

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

Roll Call

All LUPC members present

Phil Raider, Stan Muhammad, Brett Miller, Challis Macpherson, Michael King, Sylviane Dugnan, Ann Gagni, Susan Papadakis, Ingrid Mueller

Minutes of December 7, 2005, corrected and approved as corrected.

Brett moved, Phil seconded, unanimous 8-0

Consent calendar: Remove: 3206 North Washington project tabled. Remove The Ambrose Group letter and table.

Announcements: Ingrid Mueller – Sabrina Vensus selected as representative for District 1.

Item #6 212 Third Street, presented by Erick Mathias attorney, Ms Truman, submitted 66 petitions in favor of granting for an Exception to Venice Specific Plan. Argued that when there is a substantial change of grade ( 21') in a project, the VSP doesn't cover hillside construction, and therefore an exception should be granted. Strict application of the VSP would restrict development to only one residence at the front of the lot.

West LA Planning Commission gave project only a five foot exception.

Stakeholders in opposition to project

Michael Jimenez, paid consultant hired by David Wollencroft and Gabriella Garay of 217 4<sup>th</sup> Street, passed out documents in opposition and in support of VSP. David Ewing spoke.

10 minutes Public Comment Yes is for the project, No is against the project

Yes Carla Mathias

Yes Karen Jaffey

Yes Barbara Gibson

No. Gabriela A\_\_\_\_\_

No Susan Papadakis ( speaking as a private citizen and not part of LUPC).

Yes Jim Murez – nothing in the VSP address hillside building. Standard throughout the city for building on a hillside.

Public comment over.

LUPC deliberation

Yes Sylviane Dugnan

?? Michael King, take under advisement

?? Phil Raider, sf existing house, proposed sf. 1300sf versus 2600 sf . This is a moral conundrum

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

Stan Mahommand – Mathias living there 1 ½ years.

- No Susan Papadakis, getting another piece of property  
?? Brett Miller, applicant going to court and will win. Highest use of property under the code.  
No Ann Giagni – support the VSP, support the 5' exception. Not ready to try projects one case at a time.

Various motions made and defeated, finally

Moved by Michael King, seconded by Phil Raider to table our recommendations on this project until hillside construction is addressed in the Venice Specific Plan.

Debate on the motion

Vote 8-0 unanimous.

An addendum to this section of the minutes is the literal transcript of Item #6 presentation, public comment and LUPC debate, motions and vote. It is added to the end of these minutes.

---

Item #8

1101 – 1109 Venice Blvd.

Gilly Rojany presenting for project. \

Didn't know his project would be on the LUPC agenda until today, he requests that the project tabled until next month. His presentation is that he is not ready.

Printed documentation and photographs given LUPC at this time haven't been seen by LUPC previously.

Parliamentarian: All written materials must be given to the entire committee 10 days ahead of the meeting.

Polled the committee, 8 in favor of hearing Maureen Cotter in opposition to this project.

Maureen Cotter in opposition to project – 10 minutes.

Gilly Rojany presenting his position – 10 minutes

Wants to build 19 units, 47 underground parking spaces. Wants us to table this issue until he can talk to his tenants.

Public Comment Yes = for this project, no = against this project

6 AGAINST, 2 FOR

No Martin Ojala

No Suzanne Thompson

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

No Jim Smith  
?? Jim Murez  
Yes Sharleen Decker  
No Ira \_\_\_\_\_  
No John Mitchell  
  
No Gregory \_\_\_\_\_

Gilly Rojany – rebut. Building is under rent control., 2 Section 8, 14 units, 1 single family home. Wants 5 ½’ exception. Wants to go 35’

Motion made by Ann Giagni to table LUPC recommendation for this project until the February 1, 2006 LUPC meeting. Seconded by Michael King, Vote 6 – 0 unanimous

---

RAD/MTA Busyard, 100 Sunset Avenue, Venice  
Presentation by Jerry Neumann for RAD Jefferson, owner Robert D’Alia

167 Market Rate units  
17 Very low affordable units  
17 workforce units  
75 BIZ parking spaces  
34 additional parking spaces for residents  
14 – 17 angle parking on Sunset  
\$8 million to city from Rbert D’Alia

PUBLIC COMMENT

1 ½ minutes allowed each person

OPINION Stakeholder’s Name

No Jim Smith  
No Naomi Glaberman  
No Steve Freedman  
No Gail Rogers  
No Ira  
No Marta Evry  
No David Ewing  
No Erick Marsh  
No Lauri Silagi

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

No Jim Murez  
No Curtis  
No Carmel Beaumont  
No Seezzar  
No Lauri  
No Rick Gunderson  
No Helen Sheer

Reason stated from most stakeholders was that it deviated from the Venice Specific Plan and that was not to be tolerated.

Yes Jack Hoffman  
Yes David Buchanan

Public Comment section closed

Rebut from Jerry Neumann

RAD has already reduced the height. Wanted 35 feet. Tried very hard to reach a balance. Loading zone will not interface with buses.

LUPC debate:

Phil Raider to Jerry Neumann, "what are the time limits for this project?"

Jerry Neumann, "June, 2007 delivery of the new MTA bus yard at Jefferson site. April 1, 2006 start date of construction."

Comments from Michael King, Sylviane Dugnan, Ann Giagni, Susan Papadakis.

Motion made by Phil Raider, seconded by Ingrid Mueller that LUPC recommend that GRVNC not approve this project as presented. Unanimous 8-0-0

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Items not on the agenda

Lauri Silagi – opposed to public comments at the end of the agenda

Emily Winters – Venice Arts Council, bring Venice together

David Ewing – VCC and Lincoln Place events

Jim Smith – MLK Rally 1-16-06

Suzanne Thompson – public comment at end of agenda

And city auction, grand & Venice, moratorium

David Buchanan – by laws and their importance

Ann Giagni – moratorium on February 1<sup>st</sup> agenda

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

---

ADDENDUM OF TRANSCRIPTION OF PRESENTATION, PUBLIC COMMENT,  
LUPC DEBATE, MOTIONS AND VOTE

*Chairwoman:* Number six item is 212 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.  
*Phil:* So, did we approve the consent calendar?  
*Chairwoman:* Yes, we did.  
*Phil:* All right.  
*Chairwoman:* 212 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, who is the presenter?  
*Kathleen:* Do you want me to talk into the mic? I feel like I'm talking to the screen.  
*Chairwoman:* You can turn it around.  
*Phil:* Well, you can hold the microphone if you'd like to.  
*Chairwoman:* Hold the microphone and do what you want.  
*Phil:* Just take it out of that holder.  
*Brent Miller:* Move around.  
*Kathleen:* So, it's fine to go first \_\_\_\_\_.  
*Brent Miller:* Dance around thing.  
*Kathleen:* That's right, **kind of around that chair**. Good evening.  
*Chairwoman:* Turn it. Push it up.  
*Kathleen:* Okay. Good evening honorable committee members and **taffity** crew men. I represent Eric Mathis of 212 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Venice. Unfortunately, Mr. Mathis just got notice of this today so he is en route back from Washington D.C. and will not arrive until later this evening. So, I'm going to try and persevere without him although he has a lot more knowledge than I do given that he lives there. I brought over 65 petitions in support of our exception. We are asking for an exception to the height requirement in the Venice Coastal Specific Plan. It's very limited in that it's not like we were building a 50 foot building. We are building a 30 foot building, but it's on the only hill in Venice and unfortunately when they were doing the Venice Specific Plan they just didn't think about it, at least that's what we're hearing from the Planning Department. So, it's a little frustrating. So, if there's ever a case for an exception it's this project. So, I'm not sure who I should give the petitions to. Shelly, should I -  
*Phil:* This is our chair.  
*Chairwoman:* Just give it to us. How many -  
*Kathleen:* There are 65 petitions signed \_\_\_\_\_.  
*Chairwoman:* 65 signed petitions.  
*Ms. Garella:* 66.  
*Kathleen:* 66. I said over 65. I suppose \_\_\_\_\_.  
*Phil:* Favor or for against?

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Kathleen:* They're in favor of granting the exception to this Specific Plan.  
*Phil:* Thank you for your clarification.  
*Kathleen:* Okay. Under the Specific Plan height is measured from the center line of the street, however there is no provision in the Specific Plan to address building height where there is a substantial change in grade over a very short distance. As you can see in the packet I gave you I did submit a letter to the committee members. It is on the only hill in Venice and there is a significant grade change, 21 foot grade change from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to the buildable pad on the lot. So, even though there's this grade change between 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and the buildable lot the height on the proposed second home will be calculated as 50 feet under the Specific Plan because what you do is you project out from the mid point of the building down to the center of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street even though there's a significant grade differential.

We've spoken with Planning, folks in Planning say, Bob Scott said, they just didn't think about it; it just was kind of an oversight. Unfortunately that means that we need to go and get an exception. I don't think the Specific Plan is bad. I think it was very well done. I think they just forgot about this one hill. The home, actually, would be only 30 feet in height when you measure it from adjacent grade. It would be barely seen from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street as you can tell from attachment one in my letter because it's on such a steep slope and it's going to be built at the rear of the property. The strict application of the Specific Plan would restrict development on this site to just one single story home. There's a currently existing home in front. This is all part of, as Mrs. Mathis will explain, Eric's mom, it's all part of the Mathis Family Plan. Eric is living with his parents right now in a two bedroom, one bath place and as all of us who've ever lived with our parents can attest that's probably getting a little cramped. But, unfortunately, the West L.A. Area Planning Commission did give us an exception but they only gave us a five foot extension so that still limits it to a one level home. What will happen is as you can tell from, I believe it's attachment two, there's currently a wonderful courtyard between the existing garage in the front home. In order to build and achieve any kind of square footage so that you could live in between with your parents, I suppose, they would have to go into that courtyard and their beautiful mature fruit trees. It would really be a shame.

The strict application is inconsistent with the surrounding two and three story buildings and with the intent of the Specific Plan to regulate development so that it will be compatible and in character with the surrounding community. As I explained, to get any of the living space they need and indeed that living space that almost

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

every other family in Venice can get without even needing an exception to the Specific Plan, the Mathis family would have to extend into the courtyard. The exception, there is a precedent for this exception, as I'm sure a lot of you will remember when you were expanding the St. Joseph Center, which Grassroots Venice neighborhood council supported. In June 2004, the city recognized the unique topographical character of the lots on this hill and created - and recognized that that created an exceptional circumstance. So, they granted the height exception.

*Chairwoman:* \_\_\_\_\_, your five minutes are up.

*Kathleen:* Okay. I will stop then. Should Mrs. Mathis go now or do you want her to cede with those in support.

*Chairwoman:* Well, I believe that the next five minutes are for the people that the **stake** are in opposition to this project and then there'll be a 10 minute public comment.

*Kathleen:* Terrific. Okay. Then, she will speak during that time. Thank you.

*Chairwoman:* We can thank you in public comment.

*Kathleen:* Thank you for your consideration.

*Chairwoman:* Name, address and vitals.

*Mr. Jimenez:* My name is Michael Jimenez, 904 16<sup>th</sup> Street in Santa Monica. I'm representing David Wolstencroft and Gabriella Garay **appoint** opposition to this here.

*Chairwoman:* Your name is David Jimenez?

*Mr. Jimenez:* No, Michael.

*Chairwoman:* Michael.

*Mr. Jimenez:* And we have a little handout that we'd like to give to you as well. Thanks for the opportunity for us to discuss this project. Obviously, we're in opposition to the appeal. When this project was originally proposed as a 21 **full time** exception and after the West L.A. Planning Commission opposed the - disapproved that request and instead offered a five foot exception we believe that that was a compromise that we could support however, obviously, now they have appealed that and so we wanted to express to this committee and to the **field** council our opposition to that appeal. I do tend to take a different view than Kathleen about what the plan intended to do and what the purpose of the height restriction is. The Plan very specifically in section nine, **in this section to discuss is coming** talked about various \_\_\_\_\_ accommodations in three or four subareas of the various Coastal Specific Plan. In this area as in all of the other lots they intended their slope to measured from the center line of the street. That was both present in the original version of the Coastal Plan that was adopted in 1999 as well as the currently operative version that became operative in the year 2004.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

When you look at a Specific Plan exception it's supposed to be an unusual circumstance that will not lead to other opportunities, precedents being set to allow the neighborhood to grow outside of your character of those existing dimensions. This Specific Plan exception of 21 feet would critically alter the composition of this neighborhood. So, that is why - it's not just without this particular application. This is about opening the door that is in affect an amendment to the Plan. Obviously, it's not an amendment, but it has the practical effect of being an amendment to the plan.

As my clients stated, we're not opposed to the current five foot exception. A second single family dwelling can be built on this lot with the granting of that five foot exception. Because the existing house is 32 feet above the center line of the street, this would allow three feet above that, which inarguably still of an in detrimental nature, but again, in the spirit of compromise we think that's an acceptable conclusion. So, what I wanted to do was just want to give a little bit more of the time to David and Gabriella to actually \_\_\_\_\_ keep with that \_\_\_\_\_ specific opposition.

*Chairwoman:* How much more time do they have? Hop to.

*Phil:* How much?

*Chairwoman:* Two minutes.

*Phil:* Two minutes?

*Mr. Wolstencroft:* Very good **swing**. I will speak fast. My name's David Wolstencroft who live at 217 4th Ave.

*Phil:* Well, here.

*Mr. Wolstencroft:* - number A. I just distribute to \_\_\_\_\_. Okay, basically, the opposition is really a, as Michael said, it's in the likes of this whole process to which we're planning a hearing with John Foreman, the hearing officer made a recommendation the WLAAPC voted unanimously in support of the Planning Department Report. Bill Rosendhal's always turned up and went on record to support the report. There really is - by appealing it \_\_\_\_\_ I just feel that's sort of going against the spirit of the whole process that's been going on. To be honest, the reason when we and the WLAAP Commission - the Commission rather -

*Chairwoman:* One minute, David.

*Mr. Wolstencroft:* We felt actually the compromise was very generous of them and we still stand by that. Granting the appeal on the 20<sup>th</sup> of January would allow property owners of lots in the **airport** neighborhood to develop similar buildings in excess of \_\_\_\_\_ Specific Plan height and over time it's like we were having this will have the same affect as an amendment to the Plan. We have had an amendment to the Plan based on a specific change in the way things are done. So, I'm kind of worried about that now because we've been trying



UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

- to squeeze a Swiss cheese through a mouse hole. It's very difficult. Just please support the Venice Specific Plan, support the intent of it to restrict height, to keep scale back, save the neighborhood and don't let it - this tidal wave of development which this specific height exception could create. Thank you.
- Chairwoman:* Thank you David. We'll now open it up to public comment. Ingrid, you have some public card - the speaker cards for item six. How many are there?
- Ingrid:* There are one, two, three, four against the project and another one, two, three for the project.
- Chairwoman:* So, we've got eight speakers into 10 minutes. So, you've got one minute. First speaker please. Ingrid?
- Ingrid:* It would be Carla Mathis, please. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Chairwoman:* You okay there?
- Mrs. Mathis:* I'm fine, thank you. I'm the mother in this project and we were -
- Chairwoman:* Carla?
- Mrs. Mathis:* -asked to come down to you.
- Chairwoman:* Carla?
- Mrs. Mathis:* We were asked to come down so we could build our family complex and it's just a two story building on top of a garage. It's not a skyscraper and there are three story buildings right next to us. In fact, David's house is a three story building and he's not even in back of us. He's to the side. So, I do not understand why we cannot build from the ground where we are. We could build a bunker in our courtyard. Where is that for our children to play? That doesn't seem to be what Venice wants. We want a family and we want a community. So, I just don't understand. Every other city has planned for height from a hill. I just don't understand.
- Chairwoman:* Next.
- Ingrid:* Karen Jaffey?
- Chairwoman:* Okay. What? Ingrid, would you please read them - four in a line off so we can line up?
- Ms. Jaffey:* My name is Karen Jaffy -
- Chairwoman:* Hold on a second, please, Karen.
- Ingrid:* After Karen Jaffy, Kathleen Truman -
- Kathleen:* That's me.
- Ingrid:* Oh, that was you. I'm sorry. Barbara Gibson.
- Chairwoman:* Thank you. Go ahead.
- Ms. Jaffey:* My name is Karen Jaffy. I live - I'm the next door neighbor to Eric Mathis and his family and I support his plan to build a residence for himself and his wife at 212 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue. Several of the home owners on the Oakland Road have made additions to their property and I believe the Mathis family should have the same right to do what others have already done. Mr. Mathis isn't asking for special consideration. He simply wants to be given the same consideration as others who live on 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Streets. I feel

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

it is extremely unfair that several people have been able to make additions to their homes while some of these people are trying to deny their neighbors the right to do the same. I don't feel some people should be given privileges that are denied to others. I hope the Mathis family will be given the exception to the Specific Plan. Also, as Carla mentioned, the opposition, David, and I don't know his last name who lives at 217 4<sup>th</sup> Street in a Condo, which I was just in and it has a garage and three stories, but he won't -

*Chairwoman:*

Your time is up.

*Ms. Jaffey:*

Carla's fields were just two stories.

*Chairwoman:*

Thank you.

*Ms. Gibson:*

My name is Barbara Gibson. I'm part of the Rose Avenue Working Group, but I'm speaking for myself. I own - my husband and I own a home on Rose Avenue at the alley and as the person who was bringing this up against them, he said this will set a precedent. Well, the precedent was set when you approved St. Joseph's Center at 47 feet high on a hill on Hampton, which is the street just in front of this project. That was for poor people. Well, you know what? These people are a husband and a wife and a mother and father. They're poor people also. They want - they are zoned to have units. They want to have what the city is calling for. We need housing. We need housing desperately. They want to provide housing. So, I am asking you to please support this. It's zoned for the multiple units, it's - the houses beside it are high just like this and the opposition has a place higher than what the Mathis want to build. Thank you.

*Mr. Wolstencroft:*

Built in 1990.

*Ms. Gibson:*

Well, it doesn't matter. It's there.

*Ms. Garay:*

It does matter.

*Chairwoman:*

Thank you. Next it - Ingrid, will you read the next three please?

*Ingrid:*

Gabriella - sorry - Altricia Tricia, Jerry Jaffey - oh, sorry - and Susan. Sorry, I'll state on the record now instead out on the microphone. Can you hear me?

*Chairwoman:*

Keep going. You've got two minutes.

*Ingrid:*

Yes, first of all, I'd like to ask you to double check the petition because so much has been misstated so far that I don't know what these people signed and I hope you guys double check that. Second of all, our building that they keep pointing at was part of the reason the Venice Specific Plan came into effect. We didn't build it, but we do want to preserve the Venice Specific Plan. If we could afford a house we would've bought a house, but we can't. Third of all, the council office has approved the - the council office has approved the recommendation made, which was the five foot exception and a five foot exception is one thing, but a

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

- 21 foot exception to the Venice Specific Plan? Lastly, the St. Joseph's Center is, yes, for poor people, but I'd like to know if they actually want to build a family compound or if they want to build condos, which is what they have stated to us previously.
- Chairwoman:* Thank you. Tricia? Tricia? Jerry? Susan? Susan Papadakas is the area representative for this area and lives in the area. As such, she's being excused from the committee to testify as a private citizen.
- Ms. Papadakis:* I'm Susan Papadakas. I live right here on the top. That's the whole reason I've gotten involved in the Venice neighborhood council. This project is going to ruin 2/3 of my view. My husband and I are renters. We're on the top. If it's going to ruin that much of my view, you can imagine it's going to completely ruin the entire quality of life for the person that lives below me. We don't have any other front door. This is the front of our property and we face towards the ocean. Just like the way the building was designed. There are other units that are on 4<sup>th</sup> Street. I'm at the back of it so I face over the alley. I've been very involved. I've been to every meeting and I was willing to compromise. I drew up drawings, I showed how the project was going to affect me and my husband and the Mathis' are getting a five foot exception, which is going to allow them to build up into the bottom of a big below me unit, the unit below so that her view and her quality of life, the air, the sunlight, the breezes, everything is preserved for her unit. The city directed the Mathis' to re-design their project and they haven't done that.
- Chairwoman:* Thank you Susan. Ingrid, are there any other speakers cards? The public comment section is -
- Phil:* Here give me the rest.
- Chairwoman:* Hustle.
- Phil:* Give me the rest.
- Chairwoman:* Is it?
- Ingrid:* Yeah, it's \_\_\_\_\_.
- Chairwoman:* Okay, Jim. Hurry up. You've got two minutes.
- Phil:* Now you've only got -
- Chairwoman:* One and ¾.
- Phil:* You've only got 40 seconds left.
- Brent Miller:* One minute.
- Chairwoman:* 40 seconds.
- Jim:* Okay, so I just reread the Specific Plan. I helped write this section of the Specific Plan -
- Chairwoman:* I - come on. Shove this thing in your mouth.
- Ingrid:* Give him the mic.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Jim:* I helped write the Specific Plan for this section of community at the time it was being written. There's nothing in here whatsoever that addresses hillside housing. I didn't think there was, but somebody said earlier that there was.

*Chairwoman:* You're going to have to -

*Jim:* There is a standard -

*Chairwoman:* - turn it on and talk into it.

*Jim:* It's on.

*Phil:* It's on.

*Jim:* There is a standard throughout the city for building on hillsides. I don't know what the correct height is but I know the plan to cause people to build to a flat level standard is not right and I think that before this committee decides on this they ought to look at what the rest of the city's code is for building on hillsides and how that code would apply because there is definitely - Michael knows this - there's definitely a formula for rules for how you measure height when it's on a hillside. This doesn't address that and I think it would only be fair for the committee of you guys - just like last month we talked about rooftop housing or rooftop whatever, structures, this plan needs to be redesigned to address hillside housing. I don't know what the right number is -

*Chairwoman:* Jim.

*Jim:* But I know it needs to be addressed.

*Chairwoman:* Two minutes up.

*Jim:* That was two minutes?

*Chairwoman:* That was two minutes.

*Phil:* One minute.

*Brent Miller:* One minute.

*Jim:* Thank you.

*Chairwoman:* Public comment is now closed for item six and we are opening it up to the Land Use Planning Committee. **Saleen.**

*Saleen:* I feel very sensitive to your situation that you want to live together and everything. There is the issue of your blocking peoples' view. I don't know if you looked into an apartment which as Jim said, which is also is that we should look into it. The first thought that I have is that have you looked into digging into the ground and I tell you this because I **work in \_\_\_\_\_ yours** with some developers who did that and they managed to circumvent the code, the local code that had to do with preventing peoples' view by going down and doing very, very nice and very open if they had like a well \_\_\_\_\_ in the middle. So, it was a matter of design and that would allow you to have people keep their view there. There and you would have your building site where you could keep your **man** and then have a terrace on top of your building that way. So, that might be something you want to look into also.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Mrs. Mathis:* \_\_\_\_\_ prohibits you -  
*Chairwoman:* Remember, there's no answers from -  
*Phil:* **May.**  
*Chairwoman:* Oh, we only have 10 minutes for this - okay, Michael.  
*Michael:* I'll give you a little background. Any place else in the city \_\_\_\_\_ is only way. The issue is there's an ordinance of the city, which allows you a 36 foot **plane** five feet outside the perimeter of the building there adjacent to the build. So, the 30 feet that they're really going after is the thus the difference we could go after. But I think if they actually did get the **court fans** \_\_\_\_\_ time with this they're going to get to join the ranks of their property the same way that the rest of this \_\_\_\_\_ people of City of Los Angeles hillside areas to enjoy their property rights. But, the fundamental issue is to - how do we handle - take this on as an exception right now and approving it and whether that's enough and whether we're actually going it to take it under advisement and do the research and how to fix the Specific Plan for hillside areas. That's probably the most direct method. I vote we need to make a decision on this tonight.  
*Chairwoman:* Mike, would you make a motion that we could debate directly to?  
*Phil:* I have some questions about the project.  
*Chairwoman:* Okay. Thank you.  
*Phil:* So, the existing - nowhere, it's nowhere in my paperwork that I can - unless it's in your lengthy letter that I couldn't read. How many square feet is the existing home? How many square feet is the proposed addition? I'd also like to point out a few things that in your presentation you said this is the only hill in Venice. That's not the case. There are three hills in Venice. There's the hill on Hampton, there's the road on 2<sup>nd</sup>. I mean the hill on 3<sup>rd</sup> and the hill on 4<sup>th</sup>. So, it's not the only hill in Venice. And you made - \_\_\_\_\_, it's the same hill.  
*Mr. Wolstencroft:* \_\_\_\_\_, it's the same hill.  
*Ms. Garay:* Same hill.  
*Chairwoman:* No interaction.  
*Brent Miller:* And you're probably the only person in the room who thinks that the Venice Specific Plan is a good thing. I would also just echo that because I was also sitting at the table when the plan was written that it's another example of the City of Los Angeles, the failure of the Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles to adequately advise residents and people **both** in the planning process. Had the planning people not dropped the ball this area probably would have been included in the citywide hillside ordinance. So, that - the problem with the Specific Plan in this instance is specifically the failure of the Planning Department, but I'd really like to know the square footage. \_\_\_\_\_ square footage. \_\_\_\_\_.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Chairwoman:* Briefly.

*Mrs. Mathis:* We have 1300 square feet that the four of us are living in at the moment.

*Chairwoman:* That's it? Okay.

*Mrs. Mathis:* Right now.

*Brent Miller:* Add the proposed -

*Phil:* How many square feet is the proposed -

*Chairwoman:* And the proposed square footage is -

*Kathleen:* It's about that. It's double that.

*Phil:* 2600?

*Kathleen:* Right.

*Chairwoman:* Are there anymore -

*Mr. Mohammed:* I have a question.

*Phil:* No -

*Mrs. Mathis:* No, no, no. How much more -

*Kathleen:* \_\_\_\_\_ ivy.

*Mrs. Mathis:* Like it's under 2000 feet. It's a two story small, like -

*Chairwoman:* Mr. Mohammed, you have a question?

*Mr. Mohammed:* Yeah. What I wanted to ask you is how long have you been living in that area in \_\_\_\_\_.

*Mrs. Mathis:* Our son has been living in this area -

*Mr. Mohammed:* No, how long have you been living?

*Mrs. Mathis:* A year and a half or since - yes, since June a year ago.

*Chairwoman:* If there are any other questions I'd like to ask for a motion. The Chair will entertain a motion on this. Mr. King? It's a bear, but somebody has to do it.

*Phil:* It's a moral **commitment** -

*Stan:* \_\_\_\_\_ moral commitment \_\_\_\_\_.

*Phil:* Yeah. Could we have a little more discussion and maybe we might be able to fashion a motion?

*Chairwoman:* **View**, is it the play here that the committee that we take 10 more minutes for discussion?

*Brent Miller:* Yes.

*Stan:* Yes.

*Chairwoman:* Okay, **fire a light up**. We have **pop yokies**. 10 more minutes and -

*Phil:* I'm going to be very brief. In the letter here it says the Venice Specific Plan is at stake. Well, the Venice Specific Plan is being burned at the stake. The problem is that exceptions have already been granted for much larger projects. The - and I've been in the alley, I've been around the side. I know that people live two doors up. The area is surrounded by a lot of other pretty massive structures that could not be built today. What my problem at even drafting a motion is that my desire to see peoples' quality of life protected, to see the Venice Specific Plan protected, but then I also have to understand that when you make one exception for one

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

group how do you then say, “No, you qualify; you don’t.” What is - how do we judge what the **merit of values**?

*Chairwoman:*

Charlie?

*Saleen:*

I’m ready to reiterate the matter of the view, other peoples’ view particularly within the hills. You have to - you live in a community, you’re going to have to kind of protect each other’s situation. So, you want to have \_\_\_\_\_ to if you want to have a duplex, fine, but make sure you want to find a designer who’s good enough to create this duplex for you so it doesn’t bother the neighbors. So, whether it’s in the Specific Plan or not I know that we can’t **re-hurt** better hills, for example, in the hill. There’s no way you can build if you’re going to take away the view of other people. So, you would have to - that’s how these developers can help with digging in the ground and if you - you could do some great stuff with that and ultimately we don’t have - \_\_\_\_\_ you don’t have the water to deal with.

*Chairwoman:*

Susan?

*Ms. Papadakis:*

Well, I wanted to say that there are other properties for sale on top of the hill that are available now and I don’t understand why the Mathis’ don’t just move a few hundred feet. They would be moving closer to me. I’m not saying get out of the neighborhood. I’m not saying don’t do what you’re doing. I’m saying doing it on a lot that allows you do be able to do it. There’s one for sale now and it’s available and I really think you should consider it and I really feel that you’re misled by some people and that’s not everyone else’s in the neighborhood’s problem really and fault that you maybe misled by a realtor or maybe misled by someone in the city that didn’t have authority to give you the advice that Eric says that he received.

For you to just ignore everyone else’s in the neighborhood’s needs is very disturbing to me and John Foreman said you need to work with your neighbors. You need to redesign this and go back to your neighbors. John Foreman even said he was going to make it as easy as possible so that you didn’t have to go back to the Planning Commission. You could do it through the permitting process and not have to go through the series of meetings. He made it very, very easy for you to compromise and work with your neighbors and really expedite the process of redesigning your project. I think you’re very insensitive to your neighbors.

*Chairwoman:*

Okay. Brent Miller and then Ann **Dagee**.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

- Brent Miller:* Michael, I think you have right idea. They're going to go to court and they're going to win. Nothing personal to anybody complaining about losing their view, but it is their property. They're entitled to build according to code.
- Ms. Papadakis:* It's not just about the view.
- Brent Miller:* Well, that. I've heard the view brought up several times. What I'm saying is they're entitled to the highest use of the property under the code and I think to punish them for what reason? They're going to go to court and they're going to win. So, I think we ought to -
- Chairwoman:* Ingrid.
- Brent Miller:* I think that we ought to do some more research, let them do some research and see what the code is because I have a very distinct feeling that it's not going to be measured from the center line of the street.
- Ms. Garay:* It is and it's -
- Brent Miller:* Well, show me some documentation and we'll see.
- Chairwoman:* No interaction. No interaction.
- Brent Miller:* I think Michael -
- Chairwoman:* Next on is Ann.
- Brent Miller:* I think that we should table it and I think \_\_\_\_\_ it's going to happen here because -
- Chairwoman:* And then Phil.
- Brent Miller:* - you know as well as I do.
- Ann:* I'm not -
- Mr. Wolstencroft:* You will see.
- Ann:* I'm not willing to amend -
- Chairwoman:* You want to make a motion?
- Ann:* - the Specific Plan \_\_\_\_\_.
- Chairwoman:* Make a motion to approve.
- Phil:* You know I can't hear her for all of your noise. I'm sorry.
- Brent Miller:* I'll make a motion \_\_\_\_\_.
- Ann:* I'm not willing to amend the Specific Plan one project at a time. I don't think that's the role that we play. I think our responsibility is to the Venice Community, learn those responsibilities and -
- [Applause]*
- Ann:* - that brought us to the Venice Specific Plan. So, I'm not willing to do it one project at a time. I don't have a problem tabling this and having some more research done. I do think the city has spoken and the city has said a five foot compromise is reasonable. So, I'm not sure that would've come up if it was totally \_\_\_\_\_ in court because the Planning Department goes through the attorney's office and they fight these battles all the time. I'm not willing to support a project \_\_\_\_\_.
- Chairwoman:* Phil?



UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

- Phil:* Yeah. After not hearing anybody willing on the committee willing to step up and say, "I move that we approve this or disapprove this or we need to take a position," I'm just going to move that we table this and let them \_\_\_\_\_ in court. We think the **Land Use** and Planning Committee is not necessarily charged with taking a position on every item. I don't want to sit here and provide fodder for someone's cannon. If nobody on this committee is willing to step up and make a specific motion I would move that we table it.
- Brent Miller:* I'll step up and make a motion. I'll make a motion to approve it.
- Chairwoman:* That's a - wait a minute.
- Phil:* Do we have another motion on -
- Jim:* \_\_\_\_\_ are we making a \_\_\_\_\_?
- Chairwoman:* Parliamentary.
- Stan:* Listen, if that's what you want to do Phil then - if nobody makes a motion it will just go away from here. I'm saying -
- Phil:* Well, no. I think that -
- Stan:* If you move - wait a minute. If you move to table then you have to bring it up again at some point.
- Phil:* At some point. Right.
- Stan:* Well, either way you have to decide now when you're going to do that. So, that's up to you -
- Phil:* Well, I'm - I would move then - I'll amend my motion to make it - I move that we table this issue for six months.
- Brent Miller:* Six months?
- Chairwoman:* Is there a second?
- Michael:* I'll second it.
- Chairwoman:* Michael.
- Stan:* It's not the end. We just didn't approve it.
- Chairwoman:* If there is no more discussion I would like to \_\_\_\_\_ a question.
- Stan:* No, but they can't go to someone and say they have our approval.
- Chairwoman:* All in favor of the motion as stated that we table this for six months? One, two, three.
- Stan:* All right.
- Chairwoman:* All against? One, two - what are you Stan?
- Brent Miller:* \_\_\_\_\_ Stan, it's too long. It's too long.
- Stan:* So, then offer a friendly amendment.
- Chairwoman:* Okay, so it's two to - okay, folks it's two to two with abstentions.
- Stan:* Did you ask for abstentions?
- Chairwoman:* How many abstentions? Two? So, we've got two, two and one. How many abstentions?
- Stan:* One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. You have seven people. Do you have seven votes?
- Chairwoman:* No, we have -
- Phil:* We have eight votes. She votes.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Chairwoman:* I can vote. Yeah.  
*Councilman:* She votes like she's the tie breaker.  
*Phil:* No, she votes.  
*Chairwoman:* I can vote.  
*Phil:* She votes.  
*Chairwoman:* I'm not the president. I'm just the Chair.  
*Phil:* It's not only the president with only \_\_\_\_\_ -  
*Chairwoman:* I would like to - I want to see this vote again. All in favor please raise your hands. Michael, Phil, Me. All against? Where's the other one?  
*Phil:* So, then Ann's abstaining?  
*Ann:* Abstaining.  
*Chairwoman:* So, it got three, two, one.  
*Phil:* So, the outcome of that is it's tabled indefinitely.  
*Chairwoman:* No, it passed.  
*Kathleen:* The negatives were grievous, three -  
*Chairwoman:* Wait a minute. Three said, "Yes, let's table it for six months." Two said no.  
*Stan:* Three said no. Three said no. Three said no.  
*Chairwoman:* I call **bre ayse**. Let's do this one more time.  
*Stan:* Put your hand way up.  
*Chairwoman:* Everybody in favor of the motion to table this for six months raise their hand. Michael? Phil.  
*Stan:* And **chow**.  
*Chairwoman:* And me. All against the motion to table it for six months? Stan and Ingrid. All ready got him. We've got it. Abstentions? One.  
*Brent Miller:* Oh, two abstentions.  
*Chairwoman:* Three and one -  
*[End of Side A; Begin Side B]*  
*Chairwoman:* - very simple. I make a motion to deny the project.  
*Stan:* See? Step right up.  
*Chairwoman:* Is there a second to that motion?  
*Ann:* Yeah.  
*Chairwoman:* Who made the second? Ann?  
*[Applause]*  
*Chairwoman:* All right. I call for a vote. Who is in favor of denying the project? Hands up please. Ingrid, Ann. Who is in favor or - who is against this motion to deny the project? Brent, Mike, \_\_\_\_\_. Who is abstaining?  
*Phil:* I'm abstaining.  
*Chairwoman:* Okay.  
*Phil:* You've got to do something.  
*Brent Miller:* Because wait a minute, we **got to give him** all the votes.  
*Phil:* You don't think? A no balls vote, that's -

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Chairwoman:* Stan, what are you doing?  
*Phil:* I think that's **ambiguous**. How can you deny somebody to -  
*Chairwoman:* Are you for or against it? Are you abstaining?  
*Stan:* Abstain.  
*Chairwoman:* Stan's abstaining. That's six and -  
*Ann:* It's denied. Anyway, let's just move to the next motion.  
*Brent Miller:* Next motion. Mike.  
*Chairwoman:* It's denied.  
*Brent Miller:* Mike - Mike's making a \_\_\_\_\_.  
*Chairwoman:* Okay, I need a motion. Mr. King, do you have a motion?  
Audience, could you shush?  
*Michael:* I guess the issue here is the Specific Plan needs to be fixed. I'd actually like to tie it to something specific which says could we make a motion to continue this vote; the Specific Plan addresses hillside construction.  
*Stan:* A better motion - well, we already have a motion that's been **carried**, right?  
*Brent Miller:* No.  
*Chairwoman:* No.  
*Stan:* It didn't carry?  
*Brent Miller:* No.  
*Chairwoman:* Everything's been denied so far. If I had a motion why would I be doing this? The motion has been made that we table this project - recommendations on this project until hillside construction in Venice has been addressed by the Venice Specific Plan. Is there a second?  
*Phil:* I'll second that.  
*Brent Miller:* I'll second it.  
*Chairwoman:* Phil.  
*Phil:* That will be years. That'll be years.  
*Chairwoman:* Anybody want to speak to this?  
*Ann:* Yes, I do.  
*Chairwoman:* Ann, please.  
*Ann:* I just want to say that this is something I can support because it gives a public process for **engineer decreeing** and the public process that we're not making ad hoc individual project by project by moving to support this motion.  
*Councilman:* They know you support it though. Understood \_\_\_\_\_.  
*Phil:* Call for the vote. **Everybody on it**.  
*Chairwoman:* Okay, I'd like to call for the vote. Everybody in favor of the motion to table this until hillside construction has been addressed in the Venice Specific Plan? One, two, three, four, five, six.  
*Phil:* Seven. Seven.  
*Chairwoman:* Seven.  
*Phil:* Eight.

UNAPPROVED, UNCORRECTED DRAFT MINUTES FOR  
LAND USE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING January 4, 2006

*Chairwoman:* Any abstentions? Of course. Eight abstain.  
*Brent Miller:* Four. You have eight votes for -  
*Chairwoman:* That's it. Okay. It's unanimous. Whew. Okay.  
*Brent Miller:* State the \_\_\_\_ so the motion is carried.  
*Chairwoman:* Motion is indeed carried, finally.

*[End of Audio]*