### December 13, 2016 Joint VNC Board & Discussion Forum Committee Meeting Final Updated Discussion Generator

Since it is the beginning of a new one-year DFC term, it is an opportune time to consider options for our work during this coming year.

This will be the topic of discussion at our December 13, 2016 Discussion Forum Committee meeting.

#### I. One option I would like us to consider is as follows:

The attached LA Times OpEd – contributed by two individuals who clearly understand the history of US land use and its zoning underpinnings – challenges both the mayor's <u>Hoover Style Development</u> & the protectionists' <u>Neighborhood Integrity Initiative</u> strategies for dealing with the current LA Housing Crisis. It has implications for the VNC's LUP and Homeless Committees among others.

The authors of the attached propose the following alternative integrated strategy:

- Instead of trying to preordain exactly what is or isn't allowed on every single piece of land, we should abandon micromanagement and — simultaneously — think big by funding improvements to infrastructure.
- We should begin by eliminating parking requirements and easing up restrictions on commerce in residential areas, which can make neighborhoods more walkable and diverse.
- We should reverse the bans on density that hindered L.A.'s ability to absorb new housing units in the early 1970s, resulting in today's affordability crises.
- We should undo community planning policies that exclude low-income residents from "high opportunity" neighborhoods by limiting where multi-family housing can be built.
- Opening up the city to more small and medium scale projects can empower families, building groups, coops and community corporations to become their own developers and city shapers, rather than trying to block change in order to feel heard.
- But such tweaks will only take us so far. If we want a better city, we as a community need to build a framework for productive growth, more equitable access to opportunity, and a more sustainable future. A safer street grid, expanded transit, well-maintained and shaded sidewalks, sustainable water and energy systems, more parks and adequate city services are the real pathways to a city that works for everyone.
- o If we focus on public projects that benefit us all, a better city will evolve around them.

This is clearly a 'long-term' strategy. It is the only one that makes sense to me. It is 'urban design' based on 'visions' and it will not be easy to implement politically – but it seems that it could achieve the results currently being sought by the existing political forces but at a much cheaper cost.

I'd like the VNC's <u>Discussion Forum Committee</u> to explore strategies that could further this urban design approach to LA's land use and zoning laws.

The DFC is well positioned to do this since its mission is:

... to promote a more proactive, collaborative vision for <u>VNC Committees</u> to include in their deliberations as they formulate recommendations for Board consideration. The <u>intent</u> is to create a working framework of integrated strategies capable of achieving, over time, broader consensus and increased (see listing of referenced VNC Vision Goals <u>here</u>).

II. In this context, I'd also like us to consider my below remarks submitted to the board at its 161018 meeting:

Joe Murphy remarks addressing the following 161018 VNC Board Agenda motion 12 of the Mass, Scale and Character Committee:

#### The VNC Board shall approve the report from the Mass, Scale and Character committee.

This report continues a 40-year pattern of downzoning which has made it increasingly difficult to build the lessexpensive housing in LA residential neighborhoods essential to addressing the current housing/homelessness crises.

It is the Venice equivalent of the citywide <u>Neighborhood Integrity Initiative</u>.

Both seek to protect the physical character of our LA communities in ways which have eroded their social diversity.

This self-inflicted legal/political framework is confronting us with a variety of short-term proposals which are unlikely to successfully address the long-term problems it has created – problems which prevent us from generating and considering long-term strategies capable of dealing with the complexities of the growing city in which we live.

I urge you to vote against this motion.

## III. And further, I'd also like us to consider the relevance of the below information to the proposed urban design focus of the Discussion Forum Committee:

Joe Murphy reflections on the relevance of the following information extracted from the pamphlet distributed at the October 23, 2016 <u>Democrat of the Year Awards</u> dinner:



Paid for by Coalition to Protect L.A. Neighborhoods and Jobs, a team of businesses, homeless advocates, renters, and homeowners. Major funding by CH Palladium, LLC and Westfield DD&C, LLC., 777 S. Figueroa St., Ste. 4050, Los Angeles, CA 90017. Additional information is available at ethics.lacity.org.

For the first time, to my knowledge, a clear distinction has been made between the negative impact of downzoning (the **Neighborhood Integrity Initiative**) on efforts to address the LA housing/homelessness crises (**Proposition HHH**).

And even more important, politically, is that this distinction is recognized by over 50% of the members of the Los Angeles City Council.

Is this an opportunity to formulate strategies capable of replacing the current land-use framework (which facilitates gentrification and the resulting erosion of economic diversity) with something better?

If so, what strategies would you recommend?

Sincerely,

Joe Murphy, Chair Discussion Forum Committee 310-305-1444 joedmur@gmail.com

# IV. I recently arranged the following meeting as a way to respond to several inquiries about our upcoming 12/13/16 DFC Meeting. I'd also like us to consider the below questions in our 12/13/16 DFC Meeting discussion.

I hope we can focus, at this meeting, on long-term urban design matters and set aside the typical short-term discussion topics which seem to suck air out of such long-term discussions by shifting focus to distracting sidebars of "here's why you can't do that" or "here's what you should be doing now instead of talking about that" - the "you're wasting our time" sorts of arguments.

I hope we can also set aside the presidential election and its impacts on us individually and as a nation.

I'd like to start with introductions since I believe no one, including me, knows everyone.

But I believe it would help if I clarify why I've called this meeting.

I've been focusing attention on the *Venice Neighborhood Council's* <u>Discussion Forum Committee</u> which I chaired since its inception in May 2012 with its stated orientation to the 2009 VNC-adopted <u>Vision Goals</u> (all but one of which I drafted). The monthly DFC discussions of these <u>Vision Goals</u> sparked the recent idea of focusing the DFC on Urban Design - especially since its focus since July 2014 has been almost entirely on the <u>Diversity Vision</u> <u>Goal</u> - a focus which has led inevitably to consideration of the current <u>LA housing/homelessness Crises</u>: their causes and possible strategic solutions. In doing this, it has been impossible to ignore the various legal and political impacts of the land-use laws and their implementations - and I believe Urban Design is an inescapable part of the mix.

In my prior email, I explained why I included you as an invitee - so I won't repeat that information here.

I'll introduce myself further at the meeting and I hope you will do likewise.

•••

Sincerely,

Joe Murphy <u>310-305-1444</u> <u>joedmur@gmail.com</u> PS-The Canal Club, 6pm, next Tuesday 11/22/2016

### November 22, 2016 JDM Urban Design Advisory Meeting Discussion Generator

- 1. I am puzzled by the apparent political alliance between the downzoning/protectionist forces and lowincome/homeless people when their objectives appear to be diametrically opposed to one another.
  - Low-income/homeless people would benefit greatly from increasing the supply of less-expensive homes which they can afford to purchase or rent. Downzoning/protectionist efforts reinforce the very gentrification which undermines efforts to encourage the supply of the housing which lowincome/homeless people need.
  - Are the downzoning/protectionist forces primarily wealthy home-owners?
  - If so, what is it that creates this awkward political alliance between less wealthy low-income/homeless people and wealthier downzoning/protectionist forces?
  - o If not, what drives low-income/homeless people into this awkward alliance?
- 2. My perception is that 'urban design' is intended to create human settlements which encourage the long-term objective of socially enriching families with children regardless of economic diversity or racial/ethnic differences. If so, what are the urban design elements which could accomplish this objective? And what hasn't worked up to now?
- 3. Former President Hoover introduced zoning based on the assumption that there was abundant vacant land where new 'cities' could be created ie, suburbs, primarily. My reading suggests that this is the framework around which LA land-use laws and regulations were shaped and are being applied today. If so, are there alternative frameworks which might be used to shape LA's future? And if so:
  - What are they?
  - What strategies would make efforts to implement such an alternate framework politically viable?
- 4. If you had four typical contiguous blocks of an existing LA residential neighborhood to 'urban design' perhaps as a 'model' for use in other residential neighborhoods what would that neighborhood look like? How would it differ from the existing selected four typical contiguous blocks of the existing LA residential neighborhood you started with? What would the (presumably changed) 'urban design' framework and its associated laws and regulations look like? What would you identify as the key differences between them?
- 5. A 'meta-question' I'm adding today (12/1/20160): What changes to the current land-use laws would discourage the discouragement and encourage the encouragement of construction of homes in existing residential communities which would become, over time, within the economic reach of ownership by our less wealthy residents?

JDM Caveat: I'm not sure that I've raised all or any of the 'right' assumptions or questions in what appears above.