

PLUM/WRAC report:

Victoria/Charnock development: Councilmember Bonin reports that he WILL NOT utilize City Council Rule 245(e) as requested and voted upon by the MVCC to assert jurisdiction over the development (6 stories, out of character for the community) , nor will his office be obtaining a new Preliminary Letter of Determination on this project. The Community is free to challenge the Preliminary Letter of Determination (which contains errors involving the date by which appeals were to be filed), and can do so by getting counsel from a land use attorney if they desire. Since the appeals deadline has passed, challenging the Preliminary Letter of Determination and/or filing suit over the proposed development may be the only remedies available at this time.

Futterman Development (McLaughlin/Charnock): private negotiations were held between Tom Poton and the developer, an agreement was reached however it is uncertain if both the developer and Mr. Poton, on behalf of the community, executed the agreements. At the present time Councilmember Bonin's office advises that they have had no recent communications with the developer to ascertain what the status of the development is because the developer's attorney has not returned phone calls or email inquiries.

2512 Centinela: A Motion of Opposition to this development was passed at PLUM. Since the original presentation, the PLUM Chair, co-chair and advisor, Neil Kritzinger, spoke with the developer's representative about potential changes to the height and increase in parking if the ingress and egress point was changed from the alley to the street. At this time we have no guarantee that the project will be changed, however the architect who is representing the project reports that consideration and changes are still being discussed and worked on with the developer. If no changes are reported to the PLUM Committee by the time of our next board meeting, we will proceed with a Motion in Opposition to the development at the full BOD meeting in accordance with the vote and input of the local community stakeholders.

Application has been filed and outreach will be conducted concerning a new 12.22A density bonus development filed with DCP for a property on National Blvd., across the street and one block east of the Frymer development. The proposal is for increase in height and density, and this parcel backs directly up to R-1 houses. The parcel is just east of Whole Foods, south side of the street and would replace a single family residence.

PALMS/Sepulveda: Councilmember Koretz's planning deputy, Daniel Skolnick, made representations to the PLUM chair on July 10, 2020 that a letter is forthcoming to both the MVCC PLUM Chair and Councilmember Bonin confirming that the Ordinance asking for a waiver of the West LA TIMP fees for this project will be scheduled for hearing at the Transportation Committee so that it may be "killed" without any action.

WRAC land use policy statement, the "Atkins Package of Bills" is as follows:

1. **SB 902 (Wiener):** https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB902 "A local government may pass an ordinance, notwithstanding any local restrictions on adopting zoning ordinances enacted by the jurisdiction, *including restrictions enacted by a local voter initiative*, that limit the legislative body's ability to adopt zoning ordinances, to zone any parcel for up to 10 units of residential density per parcel, at a height specified by the local government in the ordinance, if the parcel is located in one of

the following: A transit-rich area, jobs-rich area, urban infill site”.

2. **SB 995 (Wiener, Atkins):** https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB995 CEQA authorizes the preparation of a master EIR and authorizes the use of the master EIR to limit the environmental review of subsequent projects that are described in the master EIR, as specified. This bill would require a lead agency to prepare a master EIR for a general plan, plan amendment, plan element, or specified plan for housing projects where the state has provided funding for the preparation of the master EIR. Only 15% affordable housing is required. Subsequent projects would basically be ministerial.
3. **SB 1120 (Atkins, Caballero, Wiener, McGuire, Lena Gonzalez, Hill, Roth, and Rubio):** https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB1120 ministerially approve parcel maps for urban lot splits that meet certain requirements, plus: “a local agency shall not impose regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way or the construction of reasonable offsite and onsite improvements for the parcels being created as a condition of issuing a parcel map for an urban lot split”.
4. **SB 1385 (Caballero, Rubio, Atkins, Lena Gonzalez, McGuire, Wiener, Hill and Roth):** https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB1385 authorizes housing as a “use on a neighborhood lot that is zoned for office or retail commercial use under a local agency’s zoning code or general plan. The bill would require the density for a housing development under these provisions to meet or exceed the density deemed appropriate to accommodate housing for lower income households according to the type of local jurisdiction, including a density of at least 20 units per acre for a suburban jurisdiction”.
5. **AB 3173 (Bloom):** Micro-units sized to 80 square feet. Exempts local review and height rules. No affordable housing. *“Microunit buildings shall be permitted to exceed the otherwise applicable floor-area ratio by up to 50 percent, or to a floor-area ratio of at least 3.5:1, whichever is greater. Microunit buildings shall not be required to provide parking spaces for its tenants. No private or common open space shall be required for microunit buildings”.*
6. **AB 1279 (Bloom):** https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1279 “High resource areas”. Cities which do not achieve their RHNA goals will see their plans overridden with no hearing.
7. **AB 725 (Wicks, Skinner, Wiener):** https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB725 shifts 25% of future RHNA growth to stable neighborhoods that are currently home to 2 to 35 housing units per acre: “This bill would require that at least 25% of a metropolitan jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need for moderate-income housing be allocated to sites with zoning that allows at least 2 units of housing, but no more

than-35 units per acre of housing. The bill would require that at least 25% of a metropolitan jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need for above moderate-income housing be allocated to sites with zoning that allows at least 2 units of housing, but no more than 35 units per acre of housing. The bill would exclude unincorporated areas from this prohibition and would include related legislative findings".

8. **SB 1085 (Skinner):** https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB1085 Revises "definition of "incentives or concessions" to include those proposed regulatory incentives or concessions that the developer determines result in identifiable and actual cost reductions to provide for affordable housing costs. Requires a unit designated to satisfy the inclusionary zoning requirements of a city or county to be included in the total number of units on which a density bonus and the number of incentives or concessions are based. Remove the specified adverse impact on the physical environment from the list of reasons for which a city or county is authorized to refuse a concession or incentive".
9. **AB 3040 (Chiu):** Gives RHNA credits for older single-family homes zoned for fourplexes