



## Officers

**Louis Krokover**  
President

**Laurie Kelson**  
Vice President

**Michael Kaufman**  
Treasurer

**Shelley Rivlin**  
Secretary

**Gerald A. Silver**  
Sergeant at Arms

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE & GENERAL MEETING**  
**TUESDAY, April 17, 2012**  
**ENCINO WOMENS CLUB**  
**4924 Paso Robles Avenue, Encino, CA.**

## **APPROVED MINUTES**

[www.encinocouncil.org](http://www.encinocouncil.org)  
[www.encinonc.com](http://www.encinonc.com)

1. Call to Order 1:00 Roll Call: Louis Krokover, Michael Kaufman, Gerry Silver, Shelley Rivlin, Laurie Kelson, and Diane Rosen, Sharon Brewer, and David Rankell. Determination of a Quorum of 5.
2. Approval of the Executive Minutes – March 20, 2012
3. President's Report: (Mr. Krokover) – Mr. Krokover received notice that Rec and Parks is on overtime after 9:00 pm. Mr. Silver moved to send letter to R and P requesting another 1/2 hour when we have important land use issues and to not complain to Chair. No second. Ms Kelson moved to start at meetings at 6:45 if we have important land issue. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Mr. Silver. Passed by voice vote. There is no official election update, but rumor is to have them in August. Bylaws state the 21 Board positions terminate in June unless Board votes to extend.. Mr. Silver moved for a motion on the Agenda for April meeting to extend term until next election or Dec. 31, whichever comes first. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Mr. Kaufman. Passed by voice vote.
4. Report from Vice-President on Committees (Ms. Kelson) – deferred
5. Report from Treasurer (Mr. Kaufman) – Distributed March 2012 Expense account. Thanks to Ms. Brewer he has a response from DONE on items reflected in report. Balance does not account for items from last general meeting or Mr. Silver's \$1.00 for the list.
6. Proposed Guest Speaker(s) – Erik Johnson, Bronwen Triste, Metro Regional Communications requested in correspondence shared with committee, and Don Ferguson of MobileTREC. requested by Public Safety committee. (30 mins)
7. Discussion on the April 25, 2012 General Council Agenda Board Business- Possible Committee Reports (To be presented)
  1. By Laws
  2. Education – Chair asked to Ms. Rivlin to contact Ms. Henderson. Mr. Kaufman says May 16 is last date for vouchers.
  3. Finance – Glad we set election money aside.
  4. Outreach
  5. Planning and Land Use - Fresh and Easy presentation. Mr. Krokover reiterated that council members have requested we not take positions on projects outside our ENC boundary until that

NC has a position. Mr. Silver shared his personal opinion that we should take a position on projects that effect Encino. Ms. Kelson thanked Diane and Theresa for distributed 2200 email and 400 fliers. Five people showed in response. Permits issued on 4949. Ms Rosen asked to put Valley Vista on agenda due to changes.

6. Public Safety – speaker

7. Parks –

8. Traffic & Transportation – Ms. Kelson asked to that the following motions re: bicycle lane and SCAG project be on this agenda.

a. MOTION: BAILEY 2ND JARVIS

MOTION: THAT THE ENC SUPPORTS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LA CITY'S 2010 BICYCLE PLAN WITH THE INSTALLATION OF BIKE LANES ON WHITE OAK AVE BETWEEN VENTURA BLVD AND OXNARD ST ON BOTH SIDES OF WHITE OAK AVE. VOTE 51N FAVOR, 3 OPPOSED

b. MOTION: KELSON 2ND JARVIS

MOTION: THAT THE ENC OPPOSES THE INSTALLATION OF A REVERSIBLE LANE ON SEPULVEDA BLVD THROUGH THE TUNNEL UNDER MULHOLLAND DR. (SCAG PROJECT LA996425 IN PAGE 42). VOTE 7 to1

9. VNY Airport

10. 12<sup>th</sup> Council District Service Committee Report

A. NC Election's & NC Funding - Status update regarding 2012 from Tom Soong.

May 16, 2012 Last day to submit Request for Demand Warrant forms to be paid with current fiscal year funds. (Must have completed paperwork.)

May 16, 2012 Last day to submit list of possible election outreach vendors, board approval, and total amount allocated for election outreach.

June 15, 2012 Last day to make board approved expenditures with purchasing card, by 5:00pm. Purchasing cards deactivated at 5:00pm.

B. Comments and information regarding 17720 Magnolia Blvd  
In #380 Encino Community Update:

#380 ENCINO COMMUNITY UPDATE

Mr. Kaufman presented a response to the discrepancies in this update. (See attachment) In response, Mr. Silver said that Mr. Kaufman's remarks quoted Update correctly. He said it reflects positions of board of HOE and was not sent by him, even though the email address indicates he sent it. He did not identify who wrote and sent the newsletter. Mr. Kaufman has the opportunity to present his views in their newsletter. "We stand behind all those comments". Mr. Krokover reminded us that according to the City ethics commission only city council members are exempt from making negative comments concerning city votes. ENC are not allowed to make comments after the vote. A HOE board member, not the ENC member, may publish the HOE newsletter.

C. Monthly Food Expense Allowance – Refreshment for 20 people, water and cookies. Not to exceed \$500.

D. Other items for Council consideration (General) – City of LA website, Dec.7, 2010 item 11 deals with impartiality and fairness.

8. Public Comments on non-agenda items within the Board's jurisdiction. . Ms. Rosen asked for clarification of spot zoning. Mr. Rankell said that the last ENC public meeting was disturbing.
9. Board Member Comments on subject matters within the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Silver asked that we record meetings or listen carefully to the dialogue.
10. Next Executive Committee meeting: Tuesday, May 15, 2012. General meeting is May 23.

Adjourned at 2:15.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shelley Rivlin

**The Encino Neighborhood Council (ENC), is a Certified Neighborhood Council of the City of Los Angeles which ADVISES City, other Governmental Officials' and the Community on issues or concerns that are affecting OUR community of ENCINO.**

**The ENC is made up of VOLUNTEERS who are elected by the community who live, work or otherwise are involved in the community of ENCINO.**

**The ENC also makes appropriations of City Funds for Community Projects and needs as requested and approved by the general board.**

The ENC meetings are usually held on the 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of each month at the:  
**Encino Community Center, 4935 Balboa Blvd starting at 7:00pm.**

For further information – Please go to: [www.encinocouncil.org](http://www.encinocouncil.org) or [www.encinonc.com](http://www.encinonc.com)

**PUBLIC INPUT AT ENC MEETINGS** - An opportunity for the public to address the Council or Speaker on agenda items will be provided before or during consideration of the item. Members of the public who wish to be recognized on any item are requested to complete a question card for each item they wish to address, and present the completed card(s) to the Sergeant-At-Arms. Speaker cards are available at the back of the meeting room.

The Council will also provide an opportunity for the public to speak on any **[Non-Agenda Items\*]** during **“Public Comment”**. **The Council may not take any action or discuss matters addressed in “Public Comments”**. However, the Council President may refer such matters to the appropriate Council Committees for further consideration.

**\* Public comments are limited to TWO (2) minutes per speaker.**

**\* ENC COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND TIME LIMITS** – ENC Councilmember's requesting to speak will be recognized by the President in the order requested. **For any item, the Chairperson of the Committee, or the maker of the original motion shall have up to THREE (3) minutes to discuss the item. Councilmember's may speak up to TWO (2) minutes each on the matter unless extended by the President or Council.** After all members desiring to speak on a question have had an opportunity to be heard once, **the time for each Member desiring to speak again shall be limited to a maximum of ONE (1) minute unless extended by the President or Council.** A motion calling the **“Previous Question”** may be introduced by any member during a Council debate.

If adopted, this motion will terminate debate on a matter and the matter will then be submitted for a vote.

**VOTING AND DISPOSITION OF ITEMS** - Most motions require a majority vote of the Councilmember's present and voting will be by hand vote unless otherwise decided by the Council. Unless requested for further consideration by an ENC Councilmember, any item which has been forwarded to the Council by a unanimous committee vote shall be approved as a “Consent Item” without further discussion.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

Sign language interpreters, assisted listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request.

To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by contacting Tom Soong, at (323) 359-2579, toll-free at (866) LA HELPS, or e-mail [tsoong@mailbox.lacity.org](mailto:tsoong@mailbox.lacity.org)



MAIL: P.O. BOX 260439, ENCINO, CA. 91426-0439

VOICEMAILTEL: (818) 817-6998

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

## ENC Executive Committee Meeting (4-17-12)

Inasmuch as the purpose of the Neighborhood Council is to inform the community, numerous **FACTUAL ERRORS & MISCHARACTERIZATIONS** of the 17720 Magnolia Blvd project, and the ENC Board review of that project, as stated in #380 Encino Community Update, should be appropriately reviewed in a public forum. They are as follows:

**DENSITY:** The project is referred to as a *“high density apartment”*. In fact it is Medium Density, which is the same as all the multi-family residential buildings surrounding it. High density would describe the Wilshire Corridor from Westwood to Beverly Hills, not Encino.

**NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY:** The project is referred to as being, *“incompatible with the neighborhood”*. The adjacent surrounding uses are multi-story, multi-family residential buildings, which is the same as the proposed use. It is consistent with the adjacent uses and is entirely compatible.

### **THE PROJECT IS DESCRIBED AS INCOMPATIBLE BECAUSE:**

A. It is *“too large for the lot size”*. This is not true. It is similar in size to the surrounding buildings.

B. The *“city lacked adequate infrastructure”*. This is not true. The change in population as a result of the proposed project is within the growth projections of the City of Los Angeles Community Plan for the Encino area. Any local improvements that the City may require to infrastructure, as a result of the project, are the responsibility of the developer and the building permit is contingent upon the developer providing those improvements.

C. The city *“could not provide water, solid waste, sewage, and street/traffic capacity.”* This is not true for the same reason stated above.

D. *“HOME objected to the traffic, noise, congestion and pollution”* [resulting from the proposed project] It is insulting and untrue to imply that the ENC Board is indifferent to these matters and that HOME is the only entity opposed to these things. None of us like traffic, noise, congestion or pollution, but the simple fact of the matter is, to whatever extent these are existing conditions, this project will have no significant impact on the levels of those conditions within our community. For example, the total traffic count will be very slightly lower under the proposed project than under the existing use. It is hard to imagine that a residential use in a residential neighborhood will be intrusive, or any noisier than the school that was on this property.

E. *“Most residents believe that it will bring more traffic and congestion to the area”*

Most residents? Approx. 40,000 people live in Encino. There were only 5 people who showed up to oppose this project and they complained primarily about street parking. To characterize 5 people as most of the residents is both untrue and ridiculous.

F. *“a number of residents were not allowed to speak in opposition”* This is not true. They were not allowed to speak for as long as they wanted, but they were allowed to speak within the time limits allowed by the rules of the Board.

G. **ZONING:** The project is characterized as a *“massive rezoning”*, which is untrue, and it is proposed that an RD2 zone, in lieu of R3, will reduce the size and height of the project. This is not true either. Both R3 & RD2 have the same:

- Allowable uses,
- Maximum building height,
- Front Setback,
- Rear Setback,
- Side Yard Setback,
- Minimum Area requirements per lot,
- Minimum lot width requirements, and
- Parking requirements.

The only difference is the minimum area per dwelling unit. While this will result in fewer total units allowed in an RD zone, there is no limit on the size of those units or the number of bedrooms or bathrooms. The project can have the same number of bedrooms, bathrooms, occupants and automobiles in either zone.

An RD2 zone will not cause a change in the allowable size or height of the building.

Finally, what is most troubling is the **DISPARAGEMENT OF THE INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS AND REASONABLENESS OF THE DECISIONS REACHED BY THE ENC BOARD:**

(6 quotes from the #380 Encino Community Update)

1. *“There is a clear unhappiness with the Encino NC because they voted to approve this project”*

2. *“There is a consensus that the ENC made a wrong decision in endorsing this project”*

3. *“ENC Board disregarded the pleas of opponents and instead supported the massive apartment project”*
4. *“The Encino NC turned a deaf ear to neighbors [and] stakeholders”*
5. *“The Encino NC showed its pro developer ways when it voted to approve the project”*
6. *“There is no reason to build such a high density R-3 [project] except to maximize developer profits and make the neighbors suffer for it”*

The statements and implications that this Board is only interested in maximizing developer profits is both ludicrous and insulting. And, I am certain the developers from LEGADO didn't leave with that impression when they proposed putting Condos on Oak View.

It is very troubling that a member of this Board, because that Board member was not on the prevailing side of a vote, should as a result publish and circulate to the members of the Encino community and adjacent communities, **factual errors and misstatements that intentionally misrepresent the thoughtful and reasoned actions of the Board.** The use of inflammatory and misleading language to mischaracterize the actions and intent of the Board, and to insinuate that this Board acts unfairly, without consideration for neighbors and stakeholders, is not only reprehensible, but it undermines the credibility of not just that Board member, but of the entire Board and the process of Neighborhood Council review.