

**LAND USE COMMITTEE
OF THE CRESCENTA VALLEY TOWN COUNCIL**

**MEETING MINUTES
March 4, 2021, 6:30 P.M.**

[Minutes approved at April 1, 2021 Land Use Meeting]

Zoom Meeting (Zoom Meeting ID: 975 8957 0194)

Meeting Recording:

https://zoom.us/rec/share/DtMidDQ_cL1NNB7QHyWnwYpfeW2N12dpWF2AuDFUG5yh3AIKit098c7TG6ET1P2N.d26FyHf2tvG6iQZF

Access Passcode: 88XD9%Vc

CALL TO ORDER: 6:32 p.m.

OPENING BUSINESS

1. Flag Salute – Frank Beyt led the LUC in the Flag Salute.
2. Roll Call: Present: F. Beyt, J. Bodnar, I. Chessum, C. Davis, K. Hales (6:34 pm), C. Kilpatrick, A. Ordubegian and P. Rabinov Absent: N. England,
3. Approval of Agenda for March 4, 2021 – FB JB 7:0
4. Approval of Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes February 4, 2021 – AO FB 7:0
5. Public Comments – non agenda items.

Members of Public: Harry Leon (CVTC), Mr. Kroening, Zoe Axelrod, Donna, Sharon Raghavachary, Doug, Barb Goto, Ayala Scott, Judy Tejada, Sandy Switzer, Dede Mueller, Kerri, Stuart Byles (Marie Yeseta), Steve Goldsworthy, Wendy Pitcher, Jaleen Lunt, Dede Mueller, Grant Michals, and Dolores.

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. 3037 & 3043 Foothill Blvd., next to Walgreens. Hearing Officer hearing **February 23, 2021** <http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/tr073310> Project No 2014-03733-(5), Amendment Map to remove one detached residential condominium unit from Lot 2 of which was previously approved for 29 attached residential condominium units in six detached buildings. Conditional Use Permit Modification to modify text conditions of CUP 201400181 to reflect the changes proposed by the amendment to the tentative tract map. Amendment and CUP modification was approved.

7. LA Regional Planning Presentation – Housing Element (Zoe Axelrod and Ayala Scott)

Zoe Axelrod (Housing Policy Section with the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning) provided a presentation on housing in the unincorporated communities. We are in a middle of a housing and homelessness crisis. The amounts and types of housing are not meeting the overall need. Rule of thumb, if you are spending more than 30% of income on housing you are “housing cost burdened”. In Los Angeles County around 43% of households are “housing cost burdened”. In unincorporated area, 57% is owner-occupied. In summary, there is not enough housing that is meeting Los Angeles County needs.

Looking for 90,000 homes that could be built in the upcoming eight years. Rezoning will ensure that the homes can be built under the housing element rezoning program.

Ayala Scott from DPR discussed about different proposed land use category and proposed zoning. Each site is proposed to increase one step above. For example, H30 (20-30 units/acre) would go to H50 (20-50 units/acre). All of the proposed zoning opportunities are in Montrose on the border with the City of Glendale.

This housing element is not a land use plan that is done by area planning processes which includes environmental reviews and capital improvement plan. Public Works and Parks would evaluate the infrastructure needs. Timeline: Until 2024 to do the area planning process that would implement the recommendation of new housing opportunities. The proposal would impact 33 parcels in Montrose.

Public Comment

Sandy Switzer – asked about infrastructure question impact on schools. Answer: Developer is required to pay the appropriate fees. DRP will look at infrastructure and taken into account.

Harry Leon – how are you planning on having the public be informed and how the public can relay their opinion. Answer: There will be additional opportunities for public comment on the Housing Element. It is not a done deal. DPR staff is outlining the methodology. For example, some changes can be made to correct information. State law is prescriptive that they cannot concentrate new housing in one area and apply a methodology across the board. DPR asked that if there are other areas of the community that the residents feel would be more appropriate for housing, they would like suggestions.

Dede Mueller asked how were the sites chosen?

Mtnel Annexation of La Crescenta to a City: to La Canada and Glendale?

Sharon Raghvachary – Did you look at what is on the 33 parcels? Answer: yes, they looked, there are parking lots, churches, but none of the existing uses would continue under the proposed zone land use. 33 parcels 40 units per parcel, looking at “16.5%” population increase in one area. Concerned that the addition will be a strain on infrastructure.

Sandy – the builders on any of these projects are given accommodations to build projects, such as: they would be able to provide less parking. With all of these buildings will there be parking required? Answer: Parking is required. They would need to go through the State statute parking in exchange for providing affordable units. They will review the parking impacts.

Public comment in chat: A city has more control, get incorporated into La Canada and Glendale. Answer: Every city is assigned a number of units with a mandate.

Public Comment Closed

LUC Comments

Paul Rabinov – How many units La Crescenta will absorb from the 90,000? Answer: The 33 parcels in Montrose. (Didn't know the number)

Chris Kilpatrick – You are not sure how many units will come from the 33 parcels. Answer: They have not looked at the density and can get back to the LUC.

At least two of the sites have Churches on them. Churches are going through difficult time now. The proposal could have drastic changes to the neighborhood. Has anyone actually been to the neighborhood? Answer: Ayala Scott responded she has visited the neighborhood in the past.

Has any feedback been included in choosing the sites? Answer: They are using the standard methodology. They would like to hear if there are other sites that would be better for the community. They would welcome our feedback.

Comment on how long it takes to get permits in the Los Angeles County. The county is not developer friendly. Answer: Realize that the permit process is lengthy. New by right housing ordinance should improve process in about a month.

Is there traffic consideration and can the roads handle the additional traffic? Answer: There will be a traffic report when the additional housing opportunities are added, an additional analysis will be performed. There will be an environmental impact report.

Ines Chessum – Single family homes although they have not been rezoned, are increasing density by including ADUs and Jr. ADU making R-1 a three family lot; has the 90,000 household goal for the unincorporated areas factored this into the math? Out of the 90,000 units it's difficult to understand the size of the unit (400 sq ft., 800 sq ft., 3,000 sq ft.?) Montrose is a place that we need in our community; the selected sites have 2 churches, the AAA Automobile Club, the Post office, and several small local businesses. In general, we have seen a lot of units being built along Montrose in the past 3-4 years. The concern is that in a matter of three years – 2024- there could be a huge impact to the community caused by the number of units that would be allowed under this proposal. The proposed zone changes in Montrose would be:

EXISTING: 0 minimum to 417 units maximum number of “units” to

PROPOSED: 221 minimum to 1,179 maximum number of “units”

How do Cities deal with their housing units? Answer: Every jurisdiction in California is assigned a number with a mandate. Every jurisdiction has to prove that they are meeting the mandate. If they do not meet the mandate, they need to rezone. The city of Pasadena is not requiring developers to build. The development in Pasadena is market driven. Los Angeles County did not require the development.

What would be the next steps? Answer: A few milestones: April 28, 2021, Regional Planning Commission to discuss the Housing Element. They are not taking any action on that date. Then, in May and June there will be a public draft review. In July the first hearing, and then September Board of Supervisors hearing. There is public comment at each. Following the Board action, by the end of the year in December, the Housing Element then goes to the state for approval. Between 2022 and 2024

there will be additional discussion. If you have ideas for alternative sites in community or concerns about a specific parcel. Los Angeles County staff volunteered that they could come back to the LUC.

Housing Element Survey: bit.ly/housingelementsurvey (Will be up for another week)

Comments and questions: Email housing@planning.lacounty.gov

More information can be found at the Housing Element webpage:
<http://planning.lacounty.gov/housing/involved>

PUBLIC HEARING & ACTION ITEMS

8. LUC Terms

Dec 2020 – Paul Rabinov, Nicole Englund, James Bodnar

Dec 2021 – Chris Kilpatrick* (replaced Carin Hoffman), Ines Chessum, Kendall Hales

Dec 2022 – Cheryl Davis, Frank Beyt, Aram Ordubegian

*Chris Kilpatrick's term on the CVTC will expire in 2023.

One application has been received to date, Harry Leon will check on any additional applications.

a) Applications due March 4 & Interviews March 11 afternoon – March 15 candidates to be notified for submission to the CVTC for approval at March 18 meeting.

9. Glendale City Council Public Hearing on Appeal of Design Review Board Case No. PDR2004976 located at 2941-2943 Honolulu Avenue. Letter sent. Grant Michals – the letter was received, the debate was extensive, no motion was successful. The item will be heard later this month, likely March 26th. No resolution has been made at this time. Updated plans were going to be part of the upcoming discussion.

FUTURE PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

10. 3830 Hillway Drive (Whiting Woods) – Glendale DRB 1/14/21 was continued. Removing from agenda.

EARLY NOTIFICATION / APPLICATIONS FILED AT DEPT. REGIONAL PLANNING

11. Walgreens CUP renewal application for the continued sale of alcohol (3001 Foothill), Stephen Jamieson. Application not filed as February 11, 2021. 2/18/21 Requested to present at April 1 LUC meeting.

12. Ocean View Bar & Grill – request for renewal of CUP for alcoholic beverages. Janelle Williams, Williams Land Use Services, williamslanduse@yahoo.com. No update.

13. 2413 Foothill & 4521 Briggs (NW corner of Foothill & Briggs) - RPPL2019006557 housing permit associated with Conditional Use Permit RPPL2019006553 to establish a Mixed-use 40 unit, 52 feet tall, 5 stories (4 units affordable at 50% AMI) ground floor 2,500 sf commercial,

1,700 sf multipurpose room and 3 levels of underground parking (103 standard spaces) in the C-2-DP-BE zone. Requested 35% density bonus and 2 incentives (10 feet height increase and FAR) via Discretionary Housing Permit. RPPL 2019006559 is housing project next to it. To establish a 28 unit, 45 feet tall, 4 stories (2 units affordable at ? % AMI) 2 levels of underground parking (69 standard spaces) in the C-2-DP-BE zone. Requested ?% density bonus and 2 incentives (10 feet height increase and FAR) via Discretionary Housing Permit. They were planning on contacting the LUC. Maybe two year process to complete the project. The planners are giving them an extension.

14. 2434 Foothill Blvd (SE corner of Sunset) – Project PRJ2020-001576; Plan RPPL2020005035 filed 8/10/2020. 4-story 31-unit apartment building with 2-level sub-garage. Providing three affordable units at 50% AMI and requesting 1 incentive - 10 feet height. Per Planner Elsa Rodriguez, project is ministerial/by right, but may become discretionary due to oak tree encroachments. (Zoned C-2-BE). By right development.

UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

15. Update from Nicole Englund regarding the DRP's Design Review Committee – Nicole unable to attend today.
16. Next LUC meeting is April 1, 2021

Grant Michals: After two hours of discussion of mixed use building on near Lowell and Foothill Blvd. in Glendale has been continued. Main objection from community is the traffic impact on al already busy intersection.

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned 8:00 pm