



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 23-0623

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org
Cc: VanGundyCNC@aol.com

Thu, Oct 3, 2024 at 5:11 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or resolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Chatsworth

Name: Jim VanGundy

Email: VanGundyCNC@aol.com

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(14) Nay(0) Abstain(1) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 09/04/2024

Type of NC Board Action: For if Amended

Impact Information

Date: 10/04/2024

Update to a Previous Input: Yes

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 23-0623

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 10/03/2024

Item Number:

Summary: The Chatsworth Neighborhood Council (CNC) has reviewed the proposed Draft Affordable Housing Ordinance (also known as the ED1 Ordinance) of 9/14/2023, the Mayor's ED1 Directive (3rd revision) 7/1/2024, and the United Neighbors proposed ED1 Guidelines. The CNC would be supportive of codifying ED1 (the streamlining of 100% affordable and supportive housing projects) as long as there are certain guidelines and limits to what can be a ministerial project.

Ref:MSG11211647

 **CNC final CIS ED1.pdf**
53K

Date: September 4, 2024
RE: CF 23-0623 / Proposed ED1 Ordinance

Dear Councilmembers,

The Chatsworth Neighborhood Council (CNC) has reviewed the proposed Draft Affordable Housing Ordinance (also known as the ED1 Ordinance) of 9/14/2023, the Mayor's ED1 Directive (3rd revision) 7/1/2024, and the United Neighbors proposed ED1 Guidelines. The CNC would be supportive of codifying ED1 (the streamlining of 100% affordable and supportive housing projects) as long as there are certain guidelines and limits to what can be a ministerial project. We would want to see the following ED1 guidelines and limitations:

1. Does not apply to R1 zoned or more restrictive zoned properties (such as RS, RE, RA, A2, A1, OS) including equestrian areas.
2. Does not apply to High Fire Hazard Severity Zones
3. Does not apply to Substandard Streets
4. Does not apply to Environmentally Sensitive Areas (such as near Open Space Areas, Santa Monica Mountains Zones, Biological Resource Areas, etc.)
5. Does not apply to Rent Stabilized Units (RSO)
6. Requires rear yard setbacks of 15 feet (not 8 feet) to allow existing trees to be preserved and/or new trees to be planted with sufficient room to grow and provide adequate shade, habitat, etc.
7. Requires that yard reductions may not be applied along any property line that abuts an R1 or more restrictive residential zoned property.
8. Requires that if adjacent to horsekeeping lots, the project must comply with equine keeping setbacks (habitable structures must be setback 75-feet from adjoining equinekeeping areas or 35 feet if in a K-district).
9. A reduction of 50 percent on-site Open Space shall only apply if the project is within ½ mile of a public park or 60 percent of the units are comprised of two and three bedrooms.
10. Conversion of on-site open space (whether indoors or outdoors) shall not be permitted.
11. No reduction in tree requirement shall be permitted. Projects that cannot fit all the required trees (one per every four units) on-site or as street trees in subject right of way, shall pay cash in lieu fees as required of all other projects. The additional off-site street trees or park trees that the in-lieu fees provide, shall be planted within close proximity to the project site (i.e. within a 500 foot radius). We cannot afford to reduce our tree canopy.
12. Any proposed tree removal for street trees and protected trees shall follow the required discretionary review. These reviews can be expedited for affordable housing projects but should not be ministerial.
13. Limit the number of Waivers and "Off Menu" incentives to no more than a total of TWO combined (instead of SIX – 5 incentives and 1 waiver). Given that there is no limit to the number of "on-menu" incentives for 100% affordable housing projects under LAMC 12.22.A.25, and given that there are NEW incentives being offered beyond this with the Mayor's Directive and Proposed Ordinance, it is hard to appreciate where the buck stops for a ministerial project and how this would be viewed as having no impacts.

Additionally, we would like to see a swift action plan to update all of the Specific Plans and Overlays which have been viewed as “subjective” (thus not applicable to affordable housing projects) be AMENDED as soon as possible with “**objective**” requirements. Without such attention, there is no sense of place, distinction, or pride anymore. Reducing projects to having a front door facing the street and some glazing will turn our city from something treasured to something lost.