WEST LA SAWTELLE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

WWW.WESTLASAWTELLE.ORG // CONTACT@WESTLASAWTELLE.ORG // WALTON CHIU // MONICA MEJIA LAMBERT // JAMES ALTUNER // JAY HANDAL // ALEXANDRA POLIN // DANILO TORRO // DAVID SWARTZ // KENT KAISAKI // PIERRE TECON // RON BEN-YEHUDA // RON MIGDAL // VIC PACHECO // // ADRIANE RANSOM // ALEX CARYOTAKIS //

BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING

SATURDAY, 05.18.2024 2PM

STONER PARK [SMALL GYM]

1835 STONER AVE. CA 90025

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
   2PM

2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

3. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

4. ADMINISTRATIVE
   a. MOTION: TO APPROVE NPG FOR CA YIMBA FOR $1,375.00 [ANIME LICENSING]

5. CURRENT BUSINESS:
   a. LISTEN TO COMMUNITY INPUT ON PLUM'S ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL.

COMMENTS

Angelica - keep R1 Zoning
Mark F - against upzoning
John - west of Bundy
Saya - this will destroy our neighborhood
Tom H - 1732 S. Centinela (in the zone) this is a land grab
Liz - SE quadrant, wants to downzone?
Tracy - presented a map for upzoning

Ron - on Wellesley, what gave you the hope that you could “preserve and rescue” rather than saying a blanket “NO”? Affordable housing doesn’t exist
Doug - Wellesley 52 years, against building, whose dumb idea was this?
Cesar A - for the alternative plan “All R1 is exempted from development”
Tony S - Bundy Drive, stop the Carmel developers
Scott - against the plan to increase density, pitting neighbors on Amherst/Bundy against each other
Jay Handal - we DO represent you, many board members have looked into this more deeply. This is a listening session
Carol Mcconnel - barry/mississippi - has too much upzoning
Xochitl - alternative to the PLUM alternative plan, right to retain current zoning, against alt plan to upzoning to industrial hybrid b/c it benefits some on the board
Tony - Carmelina - against 100% - developments will benefit
Lisa Abbot - Idaho - alternative plan is unfair, totally against this
Lori Kwan - on Wellesley W of Bundy - trying to create a petition to preserve our neighborhood
Roberta Barnes -S. CArmelina, this has nothing to do with low cost housing, only to upzoning
Frank - 1707 Bundy Dr - bad, noisy, high traffic, don’t destroy the houses
Arash/hazel - 1752 wellesley, love the quiet neighborhood, against upzoning
Hirshberg(?) - there’s nothing you can do about it, we are all getting screwed
Lori - wants to meet to fight this
?? - metro has been a disaster, people shouldn’t have more than 2 children
Albert - bundy/Idaho, wants to keep his house as is
Xochitl- more than enough underutilized space, do not need to upzone to provide additional housing - it will go to developers, not the city. Maintain zoning as is
??? (missed name) - native of CA “you guys are trying to take away the quality of life from this area” - take Pico corridor or other industrial areas like bed, bath & Beyond
Ron Ben-Y - says we must upzone, let’s do this
John Willimas - lived here 34 years, should not be changed into an apartment neighborhood. This area should not be upzoned, what about Bed Bath & Beyond, intend to keep it as single family, our single family home is our biggest investment.
Mitchell - neighborhood is gone downhill, winds of change
Mat Wilkinson -huge mistake to rezone
Cesar a - the alt plan is available in the meeting folder, there is a lot of confusion and lack of knowledge
Carol - intends to stay here, loves neighbors and SAwtelle
Kent- doesnt want judgment on how we are reacting, only speaking for himself, not a unique situation, we are an advisory board, press the council woman who has more power than NC
Tracy - upzoning is happening all over the city, undue pressure on Sawtele, try to come up with a plan rather than just say no -supports upzoning in one block near bundy
Danielo - timeline/ right now we are collecting feedback, 2025 is the year of decision
Scott - split block recommendation, not happy about it, pitting neighbors against neighbor
Cesar a - cars crashing into our bedrooms and living rooms - keeping it perfect for you at “our expense”
Liz - many people have worked hard to put together the ideas so she challenges others to think creatively
Scott - asks Cesar to NOT roll his eyes at him and please listen, he should identify himself
Pierre - when you sell your house you take the responsibility to whom you sell it

Danieleo - SB9 - you can split your lot in 2, we cannot stop than, better than 6 story, keep them from building high

Summation of Key Points & Statements from Meeting

Individuals, particularly from the Bundy corridor, expressed disappointment and dismay at PLUM and Save Sawtelle for creating an “alternative plan,” that did not include their voices and “sold them out.” Concerns also expressed at what is this plan an alternative to? And if it is an alternative, where is the original plan? Some of these queries were addressed. Many complaints focused on being excluded from this process, and at the PLUM organization and its leadership. Many demanded (from this corridor) that they did not support the alternative proposal and demanded that the alternative proposal be rescinded or reconsidered by the WLANC board.

- Individuals from PLUM, and/or Save Sawtelle organization and/or community members who supported the alternative proposal presented posters and placards, describing their plan and insisting on its efficacy. They wanted Cesar Anugurri to make a presentation or for members to present. However, as this was a listening session, it was encouraged that the board listen and not do the talking, or explaining, or presenting. The purpose of the meeting was listening. Members from Save Sawtelle and/or PLUM also insisted that the process had been conducted fairly, despite numerous comments from community members that the had not been consulted. This assertion had also been made at the January 2024 Board meeting by two individuals who claimed they had scoured the neighborhood and talked to hundreds of individuals. Members from the Bundy corridor, opposing the alternative plan, stated this was not true creating great dissonance. Board members Ron and Alexandra stated that the alternative proposal was the only proposal that could be considered as it provided the only way forward – that there had to be some compromise made, otherwise the city would take over and build and rezone anyway. The tone of the meeting was contentious at times – Members from Save Sawtell presented placards describing their plan and signatories supporting the plan. Some members stated they had supported this plan but their names were posted in support anyway, i.e. Ron of a church located on Sawtelle. Additionally, for the record, a member of Save Sawtelle member contacted the board one day earlier requesting that the listening session meeting be re-scheduled and postponed due to an “equity and diversity issue,” citing a conflict with an event at Kuruvugna Springs, which had begun at 8 AM and ended at 2 PM on that day. Individuals from save Sawtelle demanded that the proposal remain intact. Plum member Cesar stated that densification could lead to vehicles crashing through individuals living rooms. Member Alexandra stated that her mother had suffered severe anxiety and development near her residence had impacted her health.

Individuals supporting the alternative proposal spoke of the WLANC board “destroying” the community and not caring. Others spoke of being “silenced.” It should be pointed

that the board conducted this meeting as a listening session, and as a safe place in which community members could speak. Save Sawtelle members, in particular, spoke of the board not knowing what they are doing and that they were throwing the community members 'under the bus.' Others, from the Bundy area, demanded the opposite – that the board rescind its support of the alternative proposal. Community members cited:
-the proposal needed to be approved
-the proposal needed to be rescinded
-Bundy members felt excluded
-Plum and SAVE SAWTELLE said they had incorporated all feedback and sought feedback
-Some homeowners are very concerned about upzoning and don't want to see their neighborhoods "ruined," or compromised by development, particularly if it occurs where they live
- Some members spoke of their families, a legacy of home ownership (decades of ownership for some), their love of the community, and why "anyone would want to change the beautiful neighborhood I live in and just moved into. I just can't understand it."
-A small group of voices spoke of the importance of providing new homes and units to meet demand and to lower rental costs. Some spoke of the very high cost of living in LA and why the burden of development is not shared across more communities in LA (i.e. Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Pacific Palisades). Some wanted more diverse living options and development to continue in areas to provide additional units.
-Concerns were also expressed regarding the occupancy and vacancy rates – what does the data and actual numbers represent? Is it even true that we need more units or is this an artificially created problem not held up by actual numbers. Some members asked for data and hard numbers.
-To ensure a fair representation of comments, it should be noted that more voices supporting development and additional rental units in WLA spoke at subsequent listening session to support that viewpoint (i.e., August 12 listening session).

ADJOURNMENT TIME 4:00 PM

NOTES:

SENATE BILL 411: In conformity with the October 6, 2023 enactment of California **Senate Bill 411** (Portanitino) an LA City Council approval on November 1, 2023, The Sawtelle Neighborhood Council will be conducted virtually.

AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT: As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, make your request at least 3 business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by contacting the Dept of Neighborhood Empowerment at (213) 978-1551 or **NCsupport@lacity.org** Si requiere servicios de traducción, avisar al Concejo Vecinal 3 días de trabajo (72 horas) antes del evento. Contacte contact@westlasawtelle.org para avisar al Concejo Vecinal.

PUBLIC POSTING OF AGENDA: Neighborhood Council agendas are posted for public review at **Stoner Park 1835 Stoner Ave**, **www.westlasawtelle.org**. You can also receive our agendas via email by subscribing to LA City's Early Notification System **https://www.lacity.org/subscriptions**.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Comments on matters not on the agenda that are within the Board's jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Board is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Board meeting. Public comment is a maximum of 90 seconds per speaker.

PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS: In compliance with Government Codek 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority of the board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at Stoner Park 1835 Stoner Ave, via appt, at website: **www.westlasawtelle.org**, online at **https://tinyurl.com/WLASNC-Board**, or at the meeting. If you want a copy of any record on the agenda, contact James Altuner at: **james@westlasawtelle.org**.

PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST: Requests shall be forwarded to DONE and the City Attorney for guidance in determining compliance with the request. The Board will respond to the person or agency requesting the records in writing, within 10 days of receipt of the request, informing them that their request has been received and forwarded to DONE and the City Attorney to determine compliance. Link **https://recordsrequest.lacity.org/** DONE link **https://empowerla.org/public-records-requests/**

RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCESS: For information on the NC's process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the NC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website **www.westlasawtelle.org**.

SB 411 UPDATES: If a Neighborhood Council has a quorum of board members in a physical location, board members who wish to join the meeting via teleconferencing must adhere to AB 2449 rules and regulations. If a Neighborhood Council does not have a quorum of board members in a physical location, they must adhere to SB 411 rules and regulations.

In the event of a disruption that prevents the eligible legislative body from broadcasting the meeting to members of the public using the call-in option or internet-based service option, or in the event of a disruption within the eligible legislative body's control that prevents members of the public from offering public comments using the call-in option or internet-based service option, the eligible legislative body shall take no further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting via the call-in option or internet-based service option is restored. Actions taken on agenda items during a disruption that prevents the eligible legislative body from broadcasting the meeting may be challenged pursuant to Section 54960.1.

The eligible legislative body shall not require public comments to be submitted in advance of the meeting and shall provide an opportunity for the public to address the legislative body and offer comments in real time.

Notwithstanding Section 54953.3, an individual desiring to provide public comment through the use of an internet website, or other online platform, not under the control of the eligible legislative body, that requires registration to log in to a teleconference may be required to register as required by the third-party internet website or online platform to participate.

(i) An eligible legislative body that provides a timed public comment period for each agenda item shall not close the public comment period for the agenda item, or the opportunity to register, pursuant to subparagraph, to provide public comment until that timed public comment period has elapsed.

(ii) An eligible legislative body that does not provide a timed public comment period, but takes public comment separately on each agenda item, shall allow a reasonable amount of time per agenda item to allow public members the opportunity to provide public comment, including time for members of the public

to register pursuant to subparagraph (D), or otherwise be recognized for the purpose of providing public comment.

(iii) An eligible legislative body that provides a timed general public comment period that does not correspond to a specific agenda item shall not close the public comment period or the opportunity to register, pursuant to subparagraph (D), until the timed general public comment period has elapsed.

PAID REPRESENTATIVES: If you are compensated to monitor, attend, or speak at this meeting, City law may require you to register as a lobbyist and report your activity. See Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 48.01 et seq. More information is available at ethics.lacity.org/lobbying. For assistance, please contact the **Ethics Commission** at (213) 978-1960 or **ethics.commission@lacity.org**