LUED Committee Minutes
Tuesday, October 3, 2017, 6:30 p.m.
Simon Wiesenthal Center, 3rd Floor
1399 S. Roxbury Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90035

I. Call to Order and Roll Call
Krystal Návar called the meeting to order at 6:59 p.m. (Delayed start due to issue with room availability.)

Board Committee Members Present: Ken Blaker, Doug Fitzsimmons, Beth Hirsch, Barry Levine, Jon Liberman, Krystal Návar, Linda Theung

Community Committee Members Present: Ellen Lanet

Committee Members Absent: Michael Bitton, Michoel Bloom, Susan Burden, Steve Chocron, Martin Epstein, Giovanni Ferdinand, Terrence Gomes, Victor Mitry, Marjan Safinia, Charlie Stein

Guests: N/A

II. General Public Comment
a. Carlos Matricardi requested to join the SORO LUED committee. He stated that he has attended the last four meetings and previously ran for an open board seat as Zone 3 representative. Jon asked that he start in the next meeting, given the numerous items in the evening’s meeting. No one on the committee objects to Carlos’s joining. Carlos began his tenure at this meeting but did not vote, as he has not yet taken the required ethics training courses.

b. Ellen: Recommended Madeleine Brand’s Press Play show that aired on October 3 on KCRW on the topic of gentrification.

c. Doug: Announced Great Streets presentation was now live and viewable online.

d. Barry: Invited potential tutors to volunteer at Shenandoah Elementary School. Noted to contact him for more information.

III. Unfinished Business
a. Draft meeting minutes of June 06, 2017 (Theung / LUED100317-1) Jon moved to approve the minutes; Linda seconded. Vote: 8-Y, 0-N, 0-A. Item approved.

b. Draft meeting minutes of July 11, 2017 (Návar / LUED100317-2) July minutes are still in process.

c. Draft meeting minutes of August 08, 2017 (Liberman / LUED100317-3) Jon moved to approve the minutes; Linda seconded. Vote: 8-Y, 0-N, 0-A. Item approved.

IV. New Business
b. Discussion and possible action on proposed addition of one unit to existing 4-unit apartment building at 8617-8619 W. Cashio St. (LUED100317-4)

i. Case number ZA-2017-2268-ZAA
Ellen asked about the side yard and the fire routes in the side yard. She inquired about the possibility of adding more windows. Doug moved that the committee recommend to the board to support the project. Linda seconded. Ellen abstained. Because October’s board meeting is after the project’s hearing date, Doug noted that the developer can let the Zoning Administrator know that the SORO LUED committee supported the project (but not the board, formally). **Vote: 7-Y, 1-N, 0-A. Item approved.**

b. **Discussion and possible action on latest draft of the Exposition Corridor Transit Neighborhood Plan (LUED100317-5)**
   i. **Presentation by Lameese Chang from the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Transit Neighborhood Plans division**

Ellen raised issues about the communication between the Planning Department, the SORO board, and the community. Doug confirmed that the board has reached out to Planning about this project. Jon asked about the single-family houses affected and how they are being compromised. Planning representatives say they are not impacted in this neighborhood plan. Linda asked about how Planning’s plan and CalTrans’ plans for the I-10 on-ramp/off-ramp reconfiguration at Robertson and National will be reconciled. Doug asked for pedestrian connections between the Culver City Expo stop and the SORO neighborhoods. Planning representatives agreed to look into better integrating pedestrians into the plan. Planning representative noted that this is a community plan and not a specific plan. Planning representative was going to look into inserting the pedestrian connection in the purposes of the plan. Presentation is available to the public on www.latnp.org. Community member asked about the impact to side streets. Another community member asked about the impact to Hamilton High School. Another asked about how the plan might impact the parking situation near the Expo line stations and surrounding areas. Ellen proposed studying this further as a committee. Doug said he will send a letter to SORO LUED committee that will start the discussion about points regarding this project. No action taken at this time.

c. **Discussion and possible action on requested Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to construct a Verizon wireless telecommunication facility (cell tower) at 2512 S Robertson Blvd (LUED100317-6).**
   i. **Case number ZA-2017-3013-CUW**
   ii. **Previous request to build cell tower on this lot: Case numbers ZA-2014-4204-CUW and ZA-2014-4204-CUW-1A.**

Verizon presented. Equipment enclosure has been reduced in size; facility dimensions (not tower) are 9’ L x 13’ W x 8’ H.

Elisa Leonelli, nearby resident, asked if the lease is 25 years and how much money Verizon is offering the property owner. Verizon representative said they can’t discuss lease rate and terms. Scott Weintraub, nearby resident, said that even though the fake tree is green and tree-like, it looks ridiculous. He asked why Verizon has returned with this request despite being denied. Verizon representative noted that the current application is a continuation of the existing application. He informed the committee and community members that Verizon was instructed to resubmit their application as part of an ongoing Federal court case in which Verizon is challenging the City’s previous denial of their application and appeals. Jonny Norton, nearby resident, asked for the federal court number. Verizon representative did not know. Grace Kamins, nearby resident, stated her opposition to the project. Tal Grinblat, nearby resident, said that there are no eucalyptus trees in the area and that it doesn’t hide what Verizon is doing. He stated that Verizon reception is not an issue. Verizon representative said that they want to service the area for more customers. Hector Garza, nearby resident, asked what is the standard height for most of these towers and if there are other locations where one is more suitable. Verizon representative
said they need to place the tower in a zone that currently does not have a nearby tower. Member of the public asked if Verizon’s engineers studied other options, stated that there have been developments in technology that allow other ways to cover this area beyond tower. Deni Mosser, nearby resident, read letter stating opposition to the project, noting specifically that the site is absolutely not zoned for the project. As a result, the City of LA should not grant the CUP to Verizon. Aleksander Tamm-Seitz, nearby resident, stated that the project does not conform to any plan—specific or community plan—and that the City should not grant Verizon a CUP. Harry Rosenfeld, nearby resident, stated opposition to the project. James Gierman, nearby resident, stated opposition to the tower. Lisa Barnet, nearby resident, stated opposition to the tower. Sandra Willard, nearby resident, noted that Verizon never asked for community input and said that they just sued the City. Larry DeMers, nearby resident, asked how can the community come together to find a solution; he lives near the tower at 1836 South Robertson. Member of the public asked why Verizon is coming back to the council despite suing the City and asked if the City has a say. Verizon representative said the City of LA and Verizon agreed that Verizon would reapply. Nicholas Sparks asked about the particulars of the base of this tower. Ken asked if the existing tower has been optimized for future technology. Doug moved to request a delay for the hearing to early November in order for the board to consider the issue. Beth seconded. **Vote: 8-Y, 0-N, 0-A. Item approved.**

Doug motioned that the committee recommend opposing the application based on previous Zoning Administrator’s denial of the CUP, citing that it runs contrary to community plans including Great Streets and all surrounding neighborhoods and stakeholders. Jon seconded. **Vote: 8-Y, 0-N, 0-A. Item approved.**

**d. Update, discussion, and possible action on the creation of Business Improvement Districts on Pico, La Cienega, and Robertson.**

Move this to unfinished business for next meeting.

**V. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.