

SCNC BOARD

Jeffrey Carter
Ben Di Benedetto
Joshua Gelfat
Victor Helo
Wayne Kartin
Remy Kessler
Ben Neumann
Richard Niederberg
Todd Royal
Lisa Sarkin
Lana Shackelford
Gail Steinberg
Ron Taylor
Rita Villa
John T. Walker



BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, October 20, 2010,

7:00pm

at

**CBS Studio Center, Building 8, MPR-3,
4024 Radford, Studio City CA, 91604**

PRESIDENT
John T. Walker

VICE PRESIDENT
TODD ROYAL

TREASURER
Remy Kessler

SECRETARY
Rita C. Villa

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
Lana Shackelford

4024 Radford Ave.
Edit. Bldg. 2, Suite 6
Studio City, CA 91604
Phone (818) 655-5400
www.scnc.info

The public is requested to fill out a "Comment Card" to address the Board on any item of the agenda prior to the Board taking action on an item. Comments from the public on Agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the Agenda that is within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction will be heard during the Public Comment period. **Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker, unless directed otherwise by the presiding officer of the Board.** The agenda is posted for public review at: Studio City Neighborhood Council website (www.scnc.info); as well as CBS Studio Center, Radford and Colfax gates; the Studio City Library, 12511 Moorpark St.; the Studio City Recreation Center, 12621 Rye Ave. and at Carpenter Avenue Elementary School, 3909 Carpenter Avenue, Studio City, CA 91604. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least three (3) business days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting the Neighborhood Council Project Coordinator (213) 473-5391 or by e-mail to Thomas.Soong@lacity.org. In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board in advance of a meeting, may be viewed at our website by clicking on the following link: www.scnc.info or at the scheduled meeting. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact office@scnc.info.

Agenda

1. Call to Order & Roll Call (2 min).
2. Approval of September 22, 2010 Minutes (2 min).
3. Comments by the President (10 min).
4. Appointment of **Richard Niederberg** as Chair of Cultural Affairs Committee (1 min).
5. Presentation by **Battalion Chief Peter Benesch, for LAFD Battalion 14** (Studio City) (15 min).
6. Presentation by **Paul Darrigo**, Volunteer Marketing Coordinator, LA Animal Services (10 min).
7. Public Comments on non-agenda items within the Boards jurisdiction (2 min each speaker).
8. Responses to comments from the Board (10 min).
9. Treasurer's report by **Remy Kessler** (5 min).

MOTION: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council has reviewed the October 2010 financial statement and the September bank statements and hereby accepts and approves them.

10. Budget Committee report by **Remy Kessler** (10 min).
 - a) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request of \$2,500 for the Cultural Affairs Committee of the SCNC for additional sponsorship of the 75th Anniversary of Republic Pictures event held on the CBS Studio Center.**

- b) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request of up to \$200 towards the expenses of the Valley Alliance of Neighborhood Councils (VANC) Planning Seminar currently scheduled for November 11, 2010 on the CBS Studio Center.**
- c) **The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request from the Studio City Beautification Association (SCBA) for \$5000 towards the annual maintenance of trees and landscaping under the jurisdiction of the SCBA including, but not limited to, the trees on Ventura Blvd., the welcoming signs on Laurel Canyon and Coldwater, the Moorpark Median, and the Studio City Library.**
- d) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council approves a funding request of \$1,000 from the Reserve Animal Control Officer's Program to join other neighborhood councils in sponsoring the training of volunteer animal control officers with the condition that the SCNC receives appropriate credit along with the other participating organizations.**

11. Land Use Committee Report by **Lisa Sarkin** (20 min).

- a) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports TT-71380 located at 4342-44 Babcock Avenue, Studio City, with the attached agreed upon recommendations.**

**Studio City Land Use Recommendations for
4342-44 Babcock Avenue**

Construction contact information including emergency phone numbers to be posted on outside fencing and maintained.

Basic Site and Landscaping

- 1. Tree Plan to be reviewed by Studio City Neighborhood Council before demo begins.
- 2. Landscaping plan to be reviewed by Studio City Neighborhood Council.
- 3. Parkway landscaping to be reviewed by Urban Forestry Division.

Design, Open Space, and Utility

- 1. Balcony railings will be 30" solid wall with 12" railing.
- 2. Articulation or design element on all exterior walls of buildings (front, sides and rear) conforming with the neighborhood.

Parking and Roads

- 1. Minimum 2 ½ parking spaces per unit
- 2. At least, ½ parking space dedicated for guests with an intercom from parking entrance to each unit with a sign notifying public of guest parking spaces.

- b) **Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council opposes the MND (DIR-2010-1000-SPP-SAPA) regarding the proposed Equinox Fitness Club on the Sportsmen’s Lodge lot. A careful review of the MND regarding the proposed Equinox Fitness Club on the Sportsmen’s Lodge lot has failed to adequately address an extensive number of topics listed in the MND, including subjects such as, but not limited to, parking, traffic, building design, and utilities. Furthermore, the MND failed to address items such as construction traffic, air quality, presentation of a tree report, or the provision of the LA River access, Specific Plan requirements, etc. The report advisory committee is attached.**

Comments related to Equinox at Sportsman’s Lodge Project

DIR-2010-1000-SPP-SAPA 12825/12833 Ventura Blvd. Studio City

Parking: The parking plan, as presented is flawed, and based on questionable data. The Specific Plan requires 1,025 spaces for the property, including 300 for the gym alone. Currently, there are 567 parking spaces on the property, including 71 spaces located on an easement projecting out over the Los Angeles River that can potentially be lost to the Revitalization Program as the river is restored. Thus there are effectively 496 parking spaces for planning purposes.

Construction of the Equinox building will eliminate 78 current spaces, which are to be reclaimed by re-striping the remaining paved surface of the property, adding spaces wherever possible, including numerous double parking spaces which will require permanent valet services in order for them to be utilized.

There is also the issue of differing numbers for projected parking requirements being submitted for review on different documents. The MND shows expected peak usage of the gym combined with expected hotel demand for that time as needing 484 spots, 180 for the gym and 304 for the hotel and banquet facility. Without the easement spaces, that is only 12 more spots than maximum capacity. The MND also shows maximum projected demand for the Lodge facilities to be 351 spaces, which, when combined with a worst case scenario of that demand coinciding with peak gym use, means a parking demand of 531 spots.

However, the numbers shown in the MND differ from those in the Master Land Use Permit Application, which shows a peak weekday demand of 524 spots at 6PM and a weekend peak of 544 spots at 5PM. Thus, it would appear that the numbers have been artificially driven down to what spaces can be found rather than what the parking needs are likely to be. As such, there is some question as to the validity of the findings presented for review.

Furthermore, none of these numbers reflect the perfectly understandable efforts by the Lodge management to increase their business. The banner currently displayed on Coldwater Canyon Ave. advertises banquet facilities for parties of up to 1000 people, a customer flow that, if combined with employees, hotel guests, and Equinox members would completely overwhelm available parking on the lot.

The parking plan also uses the spaces available on three different lots, but does not contain any guarantees that these spots can not later be withdrawn from use, either by their current owner(s), or a new one that might come into possession of one or more of the properties in the future. The spaces that will be available on the lot where the gym is proposed would be completely inadequate to provide parking even at the given projected usage, let alone what would be required if the building use reaches the maximum capacity allowed by law. As

such, any plan relying on shared parking for these properties without ironclad written agreements guaranteeing their premise is unreliable, and therefore no plan at all.

One more parking issue is the ongoing Lodge practice of renting lot space to movie and television shoots in the area, and the extra space required for large vehicles driven by guests staying in the Lodge. Any parking plan that doesn't specifically address guest bus and RV parking as a separate space requirement and that doesn't ban the rental of spaces to outside users is doomed to failure.

Traffic: Ventura Blvd. and Coldwater Canyon Ave. are both chronically busy throughout the business day, and approach gridlock during projected peak gym use hours in the morning and evening. The current proposal does not address in any manner the additional traffic the gym will bring to the area at any time, nor the additional slowing and blockage of traffic flow by cars slowing to ingress the property, either from the side of the street where the gym will be, or from vehicles trying to turn across traffic from the opposite side. Additionally, the customers will cause the same sort of delays and hindrances to vehicle flow when they egress the property after visiting the gym. Inevitably, these additional trips and their unavoidable disruptions will cause an increase in vehicle collisions. The increase in traffic will also make the area that much more hazardous for pedestrians.

The current Metro bus stop and lay over point at the Goodland Ave. entrance will likely need to be relocated, as the current practice of leaving buses there creates a blind spot for anyone looking to travel east on Ventura from the gym. Since Ventura also curves to the south just east of this location, westbound Ventura traffic is also difficult to see, both from the curve and the street parking along the north side east of the exit. Unless the intersection is controlled with a signal, or a physical barrier is installed making said driveway a right turn only exit, it is a given that people will attempt left hand turns out of the driveway and thus they will be involved in accidents with drivers traveling in both directions on Ventura, an event for which this area is already too well known.

The Alcove Ave. entrance to the west has similar issues with sight lines and traffic flow, with the a Metro stop being located just west of it, as well as parked vehicles in both directions and the additional issue of traffic maneuvering to turn north on Coldwater potentially creating a third lane of westbound traffic for drivers to cross during their ingress or egress. There are actually two driveways at this location, but one is blocked with a chain and used for permanent parking spaces.

Restricting the southern exits to right turn only for safety reasons causes further traffic problems in the area, since there is no easy way for patrons to reverse their path and travel east, should that be their destination. The first two options are to go south on Coldwater and then left on Hallkirk to come back through the residential neighborhood there, or north on Coldwater either to Moorpark, which is one lane each way at that intersection and already heavily traveled, or to take Woodbridge through the residential area between Moorpark and the river. The third option is to continue west on Ventura, and turn around at the Valley Vista/Ethel intersection, either by a u-turn at that intersection, by turning left onto "Little Ventura", rejoining Ventura at Van Noord, or by turning right onto Ethel, then right onto Valleyheart at the river and then right onto Coldwater and then turning left at Ventura. The popularity of any of these routes with the area residents affected by them or the drivers having to use them is predictable.

The effects of the sun shining into the eyes of drivers as they attempt to ingress or egress via Ventura Blvd cannot be overstated during the times it is an issue, the same morning and evening times when peak customer use is expected and peak traffic flow occurs on Ventura. Nor can the additional hazard caused by glare from the metal and glass surfaces proposed for the building's exterior design affecting drivers on Ventura Blvd,

both at the gym entrances, but as far up and down Ventura as the light will travel. Although the MND says this will be remediated by the use of non-reflective materials, we have the recent examples of the Disney Hall downtown and the Vdara Hotel in Las Vegas to show plans are not the same as reality. As such, the current design for the exterior of the proposed building is itself a traffic hazard, above and beyond the traffic issues it will cause by drawing customers to its services.

The western entrance to the property, located on Coldwater Canyon at the LA River Bridge, across the street from the south side of Valleyheart Drive presents similar issues as the others, possessing a bus stop located between the 76 station and the corner and the site of the former fire station albeit without the parked vehicles or sun glare. However the problems with traffic flow and cross traffic turns are the same, with the addition of traffic entering the street from the service station, which gives little warning to the drivers exiting the Lodge property.

Another impact that the additional traffic the gym will bring and the inevitable congestion that will result because of it will be the increased travel time and the thereby delayed response for the vehicles of Fire Station 78, which uses Ventura at least three to five times a business day to respond to calls in the western portion of its area of operations. These delays will undoubtedly result in literally being a matter of life and death for someone they are responding to, the only question being when and how often such an event will occur.

Additionally, all vehicle traffic from vendors bringing supplies and services to the gym must be required to occur only during off peak traffic hours on Coldwater and Ventura, as a condition of doing business at the location, should the project proceed.

Construction Traffic: Beyond the burden of daily traffic that the gym will bring, the issue of construction traffic has not been addressed. Besides the flow of vehicles bringing building materials, the current plan calls for the removal of approximately 7000 cubic yards of excavated material. At a nominal 10 cubic yards per truckload, this will require 700 round trips to and from the building site. Even a generous, but unrealistic, estimate of 10 loads a day means at least fourteen weeks of increased truck usage on Coldwater, with the resulting impact on traffic, and causing further damage to a street already in horrible repair. The creation of a hauling plan, with a designated route, hours of use and an attendant public hearing are required for such activities, yet there is no plan available for review.

Another problem with the excavation is the nature of the material being removed and the potential for health risks to the public because of it. Besides the additional particulate and other pollution emitted into the area by the trucks and excavation equipment moving the soils, the likely hood that the soil in question, being so close to the river, is sandy and thus a source for silica inhalation exposure to members of the community needs to be addressed before the first scoop is moved. The possible presence of mold spores in the soil that could be released is also a health concern that needs to be evaluated and discussed prior to any construction activity occurring at the site.

Additionally, the DWP is expected to begin work on the Coldwater portion of its ongoing trunk line replacement project in the near future, which will bring both the loss of traffic lanes, and the attendant truck traffic bringing supplies to the site and hauling away soil and debris from it. The difficulties that would be caused if these two construction events coincide should be obvious. Numerous procedural delays internal to the city have already caused serious disruption in the water main project, hampering the completion of sections currently under construction locally and should therefore be expected to have a similar effect on both the trunk line project and the proposed building under discussion here.

Building Design: The most obvious flaw in the building design is the extension of the second floor over the driveway area. This will likely reduce the maximum height clearance below that of most delivery vehicles and, more importantly, that required for emergency vehicles such as fire trucks. In fact, from a review of an aerial view of the property, it appears that these sort of trucks, as well as guests with oversize vehicles, will be forced to enter the property from the Coldwater entrance only, and exit from there also, and then only if they possess a sufficiently short wheel base as to be able to maneuver in the restricted lot space available. As such the present design needs to be reviewed with an eye for resolving this issue, both for the building design itself and the obvious problems it causes to the parking plan as presented.

Furthermore, the proposed design does not fit into the style of the existing Lodge buildings, nor does it fit into the general style sense of Studio City in general. Besides the aesthetic issues it raises, the slab sided metal and glass surfaces of its exterior are the potential source of dangerous effects on traffic as discussed in that section of this report. Any redesign must address the issue of glare by removing design elements that can cause it, and the exterior of the building must substantially reflect the style and appearance of the main Lodge building in order to be acceptable to the community.

Utilities: The additional burden the gym will place on the local sewage system is inadequately addressed. There is talk of building a “gray water” landscape irrigation system, but no information on where or how this will be implemented, or even any assurances that doing so is acceptable to the various City agencies that review such things. Nor is the issue of additional permissions from other agencies outside of the City who may have a say in such things addressed. Thus this mediation is unsubstantiated in its current form.

The issue of raw sewage, as opposed to “gray water” from sinks, showers, floor drains, etc, is also not discussed thoroughly. There is mention of a “wastewater tank” that would store up to three days projected generation of “wastewater”, allowing it to be pumped into the sewer during periods of reduced flow. Since the term “wastewater” is used instead of the previous term “gray water”, there is some question as to whether this tank will contain human waste from toilets and urinals, or if it is part of the proposed irrigation system. Regardless, the presence of this tank creates the potential for a large spill of contaminated liquid almost directly into the LA River channel, with the attendant pollution, health issues and ecological damage that would necessarily result from such a spill. Furthermore, no evidence is presented that there are any periods of reduced flow in the main sewage line locally. Since the entire Valley area drains through it, the possibility readily exists that the line is either at or near maximum capacity at all times; certainly the presence of a scrubber station in Studio City that is operating at a higher than projected use indicates that the area systems are already dangerously near maximum capacity.

Water usage is also not discussed in an acceptable fashion. There is no certification from the DWP that they can provide the water demands this facility will create, nor is there any such calculation available for review or study. The additional burden on the current water supply capacity of the area is supposedly addressed by the use of self-closing faucets in sinks. Although the use of low flow toilets and urinals is required, nothing is said in regards of water use for showers. Unless the facility is somehow equipped to limit shower use by patrons to a short period of time, say three to five minutes, with no additional use after that time, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of water use in the building will be from post work out showers. Even if such usage is partially addressed by the presence of low flow showerheads, any projected reduction in demand from their use will likely be offset by the time of flow for each user. Since the cost of such water usage is transparent to the individuals, unlike their home use where the bill comes to them, there is no impetus for them to be conservative in their use there. Since the Equinox is marketed to a high-end customer base, it is unlikely that they will wish to curtail their client’s shower use, and therefore there is no mediation of the facilities water use or sewer discharge.

Rainwater and runoff management are also not specifically addressed in the applications, but need to be prior to any approval of this project, as does the requirement for the creation of a dedicated public access to the LA River.

Conclusion: This report, while covering a large number of major problems with the Equinox development as currently proposed should not be considered a complete listing of all shortcomings with the proposal, but rather a synopsis of the most egregious ones discovered during the short period of time available for the subcommittee's review of the submissions. Undoubtedly, further research and discussion will reveal more items that are not in compliance with the established requirements for property development in Studio City.

11. Government Affairs Committee report by **Barbara Monahan Burke** (10 min.).

Motion: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council authorizes the issuance of a letter, substantially in the form attached hereto transmitting our comments on the Community Design Overlay Streamlining Ordinance to the City Planning Department, the City Planning Commission and the City Council.

On SCNC Letterhead

October 2, 2010

Los Angeles City Planning Department
Attn: Michelle Sorkin (michelle.sorkin@lacity.org)
Alan Bell (Alan.Bell@lacity.org)
Michael J. Lo Grande (michael.logrande@lacity.org)
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring St., Room 621
Los Angeles, CA 90012

The City Planning Commission:

The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council has reviewed the proposed CDO (Community Design Overlay) Streamlining Ordinance of August 2010. Please place our comments below in your formal record on this matter.

General Comments on Q & A:

The "CDOs" should be mandatory not voluntary.

#1 Question: What is being proposed?

Answer: The Department of City Planning is proposing an ordinance that would allow for administrative review of projects when they are fully compliant with design guidelines and standards contained in Community Design Overly Districts.

Response: We contend that any determination over 10% is unacceptable without a public hearing. An administrative clearance (ministerial approval) shall be limited to a 10% change. A director's determination of any amount over a 10% change shall not be allowed without a public hearing. The neighborhood councils shall be made aware of any application and the time for response shall be sufficient to accommodate the neighborhood council review process.

#2 Question: What does that actually mean?

Answer: The purpose of these changes is to reduce the process length of time for projects that meet CDOs. Basically, if a project complies with all a CDO's guidelines and standards, applicants would get a meeting and approval relatively quickly instead of waiting for Planning to issue a determination letter that authorizes the approval. If a project doesn't meet all the standards, but still generally meets the intent of the CDO by meeting the guidelines, a determination letter will be written up detailing what is in compliance and how.

Response: Based on the answer above, a letter of approval still needs to be issued. The words "Still generally meets the intent of the CDO" do not mean that the project meets all the standards of the CDO. This does not seem to be in compliance with the requirement for a project to be "fully compliant with design guidelines and standards contained in Community Design Overlay Districts" as cited for administrative review in the first Q & A. This attempt to expedite the approval of projects at the expense of community input and compliance with guidelines specifically constructed to insure that the scale and character of an area is maintained is unacceptable. Again, Neighborhood Council and public input are necessary.

#3 Question: Does this take away regulations? (Read: Does this make it easier to build uglier buildings?)

Answer: No! All adopted CDO standards remain as is! Projects in CDO districts are still subject to CDO provisions. In fact, CDO standards are technically not regulations or law, which is why we are focusing streamlining on the process. If anything, streamlining the process provides an incentive for property owners and developers to meet the guidelines and save time in the permit process.

Response: Fully complying with the CDO standards and guidelines is the only way to save time in the permit process.

#4 Question: Why is this being proposed?

Answer: With Planning Department staffing levels at almost half of what they were five years ago, and continuous additions of special zoning overlays and plans that require staff's attention, we have fewer Planners and more work (with legally-mandate deadlines!). We must prioritize and focus our limited resources. The proposed ordinance reduces timelines and staff expenditures, while not changing or undermining the guidelines or standards that apply to projects.

Response: Reducing timelines and saving staff time is not acceptable when it is accomplished at the expense of the community. It changes and undermines the standards and guidelines that are to apply to projects. The Neighborhood Council shall be added to the review process and sufficient time allowed for them to review and comment. The Planning Department shall prioritize those projects that have legally mandated deadlines.

#5 Question: Why am I just hearing about it now?

Answer: This is the perfect time to hear about it! These public information meetings are just an initial step in reaching out; the goal is to explain what we are proposing so that we can receive your input. Your comments are welcome throughout September (in order to be incorporated in to the staff report), and beyond; you can continue participating at the City Planning Commission Hearing (yet to be scheduled) and the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of Council (PLUM) and City Council. Please sign in to be on the mailing list of future meetings.

Response: The initial time allowed for formal input from Neighborhood Councils and the public was too short. Neighborhood Councils need a minimum of 60 days to research and hold Committee and Board meetings before reaching a formal opinion. The advisory opinions of the neighborhood councils are essential and they are mandated by the Los Angeles City Charter.

6 Question: Wasn't this already proposed?

Answer: Yes! In 2007 the Planning Department proposed CDO streamlining, which was approved by the City Planning Commission without much fanfare. The ordinance at the time defined types of projects that could receive sign-offs (also known as administrative clearances). Given further budgetary restrictions in recent times, and because the City Attorney had concerns about defining signs as minor projects, we decided that a more comprehensive version of the CDO streamlining ordinance would be most effective. We are now bringing it back through public review

Response: The Studio City Neighborhood Council expects the CDO Streamlining Ordinance to uphold the Billboard Ordinance in its entirety as instructed by the City Attorney, with no exceptions. Supergraphics, digital, and oversized signs and billboards, as well as an excessive number of signs, shall not be allowed unless they are located in the few previously approved Sign Districts. Nothing is "Minor" about Signs.

#7 Question: Is this the same thing as the "Core Findings" Code Amendment?

Answer: No! The CDO streamlining ordinance is coming from the Community Planning Bureau, a portion of the Planning Department that is responsible for creating and "implementing" the CDOs (that means reviewing projects and making sure the plans are followed). The Core Findings and Code Simplification efforts are being done by a different section of the Planning Department, the Code Studies unit, in order to make findings consistent throughout the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

Response: The Community Planning Bureau creates and implements the CDOs. Provisions for continuing enforcement are necessary. The tools for enforcement must be in place before any changes are implemented.

#8 Question: Why is the CDO Streamlining and Citywide Design Guidelines meeting combined:

Answer: We devised a combined meeting as an innovative way to maximize attendance and draw in people who may have heard about one but not the other. A combined meeting also conserves resources (for example shared staffing cuts down on costs) and helps staff coordinate and learn from each other.

Response: Combining presentations is a sensible way to save both staff and attendees time and to save the City money. Stakeholders shall receive earlier notification of proposed workshops and meetings. They shall take place over a longer time span to enable greater participation and their locations shall be spread-out over more areas of the City.

Comments on Community Design Overlay Streamlining:

p.1 Section 1. (d):

This Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process.

p.1 Section 1. (d) (3):

This Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process.

p.1 Section 2.2. Project:

All signs or billboards including but not limited to pole signs and/or monument signs shall comply with the Billboard Ordinance as instructed by the City Attorney with no exceptions. Supergraphics, digital, and oversized signs and billboards shall not be allowed unless they are located in the few previously approved Sign Districts.

p. 2 Section 3. E.2. (b):

An Administrative Clearance shall include review of the project through the neighborhood council review process. An Administrative Clearance (ministerial approval) shall be limited to a 10% change. A Director's Determination of any amount over a 10% change shall not be allowed without a public hearing.

p.3 Section 3. E 3. (a) and (b):

A Director's Determination of any amount over 10% shall not be allowed without a public hearing. "Substantially" is a subjective and not measurable. The standard shall be objective with measurable criteria. The meaning of the phrase "scale and design" is not the same as the meaning of the phrase "scale and character." This constitutes a significant change in the provisions of the CDO.

p.3 Section 3. E 4:

The Notice and approved plans shall also be mailed to the Neighborhood Council. Additionally, we reiterate that any determination over 10% shall not be allowed without a public hearing.

Sincerely,

John Walker, President
Studio City Neighborhood Council

12. Cultural Affairs Committee report by **Richard Niederberg** (10 min).
13. Outreach Committee report by **Lisa Cahan-Davis** (10 min).
14. Transportation Committee report by **Ben Di Benedetto/Scott Ouellette** (10 min).
15. Bylaws Committee report by **Ron Taylor** (10 min).
16. Crime & Safety Committee report by **Wayne Kartin** (10 min).
17. Comments from Board Members on subject matters within the Board's jurisdiction (10 min).
18. Adjournment (1 min).

