



Venice Neighborhood Council

LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294 / www.VeniceNC.org

Email: Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org



MINUTES

LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, January 15, 2014

LOCATION: Oakwood Recreation Center, 767 California Avenue, Venice CA 90291

TIME: 6:45pm-10:00pm

CASES HEARD:

1. 1414 Main St: Mixed Use Project with Condos
2. 3223 Washington: Firestone Walker Brew/Pub Restaurant
3. 1033 Abbot Kinney: Mixed Use Hotel Project
4. 758 Sunset Ave: Small Lot Subdivision with 3 homes

DETAILED AGENDA:

1. Call to Order - Roll Call.

Name	P	A	Name	P	A
Jake Kaufman, Chair	x		Mia Herron	x	
Sarah Dennison, Vice Chair	x		John Reed	x	
Robert Aronson	x		Robin Rudisill, Secretary	x	
Mehrnoosh Mojallali	x		Steve Traeger	x	
James Murez	x				

2. Approval of Minutes from last meeting(s) – DEFERRED TO NEXT MEETING.
3. Approval of Agenda as presented, or amended.
4. Chair Updates –
 - a. Jim Murez will recuse himself for the 1414 Main St. case agenda item.
 - b. Cityhood.org is the database where the LUPC posts our case information/reports.
 - c. VeniceNC.org/LUPC is where we post our Agendas, Minutes, the Committee’s email addresses.
 - d. Venice remains at approximately 20% of City Planning cases, and is only 1% of the City.
 - e. The LUPC is doing its best to hear as many cases as we can.
 - f. The Public is requested to please let us know if there are important cases that it does not appear that we are hearing.
 - g. The 101 Dudley cell tower Applicant, AT&T, withdrew its application.
5. Land Use and Planning Committee Current Case Updates – none.
 - a. Case members provide updates/schedule on their “Pending” cases.
6. Public Comment on non-agenized items related to Land Use and Planning only –

1. **Jed Pauker:** He is very concerned about small lot subdivisions, especially in consideration of the current economic boom and related incredible amount of development in Venice right now. LUPC first started working on small lot subdivision issues in 2009 or 2010.

Chair Jake Kaufman responded that the LUPC opposed the last two small lot subdivisions, but City Planning still processes them as the VNC only makes a recommendation, and not a legal approval or denial.

2. **Janice Udel:** The result of a small lot subdivision is three homes on one lot. Her concern is parking, as there is no guest parking required on small lot subdivisions.

3. **Peggy Kennedy:** There is a Motion in front of the City committee run by Tom Labonge to look at small lot subdivisions. Venice is a special place in terms of its Local Coastal Plan as well as its Specific Plan, both approved by the California Coastal Commission. Even though our Venice Specific Plan supersedes the City's General Plan, the City uses the City's ordinance for SLS, not the VSP, which is the main cause of the problem. Her friend Yvonne Guzman has a petition for a moratorium on small lot subdivisions. Please sign this petition, as we need to form a coalition.

4. **Dede Audet**—She is one of the Public contacts for a new study on Sea Level Rise Vulnerability for the City of L.A., along with LUPC member Robin Rudisill. The report, released on January 7th, is difficult to navigate and she will try to improve that. However, the Venice LUPC really needs to pay attention to this issue. Also, citizens should take a look at their fire and flood insurance to see if they are insured. This is an extremely important issue.

5. **Noel Weiss:** He is an advocate for the reinstatement of Commissioner Tom Donovan.

What we have on the Westside is very unique. The City's Area Planning Commissions are supposed to support the local neighborhoods. People like Commissioner Donovan are thoughtful and thorough. The mayor unceremoniously fired him. He would like the members of the LUPC committee to get behind him and let the mayor know he can't fire someone like this. We need to ask City Planning to protect the Neighborhood Values!!

COMMISSIONER DONOVAN WILL BE AT THE VNC BOARD MEETING NEXT WEEK FOR A Q&A.

Also, 660 SUNSET and 732 VERNON are two projects that did not go through the LUPC. But they are out of mass and scale and should have gone through the Venice LUPC. Something needs to be done so that this doesn't happen, and we need some kind of a procedure for when it happens. These two projects are out of compliance in many ways. They are being developed in sync, i.e. are even carrying lumber from one property to another.

We must stop rogue development in our Community, but how?

7. Active Cases

- a. **1414 S Main St:** Mixed use construction with low income density bonus; density bonus (off-menu) with 5 incentive requests; SPP; CDP; Mello Act compliance review to develop a 46-foot / 4-stories.

Mia: The Applicant did provide new information today at 6 p.m., a ProForma showing the need for the incentives. The project hasn't changed, this is just additional information. The Applicant will present this and then we will do Public Comment. There are the 17 speakers from last meeting and 12 signed up tonight (may only comment on the new issue). If a speaker needs more than 60 seconds please let her know ahead of time. There will be 5 minutes for the Applicant and 5 minutes for the organized opposition. There may be some overlap between those who didn't speak last time and those who signed up tonight, but each person only gets one minute.

Robert Aronson: Many times when we approve a project we give reasons or conditions. For disapprovals, such as what is being proposed here, we should give some reasons to guide the Applicant for the future. Also, after the last LUPC meeting he met with the 1414 Main Applicant and his representative and discussed small lot subdivisions.

Background Information:

<http://cityhood.org/ReportCaseActivityDetail.cncx?CID=33230&UGP=Anonymous>

- i. Case No: CPC-2013-2377-DB-CDP-SPP-MEL
- ii. Staff Contact: Mia Herron
- iii. Applicant Contact: Brian Silveira (310) 753-1090—

Brian Silveira: When we first started this project, we weren't trying to do anything not allowed by SB1818.

The Goal was always to do the best project they could, and then take advantage of any incentives they are allowed. When you have to provide affordable units, you need that 4th story, that's the economics. He was told in a meeting yesterday that the City Planning Commission requires a pro forma showing that the developer NEEDS the incentives, so they prepared the report and also brought it to the LUPC tonight.

Jason Taegue: When he first began this process before he purchased the lots, he was interested in doing a mixed-use building on Main Street, which he thinks is the primary purpose of a Commercial zone. He wants to make use of the 7% to invigorate the commercial portions of Venice. Abbott Kinney didn't design Venice as a sleepy beach town. Residents want to be able to walk to restaurants and stores. There would be no 4-story condos on the canals, but he's just saying that in this particular area, on Main Street, is where he feels a mixed use project, with 4-stories could and should be.

He would like to provide SB1818 on-site affordable housing. NO one has done it, and it's usually provided off site. Also, he would like to "over park" the project. It is 50 feet from a mass transit stop.

He reviewed the Pro Forma. Estimated project revenue is \$700 per square foot, cost per additional parking space is \$55,000.

- iv. Public Comment:

Renata Pompelli—

Has lived on Riviera for 20 years. There is 92,000 square feet of building area, 3 levels above grade. We

reject this request. Organized opposition applauds affordable housing, but this is completely out of mass, scale and character. Redesign to reduce the mass to comply with the VSP. Need to accomplish project within the VSP height restriction. Eliminate the ground floor commercial.

Eliminate underground bar and performance area.

Reduce parking to what is required.

Eliminate construction of any sort in alley.

Orient any roof decks towards Main St.

Provide drawings that are more realistic.

A more conceptual drawing.

Current Plans consider only half the story and therefore wastes valuable public and City time.

??? should be considered.

No variances acceptable to this community

Must comply with all requirements of the Coastal Zone and PPC

If owner will make meaningful changes, keep working together.

All those who agree stand up and raise hands.

A petition with 933 signatures.

Janet Gervers: another viewpoint that hasn't been heard yet. Jason T. has been very supportive of the Venice community. Very inclusive in the arts area. Opened his home studio. For this project, there's an art gallery component. Will allow the Community to participate in it. Would be a kind of a Community center. Consider that Jason is a developer who lives here and not from the outside. Who close off the buildings to us.

Charlotte Purin--It doesn't matter if he lives here, it doesn't matter if he started a band. If Mother Theresa was proposing this would still say no. Not a reason to disrupt an entire res. NH into a Commercial loading zone.

Can I break the law but call it a variance.

The Community worked on the VSP for years.

Joel Marcus: we live in a beach lagoon, Main St. & Market St. Only a few feet above sea level.

Properties just east have been?

Property is a high risk of liquefaction.

How could have a subterranean parking garage in this situation.

If they go down, there goes the neighborhood.

You have a potential catastrophe on our hands.

The excavation process.

Wesley Flowers: conducts the Venice Symphony Orchestra. From Georgia. Lives in a room that was \$800.

Couldn't even sit up in bed.

Look at Jason as an artist. Has been very supportive of things he does creatively. He's an artist above developer. This seen affordable Housing.

Steve Bevilacqua: couldn't make it but sent email

*****Michael Wamback—Horizon

This development has caused a lot of fighting and chaos.

The VSP is set up to avoid that.

This project sets a precedent on mass and scale.

Will create chaos if allow this to go forward.

Give to developers to know what the groundrules are.

Tom Williams

Jules Muck:

Benton Quin:

Gary Harris: 20-year Venice resident. Stay involved, go to Yo Venice, nextdoor.com. Respectfully disagrees.

Thinks the mass, scale and character is consistent with the other projects on Main Street, i.e. building on the corner, Jim Murez's new building, and the Clown building. All of these projects are materially consistent with what he is doing. Great restaurant at Hama, 2 blocks away. Thank you Jason for bringing this project forward.

Ron Kramer (no)

Brad Neil: He likes Jason and has worked with him on projects. A lot of folks here are pissed off at him.

If I lived next door would prob be pissed off too. Do have an office 4 blocks away. He is excited about robotic parking. We need parking! SB1818 is on the books, it's State law.

George Frausco: (donated time)

Nori Takei (donated time.)

Jessie Voccia: (donated time)

Mark Kleiman: He was only allowed to see the ProForma report for 15 seconds.

It was released to us for only one reason, and that is because they HAD to give it to the City Planning Commission. Otherwise, they weren't going to show it to us. We got it at 6 p.m. tonight, just prior to the meeting. It wasn't handed out like everything else has been. It tells us one thing—this is a project where these guys are going to do for the Community only the barest minimum. They have contempt for us.

Naomi Krumins: Strongly in agreement with the opposition. (248 Horizon)

Deborah LaShever: Jason may be supporting the arts but he isn't supporting the artists. He's against helping people who don't have houses.

There are different ways to get more parking in Venice. A bar and a club on that street in a very quiet area.

It will upset and hurt the neighbors. Looking at your numbers, this doesn't seem to be a very viable project for you. I would consider dropping it. There is no reason to make an exception for you.

Matt Pennington (donated time)

George Generis: (donated time)

Tyrus Wilson—to rebut Venice

Rick Garvey: live across the street. He has two parties on site for the Venice Symphony Orchestra. If that's any indication of what the future is going to be, don't think a performance based bar is a good idea.

Tyrus Wilson—743 Sunset. Project is not neighborly or friendly to the neighborhood.

Ravi Shah: 612 Flower. Opposed. There are plenty of buildings that aren't 4 stories and they're doing fine.

They are way out of scope.

Holly Mosher: Many are calling this a piece of art but it's construction/development. Needs to be according to VSP. Also, is within 1,000 feet of the school. Actually it is 500 feet.

Frank Morfly: Now categorized as a serial developer. This project is truly a mixed-use project. Providing the low income housing. Meets the letter and the intent of SB1818.

Jonathan Kaplan: Want to call attention to a very important element. Historical value of various properties, and this project demolishes all 4. Working with the Office of Historic Resources. The historical value of these properties needs to be determined.

Olivia Derny: Opposed. Is 23, grew up here. Completely opposed. Live near Venice High. Would completely change the neighborhood. Opens Venice up to become something in the future that no one wants it to be. If it happens we won't even recognize Venice in 10 years.

Noel Weiss: Under the State law, the economic feasibility of the need for affordable housing needs to be documented. It needs to be clear whether the affordable housing units are needed or not. Make a specific Finding on the feasibility.

APPLICANT RESPONSE & LUPC DISCUSSION TO BE ADDED BEFORE DRAFT FINALIZED.

iii. Motion for Board consideration –

The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends denial of the project as presented based on excess of off-menu affordable housing density bonus incentives (five vs three that are specified by SB 1818); inconsistency with the character, mass, and scale of the surrounding neighborhood; the applicant's failure to show that the off-menu incentives are necessary to make the housing units economically feasible (especially in lieu of cost to develop 89 excess parking spaces); excessive FAR; danger of extremely poor circulation with the parking entrance onto alleyway Toledo Court (except for residences and employees); excessive lot consolidation; missing transportation demand management strategy; and unaddressed historic preservation issues.

Moved by Mia Herron

Seconded by Robert Aronson

Including Amendment to original Motion, moved by Robert Aronson, seconded by Robert Aronson

Approved 7-0-1

- b. **3223 N Washington Blvd 90292:** CUB for the sale of beer for on and off-site in conjunction with a restaurant/brew pub and retail store

Background Information:

<http://cityhood.org/ReportCaseActivityDetail.cncx?CID=34058&UGP=Anonymous>

- i. Case No: ZA-2013-3173-CUB
- ii. Staff Member: Jim Murez
- iii. Applicant Contact: Elizabeth Peterson (213) 620-1904
- iv. Public Comment:

PUBLIC COMMENTS, APPLICANT RESPONSE & LUPC DISCUSSION TO BE ADDED BEFORE DRAFT FINALIZED.

- v. Motion for Board consideration

MOTION:

- a. Prior to the February 18, 2014 VNC Board meeting, the Applicant shall provide a landscaping plan that has sufficient protection/buffers to mitigate traffic, noise and headlights to LUPC and to the VNC Board.
- b. Prior to the February 18, 2014 VNC Board meeting, the Applicant is strongly encouraged to provide letters of support from the adjacent residential property owners to LUPC and to the VNC Board.
- c. The Venice Board of Directors shall approve the following Motion:

The Venice Neighborhood Council approves the project as presented, with the following conditions:

CUB Conditions:

1. **Hours of Operation:**
 Restaurant Use: 11 a.m. to 11 p.m. Sunday - Thursday; 11 a.m. to 12 a.m. Friday - Saturday
 Retail Use: 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. daily
 Office Use: Unrestricted
2. Any future operator or owner for this site must file a new Plan Approval Application to allow the City of Los Angeles to review the "mode and character" of the usage.
3. The authorized use shall be conducted at all times with due regard for the character of the surrounding district, and the right is reserved to the Zoning Administrator to impose additional corrective Conditions, if, in the Administrator's opinion, such Conditions are proven necessary for the protection of persons in the neighborhood or occupants of adjacent property.
4. The applicant shall train staff to provide Designated Driver resources, when appropriate, for restaurant patrons, such as taxicabs, referral services (e.g., www.designateddriver.com).

5. In addition to the business name or entity, the name of the individual Applicant(s) shall appear on the alcohol license and any related permits.
6. Security guards shall be provided as required by ABC License.
7. No display window or signage advertising of offsite sales of alcoholic beverages shall be permitted; the only permitted signage shall be limited to business identification (i.e. Firestone-Walker corporate logo).
8. There shall be no coin-operated games, video machines, pool tables or similar game activities maintained upon the premises at any time.
9. Alcohol may only be served to patrons in conjunction with a food order. Must maintain suitable kitchen facilities, and must make actual and substantial sales of meals for consumption on the premises (as defined in Type 41 license).

General conditions:

10. The applicant shall produce a Transportation Plan that offers incentives to employees to use Public Transportation, bicycle or other alternative means of transportation that do not include driving an automobile to work.
11. The applicant shall provide employee parking at no charge for the duration of their shift.
12. Any graffiti painted or marked upon the premises or on any adjacent area under the control of the Applicant shall be removed or painted over within 24 hours of being applied, and the paint shall match the original color.
13. The Applicant shall be responsible for maintaining free of litter, the area and adjacent to the premises over which they have control.
14. Noise generated on site shall not exceed the decibel levels stated in the Citywide Noise Ordinance.
15. The use and development of the property shall be in substantial conformance with the floor plan submitted.
16. No tobacco sales allowed on the premises.
17. The Applicant shall adhere to Best Management Practices as they pertain to the location. Also see LADBS Green Permit.
18. To encourage a walk-friendly environment, the applicant will install bicycle racks.
19. Exterior lighting on the building shall be maintained and provide sufficient illumination of the immediate environment so as to render objects of persons clearly visible. Said lighting shall be directed in such a manner so as not to illuminate any nearby residence.
20. The Applicant shall regularly police the area under their control in an effort to prevent loitering.
21. The entitlement will run with the applicant, not the property.
22. Trash receptacles used will be designed to contain odors per Best Management Practices.
23. Cleanup and all trash removal will be performed in such a manner as to prevent debris from entering the storm drain system, and will not interfere in any way with surrounding uses.
24. No exterior work-related activity will occur either before opening or over

- one hour after closing.
- 25. Offsite advertising signage will be prohibited.
- 26. Trash pickup will occur between the hours of 8 am and 6 pm on weekdays as necessary but shall not occur during peak traffic periods as defined by LADOT.
- 27. Loading and unloading hours will be arranged to avoid conflict with surrounding uses, and will in no case occur after 4 pm or during peak traffic periods as defined by LADOT.
- 28. The storage/changing room will be clearly marked as such on plans submitted to the City, and will not be used as service area.
- 29. The applicant will appear before LUPC twelve months after opening.
- 30. Upon change or termination of any lease regarding satisfaction of the Conditions of Approval, the Applicant will notify the Department of Planning and the Venice Neighborhood Council, and will comply within thirty days.
- 31. Upon change of ownership, the new owner must appear before the City within 30 days of the close of escrow, with a plan approval application to renew the conditions and demonstrate that the required parking can be provided.
- 32. The applicant must obtain approval for all outside signage, or must remove nonconforming signage.
- 33. All bottles will be recycled upon removal from the premises.
- 34. A laminated copy of these Conditions shall be posted in a conspicuous place.

- c. **1033 S Abbot Kinney Blvd:** Construction of a hotel with spa; restaurant and other amenities.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

<http://cityhood.org/ReportCaseActivityDetail.cncx?CID=30818&UGP=Anonymous>

- i. Case No: ENV-2012-3355-EAF
- ii. Staff Member: John Reed
- iii. Applicant Contact: David Hertz (310) 829-9932

PUBLIC COMMENTS, APPLICANT RESPONSE & LUPC DISCUSSION TO BE ADDED BEFORE DRAFT FINALIZE

- iv. Motion for Board consideration—

Project: 1033 Abbot Kinney Blvd. Proposed mixed use project consisting of an apartment hotel with accessory uses, restaurants and retail project.

Whereas, there has been considerable input and testimony from the community and residents of the immediate neighborhood between August 2012 and December 2013 expressing that any hotel project proposed for this site should fully comply with the VCZSP with no modifications or exceptions permitted.

Whereas, with any large scale development project it is only reasonable to expect that there will always be a difference of opinion as to the appropriateness of a proposed use and or building type for a specific site.

Whereas, the applicant has made revisions to the project design 4 times decreasing the scale and mass of the proposed building to address concerns and issues raised during this 17-month community outreach phase.

Whereas, after 6 LUPC meetings, review of testimony from both supporters and opponents of the project, the applicant proposes to lower the building height to fully comply with Section 10F3(a) of the VCZSP. The project architect shall provide revised building elevations to the VNC which demonstrate that the project fully complies with a 30 foot flat roof height and/or 35 feet varied roof line and all other design requirements of the VCZSP.

Whereas, the VCZSP and Venice LUP contain no definitions for the following words and or phrases; Scale, Character and Mass, compatible in character, compatible in scale and character with the existing neighborhood.

Whereas, Section 3F and 8C of the VCZSP read as follows:

VCZSP Section 3 PURPOSES. The purposes of this Specific Plan are as follows:

Section F. To regulate all development, including use, height, density, setback, buffer zone and other factors in order that it be compatible in character with the existing community and to provide for the consideration of aesthetics and scenic preservation and enhancement, and to protect environmentally sensitive areas.

Section 8 C. FINDINGS. In granting a Project Permit Compliance Review in the Venice Coastal Zone, the Approving Authority shall make each of the findings in Section 11.5.7 and the following findings:

1. That the Venice Coastal Development Project is compatible in scale and character with the existing neighborhood, and that the Venice Coastal Development Project would not be materially detrimental to adjoining lots or the immediate neighborhood;

Whereas, Sections 3F and 8C of the VCZSP are subjective and open to interpretation regarding said compliance and compatibility absent definitions of the phrases; Scale, Character and Mass: compatible in character, compatible in scale and character with the existing neighborhood.

Therefore, the LUPC recommends approval of the project based upon compliance with the VCZSP, review of the architectural drawings, review of correspondence and testimony from the applicant, applicants representative, architect, supporters of the project and opponents of the project and moves that the VNC adopt the following mandatory findings in order to support a fully compliant VCZSP mixed use project.

Proposed findings:

The design of the proposed building with a combination of 1, 2 and 3 stories blends into the fabric of the neighborhood by incorporating portions of the existing structures along Abbot Kinney maintaining the existing character of the street by stepping back the building at various locations.

Abbot Kinney Boulevard has been undergoing numerous renovations of older buildings, which have been very sensitive to the character of the street. The proposed project will continue an aesthetically diverse frontage along Abbot Kinney Boulevard. The architectural style of the proposed mixed-use building and materials selected is both sensitive and respectful of the current architecture blending in rather than creating a modern architectural statement. As designed the project is compatible in scale and character with the existing neighborhood and the project would not be materially detrimental to adjoining lots or the immediate neighborhood.

Should the VNC support the project LUPC recommends the following conditions be

imposed on the project,

- 1) The project shall fully comply with all sections of the VCZSP regulating design including but not limited to Height, Access, FAR, Parking, Landscaping, and Lighting.
- 2) That no loading or unloading of deliveries shall be permitted along Abbot Kinney Blvd, Electric Avenue and Westminster Street.
- 3) That loading and unloading of all deliveries and trash pick up shall be limited to a 60 foot yellow curb loading zone on Broadway Avenue. Noise (Receiving, Trash, Storage Areas). Any activities associated with areas devoted to trash compacting, loading and unloading, receiving, and the "tote and bale" enclosure, shall be limited as follows: Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM; Saturday, 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM; except as follows: There should be no deliveries 45 minutes prior to Westminster school commencing and 15 minutes after school commencement time and no deliveries 1 hour after Westminster school ends. Delivery and trash pickup times should be limited based upon peak traffic hours and Westminster school hours. No deliveries, receiving, trash, or storage area use shall be allowed on Sunday or legal holidays.
- 4) That passenger loading shall be limited to 5 timed passenger loading spaces along Abbot Kinney Blvd. which shall be used by the valet. No other street parking shall be used by the valet at any time.
- 5) There shall be one valet operator responsible for all uses on site that will be accountable for enforcement.
- 6) Required parking shall be satisfied with automobile parking only and all bicycle parking shall be in addition to the minimum number of parking spaces required by the VCZSP. The applicant has agreed that no grandfather parking rights or credits shall be applied to any parking calculation for the project.
 - a) All restaurants, hotel, retail, spa, and office employees that drive to work shall park on site and free of charge during their employment shift hours.
 - b) All hotel guests that arrive to the hotel by automobile shall park free of charge during their stay at the hotel.
 - c) All restaurant and spa patrons shall receive a free 90-minute parking validation.
- 7) That prior to the commencement of construction the applicant shall provide documentation that 56 temporary parking spaces are available for the restaurant and office uses should these businesses remain open during construction.
- 8) That prior to construction the applicant shall provide documentation that Construction Related Parking is being provided as follows: Off-street parking shall be provided for all construction related employees generated by the proposed project. No employees or subcontractor shall be allowed to park on the surrounding residential streets for the duration of all construction activities. There shall be no staging or parking of construction vehicles, including vehicles to transport workers on any residential street in the immediate area. All construction vehicles shall be stored either on site unless returned to their owner's base of operations or in a designated parking area provided by the applicant.
- 9) Should this project be phased as currently proposed by the applicant, a separate plan approval shall be required filed no less than 12 months prior to the issuance of the second building permit which shall address the following:
 - a) Compliance with all existing conditions of approval
 - b) Review of all existing conditions of approval to determine if any conditions should be modified for the second phase of the project
 - c) Review of the cumulative effect of any project not considered in the environmental review for this planning application raising a substantial issue regarding the 2nd phase of the project.

d) Changes required to the project design based upon the enactment of new zoning or building codes.

Motion made by:	John Reed
Seconded	Mia Herron
Approved	6-1-1

d. 758 Sunset Ave: Small lot subdivision to 3 homes – DEFERRED TO NEXT MEETING.

8. Project Backlog – DEFERRED TO NEXT MEETING.

New Project Review and Staff Assignments and Coding of De Minimis Cases.

Review, discussion, and possible action on projects identified in applications filed with the City of Los Angeles Department Of City Planning as reflected on the CNC Reports, to build Agendas for future meetings. (To review the CNC Reports please go to www.Planning.LACity.org and click on "Case Information" on the left side, then click on "Bi-Weekly Case Filing" or, visit our internal working site, www.CityHood.org)

9. Adjournment

In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the LUPC members in advance of a meeting may be viewed at www.CityHood.org, Venice Public Library, 501 Venice Blvd., at our website by clicking on the following link: www.VeniceNC.org/LUPC, or at the scheduled meeting.

In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact the LUPC Chair at Chair-LUPC@venicenc.org or the Committee at LUPC@venicenc.org.