

**OFFICIAL**  
**CITY OF LOS ANGELES**  
**South Valley Area Planning Commission Minutes**  
**March 08, 2001**  
**4:30 PM**  
**Sherman Oaks Women's Club**  
**4808 Kester Avenue**  
**Van Nuys, CA 91423**

MINUTES OF THE SOUTH VALLEY AREA PLANNING COMMISSION HEREIN ARE REPORTED IN SUMMARY FORM. COMPLETE DETAILS RELATING TO EACH ITEM ARE CONTAINED IN THE HEARING TAPES FOR THIS MEETING. COPIES OF TAPES ARE AVAILABLE BY CONTACTING CENTRAL PUBLICATIONS, at (213) 580-5249.

The meeting was called to order by the Commission President at 5:10 p.m. Commissioners present: Darren Martinez, Matt Epstein, Tony Lucente, Janel Huff; Tsilah Burman

1. **DEPARTMENTAL REPORT - ITEMS OF INTEREST**

The Senior Planner informed the Commission of the following issues:

- A. Distributed the Mulholland Scenic Corridor DRB subcommittee workshop agenda for March 10, 2001
- B. Distributed material regarding the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) conference at the L.A. Central Library being held by the Planning Department on March 10, 2001. The State Historic Preservation Office and L.A. Conservancy will also have representatives present.
- C. Van Nuys Airport Master Plan hearing and open house was held last night. Discussion focused on limiting size and number of flights. This issue will come to the South Valley Area Planning Commission for review and comment sometime in the fall of this year before going on to the City Planning Commission.

2. **COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. Advance Calendar

The regularly scheduled meeting for March 22, 2001 has no cases scheduled and was cancelled.

B. Commission Requests

The Commission request a briefing on housing issues be scheduled for an April meeting date.

C. Minutes of February 22, 2001

Approved by consent.

3. **CPC 2000-0846(SPA) - Warner Center Specific Plan Amendment - Review & Comment AMENDMENTS** to the Warner Center Specific Plan (Ordinance Nos.168873, 168984, 171529, 173071 and 173072 ). Proposed Amendments to the Specific Plan as follows:

- 1.) Refinement and clarification of existing development standards relative to Phase I development;
- 2.) Revision of the Warner Center Transportation Improvement Plan (TIMP) strategies and implementation mechanisms for transportation system improvements relevant to growth in Warner Center;
- 3.) Amendment of the Specific Plan to limit development to either the Phase I limitation of 21.5 million square feet or to the end of the year 2010;
- 4.) Provisions for the Specific Plan's revision for subsequent future Phase II, III and IV pending the necessary environmental analysis; and
- 5.) Clarification and improvement of the procedural/regulatory elements of the Specific Plan in order to make the Plan more understandable and easier to implement, including changes to the Plan's sign provisions, land use categories, application processes, child-care provisions, and urban design standards.

Discussion:

Planning staff gave a presentation on the history and current status of the Plan amendments.

The issues raised and discussed by the Commission, Planning staff and interested parties included the following: amount and type of parking spaces; funding sources; allocation of funds; neighborhood protection program; staffing; mass transit and alternative transportation; Impact Assessment Fees; tenant retention and vacancy rates; density comparisons; excessive restrictions; fairness of assessments; pole sign and banner restrictions; community input; setbacks; traffic

impacts; clarification of designated neighborhoods impacted.

The public hearing was closed.

Deliberation:

During deliberation the Commission established consensus issues to be detailed in the Planning staff report to the City Planning Commission including the following: establishment of an approved sign program; time limit for expenditure of neighborhood protection program funds and a cap on administrative costs for that program; establishment of enforcement provisions; review of the parking space increase and national standards and impact on tenant retention; modification of language on Item No. 8, page 48 regarding setback relief.

4. **ZA 2000-1769(ZV)(ZAA)-A1**

AN APPEAL from the entire Determination of a Zoning Administrator pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.28-A, denying a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment from Section 12.10-C,1 and 2 of the Code to permit five-foot front and -zero-foot side yards in lieu of the required 20-foot and five-feet, respectively; AND pursuant to Charter Section 562 and Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.27, approval of a Variance from Section 12.10-A of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to permit the construction, use and maintenance of a 101,556 square-foot self storage facility, 1,239 square-foot manager's residence, and 1,239 square-foot office with 41 parking spaces and hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sunday with no provisions for bicycle parking, no recycling room/area, no landscape parking area, and no glazing of exterior windows AND approval of a Variance from Section 1.21-C,5(h) of the Code to permit access for a less restrictive Zone (R3) to a more restrictive Zone (R1) AND pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.28-A, approval of a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow for zero-foot rear yards on the R3 and R1 lots providing the Department of Building and Safety determines that the front yard for the R3-zoned portion of the site is Sepulveda Boulevard and the front yard for the R1-zoned lots are Valerio Street and Leadwell Street AND pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 16.05, approval of Site Plan Review.

Staff recommended denial.

Discussion:

The Zoning Administrator gave the description, background and history of the case; stated the Appellant withdrew his appeal in writing.

The Applicant and the Applicant's representative described working closely with the community to ensure all concerns were addressed.

One speaker opposed to the project submitted material to the Commission outlining reasons for his opposition; stated that the project does not meet the Code requirements for a Zone Variance; that this project should be a Zone Change, which requires a more thorough review; that he was not notified of the project until receiving notice from the Zoning Administrator on the hearing date; that none of the supporting neighbors are members of the Van Nuys Homeowners Association; this use might be detrimental to neighboring business.

A speaker representing the Van Nuys Homeowners Association stated his group supports the project and the developer has addressed all the concerns; this use is much better than another apartment building; asked to deny the appeal; submitted petition; 15 people raised hands in support of project and as petition signers.

Deliberation:

The motion was made to deny the Appeal and sustain the Zoning Administrator's determination.

**MOTION: Martinez moved; Lucente seconded**  
**VOTE: 5-0**

The Commission President called a recess at 7:54 p.m.

The meeting was reconvened at 8:39 p.m.

5. **ZA 2000-0436(YV)-A1**

AN APPEAL from the entire Determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator's approval pursuant to Charter Section 562 and Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.27, as modified, of a variance from Section 12.08-C,3 to permit reduced easterly and westerly side yards of three feet in lieu of the four-foot side yards required in conjunction with the construction, use and maintenance of a new single-family dwelling on a substandard 3,601.5 square-foot, 30.02 foot wide parcel in the R1-1 Zone.

Staff recommended denial.

Discussion:

The Zoning Administrator gave the description, background and history of the case; stated that some property owners opposed the Variance grant; the issues were that the lot was too narrow for the house size and such building is not allowed on other properties in the area.

The Appellant spoke, citing other nearby properties for size comparisons and stated opposition to the project based on size.

The Applicant spoke and his issues included: the legality of the lot; having same rights as neighbors to build within the law; the need for relief due to narrow lot.

Several speakers in support of the Appeal submitted photos and raised the following issues: illegality of building on the subject property; privacy; size; parking impact; safety related to traffic visibility; buildability of the lot; blight; setbacks;

There was discussion between the Commission and the various parties present on the following issues: background history of the property sale; comparative frontage sizes on the neighboring lots; whether the Applicant was aware of the difficulties when he bought the lot; ownership status of the Applicant; the Code requirements on set back variance.

The Applicant stated that he has a letter establishing power of attorney from the owner and he can provide that for proof of legality to build on the property.

The Applicant agreed to an extension beyond the expiration date and a continuance for the case to be heard at the April 26 meeting date and to provide the letter establishing his power of attorney at that time. The Commission also recommended that he communicate with the Appellant to try to resolve issues during the interim.

The Commission agreed by voice vote to continue the case to the April 26, 2001 meeting.

6. **ZA 1999-0687(CU)(ZV)-A1**

AN APPEAL from the entire Determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator's approval pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W, 12 and 36 of the continued use and maintenance of an animal farm with pony riding lessons and pony rides with a maximum 23 ponies on site, a petting farm and the boarding of two equines with riding lessons AND pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.27-B, a Variance from Section 12.21-A,6(c) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to permit the continued use of permeable paving (as permitted by ZA 96-0779(ZAI) in lieu of impermeable paving for only that portion of a parking area where pony/equine loading and unloading takes place, in the RA-1 Zone, upon the following additional terms and conditions:

- A. All other use, height and area regulations of the Municipal Code and all other applicable government/regulatory agencies shall be strictly complied with in the development and use of the property, except as such regulations are herein specifically varied or required.

- B. The use and development of the property shall be in substantial conformance with the plot plan submitted with the application and marked Exhibit "A", except as may be revised as a result of this action.

Staff recommended denial.

Discussion:

The Zoning Administrator gave the description, background and history of the case.

The Applicant spoke stating that the use was established by right at the subject property.

The Appellant was not present at the meeting.

One speaker, a neighbor opposed to the project, raised the following issues: the Applicant has not been a good neighbor; odors; past protests by neighbors have been ignored; mistreatment of animals; health hazards; parking violations; people supporting the project don't live in the area; the Applicant doesn't live on the property, she lives in Chatsworth; negative impact on property values; many neighboring houses are now rentals because the owners can't sell their houses due to concerns of potential buyers about the subject property.

An inquiry by the Commission revealed that there were nine speakers in favor of the project and two of those individuals, speaking for the group raised the following issues: the subject site has brought business to the community; benefits the children of the area; no negative impact from odors; neighboring church is a worse neighbor.

The Applicant also indicated the following: that she has used the land since 1973 and has always had animals on it; has had petting farm in the area for 37 years; the property is kept clean; filming is done there regularly; should deny the appeal; zone allows animals; submitted the health report approving the use; that she does not reside there but there is always someone residing there.

Deliberation

Issues covered by the Commission during deliberation included: benefit to the neighborhood; use violations found by the Planning Department; renewal period of two years versus three years; reinstatement of the parking condition to retain parking use; nuisance issues.

The motion was made to deny the Appeal and sustain the action of the Zoning Administrator.

**MOTION: Martinez moved; Huff seconded**  
**VOTE: 5-0**

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There was no public comment.

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:14 p.m.

ATTEST:

---

Darren Martinez, President

---

Greg Bartz, Commission Executive Assistant  
South Valley Area Planning Commission