

# Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council



Sherman Oaks Neighborhood Council

Land Use Committee

February 16, 2012

Minutes

Present: Ron Ziff, Chair, Alicia Bartley, Craig Buck, Jackie Campbell, Robert Cohen, Jackie Diamond, Art Fields, Arthur Hutchinson, Jeff Kalban, Mikie Maloney. Guest: Jill Barad.

1. Call to order at 6:30 pm
  2. Roll Call
  3. Minutes approved as presented
  4. Electeds and staff presented: Karo Torrosian from CD2.
  5. Public Forum: none
  6. Chair's Report
- River Ordinance passed by Planning Commission on Feb 9. Will impose landscaping and design requirements on about 70,000 properties in the ordinance area. Ron spoke in opposition.

- DWP approved less expensive option to cover Upper Stone Canyon Reservoir in Sherman Oaks. Ron spoke in support of that option.
- Appeal of an application for a beer and wine license at car wash in Sherman Oaks went before South Valley Area Planning Commission, which approved the appeal. LUC, SONC and ZA had previously approved project – with conditions.
- Motion by LUC on Metro’s Van Nuys Blvd. transportation corridor was returned by SONC for more information.

7. Returning Business: Discussion and possible motion on Il Villaggio Toscano.

- Introduction of Working Group: Ron Ziff, chair, Alicia Bartley, Bob Cohen, Jeff Kalban and Mikie Maloney. Chair read Findings and Recommendations of the Working Group. (See attached.)
- Applicant presented project in current iteration (413 multi-family apartments (from 500) and 55,000 sq feet of commercial. Height 75 feet at front (instead of 100 feet at street as originally proposed). Works back to 100 feet. Progresses from 4 stories at Sepulveda, followed by 6 story buildings, followed by 8 story buildings at rear of property. (Originally 100 feet at sidewalk and throughout project.) 1273 parking spaces – all on-site. Asking for Specific Plan exceptions: FAR 2.9:1 instead of 1.5:1); Height to 100 ft instead of 75 feet. DOT-mandated traffic mitigation fee of \$300,000. Transit-oriented project. LEED certified. Retail now pedestrian-friendly with arcade frontage. Some green open space visible from street level.
- Applicant presented list of Voluntary Conditions (See attached.) in response to Working Group’s concerns and Working Group’s Findings and Recommendations.
- Comments from the public were extensive:
- **Pro:** Sight is an eyesore and needs improving. Community needs revitalizing. Business will be helped. Funds will come into the community. Project residents can walk to work, shopping, dining. Local residents will walk to the retail component. Jobs will result from construction, operation of the complex, and retail uses. Perfect area for this height and density. Galleria will be a natural, walkable destination. This will provide a beautiful center for Sherman Oaks. Cutting edge project speaks well for the community. LEED building. Transit-oriented.
- **Con:** Traffic is a nightmare already, with cars backed up to Oxnard on Sepulveda in the am. Residents of complex will not be able to get out of Camarillo. Residents across

Sepulveda will be inundated with cross traffic. Too large; violates Specific Plan; vacates 2 city streets previously used for parking. Even against the freeway, 100 feet is too high. Too dense for the site. Green space lacking. Traffic management plans are not defined. Who administers the \$300K? What are the traffic mitigations? Concern about construction vehicles and haul routes. EIR review? Will these stay as apartments? Concern about keeping the units rented. Concern that project will not be monitored carefully by the City.  
Unfriendly to residents nearby.

- Committee Questions to Applicant:
  1. How will the proposed Transportation Management Organization be funded once the set-up funds from PIA fees run out? From the business groups that participate in it.
  2. Construction schedule? 20 – 24 months.
  3. Haul Routes? Not in residential areas.
  4. Is the public green courtyard real public space? Yes, open to the public Can project be made less dense and more open space added to make up for the congestion it will bring? Probably not, cannot fix the traffic issues of the last 35 years.
  5. How is this pedestrian serving? Retail uses negate need to drive for services. Additionally, Galleria and area retail are in walking distance.
  6. Working Group did not have enough time to study applicant's Voluntary Conditions delivered that day, but did have questions about the Transportation Management details and the difference funding sources identified for community benefit. Working Group will work with applicant to get details.
  7. Thank you for your presentation. Would have liked handouts to accompany it.

- LUC Committee Discussion:
  1. Thanks to the Working Group for all your hard work.
  2. Why do you feel this is too dense? Not enough space around buildings. Too large, too tall, too much for that space.

-

- Additional Discussion:
  1. *Jeff Kalban moved to ask the developer to return with a project in compliance with the Specific Plan with a FAR of 1.5:1; step up to 100 feet in height; and make a donation of a 27,000 square foot public park (accessible from the public right-of-way) in exchange for the 2 public streets being vacated for the project. Jackie Diamond seconded. Committee discussion followed. Bob was concerned about dictating donation of a park to a developer. Art Fields felt it was premature and perhaps draconian, and suggested the Working Group*

meet again and that this motion be tabled until the next LUC meeting. Craig Buck supports the Specific Plan, but thinks this project might be a fit for this property. Bob Cohen does not see the proposed vacated streets as an asset, but Jeff feels it is only right to get something back for the community.

2. *Bob moved that the motion on the floor from Jeff Kalban be tabled until the next LUC meeting. Second by Craig. Motion to table initial motion passed 7 to 2.* Ron Ziff sent the initial motion back to the Working Group to reconsider. He also asked for a written response from the Working Group to the Voluntary Conditions.

8. Announcements: none

9. Adjournment: 9:15 pm.

10. Next Meeting, March 15 at 6:30 pm at the S.O./East Valley Senior Center.

Respectfully Submitted

Mikie Maloney

February 29, 2012