

Venice Neighborhood Council

Post Office Box 550

Venice, CALIFORNIA 90294



Land Use and Planning Committee MINUTES November 13, 2007



1 **1. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL AND APPROVAL OF THIS AGENDA AS**
2 **PRESENTED OR AMENDED**

3
4 Challis Macpherson called the meeting to order. Committee members
5 present: Robert Aronson, Challis Macpherson, Stewart Oscars, Susan
6 Papadakis, Jed Pauker, and Arnold Springer. Lainie Herrera and Sylvianne
7 Dungan arrived later.

8
9 Challis Macpherson suggested that Item 5E be removed from the Agenda.
10 Laura Silagi interrupted the discussion to demand that Item 5E be removed.
11 Ivan Spiegel went on to describe the intent behind the agenda item he had
12 proposed.

13
14 **Susan Papadakis moved to remove Item 5E; seconded by Stewart**
15 **Oscars.**

16
17 **VOTE: 7 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention. Item 5E is removed from**
18 **this Agenda.**

19
20 **Lainie Herrera moved to approve the Agenda as amended; seconded by**
21 **Susan Papadakis.**

22
23 **VOTE: 6 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention.**

24
25 **2. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES**

26
27 **Susan Papadakis moved to approve the Minutes for the March 28, May**
28 **2, June 6, June 27, July 25 and August 22, 2007 meetings; seconded by**
29 **Stewart Oscars.**
30

1 **VOTE: Unanimous in favor. The motion passed.**

2
3 **3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

4
5 Sylvianne Dungan reported that she had been told that a proposed T-Mobile
6 cell tower will not be allowed to go above 25 feet, and that T-Mobile is
7 considering a different location that is even closer to a residential area.

8
9 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

10
11 Ivan Spiegel provided background information on Agenda Item 5E and stated
12 the intent to protect LUPC and VNC from the need to re-hear topics already
13 fully deliberated upon for which a decision was rendered both by LUPC and
14 VNC and to allow LUPC the ability to decide whether it reconsiders an issue.
15 There was discussion about appropriate noticing procedures.

16
17 Susan Papadakis left the meeting.

18
19 Stewart Oscars asked if LUPC had reviewed the installation of a smart car on
20 top of a building in Venice.

21
22 **5. NEW BUSINESS: DELIBERATION OF FOLLOWING PROJECTS &**
23 **ISSUES:**

24
25 Items 5A, B and C were addressed at LUPC meeting November 7, 2007.

26
27 D. 1305 Abbot Kinney Blvd. Applicant requesting CUB and project permit for
28 restaurant with service area 700 sq feet, and 7 on-site parking spaces, 7
29 parking space credits. LUPC Staff for this issue: Robert Aronson

30
31 Copies of the staff report, and various applications for the project were
32 provided to LUPC members. Robert Aronson answered questions raised
33 via e-mail from Jim Murez regarding parking for the project and stated that
34 valet parking will be from the rear of the building, not from Abbot Kinney
35 Boulevard. Sylvianne Dungan suggested a 50/50 split of the in-lieu
36 parking fee over the duration of the lease and that a business district
37 should be formed. Arnold Springer suggested that the in-lieu fee be
38 posted in the form of a bond, funds for which should be split between the
39 property owner and the applicant. After further discussion of the Venice
40 parking problem and possible solutions, Stewart Oscars suggested that
41 the owner of the subject property be required to provide stacked parking
42 machines.

43
44 The applicant was asked for an opinion; he did not state a preference but

1 stated that payment of in-lieu fees should result in a tangible solution.
2 There was further discussion of who should bear the onus of paying for a
3 solution and the imposition of a \$5000 fine for valet parking on public
4 streets; Sylvianne Dungan reiterated that creation of a business district
5 would facilitate a solution. Ivan Spiegel stated that the property owner
6 cannot legally be made to comply with conditions.

7

8 **Robert Aronson moved to recommend that the VNC Board of Officers**
9 **approve the CUB, pursuant to LAMC Section 12.24W1, to permit the on-site**
10 **sale of beer and wine with food in conjunction with a restaurant with**
11 **service area of 600 square feet, and having hours of operation from 10am**
12 **to 11pm daily, pursuant to the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan, Section**
13 **8B and LAMC Section 11.5.7, project permit compliance review for a**
14 **change of use from retail to restaurant, under the following conditions:**
15 **posting of a laminated copy of the conditions of approval in a conspicuous**
16 **place where the public can see them, no branded alcohol advertisements**
17 **shall be placed in the window or door glass of the property which is visible**
18 **from the outside of the premises, and that in addition to the business name**
19 **or entity, the name of applicant shall appear on the alcohol license and any**
20 **related permits, valet or parking attendant cannot park on public streets, no**
21 **valet parking zone on Abbot Kinney, payment of two in-lieu fees of \$45,000**
22 **each into the Venice Coastal Zone Parking Impact Fund parking folio at the**
23 **time the permit is issued; seconded by Stewart Oscars.**

24

25 Arnold Springer suggested inclusion of a fined \$5000 for every car parked on
26 residential streets, fine on evidence.

27

28 **VOTE: 4 in favor; 2 opposed; 1 abstention.**

29

30 **Jed Pauker moved to amend the previous motion to include that the**
31 **valet/parking attendant, upon documented parking in public space, to incur**
32 **a \$5000 fee per instance to be paid into the Venice Coastal Zone Parking**
33 **Impact Fund parking folio; seconded by Arnold Springer.**

34

35 After further discussion, Jed Pauker and Arnold Springer agreed to amend
36 the motion.

37

38 **Jed Pauker moved to amend the previous motion to include that if the**
39 **valet/parking attendant parks in any space open to the public and this is**
40 **documented, the applicant is subject to a \$5000 fine per for each**
41 **documented instance of valet parking in a public space to be paid into the**
42 **Venice Coastal Zone Parking Impact Fund parking folio; seconded by**
43 **Arnold Springer.**

44

1 **VOTE: 5 in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstention.**

2 E. That LUPC recommend to the VNC Board of Officers that they may not
3 rehear a project/issue unless there is substantial new information to be
4 presented which might alter the VNC Board's decision.

5
6 That LUPC add the following Standing Rule to LUPC Policies and
7 Procedures: Once the VNC Board has ruled on a LUPC case, LUPC may
8 not rehear the case unless there is substantial new information to be
9 presented which might alter the Board's decision. The issue of whether a
10 request to rehear contains substantial new information (i.e. changes to
11 approved plans, ZA or APC decisions, change of ownership, new
12 variances, etc) shall be decided by LUPC's agenda building committee.
13 LUPC Policies and Procedures document on VNC web site, LUPC Task
14 Force reports

15
16 This item was tabled.

17
18 **6. PUBLIC COMMENT**

19
20 None noted.

21
22 **7. ADMINISTRATIVE**

23
24 Nothing noted.

25
26 **8. ADJOURN**

27
28 The meeting was adjourned by common consent.

29