

## Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council



## Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee Meeting

**March 2, 2010**

Approved by the Committee  
April 5, 2010

### MINUTES

#### Call to Order

A duly noticed meeting of the Land Use Committee of the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council (“GWNC”) was held on Tuesday, March 2, 2010, at the Wilshire United Methodist Church, 4350 Wilshire Blvd., Committee Chair James Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

#### Roll Call & Approval of Minutes

Committee member Elizabeth Fuller called the roll. Committee members in attendance at the roll call were: Yigal Arens, Elizabeth Fuller, Charles Dougherty, James Wolf, Rudy Gintel, John Gresham, Rudy Gintel and Michael Genewick. Committee member Patricia Lombard joined the meeting later. Committee members Patti Carroll and Cindy Chvatal were absent.

Ms. Fuller stated that a quorum was present.

Ms. Fuller presented the minutes of the last meeting. Committee Member Mike Genewick moved they be approved as written. Committee Member John Gresham seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously.

#### Old Business

Cell Phone Tower at 535 S. Gramercy – Stakeholder Henrietta Cosentino reported that this application, for a cell phone tower on an historical landmark building, was originally denied in October. The applicant appealed in December and its case rests on a letter from a Cultural Heritage Commission consultant supporting the installation. At a January hearing on the case, however, several residents spoke against the application. Also, the GWNC Land Use Committee asked the cell company’s representative last fall to return to the committee for further discussion if there were any revisions in their plans, but they never did. At the January hearing, Ms. Cosentino said the St. Andrews Square Neighborhood Association spoke in opposition to the application, and their comments

were supported by CD4 representative Doug Mensman. The case was continued until March, in part so the CHC and the GWNC could review T-Mobile's revised plans for the site. The CHC did review the plans in February, and approved them, based on very narrow federal criteria for rooftop structures. Still, according to Ms. Cosentino, this doesn't alter the earlier findings of the Zoning Administrator regarding installation of cell towers in residential areas, and compatibility with the area plan. She said these requirements need to be met to approve a CUP...and that installations of cell towers on residential property can only be done if a CUP is obtained. In addition, she said, cell companies try to sell such installations with maps showing gaps in coverage in these areas...but their own consumer advertising maps claim full, flawless coverage. She urged the committee to write a letter to the Planning Commission supporting the original Zoning Administrator's ruling, and opposing the applicant's appeal. Such a letter would need to be sent before the final hearing on March 24.

Stakeholder Charles Rosenberg, who lives in building in question, said the building's landmark status was based on its architectural style...but the new antenna structures would still be visible, even in the applicant's revised plans. This is a tall building, which can be seen from afar, and the antennas will be noticeable. Mr. Rosenberg also noted that the CHC vote to support the application was not unanimous, and that the federal guidelines they used left a lot of things open to interpretation. "This is our Bullocks Wilshire, in our neighborhood," he claimed.

Pete Shubin, the applicant's representative, said there have been further revisions in T-Mobile's plans, based on the CHC's requests and conditions. He said the equipment will now be moved further toward center of building to make it less visible, the number of added structures has been reduced from 3 to 2, and they will be shorter than originally planned, extending only about 5 feet above the building's parapet. He distributed simulated images of the installations, and said none of the structures would be visible from the front of the building.

Committee member Charles Dougherty asked if the installation will be a square box shape, and Mr. Shubin said it would be. He also noted that one problem with historical buildings is that you're not allowed to copy the historical elements of the building. Changes to the building should be distinguished as additions, so they designed a simple box and did not try to copy the building's original ornamentation.

Mr. Dougherty asked if the box would be finished with stucco on the outside, and Mrs. Shubin said it would be a fiber-reinforced plastic panel, which can be finished in any way or painted with latex paint in any color or texture. This installation will probably have smooth sides, with paint to match the building.

Committee member Mike Genewick asked what "RF transparent" means in the equipment description. Mr. Shubin said "RF" stands for "radio frequency" and "transparent" means radio waves can pass through it. In this case, the structure will be a fiberglass panel, with no metallic flakes. There will be three structures in all, all of which are toward the center of the building and will rise 8 feet from the roof deck (which is reduced from the originally planned 10 feet).

Committee chair Jim Wolf asked if there will be emergency or backup power included and Mr. Shubin said there will be battery back up in each cabinet.

Committee member Elizabeth Fuller said she's concerned about the precedent the installation might set. If T-Mobile is allowed to locate equipment on the building, would that open the door for more companies to erect structures there? Mr. Shubin said individual companies can't have an exclusionary agreement with the building. Mr. Wolf confirmed this, but said that in other cases where antennas have located on commercial buildings, applicants who came later did have a harder time getting approval. The precedent here, though, is a tower on residential property...and specifically a landmarked residential building.

Mr. Shubin said they are looking at residential sites because all the potential sites in nearby commercial areas are already taken. And as cell phone capability grows, providers need to be able to provide the additional services. City code allows for sites in residential areas and there are lots of antennas on apartment buildings. It's just not possible to move outside residential areas and provide good service to those areas.

Mr. Shubin said T-Mobile did look at the CHC's rules for good design and abided by them. He also said the application and marketing maps are out of sync because carriers have to stay ahead of the demand for new coverage and new technology/services, and need to prevent gaps from developing in their networks.

Committee member Patty Lombard asked if a time might come when cell companies might need fewer and more efficient installations. Mr. Shubin said they're actually going the other way – they need more and more sites closer together as people use their phones for more and for more things.

Committee member Mike Genewick asked if the applicant is a private company or public utility. Mr. Shubin said the T-Mobile is a private company that operates with permission of the Public Utilities Commission. It does have the right to use public rights of way. All wireless carriers do.

Committee member John Gresham asked if the site in question is the best site in the area, or the only one available. Mr. Shubin said that if antennas are not located on this building, they would have to be located on a couple of others nearby.

Ms. Lombard asked how the rent for the space is calculated, and what it will cost. Mr. Shubin said he can't discuss the specifics of the contract, but it is a "fair amount" of money.

Committee member Charles Dougherty said there are lots of pros and cons to the issue, but it comes down to commerce vs. preservation. He said that if the landlord of a landmarked building is not allowed to change the windows in the building, he shouldn't be allowed to put cell towers on the roof. The precedent to allow towers on a landmarked building would not be right, and he moved that the Committee recommend that the

GWNC board oppose the applicant's appeal on the basis of historic preservation. Ms. Lombard seconded the motion.

Committee member Mike Genewick said the existing mechanical cabinets on the building's roof are more obnoxious than the proposed cell tower installations and committee member Rudy Gintel agreed. He said people are under a lot of pressure to use their cell phones for many tasks these days, and if we expect to have these services, cell phone companies should be allowed to provide them in a minimally offensive way. And this looks like a minimal offense...so he opposes the motion.

Committee member Yigal Arens said this isn't minimal, though, because it's on a landmarked building. If the cost of such installations is that ugly buildings get uglier, that would not be a big cost. Mr. Gintel noted that someone will object no matter where you want to put an installation. Mr. Gresham said what overrides that in this case is the precedent-setting aspect. Mr. Gintel agreed. Mr. Wolf said both the historical aspect and residential site are precedent-setting. He applauded the applicant for accepting some of the design changes this committee recommended at our last discussion of this project, but said he doesn't think the current solution fully embraces the spirit of those recommendations.

The vote was 6-2 in favor of the motion to recommend denial of the appeal. (Committee members Rudy Gintel and Mike Genewick voted against the motion.)

400 S. Western – Stakeholder Henrietta Cosentino reported that the case is still in progress. We can discuss it further when there is more information on the pending CUP.

Dubai/Cordon Bleu Restaurant – A hearing was held on this application to legalize liquor sales at a restaurant last August, but Ms. Cosentino reported there is still no official ruling. In the interim, however, the business has closed and was apparently sold. Three weeks ago, it re-opened with a new sign, but it appears to be the same (or same kind of) business as before. The ABC liquor license runs out at the end of March, and the new owners don't seem to be aware of the pending applications. Also, our City Council office reports that the former owners have withdrawn the CUP application, though the club is still operating. Committee member John Gresham said Code Enforcement should stop them...and we should ask our City Council representative at our board meeting next week to make sure this gets done.

Mobil Station at 4605 W. Beverly – Stakeholder Henrietta Cosentino reported that the business's application to sell liquor for off-site consumption has been denied.

Bricks & Scones, 403 N. Larchmont – Committee member Elizabeth Fuller reported that owner Jinah Kim has presented her plans/CUP application for liquor sales to the Larchmont Village Neighborhood Association and received its support.

Medical Marijuana Dispensaries – Committee member Yigal Arens reported that the first lawsuit challenging the new ordinance (which is not yet being enforced) was filed today.

303 S. Highland – Committee member Elizabeth Fuller reported that the organization's appeal of the CUP denial has been denied.

Moza to Go, 6610 W. Melrose – Ms. Fuller reported that the business has withdrawn its CUP application to sell liquor for off-site consumption and has re-filed a new application for on-site sales only.

Larchmont Bungalow, 107 N. Larchmont – Committee member Patty Lombard reported that the City Attorney has made a decision on whether or not to file a lawsuit against the business, but has not yet announced the decision.

CVS, 3<sup>rd</sup> & La Brea – Ms. Fuller reported that she contacted Jeff Jaccoberger, of the Mid-City West Community Council, for an update on this project, but has not yet received an answer.

#### New Business

Hancock Park HPOZ Board Nomination – Tabled until March 10 board meeting.

Yeshivath Torath Emeth Academy, 3002 W. Clinton – John Darnell, field deputy for City Council Member Paul Koretz, said there was a recent community meeting on this project, and he will be setting up a meeting for the neighbors and Mr. Koretz, who is now in the “listening” phase.

Robert Smith, from Latham & Watkins, which is representing applicant on a pro bono basis, said his clients couldn't attend tonight's meeting because it's being held in a place of worship, but they will attend next week's Board meeting at the Wilshire Ebell.

Mr. Smith said the school is making a “modest” request to replace an existing preschool and kindergarten building with a new, larger classroom building. The old 3,700 square foot building would be demolished, and a new 8,300 square foot building with subterranean garage would be constructed on the property. All entrances for parking would be through the alley.

Mr. Smith said the project would require a modification of existing height restrictions to 33 feet, which is less than the school's other existing buildings on La Brea Ave. Mr. Smith said the new height would also be consistent with nearby large apartment buildings.

Also, he said the school's original proposal was to house 180 students at the site, but because of neighbors' concerns, they will now have only 120 in the new building. There will be no changes to the school's other facilities (they have four other buildings on La Brea and Sycamore Aves.). The current site enrollment is 76 students. Staff at the site will rise from 12 to 18. He said there will be no new parking or traffic impacts because they're just moving kids from the other school buildings, not increasing overall enrollment. The project is actually smaller in some respects than what could be built by

right.

Mr. Smith said the playground will be located on the north side of the property, adjacent to Clinton Ave., which provides a buffer for the residential building to the south. There will be no changes to the current student arrival and departure plan. In response to community concerns, they have also proposed conditions calling for no more than 120 students at the site, a noise absorbent ceiling on the play area, no outdoor PA system, and drop off and pickup controlled by traffic monitors. These are in addition to conditions required by city's Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Todd Ehrlinson, the project architect, presented an aerial view of the project area, including other nearby buildings, along with a site plan, side elevation of the proposed project, and landscaping, parking and traffic plans.

Committee member Patty Lombard asked if most families drive to the school. Mr. Smith said yes, but some carpool and many walk. Ms. Lombard asked if more than 50% walk, but Mr. Smith said he couldn't say.

Committee member Elizabeth Fuller asked how much extra traffic would be generated for the alley behind this building with the increased number of students at the preschool site, but Mr. Smith said none because most of them would come from another building on the same block.

Stakeholder Michele Atkins said the current traffic plan is not working and that traffic in the neighborhood is "abominable." She said the school's various expansion projects started in the 1990s and four buildings have been developed since then. And people do park on the surrounding streets because the school buildings have no parking lots. Ms. Atkins said she has been told by school teachers that she took their parking spaces, in front of her own house. She said people who live on block have a hard time getting to their own houses without a school alley pass (which school families are required to have before they can enter the alley). She said there is no city enforcement of traffic and parking. And because the school says it's not increasing its enrollment, the City isn't requiring them to do a parking study. She asked that the GWNC insist on a formal traffic study conducted by an impartial third party, at the school's expense. Also, she said the same promises of traffic control have been made with each of the school's expansion projects, but nothing has been done to improve the situation. She said neighbors have also documented violations of the facility's operating hours, day and night, 7 days a week. Finally, she would like the school to be required to meet with neighbors quarterly to discuss ongoing concerns, and asked that the GWNC write a letter to the city and Mr. Koretz opposing the project.

Lucinda Keller, another neighbor, said she likes having the kids and school in the neighborhood...but doesn't like the plans for a modern commercial building in the small-scale residential area. Ms. Keller said neighbors have been told not to discuss the cumulative effects of the school's various expansion projects, although this is a real concern. Also, when neighbors mention the small scale of the neighborhood, school officials always bring up the one architectural "blunder" on the block – a 3-story 1970s

apartment building. She said they don't want another 3-story blunder, and Sycamore Ave. is very small scale – in fact, not every family had a car when it was built. She also said 12 parking spaces are definitely not enough, because the school doesn't have enough parking as it is. She said the neighbors didn't choose to live in the area just to be overwhelmed by school expansions...and the immediate neighbors will have their views blocked by the new building. Finally, she said the neighbors are willing to accept “organic growth” of one or two stories...but there is no room for negotiation on that because both morning and afternoon traffic are a nightmare. And when the school talks about how well the current system works, the neighbors laugh. She concluded by saying the street is beautiful, and residents don't want to ruin it by overbuilding.

Stakeholder Gillian Green agreed that existing traffic is terrible. She said cars don't go through the alley as they're supposed to. Instead, they park **on** the corner. Kids also ride bikes on the sidewalks. And one got hit by a car last week. She said she doesn't want to be one of the people who hits one of the kids some day. She said also that on Sundays, the La Brea/Clinton intersection is jammed with both foot and car traffic. This has become a huge problem, especially since the school built its boys junior high building on La Brea. Finally, she said playground noise from the school is also very loud.

Stakeholder Lloyd Solley, also a neighborhood resident, said this proposal calls for a 3-story commercial building in a residential neighborhood. The current facility contains 3 old bungalows...so this is not a “modest” proposal, and it increases the population at the site by 75%. Mr. Solley said the legal occupancy for the site right now is 87, and this project will have a “massive” impact. He said the applicant is asking for variances in city codes and a Conditional Use Permit in exchange for mitigating some of the other problems. But while the school “talks a great talk,” they “don't walk it.” Currently, the applicant is violating its existing CUPs, and probably certificates of occupancy, at all four properties they own. For example, residents can't park on Detroit Ave. because it's full of staff vehicles. Mr. Solley said the girls' school certificate of occupancy requires 14 parking spaces. And its plan shows 14 spaces. But only six are in use. He said the current preschool permit says the facility has 4 parking spaces, but they're used as a fenced kindergarten yard, not for parking. The new boys' junior high is supposed to have nine spaces, but two are fenced off for bikes and play. And the boys' elementary school building is supposed to have 19 parking spaces, but none are used for parking – the gates are closed and the area's used as a playground...even on Sunday mornings. So 100,00 square feet of school facilities are operating today with only 12 functional parking spaces. Also, he said, there are residents on Sycamore who sell their parking permits to school staff members.

Mr. Solley said all of these issues need to be addressed before a new application is considered or approved. Yes, the proposed traffic flow looks good on paper, but it's not great in real life. The alleys are clogged, you can't drive in either direction, and residents can't move. Fire and safety access is also blocked. This could be a big problem, because there's a retirement home nearby that often has ambulance visits. In addition, traffic backs up on Clinton, across La Brea...and people park in all the red zones. Finally, he noted that the school is proposing to locate a 3-story stairwell facing residential Sycamore Ave., which is not appropriate. He asked that the GWNC get involved and

make it clear to city that this project is not as it's being represented and is not acceptable. He finished by saying he would be happy to work with the applicant on finding solutions to the problems.

Stakeholder Aaron Kin, owner of several properties in the neighborhood, including the one just south of the project site, said Mr. Solley summed things up well. He said this is a proposal for a commercial building in a residential area. The school's junior high building was built three years ago, with an addition a year ago. He said he's very familiar with the facility and asked the rabbi where the parking would be for that building. He was told there are spaces in the elementary school building...but not for the junior high. And then he saw that the spaces they do have are gated off for play space. Also, the new girls' school building has no parking. The school claims it has several spaces there, but they're gated off, too. The school's history is that it makes promises and gets permits...but then does what it wants to do. Finally, he said that lots of parents simply ignore the required alley traffic pattern and meet their kids on the street.

Stakeholder Drew Hallman said congestion is the biggest problem. He's always worried kids are going to get hit. He said he was surprised at the number of neighbors that have engaged in this issue...and agrees that they don't want the project.

Stakeholder Guy Smith said he has lived on three different blocks on Sycamore in the last 20 years, and all the information presented here so far is right on target. He said he lives in the 400 block of north Sycamore now, which is one of the only blocks in the area that doesn't have permit parking...which is a big problem, especially on street cleaning days. He said the block gets lots of school traffic, and the idea that people will adhere to the traffic plan is ridiculous – they don't use it. Mr. Smith said Clinton is very narrow, congested, and dangerous. And there are lots of SUVs, which makes it worse. He said the traffic affects not just this block, but several blocks down. Also, most of the school buildings have assembly areas, so lots of people – not just students - gather there for many different kinds of events.

Stakeholder Lori Kearney, who lives on the 500 block of Sycamore, said the neighborhood is very friendly. But when residents went to meetings on the construction of the boys' junior high building, "we were bulldozed." She said neighbors were told falsehoods at those meetings, and if they endorse a 3-story building with elevators for the current project, she suspects the school will expand enrollment afterward. She said she first understood this project to be a preschool, but now she's hearing it will be a child care center, preschool and kindergarten. She said these uses have specific requirements for play space and other amenities. The school started out saying the building would be for 180 students, but now it's 120 – and she doesn't believe it. She said it's imperative that the city doesn't sign off on the plans until all the problems are addressed. She said there are 41 available parking spaces on the 500 block of Sycamore on a good night. But school parents take the spaces from residents. She said she wants to urge the school to negotiate and to be honorable about it.

Stakeholder Ron Friedman, who lives across Sycamore from the site, said he's alarmed that there are no cars shown in any of the applicant's pictures of the school,

because all streets near all the buildings are always congested. And he hears school bells and chimes throughout the day.

Stakeholder Kathy Monopolous said she has lived in the neighborhood her whole life, and bought a home there in the 1980s. She said she's been through all the school's expansions and promises...and she can't believe the promises now because nothing they've promised before has come to pass. She said mothers let their kids out in the middle of the street to avoid the school's car line. She wants an Environmental Impact Report and traffic safety report conducted before the project is approved. Finally, she said construction will present a whole other set of problems – with debris, dumpsters, etc.

Another resident concurred that there is a big need for an independent traffic study before the project is approved. He said parents who have only preschoolers, and no other children at the other facilities, will definitely just park on the street, and not navigate the required traffic pattern. He suggested someone create a Google map showing where the school families live. He said he loves having the kids in the neighborhood, but the resulting traffic has really changed the feel of area. Also, he noted that the new boys' junior high building is two stories high...but actually much taller than a standard two-story building...and it has no parking. He said he suspects the school will eventually ask to build a bigger building there, which will increase congestion even further. Finally, he noted that kids often walk between buildings to pick up their siblings, and then meet their parents on Sycamore.

Committee Elizabeth Fuller noted that the proposed preschool building is three stories tall, but asked if there's a requirement for young children to be in ground floor classrooms. Mr. Ehrlinson said Kindergartners are allowed to be on the second floor, as long as there are proper exits, etc. Committee Chair Jim Wolf said that requirements for such things do differ for public and private schools.

Committee member Yigal Arens asked if the reduction in the number of children at the facility since the original proposal would also mean a reduction in the square footage planned – it could be a chance to scale back both the size and cost of the project. But Mr. Ehrlinson and Mr. Smith said the size will remain the same.

Committee member Patty Lombard asked what how many families are enrolled at the school. Mr. Smith said there are 1,125 students. Ms. Lombard noted that Marlborough and Archer, two other local private schools, have rigorous parking requirements. She asked how this school has been able to build four buildings without parking. Mr. Smith said only has information on the one building in questions, and 12 parking spaces are what's required by code.

Committee Rudy Gintel said he hasn't heard anyone speak in favor of the project except Mr. Smith and Mr. Ehrlinson. He said this committee is supposed to represent the interests of the neighbors, and it looks like they are all against it...and even if the school does provide a valuable service, those who support it must reside elsewhere because they're not here speaking up in favor of it. Mr. Smith said most school families face the

same prohibition of entering a place of worship as the rabbi does. But Mr. Gintel said all he's hearing from the neighbors is that they don't want the effects of this project, and that the school has not been sincere in its statements, either in the past or present.

Committee member Mike Genewick said the building is a modern, architectural design...but this is an historic residential neighborhood. He asked why they didn't design something more compatible with local architecture. Mr. Ehrlinson said the building will negotiate the space between commercial and residential areas, and that it doesn't have to be Spanish style, like many of the surrounding homes, but can reference them in setbacks, gardens, color, scale, etc. Mr. Genewick said he thinks the current design is ugly.

Committee member John Gresham asked what the "RD" means in the current zoning designation. Mr. Smith said it allows schools, as long as they have a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Gresham asked if they have one now and Mr. Smith said the current facility is grandfathered without one...but they are requesting one for the new building.

Committee chair James Wolf noted that the Clinton side of the building will be the de facto front, but there's a fence along that setback...and it can only be a 3' fence without a variance. Mr. Smith said they are asking for a variance for fence height. Mr. Wolf said it's obvious the current traffic circulation plan doesn't work, so it seems like there should be a traffic study and traffic management plan, with consequences for violations, including possible revocation of the CUP. He said there should also be a transportation plan, including things like buses and vans to reduce the number of cars that drive to the school.

Mr. Wolf asked where the students will be housed during construction. Mr. Smith said they'd be at other buildings in the complex. Mr. Wolf asked where construction workers will park. Mr. Smith said there will be a construction management plan that will designate parking and shuttles for workers. Mr. Wolf said this new building proposal presents an opportunity to re-visit the school's overall traffic plan, and that a plan should be crafted as part of the approval process that would also help reduce the traffic burdens placed on the community by entire complex. He said the Planning Commission hearing on this application is March 11 – the day after the GWNC board meeting. He recommended that the school in good faith do what they can on these recommendations before then, or ask for a postponement, so they can more fully address the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Smith said they would be happy to continue the conversation with the neighbors until March 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>.

Committee member John Gresham asked about the hours of operation for the new building. Mr. Smith said it would be open Monday-Friday only, as a condition of approval. Mr. Gresham asked if the school's other buildings are open on weekends, but Mr. Smith said he couldn't say. Mr. Gresham said he is troubled by what we've heard about the school's other sites. He said the Planning Commission should pay attention to compliance on the school's other CUPs. But Mr. Smith said it's their position that they're there just to discuss the current project.

Mr. Wolf asked how many meetings have been held with the community to craft conditions for the project. Mr. Smith said they met at the City Council office last week, and there have been a couple of other meetings as well. The conditions he proposed tonight were crafted in direct response to neighbors' concerns expressed at those meetings. He said they'd be willing to consider other conditions, too, if people want to submit them. Mr. Wolf asked if the City Council office is willing to act as a clearing house for possible conditions, and Mr. Darnell said he has invited residents to meet with Mr. Koretz on Monday. He noted that Mr. Koretz hasn't been available for a meeting before this because he's been tied up in city budget meetings. Mr. Gresham asked how this matter can go forward to the Planning Commission if the Council Member hasn't had time to meet with anyone yet, and Ms. Atkins agreed that the case needs a postponement. She said neighbors submitted a petition asking for one. Mr. Gresham said postponement should definitely be on the table for discussion. Ms. Lombard asked how many signatures were on the petition and Ms. Atkins said there were about 100 on a petition saying they didn't want the project, but the postponement petition was separate. Mr. Darnell said Mr. Koretz's calendar has just opened up, and he was going to send out an e-mail tomorrow to arrange a meeting. Many of the neighbors present said an afternoon meeting would be difficult for them, because they work during the day.

Committee member Patty Lombard moved that we recommend the GWNC board oppose the application and not consider reviewing it again until the neighborhood has had an opportunity to go through an appropriate study and negotiation process with the City Council office, school, and others. Mr. Gresham seconded the motion, saying we do see cumulative effect of violations, and it does set a precedent. Mr. Arens agreed that a traffic study should be done, though Mr. Gresham said that would take a lot of time. The motion passed unanimously. Finally, Mr. Arens noted that situations like this have come up before, in which groups with a history of violations come in with their latest project and try to sever it from their previous records...but people tend to take a dim view of that.

101 S. La Brea – Committee member Elizabeth Fuller reported that she received a phone call recently from Stanley Treitel, who now represents the developers of this property. Mr. Treitel said original plans for the space were a mixed-use, residential/retail development, but after protests from neighbors, it has been scaled back to a commercial-only, by-right project. He did not provide further details.

Paul Koretz motion on code enforcement – Tabled until March 10 board meeting.

Paul Koretz motion on Digital On-site Signs – Tabled until March 10 board meeting.

Windsor Square cell Tower (3<sup>rd</sup> & Irving) – Committee member Mike Genewick reported that T-Mobile has installed cell antennas on a wood utility pole at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Irving, which the company says it has a right to do. Committee member Elizabeth Fuller said the larger issue here is that the cell companies are starting to piggyback their equipment on utility poles...and to build bigger poles that can hold both their equipment and utility wires. Stakeholder Henrietta Cosentino said many neighborhood groups around the city

have already taken a stance against such monopole locations. The cell companies can co-locate their equipment by right...but the new, larger poles are another issue – they may be good for the cell companies, but not communities. Committee member Patty Lombard asked what we can do about the issue, and Ms. Cosentino said we need two policies. First, we should oppose any further siting of cell towers in residential neighborhoods in the GWNC area, because we can't just keep fighting them case by case. Also, we should recognize the threat of the new monopoles...which don't have any regulation, notification or hearing process before they're installed. Because of the late hour, further discussion of this issue was tabled for our next meeting.

Van Ness/Elmwood Preschool, 404 N. Van Ness – Stakeholder Thomas Meyer said he is trying to acquire this property, currently a 3,600 square foot house, to turn into a preschool. He has made an offer for a short sale. The property is zoned R3, which allows a preschool housing up to 20 children by right. He said he would like to enroll 30-40 kids, which would require him to apply for a CUP. He has surveyed 60 people in the neighborhood, 20 of whom supported the project and 12 of whom opposed it. He would like to introduce the project to more people in the neighborhood, and address their concerns, particularly parking and congestion. Committee chair James Wolf asked what Mr. Meyer's timetable would be and Mr. Meyer said he hopes to hear back from the bank owner in a couple of months, and then would have to close escrow and apply for the CUP. Right now, he's just testing the waters. Mr. Wolf asked if Mr. Meyer could come back to the committee in a couple of months, when the plans are further along, and Mr. Meyer said he could...and that he wants to avoid getting stuck with the property and not be able to open the school. Committee member Mike Genewick suggested that Mr. Meyer also contact neighbors south of Beverly Blvd. to seek their support, since the area affected by the project would be larger than just the adjoining properties.

Proposed changes to CEQA – Tabled until March 10 board meeting.

Koreatown Boundaries – Tabled until March 10 board meeting.

Review of Recent Early Planning Notifications – Tabled until next meeting.

Committee Member Comments & Reports

Cell Phone Tower Policy – Tabled until next meeting.

City Planning Audit Review – Tabled until next meeting.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Announcements & Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee

MINUTES of the Meeting of March 2, 2010

Page 13

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Fuller  
Committee Member