

Venice Neighborhood Council
Unadopted Minutes
Land Use and Planning Committee
Special Meeting Pertaining to LUPC Administrative Issues
Tabor Court Community Room, 345 Fourth Street
March 5, 2007

1 **1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

2
3
4 **2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

5
6 **3. LUPC TASK FORCE REPORTS**

7
8 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

9
10 **5. DELIBERATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

11
12 **a.** LUPC Policies and Procedures

13
14 Challis Macpherson: we're talking about policies and procedures

15 Cross talk concerning the measurement of planning projects, not just

16 construction projects. Ms. Macpherson asked if agreement had been

17 reached. The recording stopped. Ruthie Seroussi suggested "to adhere

18 to the VSP absent compelling circumstances"; more cross talk. Robert

19 Aronson dissented, and stated that further constraint was not needed.

20 Discussion that followed regarding removal of the word "construction";

21 "measure and evaluate development projects" was suggested. Jim Murez

22 (?) stated that defining the level is needed. Arnold Springer discussed

23 how information regarding development projects is disseminated. Ms.

24 Macpherson suggested putting items of less interest on the LUPC consent

25 calendar. Mr. Murez stated that the City has placed the requirement for all

26 neighborhood councils to take action on all appropriate items and

27 suggested that official notice to the City that no action is being taken could

1 be important. Ms. Macpherson reiterated her suggestion regarding the
2 LUPC consent calendar. There was discussion about procedures already
3 in place for escalating items from the LUPC consent calendar. Someone
4 stated that the VNC Board would ask why no action is being taken on
5 particular items. Mr. Murez (?) suggested using a mail merge function to
6 disseminate information to stakeholders. Mr. Aronson suggested setting
7 up a process by which each Committee member reviews the CNC report
8 to identify items that should be included on the LUPC agenda. Ms.
9 Macpherson recommended that the CNC report should be sent to LUPC
10 members. Mr. Murez suggested setting up an e-mail address that LUPC
11 members can use to download information and a separate e-mail address
12 that can be used to send notices. There was consensus that Mr. Murez
13 will facilitate set up of the system he proposed; Ms. Macpherson will
14 communicate with the person that sends out the CNC report.

15 Ruthie Seroussi asked for clarification of Paragraph 4; after discussion of
16 possible revisions, Robert Aronson stated that the Committee's goal is to
17 obtain constructive feedback based on community input to be funneled to
18 the Board and to developers. Ms. Macpherson discussed the purpose of
19 the staff report. Arnold Springer suggested that the paragraph's first
20 sentence be rewritten to read "Provide a public forum for community
21 people to hear development projects and voice their support or concern."
22 Someone suggested changing "community people" to "stakeholders";

1 someone else suggested including the phrase “with the goal of making a
2 better project.” Ms. Macpherson and Susan Papadakis objected to the
3 latter phrase.

4 “Five” will be crossed out (paragraph five?). There was considerable
5 crosstalk regarding the interpretation of proactivity.

6 Discussion then ensued about requirements for outreach by developers;
7 Challis Macphers restated Lainie Herrera (?) that outreach for projects
8 over 7500 square feet should be to neighbors within 1100 feet of the
9 project. Robert Aronson suggested providing the ZA officer with copies of
10 staff report. Susan Papadakis asked if the Outreach Officer can send e-
11 mail to all VNC members. Jim Murez explained why this has not been
12 done and discuss plans for gathering this information. There was
13 discussion about LUPC’s credibility with the VNC Board, ZA and other City
14 agencies. Ms. Macpherson related proceedings of a recent hearing on the
15 fence issue.

16 Arnold Springer suggested that the second sentence of Paragraph 4;
17 cross talk. The second sentence will be removed. Discussion followed
18 regarding updating the language of the Venice Specific Plan. Robert
19 Aronson suggested that LUPC should be able to suggest changes to the
20 City Code and to the VSP so that the VSP is effectuated or is changed.

21 Challis Macpherson stated that the composition of Land Use and Planning
22 is taken directly from the By-Laws.

1 Page Six: Ruthie Seroussi suggested that the phrase “organized
2 opposition” should be defined. Arnold Springer stated that there should
3 not be organized opposition and that people should be given the
4 opportunity to express themselves. Lainie Herrera suggested that
5 organized opposition should be given the opportunity to present material
6 in advance, just as do developers. A rebuttal was offered that this would
7 provide additional opportunity to misread guidelines and make improper
8 presentations. After further discussion, Jim Murez suggested that the
9 policy should be worded to ensure that organized opposition speaking
10 time should be limited to those registered VNC stakeholders present at the
11 meeting and provision made to cede the time an individual is offered to the
12 organized opposition speaker. Challis Macpherson explained the reasons
13 for time constraints. There was further discussion about time constraints,
14 how to provide opportunities to speak to stakeholders, and whether to
15 continue hearings when Committee members feel that more information or
16 further research is needed. Susan Papadakis and Ms. Macpherson
17 suggested the wording: “Five (5) minutes shall be allowed for organized
18 opposition, if requested.” Further discussion followed; agreement was
19 reached to provide for five (5) minutes for the applicant to make a
20 presentation of the project, ten (10) minutes’ time allowed for opponents of
21 the project, and organized opposition to the project shall make itself
22 known to the Committee before the applicant makes a presentation in

1 order to receive additional time. Robert Aronson stated that the organized
2 opposition should go first and that an admonishment not to repeat what
3 has been said. Jim Murez suggested that the chair's responsibilities
4 should rotate; Mr. Aronson stated that Committee members should be
5 encouraged to speak only when the Committee member has a pertinent
6 comment to make. Mr. Murez explained the rationale for his suggestion;
7 Mr. Aronson stated that decision was the purview of the LUPC chair.
8 Speaker and Public Comment Cards will not be changed at this time.
9 Reconsideration of motion is taken from Roberts Rules of Order. (Taken
10 out of order) Ruthie Seroussi asked if limitations should be placed on
11 reconsideration.
12 Land Use and Planning Committee duties: collect the mail is removed.
13 Meeting Agendas
14 Agenda Composition: Robert Aronson stated that project specific topics
15 should be placed first on the agenda; move "3" and "4" to the end. There
16 was consensus that items of interest to stakeholders will be placed earlier
17 on LUPC agendas. The Consent Calendar item is eliminated unless
18 circumstances demand. The New Business item was reworded to read
19 "New business will be the presentation of issues for consideration,
20 deliberation and recommendations to the VNC Board."
21 Ruthie Seroussi suggested adding an additional five minutes for public
22 comment at the end of the meeting.

1 There was discussion about the order of items on the Consent Calendar—
2 Ruthie Seroussi suggested removing the example, and reorder item 1 and
3 item 2. Challis Macpherson noted how the changes will show on the
4 submittal copies. On p. 14, Ms. Seroussi suggested removing the word
5 substantial and noted that an address will have to be changed on the item
6 referring to 13 sets Maury Ruano suggested adding the legal
7 description of the property to item #2 on p. 14. Robert Aronson suggested
8 that he and Lainie Herrera should each take a project on Abbott Kinney.
9 Ms. Seroussi suggested that a Task Force be established to review the
10 project form.

11 Page 15—Minutes: no change.

12 Page 16: Challis Macpherson suggested that line 484 should be changed
13 to indicate that the staff is responsible for this report. Arnold Springer
14 suggested changing line 481; the line was changed to “summary of issues
15 and arguments.” Lines 489-497: Ms. Macpherson suggested changing
16 including addresses and the Community Impact Statement.... Robert
17 Aronson suggested that the LUPC recommendation to the VNC Board
18 could be used as the Community Impact Statement (CIS); Ms.
19 Macpherson stated that the CIS can be only 100 words or less. Lainie
20 Herrera suggested including a CIS statement at the top of the project
21 report. Ms. Macpherson stated that she has asked DONE for training on

1 this topic. Ruthie Seroussi suggested changing line 478 by removing the
2 quotes, and asked where the Minutes are posted.

3 Page 17: Challis Macpherson suggested that LUPC Outreach be
4 eliminated because there is now an VNC Outreach Chair and that all of
5 page 17 should be removed, except for the reference to business cards.

6 LUPC Committee member responsibilities—Challis Macpherson
7 suggested ending the description at “knowledge of zoning definitions and
8 their meetings.” Individual review of the CHC report “available on the
9 Web.” was accepted.

10 Page 18: Challis Macpherson noted that the Task Forces will have to be
11 listed. Robert Aronson noted his earlier suggestion that a Board member
12 that is presenting should not be seated for the entire meeting at which the
13 presentation is made. There was further discussion; consensus was that
14 this issue will be revisited at another meeting in two months or more.

15 Discussion ensued regarding a LUPC “Green Proposal,” which is still
16 being formulated. Challis Macpherson and Ruthie Seroussi discussed the
17 advantages of green projects,

18 Robert Aronson suggested that all LUPC members do a site inspection of
19 every project on the LUPC agenda. Jed Pauker suggested providing
20 visuals for each project. There was concensus on the issue of site
21 inspections.

22 Task Force Assignments

1

2 Challis Macpherson asked Robert Aronson for an update on parking on
3 Abbott Kinney; Mr. Aronson stated that he has three more businesses to
4 interview. Ms. Macpherson asked if Mr. Aronson had obtained reports
5 from the City. Ms. Macpherson stated that a written report has to be
6 provided on March 28, 2007 from the Task Forces on Parking and Fences
7 and Hedges; there was discussion how the Task Forces will proceed and
8 how members can be obtained. Regarding the Information Management
9 Taskforce, Jed Pauker stated that there was nothing new since the report
10 already made. Ms. Macpherson remarked that the Agenda Building
11 Committee meets bi-monthly and that the Specific Plan Review will not be
12 started until later. Mr. Aronson stated his preference that the Specific Plan
13 Review be listed in the LUPC Goals and Objectives. Arnold Springer
14 reported that a group is planning to work on this topic. Ms. Macpherson
15 listed other proposed Task Forces—Billboards, Construction and the
16 Development Moratorium; there was discussion about how each of these
17 topics can be assigned. Ms. Macpherson asked Ms. Seroussi about her
18 research regarding in-lieu parking fees; discussion ensued about how this
19 can be accomplished.

20 b. Commercial Construction

21

22 Projects were assigned – I couldn't tell who took on what tasks.

- 1 Challis Macpherson referred to Sylviane Dungan's research on the MTA
- 2 which revealed a provision for underground parking.
- 3 The meeting adjourned by common consent.
- 4