



**Minutes for September 8, 2014 OPA General Meeting
(APPROVED 10/6/14)**

6:30 – 9:00 PM Joslyn Park

633 Kensington Road, Santa Monica CA 90405

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT (QUORUM)

David Auch, Judy Abdo, Andrew Gledhill, Patty Godon-Tann, Mark Gorman, Sadat Huq, Jeff Jarow, Jim Lawson, Mary Marlow, Evan Meyer, Marc Morgenstern, Thane Roberts, Mike Salazar, Jodi Summers, David Tann, Bob Taylor

NOTICED BOARD MEMBER ABSENCES: Ferris Gluck, Michele Perrone

1. Introduction to OPA (Jim Lawson – 1 minute)

- Early start for procedural matters

2. Membership Announcement (Sadat Huq – 3 minutes)

- Please join OPA; explains benefits

3. General Announcements

- David A—Sept. 17 Opera at the Beach with LA Opera; secured 20 seats for OPA members
- Mary—Bergamot Arts Center Plan before City Council tomorrow night; Sept. 17 Planning Commission looking at 3 new restaurants, including Omelet Parlor; Sept. 22 at Library – Pedestrian Action Plan rolled out by city
- Roger Swanson—Business outreach on Lincoln Neighborhood Corridor Plan: need volunteers to help; Nov. 1: another clean up on Lincoln Blvd.
- Jodi—SM Civic Sept 27th 9:30-1pm – first of three floats-ups to determine community direction for Civic Center future
- Judy—Last Summer Pier Concert on Thursday night 9/11/14
- Patty—West Side Family Health Center Oct. 1 – how to understand your teenager, Mt Olive Church 12-2pm
- Evan—Mural project; expanding to Venice and Crenshaw; Silverlake asked to paint utility boxes; Vote at Beautifyearth.org; Starbucks supportive
- Mike—Classic cars at food truck night, Third Tuesday of every month at Victorian

4. Presentation of the 2014-2015 Neighborhood Grant (Patricia Godon-Tann – 10 minutes)

- OPA must spend and account for all city grant monies
- We spent every penny of current grant



- Usage Highlights: Dec-June—website; Survey Monkey; Blue Host for email, Refreshments; Technology \$1167;
- Annual Meeting—expenses must be paid out of membership fund
- To apply for 2014-15 Grant, application must be approved by OPA Board and make Patty or someone else the signatory; must be in minutes to be submitted to city
- Some question whether we should accept city grant
- [Limited discussed ensues]

MOTIONS:

Made by: Judy; Seconded by Jodi, to apply for city grant

Made by: Jeff; Seconded by David A. to designate Patty as OPA signatory

Both Motions Pass Unanimously

5. Support/Approval of LBTF Zoning Letter: Proposed Motion: Should OPA sign the LBTF Zoning Subcommittee letter to the Planning Commission that makes specific recommendations regarding the ZOU (Zoning Ordinance Update) for Lincoln south of the Freeway? (Roger Swanson – 5 minutes)

- Changes since original letter: asking zoning update for Lincoln be delayed until resolution of Lincoln Corridor Plan Completion (Dec. 2015); Create separate Lincoln South; Supports survey sentiment for adaptive reuse and improved traffic, Floor ratio held at current C4 level (not general commercial); Against activity center where Albertson's is currently
- Asking for motion to support letter from friends of Sunset Park; comes up at Oct 1 Planning Commission meeting
- Patty—Activity Center is bugaboo; not pretty but shopping center is key for community; no art gallery overlay
- Mary—Supports no activity center overlay
- Roger—will change to reflect non-support for Item 4 in letter: Activity Center at Lincoln/Ocean Park Blvd. (currently Albertson's through McDonald's)
- [Discussion of traffic]
- Mark—Development should be allowed to continue
- [Discussion of economic analysis of height restrictions]

MOTION (As submitted with change)

“OPA should sign LBTF Zoning Subcommittee letter to the Planning Commission that makes specific recommendations regarding the ZOU (Zoning Ordinance Update) for Lincoln south of the Freeway, as submitted, provided that it is amended to eliminate the recommendation for an Activity Center overlay at Lincoln/Ocean Park Blvd. (currently Albertson's through McDonald's).”



MOTION:

Made by: Patty; Seconded by: David A

Motion passes 8-6-2

6. Upcoming Council Agenda Items (Mary Marlow – 5 minutes)

- Oct. 1: Planning Commission to discuss Lincoln Blvd. plans
- Parks and Rec fees
- Oct. 14: Fred Segal site
- Laemmle Theater Remodel
- Mid-November Planning Commission community meeting on zoning ordinance

7. Meet Neighborhood Resource Officer: Erik Milosevich and Crime Prevention

Coordinator Lauralee Asch (5 minutes)

- Lauralee--Big beat: 2d St. to Lincoln, Pico to southern border
- Erik--7 residential burglaries, mostly in southern border area
- Focus last 2 weeks from police department crime impact team; neighbors calling; burglaries happening during day through unlocked windows and doors
- Neighborhood watch works; don't hesitate to call
- Lauralee—Call 911 first; make a report
- Many bikes in property room unclaimed; write down serial number
- Bob—Plan to register bikes?
- Lauralee—Advocating using national bike registry

8. New Restaurant at the Omelet Parlor Location (Howard Robinson – 5 minutes)

- Land use consultant representing new restaurateur
- New operator: Bare Burger, organic natural beef; first California store; lunch and dinner
- Remodeling; conditional use permit for sale of (full) alcohol; otherwise grandfathered since 1976 with no parking
- Mark G—hope will be restaurant, not bar-nightclub; suggests OPA email to its members about Planning Commission meeting
- Planned Hours: 11pm weekdays, midnight weekends
- No more than 35% gross sales can be from alcohol
- [Discussion of Brick and Mortar code violations]

9. Presentations by supporters of two airport-related Ballot Measures - 'D' and 'LC'.

John Fairweather – 15 minutes; Chair of Committee for Local Control to oppose D and support LC



- [Arguments against Measure D and in favor of Measure LC]
- Joe Schmitz—Retired pilot, Sunset Park; discussed safety issues

Christian Fry – 15 minutes; Q&A – 15 minutes)

- [Arguments against Measure LC and in favor of Measure D]
- Montana Wilshire resident

[Extensive Q&A and Discussion ensued]

MOTION:

To publically support Ballot Measure LC and oppose Ballot Measure D

Made by: Mark G.; Seconded by Mike

NO VOTE WAS TAKEN. MOTION WAS TABLED UNTIL OCTOBER MEETING BY SUBSEQUENT MOTION

- David T—majority wants it mitigated not closed
- Patty—LC presentation poor and did not give me the info to vote; need more research
- Jodi—MOTION to table motion so Board members can study and research, David T seconded
- Mary—We have talked about airport more than any other subject since 2010; choice clear for most of us
- David A—A lot of informing tonight; no failure if we don't vote for one or another

MOTION:

To table voting until next meeting on previous motion to publically support Ballot Measure LC and oppose Ballot Measure D

Made by: Jodi; Seconded by: David T

- [Discussion ensued]

Totals: Yes 10 No 4 Abstain 0 Absent 4

Motion passes

MOTION:

To extend meeting to 9:30

Carried unanimously

MOTION:

To publically oppose Measure D

Made by: Andrew; Seconded by: Thane

Totals: Yes 8 No 5 Abstain 1 Absent 4



Motion passes

10. Report from August 2014 Neighborhood Council Meeting (Mary Marlow – 5 minutes)

- Big Blue Bus route changes

11. Approval of Minutes from August Meeting (Marc Morgenstern – 3 minutes)

- As amended
- Motion by David A, seconded by Mary; **Motion carries unanimously**

12. Treasurer's Report (Patty Godon-Tann – 3 minutes)

- General; Account contains less than \$3,000 because of PO box payment
- \$693 profit from parade

13. Committee Reports:

Ocean Park Zoning: (Judy Abdo – 5 minutes) [POSTPONED]

Lincoln Boulevard Task Force: (David Tann – 5 minutes) [COVERED PREVIOUSLY]

Membership: (Sadat Huq – 5 minutes)
301 members; last email blast to 891

General Plan: (Mary Marlow – 5 minutes) [COVERED PREVIOUSLY]

Communications: (Jodi Summers – 5 minutes)

- Process for holiday party/annual meeting

Bylaws Committee: (Jeff Jarow – No report) [POSTPONED]

Santa Monica Airport: (Mike Salazar – See Item #9) [COVERED PREVIOUSLY]

Tree Committee: (Andrew Gledhill – 5 minutes)

- List of missing trees sent to Matthew at city; responsive

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Made by: Mike; Seconded by Thane

Motion carries unanimously

Next meeting on Monday, October 13, 2014 at 6:30PM at Ocean Park Library.



UPDATE ON BOARD MATTER FROM AUGUST 4, 2014 MEETING

Here is email from city attorney I forwarded to board in answer to concerns brought up in executive session regarding contributions to Council campaigns.

From: Marsha Moutrie <Marsha.Moutrie@SMGOV.NET>
Subject: RE: Taxpayer Protection Restriction on OPA Board DRAFT
Date: August 5, 2014 at 3:38:44 PM PDT
To: 'Mary Marlow' <m.marlow@verizon.net>
Cc: Joseph Lawrence <Joseph.Lawrence@SMGOV.NET>

Ms. Marlow,

Thank you for contacting me with your question about the City Charter.

I'll start with two caveats: Article XXII, the Oaks Initiative, is somewhat unclear; and, because it limits political contributions (which, for better or worse, have been classified as a First Amendment right), we interpret it narrowly.

In March, the Council voted to contribute \$5,000 to OPA for the parade. (Another \$10,00 was reallocated from the "Council Contingency" back into the General Fund to cover City services related to the parade.) And, last December, OPA received the standard \$4,000 grant that is available to neighborhood associations.

As you know, The Oaks Initiative precludes Council members from receiving contributions from the beneficiaries of certain Council votes. The triggering event is the vote by the Council member to confer the "public benefit" on the potential contributor. The term "public benefit" is defined by Charter Section 2202(b)(7) to include, among other things, "cash or specie of a net value to the recipient in excess of \$10,000 in any 12 month period." Potential contributors covered by the Oaks Initiative include directors and officers of entities upon which the Council confers "public benefits."

In the situation you asked about, the "public benefit" conferred on OPA totaled \$9,000 in 12 months. So, I don't think that the Oaks prohibition was triggered by the vote to grant \$5,000 for the parade. Therefore, based on my present understanding of the facts, I assume that the OPA board members are not prohibited from contributing to Council campaigns.

Best,
Marsha Moutrie



OPA Board Voting Roster

Item 4: City Grants

Motion: To Apply for 2014-15 City Grant

Made by: Judy; Seconded by Jodi

Date: 9/8/14 At Meeting

Board Member	Y	N	Abstain		Board Member	Y	N	Absta
David Auch	X				Evan Meyer	X		
Judy Abdo	X				Marc Morgenstern	X		
Andrew Gledhill	X				Michele Perrone			
Ferris Gluck					Thane Roberts	X		
Patty Godon- Tann	X				Mike Salazar	X		
Mark Gorman	X				Jodi Summers	X		
Sadat Huq	X				David Tann	X		
Jeffrey Jarow	X				Bob Taylor	X		
Jim Lawson	X							
Mary Marlow	X					16	0	0

Totals: Yes 16 No 0 Abstain 0 Absent 2
Motion Carries



OPA Board Voting Roster

Item 4: City Grants

Motion: To designate Patty Godon-Tann as OPA signatory on application for 2014-15 City Grant

Made by: Jeff; Seconded by: David A.

Date: 9/8/14 At Meeting

Board Member	Y	N	Abstain		Board Member	Y	N	Absta
David Auch	X				Evan Meyer	X		
Judy Abdo	X				Marc Morgenstern	X		
Andrew Gledhill	X				Michele Perrone			
Ferris Gluck					Thane Roberts	X		
Patty Godon-Tann	X				Mike Salazar	X		
Mark Gorman	X				Jodi Summers	X		
Sadat Huq	X				David Tann	X		
Jeffrey Jarow	X				Bob Taylor	X		
Jim Lawson	X							
Mary Marlow	X					16	0	0

Totals: Yes 16 No 0 Abstain 0 Absent 2
Motion Carries



Item 5: Support/Approval of LBTF Zoning Letter

Text of Proposed Letter (as amended to reflect recommended change in #4)

9/2/14

To: Santa Monica Planning Commission

Cc: David Martin, Director, Planning & Community Development City of Santa Monica

From: Lincoln Blvd. Task Force
Zoning Sub-committee

Re: Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) for Lincoln Blvd. south of the I-10 freeway

We request that the City delay zoning changes on Lincoln Blvd. south of the freeway until after the LiNC Plan is complete. The points listed below are intended to support this request for a delay and to retain the current C4 designation until after the LiNC Plan has been able to address some of the business-specific issues, such as a BID, parking requirements, adaptive re-use of existing structures, facade grants, safe crosswalks, etc., that will make the street safer for pedestrians and better link the three adjoining neighborhoods: Pico, Sunset Park and Ocean Park.

We also request that the City adopt an alternative zoning designation for this stretch of Lincoln – one that would more closely reflect the goals of the LUCE. This stretch of Lincoln has long been neglected and presents unique challenges and opportunities, which, we believe, can be addressed through a unique zoning designation.

All other major streets, avenues and boulevards in Santa Monica have zoning designations that reflect the goals of the LUCE; however, in its current iteration in the ZOU, the designation GC for Lincoln South misses the mark.

After a careful study of on-the-ground realities of this stretch of Lincoln, a detailed reading of the LUCE and a thorough review of the current zoning for Lincoln South (C4) as well as the proposed new zoning, General Commercial (GC), we would like to suggest the zoning designation **General Commercial-Lincoln South (GC-LS)**, which is a variant of GC and would apply exclusively to Lincoln Blvd. south of the freeway.

GENERAL COMMERCIAL-LINCOLN SOUTH (GC-LS.):

Goal: To facilitate the transformation of the section of Lincoln Boulevard from the I-10 Freeway south to the Santa Monica/Los Angeles city limit into something that more closely reflects what is called for in the LUCE: "...a vibrant, diverse, attractive, highly walkable area with pleasant, pedestrian-friendly sidewalks, mature trees, landscaped medians and parkways, public art and public furniture."

The zoning designation GC-LS would facilitate the transformation of underutilized sections of Lincoln Blvd. through the principle of *adaptive reuse* to create a unique and desirable area of the city capable of supporting a broad range of active, local-serving, regional-serving and commercial uses, including such businesses as art galleries, bookstores, boutiques, small cafes and restaurants, gourmet ice-



creameries, charcuteries, and other neighborhood-serving specialty stores along with current established usages such as auto repair shops, convenience retail stores, motels, hardware stores, laundromats, dry cleaners, beauty and barber shops, and grocery stores. All of the above are businesses for which local residents have indicated support. (LBTF Survey 2012)

The zoning designation **GC-LS** on Lincoln South would require all new developments along this stretch of Lincoln to maximize human-scale elements while providing a “sensitive transition” between commercial/new residential uses and existing neighboring residential properties. All new buildings would be required to step down in height and mass in relationship to the scale and character of adjacent low-density residential properties. All new commercial uses would be required to respect adjacent residential properties and established neighborhood commercial areas.

The diverse mix of housing types and uses on this stretch of Lincoln should complement and serve the surrounding residential properties. Allowable ground floor uses would include active, local-serving retail, open spaces such as plazas, service-oriented commercial uses, residential and even hotel uses in limited areas. Residential development and local serving office space would be the predominant uses above the first floor of any new structure.

The new zoning designation **GC-LS** would allow for and provide a FAR bonus for affordable housing above the ground floor of any new building on Lincoln. This zoning designation would retain the same FAR requirements as those existing under the current C4 zoning, i.e., it would maintain the step-down, even in the case of lot consolidation.

In order to limit density and avoid increased traffic congestion along Lincoln South, a FAR of up to 2.0 would NOT be allowed even for projects that provided additional affordable housing and/or community benefits.

The unique zoning designation **GC-LS** would be consistent with the LUCE General Commercial land use designation, and yet be tailored to meet the specific needs of this stretch of the boulevard.

•••••

While the LBTF has been tasked with making recommendations for enhanced aesthetics and safety features on Lincoln South, including improved landscaping, walkability, pedestrian and bike safety, code compliance, bus lanes, sustainability and, in general, an upgrade of the overall condition of this stretch of Lincoln, we have also been interested in supporting the creation of a Business Improvement District (BID), incentivizing adaptive re-use and façade improvement, establishing parking variances, and so on.

What follows are a number of zoning solutions that can be incorporated into the proposed viable and enforceable new zoning designation, **GC-LS**:

(1) Floor Area Ratios (FAR)

The current C4 zoning calls for a FAR of 1.0 and includes a “reductive” FAR, i.e., as site area increases the allowed FAR decreases incrementally.

In the existing ZOU, the GC designation for Lincoln South (with two localized exceptions), calls for a base FAR of 1.5, which is a 50% increase over the current C4 zoning and, importantly, is missing the provision for a *reductive* FAR.

Stated another way, in the current C4 designation, as lot area increases through lot consolidation, allowable density is reduced. In the ZOU as currently proposed, that provision has NOT been carried



over into the GC zoning designation. As proposed, the GC designation has allowable increases going up to a FAR of 2.0, reflecting a potential 100%-plus increase in allowable density over what's allowed in the existing C4 zone. The LBTF finds this to be unacceptable.

While base height is only modestly increased from 30ft to 32ft in the C4 designation, additional heights are permitted under the GC proposal for up to three stories and 47ft. Again, we find this to be unacceptable.

The LBTF objects to the allowance of increased density for Lincoln South as currently proposed in the ZOU. Increased density would inevitably lead to an increase in net daily car trips, which in turn, would exacerbate existing traffic congestion on Lincoln. This would occur even if alternate transit modes became more available. Increased traffic congestion and pollution on an already overburdened boulevard would fly in the face of the wishes of the neighborhood residents as indicated in the LBTF Survey 2012.

We strongly urge you to retain the FAR C4 zoning requirements in the proposed **GC-LS**, which would include retaining the step-down with lot consolidation and a reduction of the FAR. In other words, we want to see a reduction of the FAR, and not a doubling as is currently proposed in the GC designation.

In addition, the ZOU must take into considerations the goals of the LUCE for Lincoln South. According to the LUCE, a FAR of 2.0 is allowable only within certain areas of Lincoln South proposed as Mixed-Use Blvd (MU-BL), namely:

- (a) "Activity Center Overlay" at the Lincoln/Ocean Park Blvd. intersection, and
- (b) "Transit Crossroads" at the Lincoln/Pico intersection.

The lack of change on Lincoln in the last 10 years under the C-4 zoning may indicate that there has been insufficient incentive to redevelop; more likely, however, it's because Lincoln south of the freeway has never been included in a redevelopment zone where tax incentive financing would create the needed catalyst.

At this point, residents in the impacted area adjacent to Lincoln South wish to see a reduction in density all along the boulevard, including the two areas designated MU-BL. The LBTF strongly urges that the ZOU include FAR requirements supporting this reduction.

(2) Allowable Occupancies.

In the proposed GC designation for Lincoln South, there appears to be no change from the current C4 zoning description that emphasizes auto-related sales and services.

By our analysis, sales of used cars and auto-related services account for approximately 33% of all occupancies on this stretch of Lincoln. While the LUCE may restrict new auto dealerships on Lincoln, we understand that existing uses cannot be and should not be "legislated" away; at the same time, we would like to see the expansion of auto-related uses restricted so as to reflect the transformative intent of Lincoln South as clearly stipulated in the LUCE.

(3) Descriptive Language Conforming to the LUCE.

As currently proposed in the ZOU, nearly all of Lincoln South has been designated in a GC, which unfortunately, does not include language that would support the transformation of this stretch of Lincoln into something conforming to the LUCE.

Other boulevards in the ZOU are described in such a way as to clearly reflect the goals of the LUCE.



The GC zoning currently proposed for Lincoln is incompatible with the LUCE projections for this area. The proposed GC description does not match what is outlined in the LUCE for a 'neighborhood friendly' boulevard.

We urge that not only the zoning code itself, but also the descriptive materials in the ZOU reflect the intention of the LUCE in language that encourages neighborhood serving businesses and activities. This would mean fewer fast food chain establishments and auto-related businesses, and more restaurants and unique, local serving retail. This does not mean that we're calling for a removal of any auto-related businesses, but simply a reduction, by attrition, so they no longer dominate the boulevard. As auto-related businesses cease to operate, the sites could be open to a variety of other businesses.

We would like to see the ZOU define the principles that guide the changes as described above. According to the LUCE, Lincoln Blvd. south of the freeway will have "a streetscape enhanced to link the Sunset Park and Ocean Park neighborhoods with an active pedestrian environment, while maintaining its role as a functional regional roadway."

This description is appealing to us: "...an enhanced streetscape that will link neighborhoods instead of isolating them; an active pedestrian environment, i.e., sidewalks that are safe, more crosswalks, destinations that are attractive, public art and green spaces." The LBTF says yes to all of these changes and would like to have the language of the ZOU support it.

The LUCE recommends improvements to the physical environment of Lincoln South that would make it more pedestrian friendly and encourage more neighborhood serving amenities.

The LUCE states, "As Lincoln Boulevard transitions slowly from an auto-dominated boulevard to a pedestrian-oriented boulevard servicing the adjacent neighborhoods, a new aesthetic order will be established for the streetscape and buildings along the boulevard."

The document goes on to say that improvements on Lincoln South will focus primarily on the public realm with the installation of a gateway feature at the southern entrance to the City and improved transit and streetscape enhancements all along the boulevard. It states that the existing commercial uses will continue to be allowed, but that with an enhanced pedestrian environment, these uses will transition over time and become more pedestrian-oriented and include more local-serving businesses.

These LUCE goals form the bases of our recommendation for the unique zoning designation: **GC-LS**.

As currently proposed in the ZOU, Lincoln South is designated:

"GC (General Commercial District) – this is intended to maintain areas for a broad range of commercial uses that provide necessary daily services such as auto sales and auto repair, convenience retail, hotels, hardware stores, and small restaurants while respecting adjacent residential neighborhoods and established neighborhood commercial areas." In other words, Lincoln would stay just as it is – with no potential for the kind of transformation described in the LUCE.

By contrast, proposed zoning designations for other major boulevards, streets and avenues in Santa Monica are:

"MU-BL (Mixed-Use Boulevard Low District) - intended to facilitate the transformation of sections of boulevards into vibrant, highly walkable areas with broad, pedestrian-friendly sidewalks, trees, landscaping, and local-serving uses with new buildings that step down in relationship to the scale and character of adjacent low density neighborhoods."



“MU-B (Mixed-Use Boulevard District) - intended to facilitate the transformation of underutilized and auto-oriented sections of boulevards into vibrant, diverse, and attractive pedestrian friendly mixed-use boulevards that support local-serving retail and a diversity of housing types.”

“NC (Neighborhood Commercial District) - intended to maintain and enhance small-scale neighborhood shopping districts that provide daily goods and services easily accessible from surrounding residential neighborhoods while also serving a sub-regional role.”

Clearly, as now stated, Lincoln South with its GC designation would not be part of any “vibrant, diverse, attractive and pedestrian-friendly” transformation, nor have “highly walkable areas with broad, pedestrian-friendly sidewalks, trees, landscaping, and local-serving uses,” nor be protected with a code that ensures that new buildings “step down in relationship to the scale and character of adjacent low density neighborhoods.”

For these reasons, we strongly recommend **GC-LS (General Commercial - Lincoln South)** as a unique designation for Lincoln south of the freeway. It would include language similar to that used for other streets and boulevards and yet would be unique to Lincoln South.

(4) Activity Center Overlay.

The LUCE identifies the site at Lincoln/Ocean Park Blvd. (currently Albertson’s through McDonald’s) as an Activity Center. The LUCE states, “The intersection of Lincoln and Ocean Park Boulevards is recognized as an activity center overlay for its transit crossroad location and large parcels with redevelopment potential.” (Chapter 2.5 Activity Centers)

According to the LUCE, “...the focal point on Lincoln Boulevard is the new activity center overlay at Ocean Park Boulevard.” And, “Activity center overlays are strategically located on the boulevards as focal points of retail and convenience services as well as housing, which is designed around public open space to create community gathering places within walking distance of most neighborhoods.”

The LBTF does not recommend an Activity Center overlay at Lincoln/Ocean Park Blvd.

We are very concerned about the potential maximum height/density at this location and the additional traffic it will generate. At least one artist rendering showed it to be 5 or 6 stories high. The rendering in the final LUCE document (pp 2.5-17) shows three-story buildings with (presumably) a height of 47 feet.

The LUCE states that shared parking at the Activity Center Overlay and Transit Crossroads will support nearby businesses and provide the opportunity to create a distinctive resident-oriented commercial district. The burden this places on the surrounding community may be insupportable.

(5) Business Improvement District (BID).

We have interviewed businesses and property owners along Lincoln South and will continue to reach out to help them form a BID. A BID for Lincoln South will need further economic analysis, which will be forthcoming in the LiNC Plan.

(6) Curb-Cuts and Pedestrian Friendly Sidewalks.

In the LUCE (p. 2.4-65) it states, “Traffic flow is improved and on-street parking is increased through the elimination of driveway curb cuts.”

Under other, more favorable, circumstances the elimination of curb-cuts may be necessary or desirable to the creation of a pedestrian-friendly boulevard, but along Lincoln South, this isn’t the case. This area is an exception to the rule. As much as we, as residents of the area, would like safe



and pedestrian-friendly sidewalks, which are often obtained by reducing curb-cuts, we feel that minimizing curb-cuts would have negative consequences if imposed on this stretch of Lincoln.

If curb-cuts were reduced or eliminated along Lincoln South, there would be greater potential for increased use of service alleys and thus a significant adverse impact on adjacent residents.

Only about 25% of commercial properties along Lincoln South have access to an alley *and* access from Lincoln. These businesses should not be required to close off their Lincoln Blvd. access as this would result in greater use of the alley access and added truck traffic, noise and debris imposed on residences situated on the other side of the alley from them. Unlike street frontage, where a residence typically has a 20' setback, the side-yards that adjoin an alley typically have only a 5' setback. When the lots are smaller, as is the case in much of Ocean Park, there may only be a 4' side-yard. Therefore, when trucks or loading vans pull up into the alleyways to service businesses along Lincoln, they are immediately adjacent to the homes on the other side of the alleys. Eliminating curb-cuts on Lincoln South would exacerbate this problem and should be strongly discouraged.

Another issue is that about 75% of the businesses along Lincoln South do NOT have alleys behind them at all and therefore share a common property line with residential properties. Those commercial properties cannot eliminate existing curb-cuts, aprons or driveway access to their properties. Traffic flow is currently somewhat interrupted by these curb-cuts and will necessarily remain so. One possible undesired consequence of eliminating curb-cuts and restricting Lincoln access for these business would be the encouragement of lot consolidation so as to provide access from side streets. The LBTF strongly objects to any additional lot consolidation or elimination of curb-cuts.

(7) Conditional Use Permits - CUPs.

We recommend that closer examination be given to proposed social service or adult-oriented uses before approvals are given to any new such businesses along Lincoln South.

Conditional Use Permits, along with appropriate public hearings to determine the impact on the adjoining residential and school neighbors, should be required for all new social service agencies and entertainment establishments, particularly adult entertainment/retail businesses. We also suggest that such occupancies be required to maintain a specified distance (to be determined) from nearby schools and residences.

(8) Parking.

Our proposed designation **GC-LS** is meant to describe a transformative zone and encourage desirable business uses along Lincoln South. These could be incentivized with lower parking requirements, free shuttles or other innovative programs. We understand that parking ratios have not yet been established and we wish to be informed when that discussion takes place. This is one area in which the LiNC Plan will be able to provide excellent guidance. It will likely show the need to reduce some parking requirements as well as the need for shared parking along specific areas of Lincoln to enable a priority bus lane.

(9) Community Benefits.

We understand that a review paper has been drafted which explores creating guidelines to define what constitutes a Community Benefit. Since this aspect of development is vitally important to our community, we will be following the issue carefully. We understand that there will be an annual review of development agreements and that the Planning Commission has reviewed the suggested list of community benefits to be included in the updated zoning ordinance.

We want to be assured that any proposed "community benefit" to go along with proposed increases



in height and density allowances along Lincoln South contain actual benefits for the local residents, who are, after all, the ones “allowing” the increases.

We would also like to see an analysis comparing how our City has benefited from the allowed “public benefits” that were used to justify the increases in height and FAR in the approved Development Agreements since 1982, versus the added negative results of additional stress on traffic, infrastructure and city services caused by the allowed increases. In other words, were the benefits overwhelmed by the costs to the community? Can the City add a dollar value to the cost of increased traffic?

Thank you,
 Lincoln Blvd. Task Force, Zoning Sub-Committee
 Gloria Garvin, PhD
 Roger Swanson
 Bob Taylor, A.I.A.
 Zina Josephs
 David Tann

**Lincoln Blvd. Task Force Zoning Recommendation
 Lincoln Blvd. South of the I-10 Freeway**

Zoning Designations

Zone	Min Hgt/ Stories	Max Hgt/ Stories	Min/Max FAR	Min/Max Footprint or coverage	Min Parcel size/width/depth	Setbacks front/side/back	Notes
GC (Proposed)	32/2	40	1.5/2.0	15,000/ 20,000, 80%	5000/50/90	10 adjacent to residential otherwise none	Lincoln (ZOU Proposed)
C4	-	30/2	0.5-1.0 Less is for big parcels	-	7500/50/150	Landscape/only if abuts residential	Lincoln (Old)
GC-LS (Recommended)	-	30/2	0.5-1.0 Less is for big parcels	15,000/ 20,000, 80%	5000/50/90 (Consistent with existing lot sizes)	10 adjacent to residential, otherwise none	Lincoln Recommended (GC-LS w/old C4 hgts and FAR)

Lincoln Boulevard lots fall in three ranges in roughly equal distribution. The compact lots are about 4000-4500 sq ft. Mid-size are about 8500-10,000 sq ft, and full-size are 14,000-22,000 sq ft. Most lots have low parcel coverage (lots of surface parking). The vast majority of parcels on the east side are 80 ft deep and the vast majority on the west side are 100 ft deep. Most of the 80 ft deep lots have alleys between them and residential, most of the 100 ft deep lots don't.



OPA Board Voting Roster

Item 5: Lincoln Boulevard Task Force Zoning

Motion: “OPA should sign LBTF Zoning Subcommittee letter to the Planning Commission that makes specific recommendations regarding the ZOU (Zoning Ordinance Update) for Lincoln south of the Freeway, as submitted, provided that it is amended to eliminate the recommendation for an Activity Center overlay at Lincoln/Ocean Park Blvd. (currently Albertson’s through McDonald’s).”

Made by: Patty; Seconded by: David A.

Date: 9/8/14 At Meeting

Board Member	Y	N	Abstain	Board Member	Y	N	Abstain
David Auch	X			Evan Meyer		X	
Judy Abdo		X		Marc Morgenstern		X	
Andrew Gledhill	X			Michele Perrone			
Ferris Gluck				Thane Roberts	X		
Patty Godon-Tann	X			Mike Salazar	X		
Mark Gorman		X		Jodi Summers			X
Sadat Huq	X			David Tann			X
Jeffrey Jarow		X		Bob Taylor	X		
Jim Lawson		X					
Mary Marlow	X				8	6	2

Totals: Yes 8 No 6 Abstain 2 Absent 2



Motion Carries

OPA Board Voting Roster

Item 9: Airport Ballot Measures

Motion: To publically support Ballot Measure LC and oppose Ballot Measure D

Made by: Mark G; Seconded by: Mike

Date: 9/8/14 At Meeting

NO VOTE WAS TAKEN. MOTION WAS TABLED UNTIL OCTOBER MEETING BY SUBSEQUENT MOTION

Board Member	Y	N	Abstain		Board Member	Y	N	Absta
David Auch					Evan Meyer			
Judy Abdo					Marc Morgenstern			
Andrew Gledhill					Michele Perrone			
Ferris Gluck					Thane Roberts			
Patty Godon-Tann					Mike Salazar			
Mark Gorman					Jodi Summers			
Sadat Huq					David Tann			
Jeffrey Jarow					Bob Taylor			
Jim Lawson								
Mary Marlow								

Totals: Yes_____ No_____Abstain_____Absent_____



OPA Board Voting Roster

Item 9: Airport Ballot Measures

Motion: To table voting until next meeting on previous motion to publically support Ballot Measure LC and oppose Ballot Measure D

Made by: Jodi; Seconded by: David T

Date: 9/8/14 At Meeting

Board Member	Y	N	Abstain		Board Member	Y	N	Absta
David Auch	X				Evan Meyer	X		
Judy Abdo					Marc Morgenstern	X		
Andrew Gledhill		X			Michele Perrone			
Ferris Gluck					Thane Roberts		X	
Patty Godon-Tann	X				Mike Salazar		X	
Mark Gorman	X				Jodi Summers	X		
Sadat Huq	X				David Tann	X		
Jeffrey Jarow					Bob Taylor	X		
Jim Lawson	X							
Mary Marlow		X				10	4	

Totals: Yes 10 No 4 Abstain 0 Absent 4
MOTION CARRIED



OPA Board Voting Roster

Item 9: Airport Ballot Measures
 Motion: To publically oppose Measure D
 Made by: Andrew; Seconded by: Thane
 Date: 9/8/14 At Meeting

Board Member	Y	N	Abstain		Board Member	Y	N	Absta
David Auch	X				Evan Meyer			X
Judy Abdo					Marc Morgenstern		X	
Andrew Gledhill	X				Michele Perrone			
Ferris Gluck					Thane Roberts	X		
Patty Godon-Tann	X				Mike Salazar	X		
Mark Gorman	X				Jodi Summers		X	
Sadat Huq	X				David Tann		X	
Jeffrey Jarow					Bob Taylor		X	
Jim Lawson		X						
Mary Marlow	X					8	5	1

Totals: Yes 8 No 5 Abstain 1 Absent 4
MOTION CARRIED