Meeting of the Land Use and Planning Committee

DATE: Thursday August 20, 2020        TIME: 7:00pm – 10:00 pm

IN CONFORMITY WITH THE GOVERNORS EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20 (MARCH 17, 2020) AND DUE TO CONCERNS OVER COVID – 19, THIS VENICE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED ENTIRELY TELEPHONICALLY TO JOIN THE MEETING PLEASE USE THIS LINK

You are invited to a Zoom webinar.
When: Aug 20, 2020 07:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)
Topic: VNC Land Use and Planning Committee Webinar, Thursday, August 20, 2020, 7:00 p.m.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://zoom.us/j/98308629313
Or iPhone one-tap:
US: +16699006833,,98308629313# or +13462487799,,98308629313#
Or Telephone:
Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):
US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or 888 475 4499 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0276 (Toll Free) or 833 548 0282 (Toll Free) or 877 853 5257 (Toll Free)
Webinar ID: 983 0862 9313
International numbers available: https://zoom.us/u/auLwaRNSu

Alternatively you may submit public comment via email in advance to chair-lupc@venicenc.org and LUPC@venicenc.org

BOARD MEETINGS: The Venice Neighborhood Council holds its regular meetings on the third Tuesday of the month and may also call any additional required special meetings in accordance with its Bylaws and the Brown Act. All are welcome to attend.
TRANSLATION Services: Si requiere servicios de traducción, favor de notificar a la oficina 3 días de trabajo (72 horas)
Venice Neighborhood Council

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

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alix Gucovskv, Chair</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Matthew Royce</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Cassily</td>
<td>7:10 p.m</td>
<td>Chris Zonnas</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Bonefeld</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Shep Stern</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daffodil Tyninski</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Michael Jensen</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos Zubieta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Approval of Minutes

see draft minutes for August 6 2020 at: http://venicenc.org/land-use-committee.php
Shep motion to approve/Alix Seconds Chris, Daff, Michael abstain, 4-3-0

4. Approval of Agenda

Items 9, 10 b,c d, e, and f removed. Tim motion/Matt seconds barry daff, chris,Michael yes, shep alix no 7-0-2

5. LUPC members to declare any conflicts of interest or ex parte communications relating to items on this meeting’s agenda

6. Chair’s Report

7. General Public Comment on non-agendized items related to Land Use and Planning - 15 minutes

8. Dick Platkin – TOC and affordable housing presentation 15 minute

9. Dr. Naomi Nightingale Oakwood Presentation 15 minutes

10. CASES FOR REVIEW
(see project files for more detailed info at http://venicenc.org/land-use-committee.php )
A.

Objective Land Use Standards for Urban Heat Island Effect Reduction/Carbon Reduction/Stormwater Management
Motion submitted by Sarah Wauters

- Whereas, the Mayor Issued the first Sustainable City pLAn in 2015
- Whereas, the City of Los Angeles announced an expanded vision of the plan as L.A.’s Green New Deal in 2019
- Whereas, a 2019 study by Crowther Lab (Switzerland) reports that global tree restoration is the most effective climate change solution to date.
- Whereas, California is the 12th largest emitter of carbon in the world, among all states and nations
- Whereas, the state has enacted a body of legislation [Executive Order S-3-05 (2005), AB32 (2006) and SB32 (2016)] designed to reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and these mandated specific GHG sources for reductions, GHG reductions can also be achieved via non-mandated algorithms.
- Whereas, the California Climate Action Registry has established the Urban Forest Protocol (2008, revised 2019), which permits municipalities to offset carbon dioxide emissions by participating in forestry projects in which tree planting beyond normal replacements is planned and undertaken for the purpose of sequestering carbon dioxide.
- Whereas, the Federal Clean Water Act and the Dept of Water and Power Water Quality Compliance Master Plan (which includes Land Use via Community Plan Updates) mandate stormwater mitigation by municipalities.
- Whereas, trees sequester carbon dioxide directly via photosynthesis
- Whereas, trees reduce carbon emissions indirectly via reduction in energy consumption resulting from their reduction of the Urban Heat Island Effect via shading (per L.A.M.C. 12.42.A)
- Whereas, reforestation (via planting trees in the ground as opposed to in pots) also increases the carbon sequestering ability of soil, which is considered permanent sequestration
- Whereas, trees filter stormwater, thereby reducing the discharge of pollutants into US waters (per L.A.M.C. 12.42.c)
Whereas, a 2017 study by the USC Spatial Sciences institute, reported Urban Green Cover in the County of Los Angeles decreased between 14 and 55% from 2000 to 2009 and in CD11 it has decreased between 19 and 25%, all of which is attributed, in the study, directly to a corresponding increase in hardscape.

Whereas, trees have substantial positive effects on public respiratory health: a 2014 publication, funded in part by the US Forestry's RPA Assessment Staff, in the periodical Environmental Pollution reported that US tree health impacts included the annual avoidance of more than 850 incidences of human mortality and 670,000 incidences of acute respiratory symptoms;

Public comment and possible action:
Motion: To be continued with a new presentation Barry, Tim, Daff, Matt, Chris and Michael all were not favor or below motion felt there needed to be more information and standards although the motion calls for standards to be established.

Whereas, 90% of the Urban Canopy in the City of Los Angeles is on private land Therefore: The Venice Neighborhood Council requests that the Dept Of City Planning, in its update of the Venice Community Plan, in conjunction with Climate Action Reserve, the Dept of Water and Power and local academic institutions, create objective standards for Urban Heat Island Reduction, for Carbon Reduction and Stormwater Mitigation for each zone definition*within the Venice Boundaries. These would parallel those in the Climate Action Reserve’s Urban Forest Management Project Protocol, and would mandate set requirements, per square foot (or acre) of lot, for urban heat island effect reduction carbon reduction and stormwater mitigation through increasing the urban canopy for each project submitted on said lots to be effective after approval of the updated Community Plan. Funding for such a project would be allocated from the City of Los Angeles’ Green New Deal/Sustainable City pLAn and One Water LA 2040 Plan budgets *Current L.A.M.C Sections: 12.04.05 through 12.16 12.17.5 12.18 12.20 12.17.1 12.17.6 12.19

Pursue Historic District for the Oakwood Neighborhood
Motion submitted by: Citizens Preserving Venice and Saving Venice

Whereas a cultural heritage district does not protect the Oakwood neighborhood from destruction of the historic resources or from over development, loss of character and gentrification,

Public Comment and possible action
Motion

Therefore the Venice Neighborhood Council recommends that the proposed cultural heritage district concept should be changed to pursuit of an historic district for Oakwood, which has innumerable historic sites, many of which were not recognized by SurveyLA. Oakwood has asked for years for Historic status and it has been said over and over, at the community meetings that were held throughout Venice--Mark Twain Middle School and the Venice Library--that the
requests from Oakwood would not be overlooked. The community must not be ignored. If these concepts for the Venice Community Plan had been presented to the Oakwood community up front, you would know that we want Historical status, not Cultural Status. L.A. City planning must respect the Oakwood community and all of Venice should stand together on this.

C.

**Implement Community Outreach to Reflect the Diverse Venice Community, Particularly Oakwood**

**Motion submitted by Citizens Preserving Venice and Saving Venice**

- Whereas the residents of Oakwood have been excluded, disenfranchised and betrayed in the past (including for the last 20-year community plan proposal), and
- Whereas the Oakwood neighborhood is shocked to see a recommendation of significantly increased height as this wasn’t mentioned at any of the Community Plan community meetings, all of which Oakwood neighbors attended, and
- Whereas concepts and recommendations must be informed by neighborhood outreach before being presented to the overall community, and
- Whereas the VNC and LUPC historically do not reflect the diversity of Venice
- Whereas the Oakwood community insists on inclusion and direct communication, and that there are checks and balances and accountability built into this plan, which we will live with for the next 20-25 years.
- Whereas the Oakwood community requests and has been requesting that lot consolidations in Oakwood be limited to two as opposed to three, consistent with the rest of Venice. The Community Plan must accommodate this request.

Public Comment and possible action:

**Motion:**

Therefore the Venice Neighborhood Council recommends that as part the Community Plan process, the City must initially and on an ongoing basis meet directly with the Oakwood Community and not just LUPC and VNC or business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce. The City must respect and do proper and positive outreach to all of the neighborhoods that could be impacted, particularly the ones that could be significantly impacted, such as Oakwood.

D.
Evaluate Growth Projections and Status of Infrastructure Before Proposing Concepts
Motion submitted by Citizens Preserving Venice and Saving Venice

- Whereas according to Coastal Commission guidance the update of a Land Use Plan requires updated information on buildout/growth/population and other projections as well as analysis of any public services constraints and limits to the available capacity of public works facilities (e.g. water, sewer, roads and transit systems), along with appropriate documentation, and
- Whereas land use designations and intensities must be commensurate with the level of available infrastructure and if there are current infrastructure constraints it may be necessary to scale back development potential, and
- Whereas per the certified LUP: “Residential land use densities in this LCP have been assigned in the Venice coastal area to reflect the year 2010 Venice population as projected by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Based on circulation and infrastructure limitations, the assigned Land Use Categories result in substantially lower build out densities than current zoning capacity. The development standards also define for each land use designation a density of housing units and lot coverage to maintain the scale and character of existing residential neighborhoods and minimize the impacts of building bulk and mass. New residential development is linked to the availability of public services and infrastructure, and in addition to traffic consideration, environmental and coastal access concerns as required by the Coastal Act,” and
- Whereas any proposals with respect to the LCP require an analysis of consistency with all Coastal Act policies, and
- Whereas when there is an existing certified Land Use Plan an update to that should be more akin to an amendment than a complete new replacement Plan,

Public Comment and possible action:
Motion:

Therefore the Venice Neighborhood Council recommends that any proposed concepts or any changes to the existing certified Land Use Plan should be explained and supported with evidence, and concepts should not be presented until that information is available.

E.

Maintain Character and Scale of the Milwood Walk Streets Historic District
Motion submitted by Citizens Preserving Venice and Saving Venice

- Whereas the historic character of the Venice Milwood Walk Streets Historic District must be preserved and protected from the impacts of height increases, especially as the Milwood walk streets are much more narrow than other Venice walk street areas and increases in height would create a “canyon effect,” which diminishes the open garden experience for visitors and residents,

Public Comment and Possible Action:
Therefore the Venice Neighborhood Council recommends there should not be any increases in height for the Milwood walk streets (photos of the historic area next to the concept that suggests height limits of 1-3 stories).

F.

Protect Density, Affordability, and Character of Multi-Family Neighborhoods
Motion submitted by Citizens Preserving Venice and Saving Venice

• Whereas there is a pervasive issue that we’re experiencing in Venice where decision makers interpret policies to eliminate density and affordability in multifamily neighborhoods, and

• Whereas until recently, the accepted status quo has been to effectively down zone and/or allow projects to strip neighborhoods of existing density, affordable character and sense of community. Venice in particular has been burdened by these unfortunate land use decisions, contributing to de-densification and displacement. The cumulative impact has been measurable and observable over the course of decades, and it must be addressed, and

• Whereas Venice is losing density when projects are approved that demolish multi-family rental units for the purpose of single-family dwellings in multi-family coastal land use designations, and thus its multi-family neighborhood character is shifting to single-family neighborhood character, and

• Whereas small-lot subdivisions disrupt the unique subdivision patterns and layout of Venice, change the character of multi-family neighborhoods to single-family in character, exacerbate the affordability crisis, and cause gentrification of the Venice neighborhoods, and

• Whereas a recent Coastal Staff Report (5-19-1220) states: "...in light of a persisting lack of housing supply across the state (particularly in the Coastal Zone), it has become apparent that replacement of a full housing unit with an ADU/JADU is likely an insufficient approach to preserving housing density in the Coastal Zone." and "...due to their size, ADUs are more easily left vacant or used by the residents of the primary single-family residence, rather than rented out." and "...ADUs do not necessarily provide a meaningful residential unit that is comparable to a unit in a duplex or multi-family structure and, in this case, is not likely to adequately mitigate the impact of removal of a multi-family structure. Thus, the project as proposed with only one residential unit and an ADU is not consistent with Sections 30250 and 30253 of the Coastal Act." and "However, in light of a persistent lack of housing supply across the state and in the coastal zone, it has become apparent that replacement of a full housing unit with an ADU/JADU may not always preserve housing density in the Coastal Zone in a manner consistent with Chapter 3 policies. ADUs/JADUs are important mechanisms to increase the potential number of independent housing units that can be rented out separately from the primary residence. However, ADUs are dependent on the single-family residence to serve as a housing unit and cannot be sold separately from the primary residence. This differs from a duplex, where the units can have separate utility connections and can be sold independently from one another. In addition, it is more difficult to enforce the continuous provision of an ADU as compared to a duplex, and ADUs are more easily left vacant or used by the occupants of the primary residence."
Venice Neighborhood Council
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294 www.VeniceNC.org
Email: Chair-LUPC@VeniceNC.org

Therefore, there is no guarantee that an ADU will be used or rent out as a second unit, especially [when an ADU]...is a small component of a much larger...house, and could easily be used by the homeowner rather than rented.”

Public Comment and Possible Action
Motion

Therefore density and multi-family units must be maintained in the Venice neighborhoods, ADUs must not be considered as a replacement of a full multi-family housing unit, and small-lot subdivisions must not be allowed.

F. Additional discussion on community plain

11. Adjournment

PUBLIC INPUT AT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS: The public is requested to fill out a “Speaker Card” to address the Land Use & Planning Committee on any agenda item before the Land Use & Planning Committee takes action on an item. Comments from the public on agenda items will be heard only when the respective item is being considered. Comments from the public on other matters not appearing on the agenda that are within the Land Use & Planning Committee jurisdiction will be heard during the General Public Comment period. Please note that under the Brown Act, the Land Use & Planning Committee is prevented from acting on a matter that you bring to its attention during the General Public Comment period; however, the issue raised by a member of the public may become the subject of a future Land Use & Planning Committee meeting. Public comment is limited to 1 minute per speaker, unless adjusted by the presiding officer.

POSTING: In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the board members in advance of a meeting may be viewed at Beyond Baroque, 681 Venice Blvd; Venice Public Library, 501 S. Venice Blvd; and at our website by clicking on the following link: www.venicenc.org, or at the scheduled meeting. You can also receive our agendas via email by subscribing to L.A. City’s Early Notification System at www.lacity.org/your-government/government-information/subscribe-meetings-agendas-and-documents/neighborhood. In addition, if you would like a copy of any record related to an item on the agenda, please contact chair-lupc@venicenc.org

RECONSIDERATION AND GRIEVANCE PROCESS: For information on the VNC’s process for board action reconsideration, stakeholder grievance policy, or any other procedural matters related to this Council, please consult the VNC Bylaws. The Bylaws are available at our Board meetings and our website www.venicenc.org.

DISABILITY POLICY: THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT - As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices and other auxiliary aids and/or services, may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request at least 3 business
days (72 hours) prior to the meeting you wish to attend by contacting George Francisco, VP, at (310) 421-8627 or email vp@venicenc.org.

**PUBLIC ACCESS OF RECORDS:** In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5, non-exempt writings that are distributed to a majority or all of the Board in advance of a meeting may be viewed at our website: www.venicenc.org 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 George Francisco, VP, at (310) 421-8627 or email vp@venicenc.org.