Meeting Held June 15, 2016 at the San Pedro Municipal Building.

Committee Members:

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

Quorum? Yes

Non-Committee Member Attendees: None

Greening Plan/Cal Fire Grant

Larry Smith cancelled. The Committee decided to hold a special meeting at a date to be set with him.

Require Solar on all new construction

Jason reviewed some of the requirements of other cities and other countries. California currently has a requirement that at least 15% of the roof of new residential and commercial buildings that are 10 stories or less be “solar ready”, clear and not shaded. Effective Jan 1, 2017 San Francisco will require such buildings to actually install some form of solar energy – either electricity-generating panels or solar heating units. It is the first major city in the US to have such an ordinance. Effective April 28, Santa Monica requires roof solar systems on all new construction. For single family they require 1.5 kw/square foot and for multi family, hotel, and commercial the requirement is 2 kw/square foot. http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/articles/2016/05/santa-monica-approves-solar-requirement-for-new-construction.html

Washington DC, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York City offer financial incentives for installing green roofs. Installations have almost doubled since 2008 and now more than 17.5 million square feet of roofs across the country are considered “green.”

In France, all new buildings constructed in commercial zones must be partially covered by plants or solar panels. In Toronto, all commercial and large residential buildings built since 2009 have been required to have at least 20 percent green-roof coverage. In Zurich and Copenhagen, all new flat roofs, both private and public, must be vegetated. And in Tokyo all new buildings larger than about 11,000 square feet are required to have at least 20 percent usable green-roof space. Some places have landscape ordinances that encourage the greening of parking lots. http://pottstowntrees.org/F2-Best-tree-placement.html
There was general support for proposing some type of ordinance for Los Angeles. Jason will put together an outline. The next step is a joint meeting with the sustainability committee.

**Sign Ordinance**

The attached resolution to update the CIS on the sign ordinance to specifically state that we support version B+ while continuing to request the removal of the Port and downtown San Pedro as potential sign districts was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously.

**Proposed Harbor Grill**

Lee presented the plans for Harbor Grill, a proposed new restaurant that would be located at 233 N Harbor in the vacant unit in the shopping center with West Marine. It would be approximately 3,000 square feet and seat 74. The menu would be American and Mexican with a full bar and some live “soft” music. The proposed hours are 10-10 Monday through Wed and 10-midnight Thurs thru Sat. A liquor license is required. Lee will invite the developer to give a presentation at the next Planning Committee Meeting.

**Proposed Development at 550 S. Palos Verdes**

The property has been sold to a new developer. Lee shared renderings of the proposed mixed-use development at 550 S. Palos Verdes. It includes ground floor retail and approximately 403 rental units in a 6-story high building. In response to questions as to why they were not proposing a taller building, Lee indicated that the economics did not pencil out for a higher building. Lee will invite them to present at the next Planning and Land Use Meeting.

**Del Taco**

Lee reported that a Del Taco is being proposed for 4th and Gaffey. Currently there is an abandoned hand car wash, a marijuana shop, and two residential homes on the property. He will also invite this developer to the July meeting.

**RFP for Parking Lot**

Diana reported that the City has released an RFP for a mixed-use project for the parking lot between 8th and 9th Street behind Pacific. She will ask Kristina to port on our website.

**Downtown San Pedro Situation Analysis**

Diana distributed copies of a Downtown San Pedro Situation Analysis that was conducted by “a loose collection of experts”. Unfortunately no further information was available on who those “experts” were. It has a lot of good information about the current uses of property in the downtown area.

**Community Beautification**

- **Rose Garden at Averill Park** - The Board approved the funding to purchase a sign to give NWSPNC credit for providing the roses.

- **Peck Park Canyon Clean Up and Trail Maintenance** - A lot of clean up work has been done. There are still no doggie bags. Diana will follow up with Bill Lopez regarding setting up a regular clean up day and the remaining items that need attention. Jason reported that someone
has roped off the portion of the property that has the informal trail near the Leland Park end. He will forward the photos so this can be shared with Recreation and Parks. We will ask if they will send their surveyors out to determine if it is park property. Given the length of time that the path has been there it should be recognized as an easement.

• **Clean Up & Tree Trimming** – Beacon House completed the tree trimming on Westmont and Capitol Drive. The Board approved the additional funds for them to picking up and disposing of the litter on N. Gaffey between Westmont and Palos Verdes Drive North. This will be done in the next 2 weeks.

**Exit Park**

Diana explained that an advance copy (prior to going to the NWSPNC Board) of their letter was sent to Recreation and Parks in the interest of time. She sent it on a Sunday and received a phone call at 8:00 Monday morning. The bottom line was that it was really too late to have an impact. The specific trees had already been approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission and were included in the bid that resulted in the current contractor being chosen. They have used these same trees in many other parks in Los Angeles without difficulties. Reading about trees is a little like reading about medicines. There is no perfect tree and the articles contain the worst-case scenarios. The staff person who designed the park is available if anyone wants to speak with him further. The lesson from this is that we should have specifically invited them to give a presentation of the plans early in the process rather than simply asking when they would be available for us to see.

**Workplan**

The workplan was reviewed and updates. An updated copy is attached hereto.

**Future Meetings**

A tentative plan for the next four months was developed as follows:

TBD: Special Meeting with Larry Smith & CalTrans
TBD: Waterfront Feasibility Plan
July: Gaffey Implementation Phase I Plan, Development Projects in Downtown San Pedro; reconsider short term rentals; mobility plan
August: Meeting with Council Office; invite Central & Coastal NC Planning reps
Sept: MTA Ballot Initiative Presentation
October: Forum on Planning Issues on City Ballot

**Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wed. July 20 at 6:00 pm.
Amended Community Impact Statement

Draft Ordinance regarding the Establishment of Sign Districts

Council File Nos. CPC-2015-3059-CA Proposed Ordinance Revising the Citywide Sign Regulations
/Related Council Files, 11-1705, 08-2020, 11-0724, 12-1611

The Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council supports version B+ of the proposed sign ordinance as approved by the City Planning Commission on 10/22/2015 if amended to remove the Port of Los Angeles and downtown San Pedro as potential sign districts. We commend the Planning Department and the Planning Commission for their continued efforts to reduce sign pollution in Los Angeles and respectfully request:

1. The removal of the Port of Los Angeles Plan from the designation as a Tier 1 Sign District

The Port of Los Angeles is very different from the Los Angeles International Airport and should not be treated in the same manner. The Port has work diligently with the communities of San Pedro and Wilmington to beautify the waterfront and increase its attractiveness as a tourist designation. The primary drawing card for the Port is the view of the water not found elsewhere in Los Angeles. In fact, the Port has bought out billboards in order to take them down. The Port has committed $200 million over the next ten years to the infrastructure improvements needed to make this a world-class waterfront and is in negotiations currently for the redevelopment of Ports O Call. Allowing the development of a sign district within the Port Plan area would be detrimental to these goals.

2. The development of a process whereby Communities with small “Regional Centers”, such as San Pedro and Wilmington, could be exempted from consideration as Tier 1 Districts.

The San Pedro “Regional Center” is a small historic downtown that could easily be overwhelmed by any sign district. For the most part its buildings are one and two stories tall. The Community Redevelopment Agency and the City Planning Department worked diligently to restore the historic elements and develop planning guidelines consistent with this vision. The resulting Downtown San Pedro Community Design Overlay District (ordinance 129,935) explicitly prohibits billboards:

    Standard 14c: The following signs are prohibited: billboards, free-standing pole signs, banners, illuminated architectural canopy signs, inflatable devices, blinking or scrolling signs, canister wall or canister blade signs, and signs with vinyl letters.

Furthermore, a Greening Plan is currently underdevelopment to improve the aesthetics of downtown San Pedro. Billboards would be contrary to that plan.

3. Specifically, the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council supports the following:

   a) Disapprove any AMNESTY for billboards that lack permits or have been altered in violation of their permits.

   b) Disapprove the “grandfathering” of any sign districts that have been added to the ordinance since it was reviewed by CPC in 2009. Grandfathering weakens the City’s off-site sign ban and creates a confusing and unmanageable patchwork for enforcement.

   c) Disapprove any new process, including a Conditional Use Permit process to authorize construction or operation of digital off-site signs outside of sign districts. There should be no digital signs outside of sign districts. Restrict digital signs to areas zoned for high intensity commercial use and specifically exclude the Port of Los Angeles.
d) Increase the takedown ratio of existing billboards in exchange for any new off-site signs in sign districts. Takedown should be no less than 5 square feet removed for every 1 square foot of TRADITIONAL billboards erected AND no less than 10 square foot removed of traditional billboards for every 1 square foot of new digital billboards. Community benefits to be offered IN ADDITION to required takedowns, not instead of sign removal.

e) Only allow Billboard companies credit for removing permitted signs.

f) Request that the City Attorney review all signs without permits and those altered in violation of their permits for enforcement action and compliance.

g) Prohibit off-site signage in city parks and recreation facilities and the Port of Los Angeles.

h) Set administrative civil penalties for sign violators that will act as a real deterrent to illegal billboards and other signage.

In addition, billboard companies should be required to remove all of their unpermitted signs prior to erecting any new signs.

Finally, the City Council should increase funding to the Department of Building and Safety for the enforcement of the sign ordinance.

Substantive changes made to the ordinance since public hearings were held in 2009 have significantly weakened the ordinance as the outdoor advertising industry continues to lobby to further weaken the City’s ability to reign in signage in Los Angeles. The changes approved by the Planning Commission in version B+ would assist in strengthening it.

Once billboards are erected it is very difficult to get them removed and communities cannot stop or attempt to regulate offensive, or unhealthful messages from being posted. Billboards are protected by First Amendment Free Speech rights. Messages for junk food, alcoholic beverages, violent images from films or television programs, etc. are all protected.

It is important that communities are able to have a voice in determining how any Sign Districts in their area are operated/regulated.