



Venice Neighborhood Council

LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294 | www.VeniceNC.org
Email: Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org



Land Use & Planning Committee (LUPC) STAFF REPORT

May 28, 2026

City Case No: [DIR-2025-4098-CDP-SPPC-MEL](#)
[AA-2025-4907-PM-CC](#)

CEQA Case No: [ENV-2025-4909-CE](#)

Related City Case No(s): [ZA-1995-95-ZV](#)

Address of Project: 2 Catamaran St

Applicant/Property Owner: Kelly Doyle

Applicant's Representative: Henry Ramirez, Architect

Standard of Review: Coastal Act, with certified Land Use Plan (LUP) as guidance (for CDPs)
Venice Community Plan
Other applicable State laws: Assembly Bill 2097 and Density Bonus law, etc.
Other applicable City laws: Conditional Use (CU), Al Fresco Dining, Zoning Administrator Adjustment (ZAA), Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance (SPPC), Specific Plan Exception (SPPE), etc:

Coastal Zone: Dual Permit Jurisdiction

City Hearing: Indicate date or other status (check with City Planner)

Email for City Planner: Luis.c.Lopez@lacity.org

LUPC Staff assigned: Robin Rudisill

I. Detailed Project Description:

Preliminary parcel map to convert a 3-unit building with 14 parking spaces into a 3-unit condo building with 14 parking spaces

II. Proposed Motion:

The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends approval of the project at 2 Catamaran St, as proposed.

Moved by Robin Rudisill, Seconded by XXX

Vote: X-X-X (X absent)

III. Pros & Cons of Project:

Positive aspects of project:

None noted

Negative aspects of project:

None noted

IV. Neighborhood Outreach/Summary of Community Input:

Describe neighborhood outreach by Applicant's Representative and by LUPC Staff Member, in detail.

None noted

Summary of Community Input

Favorable comments from Neighbors:

None noted

Concerns expressed by Neighbors:

None noted

Suggestions from Neighbors:

None noted

V. Findings re. Entitlements:

For your use in determining the entitlements, here is the link to the City Planning Prefix (approving entity) and Suffix (entitlements) Report where you can look up the City Case No. coding abbreviations:

<https://planning.lacity.gov/resources/prefix-suffix-report>

A. Coastal Development Permit (CDP) – Coastal Act & certified Land Use Plan (LUP) are the standard of review

1. Parking/Coastal Access – Assembly Bill 2097 must also be considered in the standard of review

Coastal Act section 30252 states:

The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by:

- 1. facilitating the provision or extension of transit service*
- 2. providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads*
- 3. providing non-automobile circulation within the development*
- 4. providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation*

Insert applicable LUP policies from Policy Group II Shoreline Access of the LUP and analyze compliance.

The project conforms X does *not* conform with the Coastal Act and LUP policies for parking and Coastal Access because there is no change in occupancy or parking provided.

2. Scenic and Visual Qualities

Coastal Act section 30251 Scenic and visual qualities states:

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.

Insert applicable LUP policies and development standards from Policy Group I Locating and Planning New Development/Coastal Visual Resources and Special Communities and analyze compliance.

The project conforms X does *not* conform with the Coastal Act and LUP policies for Scenic and Visual Qualities because there is no change in the scale or character of the structure.

3. Environmental Justice Policy (if applicable)

The Coastal Commission's Environmental Justice Policy states:

The Commission recognizes that the elimination of affordable residential neighborhoods has pushed low-income Californians and communities of color further from the coast, limiting access for communities already facing disparities with respect to coastal access and may contribute to an increase in individuals experiencing homelessness.

Coastal Act section 30604(f) states:

The Commission shall encourage housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income.

Coastal Act section 30604(g) states:

The legislature finds and declares that it is important for the Commission to encourage the protection of existing and the provision of new affordable housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income in the coastal zone.

Coastal Act section 30116 states:

Sensitive coastal resource areas" means those identifiable and geographically bounded land and water areas within the coastal zone of vital interest and sensitivity. " Sensitive coastal resource areas" include... areas that provide existing coastal housing or recreational opportunities for low- and moderate-income persons. (Emphasis added)

The project conforms X does *not* conform with the Coastal Act's Environmental Justice Policies because it does not decrease housing.

4. Cumulative Effect

Coastal Act section 30250 (a) states:

New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources...

The project is very likely *not* very likely X to create an adverse cumulative effect or an adverse precedent for other similar projects because there are no negative impacts.

5. Protection of Special Coastal Communities

Coastal Act section 30253(e) states:

New development shall do all of the following...(e) Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods that, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.

LUP Policy Preservation of Venice as a Special Coastal Community states:

Policy I. E. 1. General. Venice's unique social and architectural diversity should be protected as a Special Coastal Community pursuant to Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act of 1976.

Policy I. E. 2. Scale. New development within the Venice Coastal Zone shall respect the scale and character of community development. Buildings which are of a scale compatible with the community (with respect to bulk, height, buffer and setback) shall be encouraged. All new development and renovations should respect the scale, massing, and landscape of existing residential neighborhoods. Lot consolidations shall be restricted to protect the scale of existing neighborhoods. Roof access structures shall be limited to the minimum size necessary to reduce visual impacts while providing access for fire safety. In visually sensitive areas, roof access structures shall be set back from public recreation areas, public walkways, and all water areas so that the roof access structure does not result in a visible increase in bulk or height of the roof line as seen from a public recreation area, public walkway, or water area. No roof access structure shall exceed the height limit by more than ten (10') feet. Roof deck enclosures (e.g. railings and parapet walls) shall not exceed the height limit by more than 42 inches and shall be constructed of railings or transparent materials. Notwithstanding other policies of this LUP, chimneys, exhaust ducts, ventilation shafts and other similar devices essential for building function may exceed the specified height limit in a residential zone by five feet.

Policy I. E. 3. Architecture. Varied styles of architecture are encouraged with building facades which incorporate varied planes and textures while maintaining the neighborhood scale and massing.

The proposed project would X would *not* protect the Special Coastal Community status of Venice because there is no change in social diversity, architectural diversity, scale or character.

B. Density Bonus Act (DB)(if applicable)

n/a

C. Conditional Use (CU) cite LAMC CU Section _____
n/a

D. Mello Act (MEL)(if applicable)
High rent beach front units.

E. Housing Crisis Act (HCA)(if applicable)
n/a

F. Priority Housing Program (PHP)(if applicable)
n/a

G. Add any other applicable entitlements here, such as SPPE (Specific Plan Project Exception), ZAA (Zoning Administrator Adjustment), etc.

VI. Existing structure:





VII. Existing Site Plan:
n/a

VIII. Rendering of proposed project:

No change, see photos.

IX. Site Plans:
n/a

X. **Plot Plan:**
n/a

XI. **Floor Plans:**
n/a

XII. **Elevations:**

A. East elevation:
n/a

B. West elevation:
n/a

C. North elevation:
n/a

D. South elevation:
n/a

NOTE: Add or attach Applicant-drafted Findings, Streetscape, Character Study or Neighborhood Photos and Index Map, or other information included in the application that you consider significant and have included in your analysis.