

Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa
NCWP Planning & Land Use Committee

Minutes for Approval

Committee: Planning & Land Use

Meeting Date: Thursday, October 12, 2023 at 6:30pm

7133 Manchester Municipal Building

Chair: Steve Donell

Attendance:

- Present: Donell, Ross, Birkett, Conyers, Mannix, O'Brien
- Absent: Lipshutz, Quon

Call to Order 6:38pm

- Committee Introductions

Public Officials:

Sean Silva - deputy for Councilwoman Traci Park, introduced himself; stated he's working on planning issues with Jeff Khau

Chair, Steve Donell, explained that we would extend the public comment to two minutes. He stated what the agenda would be and how the meeting would run.

Steve Donell stated that he has heard the following concerns about the project from community and committee members: :

- Level of outreach?
- Is it a by right project?
- What concessions the developer is seeking/expecting?
- Concerns on traffic study? Is the traffic study flawed?
- Questions about diligence and whether the project has been rushed through?

Discussion/Action Items

1. Presentation from Dana Sayles, AICP of three6ixty to PLUC regarding the proposed Pep Boys Project:

- Land use consultant team here from Cityview
- We have a big team with our experts here tonight - Dave Brown - Max Fry - Adam Perry, Steve Robert, Andre Miller, Emily - traffic consultant
- We started the process in January 2022 - about 20 months of outreach
- More than 30 meetings
- Third time presenting to PLUC
- LaVette has hosted meeting at her house

- Address changes we have made and community benefits
- The town Center and BID - have been partners and other stakeholder organizations
- Cityview is a company with more than 20 years experience of multi family housing; founder is Henry Cisneros (housing under Clinton); Providing workforce housing; Company has deep roots in the community
- They own and operate their properties

Project Specifics:

- Pep Boys / Del Taco there now; Tire Shop will not be a part of the project
- Boundaries of Westchester Town Center - commercially zoned now
- Bound by La Tijera, Truxton, Manchester
- Access to transit running east/west and train line; 12 minute walk to train station
- Metro line to culver city and south bay
- Land Use - C2 - general commercial zone - general housing by right
- Permits housing, retail, etc.
- Within the Westchester CDO - overly provision around the town center
- Within a TOC and high quality transit area
- Project would not be replacing existing housing
- 2.5 acres of land so we can offer public benefits
- Site was identified by housing element - inventory of sites - for moderate income housing
- Project proposed as 441 units - 66 low income housing
- Mix od studio, 1, 2 and live/work units
- 16,000 square feet of retail and restaurant
- 416,0000 square area
- Variable height of 4-8 stories
- 96 foot - no more than 85 feet at any site
- 549 onsite parking spaces (we are required 0 parking spaces)
- Robust vehicle charging
- Bicycle short and long term spots
- One acre of open space with a public plaza that is a community benefit
- Entitlement - state density bonus project - allows increase in market rate density for affordable housing
- SB 1287 was adopted by Newsom yesterday - 85% increase density by right - now law
- Asking for density bonus, yard reductions, waiver - transitional height requirement; Building exceeds 61 feet for a partition
- Conditional use permit for alcohol - easier for Cityview to get tenants
- Any project with 50 or more units - site plan review
- Compliance with Westchester CDO
- SCEA - environmental document - made public July 27th for a 30 day period
- We sent SCEA out to out list of interested people and made available by public record

- TOC area - not using a TOC program - the site would permit up to yesterday 449 units - below what we are allowed to do
- Offering parking and public benefits
- Public Meetings - list Streetscape, LAX chamber, individual, NC, BID, Neighbor meetings
- Secured support from LAX Coastal, Westchester Farmers Market, Streetscape, Drollinger, Westchester Lutheran, Westchester Town Center, etc.
- We were here in March but due to NC changes and Board changes - this was our first opportunity to be here

Summary of project changes:

- Redesign the building- Manchester to reduce height
- Redesigned balconies to respond to privacy issues
- No above grade parking
- Restrict operating hours and alcohol serving hours - 11pm Sun- thurs; Friday-Sat 12am
- Restrict operating hours - 11pm for rooftop decks
- 24/7 Security
- Added pet amenities, bag dispense
- Voluntary \$100,000 contribution into traffic signal/corridor upgrades along Manchester Ave; Voluntary contribution to Westport Height neighborhood for traffic calming improvements
- They will find small businesses that won't compete with town center
- Two courtyards - two driveways - La Tijera and Truxton
- La Tijera will be primary and Truxton will be secondary
- Trash activities will be inside the building
- 5 parking spaces for commercial - door dash, uber, etc.
- Project has two courtyards - series of terraces
- La Tijera 6 stories
- Around the plaza - 4 stories; Manchester - 6 stories
- Set back 40 feet off Manchester
- 1287 - density up to 50% -100% in exchange for certain amount of affordable housing
- Base density 284 units - formula
- **Committee comment:** Julie - 1287 is for new projects - so you would have to go and redo your project
- We are permitted 449 today but we are doing 441; state law says we can do even more
- Outdoor plaza with community benefits - intended to anchor the farmers market
- Live work units that line manchester and Truxton - business downstairs and live upstairs
- Large lobby area
- Commercial along La Tijera meant to be restaurant; Second area of commercial along Manchester - fitness and retail ?
- Plaza - robust outdoor area - sense of place - create signage and public art;
- Security
- Cut it back on Manchester sides - was 85 feet and now at 71 feet
- Building will be very sustainable - probably LEED gold

- Entirely electrified building - not using natural resources
- All drought tolerant landscaping
- EV charging , transit access and providing alternate mobility options
- Taken the building down one story and closed the transition balconies for privacy
- 100 feet of separation
- Opaque balconies - private and not open spaces
- Traffic Demand Management - Program to encourage rideshare incentives, bicycle amenities, Ecargo bicycle
- Sidewalk improvements, lighting, trees, transit coordinator onsite to help rodents - train and bus schedules
- Security - yards will be gated and secured; monitored with external surveillance, controlled areas of the site, security guard, maintenance cleaning
- Construction - Security, No parking for workers and equipment, sound barriers along La Tijera and Manchester
- La Tijera is only exit that has turning radius for construction trucks
- Mobility improvements
- Cityview is committed to working the local organizations
- Bringing the largest number of affordable housing, except the 8333 airport project
- 5M in infrastructure improvements; Job creation of 3000
- Next steps - City Planning Commission on Nov. 16; Would like to go to exec NC Board in Nov and have action from NC

Public Comment - 2 minutes per speaker

1. **Michelle Mitchell** - new resident of 2 years - excited about the development - concerned about the neighborhood density and residents ability to absorb the additional residents, neighborhood services, parking, guests etc. We already have challenges with people parking in our neighborhood sue to airport parkers ; density proposed as is even with mitigations - still going to be undue burden
2. **Linda Chang** - previous meetings about past developments - Grinder and then the plan turns out different and more massive - traffic impact concerns; westchester Parkway - if all of the projects are being integrated - what is the cumulative impact; what is the reality of recent projects and how they have impacted the community; Culver City a lot of projects like this with huge traffic implications
3. **Luis** - 30 years resident - concern is traffic - two multi unit projects in same area; traffic already horrendous, can;t imagine what it will be; it's going to directly impact us
4. **Jolie** - like the good parts; the reality - concerned about 441 units and would like to see that reduced and 8 stories seems too high; more than 900 people living on the block and expect that that is going to go really well for us? It need to be scaled back even further
5. **Mike** - traffic concern- works in Redondo - horrendous going through the airport now; tired of sitting in the tunnel; La Tiejra at 5:30 - horrible traffic. This is a great project for Pamdale, Lancaster, etc. most people have 2-3 cars. Not even one car per person. It needs to be scaled back
6. **Lana Sanders** - the project is attractive - but as it is now - traffic ; speed on my residential streets - speed is too high and traffic ; safety impact to families and children

7. **Suart Ellison?** - Street widening - bike path? What type of trees will you plant?
8. **Debra Huston** - timing of this project is unfortunate given the upzoning that is proposed surrounding this project - 2800 residential lots proposed for multi family housing - streets are jammed with cars, concerns about emergency vehicles, 1287 allows for even higher density, Manchester and Sepulveda are state highways with dangerous intersections, only area trucks can get off the freeway - is La Tijera and 405. Ask committee to consider ramifications of project
9. **John Ruhlen** - community member for 55 years; downtown needs a new face, large design firm - good organization - apartment units - rather do it here than take out residential
10. **Flora Nelson** - opposed to the project and this being 441 units and 8 stories; horrific how the government is managing our city these days. The information we have been getting seems flawed. 5am - a lot of traffic. What is happening in our city, government is not taking care of the city; Todd is doing the city's work - cleaning our streets
11. **John Calcienna** - traffic officer for LAPD, I know what traffic looks like - it sounds nice to have open area, but already have homeless problem, a single security office can not help with that, most people bought homes in Westchester to have single family homes, city of LA has 30% vacancy in business dwellings - why do we need more?
12. **Lavette Bowles** - support adorable project - too large for the corner - too much traffic - the parking will spill over into the neighborhoods; I take public transportation but most people can't do that if they have children to pick up, need to look the entire Westchester; opaque balconies - they can see me, not a benefit for residents. No protection for the neighborhood; we don't have more police, more clean water. Do not agree to 32% increase in density they are requesting.
13. **Rosa** - dream for a home; sold my home in Venice and bought in Westchester for the clean streets; increasing crime rates, people that will gather there will be drug addicts, thieves, etc. Your security guard - they can only observe and take notes - we don't have enough police; sue them and include them in your lawsuits
14. **Richard Travasso** - We own two properties - we are only looking at one project - there are multiple projects; don't have enough parking, current state proves it's not true; attempted break in at 8:45am and no cops. My concern is increase in density, traffic and emergency services. City needs to see cumulative impact before approving
15. **Jennifer Travasso** - share the same concerns; not enough resources, police, water, garbage, crime rate, homesles, the denser it becomes, the more resources are strained. There will be a huge burden to bear and no govt.. This will not be housing homeless.
16. **Margaret Harrington** - Westport Heights neighbor - huge housing crisis, newer developments will not immediately solve but will provide essential building blocks; until we can reach a better supply and demand with housing, housing won't be affordable; access to restaurants and retail - offers these benefits without affecting housing
17. **Chris Delja** - brings a lot of good elements - But Hanover and Grinder in foreclosure now; Concern that it would increase in density - is there a number of units that pencils out - current number is high based on what I've seen from other developments
18. **Mark Huffman** - President of Westchester Streetscape - pleased with the project ; public plaza will beautify downtown Westchester; provides critical new housing - 66 units for

very low incomes; help revitalize downtown Westchester; reviewed the SCEA - will be mitigated to acceptable level

19. Carmen - 36 year residents - increase in traffic, crime, pollution, homelessness, trash; you will destroy our community

20. Lisa Gaines - CPU - Section 8 and RSO housing is along the corridors - Westchester produced 51% of the area's housing -we are doing our share. 4800 units - every single one had an EIR - trip analysis- just like these guys - saying it's not going to impact, won't be significant; interactions 2014 - 2022 Sepulveda and Manchester went from an A to F; La Tijera; won't impact ramps - every single one was affected; Nobody in their EIR said they would have impact - we have the data that proves it. LAWA 65m to 120m - every day 101,000 cars with one freeway access to LAX - 75% of those cars come through our neighborhood. You are adding more density to an already dense area - 86 % more vehicles on our street - cumulative impact - we must look at it. Jiffy Lube, Pep Boys; SCAG says only 8 % of all adults don't have cars - where will they park - on our streets - real trips per day as much as 13,000. I took all of the North Side development, which equates to 19,000 units in our community - that's before Pep Boys, Dinah's. Etc. We have several 100% affordable projects. Take the project to the perimeter and we can support you

21. Stacey Travis - open plaza - worry it will be a meeting space for the unhoused, more crime, one security person is not adequate; Triangle businesses will go under; too large for the space and the lot; only 5 dedicated for deliveries - insufficient; the services do not pull into the building- they back up on Truxton

22. Sean Silva (from Councilwoman Park's office) - I can't stay for the next phase; please update me. Apologies for having to leave early.

Committee Comments/Questions:

1. **Julie** - unbundled parking - mixed commercial and residential with no security; construction parking offsite - where?

Dana - unbundling means lease parking spaces independently - you don't automatically get parking spaces; rented on a first come basis as needed;

2. **Steve** - what about people who don't want to pay for parking and park on the street instead

Dana - Constriction parking - required to park off site - we will rent space to lot owners; we have initiated discussions; materials would be delivered as the site is constructed; Will be times of street closures, construction diversions, etc. scaffolding requires safety protections,

3. **Dave** - community outreach - airport modernization, all three projects, no civic improvements; developer not required; state is giving developers these entitlements; traffic, parking and security are governmental issues; like the project but it's too big; why not build 264 - is it not profitable? Don't have the resources to support this; the funds get divided - so no win for the community.

4. **Tracy** - since last heard in March, there have been significant devpt zoning changes, 15,000 more units. I can no longer support 32 % increase in density, I can't support 1 setback or increase in height. Echo the concerns with faulty trip data. Trip implications. Not convinced it will offer a vibrant meeting space when there is not enough parking.
5. **Steve** - is security a condition of approval? Would you consent to it being added?

Dana - Plan to self manage after construction; Daily reports; 35 security cameras; we will be able to help with emergency services; we work with law and fire department. If there is a need for more security, we will provide it. Right now, it's not a safe lot - this project would benefit the safety of the community; We have offered building tours and not one person from Westchester has taken us up on that. We will offer again, come on a building tour.

6. **Kevin** - one security office for the entire building ?

Dana - yes as of now

7. **Cory** - What percentage of egress and ingress will be on Turxton versus La Tijera?

Dana - will answer later (never answered)

Gibson Traffic Consultants -

- Try to mitigate; we have never said it won't add traffic
- Traffic Studies - for over 25 years we prepared the document by the guidelines from the city set forth; working with LA DOT. State has changed SB 743 - not looking at congestion and vehicle delay - they moved toward VMT (vehicle miles traveled) - to try to address greenhouse gas issues and to encourage dense housing projects. Trying to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and shorten trips, so adding more housing, etc. Don't look at interactions alone; Traffic impacts are based on VMT divided by each area; West LA Area Planning Commission.
- Household VMT - per capita - 6.9 - no significant impact
- Retail Uses - less than 50,000 - no significant impact
- Local circulation effects - we did look at LOS (level of service) ; looked at net increase in traffic; the effect of the net new traffic- we do increase traffic; we are adding to interactions that are already at D,E, F LOS (level of service).
- Trip generation - develop a set of ratios based on survey of land uses across the country; Accepted is rates per unit;
- We looked at cut through traffic through Westport Heights - chose peak hours
- LADOT also reviewed it and agreed with our analysis
- Programs like this reduce number of cars on the road
- How can we improve signalized systems - provide signal camera along Manchester Corridor; \$100,000 to make these improvements - new left turn and signal facing;

corridor wide benefit; met with neighbors and provide funding for permit parking, speed bumps, cut through traffic, etc. those funds are dedicated to this neighborhood.

- We looked at traffic data that does include the airport, we looked at our project's effect on what is already here and the cumulative impact. We even looked at general regional growth. The airport is accounted for in base conditions. We looked at pre-covid and post-covid; pre-covid data reflected more impact.

Public and Committee Comments:

- **Dave** - CONRAC opens next year it should have a positive impact on the traffic; positive things that haven't filtered through yet. The issue is the City has not solved the D,F rating in the intersections; the big picture
- **Lavette** - how would we access those funds? The funds would go to the Councilwoman's office to be allocated for Westport Heights related parking and traffic issues; neighborhood improvements. Funds specific for Westport Heights area.
- **Cory** - Many of the homes most impacted by this project are also up for possible rezoning to commercial mixed use along Manchester. Our community has multiple concerns and we need to look at cumulative impact to neighbors living adjacent to this project. I support the project and there are many positive elements but it needs to be scaled back.

Dana Responds to Previous Questions:

- Density - agree to disagree- the City will ultimately vote and decide. We are not changing the project now.
- Dedication - 5 feet on La Tijera and 5 feet on Manchester - street can be improved with compliant sidewalks. The bike line along Manchester will be left in place. No intention to eliminate bike protections; Trees - currently designated for town center - tuckeroo, golden rain trees, palms maintained, cost live oak
- Shows zoning map - Equity and inclusion - We all have to take our fair share. You don't have zoning in place for this to be disbursed elsewhere. Town Center is where the density will go; required to have onsite affordable; we are executing a project that the state allows; this is the project that is moving forward.

Public Comment on Non Agenda Items - None

Discussion and possible motion/vote regarding recommendation to NCWP Board re: approval/denial/special conditions for the Project.

- Tracy made a motion to enthusiastically support the project with no discretionary bonuses, Julie seconded the motion.
- Steve to Tracy - do we have a list of discretionary items - density, height, setbacks, fewer trees?
- Dave - cap the number of units - reduce size
- Ministerial density bonus - 35% increase - 356 -

Dana - could have also done a TOC project; compliant project at 448

- Steve - based on formulaic requirements, you are not seeking a deviation from the formula that exists. We can defer this matter to the NC.
- Tracy withdrew her motion based on not enough specifics in terms of the discretionary items
- **Dave - I move that the committee deny the project unless there is a reduction in density. Cory seconded. Motion carries.**
- Cory, Tracy, Julie, Dave voted yes.
- Steve and Kevin voted no.
- Motion to adjourn - 9:48pm