

**Neighborhood Council Valley Village
Called Board Meeting
7-12-06**

Draft

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order, Roll Call, Agenda Distribution and Welcoming Remarks. The meeting was called to order by Peter Sanchez at 6:41 pm.

Mr. Sanchez welcomed those in attendance. He explained that this is a special “called” meeting of the NCVV Board to address four specific agenda items from the June Board meeting. At the June meeting there was not a quorum to allow business to be conducted. Mr. Sanchez stated that this is the first time in the history of NCVV that this has happened, and thanked those Board members in attendance for ensuring we could conduct the called meeting. He also thanked the Chair of the Planning and Land Use Committee for allocating one hour of their meeting time to the NCVV Board meeting. Mr. Sanchez provided an explanation of the Neighborhood Council process and the history of Neighborhood Council Valley Village to the audience. Mr. Sanchez asked that any who wished to speak should complete a speaker’s card. It was noted that the meeting would be conducted under Roberts Rules of Order and within the guidelines of The Brown Act.

The roll was called. Board members present were: Mr. Tony Braswell (residential renter), Dr. Alan Brody (residential homeowner), Mr. Fritz Friedman (business), Ms. Ginny Hatfield (senior based organization), Mr. Paul Hatfield (at-large), Mr. Yoni Kahn-Rose (residential renter), Mr. Ben Lautman (business), Mr. Greg O’Connor (education), Ms. Breice Reiner (community service), Mr. Peter Sanchez (residential homeowner), Mr. Stuart Simen (business), Mr. Paul Wiener (residential renter). Absent were Ms. Vanessa Lopez (student), Ms. Harriet Newton (faith based), Mr. Bill Santoro (residential homeowner). The Posting Roll was called – posting requirements were met.

Agenda Item 2 – President’s Comments, Introduction of Guests. There were no comments from the President.

Agenda Item 3 – National Night Out. Ms. Hatfield reported on the plans for National Night Out, August 1, in Valley Village Park. She motioned for \$3500 to support the event as an outreach effort. The motion was seconded by Mr. Simen. Mr. Lautman asked what would be the participation with the national event. Ms. Hatfield explained that it is a national effort that is sponsored/promoted on a local level. All sponsorship funds would only be used in the Valley Village event. The motion was approved 11-0-0.

Agenda Item 4 – Residential Renter Assistance Project. Mr. Kahn-Rose advised the Board that he would like to explore a program that would provide assistance to persons who are being evicted from rental housing in Valley Village under the Ellis Act. The purpose of the program would be to help those being evicted to assist with moving, relocation costs, search for new housing, and other costs that are related to them being

forced to move. He estimates the annual expense to accomplish this will be \$5,000-\$10,000. He has already begun contact companies that do this type of work.

Mr. Hatfield stated that he would check to see what service like this is allowed to be funded by the city. Ms. Hatfield asked if Mr. Kahn-Rose intends to introduce this as a program effort or if he is just exploring ideas? He intends to submit a proposal to the Board. Ms. Hatfield asked if we would do the work or contract it out? There are companies who do this type of work. Mr. Hatfield added that this is similar to a corporate relocation assistance program. Mr. Friedman suggested that due diligence be conducted to ensure there are no liability issues for NCVV or the NCVV Board.

Mr. Braswell motioned to support the concept as presented by Mr. Kahn-Rose and encourage that he bring a proposal for this effort before the Board for consideration. Dr. Brody seconded the motion. The motion was approved 11-0-0.

Agenda Item 5 – Planning and Land Use. The Board was asked to take formal action on the EZ Lube request for approval of their proposed use of property on the corner of Laurel Canyon and Burbank. Mr. Simen asked if the presentation addressed media reports about EZ Lube. Mr. Tom Paterson stated that the media reports were related to Jiffy Lube.

Mr. O'Connor was asked to give an overview of the details from the presentation to PLU. PLU approved the request with the following conditions – approval of the ground condition of the soil, a proposal by Mr. Sanchez and agreed to by EZ Lube to trade the street improvements requested by the City of Los Angeles for a center Island similar to the entry island on the south end of Laurel Canyon, architectural style that mimics the style in the November 2005 National Oil and Lube Magazine, and the “Q” condition and recorded covenant approved would be restricted to a lubrication business and not a general auto repair effort. The motion reads:

Approve as presented, with several things to be investigated: ground condition, environmental impact, and exchanging the improvement of the 7 foot dedication for a center line landscaped island. Architectural style to be duplicated from what has been represented in the National Oil & Lube Magazine, November 2005. Q condition and recorded covenant restricted only to the use permitted under the variance and not for general auto repair use.

Mr. Friedman asked if the 7 foot dedication was to widen Laurel Canyon? Yes.

Public Comment. Mr. Arliss asked why EZ Lube presented this to the NC? Mr. Sanchez explained that the city sends these presentations first to NC for consideration after they approach the zoning office. The NCVV Board is advisory only, and seeks to ensure that requests comply with the Specific Plan. Ms. Hatfield asked if EZ Lube would pay for the island even though the city will do the work? The EZ Lube representative replied Yes.

The motion was approved 9-1-1.

A motion came forward from PLU to approve the 11933 Magnolia project as presented. Mr. O'Connor was asked if this was the same plan that was presented to PLU? No, what is being shown to the Board is a new plan with architectural enhancements. Mr. Kahn-Rose expressed concern that the project could not be approved as presented as it had not been reviewed by PLU. The Board can approve any item if it is agendaized, but the motion must be considered as it comes forward from PLU.

Ms. Hatfield asked if they could present to PLU tonight, after the NCVV Board approves? It would be new action, and it is not on the PLU agenda so it must be posted and likely would not come back before the NCVV Board until September. Mr. Friedman asked if NCVV Board could vote on the old proposal, and then approve specifications of the new proposal? Yes.

To clarify, Mr. O'Connor stated that the Board must vote on the motion as presented. They could then take additional action pending the outcome of that vote.

Agenda Item 6 – Public Comment. Mr. Sanchez asked for public comment.

Ms. Marcie Duncan spoke against the development. She stated that there should be some environmental impact studying traffic, increasing need for schools, cut through traffic, parking needs, etc. She lives in this area and the traffic right now is terrible and will only get worse. There needs to be an study on the economic impact of this decision.

Mr. Brian Zolin stated that he feels the vote by the Board is inappropriate is wrong as there has not been enough public notice of the meeting and the vote.

Mr. John Mozzer stated that there has not been sufficient environmental notice of this development. He said there is a required public comment period for any mitigated study of the project related to the environmental review. These requirements have not been met in his opinion.

Mr. Tom Paterson stated that the proposal before the Board is different that the proposal submitted to PLU and as such should be denied. He stated that this is typical of projects from this developer and asked that the Board remember current disagreements with this developer on the property at Stevens Nursery. He asked several direct questions concerning height, parking grade, first floor level. Mr. Paterson advised the Board to deny the motion considering that the plans as submitted could change.

An unidentified member of the audience asked that the motion be returned back to the PLU for further study based on traffic patterns at Magnolia Boulevard. Although the President asked for a speaker card, there was no speaker card complete by this person.

Mr. Chuck Tenin stated that the NCVV Board does not have all the facts. There are 6 buildings that are scheduled to be demolished and a freeway ramp that will come onto

this area that will cause problems. There needs to be a hearing and proper plans presented, not just concepts.

Ms. Beth Fulton stated that she agreed with other comments made, but felt that the project presented here was an attractive use of the property and believes that we should encourage this type of development as long as it adheres to the Specific Plan.

Mr. Sanchez reminded the Board that they must move on the motion as presented. Approve, deny or send back for further study.

Ms. ^{her}Laurie Dinkin asked the Board to deny the motion, stating that it need further study within the city and further review of environmental impact.

Mr. Sanchez asked the developer to clarify – is the city sending you to NCVV Board first? Yes.

Mr. Lautman asked if the project, outside the variance request of 3', is in compliance with the Specific Plan? Yes.

Mr. Simen moved that the motion be postponed.

Ms. Dinkin stated that the Board must be absolutely certain that whatever is presented will match the actual structure. She expressed concern that the 3' variance does not adhere to the Specific Plan.

Mr. O'Connor reminded the entire body that the NCVV Board is only advisory, and that any action is such for the city and they will have to enforce compliance with the Specific Plan. He stated that the PLU and NCVV Board is not qualified to review all details related to these proposals, and can only act in good faith on the plans presented.

Mr. Simen's motion did not move forward due to lack of a second.

Mr. O'Connor asked Mr. Simen if an amendment could be offered. No. Mr. Kahn-Rose asked if there could be a second action on the motion if it were approved? Mr. Simen stated yes.

The question was called. The motion was approved 8-2-0.

Mr. Kahn-Rose made a motion that the NCVV Board support the second of the two architectural proposals presented at the Board meeting (labeled "B" in the minutes). Mr. Lautman seconded the motion. Ms. Hatfield asked if the motion could be amended to include ^{an} environmental study? The amendment was not accepted.

The motion was approved 9-1-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.