

FEBRUARY 24, 2021 – CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Pacheco called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: M/Pacheco, MPT/Ching, C/Freedman, C/Tragarz, C/Wu
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: None

Also present: City Manager Wishner; Assistant City Manager Weiner; Assistant City Manager Rooney; Administrative Services Director Ogawa; City Attorney Leibold; Finance Officer Cortez; City Planner Carlson; Code Enforcement Specialist Ramos; Associate Planner Yang; Senior Planner Vasquez; Senior Management Analyst Layman; Senior Management Analyst Guerra; Public Information Officer Maio; and City Clerk De Dios.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

- **Housing Element Update 2021 – 2029 Discussion**

It is recommended that the City Council conduct discussion(s) and receive Public Comment on each of the following items:

1. Study Area 4;
 - a. Review of Planning Commission comments.
2. Study Area 3;
 - a. Review of Planning Commission comments.
3. Consideration of new Study Area 1;
4. Study Area 6;
 - a. Review of Planning Commission comments.
5. Study Area 2;
 - a. Review of Planning Commission comments.
6. Consideration of new Study Area 5;
7. Timeline and Next Steps.

M/Pacheco announced he owned property in proximity to the Study Areas 4 and 3; therefore, he would not be participating in the discussion for those areas due to conflict of interest.

MPT/Ching presided over the meeting for Study Areas 4 and 3.

ACM/Weiner shared that the Planning Commission recommended eliminating study area 4, the largest areas of Valley Blvd. and Pierre Rd, if not made a mixed-use area.

C/Freedman stated she is against allowing eight story buildings, but four stories is acceptable.

C/Tragarz agreed with the mixed-use concept and stated that eight stories is too tall.

MPT/Ching opened public comment; there was no public input received for Area 4.

MPT/Ching and C/Wu requested that the area be studied further and compared to areas of Santa Monica.

Discussion took place amongst Council and staff regarding study area 4 and its density requirements.

After presentation of Study Area 4, Councilmember Tragarz announced she owned properties near Study Areas 3, 1, and 6 and would not be participating in the discussion regarding those items due to conflict of interest.

ACM/Weiner provided information on study area 3; the Planning Commission did not have any changes on the item and no issue with the area rezoned in the future to meet housing guidelines.

Discussion took place amongst Council and staff regarding Study Area 3.

MPT/Ching opened public comment; there was no public input received for Area 3.

After Study Area 3 discussion, M/Pacheco rejoined the meeting.

ACM/Weiner provided information on Study Area 1.

Discussion took place amongst Council and staff regarding the boundaries, density, and zoning for Study Area 1.

M/Pacheco opened public comment; there was no public input received for Area 1.

ACM/Weiner provided information on Study Area 6.

Discussion took place amongst Council and staff regarding the boundaries, density, and zoning for Study Area 6 as well as potential developments in the area.

M/Pacheco, C/Freedman, and C/Ching stated they are in favor of including the area in the housing element.

M/Pacheco opened public comment; there was no public input received for Area 6.

After Study Area 6 discussion, C/Tragarz rejoined the meeting.

ACM/Weiner provided information on Study Area 2 and noted the recommended boundaries for the area made by the Planning Commission.

Discussion took place amongst Council and staff regarding the boundaries, density, and zoning for Study Area 2.

C/Wu, C/Tragarz, and M/Pacheco recommended expanding Area 2 towards the north in the housing element.

M/Pacheco opened public comment; there was no public input received for Area 2.

ACM/Weiner provided information on Study Area 5.

Discussion took place amongst Council and staff regarding the boundaries, density, and zoning for Study Area 5.

It was the consensus of Council to expand the use and include the area in the housing element.

M/Pacheco opened public comment; there was no public input received for Area 5.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There being no input, it was unanimously moved by Council to close oral communications. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

PASSED AND APPROVED on the 10th day of March 2021.

Bob Pacheco, Mayor

ATTEST:

Teresa De Dios, City Clerk

PREPARED BY:

Ray Markel, Administrative Assitant