

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTENTS OF THIS FILE

Submissions by the public in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3, are distributed to the Commission and uploaded online. Please note that “compliance” means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies. Please review the Commission ROPs to ensure that you meet the submission requirements. The ROPs can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

All compliant submissions may be accessed as follows:

- **“Initial Submissions”**: Compliant submissions received no later than by end of day Monday of the week prior to the meeting, which are not integrated by reference or exhibit in the Staff Report, will be appended at the end of the Staff Report. The Staff Report is linked to the case number on the specific meeting agenda.
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 48-hours prior to the Commission meeting are contained in this file and bookmarked by the case number.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Submissions after the Secondary Submission deadline up to and including the day of the Commission meeting will be uploaded to this file within two business days after the Commission meeting.

Material which does not comply with the submission rules is not distributed to the Commission.

ENABLE BOOKMARS ONLINE:

**If you are using Explorer, you need will need to enable the Acrobat  toolbar to see the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.

SECONDARY SUBMISSIONS

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

Urging the LA City Planning Commission to amend the Westwood Village Specific Plan

Dana Slatkin <dana@violetla.com>

Thu, Feb 10, 2022 at 9:02 AM

To: cpc@lacity.org

Hello,

I am currently on the Zoom meeting and would like to comment about the proposed amendment of the Westwood Village Specific Plan. I am a business owner, resident and stakeholder of Westwood Village. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to rethink the onerous Plan, which has proven to retard growth and prolong vacancy and dilapidation in our Village for decades. The outdated Plan has been coopted by whiny neighborhood trolls who have no other stake in our Village but their own self-proclaimed relevance. The day our Village decides to rewrite the Plan, allowing more restaurants, businesses, parking structures and events into a friendlier environment, is the day our Village can start rebuilding, just as we have seen in Culver City, Venice, Silverlake, Echo Park and many other newly revitalized communities. This step is essential if we want to welcome the Summer Olympics, Metro users and future generations to one of Los Angeles' most vibrant, youthful, cutting-edge and sustainable communities.

Dana

Dana Slatkin
Executive Chef/Owner
Violet Los Angeles
dana@violetla.com
<http://www.violetla.com/>
1121 Glendon Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310.208.1121 bistro/school
310.753.9497 mobile



North Westwood Neighborhood Council

Community Impact Statement

Council File [18-1101](#)

February 2, 2022

RE: Westwood Village Specific Plan Amendment Ordinance ([Case No. CPC-2021-795-SP](#))

The Westwood Village Specific Plan was established in 1989, with amendments in 1991, and 2004, is the guiding document for all urban planning and business development in the Village. The Specific Plan currently contains many prohibitive definitions and restrictions that are outdated and have resulted in a destructive 3Q21 40% vacancy rate in Westwood Village. Including known moveout and sublease space, the 3Q21 availability rate in Westwood Village is 52%. The Los Angeles Department of City Planning has is considering making a recommendation to the City Planning Commission on a draft ordinance to amend the Westwood Village Specific Plan, referred to the Planning and Land Use Management Committee by Los Angeles Fifth District City Councilmember Paul Koretz, and the NWWNC supports the following amendments being considered:

- 1) **Eliminating ratios for fast food versus restaurant land uses in the Village.** The current language classifies all food uses, which are not full-service dining, as fast food and uses ratios to allocate food uses on a street-by-street basis. The food use definitions were written before the emergence of the fast-casual dining sector. As a result, fast-casual concepts, which are typically not full-service dining, are classified as fast food. This limits popular new concepts and possibly more affordable concepts to proliferate in the Westwood Village. Additionally, due to changes in consumer tastes, a rising minimum wage and as a result of the pandemic, there are a large number of full-service dining vacancies while the fast-food uses are 100% allocated. This change will allow more new and exciting restaurant concepts to more easily open in the Village and fill current vacancies.
- 2) **Eliminating additional administrative approval for signage that complies with existing**

Westwood Village Specific Plan regulations. Signage that deviates from the plan will still go through the current Design Review Board Process. The current process disincentivizes business development by slowing down the approval of signage projects and increasing costs for small business owners.

- 3) **Returning parking requirements to those in the General Zoning Code.** The current Specific Plan requires more parking than the General Zoning Code for many land uses, creating an overabundance of unnecessary parking which increases costs on developers, thereby disincentivizing investment in the Village.
- 4) **Eliminate parking requirements for businesses where the changes of use are under 5,000 square feet for existing buildings.** This is consistent with the City's "Emergency Ordinance" that was passed to help the business community respond to COVID-19. The current change of use requirements excessively burden prospective new businesses, which has contributed to our extremely high commercial vacancy rate.
- 5) **Unbundle parking to allow off-site parking requirements to be met by lease in lieu of covenants.** This would allow more property owners to lease their parking property and thereby allow more businesses to meet the requirements to establish themselves in the Village.

As the representative neighborhood council of the area including the Specific Plan, we recognize the dire need for structural changes in allowing revitalization in our district. We strongly recommend that the City Council support a unanimous and resounding recommendation to the City Planning Commission in support of all of the above amendments to the Westwood Village Specific Plan.

Thank you.

WESTWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL CIS MOTION
FOR PRESENTATION TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION ON
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2022, 8:30 A.M.

(CIS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY, FEBRUARY 9, 2022):

CIS TITLE: The WWNC CONDITIONALLY SUPPORTS the current draft of the proposed amendments to the Westwood Village Specific Plan (CF18-1101)

Be it resolved that the Westwood Neighborhood Council **only supports** the adoption of Council File 18-1101, proposed amendments to the Westwood Village Specific Plan, **on the condition that all of the 18 elements documented on January 22, 2022** that were agreed upon by the Fifth District Councilmember and Council Planning Deputy, Westwood community, Westwood business community, and UCLA, **as well as corrections to the Draft Ordinance sent on February 8, 2022 are incorporated into the Ordinance.**

Specifically, the current draft of the proposed amendments fails to include “one look” review of signage by the Westwood Design Review Board, among other material omissions that have been agreed upon by the aforementioned parties.

We therefore call for the deletion of proposed Section 4.A.1.a. of the proposed draft ordinance as well as correction of the definition of “Restaurant” to be consistent with the definition used in the Restaurant Beverage Program (RBP), and retention of section 6.B.16 in order to cover businesses selling alcoholic beverages between the hours of 11:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. which are beyond the scope of the RBP.

Absent these changes, we call on the City Planning Commission and Council Office to continue this item to allow for corrections to the draft ordinance by the Planning staff, Council Office, and the City Attorney’s office in order to make these corrections and reflect the agreement reached by the parties noted above.

Westwood Village Specific Plan Amendment
Amendments agreed to by the
Fifth District Council Office, Westwood neighbors, Westwood BID, and UCLA

PARKING

New Construction:

1. Default to citywide parking requirements. AGREE
2. New Construction: Covenanted off-street parking is required for new construction to be within 750 feet based on citywide requirements. AGREE
3. Allow for off-street parking to be unbundled and allocated at market prices to ensure efficient allocation. AGREE
4. No replacement of surface parking lot spaces at 50%, as currently required by the Plan. AGREE

Existing Buildings

5. Allow for off-street parking to be unbundled and allocated at market prices to ensure efficient allocation. AGREE
6. Commercial buildings with a Certificate of Occupancy that predates this amendment to the Specific Plan shall be exempt from new parking requirements in the event of any change of use. AGREE

CHANGE OF USE

7. Change of Use shall be eligible for an Administrative Clearance (ministerial review) by the Director of Planning for projects that do not propose a façade alteration, new construction, expansion, or a Limited Use identified in Section 6B of the Specific Plan. AGREE

FOOD USES

8. Revise definitions of restaurants and fast-food establishments. AGREE
9. Remove the restrictions on the types and number of restaurants and fast food establishments. AGREE
10. Removed ratios for food uses or limits on types of food use establishments. AGREE

11. Continue the Alfresco Dining Program. AGREE
12. Conditional Use Beverage (CUB) Permits for alcoholic beverage service shall follow the citywide Restaurant Beverage Program (RBP). AGREE

OTHER USE RESTRICTIONS AND RATIOS

13. Leave existing ratios for financial services in place. AGREE
14. Prohibit auto-oriented uses such as drive-thrus and delivery-only uses including, but not limited to, commissaries and ghost kitchens. AGREE
15. Delivery and take-out accessory services for full-service restaurants will continue to be allowed. AGREE
16. NEW: Expressly allow the following amusement-oriented uses including all of the following: “Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12.16 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to the contrary, bowling alleys, roller skating rinks, ice skating rinks, penny arcades, game arcades, laser tag game facilities, escape game rooms, and puzzle rooms shall be permitted within the Specific Plan area with a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with the LAMC.” AGREE

SIGNAGE

17. Review of Signage: Administrative clearance (ministerial approval issued by the Director of Planning) for signs that comply with Section 12 of the Specific Plan, and which do not require an adjustment, modification, exception, or a Certificate of Appropriateness), subject to a “one-look” process by the Westwood Design Review Board at a publicly noticed meeting, following submission of a completed submittal package. This “one-look” process will be an abbreviated DRB review involving one public review and recommendation by the DRB to the Director of Planning (Planning Deputy), during publicly agendized “office hours” in accordance with the Brown Act, after which time the Planning Deputy will have the authority to stamp the plans at that meeting for conforming signs, or for signs that are non-conforming, the Planning Deputy will have the authority to confirm that any DRB recommended conditions have been met, and then approve the sign and stamp the plans. No Letter of Determination (LOD) will be issued in such cases. This process would eliminate the need for any follow up DRB meeting, and any delay arising from drafting, approving, and signing an LOD. Such administrative clearance for signage approval is not subject to an appeal. AGREE
18. Update the description of prohibited sign types to include “internally lit box/cabinet signs” and add “color, context, proportion, and placement” to the design criteria in section 12.B. (Note: this is unanimously recommended by the Westwood Design Review Board.) AGREE

Corrections to Draft Amendments

pg. 3 #35 Alice's should be bold. Already designated

pg. 6 F Review of signage we had agreed to.

Sec. 4 A.a. No signs shall be exempted. E agreed to 1 look by DRB

pg. 8 Full service grocery store – 18,000 down to 12,000. Never discussed.
Where did this come from? There may be no problem but it just appeared.

pg. 10 Def. of restaurant – this allows any place that sells edibles to serve alcohol.
Needs further discussion.

pg. 11 prohibited use – ghost kitchen. Not there.

pg. 13 #10 Support al fresco dining per city. Must have ADA clearance.
Questioned why they removed 10, 11, and 12. Need explanation.

pg. 15 Why removing #16? We support city til 11 pm. Anything past 11
requires a CUB. Never agreed to change.

pg. 21 why “placeholder”
Sec. 10 Parking and Mobility. Should state, “Default to LAMC.”

pg. 22 B. Agreed to 750' Should default to LAMC.
Missing reference to bundling. Make certain it's in document.”Allow for of
f-street pkg to be unbundled and allocated at market price to ensure s
ufficient allocation.”

pg. 26 Sec. 11. placeholder. A,B,C,D, and E should remain. We agreed to
administrative clearance subject to a 1 look process by DRB.

pg. 30 # 4 and 5. Never discussed. Should revert to 1 look by DRB

pg. 31 Abatement of nonconforming signs. Never discussed.
Should read, “Signs and Sign Programs.” Context, proportion, and
placement apply to signs and sign programs. Words to be added.
Top of pg. 32 Do not want to strip board of discussing color. That goes to

the heart of their responsibility.

Sec. 14 Design Review Process. All signs to have 1 look process.

Kevin, Daniel called me while I was preparing this. If CA can't come to terms with this DRB having 1 look (doesn't work administratively), I asked Daniel to leave the language in the plan alone. Appeals to signage just don't happen. We are removing a thing that has worked for yrs and worked well. The Planning Dept. has been responsible for taking months to approve and we have no contro; over that.

Let's see where we are tomorrow.

Sandy



Planning CPC <cpc@lacity.org>

Fwd: WWNC MOTION

Stephen Resnick <saresnick@gmail.com>
To: cpc@lacity.org

Thu, Feb 10, 2022 at 9:27 AM

Below is the motion passed last night at the Westwood Neighborhood Council Special Meeting.

Stephen Resnick, Secretary
Westwood Neighborhood Council

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lisa Chapman** <lchapmangabriel@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2022 at 11:22 PM
Subject: Fwd: WWNC MOTION
To: Westwood Neighborhood Council Group Email <westwoodnc@googlegroups.com>

Revised and completed motion from tonight!

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, Feb 9, 2022 at 10:23 PM
Subject: Fwd: WWNC MOTION
To: Sandy Brown <sandy10778@yahoo.com>, Lisa Chapman <lchapmangabriel@gmail.com>

The WWNC conditionally supports the current draft of the proposed amendments to the Westwood Village Specific Plan (CF18-1101)

Be it resolved that the Westwood Neighborhood Council only supports the adoption of Council File 18-1101, proposed amendments to the Westwood Village Specific Plan, on the condition that all of the 18 elements as documented on January 22, 2022 and corrections sent on February 8, 2022 that were agreed upon by the Fifth District Councilmember and Council Planning Deputy, Westwood community, Westwood business community, and UCLA are incorporated into the ordinance. Specifically, the current draft of the proposed amendments fails to include "one-look" review of signage by the Westwood Design Review Board, among other material omissions that have been agreed upon by the aforementioned parties.

We therefore call for the deletion of proposed Section 4.A.1.a. of the proposed draft ordinance, as well as correction of the definition of "Restaurant" to be consistent with the definition used in the Restaurant Beverage Program (RBP), as well as retention of section 6.B.16 in order to cover businesses selling alcoholic beverages between the hours of 11:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. which are beyond the scope of the RBP. Absent these changes, we call on the City Planning Commission and Council Office to continue this item to allow for corrections to the draft ordinance by the Planning staff, Council Office, and the City Attorney's office in order to make these corrections and reflect the agreement reached by the parties noted above.

--