do not lead to more densification
- There was a discussion on lot size impact (RA vs RE zoning)
- In areas that are designated as historic, the city planning team would like to learn more about potential development restrictions the residents may desire

Ventura Boulevard

The Ventura Boulevard specific plan is not covered in the Encino-Tarzana community plan and not covered in the presentation. Ventura Boulevard is 17 miles long and crosses 5 council districts. The PLUM committee asked City Planning to look at ways to modernize the plan by streamlining outdated procedures. Council asked the committee to ensure that the plan is consistent with the rezoning work undertaken as part of the Community Plan Update. The update will not increase density or floor area ratios along Ventura and no regulations will change (uses, heights, parking, etc).

Committee Comment: Comments/questions from various board members are summarized as follows:

- Traffic studies should include feeder streets to main thoroughfares. Navigation systems have increased traffic on roads not intended to accommodate the increased traffic flow. Some intersections of concern:
 - Mulholland/Calneva
 - Sepulveda/Royal Hills
 - Sepulveda/Valley Vista
- Traffic studies should include real metrics such as “time in car” if possible to better monitor traffic impact
- Revisit parking regulations as they relate to alternative means of travel. For example, many projects are submitted with far less than one space per unit, creating more vehicular traffic circulating the streets.
- Stricter enforcement of current regulations (such as set-backs and owner pulled permits) along with introduction of new requirements such as more street-scaping
- Consider the need for a CUP to establish sober living and recovery houses. There are currently no provisions to allow or prevent.
- Vote against SB 50.
- The committee thanked the presentation team for their efforts and for taking the time to share with the community.

Public Comment: Comments from various members of the public are summarized as follows:

- Concerns over increased traffic in the community
- Concerns about over-development of existing sites
- Concerns over preservation of public and green space, including street-scaping

B. INTERPRETATION OF CITY SIGN ORDINANCE-CITYWIDE Regarding signs on Freestanding walls. DIR-2018-6787-BSA-1A

Applicant has challenged the department of planning & building and safety's determination that independent walls do not constitute structures, and hence signs can be placed on walls constructed in front of buildings.

Appeals question: "the overall issue involved as to whether or not the definition of a wall sign allows a wall sign to be placed on both buildings and free-standing walls or structures with four walls but no roof will generally apply to other sites in the City."

Proposed Motion (Blumenfeld): the ENC PLU supports the determination and findings of the department of building and safety and the zoning administrator in case DIR-2018-6787-BSA-1A and requests a CIS to be sent.

- **Motion Second:** Cohen
- **Public Comment:** None
- **Motion Passes with consent (6-0)**

4. Public Comment on Issues NOT on this Agenda

Janet Kleinbart spoke in opposition to SB 50.

5. Committee Member Comment on Items NOT on this Agenda

Sunday, May 19th is neighborhood council election day. Please vote.

6. Meeting Adjourned 8:58 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Greg Zeisler