

Meeting Summary

Westside Community Plans Advisory Group (WCPAG)

Planning the Westside

Meeting #3: August, 7 2023, 5PM-7PM

CONTENTS


| | |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Overview..... | p 1-2 |
| Main room summaries..... | p 3-5 |
| Breakout room summaries..... | p 5-9 |

Overview

On August 8, 2023, Los Angeles City Planning's Westside Community Plans Update team hosted the [Westside Community Plans Advisory Group's](#) (WCPAG) third meeting via Zoom.

The meeting opened with a staff presentation and summary of the topics previously discussed at the second WCPAG meeting held June 5, 2023 including a summary of the feedback received, review of the current community plan timeline, and preview of the late 2023 and mid 2024 work plan. The third meeting also included an in-depth presentation of the Draft Policy Documents, the Draft Industrial General Plan Land Uses (GPLU), and the Draft Zoning Strategies for the Industrial Areas. The Draft Zoning Strategies presentation included an overview of the different aspects of the new zoning including Form, Frontage, Use, and Community Benefits options along with example building models within the different mixed use, light, and heavy industrial zoning categories.

At this meeting the Advisory Group was tasked with providing feedback on the Draft Policy Documents including the Goals, Policies, and Programs and the Draft GPLU Industrial Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables.



The 52 WCPAG members represent organizations and individuals from the following four Westside Community Plan geographies:

- Palms - Mar Vista - Del Rey
- West LA
- Westchester - Playa Del Rey
- Venice

Composed of a diverse group of community leaders, residents, students, community-based organizations, advocacy groups, business leaders, neighborhood councils, and housing development experts, the Advisory Group serves as a sounding board to assist planning staff in evaluating land use policy and zoning at different stages of the [Westside Community Plan Update](#) process.

Please review the [WCPAG announcement letter](#) for a full list of selected members to the Advisory Group. For more information on the Westside Community Plan Update and the WCPAG, visit the [website](#) for resources and to sign up for updates.

WHERE AND WHEN

Monday, August 7, 2023, 5:00pm - 7:00pm
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Background

Members of the Advisory Group have the opportunity to serve as a community sounding board to provide feedback on draft materials shared by planning staff. Each member of the Advisory Group brings with them a unique perspective, set of experiences, and expertise. The Advisory Group is not a decision-making body and will assist planning staff in evaluating initial draft community plan materials – such as new Draft General Plan Land Use (GPLU) maps, Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables, New Zoning, and Draft Policy Documents.

Structure of Meeting

The WCPAG meeting consisted of three parts: (1) presentations from planning staff on various topics and relevant materials, (2) small, staff-facilitated, breakout group

discussions to allow for more focused, in-depth dialogue, and (3) large group report backs that will allow all members to hear what other groups discussed. In addition to these meetings, members are tasked with providing targeted feedback on the key deliverables, such as the Draft Policy Document and Draft Industrial General Plan Land Use (GPLU) maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables. Breakout groups were tailored by geography: Group 1 Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey, Group 2 Westchester-Playa Del Rey, Group 3 West Los Angeles, Group 4 Venice, Group 5 Regional (this regional group covered topics concerning the four plan geographies), and Group 6 dedicated for Spanish speaking members.

Summaries

The summaries represent a condensed version of the staff presentations and comments shared by advisory group members during the meeting. They represent various comments from different members, and not the overall opinion of the advisory group.

MAIN ROOM SUMMARIES

- The meeting began with an opening presentation by staff that covered various topics including a recap of the second WCPAG meeting and feedback received, and overview of the Draft Policy Documents, the Draft Industrial General Plan Land Uses (GPLU), and the Draft Zoning Strategies for the Industrial Areas. Recording and materials for the third meeting can be found on the WCPAG website [here](#).
- The presentation was followed by one breakout session each with six breakout groups.
 - **Breakout Session** - consisted of a guided discussion on the Draft Policy Document for each of the community plan areas and a guided discussion on the Draft Industrial GPLU maps along with the Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables. As part of the discussion, feedback was provided sharing what was liked and what should be considered in the Industrial areas.
- The presentation and breakout sessions were followed up by a Q&A which included the following questions:
 - PMVRD:
 - Questions on how to incorporate more density and open space into the industrial area.

- Questions on how schools in the industrial areas are integrated or become walkable within other uses in the community.
- Questions on how to incorporate affordable commercial and retail uses within these mixed use industrial areas to protect small businesses and away from larger corporations.
- Question on whether families or traditional residential uses can be classified as part of the live/work use type.
- Questions on if the 10,000 sf minimum tenant size includes live/work uses and if the minimum tenant size should be 15,000 sf to activate ground floor uses i.e. small grocery stores like Traders Joes.
- Questions on what could be done right now to create more moderate housing opportunities in lieu of very-low or market rate housing.
- Questions on where to find a list of vacant sites/lots.

WPDR:

- Questions on whether existing industrial uses can be converted into light industrial mixed-use.
- Questions on where housing would be allowed in the new industrial GPLU's.
- Question on whether the 3 CDO's will disappear as part of the new zoning code.

WLA:

- Questions on whether the hybrid industrial uses are compatible with being adjacent to the freeway.
- Questions on impacts of SB6 and AB2011. And how the City can strengthen the policies related to State housing incentives that don't require buffers in industrial areas.
- Questions on if any remediations will occur on industrial sites.
- Questions on whether open space bonuses are benign considered to address environmental justice.
- Questions on how broadening the intensity of development on these industrial lands may impact the existing neighborhood serving businesses, whether displacement will occur, and types of economic analysis done.
- Questions on how small is a small business space.

Venice:

- Question on how policy impacts or makes determination of what goes into an area.

- Questions on how transitional zoning applies to lots that are only one lot deep.
- Questions on lot depths for commercial abutting residential.
- Questions on why residential uses are being folded into industrial zones.
- Questions on the need for light industrial.
- Questions on reviewing both the local coastal program update and the community plan update together.

Regional:

- Questions on whether hotels are considered residential uses.

Regional (Spanish):

- None

Q&A:

- Questions on time to submit comments.
- Questions on additional public meetings for the general public
- Question on where to locate previous materials.
- Questions on what “Limited” residential means with respect to infrequency or low density.
- Questions on if density bonus would be available for projects incorporating affordable units.
- Questions on which neighborhoods alluded to in policy documents with so many references to “existing neighborhoods.”

BREAKOUT GROUP SESSION - SUMMARIES BY BREAKOUT ROOM

Breakout Group 1: Palms Mar-Vista-Del Rey

Feedback on Draft Policy:

- Additional time needed to review policy documents.
- Include policy on addressing minimizing effects of urban heat and water run-off associated with industrial uses.
- Protect local small businesses and strengthen incentives for the right of return.
- Promote more trees, landscaping, parklets, pocket parks.
- Preserve industry specifically in the Glencoe-Maxella Specific Plan area.

Feedback on Draft Industrial GPLU Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables:

- Require open space to be placed on the ground floor instead of the roof.
- Discrepancies with naming conventions i.e. low rise do not match with GPLU correspondence table and the additional five stories for density bonus.
- Make both sides of Venice and Overland Industrial and unlimited height along Metro stations.
- Curvy part along Santa Monica should be hybrid industrial.
- Airport areas in Del Rey can be used for new industrial and commercial.
- PMVDR 84 can be used for high density commercial, PMVDR 85 should allow residential facing the freeway, PMVDR 73 should allow for more commercial, and FAR is generally too high for most sub areas.

Breakout Group 2: Westchester-Playa Del Rey

Feedback on Draft Policy:

- Support adaptive reuse options for residential uses in appropriate areas.
- Preserve and support small business spaces.

Feedback on Draft Industrial GPLU Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables:

- Markets GPLU areas near Westchester/Veterans Metro station should support residential uses (with the same density as Hybrid Industrial), and have green space connections with the transit station.
- Market GPLU density, height, and FAR should match Hybrid Industrial GPLU.
- Some industrial areas are a good place to accommodate density.
- Ensure small businesses, especially near the farmers market, are supported and protected.
- Gateway LA BID relies on the existing CDO's and should be equally translated into the new code.

Breakout Group 3: West Los Angeles

Feedback on Draft Policy:

- Convert industrial zones to green space near high density areas.
- Greater specificity and policies to achieve Land Use Goal 68 regarding creating accessible and culturally relevant spaces.

Feedback on Draft Industrial GPLU Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables:

- Minimize displacement of neighborhood serving services such as veterinarians, daycare, kennels, and auto service by broad.
- New land use changes near transit need more consideration with impacts to the existing communities.
- Multi-unit housing and density should remain along commercial corridors.
- No public storage in walkable areas.
- Disclosures needed for contaminated sites.
- Supportive of no housing in WLA 48 and allowing hybrid industrial for WLA 47.
- Supportive of greater density at the underdeveloped gas stations in WLA 55.
- Fox Studio site and specific plan areas should account for additional jobs and housing.
- NEC of Sepulveda & Pico recently purchased to become a research and development use and nearby development of a ghost kitchen along that corner is generating lots of traffic.
- Apply height limitations for industrial sites across from 1-3 story residents. Parcels across the street from residential should have limited height or transitional height (3 stories within 50-75 ft)
- Keep unlimited heights along Bundy and Olympic.
- Reduce base floor area ratio, create sliding floor area ratios with bonuses to create more community benefits.
- Consider zoning to allow for lumber and hardware stores.
- Expand Expo bike path in WLA 63.

Breakout Group 4: Venice

Feedback on Draft Policy:

- Additional time needed to review policy documents.
- There is concern that industrial lots are transitioning to purely residential.

Feedback on Draft Industrial GPLU Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables:

- Input from the existing industrial businesses would be helpful to understand the need for light industrial as suggested in VEN 38. The existing uses in this area seem to be more commercial.
- The only residential area along the corner of Abbot Kinney and Venice is the mixed use project.
- There should be more consideration for the high water table in the areas proposed.

- More time spent to discuss what is being proposed and what is on the ground for the Industrial GPLU. Concern if there is commercial and/or industrial being proposed where there might be existing Multi-Family or Single Family homes.
- Include more information on what types of industry/employment is being planned for in Venice.
- Consideration on how to fold in live/work and artist in residence.

Breakout Group 5: Regional

Feedback on Draft Policy:

- Language added to explicitly mention furthering fair housing.
- Language on the history of the City's exclusionary zoning.
- Language on furthering missing middle housing.
- Language to eliminate minimum parking requirements.
- More language about the future transit projects forthcoming.
- Language about pedestrian safety, fully protected bicycle lanes, wide sidewalks, and ADA accessibility.
- More language addressing the need for encouraging more homeownership..

Feedback on Draft Industrial GPLU Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables:

- Strong support for expanding where housing would be allowed.
- Too many parking lots on the eastside of Playa Vista. Expand uses and housing opportunity
- PMVDR 81 is a missed opportunity to allow more housing.
- Include more specific information on open space.
- Example developments, reference to subareas, and visuals of sub areas were helpful.

Breakout Group 6: Spanish Regional

Feedback on Draft Policy:

- Include policies that encourage innovative uses like urban agriculture as a community benefit to address sustainability and environmental resilience. An example of vertical agriculture integrated with affordable housing, systems that recapture water to address climate change, and use examples from India.
- More considerations of how to help seniors who will be more vulnerable to climate change and limited resources. An example to include combining health service

with residential uses to reduce travel times while reducing emissions from vehicles.

- Provide bonuses in exchange for more green/open space especially in industrial zones.

Feedback on Draft Industrial GPLU Maps and Draft GPLU Correspondence Tables:

- Varied single-family residential conditions. At Pico/Centinela residential is adjacent to industrial and homes have lost their value. It would make more sense to combine with hybrid industrial, and include bonuses for green space.
- At Stoner, residential is a more appropriate residential area long-term and is an example of housing that has unique character worth preserving with a nearby park but not all areas are like this.
- There are areas where it makes more sense to add more mixed-use or hybrid density where the existing single-family residential is no longer appropriate.
- There are some single-family that remain so because they do not attract investment with current zoning but are losing their value nonetheless -- consider adding more bonus so that they actually attract more mixed-use density where it makes sense.
- Live/work should be applied more broadly and have more uses included, especially for local and neighborhood serving, like medical or agricultural.
- Add more categories in industry for the types of uses that may be necessary in the future to address social and environmental/sustainability issues.
- Combine more uses like community services, physical activity, art, schools, etc. that would provide access to activities that increase the quality of life and health of the families that live in the area.
- Encourage more integration of uses that would help the daily life of communities.
- Include more incentives for vertical green space for transition between industrial and residential while also mitigating environmental impacts.
- The building at Olympic/Purdue has one acre of vertical green space that serves as part of the transition to the single-family zones -- and does not take as much floor area on the ground floor -- there are areas along Bundy/Nebraska that would benefit from this type of design.