

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

George Skarpelos, Voting Stakeholder
Susan Swan, Voting Stakeholder
Rosalind Helfand, Voting Stakeholder
Robert Morrison, Board Member
Brandi D'Amore, Board Member
Cesar Cervera, Voting Stakeholder
Jim Van Dusen, Chair



HOLLYWOOD UNITED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
Certified Council #52,
P.O. Box 3272 Los Angeles, CA 90078
www.MyHUNC.org email us at Info@MyHUNC.org

COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee

Thursday, August 4, 2022, 6:30 PM

Webinar ID: 845 0435 7879

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84504357879>

Welcome

6:30 PM start

1. Roll Call

Attending

Jim Van Dusen Brandi D'Amore Robert Morrison George Skarpelos

Absent

Cesar Cervera Rosalind Helfand Susan Swan

2. Approval of Minutes

Edit for typos.

Motion passed.

Motion Made: Approval of July '22 Minutes with spellcheck for typos.

Motion: Brandi D'Amore **Second:** Robert Morrison **Vote:** Yes-4, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Brandi D'Amore George Skarpelos Jim Van Dusen Robert Morrison

3. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda (2 minutes each)

None

4. Continuation from last month's PLUM meeting of the review and possible motion regarding 2332 N. Allview Terrace East/2371 N. Allview Terrace East: Project: Renovation & addition of a single family dwelling on a substandard street in a hillside/new construction of a detached ADU on a lot-tied adjacent property. Action Requested: Requesting a Zoning Administrator Determination per a Hillside Referral Form.

Will be scheduled at a later time. Applicant needs until October '22 to submit items to Planning.

5. Presentation by Savannah Walseth for United to House LA regarding ballot proposal to impose additional city tax on property sales over \$5 million and direct the funding toward homeless services and housing. Potential motion regarding the proposal.

Link: <https://unitedtohousela.com/>

Robert Morrison gave preface for item.

Jeffrey Star (instead of Savannah Walseth) gave the presentation; he was given 10 minutes to present United to House LA, a citizen-led measure on November ballot. Proposal is to tax on mega mansions as an ongoing source of homeless funding and prevent homelessness. The committee is by Mayoral appointment/citizen seated.

Presentation covered aspects of the presentation, including its scope, the construction and labor conditions for homeless with measure's 2nd part to protect those that are currently housed to stay housed.

Question from stakeholder Brandon asked about where money would come from and what would not be serviced.

Committee had multiple questions about the measure's implementation; concerns about a lack of oversight without City officials was brought up in different ways. Jeffrey Star would get back to committee.

It was also addressed that it may not be permissible for HUNC to take a position on a ballot measure; follow-up with DONE to determine.

Jim Van Dusen asked for presentation by Jim to give to board

6. Discussion and possible motion to recommend that HUNC submit position on LA Zoo Draft Plan Alternative 1.5. Link to the LA Zoo Draft Plan alternative 1.5

Link: Alternative 1.5 Plan - <https://s36593.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/22.07.14-LA-Zoo-Draft-Plan-2022-Alt.-1.5.pdf>

Link: LA Zoo Vision Plan - <https://www.lazoo.org/about/visionplaneir/>

Link: Zoo Vision Plan Notice of Availability - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nYLRZGkUuK3L-1d77pYBRKhRvVKVM4Oj/view?usp=sharing>

Link: Zoo Vision Plan Notice of Availability (Spanish) -

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IAg2jaoDK6ULXb8irbxsh27J1Qoosb8o/view?usp=sharing>

City of Los Angeles has put forth a new version of its Zoo Expansion Plan, 1.5 Alternative. It was released with minimal exposure with a rapidly approaching deadline. HUNC has previously taken a position to support the 1.0 Alternative Plan.

Gerry Hans of Friends of Griffith Park made presentation and discussed how the rapid release and deadline of the new 1.5 plan and Reconsideration Environmental Impact Report made it hard for FOGP to have a formal opinion at this time. He directed the committee where to look, highlighting some positives. However, initial review of the plan by Mr. Hans indicates:

**Fundamentally opposed to CA area.*

**Condor corridor to reconfigure that area*

**It will prevent animal migration and connectivity*

**It will affect biospecies*

**It will move too much dirt which will have affect on topography and habitat, let alone the routing to move it out*

**The push to night time use will affect animals*

**Inaccuracies Baseline information in the first EIR does not match EIR 1.5*

**Remiss in mentioning new event area right inside entrance; 60sq feet.*

**Concern sonic/light disturbance affects animals*

**Traffic fuzzy numbers*

**stormwater collection*

**parking plan punishes Angelenos that need to come on weekends*

Laura Velkei, attendee imploring and highlighting that the Plan makes no sense and the rapidity with which it was put forth makes no sense.

Committee determined to recommend the following:

**First and foremost, there should be an extension on deadline as a) the EIR shows that there was no outreach to the area of our NC which clearly has Griffith Park in its bylaws, and that it was so rapid that no one can really analyze the reconsideration*

**Reiterated position of 1.0 alternative*

**Note that HUNC area was not included in Notice of Preparation & Scoping*

**Reconsideration has inaccuracies and does not correspond to original EIR*

**No Condor Corridor*

Motion passed.

Motion Made: Motion to recommend to Full Board that HUNC submit position on LA Zoo Draft Plan Alternative 1.5. Link to the LA Zoo Draft Plan alternative 1.5

Link: Alternative 1.5 Plan - <https://s36593.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/22.07.14-LA-Zoo-Draft-Plan-2022-Alt.-1.5.pdf>

Link: LA Zoo Vision Plan - <https://www.lazoo.org/about/visionplaneir/>

Link: Zoo Vision Plan Notice of Availability - <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nYLRZGkUuK3L-1d77pYBRKhRvVKVM4Oj/view?usp=sharing>

Link: Zoo Vision Plan Notice of Availability (Spanish) -

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IAg2jaoDK6ULXb8irbxsh27J1Qoosb8o/view?usp=sharing>

Motion: Jim Van Dusen

Second: Brandi D'Amore

Vote: Yes-4, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Brandi D'Amore

George Skarpelos

Jim Van Dusen

Robert Morrison

7. Discussion and possible motion regarding the Planning Department's apparently new policy to include LA City DASH shuttle buses in the calculation for approval of Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) projects.

Brandi D'Amore covered the reasoning for putting this on the agenda and the potentiality on the effect on our area. She talked about a recent housing project that was granted TOC status because it was in proximity to LADOT DASH shuttles.

George addressed how he wants a more specific policy to utilize making a decision.

Richard Larsen - John Parkinson Lincoln Heights chair emeritus PLUM, current chair of LA Planning Alliance, and Secretary for LA Congress discusses the impact using a DASH on areas with proximity to a DASH. He also addressed that DASH is not permanent yet to allow this as an aspect to use is of concern.

Jim Van Dusen used Beachwood DASH as an example of how using a DASH shuttle could have repercussions.

George Skarpelos agrees with transient nature of DASH, and does not support the manipulation for using them for TOC use.

Committee recommends a letter to be recommended to Full board, addressed to Planning and Land Use departments.

Motion passed.

Motion Made: Motion to write a letter to the Planning Department's CD4 and CD 13 apparently new policy to include LA City DASH shuttle buses in the calculation for approval of Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) projects.

Motion: Jim Van Dusen **Second:** George Skarpelos **Vote:** Yes-4, No-0, Abstain-0, Recused-0, Ineligible-0

Yes

Brandi D'Amore George Skarpelos Jim Van Dusen Robert Morrison

8. Review, discussion and possible motion regarding AECOM request for input for the Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER) for the Hollywood Walk of Fame Renovation Environmental Documentation Project.

Jim Van Dusen received an unsolicited letter from AECOM.

Mike Callahan- Hollywood Heritage - member of community is trying to find out what exactly this letter says.

AECOM has a contract for consulting services \$600k contract to prepare HRER regarding Hollywood Heart o Hollywood project. Hollywood Heritage was not contacted.

Committee decided Jim can contact the organization to find out what it wants.

9. Discussion and potential recommendation to move September PLUM meeting to a different date to accommodate a potential Town Hall meeting regarding the Griffith Park Safety & Mobility Improvements Project.

Discussed that Council District 4 requested multiple dates to put on a Town Hall for the Griffith Park Safety Survey and Pilot Closure which included potentially being on the same date as PLUM. However the date chosen does not require date change; Robert Morrison suggested committee members attend.

10. Announcement regarding Digital Media Communications Policy Training on August 31

Robert Morrison discussed new policy, reminding committee members to attend. Jim Van Dusen has scheduled to take training.

11. Committee Member announcements on items not on the Agenda

None

12. Old/Ongoing Business

None

13. New/Future Business

None

Adjournment at 8:31 PM

Reconsideration: The Board may reconsider and amend its action on items listed on the agenda if that reconsideration takes place before the end of the meeting at which it was considered or at the next regular meeting. The Board, on either of these two days, shall: (1) Make a Motion for Reconsideration and, if approved, (2) hear the matter and take an action. If the motion to reconsider an action is to be scheduled at the next meeting following the original action, then two items shall be placed on the agenda for that meeting: (1) A Motion for Reconsideration on the described matter and (2) a [Proposed] action should the motion to reconsider be approved. A Motion for Reconsideration can only be made by a Board member who has previously voted on the prevailing side of the original action taken. If a Motion for Reconsideration is not made on the date the action was taken, then a Board member on the prevailing side of the action must submit a memorandum to the Recording Secretary identifying the matter to be reconsidered and a brief description of the reason(s) for requesting reconsideration at the next regular meeting. The aforesaid shall all be in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.