



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, November 6, 2013
LOCATION: Boys and Girls Club of Venice; 2232 Lincoln Blvd., Venice, CA 90291
TIME: 6:45 - 10:00pm

DETAILED AGENDA:

1. Meeting called to order at 7:10 pm.

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	x	
Mehrnoosh Mojallali	x		Steve Traeger	x	
James Murez	x				

2. Approval of Minutes from last meeting(s): postponed to next meeting
3. Approval of Agenda as presented, or amended: approved
4. 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):

Per Jim Murez, this week there were 17 more projects—135 unassigned to LUPC members.

5. Chair Updates--General Updates by Chair, Land Use and Planning Committee: VNC meeting in 3 weeks.
6. Land Use and Planning Committee Current Case Updates--Case members provide updates/schedule on their "Pending" cases:
Jim Murez: we're not getting updates of DIR's as they go to the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment.

664 Sunset—going to Planning Dept on 13th—*Applicant did not want to go to LUPC. Going to City Hearing first.*

Sarah: 2578 Penmar Ave—in an area of Venice not governed by the VSP, so will not go to LUPC. She attended their community meeting. No one opposed it. No objections by LUPC members. De minimus.

Mehrnoosh: 835 Milwood has reached out and had a neighborhood meeting and are ready to come to LUPC at the next meeting.

7. **Public Comment on non-agenized items related to Land Use and Planning only:**

Do we have 1217 Cabrillo on the LUPC calendar? 2 lots—1217 & 1219 (joining 2 lots, not a variance). Construct a new 3-story duplex, attached garage & 1 uncovered parking. If apply to City Planning & your permit is deemed to be fully compliant, can get a stamp at the Planning Counter so doesn't normally come to LUPC. (???)

8. **Active Cases**

- a. **530-532 Grand Blvd; ZA-2013-2127-CDP-MEL and AA-2013-2125-PMLA-SL and ENV-2013-2126-MND**

(small lot subdivision—2 lots being divided into 3 single-family homes)

i. **LUPC Staff:** Sarah Dennison

ii. **Applicant/presentation:**

Used to be the Grand Canal. An unruly scale for building. Particularly the side they're on are older houses. Not many owners living in this area. They want to move into it when done. Rather than doing a condo project, these are 3 separate houses to be sold separately, but will share parking. 2 parking spaces for each unit, under Unit C.

Interested in terms of breaking down the scale of the project: making sure all units have door facing the street. Space between front two units and the back unit.

The small lot subdivision—there are a number of others with 3 units.

Designing as 3 separate houses. Started with the idea of 2 separate houses.

The 3-unit approach allowed them to break down the scale. Will develop into 3 different personalities—differences in material and color. Galvanized metal. Kitchens are on different levels. People will be moving differently inside.

iii. **Public Comment:** none

iv. **LUPC Discussion:**

Robert: The project is in the North Venice SubArea and the affordable housing requirement is applicable. Looking at it as a small lot subdivision.

But as a condo, depends on the size of the lot. You can combine 2 lots in North Venice without approval. It's already one lot. He is saying that the third lot has to be an affordable unit. Applicant has a Mello determination.

Steve: generally not a huge fan of small lot subdivisions. Concerned about lack of open space for the rear unit. No ground floor open space. Encourages them to provide some outdoor space. It will be a fine addition to the street.

Sarah: having community meeting next Sunday at 4 p.m. (delayed as Sarah out of town).

Mia: nothing noted.

Jake: it's 2 lots becoming 3 homes, on a very wide street, Grand. 4,980 sq ft lots.

Have a Venice Directors Determination that no variance is required re. no 5-foot side yards required. Talked to Duane Wyatt in Subdivisions.

Jim: the VNC Board has made it clear that one roof top access structure is the most that should be allowed. (Board unanimously voted to approve one rooftop access structure per project). We're talking about character, scale and mass. Is this out of the realm of what other projects in the neighborhood would be? Want to take off the roof top access structures?

It's very hard to tell from the drawings without dimensions where the rooftop access structures are.

A 29' and a 21' wide lot. 50' frontage on the street.

Have a hearing on December 11th for the parcel map.

They have to go to the VNC in two weeks.

Jim: We don't have enough information. The community hasn't had an outreach meeting yet.

Sarah: Make a motion that is contingent upon the support of the people at the community meeting.

We are under the law of the small lot subdivision. Don't think we can take a position that flaunts that. We agreed that if there were no variances, it's OK, and there are not requesting any modifications or variances. Is in character with scale & mass of the immediate neighborhood, and has community support—agreed acceptable. When go to VNC bring evidence of community support.

Robert: against as doesn't have enough parking or affordable housing.

Jake: we can ask for a continuance for the ZA hearing; or Sarah can make a motion to approve.

Jim: ask the ZA that the case be held open for 2 weeks.

No outreach was done for this meeting for the project other than posting of the agenda and LUPC Staff Report on Cityhood.

Sarah: motion to approve contingent on community support. Sarah will provide notes of all of the comments at the community meeting.

Robert: question for John--doesn't everyone who gets a small lot subdivision need approval for variances, pending a proposed ordinance that changes that, before the City will allow to go forward?

Have lived there for 7 years.

Are matching the prevailing front yard setbacks on both sides.

v. **Motion to VNC Board:**

The LUPC recommends that the VNC Board support this small lot subdivision (3 homes on 2 existing lots) project as presented, based upon the following:

- The Applicant is not requesting any exceptions, modifications or variances from the VCZSP;
- The project as presented is compatible with the character and scale of the immediate neighborhood and block;
- Approval will be contingent upon community support for the project, as the Community Outreach Meeting has not yet been held (scheduled for 11/10/13 at 4:00 pm, on site.)

Motion made by Sarah Dennison, seconded by Jake Kaufman

Motion approved: 6-3-0

b. 305 Rose Ave; ZA-2013-1426-ZV-CDP-SPP and ENV-2013-1427-CE

i. LUPC Staff: John Reed

ii. Applicant/presentation: Chris Parker, land use consultant

They've filed a request for a zone variance to change the use of an existing church to office use. Current zone is residential.

A zone variance can draw out a lot of opposition but this situation is very benign and should not be a big issue. Has been a church since 1905. It's a small church, with a cool personality. They believe it's the only good proposal for the use of the property. They want to leave the church building, as it's part of the neighborhood and part of the character.

This particular block was down zoned to residential, even though commercial all around it. Greg Shoop has no idea why the change was made. But has always been a church use.

The City and the VSP say that the use is less impactful than the church use, which can have nightly and weekend events. An office is a less intensive use. Officially and technically don't need to ask for a variance.

Proposing no changes to the structure.

Did search for parking even though does not seem to be required.

They have found a month-to-month parking arrangement.

They've reached out to as many neighbors who would answer the phone.

A color-coded map shows the widespread support for the project.

Yellow: def. office & not a church, but what about the parking. Have not found anyone opposed.

Had neighborhood meeting last week. Only 2 LUPC members attended, which is a good indication that the neighborhood supports the project.

In the past, the church has been mis-used by its tenants. As property owners, they really only have 3 options: leaving it as a church—the going rate for that kind of space is high, so the church group would need to be very active in order to make enough money to afford it—

Office is a much better use as they preserve the architecture. Take away the church use, which was hard on the neighborhood.

3rd option: put houses on it, or an affordable unit small lot subdivision, which is not economical.

iii. Public Comment:

Lewis Loualy: if it becomes a change of use to office space and keeping the character as is, what about the next landowner—would they be able to change the building and if so would they be required to add parking?

Katherine Boole: Representing owner of the property at 311 Rose. She lived in the neighborhood before. The church was never really a traditional church. It was almost always walk up people. No one parked there. There's no parking as the alley narrows down behind it. One of the hardest parts of renting apartments is the lack of parking for guests. The parking is extremely important and they would like to have the parking stipulated in writing. If the parking is going to be a month-to-month lease, it should stipulate that each tenant should acquire parking for the employees and guests. It's very important that the parking goes with the use of the land.

Jason T.: have a number of properties nearby. This is a great change provided that parking is there. It has to have parking. It can't be over at St. Joseph's Center, as they're already over booked. As long as there is enough parking, they're all for it.

Jim: need a spot for the dumpster in the plans. Have the building become designated on the CA historic list. Then the character could not be changed.
Owner: Trash issues occurred with prior tenant and haven't heard of any issue recently. Will look into it. For a commercial change of use: need to provide recycling and normal trash. Right now trash is being stored on City property, in the public right of way. Commercial properties must have the dumpster on their property somewhere. Usually an office building is not a heavy trash user.

iv. **LUPC Discussion:**

Robin: Healthy community support, used to be commercial and changing back this one parcel, like the office use parking use, mainly day, limit occupants. Lock in parking of some level.

Jake: Like change of use to office. Makes more sense for where property is.

Sarah: please explain parking. Church has a non-conforming parking credit of 58 spaces. Based on proposed use of an office building, total combined requirement is 31 spaces, as the City and VSP see this as a less intensive use. Essentially meet that 31-space requirement with the 58 credit. But for an office building know they will need to provide some parking. Parking structure in the Venice clown building, for their hours, M-F, 7 am to 6 pm, can give up to 33 spaces.

Mia: what is the motivation of keeping the current structure (as developers 3 stories more productive). As developers—think this is a classic structure. The building was built in 1905. Most churches these days have schools, retail centers, food distribution, which is not appropriate for this location. The office use is the least impactful and the most manageable. Highest & best use—retail/restaurants, but community has had enough of that. Had a sign out front and got a lot of inquires—major chefs, etc. Believe it's the best use for the neighborhood.

Mia: price per square foot would least it for. \$2.50 to \$3.50. To do a tear down would need to do \$4.50.

XX spaces for main part of church.

1 per 500 for rest of the church.

If tear it down, need to start over.

Intend to only have one tenant, although could work for two.

No interest in managing an incubator kind of space.

Steve T: Not really in favor of an office use. Would be dark at night. OK with office if on the hook to preserve the architecture.

No beach impact zone parking, as in Oakwood, not North Venice.

Jim Murez: In colored map, why not using the church parking spaces. On the conditional use permit they got for their whole building, supposed to put xx parking spaces for the general community. Condition that exists on the 33 spaces. An existing condition—spaces there for the general community.

John: The support map is very important. To mitigate the variance requesting, need parking. It has to be a lease that is renewable, at least every 6 months or year. Must run with the use. ZA reviews every 6 months or year. Can't change the use and not mitigate the impact. Across the street there's a use with no parking. Rose Street Café nearby. In that general corner, will be a parking deficit. What missing from the map are the letters that show the support of the main green areas of the map. Don't feel comfortable

supporting a project with grandfathered parking without seeing required parking—with a covenant.

Over the last 3 days Greg called all neighbors in the radius. They can't force people to provide letters, but will provide the ones they have. Do a phone log saying contacted these people. All you don't need is to have people surprise you at the Zoning Hearing. They notify people of the hearing last week, as well as this LUPC hearing.

Jim: does not support in lieu parking fees of \$18,000 per space. If they would like to entertain paying for this, he would be in support. Or they could pay to upgrade the lot at Rose and Main.

Robert: suggesting a motion. John wants to write conditions. 5,965 usable square feet. We recommend approval so long as there's a covenant for at least 33 parking spaces, no in lieu fees can be paid. All 125 spaces in the clown building have already been conditioned to another use. Should be able to get a contract for the parking if have a covenant.

If they're OK with our support being based on a covenant for the parking, we'll vote now.

Supports

Based on a covenant for 33 parking spaces, based on a general office use calculation of 1 per 250 (general office use), including Beach Zone requirement. (but no BZ requirement for Oakwood). No in lieu fees. Covenant agreement, within 750 feet? (Jim Murez)

Robert: a 6,000 sq ft office space with 24 spaces.

Trash AND recycling to be enclosed and located within the property lines.

There are three different office uses for parking—must be general office use of 1 per 250.

v. **Motion to VNC Board:**

The LUPC recommends that the VNC Board support this adaptive reuse from Church to General Office, based upon the following:

There is a covenant parking contract in place, based on the General office ratio of 250:1 sq ft, for parking within 750 feet of the property;

Enclosed recycling and trash located within the property and out of the public right of way;;

In lieu fees not to be used in order to meet parking requirements.

Motion made by Robert Aronson, seconded by John Reed

Motion approved: 7-1-1

c. **259 Hampton Ave; ZA-2012-1770-CDP-CUB**

(addition and remodel of an existing 1,658 sq ft take-out restaurant to a 2,831 sq ft restaurant with sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages)

i. **LUPC Staff:** Jim Murez

ii. **Applicant/presentation:** Stephen Vitalich

De minimus?

Right across the street from the church

0 parking

Restaurant called Sauce.

Supposed to be a retail store, and retail take out food only food establishment, with no seating or eating on site.

As a result they are allowed parking credits, or grandfathered parking rights. Proposing a remodel, where the dining space will be on an open air terrace on the second story. The question that seems to still remain, is how will they come up with the additional parking spaces. Robert asked if they lose the parking credits if they take off the roof. No, they're leaving enough of the roof (not taking off the ceiling joists; taking off the top skin and leaving the rest of it here).

Parking credit is 10 spaces.

Project has been going on since 2010. Originally Jay Golfer's project. He had a completely set of drawings and different application. Put on hold and all changed.

Robert Aronson went to the Community outreach meeting and took notes, and they are online.

Applicant's architect: idea to take dining terrace and put it up in the air and add 63 seats. It has 10 non-conforming parking credits. Proposed service floor area would require an additional 10 spaces, and they would ask that they could take advantage of in lieu fees. They do realize that the amount is substantially insufficient to compensate for not providing parking, and the owner has asked what amount the LUCP would deem sufficient.

Jim: How do they propose to pay more than the City is allowed to take?

The Councilperson's office was represented at the ZA hearing. They aren't in support of the in lieu fees, as they don't believe they're being used to benefit Venice. If there isn't any opportunity to provide

Hate to say it but there's no one on the planet who will provide a covenant.

Proposing a reasonable figure for a parking space. Have seen in a report that it varies between \$40-70,000 depending on the neighborhood.

An issue brought up in public comment in the ZA hearing re. the residential uses nearby—a 7-unit residential building. Concern about the open air dining area making noise into the late hours. Paying for a report that will help them to encapsulate the noise. The design will change. Will need to be more than the one tree. Think it's a great spot for a use like this.

The other comment brought up at the hearing was the parking.

3 people there. Not a lot of opposition or support. The project doesn't seem to be drawing a lot of attention.

iii. Public Comment:

Jason Teague: very supportive of the project, as long as it has parking. St. Joseph and Archstone is already over subscribed with parking, so can't get it there. No problem with the noise as it's a commercial area.

John: what if they paid a large amount of money to support a parking structure at Rose & Main?

Andy Rovus: handicapped access: an elevator runs up the center.

iv. LUPC Discussion:

Robert: there are some serious noise issues. It needs to be fully enclosed after certain hours on the weekdays, with slightly later hours on the weekends. But per Jim Murez, if enclose it changes the FAR. So whatever sound mitigation thinking about doing it has to remain open. Residences are right across the street. It's insane. *Don't think that if we came to an agreement to accept more than \$18,000 that the City would agree with that.* But John

indicated that they could double the parking requirement. No sidewalk dining? John hasn't calculated the service floor area.

2 stories with 1,000 sq ft service area. 294 + 706

Steve: very interesting concept. Modern, post modern. Security of the space? *How able to project over the property line? Answer: within the limits of the code.*

There's a lot of massaging that has to be done, a lot more things need to be addressed. It will change to be a *partially open air terrace*. The influx nature of it are in addressing the concerns. They would like to stay within the spirit of the concept. Steve loves the open-air aspect.

Mia: have you looked at the option of an in lieu option?

It's next to impossible to get a property owner to commit to providing parking, as it ties up their property and it runs with the land.

A more interesting concept is how to increase the in lieu fees. But *the CP office says that all of the money that has been collected over the years hasn't gone towards one parking garage*. The parking garage that Google was proposing has been abandoned. 11 a.m. to 1 a.m. Not sure who the operator will be. App: it'll be interesting to see how things will be when the Rose café goes to evening hours now that they've been approved for full alcohol.

Mia: What community outreach has occurred. *A community outreach meeting was held in February. Jay Goldberg was the LUPC member assigned at the time. 3 people showed up: owner of the Firehouse, and two property owners. The only concern expressed was the parking.*

Mehrnoosh: Like how it's raised off of the ground. The perimeter "envelope" will need to be transparent, but will need to be something that will mitigate sound that can be put into use in the later hours. The green elements will help soften the space. The one large tree is a whimsical idea, but it will probably be more than one tree. Want it to feel like you're dining in a garden.

Sarah: like the design concept. Very interesting. Strange with 2-3 acre properties surrounding it, and *not appropriate with residential area so close*. Use the trees for part of the sound containment system. Having noise towards the street where there are other businesses, there shouldn't be a problem. But the residents should not be able to hear anything after hours. This is very extreme. *Re. the FAR, how will you use vertical space to keep the noise from going out the top without putting on a roof of some type....and then you lose the concept.*

Jake: *don't support the project. This is the most out of compliance restaurant in the City. There's sidewalk dining, using a retail space to serve dinner.*

Robin: There's already a lot of noise that migrates from Main Street uses. What they're intending to do to mitigate that is to mitigate as much of the sound issue as possible.

John Reed: Hours of operation should be consistent with the Rose Café (think outdoor dining closes at 11 pm (they do have people living directly across the street, but per Robert, they're 200 feet away instead of 30 feet, and have tables out over the sidewalk). If willing to pay a number equivalent to \$25-30,000 per space, and go with 20 spaces instead of 10, specific for Venice. Or just say not retaining roof structure and lose the parking rights so have to come up with it.

John: Looking at half a million dollars for a parking structure of this size. \$18,000 * 10 isn't going to work. *Say that based on the impact that this project is going to have, require 20 spaces.*

Jim Murez: but half a million is more appropriate, but how do you get there in terms of the number of spaces? *Should we be concerned about the cumulative effect of the parking impact of this project as well as the church project that we just approved?*

Sarah: *not comfortable that the noise issues have been solved. Don't know what you're going to do, so don't see how can vote on it.* She's worried that the design is going to change a lot. It's not going to be the same in the end. Here to represent community as well as legal aspects to the code.

Robert: have had a couple of projects with commercial abutting residential, where the applicant gets a report a sound engineer report saying it can be taken care of. The community can't afford to respond. So you have a 1-sided expert. The property doing the complaining—residential property across the alley who are complaining also doesn't have adequate parking. The other residential uses are 50 feet away.

Jim: at the ZA hearing they agreed to 90 days. They have until after the VNC Board meeting, so can take the time to wait for their proposal on how to mitigate the noise, and wants to explore with the Council office to see if there's a way to receive funds greater than the set in lieu amount.

Applicant: *What happens when the case is appealed at Coastal (can't appeal with the City as it's in the VSP) due to the in lieu fees.* Coastal says that the amount has to be an amount related to the replacement for the parking. They agreed to in lieu parking on Abbott Kinney recently, where the money is going to be spent on the proposed parking lot on Electric. If they offer \$40,000, that can be tied to Rose and Main, the Coastal Commission would approve.

v. [Motion to VNC Board: Motion to postpone](#)

d. [1414 Main St; CPC-2013-2377-DB-CDP-SPP-MEL](#)

There's no motion to be made tonight—a presentation and community input, they want to both share with and hear from the community.

Jim Murez is recusing himself, as he has property within 500 feet. Jake noted that as this is just a presentation and not a vote, it's ok for him to be in the room as a listener.

Attempting to come to some consensus between the developer and the community, so that the developer's plans can evolve over the next few months into something the community can be comfortable with.

Have had two community meetings—a lot of people didn't hear about the first one, so had another one last night. Per Jake, there will be at least 2-3 more meetings like this one. Very glad the community members are here tonight.

Jason: 5 contiguous lots on Main Street. 4 of 26 units are affordable, subterranean 3 levels of automated parking.

Brian Silveira, is the planning expediter of the project. The site area is 14,000 sq ft., with 2 restaurants, 1 retail space, 26 condos, parking below.

Public space—seating, bike racks, 1200 sq ft retail space. Dogtown Coffee 1st tenant, in middle.

Jason is one of the original founders of the Venice symphony orchestra, maybe also leased to other cultural events, i.e. Venice Art Walk.

The massing is intentionally broken up by separating the project into 3 spaces/ According to the VSP avoid massing by breaking up the building.

2nd floor above the commercial is the first residential space. Swimming pool & spa.

Roof decks on top.

Parking to be accessed from the alley, per DOT requirement. Not allowed to be off of Main for several reasons. Will enter off of Main into 3 separate parking bays.

This automated parking is used all throughout Europe. Permitted in the Valley about 6 months ago. Pull in similar to a car wash. Green light/red light, swipe access card. Door closes, laser determines length of the car, the car will be dropped down to the lower level. Retrieval time is less than 40 seconds.

Robert: what is the FAR? 2.4.

Residential parking: based on the SB1818 calcs, or a total of 46 (?).

There is guest parking for the guest spaces?

For the VSP parking for the restaurant. To be conservative using total square feet. Coming up with 86. For retail 6 spaces.

For any new project in the Beach Zone, required to provide new parking. 5,700 square feet requires 9 spaces.

Total of 145 parking spaces.

Providing 245, due to robotic parking, as able to fit into a much smaller space.

97 surplus parking spaces (includes the guest parking).

Traffic analysis—trip generator.: 4 AM trips and 32 PM trips.

Need to check the numbers for the existing land use credit. Please clarify for future presentations.

Density Bonus & Incentives—setting aside a certain number of units. The units are controlled by the Housing Dept. Must qualify based on applicant's income and market rates. In 2008, the City passed this ordinance, which has 3 components:

- 1. density bonus—proportionate to affordable housing set aside.**
- 2. Parking reductions (1 space for studios & 1-bedrooms, 2 spaces for ??)**

3. Incentives, increased height, FAR, etc.

Way calculated density—Under VSP, allowed 19 base units. Proposing 4 affordable units and end up with 26 units.

46 foot height, relief from the SP step-back requirement, 2:4:1 floor area ratio, 7 foot rear yard.

4 stories + roof top deck.

VSP—for every story over 2, an additional foot of set back.

Thus, asking for a full 4-story unit.

7-foot rear yard.

B&S automatically consider the shortest distance as the front yard. The rear yard is basically now the side yard.

Public Comment:

Rick Garvey, own 234: Distributed his list of concerns. Live in the back house, on the alley. He doesn't trust the developers. Don't believe some of the things putting in the presentation. Urging us to deny any of the variances they are asking for. If think Horizon is the front yard and it fits the character of the block, that's wrong.

If you have ever walked in that alley, the idea of having 3 in-take bays and say that zero cars are going to come down Lido Court, that is disingenuous.

Kevin, Market Street: The back side of his property is on Toledo.

Like many neighbors did not receive a notice. He raised some concerns with the neighbors. He did a petition within a 3-block radius of the project. 260 people have signed. 2 signatures in favor—both of which are from Brian, because he repeated himself. There are size restrictions in the automated parking lot—does not fit SUB's, who will need to park in the nearby neighborhood. There are traffic and safety concerns in using alleys. They are proposing to annex the ?? from the ?? driveway. Unacceptable from a safety aspect.

Jake urged them to put up a website the sooner the better.

Mia is the LUPC case manager for the project. Email her so can make sure all of the information is distributed to the full board. All of the information she has been provided is on Cityhood.org.

An organization referred by the City called BTS.

Said they're here as they object to the building, not because received the notice. Been a resident for 15 years.

Don't like the building—the pollution, the safety, the traffic.

When Steve has made the time to present a proper argument, they will hear more from them.

215 Market Street: have been there for 33 years. Would put him out of business. If this monolith comes, I'm out. Is it OK for them socially and morally to wipe out an entire community's pursuit of happiness. Come down

to see this microscopic alley. They tried to buy my building. This is an outrage. It's a monolith. These guys are bandits of the first order. They will be waiting at every turn of the project.

Height—the gold rush isn't. Were here last month for Dan's building and he knocked a floor off. When go into these projects, know what the VSP is requiring. To add 11 feet PLUS a roof top deck. Once give these variances for one project, it's going to be another Miami Beach.

Jake: we're early in the process. The goal for the developers to reach a middle ground.

Request to move this up sooner for the next meeting. They've seen the power point presentation each time.

Email your concerns to mia.herron@venicenc.org?? (LUPC?)
This is the third time the community has seen same presentation, the community came here to speak tonight.

They will probably have a tract map hearing in about 4 months. (Greg Shoop said 2 months).

Sarah Dennison: Need to go back and make adjustments to the project and then come back.

30+ people came here to talk about this.

They all want a meeting where they can be heard.

9. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at: 10:10 pm.

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.