



NORTHWEST SAN PEDRO NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Planning and Land Use Committee Report

Meeting Held November 2, 2015 at the San Pedro Municipal Building.

Committee Members:

- Diana Nave, Present
- Carolyn Grayson, Present
- Chuck Hart - Absent
- David Rivera, Absent
- Pete Burmeister, Absent
- Jason Herring, Present
- Bob Garcia - Present
- Lee Williams, Present

Quorum? Yes

Non-Committee Member Attendees: Vicki Bilinski & Mike Bilinski (Rolling Hills Riviera HOA), Andy Noel (Rolling Hills Riviera & Rolling Hills Covenant Church), David Roberts (CD 15), Adele Healey & Cathy Hetzer (Coastal SP NC), Lu Watson Harbor Gateway North NC.

This was a special meeting held for the purpose of discussing a number of issues with David Roberts, Director of Planning and Economic Development for Councilman Buscaino. David explained that in addition to him, there are two other staff members in the office working on planning & economic development. Heather Anderson has responsibility for the north end of the district while the position for San Pedro and Wilmington is currently vacant. He will introduce the new staff person to us once they are hired. They also serve as the Councilman's Liaisons to the Economic Development, Housing, and Planning Committees of the City Council and staff the Councilman with regards to SCAG where he actively participates.

GAFFEY STREET CONCEPTUAL PLAN UPDATE

The Gaffey Street Conceptual Plan has been completed but has not yet been released. The estimated cost of implementation is about \$7.5 million. Neither of the grants applied for were received. The Council office has identified about \$1.5 million and is working with LANI to finalize a Phase I implementation plan that they anticipate releasing to the community soon along with the conceptual plan. Phase I will focus on the entry to San Pedro from the Harbor Freeway and will include items like trees, lighting, street furniture, way finding signage, and median and sidewalk improvements. Once finalized, they anticipate there will be a nine-month design and approval process. In the meantime they may be able to begin some improvements that don't need to go through the approval process.

It will be difficult to ever be competitive for the METRO grant because those grants are based in large part on bus ridership. They will however re-apply in the next round of funding for an ATP (Active Transportation Program) grant that comes from California AB32, for reduction of greenhouse gasses.

David indicated this program will have hundreds of millions of dollars in funding over the next few years.

The process is underway to create a BID (Business Improvement District) on Gaffey from Oliver to 15th Street. The BID taxes itself and then administers those funds themselves. Once formed, the BID would be asked to take responsibility for maintaining the improvements as they are made.

Status of Billboard & Property at 427 N. Gaffey

The billboard company has a lease through 2018 with an option to renew to 2021. There is no discussion of relocating the billboard within San Pedro. The options are either waiting until 2021 or relocating it along the Harbor Freeway. Nothing will be done without community input.

Removing the structure on the property has proven more difficult than originally anticipated because the house is helping hold up the hillside. Engineering is still studying the options.

Proposed Apartments at Sepulveda and Gaffey

The Planning Department determined that due to the proposed plan having shade and shadow issues on the adjacent property an EIR would be needed. The developers have decided to rework the plans instead and will return to the Neighborhood Councils once they have new plans available.

Former Nader's Building

Several suggestions were made for this piece of property including making it a bus plaza, residential, and incorporating it into Leland Park. These are long-term ideas that would need to be explored more.

Sign Ordinance

The Planning and Land Use Committee (PLUM) of City Council had significantly weakened the proposed ordinance including creating a process to allow electronic billboards outside of sign districts. Billboard companies have been making significant contributions to council members. In addition, billboards, particularly electronic billboards, are a potential source of revenue. The creation of a sign district might, for example, allow a developer to cover a gap in funding.

Changes made by PLUM from what the Planning Commission had originally approved, were sent back to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission considered those changes and for the most part rejected them opting instead for stronger provisions. This will now return to PLUM before going to the City Council for a vote.

When asked about Councilman Buscaino's position, David did not have an answer. He recommended we discuss the ordinance at the next HANC meeting and that all of the Harbor Area NCs consider taking a position on it.

Next Steps: Lee distributed a draft motion for consideration at our next committee meeting. This motion was shared with HANC.

Accessory Dwelling Units CF 14-0057 and 14-0057-S1 and Amnesty for Illegal Dwelling Units CF-1150

Bob Garcia distributed a packet of information on CF 14-0057 and 14-0057-S1 and indicated that the second one is more likely to be considered since it was authored by Gil Cedillo who chairs the Housing Committee. There is some overlap also with CF-1150 Amnesty for Illegal Units. Both motions instruct Bldg & Safety to report on the number of illegal units on single-family properties discovered per/year and to provide options for approving previously unapproved units. The report back is completed and Jason summarized the information in his report. Several concerns were raised by those present including questions about parking and assurances that any illegal units would be brought up to safety codes. The Rolling Hills Rivera Homeowners Association submitted a list of questions regarding amnesty.

14-0057-S1 also requests the City Attorney in conjunction with Bldg & Safety to prepare an ordinance that prescribes a permit process for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in accordance with AB 1866. Both ADUs and Amnesty would allow for second units on existing R1 zoned properties and thus are exemptions to existing zoning codes. Amnesty, however, does not allow for any new units, only for keeping/upgrading existing units and preventing people from being thrown out of them. ADUs are new units. Many comments made were in support of not allowing ADUs in R-1 zoning. The Pastor of Rolling Hills Covenant Church expressed his opinion that ADUs would not help with the homelessness problem. Carolyn raised a question of how allowing ADUs to be exceptions to required zoning requirements (such as 10 foot open to the sky passage from ADU to front of lot, and parking requirements) would fit with the RECode LA program. Diana said she thought the memo regarding ADUs was already in place.

With regard to ADUs, Bob is recommending that the Committee recommend a no vote. David suggested that we recommend a process for community input including getting input from Harbor Area NCs. Diana indicated there had previously been such a process (2009) and will try to find out what happened out of it.

Next Steps: Place both issues on agenda for next meeting for continued discussion and possible motion.

Rancho San Pedro Feasibility Study

The Rancho San Pedro Feasibility Study is completed and has been shared with the Housing Authority. A community meeting is scheduled for Nov 18 from 6:00 - 8:30 at the Port Administration Building to review the options and discuss next steps. The study looked at four possible scenarios ranging from simply rehabilitating all existing housing, to rehabilitating a portion and building up to 6 to 7 story condos on the Eastern edge of the property. The current real estate market in San Pedro makes it difficult to build high-end housing. For example the rents at the Vue are \$2.75 per square feet compared to \$3.50 per square feet in Long Beach for similar properties. All of the redevelopment scenarios had a gap between costs and income ranging from \$25 million for the simplest scenario to \$58 million for the highest end scenario. What the study did not take into account, however, is the increase in property values expected as a result of the redevelopment of the waterfront. No matter what scenario is ultimately adopted, all of the affordable housing must be replaced, but it does not all need to be replaced at the same site. A copy of the presentation about the study was forwarded to Planning Committee Members and posted on the NWSPNC website.

Next Step: Attend public meeting. Consider placing on future committee agenda

Waterfront Development Feasibility Study

This is a market feasibility study outlining opportunities and constraints for a variety of publicly owned properties along the waterfront and in downtown San Pedro. David distributed copies of the request for bids for a firm to conduct the analysis. The City has selected the same firm that did the Rancho San Pedro Study and anticipates that it will be completed in March/April 2016. One of the Study. One of the things that needs to be looked at is what incentives can be offered to attract developers given the comparatively low rents. A number of concerns were raised about impact on traffic, particularly Harbor Blvd.

Next Steps: Review and comment on study when it is completed.

Red Car

Supervisor Knabe asked Metro staff to work with the Harbor Department staff on this. David anticipates that there will be a report back to the Metro Board this month. He does not anticipate that the Red Car will be kept. Instead he thinks that there will be consideration of something like a street car that is cheaper, meets ADA standards, has more flexibility in its routing, could run more frequently by using dual tracks, not just a single track, and could be extended into other areas such as downtown San Pedro and Cabrillo Beach. The engineering firm that is working on Ports O Call and the Downtown Plaza is looking at options. In the meantime the Port is looking at increasing the BID trolley service.

David indicated that about \$60 mil of the \$200 million over the next 10 years has not yet been designated and some of this could possibly be used for mass transit option.

Other

There is a developer currently looking at 550 S. Palos Verdes. David will provide more information if the developer decides to move forward. David stated that development is good for a variety of reasons including the fees the city collects, jobs created by construction, construction workers spending money in the community, and new residents patronizing businesses here.

A new Starbucks is proposed for Gaffey.

Brewery West is scheduled to open the week before Thanksgiving.

The Silverline Bus will run every 20 minutes starting Dec 13.

Next Regular Meeting

The next regular meeting was changed to Nov. 17 due to the community meeting on Nov 18. Tentative agenda items include continued discussion and possible motions regarding: sign ordinance, amnesty for illegal dwelling units, Accessory Dwelling Units, and beautification projects.

Questions for Planning and Land Use Committee

From: RHRHA Homeowners

1. Legalizing currently illegal units could cause re-zoning of just one specific property in a neighborhood. This could negatively affect neighboring property values and would be unfair. Would adjoining or neighboring properties be notified that an illegal unit exists and will be legalized? Will neighbors have any recourse?
2. Currently properties with illegal/unpermitted units rent for less than properties that have additional units that are permitted. Legalizing these units could result in an increase in their property value which seems unfair for property owners that obtained the proper permits to add rooms or additional units.
3. Illegal units rent for less than permitted units. By classifying these units as legal could result in an increase in rent the property owners can charge for these units. Will some sort of rent control be put in place?
4. By passing an ordinance to legalize illegal units without inspections could put people's lives and health at risk.
 - a. Electrical wiring may have been done improperly and could cause a fire.
 - b. Inadequate light and air ventilation requirement which could cause carbon monoxide poisoning.
 - c. Units may not have the proper egress requirements met so occupants could be trapped in the unit during a fire or earthquake.
 - d. Inadequate plumbing and heating could be a hazard for tenants
5. Could this legalization also apply to commercial spaces where residential living is currently prohibited like storage units and office space?
6. What is the projected budget impact for the city staff time and paperwork that will need to be done to inform all Los Angeles residents that current illegal units will be now legal?
7. What is the projected budget impact for the staff and cost of additional forms that people will need to submit to building and safety and the planning department that they have a unit that is currently illegal and unpermitted and they are requesting under the new ordinance/program that they request their unit be classified as legal?
8. What is the projected budget impact for building and safety to physically inspect all these illegal units?
9. What are the projected budget impacts for the tax assessor's office to review all the properties that had illegal units and the property owners request that their units be legal and part of their property taxes?
10. What are the estimated additional property taxes the property owner will need to pay for each unit that is now classified as legal? Won't this in and of itself cause rents to go up?
11. Will those property taxes be retroactive to the time the illegal unit was built?
12. Will there be fines or penalties payable to Los Angeles building and safety for the property owners for initially failing to properly permit the illegal units?
13. Will property owners with illegal units be required to amend their Federal and State income taxes to include any rent they have received for these units