

Communication from Public

Name: Miki Jackson

Date Submitted: 06/22/2021 12:59 AM

Council File No: 12-0460-S4

Comments for Public Posting: Miki Jackson for AIDS Healthcare Foundation/Housing is a Human Right. We are concerned that the ordinance has a much higher standard of notification for plan applications, projects and other actions in their area for "Coastal Communities" than for other areas and communities. This creates a separate and unequal situation for our communities. Coastal areas tend to be much more affluent and whiter than many other communities and this is very concerning. The standards for "Coastal Communities/areas" should be extended to ALL areas and communities. The proposed Ordinance requires that NCs only be notified of public hearings. The Ordinance must codify the Early Notification System. The Ordinance must require that NCs are notified of plan applications for projects in their area. The Charter makes it clear that NCs are to have a voice in issues of concern to their community. It currently only requires notification of public hearings, therefore the Ordinance thwarts public input and violates due process. We have questions about this Ordinance's constitutionality. The proposed Ordinance lets developers get "adjustments" through a process of only a decision by the Director of Planning. There is no clear definition of what constitutes an "adjustment", which could allow incremental changes that could really change the original project. We join the requests of many others that the City Council postpone consideration of Council File #12-0460-S4 for a minimum of six months to enable further community presentations and feedback. The documents in this file are 900+ pages and has not adequate review nor presentation to the community. there has not been enough time to study this very troubling proposed ordinance. We hereby adopt all opposition to this item.

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broide

Date Submitted: 06/22/2021 08:30 AM

Council File No: 12-0460-S4

Comments for Public Posting: It is extremely troubling to see that the City Council will be considering this item at your meeting of June 22. This measure has moved forward without the necessary review and scrutiny that it deserves. Since the inception of the ReCode LA process, this introductory chapter was presented by the Planning Department as the collection and compilation of all the various existing processes and procedures that were scattered throughout the existing code. We were specifically told that its purpose was to centralize the over 120 processes and procedures into ONE place and that no policy or substantive changes were to be made as part of that effort. As now written, this Chapter 1 document has gathered the various processes and procedures from throughout the existing code BUT, it also does far more, and it is critically important that this Council discuss and consider the impacts of some of these substantive and significant changes of authority which will go to weaken the Council's ability to weigh in on certain types of land use entitlements as well as make the process of appealing other entitlements more burdensome and costly to the public. The City Planning Commission Report is a document of over 1000 pages. Have you had adequate time to review the document? Is it fair to assume that each Councilmember and/or their Planning Deputy has read and reviewed the key portions of the document that community members have called out as being problematic? Or, are you assuming that a document that has quickly passed through the CPC and PLUM is just fine? Are you aware that the so-called "technical corrections" made before the PLUM Committee considered the measure were anything but technical (and some are in conflict with the City Charter)? How do you explain the rationale behind the omission of any reference to Neighborhood Councils, the role that they play in public engagement of land use issues, and the need to codify notification to Neighborhood Councils of new planning applications. Are we a part of the City Charter and have a defined role in public engagement, or is our presence merely window dressing? *It would be wrong to approve a document that is in conflict with the City Charter. *It would be wrong to approve a document that removes planning authority from elected officials (City Council) and places it in the hands of unelected bureaucrats. *It would be wrong to approve a document that fails to acknowledge or include reference to the role of

Neighborhood Councils (the only entities in the City Charter that are not included in this Chapter draft). *It would be wrong to approve a document that is meant to be a part of the ReCode process without actually relating to it. *It would be wrong to ignore the efforts of those who have read and reviewed the document and who have questions and concerns about it. The Council should welcome those who have invested significant time and energies to review the document in full and who seek to address this document's shortcomings. The Council should continue consideration of the measure and address the concerns that have been raised. Vast human and financial resources have been invested in the ReCode process and the City and its citizens should know that those investments have brought forth a thoughtful and much-improved product. Rushing through a measure of this complexity without proper review is wrong. It deserves true deliberation and discussion; a vote to approve should not be taken today. This letter submitted by me personally and on behalf of the stakeholders of Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. Homeowners Association -- a community of over 3500 condominium and single family homeowners on the Westside of Los Angeles.

June 17, 2021

Mayor Eric Garcetti &
Los Angeles City Councilmembers
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Processes & Procedures Ordinance
Council File 12-0460-S4
Request to Postpone Consideration

Honorable Mayor Garcetti and Members of the Los Angeles City Council:

We, the undersigned, are writing to express our concerns about the pending approval of the proposed Processes & Procedures Ordinance (Zoning Code/Reorganization of Administration Provisions, CF 12-0460-S4). No one can argue with the fact that it is time to update the City's Zoning Code and to clarify the structure of the Code. However, after having conducted a thorough review of the Ordinance's content and finding that it fails to address important issues, including recognition of Neighborhood Councils, State-mandated General Plan Elements, and the City's own equitable housing study, we urge the City Council to postpone further consideration of the Ordinance.

The Ordinance appears to perpetuate problematic aspects of the City's current Code and at the same time makes significant changes that have the potential to reduce public engagement and thwart transparency. Additionally, we find there is a lack of coordination in efforts to revise the Zoning Code and plan for the City's future. The Processes & Procedures Ordinance is just one chapter of the proposed New Zoning Code (NZC), and yet this chapter is being pushed toward adoption in advance of the rest of the Code in an attempt to radically streamline the approval process. There should be no further streamlining of project approvals when the City has failed to address planning fundamentals that are necessary to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the people of Los Angeles.

Key Concerns:

1. The Ordinance moves Planning authority away from elected officials, accountable to the public, to unelected bureaucrats.

Unelected officials will have authority to make decisions regarding project adjustments, alternative compliance, conditional use permits (CUPs), and Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs). This shift would reduce public engagement and allow important decisions to be made with no public oversight. Further, the text does not clearly define *adjustment*. There is also no clear definition of the term *alternative compliance*.

The Ordinance is nearing final approval even though LA City Planning (LACP) has failed to follow explicit instructions from the City Council. The Council unanimously approved a motion from Council President Nury Martinez instructing LACP to update the Ordinance with additional criteria for granting entitlements and to include language to ensure the furtherance of the public's interests (CF 20-1045), as well as citing public concern over the approval process for some projects. Martinez stated, "For this reason, it is necessary to provide additional criteria in the Processes and Procedures Ordinance when legislative actions and other entitlements occur. This will give more discretion to the Planning Department to make sure these actions align with broader city goals and the public interest. This will also provide more transparency to the public when a project can diverge from existing zoning."

The need for transparency could not be more obvious, considering the recent City Hall scandals involving former councilmembers, a former General Manager of LADBS, and a former member of the City Planning Commission.

2. Ordinance further codifies existing policies that promote housing inequality and should not be adopted before the completion of the Housing Element.

For increased validity, allow the City to continue its current process of updating the Housing Element before adoption of the Ordinance. The language under Sec. 11.5.11.a continues the practice of counting replacement units toward the affordability requirement, which does not contribute to resolving the affordable-housing crisis. While the City claims to have produced over 20,000 new affordable units since 2013, the actual net gain in units available to low-income households is much smaller, since rent-stabilized (RSO) units are often demolished to make way for new projects.

In addition, Sec. 11.5.11.a allows developers the option of building off-site affordable units to fulfill affordability requirements, which perpetuates segregation and promotes housing inequality. On May 21, 2021, LACP and HCIDLA submitted "Report Relative to the Citywide Equitable Distribution of Affordable Housing" (CF 19-0416) to City Council. The report makes clear that affordable housing in LA is mostly concentrated in the City's central areas, and that many communities in high-resource areas have little or no affordable housing available to low-income households. Allowing developers to build affordable units off-site perpetuates this trend.

Nothing in the Ordinance should preclude policy changes that may be included in the updated Housing Element to reverse growing housing inequality.

3. There has been limited public outreach and no meaningful effort to present the Ordinance to Neighborhood Councils for scrutiny.

LACP has conducted very limited outreach to Neighborhood Councils (NCs) and the general public. The Ordinance makes significant changes to the approval process. LACP has held three meetings of 1.5 hours each to review a 900-plus page document, not including exhibits.

Further, despite repeated requests, LACP has refused to provide a redline document that shows what changes were made after the last round of feedback.

The Recommendation Report from the City Planning Commission, a document that runs over 1,000 pages, was released just over two months ago. This is not nearly enough time for NCs and Council Office planning deputies to review and comment. Technical corrections were posted on May 25, 2021, and the Ordinance appeared on the PLUM agenda just seven days later, but these “technical corrections” appear to contain substantive changes. The reduction in notifications for appeals from property owners within a 300-foot radius to only abutting property owners is significant. Also, the tables in the technical corrections claiming that something is or is not required by the City Charter (in red) appear to be an effort to recast the requirements of the Charter, which cannot be changed by ordinance or by the LACP.

4. The Ordinance must explicitly reference Neighborhood Councils, the role they play in public engagement for land-use issues, and codify notification to NCs of new planning applications.

The Ordinance seems designed to remove NCs from the planning process. It only requires that NCs be notified of public hearings, of which there will be far fewer under the NZC, since it allows substantial by-right increases in height and density. Also, it does not mention the Early Notification System (ENS), which allows NCs to get regular updates on submitted applications in the area they serve. The ENS must be codified within the language of the Ordinance.

While NCs have no decision-making authority, they provide a crucial forum for public engagement, giving stakeholders the opportunity to review and comment on proposed projects. The NCs and the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment are the only entities required by the Charter for land use that are not expressly included as a Section in Division 13A.1. Their exclusion is baffling and, again, seems to be part of a larger strategy to remove NCs from their role as agents of public engagement with regard to land-use decisions.

5. The time allowed since the publication of the recommendation report and later technical changes has been insufficient for review by Council Offices, Neighborhood Councils, and the general public.

Further time needs to be allowed for City Council members and their staff to review the documents in their entirety. It is strongly encouraged that the Council obtain outside counsel to review the document rather than rely on the City Attorney’s office, to ensure that no transfer or elimination of land-use authority occurs that would diminish the explicit authority of the Los Angeles City Council to preside over land-use issues in the City.

6. The City has failed to update elements of the General Plan for decades, despite State requirements.

The Ordinance will radically streamline project approvals, but the City has failed for decades to complete the fundamental work of updating a number of General Plan Elements, which include: Air Quality (1992); Conservation (2001); Safety (1996); Infrastructure (1968-1972);

Open Space (1973); Public Facilities & Services (1969); and Noise (1999). In addition, the City has failed to comply with the General Plan's monitoring requirements.

It is clear to Los Angeles residents that the City's speculative growth and development is causing increased inequality, depleting precious resources, and causing unacceptable strains on public services and infrastructure. Yet, in spite of these grave problems, the City's leadership is pushing forward with an Ordinance designed to accelerate project approvals. We believe this demonstrates that the priorities of the Mayor, the City Council, and LACP bear no relationship to what the City of Los Angeles actually needs. Our elected officials and City agencies need to shift their focus from streamlining project approvals to addressing planning fundamentals.

For the reasons given above, it is essential for Council to postpone consideration of the Processes & Procedures Ordinance. Council Offices, NCs, and the general public must have more time to study and comment on this complex document. Furthermore, the City's piecemeal approach to the adoption of the NZC, along with its failure to first address fundamental planning issues through the Elements of the General Plan, has created a chaotic process that threatens the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Organizations:

Franklin Corridor Communities

*Hillside Federation **



La Brea Willoughby Coalition

Los Feliz Improvement Association



Responsible Urban Development Initiative



Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization



United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles



Westside Village Homeowners Association

Individuals:

Connie Acosta, Board Member, Echo Park NC

Ken Alpern MD

Garm Beall, Woodland Hills

Sylvia Bedrossian, Woodland Hills

Naomi Benghiat, Woodland Hills

Ron Bitzer, North Hollywood

Barbara Broide

*Carol Cetrone, President, The Silver Lake Heritage Trust ***

Peter Colley, Woodland Hills

Ellen Colley, Woodland Hills

Kathryn Cornelison, Canoga Park

Marian Dodge, Los Feliz

Brian Dyer, Hollywood

Orrin Feldman, Hollywood

Mark Fergus, Topanga

Julie Fergus, Topanga

Allen Franz, San Pedro

Annie Gagen, Hollywood

John Girodo, Hollywood

Raymond H. Goldstone, West LA

*Linda Gravani, President, Lake Balboa NC/Exec. Committee of Valley Alliance of NCs ***

Laura Grenfell, Board Member, Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization
 Amy Gustincic, President, Los Feliz Improvement Association
 Doug Haines, Hollywood
 Cheryl Holland, President, Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization
 Raymond Hovsepian Esq., Los Feliz
 Mary Hruska, Community Plan Update Chair, Mar Vista Community Council **
 Jack Humphreville, Hancock Park
 RoseAnn Kelley, Woodland Hills
 Schelley Kiah, Hollywood
 Donna Kolb, Los Feliz
 Alex Kondracke, Los Feliz
 Neil Kritzinger, Principal, Kritzinger + Rao Architects
 Kim Lamorie
 Richard W. Larsen, Los Angeles Planning Alliance
 Casey Maddren, President, United Neighborhoods for Los Angeles
 Anastasia Mann, Hollywood
 Arminda Maruffo, Lincoln Heights
 Debra Matlock, Los Feliz
 Brian McCaughey, Woodland Hills
 Reina McCaughey, Woodland Hills
 Scott McCausland, Board Member, Westside Village HOA
 Jeff McDonough, Hollywood
 Charley Mims, President, Hillside Federation
 Diana Nave, Chair, Planning & Land Use Committee - Northwest San Pedro NC **
 Lesley O'Toole-Roque, Board Member, Spaulding Square Neighborhood Association
 Sam Evans, Woodland Hills
 Laura Thorne, Woodland Hills
 Angela Robinson, Los Feliz
 Joel Rochlin, Los Feliz
 Lucille Saunders, President, La Brea Willoughby Coalition
 Donald Seligman, Los Feliz
 Stacy Shure, Co-President, Westside Village HOA
 Dan Silver MD, Downtown
 Cherilyn Smith, Hollywood
 Karen Stetler
 Carrie Sutkin PhD, Alliance of River Communities and Elysian Valley Riverside NC
 Gina Thornburg PhD, Executive Director, Coalition for Valley Neighborhoods
 Paul Thorne, Woodland Hills
 Brenda Valdivia, Echo Park
 Azul Weldon, Woodland Hills
 Tony Wilkinson, Panorama City
 Tom Williams, President, Citizens Coalition for a Safe Community/Director-Elect LA-32 NC **
 Susan Winsberg, President, Franklin Corridor Communities, Hollywood

* The Hillside Federation represents 44 homeowners associations spanning the Santa Monica Mountains.

*** Position and/or group included to indicate affiliation.*

cc:

Vince Bertoni, Director of Planning

Kevin Keller, Executive Officer

Bonnie Kim, City Planner, Code Studies

CD 1, Gerald Gubatan

CD 2, Aaron Ordower

CD 3, Elizabeth Eve

CD 4, Mashael Majid

CD 5, Daniel Skolnick

CD 6, Max Podemski

CD 7, Paola Bassignana

CD 8, Luciralia Ibarra

CD 9, Sherilyn Correa

CD10, Hakeem Parke-Davis

CD11, Len Nguyen

CD12, Erich King

CD13, Craig Bullock

CD14, Emma Howard

CD15, Aksel Palacios

Communication from Public

Name: Will Wright

Date Submitted: 06/22/2021 11:15 AM

Council File No: 12-0460-S4

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Honorable Council Members, On behalf of the Los Angeles chapter of The American Institute of Architects, I am writing to share strong SUPPORT for the Process and Procedures Amendment Ordinance (CF # 12-0460-S4). I encourage The Los Angeles Department of City Planning (LACP), as part of the larger narrative of this effort (and to gain wider support for this ordinance) to measure the time savings and the cost savings that LACP will benefit from, as well as, the time and cost saving that the private sector will receive once this ordinance is implemented. A smart analysis of the time and cost savings (and carbon/resource-management savings) will help underscore the vital importance of clarifying and streamlining the entitlement procedures so that more resources, time and money can be dedicated to ensuring that the project is well-designed with high environmental performance, contributes to the community and uplifts the human spirit of the neighborhood. With regards to potential cap-and-trade credits, I encourage LACP to measure the carbon footprint of the current process and to analyze the net reduction in that overall carbon footprint once the new, streamlined process is put in place for approvals. If we can begin to measure the sustainability benefits of smart policy, we can then begin to pay for the administration of those smart policies with carbon credits, etc. Lastly, I'd like to share our strong support for an Alternative Compliance process, which will enable an applicant to request relief from a development standard if an alternative standard is consistent with the 'intent' of the original standard. Very truly yours, Will Wright, Hon. AIA|LA Director, Government & Public Affairs American Institute of Architects/ Los Angeles Chapter 3780 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 701 Los Angeles, CA 90010 www.aialosangeles.org