LUED Committee Minutes  
Tuesday, August 2, 2016 6:30pm  
Simon Wiesenthal Center, 3rd Floor  
1399 S. Roxbury Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90035

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Krystal Návar called the meeting to order at 6:35pm.

Board Committee Members Present: Ken Blaker, Sue Burden, Doug Fitzsimmons, Terrence Gomes, Barry Levine, Ellen Lanet, Jon Liberman, Krystal Navar, Charlie Stein, Aimee Zeitzer

Community Committee Members Present: Linda Theung

Committee Members Absent: Michael Bitton, Michoel Bloom, Martin Epstein, Giovanni Ferdinand, Victor Mitry, Marjan Safinia

Guests:

II. General Public Comment

Community members present introduced themselves. In attendance were the following individuals:

Carol Eisner, Crestview resident
Jonathan Kim, Crestview resident
Chris Klatman, Crestview resident
Ellen Lanet, Beverlywood resident
Mark Miner (sp?), Crestview resident
Deni Mossier, Reynier Village resident
Grace Kamins, Beverlywood resident
Marilyn Schneider, Beverlywood resident
Nancy, Beverlywood resident
Steve Teitsor (sp?), Crestview resident

Deni Mosser read a letter expressing displeasure at the Community Impact Statement (CIS) that was presented to the SoRo Board on July 21, 2016. Mosser stated that it was particularly egregious that religion was brought up as a statement in the CIS defending an exception to part of the BMO.

Grace Kamins said it was unfortunate that the CIS was passed by the board. She also stated that religion should not have been brought up as an attempt to divide the community.

Marilyn Schneider stated that the CIS, with the six exceptions to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO), eviscerated the bill as it was going to the City Council. She said that it was unfortunate that religion was brought up; separation of church and state should have been honored per the First Amendment.

Chris Klatman said the CIS is so far askew from what the community is aiming toward. Suggested SoRo take the statement down.

Carol Eisner said that she originally asked for the CIS based on what other communities have done with their respective CISs. She questioned why the Crestview signatures weren’t reflected in the CIS. Eisner calls for the immediate
rescinding and nullification of the CIS, as it does not reflect the people here and the people in the community who have been involved in the process.

Jonathan Kim expressed that the religious exception was not appropriate.

Mark Miner stated that the religious exception was serious and should not be a path that we go on.

Eisner mentioned a letter from Sandy Block (?) that was distributed. She asked why the letter was not reflected the CIS.

[Unidentified] mentioned that the small group at the meeting represents about 50 people living in Crestview. He said that this collective represents more people than who can be present at the meeting.

[Unidentified] stated zoning changes betrays the trust of the person who originally bought the property with the understanding of the circumstances of the adjacent zoning.

Ellen Lanet made public comment, abdicating her participation as a board member in this meeting to do so. She stated that the CIS should have been vetted by the Land Use and Economic Development Committee (LUED) before it went to the SoRo board. She is against the CIS.

Eisner stated that there is “consensus” and there is a “poll” about the neighborhood’s sentiments on this issue.

Klatman stated that Crestview collected about 160 signatures, which represent over 50 percent of the Crestview neighborhood. He stated that CIS does not represent the community.

### III. Old Business

**a. Update on creation of a Business Improvement District for Pico**

This item has been on the agenda for a while. Gomes: Working group meeting on August 10. BID working committee comprises Michoel Bloom and Jonathan Brand.

**b. Update and discussion of possible action of potential lawsuit by Verizon challenging zoning administrator’s ruling prohibiting erection of cell-phone tower at 2512 Robertson Boulevard.** Issue would no longer be discussed. Fitzsimmons noted that it is inappropriate to comment on potential litigation. Stein suggested tabling the issue.

### IV. New Business

**a. Nomination and election of Land Use Officer (Secretary)**

Linda Theung volunteers. Liberman moves to nominate and approve Theung by acclamation. All in favor.

**b. Discussing and possible action on draft ordinance of Department of City Planning regulating short-term rentals such as AirBnB.**

There was a draft CIS prepared by board member Adam Rich (not present). Rich asked Stein to speak on behalf of Rich. Proposed ordinance regulates home sharing; to some degree, it allows AirBnB (with exceptions) to operate in the city. Rich reviewed the draft ordinance and drafted a CIS.
Public comment: Mosser remarked on the fact that there is no proper way for neighborhoods to enforce home sharing rules per neighborhood.

Schneider stated that it would be helpful if there were two backgrounders, covering the following questions: What’s the city asking for? What are SoRo’s issues in regard to this issue? Remarked that the draft CIS is misleading.

[Unidentified] Couple engage in home sharing. Stated that it is an alternative source of income, especially for seniors who have property.

Fitzsimmons said that this issue has been in community for years. SoRo has had at least four meetings where home sharing has been a subject of discussion. Provided history of SoRo’s involvement in this topic. October 2015, SoRo passed motions stating what the neighborhood council wanted out of the home sharing ordinance. City adopted majority of them. City is close to passing it.

Move to permanently table this motion: Gomes, Fitzsimmons. Liberman proposed an ad hoc committee to revisit the issue, essentially referring Rich’s draft CIS to a working group to see how this draft looks vis-à-vis the existing CIS.

Motion in favor to form a working group to review the proposed motion as it relates to the existing motion that has already been passed (and any need to change position). Would report back to LEUD committee: 4 votes (passed).

c. Approve minutes from previous meeting
Move to approve minutes at the next meeting.

V. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 8:35pm.