

Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council



"1. Meeting was called to Order at 6:34 p.m.

In attendance: Chairperson, Larry Slade, Vice-Chairman, Richard Mayer, Jackie Diamon, Jeff Kalban, Mikie Malone, Jackie Campbell, richard Gauthier, Kenny Gerston, Ex-Officio. Bob Cohen was excused.

2. 13845-13849 Moorpark Street, Presenter: Charles Hefner, architect.

This is a follow-up presentation to provide additional information.

Planting of trees directly into the ground in three foot square sections.

Retaining wall with 3 ft walway and security lightling at grade.

15 ft planting projecting out to property line from rear of building.

the stairs were adjusted.

Front grade 2% from garage to street.

Twelve rental units.

Scaled down building mass on rear side of project to accommodate residential neighbors.

Time for completion of project approximately six months.

Will be breaking ground in late summer.

COMMITTEE MOTION:

Move to approve 13845-12849 Moorpark Street in concept with the condition that petitioner returns to committee with their ""Plan Check Submittal"" for review and approval by the LUC before the Dept. Of Building and Safety signs off.

This motion was made by Rick Mayer and seconded by Jeff Kalban.

Public comment:

None noted. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. This item will come up for vote at the regular scheduled Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council Meeting January 10th, at Millikan Middle School in the Library. You will need to be present.

Item 3 4827 Sepulveda Boulevard

PRESENTERS M DAVID PAUL, PAUL W. KRUEGER

This project was before the LUC one year ago for comments. We are here tonight to show what the concept is and to get a basic idea of the issues to be addressed. We held a scoping meeting for the EIR approximately two weeks ago.

Site is located at Northwest corner of Camarillo Street and Sepulveda Blvd.

Five acres total in this project.

Current zoning designation are requested.

There is an exception to the Specific Plan height of 75 ft (asking for 96 ft).

Proposing mixed use structure.

55,000 sq ft retail space below 500 apartments to be built to condo specifications.

Rentals to be priced at upper end market value.

On site parking in separate areas for retail (250 spaces) and residential (2 1/2 spaces per unit.)

Residential parking entrances at north and west sides of project.

Ground floor retail facing Sepulveda and Camarillo Streets

South of project, Sherman Oaks Galleria's parking structure.

CURRENT STATUS OF PROPOSED SITE:

Abandoned 6 story office building, empty since 1994 earthquake, city giving credit to owner not to demolish till redeveloped. Small apartment building in use. Several single family homes - rented.

Open space with trees.

Developers proposal:

The entire project will be built on a structural deck that covers the total five acres, with the exception of the private roadway that bands the rear of the property. There will be 2 stories of retail below 6 stories of residential space. (8 stories) Developer requesting vacation of Peach Street and La Maida Street. Guest parking provided off of Camarillo Street. Lobby access of Camarillo Street. Entrance for retail stores is off Sepulveda Blvd. and Camarillo Street. Theme courtyard includes pool and clubhouse. Access from the Project to S.O. Galleria is on the Sepulveda and Camarillo Streets. No traffic study was presented.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

What are the existing (Q) conditions?

Did you submit alternate plans for this site as part of your EIR procedures/

What could be built on this site under current zoning designations?

We would like to study the traffic plan. This is already a very congested area of our community..

The loss of open space and greenery will have a negative impact.

The "green open space" in your proposed plan is not visible to the community.

There are freeway ramps adjacent to this project, have you worked with any Government agencies on traffic matters with respect to this project?

Traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. in the area of this proposal is currently at a stand still during high volume a.m. and p.m. times. Increasing the density of this site will add to this congestion and spill over into the side streets.

You are talking about tenants walking to and from work along Sepulveda Blvd, yet you are requesting only a 5 foot set back. I wish you would take a more serious look at the aspect of the sidewalk.

Are you allowing for a turn around at the end of Camarillo Street?

We would like to see a scale back of the project, giving more room to added landscaping along the edges. There has been a forest of trees in this area and they add a buffer from the freeway.

Consider advancing your perception of the pedestrian environment by making a stronger connection to the boulevard with a wider sidewalk and amenities.

There has been no study of the streetscape plan in this project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS;

I don't believe the developers are fully aware of the traffic all around this project between 7:00 and 10:30 am.

The environmental impact on this community is great.

The neighborhood east of Sepulveda Blvd. is still experiencing parking problems from the Galleria. We have worked with Wendy Greuel's Council Office for over two years. We see no solutions in sight.

This is the same traffic engineering firm that worked with the Galleria, and we know they have not solved the problems from the past. We can't think they will do any better now.

As a neighbor who walks my dog both mornings and evenings and see other neighbors out also, we enjoy the quaintness of this community: all without curbs. We know your project will bring your tenants here to share this quaintness also. We feel that is unfair to our single family residents.

We may need to shut off the side streets to prevent people from using these streets to get around the stopped traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. This will also preserve the identity of our neighborhood.

I am a homeowner in Encino as well as a member of Encino's Neighborhood Council, and I have spent 3 1/2 years on the Ventura Specific Plan. Both the N C of Encino and the Homeowners Association takes a strong adversary position on this project. I feel we need to use the Specific Plan as the base and reduce the density from there. I would hope our Council Offices would endorse this idea.

How many truckloads will be needed to remove the dirt just to start this project? This looks like a too large project for the area with existing traffic problems.

Leaving a vacant building ten years is not a responsible attitude for someone who wants to see us a "better community" now.

We are working in the dark, we don't know what City of L. A. Dept. of Transportation and all the experts will advise on the environmental concerns.

Access to all freeways in all directions with the present traffic is not good.

PRESENTER RESPONSE:

We recognize the importance of landscaping and trees. We have worked with Caltrans for the past three years. Caltrans has taken the right of way next to our property to allow for freeway widening improvements. In doing so they have developed a 12 ft sound wall along the freeway adjacent to our site and a 14 ft retaining wall from our grade. West and North of our project is a 26 ft high wall. We purposely designed our retail portion of this development to match that height. We put the residential component up above these wall. We didn't want them staring into a cavern or looking down on a wall. We are trying to be sure to meet the requirements for condo development. As designed, this landscaping would only be seen from the freeway and our residential units.

The vehicle exit on the north side of this project, (on to Sepulveda) will be a "right turn only" exit.

I don't think people will walk north under the freeway. The main walking traffic will come out of our project and toward the Galleria.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

We are tabling this project. We will see this proposal again before it will come to a vote. Our intention tonight was to start to inform the community. Thank you for your presentation.

ITEM 4 Discussion: Guidelines for LUC involvement

COMMITTEE COMMENTS:

The following is a document developed by Tom Krutsch for committee review and consideration:

Consider Land Use and Planning Committee involvement when:

1. There is know to be discretionary land use action required.
2. There is a departure from existing or customary zoning or land use practice (Whether or not discretionary action by the City is required to allow the departure.)
3. Stakeholders have made good faith efforts to resolve the matter using other means but have been rebuffed or thwarted, or where there is no other apparent or effective City means by which to resolve the issue.
4. The issue or project will have a significant effect on a neighborhood. (As opposed to an impact on a single adjoining property, for example), whether or not discretionary action is required by the City.
5. All large projects.
6. Large group neighborhood concerns.

COMMITTEE CONCERNS:

1. We need to get better notification on the front end of this process.
2. The manpower to review all the projects.
3. On the back end are the plans approved the same as construction plans
4. We acknowledge there are always some changes to every plan.
5. There is a need to be aware of all the applications in Sherman Oaks and then we can review these to pick the ones that get total community and LUC's extended study.
6. To simplify - ""buy right"" should not pre-conclude LUC from getting involved. ""Buy right"" is only after all the City's Departments have approved the project.
7. Developers must take the test to prove they are truly a ""buy right"" project. LUC is part of this testing procedure.
8. Proposal can only be thoroughly reviewed with complete plans
9. LUC needs to stamp plans to show the Department of Building and Safety these are the plans that are approved by the Neighborhood Council.

COMMITTEE ACTION;

Discussion tabled.

ITEM 5 APPROVAL OF MINUTES 11-15-04

The minutes are approved as corrected.

ITEM 6 NEXT MONTH'S AGENDA

to be arranged

ITEM 7 COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE:

LUC MEETING LOCATION

LUC will continue scheduled meetings at the Sherman Oaks Library. The Library is the safest and friendliest for developers, community and the committee with the expense of \$120/00 to

extend our meeting beyond the 8:00 p.m. library closing time.

ITEM 8 PUBLIC COMMENT""

None noted

ITEM 9 GOOD AND WELFARE

None noted

Item 10

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Mary Ann Bryson

Entered June 3, 2005

"