

1) Please explain why you wish to serve on the LUPC.

I have previously served on the VNC LUPC and wish to continue to serve on the VNC LUPC because I care about the community that I live in and would enjoy being a part of the process of shaping the future of development in my community. Additionally, continuing to serving on the LUPC will provide me with much needed hands-on experience in the local planning process and will help me to be engaged in community planning issues as I finish my Masters Thesis for my M.A Community Planning and Development Program.

- a. Have you served before on the LUPC or other planning and land use related committee? If so, what committee and when?
- b. Please state your professional qualifications or related experience relevant to this position.

I served on VNC LUPC from May 2009- Present.

I hold a B.A in International Development and Economics and am in the process of completing my M.A in Community Planning and Development, I served on LUPC from May 2009 to the present and most recently I worked as an Assistant Environmental Planner for a private consulting firm in Los Angeles, the combination of which I feel qualify me to re-apply and hold a position on LUPC.

2) Please list your previous and/or current neighborhood or community involvement.

I am currently a member of LUPC and have served on the committee since May 2009. Prior to that I was a volunteer for the New London Main Street Organization in New London CT, an intern for the City of Worcester Executive Office of Neighborhood Services and City Of Worcester Office of Economic Development.

3) Please list the three most pressing planning and land use issues you feel are facing the Venice Community.

The three most pressing issues that have the Venice community and future development efforts are; the availability of parking and transportation for commercial as well as residential uses; the availability of affordable housing; and from an aesthetic as well as a sustainability perspective how the Venice community will be able to develop, progress and remain viable while respecting its' unique architecture, community history and unique coastal environment in which it is located.

4) Under what kinds of situations do you feel it to be appropriate to grant exceptions or variances to the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan or other LA City Planning codes? (Findings regarding these entitlements below)

a. What is your opinion of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan?

In my opinion the VCZSP is a well thought out document and should be strictly enforced.

b. Have you read the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan?

Yes, many times.

c. Have you read the Venice Land Use Plan which was certified by the California Coastal Commission?

Yes.

Generally, I feel that exemptions or variances should not be granted. I feel that it is appropriate to grant exemptions or variance for entitlements pursuant to the VCZSP or Venice Land Use Plan certified by the Coastal Commission in very specific circumstances such as; the project or applicant has provided mitigating alternatives or has satisfied in-lieu alternatives described in the VCZSP i.e. in-lieu parking fees, or Mello Act replacement of affordable housing. However, there are always exceptions and if in fact the development of the project would prove to substantively benefit the entire Venice community, while at the same time addressing issues that currently impact the community i.e.; parking and affordable housing issues, the secondary impacts on the community would have to be considered in relation to the proposed benefit.

5) How do you view your role in private interactions with developers who have projects proposed before the Land Use and Planning Committee?

As a member of LUPC, your role in private interactions with developers who have projects proposed before the LUPC should remain strictly informative as to give them guidance regarding the procedure and process of the LUPC and the VCZSP. Any and all ex-parte communications between committee members and developers of proposed projects should be made clear at the time their project(s) are heard before the committee.

Every community, including Venice, has problems with following up on conditions imposed on a project. How do you think the Venice Neighborhood Council should follow up on our conditioning process to see that conditions are met?

I feel that there should be a one year review period for all projects which are approved with conditions, during which time the applicant should provide documentation or proof of the implementation of the conditions to LUPC, and LUPC should hold a community meeting to hear public testimony regarding the project, its operation and implementation of conditions.

1. Define "change," and what, if any, community planning considerations, should govern "change." Include the correlation between built environment change and governance change. In respect to land use and planning "change" is defined as any action that will have an impact on the intensity, density, or intended use of a property which; may impose significant impacts relative to the consistency and compatibility with adjacent, neighboring or surrounding uses. Similarly, "change" in respect to governance is defined as any action that will have an impact on the intensity, density, or intended use of a property which; may impose significant impacts relative to the consistency and compatibility with adjacent, neighboring or surrounding uses.
2. What is your view and VNC/LUPC action recommendation regarding the ability of a proposed commercial or residential development to receive physically nonexistent entitlements (i.e., parking), which will negatively impact surrounding developments?

Although it is not ideal, it is an unfortunate reality that there exist in Venice properties that have the legal right and ability to receive physically nonexistent entitlements such as grandfathered parking. It is my opinion that in these cases the applicant should exhaust all practical and financially realistic alternatives to these entitlements to make a best effort to mitigate the negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood. After all alternatives have been considered, and no feasible alternative exists, then the project should be granted the entitlement. It is my opinion that no one property/project or applicant should be punished or held responsible for a community-wide issue. However we should make a community effort to put into place a system whereby the negative impacts could be mitigated in the future i.e. in-lieu parking fund to finance future city parking in the community.

6) What is your Vision for Venice?

My future vision of Venice includes the construction and development of future projects which aim to address current issues that impact the community, such as creative parking alternatives, public transportation, affordable housing, green-sustainable development that is progressive yet still speaks to the diverse and unique history of this very eclectic beach community. Essentially, it is a vision that is economically diverse, environmentally sustainable, progressive yet historically consistent and compatible.



Venice Neighborhood Council



Questions:

Answer all these questions, please limit your answers to 200 words or less each . Print on a separate sheet of paper and email to Secretary@VeniceNC.org.

- 1) Please explain why you wish to serve on the LUPC.
 - a. Have you served before on the LUPC or other planning and land use related committee? If so, what committee and when?
 - b. Please state your professional qualifications or related experience relevant to this position.
- 2) Please list your previous and/or current neighborhood or community involvement.
- 3) Please list the three most pressing planning and land use issues you feel are facing the Venice Community.
- 4) Under what kinds of situations do you feel it to be appropriate to grant exceptions or variances to the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan or other LA City Planning codes? (Findings regarding these entitlements below)
 - a. What is your opinion of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan?
 - b. Have you read the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan?
 - c. Have you read the Venice Land Use Plan which was certified by the California Coastal Commission?
- 5) How do you view your role in private interactions with developers who have projects proposed before the Land Use and Planning Committee?

Every community, including Venice, has problems with following up on conditions imposed on a project. How do you think the Venice Neighborhood Council should follow up on our conditioning process to see that conditions are met?

1. Define "change," and what, if any, community planning considerations, should govern "change." Include the correlation between built environment change and governance change.
 2. What is your view and VNC/LUPC action recommendation regarding the ability of a proposed commercial or residential development to receive physically nonexistent entitlements (i.e., parking) which will negatively impact surrounding developments?
- 6) What is your Vision for Venice?

Access VCZSP at <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/specplan/pdf/VenCoastal.pdf>.



Venice Neighborhood Council



VARIANCES AND SPECIFIC PLAN EXCEPTIONS

Sec. 562, Los Angeles City Charter

The Area Planning Commission may permit an exception from a specific plan if it makes all the following findings:

- (a) That the strict application of the regulations of the specific plan to the subject property would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose and intent of the specific plan;
- (b) That there are exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the subject property involved or to the intended use or development of the subject property that do not apply generally to other property in the specific plan area;
- (c) That an exception from the specific plan is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use generally possessed by other property within the specific plan area in the same zone and vicinity but which, because of special circumstances and practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships is denied to the property in question;
- (d) That the granting of an exception will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements adjacent to or in the vicinity of the subject property; and
- (e) That the granting of an exception will be consistent with the principles, intent and goals of the specific plan and any applicable element of the general plan.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, (LAMC) Chapter I, General Provisions & Zoning. Article 2, Sec. 12.27, Variances

D. Findings for Approval. The decision of the Zoning Administrator shall be supported by written findings of fact based upon evidence taken, written or oral statements and documents presented, which may include photographs, maps and plans, together with the results of any staff investigations.

Consistent with Charter Section 562, no variance may be granted unless the Zoning Administrator finds all of the following:

- 1. That the strict application of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purposes and intent of the zoning regulations;



Venice Neighborhood Council



2. That there are special circumstances applicable to the subject property such as size, shape, topography, location or surroundings that do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity;
3. That the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use generally possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity but which, because of the special circumstances and practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships, is denied to the property in question
4. That the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to the property or improvements in the same zone or vicinity in which the property is located; and
5. That the granting of the exception is consistent with the principles, intent and goals of the Specific Plan.

Court Decisions

In *Orinda Assn. v. Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County*, the California Appeals Court ruled that a building height variance could not be granted, regardless of the alleged benefits of the project, absent a finding detailing the special circumstances that justified its issuance. In its decision, the court majority said, "Thus, data focusing on the qualities of the property and Project for which the variance is sought, the desirability of the proposed development, the attractiveness of its design, the benefits to the community, or the economic difficulties of developing the property in conformance with the zoning regulations, lack legal significance and are simply irrelevant to the controlling issue of whether strict application of zoning rules would prevent the would-be developer from utilizing his or her property to the same extent as other property owners in the same zoning district." (The Contra Costa County conditions for granting variances were virtually identical to those in the L.A. City Charter)