LUPC Meeting Minutes

4-16-14

Secretary’s Notes

Absent: Sarah, Mia, Steve

Explained how to see open cases

May 18, 2014—election

His seat is vacated, he’s not running

Then the new Board will select this committee

Case updates

Community meeting for convenience store Lincoln & Rose

Keep gas station and put up convenience store

Have had 1 mtg with architects

Lincoln & Rose

At restaurant,

Robin: reported in the Scopa case, 2905 Washington. The original case was withdrawn and it’s expected that a new CUB will be filed.

Jim: working on several cases:

320 Sunset

There’s been a request on 320 Hampton—requested we schedule a special meeting of LUPC.

Say they’re now prepared.

Want as much of the hearing as possible to be local.

They und LUPC can’t make an official decision on anything, but CCC has told them they will accept the permit pending the VNC approval if they are heard.

Want to get on the VNC calendar.

Need 2 months filing time prior to filing with the Coastal Commission filing.

June 11 CCC meeting is in Manhattan Beach

Is in Ventura in July

So we should try to do a special meeting

Special meeting of LUPC on 30th

Jim asked for 22, 23, or 24

They want prior to the 25th.

Mehrnoosh:

1511 AK

just changing the interior

scheduled them for the 7th

Jim: 600 Mildred

Kim’s Market

Corner of Mildred & Ocean

Jim:

5-7 Dudley

withdrew their request for off site sales

City Zoning Hearing is postponed

9 Dudley is also postponed

Both cases have the same owners

6. Public Comment on a :

24-24th Avenue

Lisa Little

Modest add of 440 sf

Was approved by CP

An adj

ZAA for a passageway

Expect issue with CCC re. lift parking

Org house 1909

Had a Zoning Hearing

John Reed assigned

4100 S. Lincoln Blvd

single story

at intersection of Jefferson

adding 2nd floor 3100 sf

parking req

mechanized parking

assigning Robert to the case as he’s already familiar with cases on Lincoln

case hasn’t been filed yet

can have a community outreach meeting

Carolyn: attended Westside Regional Town Hall

Alan Bell & Bonin agreed perfectly normal to request a moratorium, while they decide how to modify the SLS for Venice

How treated by City Planning

Didn’t get any written notice

Has a problem with the posting of the Coastal Dev Permits

S.B. put at eye level

Ivonne Guzman:

Nice to see the house is full

664 Sunset a SLS LUP approved & the VNC Board denied

Wants to know how it’s possible when denied by the Board, the Planning Department gets an approval letter.

Do we have any mechanism to assure that the letter that is intended to be sent to the City ZA IS in fact sent?\*\*

If there isn’t a policy for that, there should be.

Wants everyone to know it happened.

LUPC is supposed to be the gatekeepers of Venice & we’ve done a bad job.

\*\* LUPC to GET BACK TO IVONNE GUZMAN

Sue:

June meeting Huntington Beach

July meeting Ventura

Jed:

Want the kind of LUPC that used to have

It’s about what Venice wants, regardless of the technical requirements

Have Minutes that are still not posted

Agenda missing from the bulletin board

Stephen G:

Lived in Venice 32 years

Paying taxes as a homeowner for 27 years

Getting 0 representation for their tax dollar

If don’t protect Venice will do a class action

Arna:

Own the duplex at 524 Grand Blvd

Adjacent/west to 530 Grand

Has the permit to redistrict prop into 3 lots & build 3 houses on 4460 sf

There are so many reasons this should not be built

Call for affordable housing

30-35’

no space between

have reciprocal easements

she could appeal (John Reed will help)

Can put a request into the Board.

CASES:

750 California

SLS

Apologized for having to reschedule the cases three times.

Robert A: SLS, 2 units on a 40 x 30 lot

Applicant: Richard Godina

Civil Engineer

Here to answer questions

Have been working with planning staff & Robert for about 13 months

Initial goal was to work with neighbors

2 lots

750—facing CA Ave

752—facing alleyway

In compliance with all ex the side yard req. of 5’

Based on LAMC allowed to go down to 4’

Neighbor Carolyn Rios had asked for a sunlight report and a result of it was to open up a 5’ portion

Both council office and ?? said wanted 5’

Advisory agency wanted 6’ (he took care of it

At 70% lot coverage

Public Comment:

Jenny: concerned about parking situation. Wants to know if meets the requirements.

Ivonne: On Feb voted no more SLS in Venice. Wants us to uphold (nothing with variances)

How fits into Community Character—doesn’t look like Venice, looks like the Jetsons.

Need to stop this, as we’re destroying the historic value of Venice.

Stop exploiting Venice for $$, especially if don’t live here.

Peggy Lee Kennedy:

VZSP

F: to regulate all development, including ht, etc. in order that it be compatible with the existing character.

How does it do these things.

When split lot the homes are allowed to be much larger than a normal lot with a home.

SLS ordinance in direct conflict with the VSP

Should not be approving any more SLS until that is fixed.

Karen: only reason to pass it is that it’s modest as compared to some.

This is way out of character

Doesn’t match mass and scale of the neighborhood.

Carolyn Rios: went around the neighborhood with a tape measure

Even the nasty ones on Brooks have a 5’ side yard

In this block, every house has at least 10 feet between them.

New developments mostly 5’

Kirby:

Question: Is there any consideration about light pollution (reflection of windows)

If build big buildings with Bay windows,

Robert A: the way I look at SLS is:

What would you do if you were building a similar # of units, condos or apts.

What does the SLSO do that changes that?

If were to build a 2-unit condo, one big building, 25-30 feet high.

4’side yards

would be required to have 5 parking spaces

The SLS is not allowing something other than what normal code allows.

Reason he is against is no guest parking

Giving us a 5th substandard parking lots.

When have tandem parking spots, people are more likely to park on the street.

Won’t require the guest spot as the alley isn’t wide enough to back up.

We could talk about mass and scale

The project could be taller.

Someone said it looks like the Jetsons

We aren’t an architectural review board

Board passed a motion calling for a moratorium on SLS in L.A.

Motion came from L.A. Coalition

The advisory committee for the subdivision has already had their meeting.

They’re only holding it open until May 31st.

Jim: the project does comply with ordinances.

Mehrnoosh

SLS has changed

CALL AND ASK HER WHAT SHE SAID.

ROBERT Aronson

Specific Plan requires 3 spaces per unit

If they comply with the specific plan

The LUCP rc that the VNC rec

On the following conditions:

1. VNC (saying as if the Board) supports the A. req, pursuant to section
2. Supports app req for reduction of yards—setbacks are in conformance with the prevailing setbacks in the area. Neighbors are happy.
3. VNC does not support a red in side yards LAMC 12.27xxxxx shall be filed????
4. 4” building separation in lieu of req. 10’, but only at the 1st floor
5. roof deck railings shall be set back 10’
6. no structure on the roof other than access structure. Trees maintained in perpetuity so don’t obstruct

8.

9. If a modification exists all neighbors shall be notified

Motion by Robert

Seconded by Jim Murez

Murez: can’t use 752—call them front and back house

Condition 5. Handrails shall be 10’ from the edge on both sides

Privacy

Condition 6. Is granting them rights the VSP doesn’t allow.

Talks about the need to be 75% transparent. Must maintain 75% transparency on the handrail.

Guardrails (at least 75% transparent)

Shall comply to the guidelines of the Specific Plan

By introducing landscaping on the roof letting them do something they don’t need to do

Robert: applicant originally proposed to put in planters with trees

Condition 9. Suggesting to the general public

Not part of the memorandum of understanding

Mehrnoosh—agree with John on landscape

Robin moved to make an amendment to the Motion to say we support the moratorium but until there is a moratorium on the project this is how we feel about the project

No 2nd

Jim’s amendment

Strike 6. And 9.

No 2nd

Robert’s revision:

Change from 750 and 752

All in favor: John, Jim, Mehrnoosh, Robert

Robin: No

Jake: Abstain

Passed 4-1-1

AdCom was concerned the Motion was not accurate to what we voted on.

ZA agreed to hold the case open until we’re more clear on our position

What decided to do as Chair is to ask the applicant.

Jake personally asked them to have an outreach the applicant to have an outreach meeting 45 seconds ago.

Applicant agreed.

Jake is going to run the meeting the way he wants to run the meeting

His goal is to get opinions voiced

He’ll make the decision.

Applicant has agreed to hold a COM after this.

There will be a COM and then will hear the case after that.

Ivan suggested getting a notice of the meeting out on the VNC site.

60 seconds each

Three meetings:

1. Outreach meeting

2. LUPC Hearing

3. VNC Hearing

Trying to get as much open dialog as possible

If the Applicant is going to speak tonight the public should be able to ask questions.

Note that those in attendance wanted to follow the customary agenda order, which is for the Applicant to first make a presentation and then the Public to comment and ask questions based on their presentation, and then for the Applicant to answer questions/rebut, but the Chair decided to first have the Public Comments and then let the Applicant speak.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

(with questions)

Marilyn:

Immediate neighbor.

Asking for greater transparency.

Concerns about how the development impacts the immediate neighborhood.

 Peggy Lee:

Concerned that this may be some time of Brown Act violation if ???

Concerned about any rezoning from a manufacturing area.

If we do that, change precedent.

Starts to change property values.

Starts to drive people out of the area.

An important issue to maintain the last piece of that type of zoning that we have.

Ivonne G:

Changes of use are dislocating a lot of our artists locally.

Sunset is one of the thoroughfares to Pacific & ain Street.

This is going to cause a huge problem with traffic.

Why has the applicant been allowed to build and build? Why are we even here?

Stop bending over backwards to please all these applicants.

Jenni:

Lives at 845 Brooks.

When Gilina first opened, they used to be kind of cool.

But something happened.

Not sure what it is.

Douche bags driving Maserati's?

Not cool any more, ruining it for everyone.

Roxanne:

300 block

Within 500’

Is a homeowner

Lived her since 1989

Against project.

Jolena has been a bad neighbor.

Got a C from health dept.

Neighbors complain of noise.

Not a safe crowd control policy

Not legal to sit and eat at the gutter.

The 320 Sunset project also appears to have a bad neighbor policy

Need to change their plans.

Ilana:

Seems to be a case of piecemealing

Originally a bakery/retail w/coastal ex.

Now a restaurant w/off-site beer and wine sales.

Now Camaj writes it’s just going to be wine.

Transparency—wish would just be up front with the neighborhood.

CE says the office ofcc was 47 and bakery retail 23.

Saying not going to increase the occupany load

Don’t know how 130 in a restaurant is less.

His #’s don’t add up.

Needs to get his story straight.

Alex:

lives in close proximity

Main concern is parking

Having a restaurant a block away.

30 employees and 90 seats on a patio—will be able to hear it.

WILL be subjected to late night noise.

Brian Reed:

90 people out to 1 a.m.

smells from the bakery, sounds until 1 a.m.

Unless the community is going to be reimbursed…..

Consider us as one of the costs of doing business.

Enhance the area all around him

Or do it right.

Barbara:

Want to say that this is a M-1 zone, manufacturing

The only way to change the zone is to a C-2, which requires that the restaurant be fully enclosed.

They had talked about a retractible roof.

Reason it has to be fully enclosed is to mitigate the noise.

Reason having another outreach meeting is because the applicant misrepresented the project from the beginning.

David Winkler—pass

Arna--(? listen to recording)

Huburt:

300 block of Vernon

Transparency issue is huge.

What have been told and what is actually happening.

Charlotte:

Stop calling this a restaurant, it's a bar!

3 things:

1. Everyone's going to park in the neighborhood.

2. A bakery is fine.

3. There's no parking.

The lot next door can't fit 4 pickups and a dumpster…

Petra Rudisill:

I'm a high schooler and live near Washington and Pacific.

There are safety concerns for the neighborhood with this project

In my neighborhood when I want to go out in the night or even go downstairs to the lower unit there are drunks out on the street.

It's a matter of safety, that's why I choose to oppose the project

Jim Murez, LUPC Staff for case:

Have been listening and taking notes.

We need to follow the basic guidelines that the City uses.

John Reed gave his time to Jim.

Change of use—this case was first heard much earlier this year.

The applicant chose not to come in.

The case went through the city without any public hearing process.

City allowed to change its use to bakery and accessory retail.

When the public process recently came about, he raised his hand and the LUPC passed a motion against the project, and he wrote a letter.

But the LUPC Chair and VNC Board President decided that they could start over and the motion recommending denial of the project did not go forword to the VNC Board.

Yvonne:

Would like to clarify that the Chair of LUPC can make a decision in spite of the Motion to deny the project.

Other Citizens: this was not documented in any AdCom or Board minutes.

Venice NC makes a recommendation to the City

And the idea of a NC is to help create the Public Outreach.

That wasn’t happening prior to the City Zoning hearing.

The VNC President reopened the case, and said no, we’re not going to move forward with a recommendation to deny if they changed their minds and are now willing to go through the NC process. Thus, Linda let the process be reopened.

Is this a Brown Act violation?

If LUPC voted for something, people were here and witnessed the public discussion, Motion and vote.

And then it was later changed non-transparently.

Jim Murez:

The project before us is the Conditional Use alcohol portion.

 I’ve taken note**s tonight**

**I will go back and have another community outreach meeting.**

**If you think there is a pro**blem, what needs to take place is an appeal through Building and Safety.

A retail store is allowed to have a take out restaurant.

???

Mehrnoosh—no comment

Chair:

asked Fran or Stephen if there's anything they want to add before the Community Outreach Meeting.

Fran:

I think Jim tried to explain the process and tried to break it down into its simplest form how to do a project like the one I'm doing. Jim’s report is 15 pages long.

LUPC made it clear that we should have a Community Outreach Meeting at the site.

He agreed to the original Community Outreach Meetings.

Sent out a 100’ mailing

There were at least 30 members of the community at those two Community Outreach Meetings.

In those two meetings, there were at LEAST 30 people--woman who lives behind the building with a baby. They came to my two public hearing meetings, and I verbally looked them in the eye and told them that that was what I was requesting…... I had the two public outreach meetings. In Jim's report, it's very clear that this number of people attended.

It was very clear to those citizens who came that he was applying for a full line of alcohol.

Thinks it’s OK not to mention the off site alcohol sales as it was just the first step of many public hearings going to have.

If he had brought alcohol into the equation at that time, then there would have been public hearings.

[changes of use too?]

(missing some stuff)

"Golly Geez, now he's 75% done with the construction….."

"It's so blatantly obvious that it's a bakery. The place is built to make food and feed people."

I let the community down in their trying to understand the process.

I think one of the members was confused by the vote and said the vote wasn't fair.

Jake interrupts him--the goal here is transparency and communication.

Fran interrupts him--Jim, is that Staff Report you wrote available for people?

Jake interrupts him--my goal is transparency and communication.

Can you give me some acknowledgement that we're trying to make this happen?

Clapping from the audience.

Jake: the goal is to get everybody to work together towards the solution.

Fran: I absolutely would not want to borrow 15' from my….. (??)

Jake: We've got another case to hear.

Next outreach meeting is….

Fran: The public outreach meeting that'll be on site, is Saturday April 26th, where I will be requesting/asking for permission, to have 25 seats inside, 60 seats outside. I'll be happy to give a tour of the place.

It's a public outreach meeting, to talk about the project, and voice concerns and answer questions.

Still think there's a little bit of a disconnect…like where we are in the process, in terms of, wow, are they gonna…and again….

Jake: guys, listen, so Saturday April 26th

Fran: is it, no, it's April 26th, Saturday, 11 a.m. to 1 a/p.m.

Jake: OK, 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Jim: uh, could we just state a starting time of 11 a.m. because otherwise you have to stay there until 1 p.m. even if everybody gets all their questions answered

Jake: 11 a.m. start time, 11 a.m. on Saturday April 26th

Fran: 11 a.m.

Jake: It will not go longer than 1 p.m. If it ends sooner, it ends sooner.

Jim: excuse me Fran, I need to get. Fran, I need to get somebody to send me a letter, that re-announces the new

outreach meeting so it can be properly posted.

Fran: I'm sorry, what's that?

Jim: I need a letter, I think from Steve, are you listening? I need a new outreach letter that reflects the new meeting so I can update the calendar.

Fran:

the biggest misunderstanding, as Jim has explained, if I bring alcohol into the equation there will be hearings required. If someone asks how he can be 75% done with the construction, that's why.

He’s there every day 3 times a day.

Will give a tour to anyone.

80% of it is bakery

Citizen: do they cook chickens in bakeries

(NOT ADEQUATE)

Ilana has one question: would you like a bar 15’ from your home & children?

1212 Electric

Robin presented the basic project

Architects

Jim Murez had to interrupt.

The Applicant rep/architect would like to have her wedding at his house.

Should he recuse himself?

Decides yes

Applicant:

2 lots currently tied by use

Most of the lots on Electric are triangular and that’s why are built up to the lot.

Building less than would do by right on a regular, rectangular lot, as is most of Venice.

Showed the portion of the building mass actually at that 5’

setback.

Really tried to open the project up on the façade.

On the other side of the street is a condo building that’s built up to the edge so trying to

Jenny:

Ivonne:

Kirby Shenklen:

Jake Matthews: live at 1617 AK, come here as interested to see how the community is able to shape what gets built in our NH’s.

Something he would like to see as he’s walking down Electric.

To him this is a good project and fits in well in the Community.

Complement the architects.

Phil: this looks great in terms of the materials and the aesthetics.

Community can really use it.

The triangular shape really flows.

Lived here for last 5 years feel it really makes sense.

There’s a lot of flow and that’s what the NH needs.

Brian O’Connel

Live around the corner.

Asking for a variance for the front setback.

Have properties across the street so this is amplifying the problem. Wouldn’t need to ask for a variation if building smaller units on the property.

Ivan S.—To put this in perspective, look at where the hotel is going to be. The entrance of the hotel and all those cars is nearby—up a couple of blocks.

Kirby: The challenges were there when they bought the property. Don’t think should use as a rationale for what you do.

To change the front yard to 5’, don’t have a front yard, people don’t talk as they walk down the sidewalk.

Motion:

There’s commercial property across the street.

Jakes 5 bullets

Robin moved

Jake seconded

Support the project as presented for the following reasons:

In favor: Robert, Robin, Jake, Mehrnoosh.

John Reed abstained

Jake delayed the Motion process until

They turned the lights out right at 10 p.m.