

## BOARD MEMBERS

**PRESIDENT**  
Michael Greenwald

**VICE PRESIDENT**  
Ray Pollak

Brian Allen  
Alfredo Castillo  
Chris Coyle  
Berj Demirjian  
Kyle Ellis  
Sid Gold  
Bill Hopkins  
Wayde Hunter  
Oscar Jimenez

Rahim Kazi  
Ralph Kroy  
Dave Parikh  
Skylar Rose  
Jan Subar  
Andres Topete  
Joe Vitti  
Keren Waters

## CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CA



**Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council  
Executive Committee Monthly Meeting  
Tuesday October 3, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.  
GHNNC Office, 11139 Woodley Avenue,  
Granada Hills, CA 91344**

## GRANADA HILLS NORTH NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

11139 Woodley Avenue  
Granada Hills, CA

Tel: (818) 923-5592

[www.GHNNC.org](http://www.GHNNC.org)

**All agenda items are subject to discussion and possible Board action**

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items (limited to two (2) minutes).
3. Formulate 11/6/2018 Board Meeting Agenda
  - A. Executive Committee
  - B. Treasurer Report
    1. Motion to approve the September 2018 MER.
    2. Budget Advocates Report.
    3. Update on the new Equity funding program for N.C.'s.
  - C. Planning and Land Use Committee
    1. Motions attached.
  - D. Citywide Issues Committee
  - E. Outreach and Publicity Committee
    1. Motion to approve up to \$750 for the Docu Shred Event 12/8/18 and up to \$750 for the event.
    2. Motion to approve two Town-hall Meetings: 1) for NC Election Preparation. The town-hall will be hosted by GHNNC Outreach with NC Election Board. 2) Townhall for community feedback of traffic concerns in and around Granada Hills. Request approval for up to \$250 per event for refreshments.
    3. Motion to approve NPG for up to \$2500 for Granada Hills Holiday Parade.
  - F. Public Safety Committee
    1. Motion to the LADOT and CD12 that signs reading "No Left Turns 4-7 PM except Saturday and Sunday" be placed on the following feeder streets where they intersect the west side of Balboa Blvd: Westbury Dr., Lisette St., Tennyson Pl., Orozco St., Sesnon Blvd., and Timber Ridge Dr. Also one sign reading "No Right Turns 4-7 PM except Saturday and Sunday" be placed on Woodley Ave. where it intersects the east side of Balboa Blvd.
  - G. Emergency Preparedness
  - H. Board member Comment on Non-Agenda Items
  - I. Adjournment

Time allocations for agenda items are approximate and may be shortened or lengthened at the discretion of the Chairperson.

The public is requested to fill out a "Speaker Card" to address the Board on any agenda item before the Board takes an action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing 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 limited to 2 minutes per speaker, unless waived by the presiding officer of the Board.

The agendas for the GHNNC meetings are posted for public review at the GHNNC Office (11139 Woodley Ave), as well as on the GHNNC's official website at [www.GHNNC.org](http://www.GHNNC.org). Stakeholders may also subscribe to the City of Los Angeles Early Notification System (ENS), through the City's website at [www.lacity.org](http://www.lacity.org), to receive notices for GHNNC meetings. For more information, you may also contact GHNNC, at 818 923-5592.

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, assisted listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business days (72-hours) prior to the meeting by contacting the Neighborhood Council Project Advocate at (213) 978-1551.

In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all members of the Board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at the Neighborhood Council meeting or on the Neighborhood Council website at [www.GHNNC.org](http://www.GHNNC.org). In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact the Council, at 818 923-5592 or email [info@ghnnc.org](mailto:info@ghnnc.org).

SI REQUIERE SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION, FAVOR DE NOTIFICAR AL CONCEJO VECINAL 3 DÍAS DE TRABAJO (72 HORAS) ANTES DEL EVENTO. SI NECESITA ASISTENCIA CON ESTA NOTIFICACION, POR FAVOR CONTACTE A GHNNC, at 818 923-5592.

### RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE

For information on the Process for Reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matter related to this Council, please consult the GHNNC Bylaws by visiting [www.GHNNC.org](http://www.GHNNC.org) or visiting the GHNNC, at 818 923-5592.

### **Motions from the October 24, 2018 PLUM Committee**

- (1) [*Council File No. 12-0460*] Motion to oppose the Department of City Planning's October 11, 2018, proposed process overhaul unless amended to include all of the following changes:

The Department of City Planning's complete dismissal of the concerns raised by community members about the notification process to Neighborhood Councils demonstrates a fundamental disregard the Department of City Planning has for Neighborhood Councils as advisory bodies. This aloofness is further demonstrated by the complete absence of Neighborhood Councils in the proposed regulations, even when the use of Neighborhood Councils in their advisory capacity would be both appropriate and beneficial to the planning process.

Specifically, GHNNC disagrees with the Department of City Planning's analysis on page 26 of their report and their determination that the early notification system and the mailed notice is sufficient to notify Neighborhood Councils of all relevant projects within their areas of responsibility. Mailed notifications almost always arrive too late for a Neighborhood Council to take action due to the fact that committee meetings and board meetings are usually held on a monthly basis, making the turn-around typically take two full months. Together with the arbitrary release schedule for early notification updates, the early notification system often hides projects relevant to communities by improperly designating the relevant neighborhood where the project is located, and by requiring Board members to read through every single project in the City in order to try to find projects that are relevant to their particular Neighborhood Council. Neighborhood Councils require substantially different notification in order to effectively communicate with their communities and seek stakeholder feedback on proposed projects. GHNNC suggests that the Department of City Planning change their notification system to Neighborhood Councils and provide additional and different notification to Neighborhood Councils than is currently provided. One suggestion would be to implement direct communications by City project managers to Planning and Land Use Committee chairs and vice chairs via phone or email, when a new project is received by the project manager as part of the ordinary bureaucratic process.

As to the other matter, GHNNC refers the City Council to pages 28-29 (Section 56), 36-37 (Section 74), 49 (Section 91), 50 (Section 93), 68 (Section 95, X., 14, b), 73 (Section 95, X., 19, b, 2), 75 (Section 95, X., 22), 109-10 (Section 154, G., 2), and 123 (Section 176, E.) as a non-exhaustive list of examples where the Department of City Planning could have incorporated the Neighborhood Council advisory function into the proposed code amendments in an appropriate and beneficial manner, but failed to do so. As the City Council is aware, the purpose of Neighborhood Councils is to "have an advisory role on issues of concern to the neighborhood" (City Charter, Art. IX, Sec. 900). The sections of the proposed amendments referred to in this paragraph all relate to considerations that the Department of City Planning has to make about the compatibility of proposed projects with the scale and character of the surrounding community. Unelected employees of the Department of City Planning have no legitimate basis for making determinations about the character of a

community absent significant input from members of the community or their elected representatives, i.e. without the advice of the relevant Neighborhood Council.

Accordingly, the Department of City Planning should be required to seek the advice of the Neighborhood Council when they are obligated to consider character of the community. Specifically, they should be required to request feedback from the Neighborhood Council on the following considerations: (1) whether a project is in the substantial interest to the community; (2) whether a project is designed to match or contribute to the aesthetics of the community; (3) whether a project alters or changes the existing uses of the development site in a manner that conflicts with or divides the community; (4) whether a project is designed to meet the needs of the communities existing and future residents; (5) whether a project would accommodate a broad range of uses that serve the needs of adjacent residents and promote neighborhood activity; and (6) whether a project is adequately served by City services, including access to parks, recreation, public transportation, police, and fire services. These are all considerations that a Neighborhood Council is well placed to offer substantial and constructive advice, and which an employee of the Department of City Planning is unable to consider in any meaningful manner absent such advice. To the extent that the straw-man argument is raised regarding how such a requirement would delay projects if the Neighborhood Council fails to respond or grant Neighborhood Councils a veto power over projects, the City Council should note that the simple solution to such a trivial problems is to give Neighborhood Councils a timeline for completing such comments – say three (3) months from when the Department solicits the Neighborhood Council’s advice – and keep the ultimate decision-making authority vested with the Department of City Planning.

In conclusion, Neighborhood Councils should play an active advisory role in the land use and development of their communities, and the proposed changes to the code do not provide Neighborhood Councils with the opportunity to exercise their obligation under the City Charter to have an advisory role in these project. Therefore, GHNNC opposes the changes to the City’s Zoning laws unless they are amended to ameliorate the concerns raised herein.

(2) [Council File No. 13-1493-S5] Motion to re-submit GHNNC’s street vending proposal, dated September 27, 2017, together with the further amendments related to opt-in/opt-out dated December 05, 2017, and May 01, 2018. Specifically, GHNNC re-submits the following recommendations:

- 1) Street vending should be prohibited on all purely residential streets absent the residents of the street ‘opting-in’ to allow street vending to occur on their street;
- 2) Prior to the City issuing a permit, any applicant seeking a permit should be required to submit to a review and obtain an opinion from the Neighborhood Council(s) from the neighborhood(s) where they seek to engage in vending activities;
- 3) There should be a process for the local Neighborhood Council(s) to be able to recommend to the permitting agency: (a) conditions on the hours of operation, (b) conditions on the location(s) in which the applicant may

- conduct business within the neighborhood, and (c) conditions on the types of products they may vend;
- 4) Prior to a permit-holder being issued a renewal for an existing permit, the permit-holder should be required to return to the local Neighborhood Council(s) and obtain another opinion under the same conditions as for new applications;
  - 5) There should be different lengths of time that a permit can be valid prior to requiring a renewal depending on whether food is being sold at the location: (a) permits for the sale of non-food (products-only) should be able to be approved for a period of either one-year, two-years, or three-years; and (b) permits for the sale of food and non-food products, or only food, should be renewed every year;
  - 6) There should be different categories of permit for street vendors that will primarily sell their food and/or products: (a) at a stationary location, or (b) in a manner that is non-stationary (*i.e.* using handcarts, at multiple temporary locations, using trucks, *et cetera*);
  - 7) An applicant seeking a permit for a stationary location should be required to submit a plan that describes: (a) the proposed location of their merchandise, (b) their plan for any deliveries or drop-offs, (c) the proposed locations of any signs, and (d) how their proposed location will permit the free flow of (i) foot traffic, and (ii) automobile traffic;
  - 8) Any permits issued for a non-stationary street vendor should specifically delineate the boundaries within which they are permitted to vend;
  - 9) No permit for a stationary street vending location should be issued within 100 feet of a single-family residence or a school;
  - 10) Non-stationary street vendors should be barred from selling anything (food or products) within 100 feet of a school;
  - 11) After obtaining an opinion by the local Neighborhood Council(s), and prior to the issuance of any permit, the agency in charge of the permitting process should review the application for compliance with all relevant laws and deny the applicant if the applicant is not in full compliance;
  - 12) The agency in charge of the permitting process should take the opinion of the local Neighborhood Council(s) into consideration when determining whether to grant or deny a permit;
  - 13) The City should not set minimums on the number of permits the agency in charge of the permitting process should be required to approve;
  - 14) If an applicant seeks a permit with a component that includes the on-site preparation of food, the Department of Health & Safety and the agency in charge of the permitting process should review the application for compliance with all relevant food-handling laws and deny the applicant if the applicant is not in full compliance;
  - 15) Depending on the types of food or products that an applicant seeks to vend, the applicant should be required to demonstrate compliance with any of the following on an as-needed basis: a Food Handling Certificate, FTB Resale License, Los Angeles County Health permit, and compliance with relevant federal, state, or local statutes, ordinances, or regulations;

- 16) Upon receipt of a permit, the permitted street vendor should be required to openly and visibly post their permit during all hours they are engaged in vending, including setting up and tearing down a stationary location;
  - 17) The permit should clearly and visibly list: (a) hours of operation, (b) the location(s) in which they may engage in business, and (c) the types of products they may vend;
  - 18) Failure to adhere to the permitting, display, or operational limitations and requirements should lead to incrementally more severe punishments, including but not limited to: (a) impounding of any products on offer by a non-compliant vendor, (b) a fine that can incrementally increase, and (c) up to 6 months in jail for egregious violations or repeated violations by the same person(s).
- (3) [*Council File No. 18-0911*] Motion to support the development and publication of a directory of affordable housing units made publically available to the public. Additionally recommend that the City authorize renters of units to have a right to file a claim in court to enforce affordable rental units in the building where they reside. Further, GHNNC recommends that the City incorporate any such database in a mapping directory such as Zimas.
- (4) [*Council File No. 18-0002-S124*] Motion to support the City's resolution that encourages the State Legislature to mandate that the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration develop a universal standard for the integration of an address-specific formula into all online retail tax software, and that the state enact legislation that expands the current registration requirement that all online retailers use certified tax software that meets this standard.
- (5) [*Council File No. 18-0932*] Motion to support if amended to modify Article 4 of the "responsibilities and tasks to be performed" in order to include a requirement that Consultants should demonstrate substantive attempts to solicit feedback from Neighborhood Councils within whose boundaries the task is performed & surrounding Neighborhood Councils, and incorporate any feedback from Neighborhood Councils into their environmental analyses. Specifically, to the extent the consultant's tasks requires evaluation of whether any proposals require evaluation of the character of the community, contractors should solicit feedback from Neighborhood Councils on: (1) whether a project is in the substantial interest to the community; (2) whether a project is designed to match or contribute to the aesthetics of the community; (3) whether a project alters or changes the existing uses of the development site in a manner that conflicts with or divides the community; (4) whether a project is designed to meet the needs of the communities existing and future residents; (5) whether a project would accommodate a broad range of uses that serve the needs of adjacent residents and promote neighborhood activity; and (6) whether a project is adequately served by City services, including access to parks, recreation, public transportation, police, and fire services.
- (6) [*Council File No. 18-0002-S125*] Motion to support City's position of 'opposed unless amended' regarding the High Speed Rail Authority's preferred S-14 route, where the City opposes the current plan and requests the authority move the Sun Valley portion of the route underground.

- (7) [*Council File No. 14-1635-S2*] Motion to support if amended to clarify that the home sharing ordinance expressly does not include rental property that is rented out on a month-to-month basis, as there is concern that the language of '30 days' may inadvertently be interpreted to include month-to-month rental arrangements.