



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 21-1230-S5

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org
Cc: sandy@magazinec.com

Wed, Nov 20, 2024 at 4:18 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Valley Village

Name: Sandy Hubbard

Email: sandy@magazinec.com

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(13) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 10/30/2024

Type of NC Board Action: For if Amended

Impact Information

Date: 11/21/2024

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 21-1230-S5

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: CF 21-1230-S5. POSITION: FOR CHIP Draft #3 / AGAINST Exhibit D, All Options. The Neighborhood Council Valley Village, in a 13-0 vote at its October 30, 2024 board meeting which was duly noticed, adopted the Land Use Committee's recommendation to support the Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) with a FOR CHIP Draft #3 / AGAINST Exhibit D, all options position. The Planning Department in its report clearly stated that they had identified enough areas to meet the State's mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. To ensure the

State agreed with the City's opinion, Director Bertoni relayed at the PLUM hearing that Planning had forwarded CHIP Draft #3 without Exhibit D to the State, and received verification that CHIP Draft #3 without Exhibit D meets the RHNA goals and is acceptable to the State. The Neighborhood Council Valley Village requests that City Council support Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP Ordinance that rezones LA, disregarding the Exhibit D "options." Enclosed please find the NCVV letter written in August 2024 for the CPC hearing, and note that a CIS was also filed for the PLUM hearing held 11/19, all consistently supporting CHIP Draft #3, and when it became applicable, opposing Exhibit D, all options.

Ref:MSG11465116

 **CHIP letter NCVV 08242024.pdf**
183K

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
VALLEY VILLAGE

P.O. Box 4703
Valley Village, CA 91617
www.myvalleyvillage.com

Tony Braswell, President
Jake Yocham, Vice President
Dorothy Apple, Treasurer
Marc Woerschling, Secretary
Carol Kiernan Convey
Alice Hart
Ginny Hatfield
Sandy Hubbard
Suzanne Lewis
Ernie Merlan
John Moser
Jenna Powers
Christyn Saracino
Paulette Stokes
Maribel Ulloa-Garcia

CELEBRATING 20 YEARS OF SERVICE

August 23, 2024

Sent by electronic communication:

paul.krekorian@lacity.org
housingelement@lacity.org
tiffany.zeytounian@lacity.org
zeke.wapner@lacity.org
sarah.hounsell@lacity.org
brian.chun@lacity.org
amanda.kainer@lacity.org

Dear Councilperson Krekorian, the CHIP Ordinance staff & the Housing Element team at LA Planning:

The Neighborhood Council Valley Village (NCVV) supports the CHIP draft ordinance that rezones our commercial corridors to allow mixed-use development while protecting single-family neighborhoods, Historic Districts/HPOZs and Rent Stabilized Units from being rezoned, and that keeps single-family neighborhoods from being considered in the expansion of the Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Program.

NCVV encourages the City to create transitional housing from the commercial corridors into the single-family neighborhoods. For instance, a proposed housing development on a commercial corridor adjacent to single-family neighborhoods should encourage 2-3 story single-family attached housing (facing single-family) as the transition to higher multi-family buildings. This will offer much needed missing middle housing opportunities.

NCVV opposes creating additional multi-family housing units within the single-family home blocks, beyond the ADUs and duplexes that state law currently allows.

NCVV strongly recommends that a solution is developed for parcels that contain mixed-zoning designations, and that they should not default to the highest-use possible, but rather, the density should be allocated on the parcel reflecting sensitivity to the density of the parcels adjacent to them. This is an issue that affects much of the San Fernando Valley due to older zoning policies.

The Purposes stated in the Valley Village Specific Plan—part of the Community Plan for more than 30 years and developed by the Valley Village community at large in conjunction with City Planning—should continue to be the Guiding Principles of managing growth in what has been identified as a neighborhood with distinctive character.

Whereas some of the following comments are specifically related to the Housing Element Inventory Listing of sites, NCVV would appreciate it if you would forward this communication to the appropriate planners and staff.

- 1) There are a number of locations on Magnolia Blvd, between Irvine and the 170 highway that are owned by Oakwood, a private school. These properties are currently marked as Faith-based, but they are not. They are owned by a private entity, and this information should be updated on the Inventory List.
- 2) There are addresses for small-lot projects located on Emery Lane and Milan Drive that are designated as vacant or otherwise available to be upzoned. These are relatively recent developments, and we query why they are on a list as available to upzone?
- 3) There are other addresses that we question which will need a boots-on-the-ground investigation. We respectfully request the right to add to this list.

Whereas some of the following recommendations may apply more to the NoHo/Valley Village Community Plan Update process, NCVV would appreciate it if you would forward this communication to the appropriate planners and staff.

- 1) We recommend that future growth be concentrated along the Orange Line path (on Chandler, in Valley Village), to encourage walkability to the Orange Line, especially if parking reduction continues to be implemented.
- 2) We'd recommend a parking permit or "renters without cars" certification program be instituted for every building where development is permitted with reduced or no parking allocations. Increased density justified by transit proximity cannot simply encourage transit ridership, it must mandate it to bring the plan to fruition, and to avoid exacerbating street parking scarcity and competition.
- 3) Magnolia Blvd., between the 170 freeway and Laurel Canyon should not be designated Medium Neighborhood Residential because the street is narrowly constrained to two lanes of traffic, and will be constrained for many years in the future by the designation of the Historic Monument status granted to the trees at NHHS, as well as the tremendous amount of school traffic (both vehicular and pedestrians) carried on this stretch that is only one lane in each direction.
- 4) We recommend instead that the Medium Neighborhood Residential designation be allocated to the area of Riverside and Whitsett, as both of those streets are 2 lanes in each direction and have the infrastructure to sustain more growth.
- 5) We recommend that the density for the area between Chandler and Magnolia, along Agnes and Ben Street, should be increased to be consistent with the area extending east to North Hollywood High School.
- 6) We recommend that the density for the triangular area between Chandler, Colfax and the 170 freeway should be increased.
- 7) The maximum seven-story height proposed for the Community Commercial designation is too high. It should be reduced to five stories maximum.
- 8) The Community Commercial area designation at Laurel and Chandler should be designated for more residential than Commercial use to assist taking the burden off of Magnolia, and because the job centers planned for at NoHo West, NoHo Metro, the eventual Valley Plaza developments, ReImagine NoHo, and Studio City will need to be sustained by local housing.
- 9) We recommend that the City consider a Conservation District designation for the corners of Magnolia and Whitsett, to preserve the existing distinctive and historical architectural motifs, and to encourage future development that is complimentary and harmonious with it, supporting pedestrian orientation and inclusion of open space, as the natural community use of this area has evolved.

10) We recommend that the RiteAid property at Magnolia and Whitsett be designated for mixed use, with commercial on the lower level, housing above. Open space should be included at this site to serve as a community gathering area, as this area of the North Hollywood-Valley Village community is lacking open space.

11) We recommend that the Gelsons property at Laurel Canyon and Riverside be designated for mixed use, with commercial on the lower level (appropriate for retaining large market), housing above. Open space should be included at this area to serve as a community gathering area, and to mitigate the density and ingress/egress in close proximity to the 101 freeway. Parking reduction should not be allowed for mixed-use projects containing grocery stores.

12) We recommend that the Jons Market corners at Laurel Canyon and Magnolia be designated for mixed use, with commercial on the lower level (appropriate for retaining large market), housing above. Open space should be included at this area to serve as a plaza-like community gathering area at the core of Valley Village, consistent with use on the adjacent corners. Parking reduction should not be allowed for mixed-use projects containing grocery stores.

13) We recommend that developments along the Tujunga Wash should have access to the Wash.

14) We encourage the revitalization of the Tujunga Wash area for community use of open space, with appropriate landscaping, walking/biking paths, and amenities such as playground and fitness equipment.

15) In alignment with the goals of the Landscape Ordinance and the 2023 Memo on Tree and Biodiversity Planning, we recommend that any concentration of mature trees warrant inclusion in a Conservation zoning designation, whether commercial or residential. The City needs to make a greater effort at retaining these trees that in many cases date back to the WWII era housing found here.

16) We recommend a review of the Infrastructure in Valley Village—there are many areas that have underperforming (or no) storm drains or an absence of sidewalks, due to the aging infill areas built in the WWII/mid-century era. Building to maximum density allowances may exceed the deliverable services, ultimately degrading what is now considered to be a “high opportunity” area.

17) Valley Village has a Specific Plan in place that designates a height-limitation for this community. We recommend that zoning throughout the area acknowledge the height that bonuses and incentives could reach, and that the underlying zoning be applied so the height-limitation cannot be exceeded by the bonuses and incentives.

18) We also request a review of the Specific Plan to see what should be updated/changed/removed. The action of the Community Plan Update should not be taken with the intent of removing the goals of the Specific Plan without being specifically addressed with the community.

Respectfully,



Tony Braswell
President
Neighborhood Council Valley Village



Sandy Hubbard
Chair
Planning and Land Use Committee

