

Venice Neighborhood Council

Post Office Box 550

Venice, CALIFORNIA 90294



Land Use and Planning Committee MINUTES February 11, 2009



1 **1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

2

3 Challis Macpherson called the meeting to order at 6:38 pm. Committee

4 members present: Challis Macpherson, Kelli Li, Jim Murez, Jed Pauker, John

5 Reed and Arnold Springer.

6 **2. APPROVAL OF THIS AGENDA AS PRESENTED OR AMENDED**

7

8

9

10 **3. APPROVAL OF OUTSTANDING MINUTES**

11

12

13 **4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

14

15

16 **5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

17

18 There was considerable discussion regarding the City of Los Angeles Small

19 Lot Subdivision ordinance. Stakeholders voiced their concerns regarding

20 density, parking provision, affordable housing as provided for by the Venice

21 Coastal Zone Specific Plan, and the effect the ordinance could have on the

22 Venice community specifically. Arnold Springer suggested that a series of

1 workshops should be offered by the Planning Department. Challis
2 Macpherson explained why she had filed an appeal of the Director's
3 Interpretation of the Small Lot Subdivision ordinance as it pertains to the
4 Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan. Ms. Macpherson reported that her
5 request for support from the Board of Governors of the Venice Neighborhood
6 Council will be considered shortly before the City hearing. The discussion
7 that followed clarified actions that can be taken by stakeholders, LUPC and
8 the VNC Board on this issue. Frank Murphy was asked by a stakeholder to
9 discuss the Small Lot Subdivision ordinance from the perspective of a
10 developer. Both Mr. Murphy and John Reed listed the advantages of the
11 ordinance.
12
13 Jed Pauker suggested that one more discussion of this issue take place prior
14 to an action being taken by LUPC regarding a recommendation to the Board.
15
16 John Reed asked for a straw poll of stakeholders present, asking for opinions
17 regarding a requirement that one unit of a three-unit development be
18 workforce affordable. Six stakeholders indicated they are in favor of this
19 option. One stakeholder indicated that three market rate units were preferred.
20 Twelve stakeholders expressed interest in acquiring more information. This
21 issue will be discussed again at the March 11, 2009 LUPC meeting.
22

1 Jed Pauker moved to schedule this issue for discussion at two additional
2 LUPC meetings. There was unanimous consent.

3

4 Sign Ordinance discussion was postponed by common consent until March
5 11, 2009.

6

7 Artur (sp?) Boutique Hotel on Ocean Front Walk. John Reed, LUPC staff
8 member assigned to this project, stated that this issue should be set for
9 discussion at another LUPC meeting. Mr. Reed stated that he had received
10 pertinent material for review earlier that day and went on to describe the CUP
11 being requested. Proposed use for the commercial property is in consistent
12 with current zoning and the local coastal program. The developer is
13 requesting 24 rooms, 20 are provided for in current zoning. Parking is in
14 compliance with the municipal code and with the Venice Coastal Zone
15 Specific Plan; four additional employee parking spaces are provided. Mr.
16 Reed then introduced Mr. Artur. Challis Macpherson asked about access to
17 parking; Mr. Artur indicated that access from Speedway is planned, and
18 stated that a deed restriction will be recorded that provides for limitations with
19 regard to deliveries.

20

21 Nathan Artur described the change of the proposed use of the property from
22 mixed use to hotel, ascribing the need for the change to market forces, and

1 indicated encouragement received from the Coastal Commission and from
2 the office responsible for the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan. Mr. Artur
3 reported that stakeholder feedback was positive as well, for the project, which
4 will increase the current FAR and density by approximately 30%. There is a
5 provision for a small restaurant. Mr. Artur stated that there would not be an
6 increase in the height of the building requested or in setbacks. The proposed
7 hours of operation for the restaurant will be 7am to 9pm in the summer and
8 from 7am to 6pm approximately. Mr. Artur then described plans for the
9 structure's decoration and noted benefits to the community with regard to
10 safety, beautification, and creation of jobs for community members.

11

12 Arnold Springer asked about the car parking elevator, was told about the
13 dimensions of the 800 square foot restaurant. Jim Murez asked for the
14 location of the trash enclosure. Mr. Murez expressed concern about
15 deliveries, handicapped parking, beach impact zone parking, seating area
16 square footage for the restaurant, and asked for specific information about the
17 division of the ground floor space with reference to hotel guest use only. Mr.
18 Murez then referred to the requirement for handicapped parking.

19

20 John Reed noted several code violations not addressed on the drawings
21 presented with regard to the parking elevator, provision of separate mens and
22 womens restrooms for guests and for employees, and stated that Mr. Artur

1 should seek advise from an experienced hotel developer. Jim Murez asked
2 for specifications on the design of the parking structure. Mr. Reed asked if
3 LUPC members considered the proposed use of the property is a good one.
4 In response to Challis Macpherson's question, Nathan Artur stated that the
5 restaurant operation is financially necessary.

6

7 This issue will be discussed again at the second March 2009 LUPC meeting.

8

9

10

11

12 **10. ADJOURN**