

Report on the Preference Survey and Public Comments

Community Planning/Local Coastal Program Ad Hoc Committee

Introduction:

City Planning has been in the process of updating both The Venice Community Plan and the Venice Local Coastal Program. The Venice Neighborhood Council in October 2023, voted to become more involved in these planning efforts by establishing a Community Planning/Local Coastal Program Ad Hoc Committee (“Committee”). It became active in late December 2023 with the naming of its Chair, Dr. Naomi Nightingale, and members: Ed Ferrer, Alix Gucovsky, Mark Mack, Robin Rudisill, Richard Stanger, and Steve Williams.

In order to determine how Venetians want to see their community develop in the future, the Committee initiated a series of seven public meetings each one focusing on 1-2 subareas (neighborhoods) within Venice. The intent of these meetings was to present City Planning’s latest plans, as the Committee understood them, and to obtain feedback and public comment. Importantly, the Committee also developed a Preference Survey (“Survey”) available first to meeting attendees, then as an on-line survey sent out to VNC’s large email list.

This Interim Report presents the results of the Survey and public input. It has a separate section for each named subarea, or neighborhood. Within each section are the results of the Survey in table form showing the number of responses, the percentage of each question’s choices, and a corresponding bar chart showing visually what the tables indicate. Accompanying this information is a brief textual summary of the findings. Also included are summaries of the public comments made at each of the seven public meetings.

There were a total of 146 paper Surveys received at the public meetings and 448 valid on-line Surveys filled out for a total of 594 Surveys representing 12 subareas of Venice. (See Table 1.) Will the Surveys be useful? Yes! Those who took the time to attend the public meetings are obviously interested in land use planning and how it relates to their neighborhoods and property. Those that completed the on-line Survey were already on the Venice Neighborhood Council’s extensive mailing list. The results of this effort, then, reflects the contribution of those in our community perhaps most interested and informed.

Table 1: Number of Total Surveys by Subarea

Concern	All Venice	East Venice	Oakwood	Milwood	Southeast Venice	Oxford Triangle	Southwest Venice	Marina Peninsula East	Marina Peninsula West	North Venice	Ocean Front Walk	Venice Canals	Abbot Kinney Boulevard	I Don't Live in Venice
Number of Surveys	594	100	57	55	42	24	37	33	34	108	24	54	10	11

This report ends the first phase of the Committee’s work. The next phase will take the information gained and translate it into recommended guidelines for future land use decisions within each subarea. These will be used in discussions with City Planning staff.

Table of Contents

Introduction:	1
I. Background:	4
Subareas/Neighborhoods Map:	4
The Preference Survey:	5
II. Summary of Results:	5
Homelessness and Safety & Security	5
Summary Matrix:	6
Survey Responses for All Venice Regardless of Subarea:	10
Preferred Height Limits on Along Major Roadways	14
Public Comment Summary for All Venice Regardless of Subarea:	15
III. Preference Survey Results & Public Comments for Each Subarea	26
East Venice - Survey Results and Public Comments	26
Preference Survey Results for East Venice:	27
Public Comments Summary for East Venice:	27
Oakwood - Survey and Public Comment Evaluation	31
Preference Survey Results for Oakwood:	31
Public Comment Summary for Oakwood:	35
Milwood - Survey and Public Comment Responses	37
Preference Survey Results for Milwood:	37
Public Comments Summary for Milwood:	38
Southeast Venice - Survey and Public Comment	42
Preference Survey Results for Southeast Venice:	42
Summary of Public Comments for Southeast Venice:	42
Oxford Triangle - Survey Responses and Public Comments	46
Preference Survey Response Evaluation for Oxford Triangle:	46
Public Comments Summary for Oxford Triangle:	46
Southwest Venice - Survey Responses and Public Comments	50
Preference Survey Results for Southwest Venice:	50
Public Comments Summary for Southwest Venice:	54
Marina Peninsula East - Survey Responses and Public Comments	54
Preference Survey Results for Marina Peninsula East:	54
Public Comments Summary for Marina Peninsula East & West:	58

Marina Peninsula West - Survey Responses and Public Comments	59
Preference Survey Responses for Marina Peninsula West:	59
Public Comment Summary for Marina Peninsula West (See Marina Peninsula East Public Comment Summary):	60
North Venice - Survey Responses and Public Comments of North Venice	64
Preference Survey Results for North Venice:	64
Public Comment Summary for North Venice:	64
Venice Canals - Survey Responses and Public Comments	68
Preference Survey Results for Venice Canals:	68
Public Comment Summary for Venice Canals:	72
Ocean Front Walk - Survey Responses and Public Comments	73
Preference Survey Results for Ocean Front Walk:	73
Public Comment Summary for Ocean Front Walk:	74
Abbot Kinney Boulevard - Survey Responses and Public Comments	78
Preference Survey Results for Abbot Kinney Boulevard:	78
Public Comment Summary for Abbot Kinney Boulevard:	78
Appendix A	79
Appendix B	81

I. Background:

Subareas/Neighborhoods Map:

For this study Venice was divided into logical subareas based partially on the subareas used in the 2001 Venice Land Use Plan (VLUP), but updated to its 2024 realities (see Map 1). For example, the 2001 VLUP had all of Oakwood, Milwood, and the neighborhoods between Venice Blvd. and Washington Blvd. from Lincoln Blvd. to the Venice Canals as one Subarea. This area was subdivided into separate subareas of Oakwood, Milwood, Southeast Venice and Southwest Venice. The Marina Peninsula had four subareas in the 2001 VLUP probably because of the then extensive new developments along the Lagoon. However, the land around the Lagoon has since been developed and two subareas seems more appropriate now. Finally, Ocean Front Walk and Abbot Kinney Blvd. are now seen and having unique issues, so they are broken out from the residential neighborhoods surrounding them as separate subareas.

Map 1: Venice Subareas for Preference Survey



The Preference Survey:

An initial draft of the Survey was reviewed by the public and the Committee at its meeting on January 10th, and changes were incorporated into a revised draft presented to the Committee on the 17th. After several changes the paper version of the Survey was approved by the Committee. It was made available at each of the Committee’s subsequent seven public meetings. The Survey was handed out and collected to ensure only one response per attendee. In total 146 paper Surveys were collected. The Survey form is shown in Appendix A.

The on-line version of the Preference Survey using Google Forms was released on March 2nd and March 11th was the deadline for responding. Its questions were the same as the paper Survey’s, but necessarily formatted differently. A total of 448 valid Surveys were collected. It should be noted that a total of 41 on-line Survey responses were removed because of clear duplication as detailed in Appendix B. While there are bound to be a few remaining duplications remaining among the responses, it is unlikely that they are more than a few and should not affect the validity of the results.

II. Summary of Results:

This section summarizes the results of the Preference Survey for all subareas in Venice together. The detailed results for each of the 13 subareas will be discussed in turn in Section III.

Homelessness and Safety & Security

Question 13 of the Survey asked respondents to indicate which two of a list of nine concerns were most important to them. Homelessness ranked first within all subareas and Safety & Security ranked second within all but two subareas (where it was a close third). Their percentages are shown in Table 2. The Survey confirms how great the issues of Homelessness and Safety & Security are within every neighborhood of Venice.

Table 2: Responses on Homelessness, Safety & Security and Climate Change

Concern	All Venice	East Venice	Oakwood	Milwood	Southeast Venice	Oxford Triangle	Southwest Venice	Marina Peninsula East	Marina Peninsula West	North Venice	Ocean Front Walk	Venice Canals	Abbot Kinney Boulevard	I Don't Live in Venice
Homelessness	31%	28%	29%	29%	38%	29%	41%	29%	25%	36%	42%	23%	30%	32%
Safety & Security	19%	19%	18%	16%	21%	15%	13%	26%	19%	21%	20%	15%	20%	18%
Climate Change	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	9%	3%	3%	12%	1%	2%	14%	5%	5%

These two issues, however, along with Climate Change (sea level rise), mask the importance of other concerns that are more directly tied to land use issues. Therefore, the results of Question 13 in the rest of this Report will exclude these three concerns except for this section, which discusses the Survey results for all of Venice.

Summary Matrix:

The Preference Survey responses for each question vary, sometimes indicating a clear community preference and sometimes indicating a range of preference responses yielding no clear community preference. For purposes of this report, if the responses to a particular question exceed 70%, or contrarily are less than 10%, this report states that the community's preference is "very strong" for or against. If any response to a particular question is above 50%, the report states that the community's preference is "strong".

Table 2 arrays and summarizes the preferences by question and subarea in three parts: questions 3-7, questions 8-10 and 12-13, and question. Only the strongest preferences are noted; these are also color-coded. If the survey responses show no clear preference "Unclear" is stated. In addition, the highest ranking response for question 7 (parking requirements) and the highest ranking responses to questions 13A and 13 B (Issues of Concern) are shown as well. These responses are informative even if they did not reach the 50% threshold.

Table 3: Summary Matrix of Preference Survey Responses by Subarea (1 of 3)

= Responses Greater Than 70%
 = Responses Greater Than 50%
 = Responses 10% or Less

QUESTIONS →	3	4A	4B	5	6	7
SUBAREA ↓	Maximum Number of Floors/Stories ?	Maximum Square Feet Single-Family Home?	Maximum Square Feet Multi-Family Building?	Number of Living Units per Lot? (including ADUs)	Maximum Lot Coverage?	Number of Required Parking Spaces?
East Venice	2 Floors = 69%	Unclear	≥ 5,000 SF = 51%	1 living unit + ADU = 74%	Setbacks+Backyard = 74%	2 Spaces/Lot =35%
Oakwood	>3 Floors = 8%	>5,000 SF = 2%	≥ 5,000 SF = 68%	Unclear	Setbacks+Backyard = 56%	2 Spaces/Lot =34%
Milwood	>3 Floors = 6%	>4,000 SF = 6%	≥ 5,000 SF = 49%	1 living unit + ADU = 67%	Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback =8%	2 Spaces/Lot =38%
Southeast Venice	>3 Floors = 10%	>4,000 SF = 10%	≤ 4,000 SF = 55%	1 living unit + ADU = 50%	Setbacks+Backyard = 50%	2 Spaces/Lot =49%
Oxford Triangle	2 Floors = 69%	>5,000 SF = 4%	≥ 5,000 SF = 65%	1 living unit + ADU = 60%	Unclear	2 Spaces/Lot =55%
Southwest Venice	2 Floors = 69%	>4,000 SF = 3%	5,000 SF =52%	1 living unit + ADU = 74%	Setbacks+Backyard = 65%	2 Spaces/Lot =57%
Marina Peninsula East	>4 Floors = 0%	Unclear	≥ 5,000 SF = 73%	1 living unit + ADU = 74%	Unclear	2 Spaces/Lot, Spaves/LU both = 33%
Marina Peninsula West	>4 Floors = 0%	Unclear	≥ 5,000 SF = 68%	Unclear	Unclear	2 Spaces/LU =57%
North Venice	>4 Floors = 8%	>5,000 SF = 7%	≥ 5,000 SF = 60%	Unclear	Unclear	2 Spaces/Lot = 30%
Ocean Front Walk	>4 Floors = 0%	Unclear	≥ 5,000 SF = 75%	Unclear	Buildable Area Only = 54%	1 Space/LU, Spaces/Lot, both = 29%
Venice Canals	>3 Floors = 6%	>4,000 SF = 10%	≤ 4,000 SF = 55%	1 living unit + ADU = 70%	Unclear	2 Spaces/Lot = 42%
Abbot Kinney	>3 Floors = 10%	Unclear	≤ 4,000 SF = 55%	1 living unit + ADU = 60%	Unclear	2 Spaces/Lot = 33%
All Venice	2 Floors = 52%	Unclear	≥ 5,000 SF =59%	1 living unit + ADU = 58%	Setbacks+Backyard =52%	2 Spaces/Lot = 37%

Table 3: Summary Matrix of Preference Survey Responses by Subarea (2 of 3)

= Responses Greater Than 70%
 = Responses Greater Than 50%
 = Responses 10% or Less

Responses to questions 13A and 13B do NOT include responses for homelessness, safety & security, and climate change. See Table 2 of report.

QUESTIONS →	8	9	10	12	13A	13B
SUBAREA ↓	Should Roof Decks Be Allowed In Your Neighborhood?	Type of Front Yard Walls and Fencing?	If More Multi-Family Housing Is Built In Venice, Where Should It Be Built?	What Would You Want Ocean Front Walk Buildings to Look Like in the Future?	Within Your Neighborhood, What Two Issues Concern You Most?	Within Your Neighborhood, What Two Issues Concern You Most?
						Highest Two
East Venice	Unclear	Low Walls/Fences & Hedges = 57%	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 71%	Unclear	Very Large Homes = 25%	Losing Family-Sized Housing = 22%
Oakwood	Roof Decks + RAS OK = 51%	Unclear	Within Neighborhoods = 7%	Unclear	Losing Family-Sized Housing = 22%	Change in Arch/Neigh Character = 21%
Milwood	Unclear	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 62%	Unclear	Losing Family-Sized Housing = 28%	Very Large Homes and Character Change, both 21%
Southeast Venice	Unclear	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 69%	Unclear	Traffic & Parking = 28%	Very Large Homes = 25%
Oxford Triangle	Roof Decks + RAS OK = 50%	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 70%	Mix of Old & New = 57%	Traffic & Parking = 57%	Three tied
Southwest Venice	Roof Decks + RAS OK = 50%	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 89%	Mix of Old & New = 62%	Very Large Homes = 24%	Losing Family-Sized Housing = 24%
Marina Peninsula East	Roof Decks + RAS OK = 52%	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 69%	No Change = 58%	Traffic & Parking = 44%	Change in Character, Green Space Both = 21%
Marina Peninsula West	Roof Decks + RAS OK = 53%	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 78%	No Change = 58%	Traffic & Parking = 50%	Change in Arch/Neigh Character = 31%
North Venice	Unclear	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 60%	Unclear	Traffic & Parking = 32%	Change in Arch/Neigh Character = 30%
Ocean Front Walk	Roof Decks + RAS OK = 53%	Unclear	Unclear	No Change = 50%	Losing Family-Sized Housing = 45%	Traffic & Parking = 25%
Venice Canals	Unclear	Low Walls/Fences & Hedges = 54%	Within Neighborhood = 0%	Unclear	Change in Arch/Neigh Character = 22%	Very Large Homes, Traffic & Parking, Both = 18%
Abbot Kinney	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Change in Arch/Neigh Character = 22%	Isol. from high fencing. Lost gr. space, Both = 22%
All Venice	Unclear	Unclear	Growth Outside Neighborhoods = 65%	Unclear	Traffic & Parking = 30%	Very Large Homes, Lost Gr. Space, Both = 20%

Table 3: Summary Matrix of Preference Survey Responses by Subarea (3 of 3)

= Responses Greater Than 70%
 = Responses Greater Than 50%
 = Responses 10% or Less

QUESTIONS	11 - Washington Boulevard	11 - Venice Blvd	11 - Lincoln Blvd	11 - Rose Ave	11 - Abbot Kinney Boulevard
SUBAREA	Maximum Floors/Stories Along Washington Blvd?	Maximum Floors/Stories Along Venice Blvd?	Maximum Floors/Stories Along Lincoln Blvd?	Maximum Floors/Stories Along Rose Avenue?	Maximum Floors/Stories Along Abbot Kinney Blvd?
East Venice	>5 Stories = 11%	> 5 Stories = 13%	> 5 Stories = 10%	3 Stories = 80%	3 Stories = 79%
Oakwood	15 Stories = 8%	15 Stories = 7%	15 Stories = 7%	3 Stories = 54%	3 Stories = 63%
Milwood	15 Stories =0%	15 Stories =0%	15 Stories = 8%	3 Stories = 57%	>3 Stories = 4%
Southeast Venice	>5 Stories = 4%	>5 Stories = 2%	15 Stories = 2%	3 Stories = 73%	3 Stories = 80%
Oxford Triangle	15 Stories =0%	15 Stories =0%	15 Stories = 8%	3 Stories = 57%	>3 Stories = 4%
Southwest Venice	3 Stories = 57%	4 Stories = 57%	15 Stories = 8%	3 Stories = 78%	4 Stories = 78%
Marina Peninsula East	>5 Stories = 9%	15 Stories =0%	15 Stories = 9%	3 Stories = 61%	3 Stories = 75%
Marina Peninsula West	15 Stories =3%	15 Stories =6%	Unclear	>5 Stories = 0%	>4 Stories = 6%
North Venice	15 Stories =7%	15 Stories =6%	Unclear	3 Stories = 68%	4 Stories = 68%
Ocean Front Walk	15 Stories =7%	15 Stories =0%	Unclear	3 Stories = 68%	3 Stories = 71%
Venice Canals	15 Stories =6%	>5 Stories = 10%	Unclear	3 Stories = 65%	3 Stories = 75%
Abbot Kinney	Unclear	15 Stories =0%	15 Stories = 10%	3 Stories = 60%	3 Stories = 80%
All Venice	>8 Stories = 6%	>8 Stories = 5%	>8 Stories = 9%	3 Stories = 68%	3 Stories = 73%

Survey Responses for All Venice Regardless of Subarea:

- Strong preference for growth to occur outside inner neighborhoods.
- Strong preference for 2-story structures, mainly single-family homes (+a possible ADU).
- Strong preference for back yards, and against structures that use the full buildable area or more.
- Very strong preference for no more than 3-story structures on Abbot Kinney Boulevard.
- Strong preference for no more than 3-story structures on Rose Avenue.
- Acceptance of roof decks, but roof access structures are far less acceptable.

Venice is a community composed of a mosaic of quite different neighborhoods. Each has its own character, demographic mix and often predominate building type. Yet residents of these neighborhoods see themselves as Venice citizens first and have an interest in all of Venice. What does the 594 total Survey responses tell about what all of us, together, want to see Venice become in the future? The tables and charts below detail how we answered the Survey, and from them we can extract some commonalities. Here are some:

Two-thirds of the responders (66%) want homes to be below 3,000 SF. Most (58%) want to see single-family homes with a possible ADU as the maximum allowed, and most (52%) want to have lots developed with adequate back yards larger than just the rear yard setback. Two parking spaces per lot had the most responses (37%) with a fixed 3 spaces per lot, the present requirement for most lots in Venice, only supported by 8% of responders. Roof decks appear to be widely accepted (82%), but roof access structures are far less acceptable (43%).

Venetians want major growth to occur outside the inner neighborhoods (96%), along its major roadways. Yet 15-story structures on Washington, Venice and Lincoln Boulevards would be acceptable to fewer than 10% of us. Yet 59%, 64% and 54% prefer building no more than four stories on Washington, Venice and Lincoln Boulevard, respectively. A very high percentage of us want structure no more than 3 stories on Rose Avenue (68%) and Abbot Kinney Boulevard (73%).

Homelessness dominates the list of the nine concerns provided; it is mentioned in 31% of all responses. Safety & Security is checked in 19% of responses, and Parking & Traffic followed with 11%.

Again, these statistics are from the 594 valid Survey responses. This blending of responses masks the variation of responses from each of the 13 subareas. Their statistics will be detailed and discussed in the next section of this report.


PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)

All Venice - # of Surveys 594


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	440	74%
Renter	106	18%
Business/Employee	37	6%
Other Stakeholder	9	2%
	592	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	286	52%
3 Floors	198	36%
4 Floors	56	10%
5 Floors	4	1%
More than 5 Floors	4	1%
	548	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	73	13%
2,500 SF	132	24%
3,000 SF	159	29%
4,000 SF	106	19%
5,000 SF	47	9%
More than 5,000 SF	35	6%
	552	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	87	17%
4,000 SF	121	24%
5,000 SF	159	32%
More than 5,000 SF	133	27%
	500	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	324	58%
3 Living Units	90	16%
4 Living Units	86	15%
More than 4 Living Units	57	10%
	557	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	293	52%
Buildable Area Only	183	33%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	86	15%
	562	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

All Venice - # of Surveys 594


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	36	6%
1 Space/Lot	97	17%
2 Spaces/Lot	211	37%
3 Spaces/Lot	48	8%
1 Space/Living Unit	80	14%
2 Space/Living Unit	98	17%
1 Space/Floor	5	1%
	575	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	107	18%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	223	39%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	249	43%
	579	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	27	5%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	242	42%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	117	20%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	188	33%
	574	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	22	4%
Outside the Neighborhoods	375	65%
Both Places	181	31%
	578	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	236	41%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	245	42%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	101	17%
	582	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Climate Change	39	
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	121	10%
Homelessness	366	31%
Very Large Homes	93	8%
Traffic & Parking	133	11%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	42	4%
Safety & Security	222	19%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	111	10%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	39	3%
	1166	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

All Venice - # of Surveys 594


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	194	34%
4 Stories	141	25%
5 Stories	140	24%
8 Stories	66	12%
15 Stories	32	6%
	573	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	213	37%
4 Stories	153	27%
5 Stories	128	22%
8 Stories	55	10%
15 Stories	26	5%
	575	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	173	30%
4 Stories	136	24%
5 Stories	135	23%
8 Stories	81	14%
15 Stories	51	9%
	576	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	379	68%
4 Stories	107	19%
5 Stories	53	9%
8 Stories	20	4%
15 Stories	2	0%
	561	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	406	73%
4 Stories	86	15%
5 Stories	45	8%
8 Stories	18	3%
15 Stories	1	0%
	556	100%



Preferred Height Limits on Along Major Roadways

Map 2 tries to simplify the responses to Question 11: What is Your preferred Height Limit on Washington Boulevard, Venice Boulevard, Lincoln Boulevard, Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard? The responses shown are those for the subareas directly adjacent to the roadway in question. The number is the highest number of stories/floors the percentage of responses prefer. For example: “4 – 80%” means that 80% of responders prefer a maximum height limit of 4 stories.

Map 2: Preferred Maximum Heights on Key Roadways



Public Comment Summary for All Venice Regardless of Subarea:

After eight initial meetings where the committee discussed each Venice subarea, we learned that there were common themes and concerns that were consistent throughout the different meetings. The overarching concerns of the community are in the following areas:

1. Planning Process Considerations
2. Unnecessary/Inadvisable Density
3. Environmental/Resiliency Concerns
4. Affordability/Diversity
5. Parking and Transportation Issues
6. Failing Infrastructure
7. Preservation of Existing Residential Neighborhoods
8. Unnecessary Changes to Commercial Zoning
9. Enforcement Needed

The above concerns can be encapsulated in a simple statement. The City and its planners have no vision for Venice and have no idea of how to encourage a thriving residential, business, and tourist community. Venice is considered to be “The People’s Beach,” a place that is accessible to all of Los Angeles, the rest of California, and the world. Additionally, there is great concern that the current proposals differ drastically from current coastal zoning that reflects the protections afforded in the Coastal Act and the certified Venice Coastal Land Use Plan. We must understand what the updated Local Coastal Program is going to propose and ensure that it is in harmony with the Community Plan update. Per the Coastal Act, Venice is one of thirteen special coastal communities and future plans must respect and honor that designation.

What follows are the general talking points covered in each of the above-mentioned areas of concern. This will be followed by a breakdown of specific comments for each subarea. And finally, we will provide a link to the summaries and transcripts from all the meetings, for your reference.

1. Planning Process Considerations

- It’s complex for the community to understand the zoning changes and perhaps we need to create a map of our community that identifies things we want in Venice and to transmit to future generations, such as parks, public art, memorials.
- It would be great if we could do a CAD presentation so that people could see the visual/rendering of the City Planning proposals.
- Community members found the draft community plan cumbersome and confusing and at time containing conflicting visions for Venice. It’s not a document that’s useful to the community. Of the 110 pages of the draft Venice Community Plan, 107 were totally worthless, unless you wanted to read ad nauseam, “*encourage* developers to do this,” “*encourage* joint efforts among these groups,” “*seek out* beautifying the neighborhood.” It seems that the community plans are cookie cutter, the same for each plan area. As is, it’s more like “welcome to Westside Village,” rather than being tailored specifically to the Venice Community and the other communities.

- I'm very concerned about the impacts from these plans--what it does to the sense of community, what it does to people being able to be neighbors and their ability to be mobile in their communities, and the opportunities to build relationships and to have recreational activities within the areas in which they live. A lot of what is proposed with these plans would make it prohibitive for people to be able to do that.
- The draft community plan is looking at Venice as a commodity and not as a community. We need to shift that focus so that we can start thinking about how to build a vibrant, diverse, equitable community.
- Maybe we should ask Planning to provide us a precedent analysis, looking at the existing recent history, sort of post bungalow era, in terms of what people have been building and what Planning's goals are in terms of changing it.
- There seems to be consensus that the community is concerned about increases in height and FAR and would like to know what Venice can accommodate as currently zoned.
- Georges-Eugene Haussmann was the architect and urban planner who redesigned Paris 100 or more years ago. He built 6-story buildings, but he created huge, wide boulevards, so you don't have these narrow, dark canyons and you don't have large 5-story or 15-story buildings stealing shade and air from smaller buildings.
- We're one of the densest parts of Los Angeles. This seems highly inappropriate. One of my friends circulated the proposal for 15-story buildings on Washington. I just was like, is this some kind of fake news or something? I had trouble believing that anybody would propose putting 15-story buildings across the street from 1- and 2-story buildings. What I expected would soon come out of this process was that on major corridors--which would be Washington, maybe Main Street, maybe Venice Boulevard, and those are the only three I really can think of--we might go from 3 to 4 stories. And frankly, I think 5 is too much because you realize that those are backing up in some cases to 1-story buildings.
- We should be looking at Venice holistically. It's important to look at the bigger picture, not just look at we're in North Venice or we're in Millwood or we're in East Venice. Look at the whole picture of what's going on. Because even if you don't live on Washington, it's going to impact you. What's going to happen with Venice? What's going to happen with Lincoln? It's going to impact you, even if it's not the change that you're looking at on your particular street.
- The city proposes 15 stories along certain areas of Washington. Why would we want that is my question. Unless it's coupled with open space or transit or infrastructure improvements, it's kind of a one-dimensional story they're telling. What would be really helpful with these things is some sort of 3D massing that shows these changes. I think people would be shocked at what's proposed. And I appreciate that most of this is built out, but there's no "why" behind what the changes really represent. If you're up zoning a portion of the Peninsula that's already built out, my question is why. I just want to understand why that's good or what the City is trying to accomplish.
- L.A. and Venice in particular is a very primitive urban structure. Zoning is a very primitive instrument to create cities. Look at many complicated cities--New York, Chicago--who deal with water, deal with infrastructure. And we are really at a very primitive state. I think we need more intelligence in how our city is planned, how our city is organized, we need to include many more elements than just zoning. The city has no tools to enforce sort of intelligent buildings for intelligent cities. Parking, traffic, environmental issues, solar access, all of these things should be considered.

- It's very primitive what the L.A. Planning Department seems to be doing--totally ignoring traffic and the infrastructure, our water table, tsunami risk, and on and on.
- Zoning is a very rough tool that was introduced last century to control health, traffic and building heights as well as use. In times like today, we face some different challenges. Now climate and gentrification have become bigger problems, and they may need different solutions.
- Where are those elements that make a community a community, that make you want to live in a certain place, that make it possible for you to live in that place, to make it affordable and livable for you to live in that place?
- I think next time we should actually receive a mailer, something so every household receives it, so it's not only the ones that are very informed or who're paying attention to what's going on in planning, but everybody can actually know about this opportunity because it is so important.
- In planning for our community, we have to think about other Californians, in Riverside or Needles or wherever, that want to come to Venice and see Venice, because they have an image of Venice that is attractive to them, and in fact this is the case worldwide.
- Our community planning must include remembering the history of Venice, because it was the people of Oakwood that built the Venice Canal that attracted the people that led to the quirks that now is known worldwide.
- I would ask for no lot consolidations anywhere in Venice above ground. You can put three lots together below ground, as you see on Market Street in the 200 block where they have ramped parking and they do all that underneath the building. They can tie them together so you can park more cars, but above ground it stays with the same architectural integrity we have throughout Venice.
- You hear the "realtor speak" about the Venice vibe. They talk a lot about the Venice vibe. And it gets me because all these proposed changes by City Planning are pointed to completely destroy the so-called Venice vibe, which is, as we know, folks who have been around here a while. Even with all the changes that we've seen, it's still mixed enough culturally and economically that it's interesting and vital and it still has some of that vibe. It's been diminished a bit, but it's still something. Yet everything that we're hearing about this plan and the density is the incentivizing of destroying all the rest of the existing affordable housing to build it out to these brand-new buildings that are going to be unaffordable. Everything's pointed to just destroy that completely and create what we've all feared all along, which is the Laguna Beach-ization of Venice. That's kind of what I see this all as being. So, it's upsetting and I'm glad there's other people that are upset. We should be preserving the existing affordable and historic housing and not incentivizing the destruction of it.

2. Unnecessary/Inadvisable Density

- The plans the City is proposing don't add any more housing than we already have the ability to have with the current zoning.
- Venice is the second most dense coastal community, after Hermosa. But we have tourism! Not only do we have residents, but we have tourism. So, our communities double in population on the weekends. Where is the infrastructure for all of this?
- We need to create change from meaningful numbers. We're not being told what the requirement is for Venice, which puts everybody in a difficult position. We're being asked

for an answer without being asked the right question. They ask us to make recommendations, but we don't have the information in order to make recommendations. The City needs to provide current housing capacity given DB, TOC, ADU, SB 9, etc.

- What we don't have is an inventory of what can be built. We need to know, particularly for our commercial corridors, how much could be built now, additional square footage for all of these commercial corridors, so we can see whether we actually have to go to five stories. It could be that if everybody built out to what's allowed now, we may be able to provide the units, including the affordable units that the city and the state are saying that we need. We need a baseline assessment provided by planning that tells us what the developers/property owners could build out now before we get forced into accepting, with bonuses, five stories. When you look at Thornton Lofts, you see how dense Thornton Lofts is, which you can do under the current zoning. Every community in all the districts has been asking for this information--what can be built with the current zoning?
- If you read the 2004 Community Plan, it states there that the zoning allows for density for a population of 46,000 by 2010. And that was one of the features of the Community Plan in 2004. Venice population is now 38,000. So, the zoning as it exists apparently would allow for a population of 46,000 according to the 2004 Community Plan, and we're nowhere near that at this point.
- If density is increased, will funding be provided for streets, parks, schools, bike lanes, etc?
- I'd like to know what it is that made them reach out to try to add this density in what is already one of the most dense parts of Los Angeles.
- There is an idea that density is going to magically solve things. And it's not. We're losing population. Our businesses are fleeing. Our services are a mess. Look at this map. What do we see? We see water on every frigging side of the Marina Peninsula. What are they thinking is all I ask myself. What are they thinking with this? And we should demand an answer. It's also going to be a problem for insurance, present and future.
- I'd like to suggest that in the plan we put a limit of a maximum unit size so that you can't have more than, say, a 2,000 square foot unit. And the way the FAR ratio will work with a maximum unit size might increase the number of units and maybe help solve the housing crisis that way.
- I'm trying to balance density and scale and character with how we can provide more opportunities for people than just super expensive single-family units. So, I'm thinking that if the height is maybe a bit taller, like on the corridors such as Lincoln or some of those, maybe that's a way to get a bit more density.
- What I see going on in our neighborhood is that we went from a neighborhood of families and a lot of people living in the buildings, to a neighborhood of middle-class transients, young people who can afford to rent their one bedroom for a year or two and then when it gets too expensive, they move someplace else. Or they're really, really wealthy people who build these enormous houses that only have a few people living in them. So, the additional development hasn't increased the population density.
- My kids can't afford to live in Venice. They're very hard working. How do you protect young people who want to create a community, families who want to live in a community and be part of a community? That's a much more difficult question than simply giving developers a chance to build bigger buildings. Ultimately, I agree with the goal of providing more housing in the state, but just plunking it down willy-nilly in every

community, so no particular politician has to bear the brunt of the blame, it doesn't really work for what you want to do, what you need to do.

- There's a linkage between density and equity. The more you restrict density, the more you limit equitable chances for people.
- When you up zone property, you increase the value of the property, which means the landlords sell, people lose their RSO housing, and it gets replaced with a different class of people. That is the economic reality of up zoning, and not equity.
- The City is pretending that we want equity, but they're not going to do it.
- Venice is a special coastal resource for the Coastal Commission and we're one of 13 in the state. And I kind of feel like maybe being one of 13 special coastal resource towns, we should get a decrease in the density bonus, a density deduction, a density reduction bonus for being special.

3. Environmental/Resiliency Concerns

- We are a coastal community, and we have Sea Level Rise and the propensity for storms to occur that are going to be life threatening. If the EIR (CEQA Environmental Impact Report) is done correctly, there should be no increased density west of Lincoln. It appears that to date that has not been studied to the degree that it needs to be. Venice is the only coastal community other than Westchester/Playa del Rey (which does not have near the size of footprint within the Coastal Zone). Thus, Venice is very unique, and any increased density should be carefully analyzed in the EIR.
- Climate resiliency should be the primary goal and standard against which everything is measured.
- As most of Venice is in a flood zone and has a high-water table, building more and higher, along with the density bonuses proposed—from 5-15 stories, depending on the subarea—would require massive amounts of dewatering, which would have negative effects, not just on Venice but on surrounding communities. Thus, we should not be increasing intensity of use in Venice.
- We anticipate flooding and we need to understand what potential impact this could have on insurers refusing to insure if we ignore climate change issues such as sea level rising. We already see insurance companies pulling out of fire zones and other areas in California.
- I have a friend who does low-income tax credits and builds a lot of affordable housing. He said that in any other place in the country you would not be building in ecologically sensitive zones, in flood zones and in fire zones.
- We want trees and front yards, and we don't want construction to destroy the street trees, our green space and our urban forest that presently exist.
- I would ask you to include trees, also on public property, and actually have an element in the community plan for provision of more trees on site. Show how that element can be incorporated, because we only have a 15% canopy in the city.
- We only have 15% tree canopy. One of the proposals you'll be hearing from the Venice Arbor Committee is that instead of doing bay windows that go out, you do cut ins off of the setback and you can do a tree there unless there's no setback and you lose opportunities to include trees in your planning.
- The City's Urban Forest Management Plan must be integrated into the community plans.

- Trees and green space must be protected, and removal or reduction must not be a density bonus incentive option.
- Planning wants to build more dense buildings--wider and higher, more units. This is going to block the sea breeze coming from the ocean. Studies show that this changes the climate. The next step will be that the neighborhoods will be filled with air conditioners, which will contribute to the climate issues. These big buildings will create heat islands within the community, will restrict air flow, and will also have reflection off the glass that will be very challenging.
- Venice is a gateway to the ocean and it's also an escape route away from the ocean.
- In case of a Tsunami, earthquake, major flooding or a gas leak, there are 3,500 people who live at the beach now who would have to evacuate. Think about what that's like for you living in the Oxford Triangle, living along Venice or living along Washington, with that many people trying to get out. Then add on the proposal to change the densification of the Marina Peninsula by going from two to five stories, and from 3,400 to 8,000 square foot buildings. There's going to be a mass of people who live at the beach that will be coming east on Washington and Venice towards Lincoln. If these streets have significantly increased density, no one's getting out.
- If you increase density at the terminus, you have more people evacuating in an emergency, whether it's earthquake, tsunami, gas leaks, or major flooding, and it's happening all over California. So, we're not exempt. We've been lucky so far, but sea level is rising. That needs to be a part of this plan, a very specific part of this plan. It should be a chapter of the plan.
- When we allow these very large FARs, developers build out the entirety of the lot. That means the destruction of trees that are providing shade for their neighbors, and habitat for birds, including migratory birds, as well as the cleaning of the air. All of that dust and dirt that comes off of the roadways is caught by mature trees. When we allow the type of development that receives density bonuses that allow coverage of the entire lot, we are decimating what makes our neighborhoods livable and beautiful.
- An increase in density usually results in a decrease in green space, things like trees and plants that actually capture and infiltrate rain and runoff that goes down the gutters to the ocean. Being a coastal town, we should be concerned with that and think about how all that additional hardscape is going to affect our water quality.
- Regarding these FAR build outs and increased density, it will cause us to lose trees and vegetation, things that make life more pleasant. Not only that but being around green space and vegetation affects our psyche and our wellbeing. Trees and plants provide what is called "eco-system services." They're doing stuff--they're cleaning the air; they're infiltrating run off when it rains--so it's not just going to the gutter and carrying pollutants to the ocean. This is very important where we live, by the ocean. All the plantable, permeable space that we lose, we're not getting it back. So, if we can't infiltrate, if we can't absorb runoff to our own properties, it's gone forever. Let's really think about that.
- We do need limits for FAR and ground coverage, in order to preserve open space. Even if it's your own backyard, it is also impacting the people who have a backyard next to you. For large homes that are two stories high and cover the entire lot, that means that the person who once had a backyard that had sunlight, now has the shading of a two-story home. And whatever plants and trees they have growing there will be challenged by that ultra-large home.

- The house next to me used to be a Craftsman. It had a beautiful backyard, and it had fruit trees back there. I used to work in my dining room, but since they demolished the Craftsman and built a new 3-story, 5,900 square foot structure next door, I have to keep lights on because there's no sunlight that comes through my windows anymore. And so, I have to keep lights on throughout my house because the whole east side of my house is shadowed by this three-story building that's a huge monstrosity.
- We must also consider the elimination of extreme amounts of sun by the increased shadow length of the higher buildings which in turn decreases solar gain and increases the use and need for more heat; and decreases the required plantings' survivability due to decreased natural light conditions.
- We accumulated three lots together and my wife was a florist and a landscaper. We built this huge garden. Isn't it ironic now as we reach the end of the line, our little paradise could be affected by a monster building they're putting up on a tiny lot next door.
- Anywhere in the Coastal Zone that's near the water, you have to look at if it's a flood zone and there're all different levels of flood zones, so I think city planning really needs to do their homework on that.
- There are solar axis shading issues. There's a famous study by USC that is called solar zoning, which allows higher on one side of the street and required lower on the other, because when you are facing north you're not giving a shadow to your neighbors. But when you're facing south you are shadowing the neighbor behind it. So, zoning can help these kinds of situations.
- Isn't there supposed to be some sort of study to determine how much an area can deal with the amount of traffic that it has, and then you build accordingly and not the other way around?
- It's hard for me to believe that the Coastal Commission will approve this kind of increased density because of sea level rise.
- Does this plan that you're talking about, that the city has, make any consideration of the fact that there are many, many oil wells, oil well sites, capped wells, and non-capped wells?
- Let's eliminate any possible discretionary adjustment out there so we don't remove setbacks that are actually critical for our greenery, for our mental health, and for our quality of life.
- We need to think about the climate change impacts. I hate to see when developers don't have to really look into the environmental impacts. It's so, so important to consider those.
- Centennial Park should get more trees because it's just a really shadowless spot.
- I have deep concerns about five stories on both Ocean Front Walk and on Abbot Kinney. To build five stories on Ocean Front Walk you would need to de-water because of sea level rise. There are lots of environmental concerns and infrastructure concerns. Our Hyperion plant is barely covering us as we are.

4. Affordability/Diversity

- It's not going to be a popular thing--but I would say either get rid of all RSOs or make every residential unit subject to the RSO restrictions, including inspections.
- Every new multi-housing infill development should have 56% affordable housing, which is according to SCAG's income level housing allocation for Los Angeles.

- If you have a density bonus, you should have it permanently for that property and not time limited. Also, there should be an increase in the amount of low-income rental unit requirements, not 10%, but closer to 25%.
- Affordable housing is done by a City formula, so it changes from neighborhood to neighborhood. Affordable housing, say in South Central Los Angeles, might be \$1,200 per month. In Venice it's going to be over \$2,000 per month. I don't think that's affordable housing, that's market rate. I would propose that any density bonuses for all of Venice should be Very Low-Income affordable housing. That will ensure our work force can work and live here. We need to know from the City what percentage low and very low income the units in these buildings, these 5 to 15-story buildings, are going to offer. That's a huge bearing on whether we can support this.
- Up zoning is not about creating affordable housing. It is about increasing the costs of the land with a bare minimum giveaway on affordable housing. And so that you understand the economics when we talk about these density bonuses, when you put in the density, you put in more market rate housing. And as a result, you raise the area median income. And as a result, your rents go up as well.
- New development actually increases the rent for low-income people.
- There is a disparity between the description of affordable housing and actual affordable housing, which is not really called out on this plan yet, it's not really specified. And that is a concern.
- Will you please commit to having these affordable, thank you very much, affordable units specifically defined on these different planning sheets. On these plans from the city, affordable is just a generalized blanket statement.
- Average household income is an aggregate of everybody that lives here. So, you have to remember that when you bring in a lot of the new money, that ups the average income level. And what you have to think about when you up zone—and you put in 10 affordable units and 90 are at market rate—is that you now raise the average median income of your entire community. This is what will be used when they determine the rental cost of an affordable unit.
- I don't see how we can do anything until we clear our streets of people that are living in cars and RVs. Almost 100,000 people in this city are homeless. We need to build affordable housing, and I wouldn't restrict it to two stories or three stories.
- We have had incrementally very few new units added over the last 10, 20 years. In fact, I think we've seen some disappear. And so unfortunately, all of our kids live 15 plus miles away because they're out of college, they're starting their first jobs, and they can't afford to live in a place that they grew up. And I think that's really a shame.
- There are locations that people could live, but they're not inhabited by people that live here. They are empty or they are used for temporary people coming in like Airbnb. There's a huge proliferation of that. And in East Venice, what's very common is they'll purchase a property that was in an area that was more affordable, where there were multiple people living there, and they turn it into a gigantic compound that people don't live in, and they rent it out for business things like filming, parties, events, things like that, and it's not a residence anymore. This is happening a lot, and there's no enforcement of the laws to protect our neighborhoods from this happening. And that takes away a ton of affordable housing. What about enforcement of that? That's something that I think the city should look at, because we bleed out a lot of potential housing for people that could be living here.

- What makes Venice Venice? It's always been sort of a melting pot with economic and racial diversity. And we've lost that. How do we claw a little back? That is through truly affordable housing. That's what we really need. I want to see as much affordable housing in Venice as we can get. We're losing diversity. We're losing economic and racial diversity.
- As a result of Project Action, we began to build this community and we proposed to the federal government low-income housing. And that low-income housing produced 15 low-income apartment buildings. We didn't want it to look like "the projects" that you have read about in New York or in Saint Louis. That's why you see those 15 buildings spread throughout the Venice community. When you disperse low-income housing throughout the community and when you allow the diversity in those apartment buildings in reference to income and affordability or very low income, and it's managed in that way, then you can keep the diversity in the community that we're looking for that is that eclectic part of the Venice community.
- As we see in Oakwood, housing for low income was achieved by a collaborative effort from government, neighborhood groups and developers receiving rent guarantees. As these guarantees run out a similar effort should be restarted.
- There was no real mention of affordability for, or the need for apartments big enough for, families.
- There was lots of talk about development bonuses, but those bonuses should only be given to developers who are truly helping to solve LA's dire affordability crisis.
- I'm a bit confused about what the city is proposing for the Plan because the law says that the Coastal Act and the Density Bonus Act, both state laws, must be harmonized. And so, we need to make sure that happens on a project-by-project basis, on a discretionary level.
- The city of LA is barreling ahead as if the Coastal Act never existed. The Coastal Act requires, among other things, that the Local Coastal Plans consider the need for access for all people, not just the wealthy. So, we could insist that half the dwelling units created are restricted to tenants of low income and there should be enforcement to ensure that hotels include room rates that are accessible for all affordability levels. One affordable unit for 19 market rate units I think is unacceptable for the Coastal Zone.

5. Parking and Transportation Issues

- Require at least one off-street parking space per unit, which cannot be converted to an ADU.
- Venice already has a deficiency in parking, and reducing or eliminating parking requirements would make it worse.
- The Azzurra building is 16 stories. The only reason why it doesn't create a ton of traffic is because it's right at the end of the 90. And that's why those buildings were put there. If we significantly increase building heights along Washington, Venice, and Lincoln, the traffic congestion will be impossible. There is no way that we can add any more cars to the road. Additionally, the nature of a building of that size is so completely out of character with what I like about Venice. Maybe the Planning Department thinks we can put up more 15 story buildings because buildings like the Azzurra are there. But it has 50% occupancy as many of the units in the building are owned by foreign owners who come only periodically, for a week at a time. Planning for significantly taller buildings is not going to solve our housing problem.

- There are many solutions for creating more on-street parking--restriping some of the wider streets, increasing diagonal parking, maybe making more one-way streets where it's very tight. The way it's done now is very unimaginative.
- I don't see any provisions here on how we get people in and how we get people out. The city seems to have this notion that if we get rid of parking then people won't use cars. But we're not there yet. These are really limited streets; they were put in place before the car. If you go up Pacific, you can't even really ride a bike and drive in two lanes of traffic. It's really dangerous. And they're not paved well and they're narrow. So, I don't understand how we're supposed to get people in and out, irrespective of how many units we have on site, if we don't address traffic corridors. I don't see us getting rail or mass transit. It's not going to fit. We have a dense area with streets that are narrower than most.
- I grew up in Venice when there were two-way streets, not one-way streets. So, you had to figure out who was going to pull over or back up and let the other person by, and that still happens on some of the streets.
- Lower parking standards are important **if** they're coupled with mobility and access improvements.
- I am concerned we're now facing traffic congestion in the Marina and in Venice like never before. Of course, the Silicon Beach traffic flows through also, which is another problem. So, I hope we're watching traffic.
- The concern that I have, and I think most of my neighbors have, is really with traffic and the intensity of population. We already have very, very dense traffic in this whole area. There are signs posted all over the Peninsula that talk about how to egress during a tsunami, but people laugh about it because the reality is there are hardly any exits out of the area and they're all going to be horribly congested in the event of any incident. So, the question becomes, what's the plan for increasing the infrastructure that will support this kind of increase in density? Because the highways and roads and the streets are all heavily congested now. If you increase density from three floors to five floors and increase the FAR, you're going to have a huge impact on traffic in the area. What is the city's intent in terms of building additional highways and roads and streets?

6. Failing Infrastructure

- The infrastructure deficit in the area is one of the biggest concerns.
- There's nothing addressing our infrastructure. We don't have an infrastructure that can handle a lot of increased density, more people using washing machines, etc.
- Re. the infrastructure, I pay \$40,000 in property taxes. I get no street cleaning. I get no drainage on my street. The trash truck can barely get through, and all the people who own the buildings across from us are now turning their buildings into apartments, into condos, and adding ADUs. There's no more parking.
- I just want to make sure that any buildings that are being built here, that we're thinking about the rains, we're thinking about the flooding. That's something that should be a requirement in this. We need to be thinking about buildings and safety in that way.
- I've lived in Europe's most densely populated city, Barcelona, and that's a city that sort of works because they have lots of parks and lots of build out of public transportation. And if they want to put six-story buildings all up along Venice Boulevard and Washington

Boulevard, so lots of different kinds of people live there, I'm sort of okay with that...if there's lots of parks, lots of access to public transportation.

- We'd like to see a public subway down the length of Venice Boulevard or Washington Boulevard.
- What about increased services? If we are talking about significantly increasing density, what about increasing our fire department and our police officers or any of these other services that are needed proportionate to the number of people that live in these neighborhoods? Do those things come congruent with these proposals? Are those things considered before these proposals are finalized?
- Yes, we can have increased housing development where we can accommodate eventually everyone. We have to allow more development. But we should also be accommodating parks, green spaces, and I'm always looking at how can we infiltrate stormwater runoff. We're going to have all this increased density and these high rises, but what about the actual infrastructure for the water, the runoff? Where does it all go and how are we going to accommodate that? There's no mention of it.
- The issue of needing the parks and the other infrastructure to go with the density is a huge issue...probably one of the biggest.
- I'm also concerned about people's utilities. Do we really have the pipes and stuff for the infrastructure?
- You're talking about creating all this new housing and height and a lot of new units, and we've already got some sewage overflows down at the breakwater. There're problems. Old infrastructure has not been upgraded. We've got some things to deal with before we start adding significant units to this area.

7. Preservation of Existing Residential Neighborhoods

- Venice is a community of neighborhoods, and we need to preserve our residential neighborhoods.
- I don't care for rooftop developments, which nobody ever uses, because when they find out how windy it is, they go down. So, it's a useless feature.
- A way they get around the FAR is using number of stories if there is no height restriction. So, you can build a story that's 20 feet floor to floor, and then you can put a loft in there, as long as your loft is something like a third less than the floor plan. If you're worried about how tall buildings are then we need a restriction on the floor-to-floor height. That is really key, more so than the number of floors.
- Height restrictions are better to talk about than floors because we know how those can be manipulated.
- The stories need to be spelled out. We need to actually have an absolute height. We need a really firm measurement. Stories is much too vague. We need transparency.
- As a matter of principle --- I am hoping that the environmental quality of the walk streets will continue to be enforceable . . . with strict parking requirements limiting parking spaces and maintaining the walk streets as 'green' corridors. Indeed, I believe that 'requirements' could be articulated that would improve the present situation, and these should be a critical part of the 'plan.'
- I want to make sure that we maintain what is called transitional heights. You're going to see that in Venice on Lincoln Boulevard because next to Lincoln there is single family residential.

8. Unnecessary Changes to Commercial Zoning

- Mixed use changes the impacts on residents because of the commercial element. Having a business below you impacts your life because of deliveries and the customers that are coming in and going out. They aren't just in the building but are going in and out. I know what it's like having a business in a residential area. We have to be so considerate of the residential neighbors. It's an impact and an inconvenience, but it's not just inconvenient, it can impact your quality of life. It's loud. There's more trash that you have to deal with. There're more services that happen. And that does impact people's way of life. We're led to believe that mixed use is just what we get now, but maybe that should be challenged.
- Mixed use is used by the City like chicken soup for fixing everything. But retail is suffering, and it does not seem to be coming back any time in the near future. We should not put endless amounts of mixed use when there are store fronts vacant not only in Venice but city wide. It may sound good, but it's sort of magical thinking. We need a vision/plan to help the businesses that are already here and to consider commercial structures for conversion to housing.

9. Enforcement Needed

- There are a lot of violations that are not enforced. We need to call for enforcement that actually works, not enforcement on folks/the little guys, and the big guys get to run roughshod.
- For city enforcement issues that have an impact or influence on the plans that we're talking about, we definitely need to make sure that the plan has the networks involved so that all of the resources that are important to the effectiveness or the success of whatever plans are being proposed are also included in the discussion.

III. Preference Survey Results & Public Comments for Each Subarea

Along with the discussion of the Survey results, public comments given at each subarea meeting were taken, recorded, transcribed, and posted on the Committee's webpage. The comments are summarized in bullet format for each subarea and included after the discussion of the Survey results.

East Venice - Survey Results and Public Comments

- Very strong preference for 3-story height limit on Rose Avenue in East Venice.
- Strong preference for single-family homes no larger than 2,000 SF (plus an ADU).
- Strong preference for low walls/fences/hedges in front yards.
- Strong preference for landscaped backyards.
- Strong preference for allowing roof decks, but a preference against roof access structures.
- Strong preference for channeling growth outside inner neighborhoods.

Preference Survey Results for East Venice:

East Venice is that part of Venice east of Lincoln Boulevard and outside the Coastal Zone. The prevailing land use within East Venice is Single-Family Residential (R1V2). There is a wide range of lot sizes from 4,000 SF to above 6,000 SF. Nevertheless, 75% of those responding would prefer home sizes to be below 3,000. (The City's Baseline Mansionization Ordinance already covers East Venice's lots zoned R1V2, limiting FARs to 0.55 and a maximum lot coverage of 50%.) As expected, given the single-family character of East Venice, there is a very strong preference for only one main living unit and one ADU on each parcel (74%).

There is also a very strong preference for leaving enough space on the lot for a landscaped backyard (74%), and a very strong preference against the complete use of the buildable area plus the rear yard (7%). Similarly, there is a strong preference for low walls/fencing and low hedges separating properties from the sidewalk (57%). Roof decks seem to be acceptable (68%), but less than a third of respondents see roof access structures as acceptable.

Responders felt very strongly that planned growth be outside the inner neighborhoods (71%) and along arterials. Very Large homes (25%) and losing family-sized housing (22%) were the two land use issues (beside homelessness and safety & security) of most concern.

As for what size of buildings should be allowed on Venice's major arterials, East Venice Survey responders were most adamant about Rose Avenue in East Venice: 81% did not want to see buildings higher than 3 stories along that street. The preference was also for no more than 5 stories along Venice Blvd., Lincoln Blvd., and Washington Blvd. (less than 12% wanted any structures higher). Three stories was also the preferred limit on Abbot Kinney Blvd. (79%).

Public Comments Summary for East Venice:

East Venice General


- We're definitely opposed to what City Planning is planning for Rose/Penmar or Penmar Park neighborhood.
- We don't want this commercialization and type of change in the E. Venice neighborhood.
- We already have commercial uses in our neighborhood and do not need or want more.
- There are many vacant commercial spaces in the area.
- Mixing residential and commercial is problematic as the business owners' priority is their bottom line and not the community and neighborhood they are inserting themselves into.

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
East Venice - # of Surveys 100


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	81	82%
Renter	13	13%
Business/Employee	5	5%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	99	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	67	69%
3 Floors	21	22%
4 Floors	7	7%
5 Floors	1	1%
More than 5 Floors	1	1%
	97	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	10	11%
2,500 SF	31	34%
3,000 SF	28	30%
4,000 SF	13	14%
5,000 SF	3	3%
More than 5,000 SF	7	8%
	92	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	17	20%
4,000 SF	24	29%
5,000 SF	23	28%
More than 5,000 SF	19	23%
	83	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Unit	73	74%
3 Living Units	11	11%
4 Living Units	9	9%
More than 4 Living Units	6	6%
	99	100%



Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	70	74%
Buildable Area Only	18	19%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	7	7%
	95	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

East Venice - # of Surveys 100


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHART


Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	4	4%
1 Space/Lot	25	26%
2 Spaces/Lot	34	35%
3 Spaces/Lot	5	5%
1 Space/Living Unit	11	11%
2 Space/Living Unit	17	17%
1 Space/Floor	2	2%
	98	100%




Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	30	32%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	36	38%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	28	30%
	94	100%




Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	8	9%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	54	57%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	14	15%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	18	19%
	94	100%




Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	4	4%
Outside the Neighborhoods	69	71%
Both Places	24	25%
	97	100%



Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	42	44%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	41	43%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	13	14%
	96	100%



Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	4	4%
Very Large Homes	24	25%
Traffic & Parking	15	16%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	10	10%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	21	22%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	6	6%
	96	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

East Venice - # of Surveys 100


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	32	35%
4 Stories	24	26%
5 Stories	26	28%
8 Stories	4	4%
15 Stories	6	7%
	92	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	34	37%
4 Stories	23	25%
5 Stories	24	26%
8 Stories	7	8%
15 Stories	5	5%
	93	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	39	41%
4 Stories	25	26%
5 Stories	21	22%
8 Stories	8	8%
15 Stories	2	2%
	95	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	69	81%
4 Stories	12	14%
5 Stories	2	2%
8 Stories	2	2%
15 Stories	0	0%
	85	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	66	79%
4 Stories	11	13%
5 Stories	5	6%
8 Stories	2	2%
15 Stories	0	0%
	84	100%



Oakwood - Survey and Public Comment Evaluation

- Strong preference for 2-story buildings with at most 2 living units (plus ADU).
- Strong preference for a 3-story building maximum on Abbot Kinney Boulevard.
- Strong preference for adequate back yard space with new projects.

Preference Survey Results for Oakwood:

Oakwood is the genesis neighborhood in Venice, and it is not a stretch to say that without Oakwood and its African-American workforce, Venice might never exist as we know it. It is without doubt the neighborhood in Venice that needs the most protection against gentrification – and the neighborhood that has received the least.

The Oakwood subarea encompasses a roughly rectangular area from the Santa Monica city boundary to California Avenue. Lincoln Boulevard is its eastern boundary and a combination of Hampton Drive and Electric Avenue is its western boundary. Its primary land use classification is Multi-Family Residential-Low Medium I and it is mostly zoned RD1.5. North of Rose Avenue, beyond its commercial properties, the neighborhood is zoned RD2.

Although zoned for multi-family structures, there is a strong preference for only 2-story (50%) and 3-story (42%) buildings with either one living unit (39%) or two living units (25%) preferred (plus an ADU). Nevertheless, SFR homes up to 4,000 SF seem to be acceptable to many, with apartments and condominiums greater than 5,000 SF also acceptable. Moreover, usable back yards are preferred as well (56%).

A requirement for 2 parking spaces per lot has the most responses, but responses range over most of the choices given. Roof decks with a roof access structure are acceptable to 51% of responders, and tall fencing and taller hedges are acceptable to almost half of them (46%). More than many subareas, Oakwood responders are willing for some future growth to occur within Oakwood (46%). The main land use-related concern is the Loss of Family-Sized Housing (again, after Homelessness and Safety & Security).

Oakwood's responders seem fairly divided on whether buildings on Washington, Venice, and Lincoln Boulevards have 3, 4, 5 or 8 stories, but there is little support for 15-story structures. They support buildings up to 4 stories on Rose Avenue (82%), and clearly prefer 3-story building maximums on Abbot Kinney Boulevard. They have no strong single opinion on the heights of buildings on Ocean Front Walk.

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)


Oakwood - # of Surveys

57


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #2: Type		
Owner	43	75%
Renter	9	16%
Business/Employee	2	4%
Other Stakeholder	3	5%
	57	100%




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	26	50%
3 Floors	22	42%
4 Floors	2	4%
5 Floors	1	2%
More than 5 Floors	1	2%
	52	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	11	22%
2,500 SF	11	22%
3,000 SF	10	20%
4,000 SF	9	18%
5,000 SF	9	18%
More than 5,000 SF	1	2%
	51	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	8	16%
4,000 SF	8	16%
5,000 SF	17	35%
More than 5,000 SF	16	33%
	49	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	22	39%
3 Living Units	14	25%
4 Living Units	10	18%
More than 4 Living Units	10	18%
	56	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	31	56%
Buildable Area Only	15	27%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	9	16%
	55	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Oakwood - # of Surveys 57


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	7	13%
1 Space/Lot	9	16%
2 Spaces/Lot	19	34%
3 Spaces/Lot	2	4%
1 Space/Living Unit	9	16%
2 Space/Living Unit	10	18%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	56	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	11	20%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	16	29%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	28	51%
	55	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	3	5%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	18	32%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	9	16%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	26	46%
	56	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	4	7%
Outside the Neighborhoods	25	46%
Both Places	25	46%
	54	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	20	36%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	21	38%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	15	27%
	56	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	12	21%
Very Large Homes	10	18%
Traffic & Parking	8	14%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	5	9%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	16	28%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	6	11%
	57	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Oakwood - # of Surveys 57


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washigon		
3 Stories	12	23%
4 Stories	16	30%
5 Stories	8	15%
8 Stories	13	25%
15 Stories	4	8%
	53	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	15	27%
4 Stories	18	33%
5 Stories	8	15%
8 Stories	10	18%
15 Stories	4	7%
	55	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	11	20%
4 Stories	16	30%
5 Stories	12	22%
8 Stories	11	20%
15 Stories	4	7%
	54	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	27	54%
4 Stories	14	28%
5 Stories	7	14%
8 Stories	2	4%
15 Stories	0	0%
	50	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	32	63%
4 Stories	12	24%
5 Stories	4	8%
8 Stories	3	6%
15 Stories	0	0%
	51	100%



Public Comment Summary for Oakwood:

Oakwood General

- Everyone who attended the meeting is in agreement that the changes recommended for Oakwood are terrible.
- Oakwood is one of the most special, and it's one of the only intentional, communities of color out of our entire 840 miles or so of California coastline. And there is nothing like it in this world. And when we really think of Venice Beach and what everyone comes here for, and the movies and everything it is, it's not this new bullshit they're building. It's the soul, it's the character, it's the people that have been there. It's the craftsman houses. It's majestic. It's like a little fairy tale that's being destroyed. So, I just want to say, and I want to put on record that I like Oakwood exactly how it is.
- So here, Venice is protecting Milwood, but here again not Oakwood.

Residential

- I live in north of Rose. I'm very concerned that the compatibility with the existing neighborhood and adjoining lots is completely being disregarded. Again, the city is only stating maxima, which are even more egregious and bigger than what they used to be, without the existing neighborhood taken into consideration. I do like that we have the FAR ratio, because that is really something that we can compare ourselves to with adjoining lots and so forth. But a FAR of 1.0 and 3 stories proposed for my little street, which is Sixth Avenue, where we have primarily single-story houses--that is egregious. What the city is proposing goes against anything that we have and what Venice should stand for.
- What is driving a lot of these changes is the requirement that's coming down from the state and from the city to provide a massive amount of new residential units because we have an incredible shortage of residential units. As a resident of Oakwood, I'm a little concerned that it seems like we are going to be tasked with providing the majority of those units, and we already provide the majority of RSOs and affordable units. I don't like the idea that we seem to be arguing between individual communities in Venice about what we don't want in the Canals, what we don't want in North Venice, so let's just shove the four stories and the increased FARs over to Oakwood.
- The question is--where does the community want to go? Does it want to remain a bedroom community or, particularly in Oakwood, do you want it all to be large, probably three lot consolidations, because that's more economical, more profit for the developer?
- In Oakwood, there is a place where a large number of people moved into one little building with no parking (742-744-746-748 Brooks). They just rent a room and then they all come with their cars and park in the neighborhood, and it's hard for the neighborhood to find any parking. I'm working on a project to redevelop our house. It hasn't had any work done to it since the 1920s and I'm trying to create two ADUs. The City is requiring me to create more parking, and it doesn't make any sense. How could a big box with all these people not have any parking requirements, but for somebody that's been in the neighborhood for so long, they require me to create enough parking for an extra ADU I need just so I can keep the lights on.

- I love the low-income buildings in Oakwood, and the reason those fit in so well into our community is because they do have really large front yard setbacks. They have courtyards. I think those are model projects. There are three stories so they're not small, and I think they're pretty good neighbors.
- We have the 15 buildings that are low income. We're going to start negotiating the contracts to be lifelong instead of 25-year increments. These are low-income buildings that service over 150, almost 200 families. We need your support. And we need letters from Ms. Bass and Ms. Parks to help us keep our community with the low-income housing on these 15 blocks. We need those low-income housing buildings. Making them market rate would put all those people out.

Density

- A little more density along the avenues might be nicer, like along 5th and 6th and 4th, potentially, because they're much wider streets. This proposed plan is so unnuanced. It's just like, slam, here, take it Oakwood, you're going to take all the density.
- It does seem incredibly unfair that Oakwood is getting the brunt of all the density.

Parking and Traffic

- I'm concerned about the traffic that cuts through our neighborhood, especially Oakwood and Milwood. You have people going up Rose, down 7th, down Oakwood, and up Palms. And during rush hours, it's bumper to bumper traffic half the time. So, I recommend the consideration of how to make our neighborhoods more of a maze so that people won't do cut through or some other type of maybe one-way streets or something to alleviate some of that activity.
- This plan is very unnuanced. It doesn't show that streets like Broadway, Santa Clara, and Westminster are really narrow. Some of them are so narrow they're one way. Can you imagine Santa Clara with a four-story building, a five-foot sidewalk? Where are all those people going to walk? I'd really like to see this more nuanced.

Environmental Justice

- What I see is institutional racism if they're going to do three lot ties in Oakwood. We all need to be treated the same. Why aren't three lot ties across the board in Venice? There's a problem here.
- There was a large population of Mexican Americans in Oakwood. And that has dwindled because of gentrification, and people moving in with a lot of money and building these big monstrosities and not really giving back to the community, not even living in those buildings, not even being a part resident of those buildings, and not understanding the community, how we feel about it. They just do what they want, and we have to stand idle because the city is allowing it because they want money. That's all the city cares about is money. And what we care about is our community, our people, our folks. And I just want to see us get together and shoot down some of this stuff that seems pretty outrageous, like those bonuses and stuff. So, hopefully we come to a good future for Venice.

Commercial

- There is an 8.0. FAR on Lincoln. If you have an 8-story building and a FAR of 8.0, that means that the entire lot is livable eight stories high, which means you don't have parking, you don't have infrastructure, you don't have stairs, you don't have corridors, you don't have utility rooms, nothing. It must be a mistake.
- Lincoln Blvd at 8 stories seems high, but where else can we put the needed units?
- For commercial, the building can come up to the property line, zero setback from the sidewalk. Let's impose a setback so everybody can put out their chairs and have very European alfresco dining or breakfasting.

Industrial

- Presently the land use is all Light Industrial. The city proposes to make a lot of that space Hybrid Industrial, which means that you have industrial on the ground floor and then residential above. Now, a lot of those areas are warehousing, trucking and other things like that. And a lot of the lots they're dividing up within the property line. I've walked around this area and what they're proposing and what actually exists is a little bit in conflict. But the idea is that, where they can, they want to put residential above Light Industrial. In the 2001 Venice Land Use Plan they point out that Light Industrial is a very important resource within Venice that needs to be protected. However, in the meantime the City hasn't protected it, and now they're really cutting into the land that's now designated as Light Industrial.

Milwood - Survey and Public Comment Responses

Preference Survey Results for Milwood:

- Strong preference for 2-story maximum height.
- Strong preference for single-family homes (plus ADU) with adequate back yard.
- Very strong preference for 5-stories or less on Venice, Washington, Lincoln Boulevards and 3-story maximums on Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard.
- Very strong preference against 5-story mixed-use buildings on Ocean Front Walk.

Milwood is that part of Venice most known for its walk streets, its pedestrian paths between regular roadways. It's boundaries are from California Avenue on the north to Venice Boulevard, and from Lincoln Boulevard to Electric Avenue on the west. Most of Milwood is presently zoned R2 and classified as Multi-Family Residential-Low Medium I. Its housing is a blend of single-family homes and multi-family living units.

Responders to the Survey are strongly in favor of a 2-story maximum height (67%) with preferred sizes of SFR homes ranging down from 4,000 SF. The same preference (67%) is for single-family homes (plus a possible ADU) and an adequately-sized back yard (62%). Two parking spaces per lot is the option most indicated (38%). Most responses favor allowing roof decks, with roof access structures less favored. Low walls/fences and hedges is favored by 44% of responders, but taller options are okay (50%).

Future growth should not be entirely within neighborhoods, but channeled mainly (but not entirely) along major roadways. Only 1 in 6 responders favored 8- or 15-story buildings on Washington, Venice, and Lincoln Boulevards; 4 stories is the choice most indicated. There is, in addition, a very strong preference for a 3-story maximum building height on Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard. Only 16% favored taller, mixed use development on Ocean Front Walk.

Issues of most concern (outside of Homelessness and Safety & Security) are Loss Of Family-Sized Housing, with Very Large Homes and Change in Architectural/Neighborhood Character tied next.

Public Comments Summary for Milwood:

Milwood General


- I want to encourage any of you who haven't seen the changes that are impacting your neighborhoods to come to the 900 block of Marco and see what's happening when you have unlimited FAR. Because we went from three single story homes to eight double and more with a deck, there is no more skyline, the tree canopy is gone.
- We need to be sure City Planning keeps walk street height restrictions the same, at 28'.
- I'm very concerned about the city's proposed change from residential to commercial along Venice Boulevard. That's going in the wrong direction. Many of you know about the Mello Act, a state law in the Coastal Zone that prohibits demo or conversion of residential structures for nonresidential projects. Under that law, I don't think the city can even do this. They're worried about people being able to walk to stores and services, but that area already can do that because they're right there by Lincoln. So, it doesn't make any sense to change to commercial there.
- The new proposed Venice Blvd "neighborhood center," as depicted in pink, stretches a couple of blocks into the residential area adjacent to Venice Blvd. Streets like Brenta and Lucille north of Venice are quite narrow with small homes and some small (mostly 2-story) apartments. Anything higher/denser would be overwhelming. And streets like Victoria have older homes, some of which I would recommend for preservation. If the mixed use could be limited strictly to those facing Venice Blvd, that would be better.

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
Milwood - # of Surveys 55


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #2: Type		
Owner	49	89%
Renter	5	9%
Business/Employee	1	2%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	55	100%




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	35	67%
3 Floors	14	27%
4 Floors	3	6%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	52	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	11	21%
2,500 SF	15	28%
3,000 SF	15	28%
4,000 SF	9	17%
5,000 SF	0	0%
More than 5,000 SF	3	6%
	53	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	10	22%
4,000 SF	13	29%
5,000 SF	14	31%
More than 5,000 SF	8	18%
	45	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	37	67%
3 Living Units	10	18%
4 Living Units	5	9%
More than 4 Living Units	3	5%
	55	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	33	62%
Buildable Area Only	16	30%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	4	8%
	53	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Milwood - # of Surveys 55


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	7	13%
1 Space/Lot	10	18%
2 Spaces/Lot	21	38%
3 Spaces/Lot	2	4%
1 Space/Living Unit	8	15%
2 Space/Living Unit	6	11%
1 Space/Floor	1	2%
	55	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	16	30%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	17	31%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	21	39%
	54	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	3	6%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	24	44%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	9	17%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	18	33%
	54	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	1	2%
Outside the Neighborhoods	34	62%
Both Places	20	36%
	55	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	20	36%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	26	47%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	9	16%
	55	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	12	21%
Very Large Homes	12	21%
Traffic & Parking	8	14%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	7	12%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	16	28%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	3	5%
	58	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Milwood - # of Surveys 55


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washingon		
3 Stories	15	29%
4 Stories	19	37%
5 Stories	10	19%
8 Stories	3	6%
15 Stories	5	10%
52		100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	16	31%
4 Stories	20	38%
5 Stories	9	17%
8 Stories	3	6%
15 Stories	4	8%
52		100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	12	23%
4 Stories	22	42%
5 Stories	12	23%
8 Stories	3	6%
15 Stories	4	8%
53		100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	36	72%
4 Stories	8	16%
5 Stories	2	4%
8 Stories	3	6%
15 Stories	1	2%
50		100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	41	82%
4 Stories	4	8%
5 Stories	2	4%
8 Stories	2	4%
15 Stories	1	2%
50		100%



Southeast Venice - Survey and Public Comment

Preference Survey Results for Southeast Venice:

- Strong Preference for only 1 living unit/lot (plus possible ADU) with back yards.
- Strong preference for only low front walls/fences and hedges.
- Very strong preference for growth outside inner neighborhoods.
- Very strong preference for 3-story maximum heights on Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard.

Southeast Venice is a triangular-shaped neighborhood between Venice and Washington Boulevard north-to-south, and between Lincoln Boulevard and Abbot Kinney Boulevard east-to-west. It is mainly residential in land use and is classified as Multi-Family Residential-Low Medium I and zoned R2. However, along Venice and Washington and Abbot Kinney Boulevards the land use classification is MFR-Medium and zoned R 3. Nevertheless, there are significant parts of Southeast Venice that are clearly SFR-Low indicating a mismatch between its classification and its actual land use.

Southeast Venice responders have a strong preference for single-family homes (63%) of one living unit (plus a possible ADU) (60%). Homes 3,000 SF or less are favored by 78% of the responders and 50% of them preferred adequate back yards.

Half of the responses opted for a 2-car parking space requirement per lot. They reflect the general sense of Venetians that roof decks are okay, however roof access structures are far less acceptable. A plurality (38%) preferred low walls/fences and hedges, but slightly more than half found taller fences, even with taller hedges, okay.

There was a strong preference (69%) for most growth to occur outside Southeast Venice's inner neighborhoods. Maximum building heights on Washington and Venice Boulevards of 4 stories are supported by 83% of responders, with 75% preferring the same height maximum on Lincoln Boulevard. In keeping with most Venetians, there was a very strong preference for only 3 stories on Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard. Only 1 in 8 responders wanted up to 5-story, mixed-used development on Ocean Front Walk.

Traffic & Parking was of most concern (after Homelessness and Safety & Security), but Very Large Homes followed closely after that.

Summary of Public Comments for Southeast Venice:


None Provided.

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
Southeast Venice - # of Surveys 42


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	37	88%
Renter	4	10%
Business/Employee	1	2%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	42	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	25	63%
3 Floors	11	28%
4 Floors	4	10%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	40	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	5	13%
2,500 SF	12	30%
3,000 SF	14	35%
4,000 SF	5	13%
5,000 SF	2	5%
More than 5,000 SF	2	5%
	40	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	7	18%
4,000 SF	14	37%
5,000 SF	11	29%
More than 5,000 SF	6	16%
	38	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	25	60%
3 Living Units	7	17%
4 Living Units	6	14%
More than 4 Living Units	4	10%
	42	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	21	50%
Buildable Area Only	16	38%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	5	12%
	42	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Southeast Venice - # of Surveys 42


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	2	5%
1 Space/Lot	10	24%
2 Spaces/Lot	20	49%
3 Spaces/Lot	3	7%
1 Space/Living Unit	4	10%
2 Space/Living Unit	2	5%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	41	100%




Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	12	29%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	13	32%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	16	39%
	41	100%




Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	3	7%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	16	38%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	12	29%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	11	26%
	42	100%




Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	2	5%
Outside the Neighborhoods	29	69%
Both Places	11	26%
	42	100%



Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	17	41%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	19	46%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	5	12%
	41	100%



Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	6	19%
Very Large Homes	8	25%
Traffic & Parking	9	28%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	1	3%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	7	22%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	1	3%
	32	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)


Southeast Venice - # of Surveys 42

QUESTION	COUNT	%	CHARTS
----------	-------	---	--------


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	24	57%
4 Stories	11	26%
5 Stories	5	12%
8 Stories	1	2%
15 Stories	1	2%
	42	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	24	59%
4 Stories	10	24%
5 Stories	6	15%
8 Stories	1	2%
15 Stories	0	0%
	41	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	21	51%
4 Stories	10	24%
5 Stories	5	12%
8 Stories	4	10%
15 Stories	1	2%
	41	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	30	73%
4 Stories	8	20%
5 Stories	3	7%
8 Stories	0	0%
15 Stories	0	0%
	41	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	33	80%
4 Stories	7	17%
5 Stories	1	2%
8 Stories	0	0%
15 Stories	0	0%
	41	100%



Oxford Triangle - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Response Evaluation for Oxford Triangle:

- Strong preference for 2-story homes of only 1 living unit/lot (plus possible ADU).
- Strong preference for only 2 parking spaces required/lot.
- Very strong preference for growth outside inner neighborhood.
- Strong preference for Ocean Front Walk to be a mix of old and new, but not 5-story, mixed-use development.

The Oxford Triangle is just that, a triangular-shaped neighborhood of mostly single-family residential homes south of Washington Boulevard and between Lincoln Boulevard on the east and Oxford Avenue on the west. It is the most “suburban-looking” of Venice’s neighborhoods. It is primarily classified as Single-Family Residential-Low and zoned R1. If located east of Lincoln Boulevard it would have fallen under the protection of the City’s Baseline Mansionization Ordinance, which excluded the coastal zone.

Survey responders strongly preferred a maximum of 2 stories (68%) with a plurality wanting a 3,000 SF limit (35%), but almost half willing to have homes up to 5,000 SF. Half of the responders preferred 1 living unit/lot (plus a possible ADU) and only 1 in 9 are willing to see homes extending to the alley. There is a strong desire (55%) to limit the required parking spaces to 2/lot. Roof decks are seen as okay (96%), but roof access structures are only half as acceptable. There is a clear split between those who prefer low front walls/fence and hedges and those who are okay with taller walls and even higher hedges.

The responses indicate a very strong preference for growth to occur outside the interior of the Oxford Triangle. A 5-story maximum height appears to be the desired upper limit on Venice Boulevard, but slightly more responses favor 5-story limits on Washington and Lincoln Boulevards. An upper limit of 3 stories was the strong preference for Rose and Abbot Kinney Boulevards. A mix of old and new is favored on Ocean Front Walk.

Besides Homelessness, the Oxford Triangle responders feel Traffic and Parking is more of a concern than Safety & Security, an anomaly with most other subareas. The fact that Traffic & Parking is an issue of concern in this neighborhood is somewhat surprising as the subarea is too far o be that affected by summer beach parking.

Public Comments Summary for Oxford Triangle:

Parking


- This is an area where the road infrastructure is already inadequate.
- One of the issues is that we don’t have street sweeping, which has resulted in the Oxford Triangle becoming a LAX alternative parking area. People park there for a couple of weeks at a time, especially during the holidays and on long holiday weekends in the summertime. Ubers and taxis pick up and drop off people. As a result, there is a significant parking issue for us.

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
Oxford Triangle - # of Surveys 24


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	20	83%
Renter	2	8%
Business/Employee	2	8%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	24	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	15	68%
3 Floors	4	18%
4 Floors	3	14%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	22	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	1	4%
2,500 SF	3	13%
3,000 SF	8	35%
4,000 SF	5	22%
5,000 SF	5	22%
More than 5,000 SF	1	4%
	23	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	0	0%
4,000 SF	6	35%
5,000 SF	5	29%
More than 5,000 SF	6	35%
	17	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	11	50%
3 Living Units	4	18%
4 Living Units	6	27%
More than 4 Living Units	1	5%
	22	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	8	42%
Buildable Area Only	9	47%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	2	11%
	19	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Oxford Triangle - # of Surveys 24


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	3	14%
1 Space/Lot	3	14%
2 Spaces/Lot	12	55%
3 Spaces/Lot	2	9%
1 Space/Living Unit	1	5%
2 Space/Living Unit	1	5%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	22	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	1	4%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	11	46%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	12	50%
	24	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	0	0%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	10	42%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	5	21%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	9	38%
	24	100%




QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	0	0%
Outside the Neighborhoods	16	70%
Both Places	7	30%
	23	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	4	17%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	13	57%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	6	26%
	23	100%



QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	2	13%
Very Large Homes	1	6%
Traffic & Parking	9	56%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	0	0%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	2	13%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	2	13%
	16	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Oxford Triangle - # of Surveys 24


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washinon		
3 Stories	8	33%
4 Stories	5	21%
5 Stories	7	29%
8 Stories	4	17%
15 Stories	0	0%
	24	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	5	21%
4 Stories	8	33%
5 Stories	8	33%
8 Stories	3	13%
15 Stories	0	0%
	24	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	5	21%
4 Stories	4	17%
5 Stories	8	33%
8 Stories	5	21%
15 Stories	2	8%
	24	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	13	57%
4 Stories	6	26%
5 Stories	4	17%
8 Stories	0	0%
15 Stories	0	0%
	23	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	13	57%
4 Stories	9	39%
5 Stories	1	4%
8 Stories	0	0%
15 Stories	0	0%
	23	100%



- Parking is scarce in the Oxford Triangle, especially on the northern end, because of all the business parking and people going to the restaurants, during the evening as well as during the day. There is also traffic that comes from the beach. It's nearly impossible sometimes to get in and out of the Oxford Triangle on a summer weekend, starting from about 3 o'clock, because everyone's exiting the beach area. Also, on weekday evenings traffic flows from Santa Monica, across Venice and up Washington Blvd.
- The Thatcher Yard development is going to be another 98 units. The Oxford Triangle is the only neighborhood that is really growing.

Residential

- The Oxford Triangle should have the protection of FAR limits. The Oxford Triangle is very low density, single-family residential, for a reason. We need significant protection that we don't presently have, to protect the type of neighborhood that it is.
- Oxford Triangle is experiencing a dearth of forest canopy and green space.

Southwest Venice - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Results for Southwest Venice:

- Very strong preference for 1 living unit/lot (plus a possible ADU).
- Strong preference for 2-story height maximums, rear yards and a maximum 2-space parking limit.
- Very strong preference for future growth outside inner neighborhoods.
- Strong preference for 3-story height limit on Washington and Venice Boulevards.
- Very strong preference for 3-story height limits on Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard.

The Southwest Venice Subarea is between Venice and Washington Boulevards, and from Abott Kinney Boulevard on the east to Via Marina/Strongs Avenue on the west. It includes almost exclusively single-family homes and is appropriately classified Single-Family Residential-Low, the "lowest" residential classification. It is predominantly zoned R1. Were Southwest Venice east of Lincoln Boulevard it would be protected under the City's Baseline Mansionization Ordinance, which excludes the coastal zone.

There is a strong preference (69%) to limit building heights to 2 stories with a very strong preference for one living unit/lot (plus a possible ADU) (74%). Back yards are also strongly preferred (65%) as is a 2-space maximum for parking. Low walls/fencing and hedges are preferred (43%), but tall fencing and even taller hedges is fine with 31% of the responders. Half of the responses have no problem with roof decks and roof access structures. There is a very strong preference (89%) for growth outside the inner neighborhoods.


There is a strong preference for only 3-story structures on both Washington Boulevard (57%) and Venice Boulevard (57%), with even 43% of responders favoring a 3-story limit on Lincoln Boulevard. Three-story height limits for both Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard are

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
Southwest Venice - # of Surveys 37


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	31	84%
Renter	5	14%
Business/Employee	1	3%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	37	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	24	69%
3 Floors	7	20%
4 Floors	2	6%
5 Floors	1	3%
More than 5 Floors	1	3%
	35	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	7	20%
2,500 SF	6	17%
3,000 SF	13	37%
4,000 SF	8	23%
5,000 SF	1	3%
More than 5,000 SF	0	0%
	35	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	7	21%
4,000 SF	5	15%
5,000 SF	17	52%
More than 5,000 SF	4	12%
	33	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	26	74%
3 Living Units	7	20%
4 Living Units	1	3%
More than 4 Living Units	1	3%
	35	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	22	65%
Buildable Area Only	8	24%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	4	12%
	34	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Southwest Venice - # of Surveys 37


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	4	11%
1 Space/Lot	6	16%
2 Spaces/Lot	21	57%
3 Spaces/Lot	3	8%
1 Space/Living Unit	2	5%
2 Space/Living Unit	1	3%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	37	100%




Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	10	28%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	8	22%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	18	50%
	36	100%




Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	3	9%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	15	43%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	6	17%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	11	31%
	35	100%




Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	0	0%
Outside the Neighborhoods	32	89%
Both Places	4	11%
	36	100%



Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	11	30%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	23	62%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	3	8%
	37	100%



Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	7	21%
Very Large Homes	8	24%
Traffic & Parking	6	18%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	4	12%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	8	24%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	0	0%
	33	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Southwest Venice - # of Surveys 37


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	21	57%
4 Stories	2	5%
5 Stories	7	19%
8 Stories	6	16%
15 Stories	1	3%
	37	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	21	57%
4 Stories	6	16%
5 Stories	6	16%
8 Stories	3	8%
15 Stories	1	3%
	37	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	16	43%
4 Stories	5	14%
5 Stories	6	16%
8 Stories	7	19%
15 Stories	3	8%
	37	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	29	78%
4 Stories	3	8%
5 Stories	4	11%
8 Stories	1	3%
15 Stories	0	0%
	37	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	29	78%
4 Stories	3	8%
5 Stories	4	11%
8 Stories	1	3%
15 Stories	0	0%
	37	100%



also very strongly supported by 78% of responders. In the same vein, only 1 in 12 Southwest Venice responses favored building new, 5-Story, Mixed-Use Buildings on Ocean Front Walk.

Public Comments Summary for Southwest Venice:

Southwest Venice General

- For Southwest Venice, we've seen a couple of major developments that snuck through that really stick out like a sore thumb. And that is a single-family, low-density neighborhood that requires probably the most protection of all. So, we need to consider what we can do to protect that neighborhood from overdevelopment.

Marina Peninsula East - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Results for Marina Peninsula East:

- Very strong preference for 1 living unit/lot (with a possible ADU).
- Strong preference for future growth outside inner neighborhoods.
- Strong preference for no change to Ocean Front Walk.

The Marina Peninsula East subarea is the area south of Washington Boulevard between Via Marina and the Venice Lagoon. That part west of Via Dolce is Venice's newest neighborhood having been developed only in the 1980's. Its character is entirely different from the rest of Venice with narrow lots mostly less than 3,000 SF in size, landscaped walk "streets", and wide alleys ("courts") acting as regular streets. The neighborhood's land use classification is Single-Family Residential-Low Medium; it is zoned R1. Between Via Dolce and Via Marina are large apartment structures classified as Multi-Family Residential-Medium and zoned R3.

As expected, given the style of homes in Marina Peninsula East, there is a very strong preference for quite large single-family homes. Three stories are fine for 79% of the responders with the rest fine with even four floors. Acceptable home sizes range beyond 5,000 SF with many responses for all size choices. Somewhat surprisingly given the small lot sizes and large acceptable house sizes, backyards are preferred by a plurality (41%). Similarly, less than a third approved of homes built into the rear yard setback although virtually every dwelling is built to the courts, which apparently are assumed to be streets.


Understandably, future growth is strongly preferred outside the inner neighborhoods. Five stories seems to be the preferred maximum heights for building along Washington, Venice, and Lincoln Boulevards. Responders prefer that distant Rose Avenue have a height limit of 3 stories (60%) and closer Abbot Kinney a limit also of 3 floors (75%). The neighborhood has a strong preference (58%) to leave Ocean Front Walk as it is.

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
Marina Peninsula East - # of Surveys **33**


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	29	88%
Renter	2	6%
Business/Employee	2	6%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	33	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	10	36%
3 Floors	12	43%
4 Floors	6	21%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	28	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	2	6%
2,500 SF	7	23%
3,000 SF	4	13%
4,000 SF	5	16%
5,000 SF	9	29%
More than 5,000 SF	4	13%
	31	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	5	19%
4,000 SF	2	8%
5,000 SF	10	38%
More than 5,000 SF	9	35%
	26	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	15	71%
3 Living Units	2	10%
4 Living Units	4	19%
More than 4 Living Units	0	0%
	21	100%



Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	12	41%
Buildable Area Only	9	31%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	8	28%
	29	100%



PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)
Marina Peninsula East - # of Surveys 33

QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	0	0%
1 Space/Lot	2	7%
2 Spaces/Lot	10	33%
3 Spaces/Lot	6	20%
1 Space/Living Unit	2	7%
2 Space/Living Unit	10	33%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	30	100%

Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	3	9%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	12	38%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	17	53%
	32	100%







Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	1	3%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	12	39%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	11	35%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	7	23%
	31	100%

Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	1	3%
Outside the Neighborhoods	22	69%
Both Places	9	28%
	32	100%

Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	19	58%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	8	24%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	6	18%
	33	100%

Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	6	21%
Very Large Homes	1	4%
Traffic & Parking	14	50%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	1	4%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	0	0%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	6	21%
	28	100%

CHART




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Marina Peninsula East - # of Surveys 33


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	10	30%
4 Stories	10	30%
5 Stories	10	30%
8 Stories	3	9%
15 Stories	0	0%
	33	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	11	33%
4 Stories	9	27%
5 Stories	9	27%
8 Stories	4	12%
15 Stories	0	0%
	33	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	8	24%
4 Stories	7	21%
5 Stories	12	36%
8 Stories	3	9%
15 Stories	3	9%
	33	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	20	61%
4 Stories	7	21%
5 Stories	5	15%
8 Stories	1	3%
15 Stories	0	0%
	33	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	24	75%
4 Stories	1	3%
5 Stories	6	19%
8 Stories	1	3%
15 Stories	0	0%
	32	100%



Public Comments Summary for Marina Peninsula East & West:

Residential

- I looked at the attached diagrams and was alarmed to see the proposed density and height increases and the elimination of the height as a measurement (in feet), substituted for height expressed in stories (from 3 - 5). I could reasonably predict that the proposed changes could be catastrophic for the character of our Peninsula West zone--a possible increase by one story or more with mezzanines, and a concomitant increase in vehicles, parking, congestion and density, and a radical decline in spatial variety, picturesque quality, ecological heterogeneity and all the values that I imagine residents of the 'zone' support.
- For VEN 3, 6, and 7, which are now single-family zoning, I don't understand why they are being changed to multi-family (Low Medium Residential), with an imposition of FAR on those lots where it doesn't exist, and a limit on stories or height that's less than what's currently built.
- It's clear that the number one objective of City Planning is to allow for as much housing as possible. It obviously makes no sense where you have single family residential in Marina Peninsula East that you would upgrade it to multifamily residential, because it's already built out as single family. Why would the city do that?
- Housing will materialize through all kinds of ways. One of them is production. We as a community need to participate in one way or another in accommodating these numbers. That being the case, it doesn't mean that the Peninsula is where you accommodate it. The Peninsula had the oil rigs 60 years ago and is now probably one of the most productive as far as housing of any area in Venice. Maybe we represent 14% of the population of District 11 on 4.6% of the acreage. So, we have a disproportionately high population already.
- To reduce height and square footage allowances and to impose a FAR where there is none or reduce FAR where there is one existing is inappropriate. I don't think that if I buy a lot that I shouldn't be allowed to build what the neighbor to my right and my left have already built, to maintain an existing look and feel. I don't think taking away what's currently allowed is appropriate.
- Increased height just destroys the character of the walk streets as does loss of proper setbacks.
- I'm looking at this map of a basically entirely constructed Peninsula, formerly a natural wetlands site, an estuary that is surrounded on all sides by water, and there's really not anywhere to easily divert runoff other than the surrounding ocean waters, tidal waters. It's a conundrum. And it makes the Peninsula an environmentally sensitive settlement just by the sake of where it is.
- Think about what happens if there's an emergency. There's a tsunami, there's an electrical issue, there's a gas issue, and there's about 2,500 people living on the Peninsula, and another 1,500 people living on the Silver Strand. This is a peninsula surrounded by water. There're not a lot of options when you need to get out of Dodge quickly. Just imagine everyone on the Peninsula getting ready to go up Pacific or around

Via Marina all at the same time. If you're going to add bonus density you're going to turn the Marina into South Beach, which is essentially what this plan does, and you're going to add all those other people into this equation.

- On the Peninsula, telephone poles are really leaning. They're reinforced with little bits of metal, and they carry all the live wires. We've become so used to seeing them that we do nothing. And before we put a single person, one extra person, onto the Peninsula, we have to make it safe for us.

Commercial

- The parcels at the Washington and Pacific intersection are quite small (west of Pacific 30'x63', east of Pacific 28'x83'). This is a busy intersection in part because there is a pedestrian scramble phase. There are no driveways in and out of these parcels now. They are 1-2 stories and rely mainly on walk-in traffic. If you have larger/taller buildings on these parcels (another difficulty given lot sizes) where are the on-site parking
- driveways? Driveways need to be as far away from such an intersection as possible. Otherwise, cars waiting for the light would block exiting or be caught up in right turn traffic or pedestrian traffic or both. Like Windward, the west end of Washington should be pedestrian-oriented with wider sidewalks, no street parking, and a lane in each direction to get to Speedway and beach parking. Any use that requires adding on-site parking, especially 5-story buildings, simply won't work in this area.

Density

- You have the ocean on one side, so there's a low water table pushing underneath all that from the ocean, and you have the Canals on the other side. So, you have this high-water table, and you can't just start digging down to do underground parking. So where are you going to put all the cars for these 5 to 15 stories that people are talking about? We know what happens in the summer with parking and it all bleeds into the surrounding neighborhoods.

Marina Peninsula West - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Responses for Marina Peninsula West:

- Very strong preference for growth outside neighborhoods
- Strong preference for 2 parking spaces per living unit
- Strong preference for no change on Ocean Front Walk

Marina Peninsula West is the stretch of land between the Venice Lagoon and the beach south of Washington Boulevard to the Marina Channel. This subarea includes a blend of apartment/condominiums and single-family homes, and has many RSO living units. It is zoned almost entirely R3 and its land use classification is Multi-Family Residential-Low Medium II.

Somewhat surprisingly, therefore, 74% of responders prefer having their neighborhood with single-family homes (plus a possible ADU) perhaps because 80% of responders were homeowners. Roof decks are acceptable to all but one responder, but roof access structures

are acceptable to slightly more than half of the responders, a common position through Venice. As for front yard walls/fence and hedges, slightly more favored low walls/fences and hedges, but slightly fewer thought tall fences and taller hedges are fine.

There is a very strong preference (78%) to limit growth within neighborhoods. As for the preferred maximum heights on Venice's arterials, five stories seems to be the upper limit on Washington (only 18% higher), Venice (only 15% higher), and Lincoln Boulevards (only 27% higher). There is a strong preference for 3-story height limits on Rose (59%) and Abbot Kinney Boulevard (72%). No change on Ocean Front Walk was favored by a strong 62% of responders.

The issues of most concern (beyond Homelessness and Safety & Security) is Traffic & Parking with Changes to The Architectural and Neighborhood Character next.

Public Comment Summary for Marina Peninsula West (See Marina Peninsula East Public Comment Summary):

PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)
Marina Peninsula West - # of Surveys **34**

QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	27	79%
Renter	7	21%
Business/Employee	0	0%
Other Stakeholder	0	0%
	34	100%

Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	13	41%
3 Floors	15	47%
4 Floors	4	13%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	32	100%







Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	2	7%
2,500 SF	3	10%
3,000 SF	10	33%
4,000 SF	9	30%
5,000 SF	3	10%
More than 5,000 SF	3	10%
	30	100%

Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	5	18%
4,000 SF	4	14%
5,000 SF	7	25%
More than 5,000 SF	12	43%
	28	100%

Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	10	36%
3 Living Units	9	32%
4 Living Units	4	14%
More than 4 Living Units	5	18%
	28	100%

Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	11	32%
Buildable Area Only	17	50%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	6	18%
	34	100%

CHARTS



PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)


Marina Peninsula West - # of Surveys

34


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHART


Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	0	0%
1 Space/Lot	2	6%
2 Spaces/Lot	4	12%
3 Spaces/Lot	3	9%
1 Space/Living Unit	2	6%
2 Space/Living Unit	17	52%
1 Space/Floor	5	15%
	33	100%




Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	1	3%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	15	45%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	17	52%
	33	100%




Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	1	3%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	15	48%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	2	6%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	13	42%
	31	100%




Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	1	3%
Outside the Neighborhoods	25	78%
Both Places	6	19%
	32	100%



Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	21	62%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	7	21%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	6	18%
	34	100%



Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	10	31%
Very Large Homes	2	6%
Traffic & Parking	14	44%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	0	0%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	5	16%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	1	3%
	32	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Marina Peninsula West - # of Surveys 34


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	10	29%
4 Stories	7	21%
5 Stories	11	32%
8 Stories	5	15%
15 Stories	1	3%
	34	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	11	32%
4 Stories	9	26%
5 Stories	9	26%
8 Stories	3	9%
15 Stories	2	6%
	34	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	9	27%
4 Stories	4	12%
5 Stories	11	33%
8 Stories	3	9%
15 Stories	6	18%
	33	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	20	59%
4 Stories	10	29%
5 Stories	4	12%
8 Stories	0	0%
15 Stories	0	0%
	34	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	23	72%
4 Stories	7	22%
5 Stories	1	3%
8 Stories	1	3%
15 Stories	0	0%
	32	100%



North Venice - Survey Responses and Public Comments of North Venice

Preference Survey Results for North Venice:

- Strong preference for growth to occur outside inner neighborhoods.
- Strong preference for 3-story height limit on Rose Avenue and 4-story limit on Abbot Kinney Boulevard.

The North Venice subarea extends west-to-east from Speedway to Hampton Drive and Abbot Kinney Boulevard. From the Santa Monica city boundary it extends south to Venice Boulevard with an extension west of the Venice Canals south to about Washington Avenue. It is primarily residential with a land use classification of Multi-Family Residential-Low Medium II and is mainly zoned RD1.5. Pockets of higher-density residential, commercial, light industrial generally flank its inner areas.

Responders to the Survey in North Venice were more likely to be renters (29%) than in other subareas. At 108 responses, it also had the highest turnout. A 3-story maximum height limit is favored by 87% of responders. Single-family homes 3,000 SF or below are favored by 71%; the favored size of multi-family structures ranges across all given choices, however, which is typical across most subareas. Preferred maximum living units/lot varies as does lot coverage, parking requirements, and front yard fencing/wall height. Roof decks are okay, but preferred without roof access structures. Generally, North Venice responses were more varied than responses in other areas.

There is a strong preference for growth to occur outside inner neighborhoods (68%). Height limits of five stories or below are favored on Washington, Venice, and Lincoln Boulevards with preferences of 80%, 85% and 70%, respectively. There is a strong preference for 3-story height limits on Rose Avenue and Abbot Kinney Boulevard (both 68%). Up To 5-Floor, Mixed-Use Development on Ocean Front Walk is supported by only 20%.

Besides Homelessness and Safety & Security, Traffic & Parking were seen as a concern with Changes in Architectural/Neighborhood Character a close second.

Public Comment Summary for North Venice:

Residential


PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)

North Venice - # of Surveys 108


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #2: Type		
Owner	64	59%
Renter	31	29%
Business/Employee	11	10%
Other Stakeholder	2	2%
	108	100%




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	37	39%
3 Floors	46	48%
4 Floors	12	13%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	95	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	14	14%
2,500 SF	30	30%
3,000 SF	27	27%
4,000 SF	15	15%
5,000 SF	7	7%
More than 5,000 SF	7	7%
	100	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	15	16%
4,000 SF	23	24%
5,000 SF	33	34%
More than 5,000 SF	25	26%
	96	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Unit	52	49%
3 Living Units	17	16%
4 Living Units	24	22%
More than 4 Living Units	14	13%
	107	100%




Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	48	46%
Buildable Area Only	34	33%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	22	21%
	104	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

North Venice - # of Surveys 108


QUESTION	COUNT	%
Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	4	4%
1 Space/Lot	18	17%
2 Spaces/Lot	32	30%
3 Spaces/Lot	9	9%
1 Space/Living Unit	23	22%
2 Spaces/Living Unit	19	18%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	105	100%




Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	10	9%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	51	48%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	46	43%
	107	100%




Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	1	1%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	32	30%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	27	25%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	46	43%
	106	100%




Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	4	4%
Outside the Neighborhoods	64	60%
Both Places	39	36%
	107	100%



Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	38	36%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	46	44%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	21	20%
	105	100%



Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	26	30%
Very Large Homes	11	13%
Traffic & Parking	28	32%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	3	3%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	18	20%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	2	2%
	88	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

North Venice - # of Surveys 108


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	32	30%
4 Stories	16	15%
5 Stories	37	35%
8 Stories	15	14%
15 Stories	7	7%
		107
		100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	39	36%
4 Stories	25	23%
5 Stories	27	25%
8 Stories	10	9%
15 Stories	6	6%
		107
		100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	27	25%
4 Stories	21	20%
5 Stories	27	25%
8 Stories	20	19%
15 Stories	12	11%
		107
		100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	73	68%
4 Stories	16	15%
5 Stories	11	10%
8 Stories	6	6%
15 Stories	1	1%
		107
		100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	72	68%
4 Stories	19	18%
5 Stories	12	11%
8 Stories	3	3%
15 Stories	0	0%
		106
		100%



Commercial

- Market is a weird little industrial zone street, but it is historic single-story brick industrial buildings. Visually, it's one of the few preserved, industrial, original Venice streets. So, to build that up to five stories, that seems to me to be taking away one of the last areas that was about Venice being a mixed use, in character community. And it's beautiful there.
- We have very unique issues in the Coastal Zone. Up to five stories on Market Street? I can't see that happening, because I don't think they're going to allow added density right by the ocean. There's something going on called sea level rise and the Coastal Commission has historically not allowed increases in density in areas nearby the ocean and in our case also the canals. I've seen determination after determination that denies increases in numbers of units in those areas. In a tsunami evacuation gridlock happens so fast, which is just another reason why we have to be very sensitive about adding density at the terminus of Washington or Venice. There are areas that will work for increased density. We need to pinpoint those where we can find them.

Venice Canals - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Results for Venice Canals:

- Very strong preference for one living unit per lot (plus possible ADU)
- Preference for low walls and hedges
- Very strong preference for a maximum of 3 stories on Abbot Kinney Blvd.
- Strong preference for a maximum of 3 stories on Rose Avenue.

The Venice Canal subarea is a unique part of Venice, although only the remaining part of a much more extensive canal network filled in by the City of Los Angeles soon after it annexed Venice in 1926. The subarea includes just the parcels fronting the canals. The properties across the alleys from the perimeter canal lots might be considered as part of the subarea in the future. Lots in this subarea are all classified as Single-Family Residential-Low Medium I with a zoning designation of RW1.

A 3-floor height limit is favored by 94% of responders with a preferred size limit of 4,000 SF or less. There is a strong preference for a single living unit/lot (plus a possible ADU). Two required parking spaces is the most popular (42%) choice, and roof decks are fine (85%), but roof access structures are not (41%) as much. There is a strong preference (54%) as well for low walls/fences and hedges which reflects the present state for most properties.

Growth was strongly preferred (69%) outside the canals, although a third of responders approve of growth both in and outside the canals. Less than 5-story structures is very strongly preferred along Washington, Venice and Lincon Boulevards, with 3 stories the most popular choice (35%, 46% and 32%, respectively). A 3-story height limit was strongly preferred on Rose Avenue (65%) and very strongly preferred on Abbot Kinney Boulevard (75%).

Somewhat ironically, the issue of most concern after Homelessness and Safety & Security is the Change in Architectural/Neighborhood Character since the Venice Canal subarea has undergone the most such change over the past 50 years.


PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)

Venice Canals - # of Surveys 54


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	44	83%
Renter	6	11%
Business/Employee	2	4%
Other Stakeholder	1	2%
	53	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	19	38%
3 Floors	28	56%
4 Floors	3	6%
5 Floors	0	0%
More than 5 Floors	0	0%
	50	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	5	10%
2,500 SF	7	13%
3,000 SF	18	35%
4,000 SF	17	33%
5,000 SF	4	8%
More than 5,000 SF	1	2%
	52	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	10	24%
4,000 SF	12	29%
5,000 SF	10	24%
More than 5,000 SF	10	24%
	42	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	30	70%
3 Living Units	4	9%
4 Living Units	7	16%
More than 4 Living Units	2	5%
	43	100%



Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	22	43%
Buildable Area Only	20	39%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	9	18%
	51	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Venice Canals - # of Surveys 54


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHART


Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	4	8%
1 Space/Lot	6	12%
2 Spaces/Lot	21	42%
3 Spaces/Lot	7	14%
1 Space/Living Unit	4	8%
2 Space/Living Unit	8	16%
1 Space/Floor	0	0%
	50	100%




Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	8	15%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	24	44%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	22	41%
	54	100%




Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	2	4%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	28	54%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	8	15%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	14	27%
	52	100%




Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	0	0%
Outside the Neighborhoods	36	69%
Both Places	16	31%
	52	100%



Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	23	43%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	24	45%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	6	11%
	53	100%



Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	15	27%
Very Large Homes	10	18%
Traffic & Parking	10	18%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	5	9%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	7	13%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	8	15%
	55	100%




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Venice Canals - # of Surveys 54


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washinon		
3 Stories	18	35%
4 Stories	13	25%
5 Stories	11	22%
8 Stories	6	12%
15 Stories	3	6%
	51	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	24	46%
4 Stories	11	21%
5 Stories	12	23%
8 Stories	2	4%
15 Stories	3	6%
	52	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	16	32%
4 Stories	7	14%
5 Stories	10	20%
8 Stories	8	16%
15 Stories	9	18%
	50	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	34	65%
4 Stories	11	21%
5 Stories	6	12%
8 Stories	1	2%
15 Stories	0	0%
	52	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	38	75%
4 Stories	7	14%
5 Stories	5	10%
8 Stories	1	2%
15 Stories	0	0%
	51	100%



Public Comment Summary for Venice Canals:

Residential

- Back in the 70s and 80s, the residents crafted building rules and ensured that the character of the Canals would be preserved. We want to maintain the existing RW-1 height limits, the side yard setbacks, front and rear yard setbacks, and especially the second story [step]backs that ensure the Canals are not walled in by the big boxes that you see built elsewhere.
- The Canals are 100 years old and the whole Canal system needs to be repaired before anything is done in any part of the Canals or adjacent properties. We currently have storm drains flowing into the Canals. The whole system is preposterous.
- Currently the Canals have a few issues. We have a leak we can't figure out. We lose about a foot a day, is what the maintenance company tells us. And so, the city has not figured out how to repair that or how to fix it, but the Canals are leaking. All the streets, not just the Canals, but in the lagoon as well, flow from the streets into the Canals, unfiltered. And right now, they're protected from flooding because we release the water prior to a rain, and then we release the water again after a rain. And we're really concerned that we may get a high tide with full Canals and not be able to release the water. But the water is going in is polluted. So, one of the things we're trying to get the council office to work on is a stormwater capture system that would clean the water before it goes into the Venice Canals or the Ballona Lagoon, and before it goes out to the pumping station, in the circle, out to the ocean, so that we get a clean ocean, clean Canals, and a clean lagoon.
- Raising the height in the Canals is a big mistake.
- Why are we adding more height in the Canals and more density in an area where they are telling us that we are under stress for future potential catastrophic events?
- I'm on a two-sided street, why should the building across be 3 or 5 or 6 stories and my house is limited to 30 or 33 feet?
- Courts A, B, C, and D have 20-foot-wide streets. Court E has a 10-foot-wide street/alley. The city calls it a street. Courts A, B, C, D are all 30 by 95-foot lots. Court E is only 30 by 80 feet. It is 15 feet shorter than the other four surrounds. As people do development with this plan that the city has, they have to take 5 feet away from this lot on the opposite side of our street. But out of 19 lots along here we only have 6 that the 5 feet has been done. We need this plan to address the 5-foot, 15-foot setback all the way along Carroll Canal.
- One of the problems we have on this street is we have no hydrants on Carroll Canal.
- Currently there're yards and about a 450 square foot permeable area. We'd like some more permeable area right now with this flooding that we're having. Our street doesn't have drainage. I know Linnie Canal doesn't have it. That's not being addressed.
- We are required to have a 450 square foot permeable area to drain from our structure. If you own a building across the street from Howland Canal, there is no requirement for a

permeable area at this point. So, all the apartment buildings basically drain into the street.

- If you come along and you make a change to your apartment building, such as from apartments to condos, it is mandated that you have to then put a drain down the middle of the street, a two-foot-wide concrete drain, but it doesn't go anywhere, not based on any actual public works plan for drainage from the area.
- It doesn't make any sense for Strongs Drive to have one zoning and the opposite street another one. It doesn't make any sense for Eastern Canal and across the other side to have a different zoning. The surrounding neighbors will all be as tall as they want to be, and we'll be stuck in the middle, basically with this sort of periphery of 5 or 11 story homes.

Venice Canals as a Historic Resource

- This community has a historical meaning. It's been this way for many years. It's actually an attraction for people who come to town. They want to see what the city was. Making change is necessary, but to change something that has historical value is ridiculous. And I think that they should look elsewhere to make changes.
- It's unique. It's a unique resource. It's a cultural resource of Southern California. And I think it kind of describes and shows Venice and the history of it better than any other neighborhood. Let's not ruin this unique thing by overbuilding.
- Tourists are walking around all the time, getting great joy from seeing the Venice Canals and enjoying the character. That's super important in the Coastal Zone. It's all about visitor-serving areas and protecting the character of these areas for future generations.

Ocean Front Walk - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Results for Ocean Front Walk:

- Strong preference for buildings using only the buildable area
- Strong preference for no change on Ocean Front Walk.
- Strong preference for a maximum of 3 stories on Rose Avenue.
- Very strong preference for a maximum of 3 stories on Abbot Kinney Blvd.

The Ocean Front Walk subarea extends 1-1/2 miles from the Santa Monica city boundary on the north to just shy of Washington Boulevard, and just the one block west of Speedway. North of Venice Boulevard most of its length is classified as Commercial except that a block north and south of Paloma Avenue and three blocks near Venice Boulevard are classified as MFR-Medium. The corresponding zoning is C1 and R3. In actuality, there are numerous living units scattered within and among the commercial properties. South of Venice Boulevard, properties are classified as SFR-Medium Low (RD1.5).

The Survey was oriented to more residential subareas of Venice than is Ocean Front Walk, so that its questions often do not really pertain. Several Business/Employees responded (17%) with renters (45%) the single largest group of responders. They show a strong preference for structures to fill only the buildable area (54%), although most extend to Speedway.

Half of the responders want no change to Ocean Front Walk rather than a mix of old and new or even taller, mixed-use structures. Fifteen-story buildings on Washington, Venice, or Lincoln Boulevards are not wanted, but no lower height limit is clear favorite. Responders show a strong preference (57%) for no more than 3-story buildings on Rose Avenue and a very strong preference (71%) for a 3-story limit on Abbot Kinney Boulevard.

Public Comment Summary for Ocean Front Walk:

Ocean Front Walk General

- We don't want national chains on the boardwalk. That changes the character right there. I would like to incorporate policies or regulations in the Community Plan update that would limit, prohibit or manage national chain stores on Ocean Front Walk. Cities all over the country, including San Francisco, have enacted laws and ordinances to protect the uniqueness of certain areas, protect independent stores from not being able to compete economically with large corporations, and protect creative communities from becoming homogenized and losing their appeal. The national chains also drive-up commercial rents and make it unaffordable for new businesses, displace neighborhood serving businesses that have been viable for decades, and erode the individual feel of the area. The former councilman, Mike Bonin, put forth a motion in November 2018 that was approved by the City's Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee in April 2019. PLUM requested City Planning to study the impacts of independent retail uses on the social fabric of a community and report on the levels of economic, social, and cultural activity such uses support, including the number of jobs per square foot and the diversity of residents. PLUM also instructed City Planning, in consultation with the City Attorney, to report on the feasibility of using zoning and other land use planning tools to encourage the siting of independent retail uses on Ocean Front Walk in the Venice community. The Venice Community Plan update is the perfect time to accomplish a restriction on these kinds of companies that, left unfettered, would eventually take over and homogenize our famous walkway that is best known for being unique, creative and different.
- The new plans indicate that Ocean Front Walk is a Regional Center land use designation, which is defined as a hub of regional commerce, usually along major transportation corridors, mid-rise to high rise, active shop fronts and active streets, provides a significant number of jobs in addition to residential, retail, government, entertainment, cultural facilities, and health facilities. That sounds more like Century City than Ocean Front Walk, so it is questionable that Ocean Front Walk should be designated a Regional Center.
- Along Ocean Front Walk, I'm not sure it's going to be acceptable to increase density/living units and bring in a lot of new building to the extent that City Planning is proposing, because of sea level rise and increased flooding. It's not clear City Planning has considered that, but the Coastal Commission will consider it when they review the LCP, and so the community plan will need to match that. Thus, it remains to be seen if increased density is going to continue in the plan at that level.
- The Density Bonus law and the Coastal Act law, which are both state laws, must be harmonized. It says that specifically in the law, and that means that in the Coastal Zone, when there are density bonus projects, you have to consider protection of coastal


PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (1 of 3)

Ocean Front Walk- # of Surveys 29


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #2: Type		
Owner	10	34%
Renter	13	45%
Business/Employee	5	17%
Other Stakeholder	1	3%
	29	100%


CHARTS




Question #3: Max Floors/Stories		
2 Floors	8	31%
3 Floors	11	42%
4 Floors	5	19%
5 Floors	1	4%
More than 5 Floors	1	4%
	26	100%




Question #4A: Max Size Single Homes		
2,000 SF	2	8%
2,500 SF	5	20%
3,000 SF	5	20%
4,000 SF	7	28%
5,000 SF	2	8%
More than 5,000 SF	4	16%
	25	100%




Question #4B: Max Size Multi-Unit Bldgs.		
3,000 SF	2	8%
4,000 SF	4	17%
5,000 SF	8	33%
More than 5,000 SF	10	42%
	24	100%



Question #5: Living Units/Lot		
2 Living Units	11	39%
3 Living Units	2	7%
4 Living Units	7	25%
More than 4 Living Units	8	29%
	28	100%



Question #6: Max Lot Coverage		
Setbacks + Back Yard	5	19%
Buildable Area Only	14	54%
Buildable Area w/o Rear Setback	7	27%
	26	100%



PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (2 of 3)

Ocean Front Walk- # of Surveys 29

QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

Question #7: Required Parking Spaces		
Street Parking Only	1	4%
1 Space/Lot	3	11%
2 Spaces/Lot	8	29%
3 Spaces/Lot	5	18%
1 Space/Living Unit	8	29%
2 Space/Living Unit	1	4%
1 Space/Floor	2	7%
	28	100%

Question #8: Roof Decks		
No Roof Decks	2	7%
Roof Deck w/o RAS	12	41%
Roof Decks + RAS Okay	15	52%
	29	100%







Question #9: Front Yard Fencing/Walls		
No Front Yard Fence	2	7%
Low Walls/Fence and Hedges	9	31%
Tall Fence, No Taller Hedges	9	31%
Tall Fence and Taller Hedges	9	31%
	29	100%

Question #10: Where Multi-Family Housing		
Within the Neighborhoods	2	7%
Outside the Neighborhoods	13	45%
Both Places	14	48%
	29	100%

Question #12: Future Ocean Front Walk		
No Change	14	50%
A Mix of Old & New, Low & Tall	8	29%
Up to 5 Floor Mixed-Use Buildings	6	21%
	28	100%

Question #13: Issues of Concern Combined		
Change in Arch/Neigh Character	2	10%
Very Large Homes	1	5%
Traffic & Parking	5	25%
Isolation Behind High Fencing	3	15%
Losing Family-Sized Housing	9	45%
Losing Access to Green Spaces	0	0%
	20	100%

CHART




PREFERENCE SURVEY DATA SET - SUMMARIES (3 of 3)

Ocean Front Walk- # of Surveys 29


QUESTION	COUNT	%
----------	-------	---

CHARTS


Question #11W: Bldg. Ht. Washington		
3 Stories	6	21%
4 Stories	10	36%
5 Stories	5	18%
8 Stories	5	18%
15 Stories	2	7%
	28	100%




Question #11V: Bldg. Ht. Venice		
3 Stories	7	26%
4 Stories	8	30%
5 Stories	5	19%
8 Stories	7	26%
15 Stories	0	0%
	27	100%




Question #11L: Bldg. Ht. Lincoln		
3 Stories	2	7%
4 Stories	10	36%
5 Stories	8	29%
8 Stories	5	18%
15 Stories	3	11%
	28	100%



Question #11R: Bldg. Ht. Rose		
3 Stories	16	57%
4 Stories	6	21%
5 Stories	3	11%
8 Stories	3	11%
15 Stories	0	0%
	28	100%



Question #11ABK: Bldg. Ht. A. Kinney		
3 Stories	20	71%
4 Stories	2	7%
5 Stories	3	11%
8 Stories	3	11%
15 Stories	0	0%
	28	100%



resources. It's a very subjective review and coastal hazards also need to be considered—sea level rise, flood zones, etc. It's not a slam dunk that a project would get five stories or whatever because they added an affordable unit. There're other factors that will be considered in the Coastal Zone.

- When you look at all the photographs at the Venice Heritage Museum, so little has changed except for the clothing that people were wearing at the time. According to Jeffrey Solomon, who ran Venice Beach Walking Tours, that's what makes Venice "The People's Beach." The people of L.A. all come to Venice, every shape and size and age and political ideology and religion and everything else. And we run a terrible risk of losing that charm that brings the 10 million people a year to Venice. So, I encourage everybody to get behind these efforts to say what we want and what we need and what we deserve. So many of us have lived here for so long and want to keep the wonderful character and its characters.

Abbot Kinney Boulevard - Survey Responses and Public Comments

Preference Survey Results for Abbot Kinney Boulevard:

Only 10 responses were obtained for Abbot Kinney Boulevard. Moreover, the questions in the Survey were not geared to the development of an almost purely commercial area. For these reasons, a detailed set of tables and charts is not reproduced for this subarea, although the Summary Matrix shows the main preferences from the limited responses from those checking Abbot Kinney Boulevard.

Public Comment Summary for Abbot Kinney Boulevard:

Abbot Kinney Blvd

- I think we ought to propose, at the very minimum, a five-foot setback for any new buildings on Abbot Kinney, because we need the space on the sidewalk for moving safely and for being a nice experience for tourists and residents alike. It's just too narrow. It's lovely to have outdoor eating.
- In the description of Villages (the land use designation assigned to Abbot Kinney) it says that Abbot Kinney is historic and a cultural regional niche market. My concern about a lot of this is that it's going to stop being historic if we allow new buildings, especially up to five stories. The thing that makes Abbot Kinney so charming is all of the original architecture that's still standing, and I think that it would be great to try and put in the plan that we'd like to retain whenever possible. Maybe there's a certain percentage that has to stay that way, or we might even want to have some of these buildings get distinctions where they cannot be changed or they cannot be torn down. Otherwise, we're going to look like everybody else. Same for the Boardwalk.
- Drive down Abbot Kinney. I drove there with my husband the other night. And I said to him, five stories--that would be the top of those palm trees. Think about whether you want buildings going up to the top of the palm trees.

10. If More Multi-Family Housing Is Built Within Venice, Where Should It Be Built?

- Within the Neighborhoods
- Outside Neighborhoods
- Both Places

11. What Maximum Number Of Floors/Stories Would You Want To See Along These Streets Near You?

Choices: 3, 4, 5, 8, or 15 Stories

- Washington Boulevard
- Venice Boulevard
- Lincoln Boulevard
- Rose Avenue
- Abbot Kinney Boulevard

12. What Would You Want Ocean Front Walk Buildings to Look Like in the Future?

- No change
- A mix of old & new, low & tall
- Up to 5-floor mixed-use buildings

13. Within Your Neighborhood, What Two Issues Concern You Most?:

- Climate change; Change in architectural/neighborhood character
- Homelessness; Very large homes; Traffic and Parking
- Isolation of neighbors behind high fencing; Safety and security
- Losing family-sized affordable housing;
- Lack of accessibility to green spaces

Prepared by: VNC's Community Planning/Local Coastal Program Ad Hoc Committee

For further information about the Plan process for Venice, go to:
venicenc.org/committees/viewcommittee/venice-community-plan-committee

Appendix B

Analysis of Survey Responses for Duplicate Entries

The Preference Survey was conducted using two methods: a paper survey handed out and collected during each public meeting of the Committee from January 24th to March 11th, and an on-line option from March 2nd to March 11th. The paper survey precluded a responder from filling out the survey twice as each person received only one survey which was collected. The on-line survey could have been responded to multiple times. In both cases the responders were told to fill in only one time regardless of the type of survey. The purpose of this write-up is to document why certain on-line survey responses were deemed to be multiple entries by the same person(s). Those entries were removed from further analysis.

The total number of paper surveys received was 146. The total number of on-line surveys was 482. However, it is clear that some on-line entries were duplicates.

- On March 2, between 4:17:13 p.m. and 4:17:20 p.m. (8 seconds), 17 identical responses were (somehow) posted. Only one was counted, the rest removed.
- On March 2, between 4:22:31 p.m. and 4:22:35 p.m. (5 seconds), 11 identical responses were (somehow) posted. Only one was counted, the rest removed.

Because the paper survey more effectively precluded multiple responses by the same person, its results are used as one basis for determining multiple responses. Tallying those 146 responses resulted in certain clear results. For example:

- Only 3% of the responders checked "more than 5 floor/stories" for the question: "What is the maximum number of floor/stories a Building Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?"
- Only 13% checked "full buildable area plus rear yard setback" for the question: "How Much of the Lot Should Be Covered With Buildings?"
- Only 8% checked "street parking only" for the question: "How Many Parking Spaces Should Be Required On Each Lot Within Your Neighborhood?"
- Only 5% checked "15 floors" for the question: "What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Washington Boulevard?"
- Only 3% checked "15 floors" for the question: "What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Venice Boulevard?"
- Only 6% checked "15 floors" for the question: "What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Lincoln Boulevard?"
- Only 3% checked "8 floors" for the question: "What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Rose Avenue?"
- Only 3% checked "8 floors" for the question: "What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Abbot Kinney Boulevard?"

Only one paper survey responder checked all these boxes. However, 13 on-line survey "responders" checked the exact same eight boxes. These 13 on-line responses had various neighborhood, and stakeholder indications, and some other answers varied. Yet the chances of 14 different responders checking the exact same set of eight rare responses is very, very small. These responses were

therefore deemed duplicates; only the paper survey was counted. Eight other almost identical responses were kept only because the response to one of the eight questions listed above was not the same as those of the 13.

Are there multiple responses by the same person still within the survey responses? Probably, but impossible to find and prove. The obvious duplicates have been removed. The survey results should be considered valid.

These responses were duplicated within seconds and may have been a Google-end glitch:

Timestamp	1. In What Area of Venice Do You Live?	2. Which One of These Are You?	3. What is the Maximum Number of Floors/Stories a Building Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?	4A. What is the Maximum Number of Square Feet a Single Family Home Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?	4B. What is the Maximum Number of Square Feet a Multi-Family Building Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?	5. How Many Living Units Should Be on Each Lot Within Your Neighborhood? (Including an ADU)	6. How Much of the Lot Should Be Covered with Buildings?	7. How Many Parking Spaces Should be Required on Each Lot Within Your Neighborhood?	8. Should Roof Decks be Allowed Within Your Neighborhood?	9. What Type Front Yard Fences Would You Prefer Within Your Neighborhood?	10. If More Multi-Family Housing is Built Within Venice, Where Should It Be Built?	11A. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Washington Boulevard?	11B. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Venice Boulevard?	11C. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Lincoln Boulevard?	11D. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Rose Avenue?	11.E. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Abbot Kinney Boulevard?	12. What Would You Want Ocean Front Walk Buildings to Look Like in the Future?	13A. Within Your Neighborhood, What Issues Concern You Most?	13B. Within Your Neighborhood, What Issues Concern You Most?
3/2/2024 16:17:13	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:14	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:14	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:15	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:15	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:15	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:16	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:16	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:17	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:17	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:18	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:18	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:19	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:19	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:20	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:20	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:17:20	Oxford Triangle	Homeowner	4	5,000	More than 5,000	4	2	1	2	3	2	8	8	15	5	5	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:31	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:31	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:32	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:32	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:33	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:33	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:34	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:34	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:35	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:35	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 16:22:35	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	5,000	More than 5,000	4	3	0	2	4	3	5	5	8	5	4	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security

These responses are exactly similar on key questions. Each of the responses to the 8 questions are rare among all responders:

Timestamp	1. In What Area of Venice Do You Live?	2. Which One of These Are You?	3. What is the Maximum Number of Floors/Stories a Building Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?	4A. What is the Maximum Number of Square Feet a Single Family Home Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?	4B. What is the Maximum Number of Square Feet a Multi-Family Building Should Have Within Your Neighborhood?	5. How Many Living Units Should Be on Each Lot Within Your Neighborhood? (Including an ADU)	6. How Much of the Lot Should Be Covered with Buildings?	7. How Many Parking Spaces Should be Required on Each Lot Within Your Neighborhood?	8. Should Roof Decks be Allowed Within Your Neighborhood?	9. What Type Front Yard Fences Would You Prefer Within Your Neighborhood?	10. If More Multi-Family Housing is Built Within Venice, Where Should It Be Built?	11A. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Washington Boulevard?	11B. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Venice Boulevard?	11C. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Lincoln Boulevard?	11D. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Rose Avenue?	11.E. What Maximum Number of Floors Would You Want to See Along Abbot Kinney Boulevard?	12. What Would You Want Ocean Front Walk Buildings to Look Like in the Future?	13A. Within Your Neighborhood, What Issues Concern You Most?	13B. Within Your Neighborhood, What Issues Concern You Most?
3/2/2024 11:12:01	I don't live in Venice	Business Owner/Emplo	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	4	2	15	15	15	8	8	3	Climate Change	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 11:36:41	North Venice	Homeowner	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	4	2	15	15	15	8	8	3	Safety and Security	Homelessness
3/2/2024 13:14:50	Southeast Venice	Homeowner	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	4	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Safety and Security	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 15:54:44	East Venice	Homeowner	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	4	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/2/2024 15:58:28	Ocean Front Walk	Renter	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	2	4	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Safety and Security	Losing Family-Sized Aff
3/2/2024 16:12:03	Marina Peninsula West	Homeowner	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	2	4	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/3/2024 9:31:35	North Venice	Homeowner	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	2	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/4/2024 9:46:52	East Venice	Renter	More then 5	4,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	4	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Climate Change	Homelessness
3/4/2024 10:02:39	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	2,500	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	3	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Homelessness	Climate Change
3/4/2024 11:10:38	Ocean Front Walk	Homeowner	More then 5	More Than 5,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	3	3	15	15	15	8	8	2	Homelessness	Safety and Security
3/10/2024 19:35:57	Oakwood	Renter	More then 5	3,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	4	3	15	15	15	8	8	2	Homelessness	Losing Family-Sized Aff
3/11/2024 8:49:40	I don't live in Venice	Business Owner/Emplo	More then 5	3,000	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	1	3	15	15	15	8	8	2	Climate Change	Losing Family-Sized Aff
3/11/2024 10:10:29	North Venice	Renter	More then 5	2,500	More than 5,000	More than 4	3	0	3	3	3	15	15	15	8	8	3	Losing Family-Sized Aff	Climate Change

