



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



## MINUTES

Community Plan/Local Coastal Program Ad Hoc Committee

Wednesday, June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2024 - 5:30 pm to 7:45 pm

Venice Public Library at 501 S. Venice Boulevard

CALL TO ORDER: 5:37 pm

ROLL CALL WITH DECLARATION OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, if any:

Naomi Nightingale (Chair)	Edward Ferrer	Alix Gucovsky
Mark Mack	Frank Murphy	Robin Rudisill
Richard Stanger	Steve Williams	

No conflicts/ex parte communications noted.  
Steve Williams was absent.

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES: Minutes of June 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting not yet available

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: There will be a free discussion on how Los Angeles can solve its housing crisis--July 10th, 7-8 pm, Books and Coffee in Culver City; we have to come together to fight this crap: AB 2560, desalination plant, hydrogen plant, etc.

CHAIR REPORT: none

OLD BUSINESS:

### Oakwood Subarea – amended motion

**Public and Committee Comments:** Concern about the city overriding our proposing to keep density in Oakwood the same; for the affordable housing project at the First Baptist Church property, the height would not exceed the height of the existing church; can go to heights in excess of maximums with state Density Bonus Law; this is a community plan, not a commercial plan; this allows for future growth and development without being excessive and disruptive; going to more stories on Rose would destroy the character and those of us who live there want to see the diversity continue; when we grew up in the area Rose was actually quite residential with a few businesses sprinkled in, and the ones that are there now gentrified longtime residents and they suck; we don't want to box in Oakwood with one more business improvement district and their private security, as every residential neighborhood deserves breathing space; let developers start with a lower baseline when requesting their density bonuses; Rose is only a two lane street.



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends the following changes for the **Oakwood subarea** to Planning’s current proposal for the Venice Community Plan:

Low Medium Residential: (existing RD2, RD1.5 north of Rose Ave)

- Maximum height: 2 stories/25’ flat roof, 30’ varied/stepped back roofline
- FAR: 0.75 for single-family (no bonus), 1.0 for multi-family (no bonus)
- Lot coverage: 40%
- Lot consolidation: 2 only if multi-family project (ADU does not count)

Low Medium Residential: (recommend existing RD1.5 south of Rose Ave proposed Medium Residential by City Planning to remain Low Medium Residential Land Use Designation)

- Density: 2 DU (1 DU/1,500 SF if lot ≥4,000 SF)
- Maximum height: 2 stories/25’ flat roof, 30’ varied/stepped back roofline
- FAR: 0.75 for single-family (no bonus), 1.0 for multi-family (no bonus)
- Lot coverage: 40%
- Lot consolidation: 2 only for multi-family project (ADU does not count)

Neighborhood Center: (existing C4 Rose Ave from 4<sup>th</sup> Ave to Lincoln Blvd)

- Maximum Height: 25’ flat roof, 30’ varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0 commercial only, 1.5 residential/commercial (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 60% with increased buildable area not permitted
- Lot Consolidation: 2 lots

Villages: (existing C2 along Lincoln Blvd)

- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/≤33’ (5 Stories/≤55’), stepped-back transition heights as required adjacent to lower land uses (R1.5, RD2 zoned properties), no roof decks when adjacent to Low Medium Residential
- FAR: 1.25 (2.0)
- Lot Coverage: 60% with increased buildable area not permitted
- Lot Consolidation: Up to 3 lots

Community Center: (existing P and C2 lots on “Whole Foods” site on Lincoln Blvd)

- Density: 800 SF/Living Unit
- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/≤33’ (5 stories/≤55’), stepped-back transition heights as required adjacent to lower land uses (R1, R2, RD zoned properties), no roof decks when adjacent to Low Medium Residential
- FAR: 1.25 (2.0)
- Lot Coverage: 50% with increased buildable area not permitted



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



- Lot Consolidation: 2 lots

Hybrid Industrial: (existing Limited Manufacturing lots SW of Rose Ave & 4<sup>th</sup> Street)

- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/≤33' (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.25 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 60% with increased buildable area not permitted
- Lot Consolidation: 2 lots

Light Industrial: (existing Limited Manufacturing lots NW of Hampton Drive & Sunset Ave)

- Density: No Living Units, artist work/live as allowed by existing code
- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/≤33' (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.25 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 65%
- Lot Consolidation: 2 lots

Public Facilities: (Oakwood Park and two blocks to the east)

- Maintain Oakwood Park as Open Space (no change to Public Facilities)
- Maintain residential blocks east of Oakwood Park along Oakwood and Pleasant View Avenues between Broadway and California Avenues as Low Medium Residential (no change to Public Facilities)

Affordable Housing sources:

- First Baptist Church site – low & very low-income units behind and across street from church, historic preservation/restoration and use of church for community space
- Extend contract for fifteen Section 8 buildings to original low-income status

Motion approved: 6-1

\*\*\*\*\*

Milwood Subarea – amended motion

**Public and Committee Comments:** All across Venice, we need to keep the buildings down, we need to keep it low, we need to stop building up and up. People come for the charm of Venice, and the charm is dissipating for big dollars, money, commercialization. As Alix always says. Are we a community or a commodity? And this is a fucking community; take note of the people who aren't in the room; Venice needs to stay affordable to Venetians; Milwood and Oakwood were once one subarea but they Milwood broke off and experienced greater protections.



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends the following changes for the Milwood subarea to Planning's current proposal for the Venice Community Plan:

Low Medium Residential: (existing R2-zoned lots)

- Density: 2 DU (1 DU/2,500 SF if lot  $\geq$ 5,000 SF) for R2; 2 DU (1 DU/1,500-2,000 SF if lot  $\geq$ 4,000 SF) for RD 1.5-1
- Maximum Height: 2 Stories (no bonus)/25' flat roof, 30' varied/stepped-back roofline; 28' along walk streets
- FAR: 0.8 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 45%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

Medium Residential: Lots along Venice Boulevard recommended to be changed from Neighborhood Center (see Neighborhood Center, below).

- Density: 1 DU/1,200 SF of lot
- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/ $\leq$ 33' (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 50%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

Village: (along Lincoln Blvd)

Change to Neighborhood Center Land Use Designation

Neighborhood Center:

Change Neighborhood Center back to Medium Residential Land Use Designation along the north side of Venice Blvd, from Orson Bean Way (by the theater) to the east side of Brenta Place, only for the Venice Blvd facing lots, with the remaining lots to Low Medium Residential Land Use Designation (to conform with the current Housing Element proposal).

- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/ $\leq$ 33' (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.5 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 65%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

Public Facilities:

- Maximum Height: 25' flat roof, 30' varied/stepped-back roofline

Other Recommended Changes, which may be errors:



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



- Maintain the lots along California Ave, between Electric Court and Lincoln Court, at Low Medium II Residential/RD1.5-1 (no change to Low Medium Residential).
- Maintain the three lots at the Vera Davis Center, at Electric and California, as Public Facilities (no change to Low Medium Residential).
- Maintain the four lots adjacent to the Vera Davis Center, on Electric near California, as Low Medium I Residential/RD3-1 (no change to Low Medium Residential).
- Maintain the five lots on Oakwood Ave near Orson Bean Way (by the theater) as Low Medium Residential/R2-1 (no change to Public Facilities).

Motion approved: 6-1

\*\*\*\*\*

## Southeast Venice Subarea – amended motion

**Public and Committee Comments:** none

The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends the following changes for the Southeast Venice subarea to Planning’s current proposal for the Venice Community Plan:

### Low Medium Residential: (existing R2-zoned lots)

- Density: 2 DU (1 DU/2,500 SF if lot ≥5,000 SF, 1 DU/1,500 SF if lot ≥4,000 SF)
- Maximum Height: 2 Stories (no bonus)/25’ flat roof, 30’ varied/stepped-back roofline
- FAR: 0.8 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 45%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

### Medium Residential: (lots along Venice Boulevard recommended to be changed from Neighborhood Center--see Neighborhood Center below)

- Density: 1 DU/1,200 SF of lot
- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/≤33’ (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 50%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

### Villages:

- Change to Neighborhood Center Land Use Designation along Lincoln Blvd.



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



### Community Center:

- Change on Harrison Ave to Medium Residential Land Use Designation and change all other Community Center areas to Neighborhood Center Land Use Designation.

### Neighborhood Center:

Change Neighborhood Center back to Medium Residential Land Use Designation along the south side of Venice Blvd, between Shell and Naples, only for the Venice Blvd facing lots, with the remaining lots to Low Medium Residential Land Use Designation (to conform with the current Housing Element proposal).

- Maximum Height: 3 Stories/ $\leq 33'$  (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.5 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 65%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

### Industrial:

- Density--not permitted
- Maximum height: 25' flat roof, 30' varied/stepped back roofline
- FAR--1.0 (no bonus)
- Lot coverage--65%

### Other Recommended Changes, which may be errors:

- Maintain Venezia Ave between Zena Place and Venice Blvd as Medium Residential/R3 (no change to Industrial).
- Maintain the center of Venice Blvd. as Open Space (no change to Public Facilities).

Motion approved: 6-1

\*\*\*\*\*

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

#### **General Policies--motions 1-5**

#### **Public and Committee Comments:**

- Naomi Nightingale, Chair: the reason that these motions have been drafted is because first, the committee was obligated to speak to the issues that were presented to us by the city planning department and we have addressed those issues the best that we can with the various subarea meetings and with other comments and with the preference survey. But there were also some issues of community concern that were not addressed within the proposal from city planning that are of import and critical need. And we heard those



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



remarks from people that came to the meetings that say these things are a concern. And so we've listened to that information from the public from those meetings and the concerns that were presented and that's the areas that these motions cover.

- The motion talks about the values that are important to us in terms of housing and it goes far beyond formulas and numbers, we need to tell the city what matters to us as a community, and this is that;
- the pre-1978 RSO properties shouldn't have to carry the entire burden of protecting affordable housing;
- it's really important that we not just react to what the planning department says, because their setting the question determines the answer;
- one of the most common themes of our outreach sessions, where people came and spoke on each subarea, was lack of affordability;
- I just don't see how we can call this a community plan if we don't protect our community, and housing is one of the most important ways we can do that;
- other neighborhood councils and council districts are pushing back in this same way;
- should drop the whereas as people will attack them instead of focusing on the objective;
- the word "area" is too vague/uncertain, use lot;
- concern that this is a new issue and is based on fear of change;
- we have all been briefed on this and discussed it in our presentations and public as well as committee comments all along; this motion was written through one lens;
- taking the whereases out would gut the motion; the whereases give the context;
- the whereas clauses are clearly the spirit and the heart of the motion and without them it's nothing...and the spirit and the heart of the motion is also the spirit and the heart of Venice;
- most of these whereases come right out of a council file from a motion that another district of Los Angeles made, and the only thing we added was the part about the Coastal Act, so I don't see where we would want to exclude anything, and other areas of LA think it's important to say all these things too.

## 1. Protection of Areas that Provide Existing Coastal Housing for Low- and Moderate-Income Persons

Whereas, while it is important to increase housing unit density in Los Angeles, it cannot be at the expense of naturally occurring affordable homes currently occupied by long-term community members who, if displaced for new development, are unable to relocate within their community or afford to return when the new development is complete,

Whereas, RSO/rent stabilized units play a crucial role in providing stability, cohesion and socioeconomic diversity for our communities as they safeguard tenants from displacement, exorbitant rent hikes and unjust evictions,

Whereas, the probability of significantly decreased RSO/rent stabilized units and other naturally occurring affordable housing due to Planning's proposed increases in density would significantly impact the housing stability of vulnerable communities such as Venice, and it also increases the potential for homelessness, especially as the statutory relocation fees do not



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



adequately cover ever increasing market rate rents, nor do they equitably accommodate larger households,

Whereas, we must not compromise the stability of the lives of our lower-income community members, many lifelong,

Whereas, the Coastal Act states in section 30116 that areas that provide existing coastal housing for low- and moderate-income persons are “Sensitive Coastal Resource” areas,

Whereas, the Coastal Act requires that Sensitive Coastal Resources be protected,

Whereas, the certified Land Use Plan Policy I. E. 1. states that Venice’s unique social diversity should be protected as a Special Coastal Community pursuant to Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act,

Whereas, a “community plan” must not displace community members currently living in older housing stock that is RSO/rent stabilized or otherwise affordable or lower cost housing,

Whereas, the “maximum allowable rent levels” for covenanted affordable housing are experiencing higher and higher increases each year due to the impact of market rate units being the vast majority of new rents included in the area median rent calculation,

Whereas, USC professor Manuel Pastor, co-author of the report Rent Matters, states "Housing stability matters because it is associated with physical, social, and psychological well-being; higher educational achievement by the young; and benefits for people of color,"

Whereas, RSO/rent-stabilized and other naturally occurring affordable housing play a crucial role in providing stability, cohesion and socioeconomic diversity for our communities, and

Whereas, the priority of the Venice Community Plan and LCP update must be the preservation and protection of existing RSO/rent stabilized units, other naturally occurring affordable housing, and our existing unique, diverse community, which must take precedence, be the priority over, and supersede any desired land use designation and zoning changes.

Therefore be it resolved, the Venice Neighborhood Council requests that prior to any decision on land use designations and zoning for Venice a report be provided by City Planning identifying lots in Venice with existing low- and moderate-income housing, including all RSO/rent stabilized units, and that community plan and LCP land use designations and zoning and other appropriate land use regulatory controls be determined such that those lots are protected, including being designated as Sensitive Coastal Resource areas in the LCP for the Coastal Zone.

Motion 1 amended to change areas to lots: 6-1

Motion 1 approved as amended: 4-2-1





# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



Motions 2 - 5 will be addressed at the next meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Abbot Kinney Subarea – motion

**Public and Committee Comments:** concerned about impact of state legislation; 812 Main is actually a consolidation of ten lots, so need to be clear on lot consolidation; concern about height of Hybrid Industrial; can do 3 stories within recommended height limit;

The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends the following changes for the Abbot Kinney Blvd subarea to Planning’s current proposal for the Venice Community Plan:

### Villages:

- Maximum Height: 30’ flat roof, 35’ varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0 commercial only, 1.5 residential/commercial (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 90%
- Lot Consolidation: 2 (>2 if conform to MSC)

### Hybrid Industrial:

- Density: 800-1,200 SF/LU
- Maximum Height: 30’ flat roof, 35’ varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0 commercial only, 1.5 residential/commercial (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 90%
- Lot Consolidation: 2 (>2 if conform to MSC)

### Light Industrial:

- Maximum Height: 30’ flat roof, 35’ varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0
- Lot Coverage: 90%
- Lot Consolidation: 2 (>2 if conform to MSC)

- No changes from existing residential uses, residential land use designations or residential zoning to commercial
- Use zoning and other land use and planning tools to encourage the siting of independent retail uses and discourage national chain stores on Abbot Kinney Blvd

Motion approved: 7-0



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

www.VeniceNC.org



\*\*\*\*\*

## Ocean Front Walk Subarea – motion

**Public and Committee Comments:** concern about residential lots between Sunset and Dudley and north of North Venice being changed by City Planning to commercial, hopefully it's a mistake, but we're recommending no commercialization of residential uses, buildings, zoning or land use designations; concern about property with numerous small retail stores paying property taxes as vacant commercial land.

The Venice Neighborhood Council recommends the following changes for the **Ocean Front Walk subarea** to Planning's current proposal for the Venice Community Plan:

### Low Medium Residential: (between S. Venice & 30<sup>th</sup> Ave walk street)

- Maximum Height: 30' flat roof, 35' varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.25 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 65%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

### Medium Residential: (between N. & S. Venice)

- Maximum Height: 30' flat roof, 35' varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.25 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 65%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

### Medium Residential: (near Navy St)

- Maximum Height: 30' flat roof, 35' varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.25 (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 65%
- Lot Consolidation: 2

### Villages:

- Density: 800-1,200 SF/LU
- Maximum Height: 30' flat roof, 35' varied/stepped back roofline (no bonus)
- FAR: 1.0 commercial only, 1.5 residential/commercial (no bonus)
- Lot Coverage: 90%
- Lot Consolidation: 2 (>2 if conform to MSC)

- No changes from existing residential uses, residential land use designations or residential zoning to commercial.



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294

[www.VeniceNC.org](http://www.VeniceNC.org)



- Use zoning and other land use and planning tools to encourage the siting of independent retail uses and discourage national chain stores on Ocean Front Walk.

Motion approved: 7-0

**ADJOURNMENT:** 7:52