



**AGENDA – PACIFIC PALISADES COMMUNITY COUNCIL
BOARD MEETING – JANUARY 28, 2021**

5:30PM – 7PM

Via Zoom Videoconference

Prior to Meeting

**5:25PM: “Zoom doors open”/
log-in and technical assistance**

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/9146619026>

Meeting ID: 914-661-9026

Audio Only/Dial-In:

1-669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 914-661-9026

- 1. Call to Order and Reading of Community Council’s Mission.** The purpose of the Pacific Palisades Community Council shall be to (1) be a forum for the consideration of Community issues, (2) be an advocate for Pacific Palisades to government and private agencies upon issues where there is broad Community agreement, as reflected by two-thirds of the Board Members voting on any one of those issues at a PPCC Meeting, and (3) assist other organizations in the Palisades which want help in accomplishing their objectives or projects, which the PPCC determines to support. *See PPCC Bylaws: <http://pacpalicc.org/index.php/council-bylaws/>.*
- 2. Zoom Engineer introduction; other introductions deferred.**
- 3. Roll-call of voting Board members and Certification of Quorum.**
- 4. Approval of Minutes & Upcoming Meetings.**
 - 1) *Approval of Minutes* – January 14, 2021. 2) *Upcoming Meetings:* February 11, 2021 – (Tentative) Public safety forum; February 25, 2021 – topics to be announced. *Note: Topics noticed in advance may change.*
- 5. Consideration of Agenda.**
- 6. Treasurer’s Report.**
- 7. General Public Comment.** *This time is reserved for non-Board members to speak on any item of interest to the public that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the PPCC (Bylaws, Art. IX.7). Speakers will be limited to one minute. Chair retains discretion to extend.*
- 8. Reports, Announcements and Concerns.**
 - 8.1. From the Chair/Presiding Officer.**

8.1.1. Riviera Country Club – Longworth maintenance gate.

8.1.2. Potrero Canyon Park – naming for George Wolfberg.

8.2. From Officers.

8.2.1. Richard Cohen (Treasurer): Harry Sondheim (past PPCC Chair & Area 4 Representative) – In Memoriam.

8.2.2. Chris Spitz (Secretary): Updates: WRAC motions and legislation.

8.3. From At-Large and Area Representatives.

8.3.1. Eric Dugdale (PP Historical Society): Dick Wulliger – In Memoriam.

8.4. From Organizational Representatives.

8.5. From Government Offices / Representatives. *Contact information available at:*
<http://pacpalicc.org/index.php/government-contacts/>.

8.5.1. Zac Gaidzik, West/Metro LA Area Rep, Supervisor Sheila Kuehl (*see also item 11.1 below*).

8.5.2. Janet Turner, Field Supervisor, Congressman Ted Lieu.

8.6. From PPCC Advisors.

9. Reports from Committees.

10. Old Business – None.

11. New Business.

11.1. COVID-19 vaccinations update. Guest speaker: Zac Gaidzik, West/Metro LA Area Rep, Supervisor Sheila Kuehl. *Discussion only.*

11.2. Motions recommended to member councils by the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC): A) Oppose SB 9 (Atkins); support CF 21-0002-S18 (Koretz); B) Oppose SB 10 (Wiener); support CF 21-0002-S21 (Koretz). *See attachment below for text of recommended motions. Background information:* <https://westsidecouncils.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Background-re-SB-9-and-10.pdf>

12. Adjournment.

For additional information about PPCC, see www.pacpalicc.org or e-mail info@pacpalicc.org.

AGENDA ATTACHMENT (11.2 – text of WRAC-recommended motions)

A) Oppose SB 9 (Atkins); support CF 21-0002-S18 (Koretz)

Motion text:

Whereas, Senate Bill 9 violates the California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code §§30000 et seq.) by failing to exempt parcels within the Coastal zone, by purporting to eliminate hearings for Coastal Development Permits, and by requiring by-right/expedited approval of all projects permitted under the bill, including projects within the Coastal zone which otherwise require discretionary review, including hearings, under the Coastal Act;

PPCC Agenda 01.28.21

Whereas, Senate Bill 9 violates the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21065 and 21080) and shortcuts required CEQA review by declaring preemptively that a project permitted under the bill is not a “project” under CEQA, without regard to the test established by controlling caselaw, that is, whether the ordinance in a given case is “capable of causing a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment” (*Union of Medical Marijuana Patients, Inc. v. City of San Diego (California Coastal Commission, Real Party in Interest)*, (2019) 7 Cal.5th 1171);

Whereas, Senate Bill 9 compromises public safety and puts the lives and property of thousands of California residents in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) at risk from increased density by failing to provide any exemption for parcels within the VHFHSZ;

Whereas, Senate Bill 9 fails to address the state’s affordable housing crisis or to further the purported goal of “ensuring an adequate supply of affordable housing” by not specifying or requiring *any* particular amount or level of affordable housing (low to moderate income/workforce housing) in projects permitted pursuant to the bill;

Whereas, Councilmember Paul Koretz has introduced a resolution in Los Angeles City Council, CF 21-0002-S18, calling for the City of Los Angeles to oppose Senate Bill 9;

Therefore, the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC) [*sub. “Pacific Palisades Community Council”*] opposes Senate Bill 9 (Atkins) and supports the resolution in CF 21-0002-S18 (Koretz) calling for the City of Los Angeles to oppose Senate Bill 9.

B) Oppose SB 10 (Wiener); support CF 21-0002-S21 (Koretz)

Motion text:

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 violates the California Constitution (Art. II, Sec. 10(c)) and principles of democracy and true local control by allowing local governments (i.e., a majority of the current or future City Council) to upzone single family residential properties and speed approval processes for increased density/multi-unit housing, without stakeholder involvement and by overriding community-driven local restrictions on adopting zoning ordinances, *including restrictions enacted by voter initiatives*;

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 violates the California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code §§30000 et seq.) by failing to exempt parcels within the Coastal zone and by allowing by-right/expedited approval of development projects with up to 10 dwelling units on properties that are upzoned under the bill, including projects within the Coastal zone which require discretionary review under the Coastal Act;

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 violates the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code §§ 21065 and 21080) and shortcuts required CEQA review by declaring preemptively that an ordinance by a local government (i.e., a majority of the current or future City Council) to upzone a single family residential property pursuant to the bill is not a “project” under CEQA, without consideration of whether the ordinance in a given case is “capable of causing a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment” (*Union of Medical Marijuana Patients, Inc. v. City of San Diego (California Coastal Commission, Real Party in Interest)*, (2019) 7 Cal.5th 1171);

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 potentially compromises public safety and may put the lives and property of thousands of California residents in single family residential areas that are also in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) at risk from increased density by failing to provide for an unconditional exemption from upzoning under the bill for properties in the VHFHSZ;

PPCC Agenda 01.28.21

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 prevents public scrutiny and bypasses democratic process by providing that state agencies alone, without local community input, would identify and maintain a controlling map of so-called “jobs-rich” areas throughout the state for purposes of upzoning single family residential properties under the bill;

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 circumvents controlling caselaw by, in effect, allowing for “spot zoning” by local governments (i.e., a majority of the current or future City Council) without consideration of whether upzoning a single family residential property would be of substantial benefit to the public in a given case (*Foothills Communities Coalition v. County of Orange* (2014) 222 Cal.App.4th 1302);

Whereas, Senate Bill 10 fails to address the state’s affordable housing crisis or to further the purported goal of “ensuring an adequate supply of affordable housing” by not requiring *any* particular amount or level of affordable (low to moderate income/workforce) housing in development projects to be built on properties that are upzoned under the bill;

Whereas, Councilmember Paul Koretz has introduced a resolution in Los Angeles City Council, CF 21-0002-S21, calling for the City of Los Angeles to oppose Senate Bill 10;

Therefore, the Westside Regional Alliance of Councils (WRAC) [*sub. “Pacific Palisades Community Council”*] opposes Senate Bill 10 (Wiener) and supports the resolution in CF 21-0002-S21 (Koretz), calling for the City of Los Angeles City to oppose Senate Bill 10.