



# Venice Neighborhood Council

PO Box 550, Venice, CA 90294 / www.VeniceNC.org  
Email: info@VeniceNC.org / Phone or Fax: 310.606.2015



## Exhibit G – LUPC Staff Report Re: Valley Village NC SB1818 Request



Venice Neighborhood  
Council  
Post Office Box 550  
Venice, CALIFORNIA 90294  
310-606-2015.

### Land Use and Planning Committee Report to VNC Board of Officers ??/??/2009



To: City Planning Commission  
William Roschen, President  
c/o Commission Secretary James K. Williams City Hall Room 272 200 North Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012  
FAX: 213-978-1029  
E-mail: james.k.williams@lacity.org

Cc: City Planners  
Sevana Mailian, sevana.mailian@lacity.org Bob Duenas, Bob.Duenas@lacity.org

Reference: City Planning Commission, DIR-2008-1178-DB-SPP & ENV-2008-1179-MND

At its regular meeting of \_\_\_\_\_ 2009, the \_\_\_\_\_ Neighborhood Council passed the following motion:

MOTION: \_\_\_\_\_ The Board of the \_\_\_\_\_ Neighborhood Council supports the stakeholders of Valley Village in regard to their two appeals of [DIR-2008-1178-SPP] regarding the SB1818 development located at 11933 Magnolia Boulevard Valley Village: (1) Dale Neglia et al. ; (2) The membership of the Board of Neighborhood Council Valley Village.

We agree:

- 1) That there appears to have been a bias within the Department to get this project approved no matter under what code of law and no matter the lack of proper documentation.
- 2) That the failure of the Director to require review by NCVV prior to approval, and to consider the input of their Neighborhood Council, demonstrates a disregard for the community, and is an inappropriate use of Planning Department discretionary authority.
- 3) That development of this site does not reflect the prevailing character of the community, and will stand dramatically at odds with adjoining properties. This is a failure of the Planning department to uphold and negotiate vigorously to minimize transgressions of our General, Community and Specific Plans.
- 4) That the Planning Department did nothing to require adequate documentation relating to economic feasibility or to use any standard by which to determine this feasibility. This impacts precisely on whether the proposed affordable units could be provided with far less density and with some other different concessions that would not trample the General, Community or Specific Plans, and be acceptable to the Neighborhood Council.
- 5) That the City lacks the process to adequately evaluate either the economic feasibility or the environmental (& health & safety) component. Therefore, the project cannot and should not be approved until such procedures, processes, and protocols are in place.
- 6) That the excessive height and density of this project will, in the future, be improperly cited as a precedent for variances and exceptions, which by its very outsized presence enable opportunities for projects that are not presently entitled to density bonus and further deteriorating the character of the neighborhood.
- 7) That there have been many procedural irregularities associated with this Developer's application with the Planning Department as an abettor to forward the approval.
- 8) That the project brings traffic congestion to the substandard surrounding and collector streets -- streets not even included in the "cumulative impact" investigations. Streets which for the most part that have no sidewalks or infrastructure to protect the many bicyclists, children and pedestrians. Traffic mitigations are inadequate and imperil single family neighborhoods with DOT's noted reliance on additional cut thru traffic.
- 9) That there was a failure of the Planning Department to defend our General, Community and Specific Plans in extending numerous incentives not even requested.
- 10) That there was failure of the Planning Department to defend our General, Community and Specific Plans by accepting conflicting, outdated and improper documents from the Developer at face value without any investigation as to their veracity or applicability to the current project.
- 11) That there was failure of the Planning Department in approving a project that invades neighbors rights to privacy, to the future use and enjoyment of their open space property and common areas.
- 12) That there was failure of the Planning Department to require mandated downzoning as was called for by AB283 and thereby defend our General, Community and Specific Plans.
- 13) That the cumulative impacts of this project on the street, the infrastructure, traffic, and other CEQA concerns have not been adequately addressed or mitigated. That a small 3-project inquiry cannot give an adequate picture to the extraordinary overbuilding in the area.

As a Neighborhood Council, we share these grave concerns. They are matters that affect all of us. We consider them unacceptable and support the appellants. Please take this position into consideration when making a decision on this matter.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours, President, \_\_\_\_\_ Neighborhood Council

*It's YOUR Venice - get involved!*