



# Venice Neighborhood Council

LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294 | [www.VeniceNC.org](http://www.VeniceNC.org)

Email: [Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org](mailto:Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org)



## Land Use & Planning Committee draft LUPC STAFF REPORT

March 5, 2026

City Case No: AA-2025-5122-VPM-SH-HCA

CEQA Case No: none

Related City Case No(s): ADU?

Address of Project: 1209 Preston Way

Applicant/Property Owner: Chris Wasley, Dream Bigger Acquisitions 2 LLC

Applicant's Representative: Brandon Arioli, Samara Living, Inc.

Standard of Review: Venice Community Plan and other applicable State laws:  
Assembly Bill 2097, Starter Home Revitalization Act  
(SHRA)--SB 684 / SB 1123 / AB 130

Coastal Zone: non-Coastal zone

City Hearing: none required

Email for City Planner: [Ira.Brown@lacity.org](mailto:Ira.Brown@lacity.org)

LUPC Staff assigned: Mark Mack & Robin Rudisill

### I. Detailed Project Description:

Subdivision into 4 fee simple parcels per SB 1123.

Letter of Compliance Issued January 29, 2026:

<https://planning.lacity.gov/pdiscaseinfo/document/ODY5OA0/82065561-f922-4efb-8b32-0e189f041683/pdd>

### II. Proposed Motion:

Title: Request for Written Explanation of Compliance Conclusions – 1209 Preston Way

**Purpose:** This request is made to ensure transparent, consistent application of adopted objective standards in current and future Starter Home Revitalization Act projects in Venice.

**Background:** On January 29, 2026, the City Planning Advisory Agency issued a Letter of Compliance with SB 684 / SB 1123 / AB 130 Streamlined Subdivision Ministerial Review for Housing Development Projects with 10 or Fewer Units, approving Parcel Map No. AA-2025-5122-VPM-SH-HCA. The determination states that it is final and not appealable. Because the project was approved ministerially under the Starter Home Revitalization Act, the decision must be based on objective standards. The Venice Neighborhood Council supports lawful implementation of State housing law but seeks clarity and consistency in how adopted City standards are applied, including how deviations are approved.

**The Motion:**

Resolved, the Venice Neighborhood Council requests written explanations from the City departments indicated:

**1. Bureau of Engineering (BOE) – Conditions 4 and 5 (page 2)**

Condition 4 requires a 2-foot dedication along Preston Way under “Limited Local Street standards and Condition 5 requires a 2.5-foot wide strip of land be dedicated to complete a 10-foot wide half alley dedication. LUPC requests that BOE provide a written explanation regarding the following sections of the Letter of Compliance:

- a. Confirm the official Mobility Plan classification for Preston Way.
- b. Explain the basis for applying “Limited Local Street” standards rather than “Standard Local Street” standards.
- c. Clarify why a greater dedication was not required.
- d. Explain how SB 684 / SHRA affects the City’s ability to require street dedications.

**2. City Planning – Conditions 21.m. and 21.n. (pages 9-10, 21)**

Conditions 21.m and 21.n. reference deviations necessary to accommodate “other conditions of approval as required by other City agencies”. LUPC requests that City Planning provide a written explanation:

- a. Which specific agency conditions required deviation?
- b. Which agencies imposed them?
- c. How did those conditions necessitate the approved deviations?

Condition 21.n permits deviation from R1V2 front yard and encroachment plane requirements. Objective Development Standards (page 21) discusses the same issue. LUPC requests that City Planning provide a written explanation:

- a. What is the statutory authority supporting these deviations under SHRA?
- b. What is the analytical basis for determining that application of the front yard setback requirement and encroachment plane requirement would “physically preclude the development of the proposed density of four single-family residences on four lots and as such these provisions are removed”?

**3. City Planning--Eligibility Criteria & Objective Standards (pages 20-21)**

Box (a)(11), page 20, and Box (d), page 21, indicate compliance with objective zoning standards. LUPC requests that City Planning provide a written explanation:

- a. Why are Box (a)(11) on page 20 and Box (d) on page 21 answered "Complies" when deviations were allowed?
- b. Which objective standards were evaluated?
- c. Which, if any, were determined to be inconsistent with SHRA?
- d. How was "physical preclusion" evaluated in the Objective Development Standards section?

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS--ATTACHED BELOW**

**ACTIONS:**

**Heard in Committee on:** \_\_\_\_\_ Moved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: \_\_\_\_\_

Vote: \_\_\_\_\_ (YEA) \_\_\_\_\_ (NO) \_\_\_\_\_ (ABSTAIN)

**Heard by VNC Board on:** \_\_\_\_\_ Moved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Seconded by: \_\_\_\_\_

**VOTE:**

David Feige Yes No A Ab  
Alley Bean Yes No A Ab  
Kenya Lee Yes No A Ab  
Gary Pearl Yes No A Ab  
Brennan Lawson Yes No A Ab  
Lisa Redmond Yes No A Ab  
Tima Bell Yes No A Ab

Clark Brown Yes No A Ab  
Nico Ruderman Yes No A Ab  
Helen Fallon Yes No A Ab  
Fran Solomon Yes No A Ab  
Richard Stanger Yes No A Ab  
Mark Mack Yes No A Ab  
Jason Sugars Yes No A Ab

Ted Henderson Yes No A Ab  
Soraya Moss Yes No A Ab  
Jim Fitzgerald Yes No A Ab  
Yolanda Gonzalez Yes No A Ab  
Erica Moore Yes No A Ab  
Joseph Garcia Yes No A Ab  
Sarah Mahir Yes No A Ab

**III. Pros & Cons of Project:**

Positive aspects of project:

The neighbors have indicated that they welcome the lot split and its small home development, as this type of project aligns with the neighborhood's built environment while increasing density in our Los Residential Area of East Venice.

Negative aspects of project:

Street dedications not required as expected. Deviations from objective development standards not explained adequately and without adequate explanation documentation and the neighbors are concerned that the deviations may not be allowed and could have been approved in error.

**IV. Neighborhood Outreach/Summary of Community Input:**

The community and the adjacent property owners patiently awaited the applicant outreach and the project presentation at LUPC. They had prepared questions for the applicant and

were relying on the expertise of LUPC members to better understand the project conditions and ask clarifying questions. While they were told that outreach would come and that a presentation to the community was imminent, City Planning moved ahead and approved the Letter of Compliance. As long-time residents with a deep commitment to their community, the neighbors feel they have been harmed by the City's action.

Summary of Community Input

Concerns expressed by Neighbors:

**No neighborhood outreach.**

Suggestions from Neighbors:

**See motion.**

**Vacant Lot:**



**Renderings:**




© SAMARA LIVING INC. PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL




© SAMARA LIVING INC. PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

**Proposed Site Plan:**




# Proposed Subdivision Map:




## North Elevation:



## South Elevation:



## Rear Elevation:



## Front Elevation:

