

BHNC Planning & Land Use Committee Minutes
Circa: 2017, July 13th



Start: 6:16pm
End: 7:59pm

Attendance

Present: Jason Gallegos (Chair), Ernesto Hidalgo, Drew Brauer, Dan Morales

Absent: Tyffany Lam

Community: ~12, including Carlos Montes (Board Member)

Item 1: **Welcome and call to order.** [6.16pm]

Item 2: **General Public Comment**

- **Carlos Montes:** 7 – Eleven is opening @ Whittier & Boyle and are circulating a petition to have a liquor license and expresses OPPOSITION to that and requests that the PLUC consider Agendizing the item.
- **Helen Mercado** – Supports Carlos' comments and adds that 7 – Eleven will enter a location without a liquor license request, that a year later they will petition to retain one. And should inform the Councilman.
- **Roselie G.** – Comments on extreme development. Recommend that the PLUC should be in OPPOSITION to any more multi-developments. And let the Councilman know, and hold him accountable.
- **Roselie G.** – Councilman needs to hold a Town Hall Meeting.
- **Christopher Rodriguez** – Was unaware of the Development on Fickett and Chavez and came to this meeting to be more involved.
- **Brigitte Secard (art's district)** – Is looking to work with the BHNC to do a public art & public health event.

Item 3: Review and Discussion of the Current of the PLUC General Policies.

- **Chair** briefly reviewed PLUC policies with Committee Members and the General Public.

Item 4: **Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Minutes for April 13th, 2017**

Motion (Jason/Ernie): to Approve the Minutes for April 13th, 2017

GPC: *None.*

Vote: 1 – Abstain, 0 – No, 3 – Yes, *passed*

Item 5: **Update regarding any previous PLUC Items, or BHNC Actions.**

Chair provide updates on the following Items:

1. **CIS submission record for the 2016 – 2017 year.**
 - (a) 0 Community Impact Statements have been recorded as being submitted by the BHNC.
2. **Dry River Brewery**
 - (a) License was granted
3. **Board of Public Works Tree Removals along Boyle Ave, State St, St. Louis, Soto St.**
 - (a) 77 trees will be removed, 105 will remain.
 1. **Boyle:** 22 will be removed, 60 will remain
 2. **State:** 10 will be removed, 11 will remain
 3. **St Louis:** 25 will be removed, 12 will remain
 4. **Soto:** 23 will be removed, 22 will remain
 - (b) These numbers do not add up to 77 removals
 - (c) Trees will be replaced with 200 "mature" trees, "planted" in 24-inch containers
 1. **Boyle, State & St. Louis** will get: 80 Australian Willows & 80 Lavender Trumpets
 2. **Soto** will get: 20 African Fern Pine & 20 Chinese Pistache
4. **7 – Eleven's requested CUP for beer and wine sales hearing (ZA-2017-130-CUP)** was on June 6th, and is currently on hold until July 14th.

- (a) Zoning Administrator confirmed that the status was on "hold" per the request of 7 – Eleven, and that the BHNC would be able to submit their statement on this item.
1. ZA: "*The applicant has requested to leave the case open til July 14th, to work on mitigating everyone's concerns.*"
5. PlanCheck NC – gave a quick update regarding the up-zoning within the 1/2 mile radii of Goldline Stations.

Item 6: Update from the Transportation & Environment Committee (TEC)

TEC Chair was unable to attend.

Item 7: Call for Nominations to the Planning and Land Use Committee

Chair announced that there were two Community Stakeholder Seats available on the PLUC, and announced the names of current candidates (Patricia Moreno, Arturo Carmona, & Robby Pinnamaneni). Then proceeded to opened the floor for any volunteers.

Respondents: *None.*

Item 8: Discussion and Possible Recommendation of BHNC Liaisons Nominees.

Chair opened the floor for nomination recommendations to the PlanCheck NC, Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance, & Neighborhood Council Emergency Preparation Alliance.

Respondents: *None.*

Item 9: Discussion and Possible Action to Support a Community Impact Statement (CIS) on ARUS.

Presenter: Vince Leus (CoPALM – the Coalition for the Prevention of Alcohol-Related Harms in L.A. Metro)

GPC:

- **Carlos Montes:** Supports
- **Rosalie G:** Absolutely Supports it.
- **Socorro Chacon:** We work closely with Co-Palm and support this.

Committee:

- **Ernie:** Support, we need to come up with verbage.
- **Drew:** Who has been actively opposing it?
 - **Response:** There has not been any opposition submitted to the Council File.
- **Dan:** Yeah, i support it.
- **Jason:** I support it as well. Question: Has the Council File Number changed?
 - **Response:** No.
- **Jason:** Is there a time limit on this?
 - **Response:** We are trying to get the motion agendized in August.

Motion (Ernie/Drew): to support a Draft Letter from CoPalm and issue a CIS draft Statement that reads as follows: "Due to over concentration of alcohol retail locations in the City of Los Angeles, and in low income communities **of color** such as Boyle Heights. The Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council supports the Motion in Council File 17-0117 instructing the Planning Department, in consultation with the City Attorney, to prepare a report on the feasibility of establishing a process to create Alcohol Restricted Use Sub-districts, that would serve to restrict the over-concentration of alcohol retailers in areas of the City where the retail sale of alchohol is negatively impacting neighborhoods and residents."

GPC:

- **Rosalie G:** the term residents of color. It should be just the term community residents, community residents. Not about color.

Committee:

- **Jason:** Does the Committee feel we should remove the term "of color"
- **Ernie, Drew, Dan** confirm that if the community would prefer.

Motion (Jason/Drew): to ammend the language suggested to exclude "of color"

GPC: *None.*

Vote: 0 – Abstain, 0 – No, 4 – Yes, *passed*

Motion (Dan/Jason): to approve as amended

Amended Motion: to support a Draft Letter from CoPalm and issue a CIS draft Statement that reads as follows: "Due to over concentration of alcohol retail locations in the City of Los Angeles, and in low income communities ~~of color~~ such as Boyle Heights. The Boyle Heights Neighborhood Council supports the Motion in Council File 17-0117 instructing the Planning Department, in consultation with the City Attorney, to prepare a report on the feasibility of establishing a process to create Alcohol Restricted Use Sub-districts, that would serve to restrict the over-concentration of alcohol retailers in areas of the City where the retail sale of alcohol is negatively impacting neighborhoods and residents."

GPC: *None.*

Vote: 0 – Abstain, 0 – No, 4 – Yes, *passed*

Item 10: Discussion and Possible Action to Support a Letter Calling for Transparency in the General Plan Update.

Presenter: Coalition to Preserve LA (Jorge Castaneda)

GPC:

- **Rosalie G.:** The Community doesn't know what the Community Plan is. The politicians are going to continue to do what they are doing.
 - **Presenter:** it is possible to combat these Plans.
- **Arturo Carmona:** It is a very sensible request. Question: As it relates to Boyle Heights, when will we see a draft plan, so that we can begin to do an analysis?
 - **Presenter:** The next thing that BH will see is the Draft Environmental Impact Report.
- **Helen :** I do like the presentation. Can it also be presented to other communities?
 - **Presenter:** We are working on a presentation.

Committee:

- **Ernie:** The Mayor's office said that they changed the process to open it up to the public. Are you familiar and can explain the process?
 - **Presenter:** With the assistance of Neighborhood Councils, the City opened up the fourth open-space element as a working group. We don't know if it continued. We guess that they are using the Hollywood Community Plan as an example, giving presentations. And then open it up for discussion.
- **Jason:** The letter that you handed out, is that what you would like us to support?
 - **Presenter:** points out the physical document.
- **Dan:** Are you saying that by law that this process is supposed to be open to the public?
 - **Presenter:** Yes. According to State Law.
- **Dan:** So all the meetings that took place there was no public notice?
 - **Presenter:** Essentially that that was true. 3 meetings were held behind closed doors, to a curated list of experts and consultants. We reached out to those on that list and responded that they did not receive invitations. It is not following the California Guidelines.
- **Ernie:** I support the intent, but I am concerned that the language is a little combative.
- **Dan:** Can we put together our own letter?
- **Jason:** Should we make our own letter?
- **Dan:** I feel we should act on it in calling it to the attention of the PTB, that this be made available to the public to participate.
- **Ernie:** As Mr. Castaneda for clarification, stating there are laws that require these plans to be made available to the public, and to hold public hearings and a prescribed amount of outreach. Specifying the actions the City has taken that the City of LA did was make Working Groups first to prepare what they were going to present to the public. After which the public may comment. That what is being requested here is asking to have more say on who is in the room when these discussions take place. "Is this more accurate than saying that the public was not going to have no say in this at all."
 - **Presenter:** Yes, the Working Groups were to be part of the public input. But the issue is that the working groups were not truly representative. And half of those contacted had no idea.

- **Drew:** Aren't working groups, temporary groups? Are they supposed to be ongoing?
 - **Presenter:** They are ongoing for each of the elements that have not been updated.
- **Drew:** What law is being broken?
 - **Presenter:** It is not in the letter.
- **Dan:** I am for the Transparency. But at this point, after the comments. I am not in a position to move forward with the letter?
- **Jason:** Is this time sensitive?
 - **Presenter:** yes, as meetings are occurring without community input. Is for adjustments to the language.

Motion (Ernie/Dan): to review the letter and draft a letter that captures the spirit of this letter that proposes transparency and inclusion and further outreach to stakeholders and bring it back to the PLUC at our next meeting.

GPC: *None.*

Vote: 0 – Abstain, 0 – No, 4 – Yes, *passed*

Item 11: **Discussion and Possible Action to create a Standing Rule Governing the Facilitation of the PLUC.**

Motion (Jason/Dan): to table the item until the next Committee Meeting.

GPC: *None.*

Vote: 0 – Abstain, 0 – No, 4 – Yes, *tabled*

Item 12: **Open Discussion on Possible Agenda Items for Future Land Use Meetings.**

Request for a PLUC meeting on Excide

Item 13: **Announcements**

Item 14: **Adjournment [7.59pm]**

Motion (Jason/Drew): to adjourn.

GPC: *None.*

Vote: 0 – Abstain, 0 – No, 4 – Yes, *adjourned @ 7.59pm*