

Venice Neighborhood
Council

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

**Land Use and
Planning Committee**

Staff Report June 1, 2007



Case Number:

DIR 2007-1996 SPP

Address of Project:

580-582 Venice Blvd, and
1702-1704 South Abbot Kinney Blvd
(at the corner of Venice and Abbot Kinney)

Size of Parcel:

6,906 sq ft (applicant's admission on Project
Form)
83' to 55' by 100'

Size of Project:

Two parcels: each 2,564 sq ft (after demolition of
garage) Total: 5,128 sq ft

Venice Subarea:

Oakwood-Millwood-Southeast Venice

Permit Application Date:

May 26, 2007 Application Numbers 06016-
30000-21304 and 06016-30000-21305

Applicant:

HMA Development, Inc

Address:

352 South Almont Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90211
310.435.4419

Representative:

Ms. Hadar (Hanoach) Aizenman

Contact Information: haizenman@yahoo.com and above

**Date(s) heard by Advisory
Agency Division of Land: TBA**

Date heard by LUPC: June 6, 2006

**WLA Area Planning
Commission Dates:** TBA

**Community Planning Bureau
Dates: (if known)**

**LUPC Motion to Recommend that the VNC Board of Officers (language
from minutes)**

Vote:

REPORT

Project Description:

Demolishing 300 sq ft (garage) tying two lots together, change of use of two buildings from Residential Occupancy (R3) to Retail Occupancy (M). Improvements include but are not limited to new disabled accessible bathrooms and new disabled accessible ramps.

**Project Description by Applicant on submitted LUPC Project Form Stating
Requested Action by Venice Neighborhood Council:**

**Section of Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan and/or the Los Angeles
Municipal Code governing this particular site:**

Summary of Arguments Against this Project/Issue:

Summary of Arguments For this Project/Issue”

Summary of Public Comment:

Summary of Findings by LUPC:

DRAFT OF COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT TO BE ATTACHED TO THIS CASE NUMBER and/or FILE:

Author of Report: Arnold Springer

Date: draft of June 1, 2007

Brief Narrative:

I was assigned to the project about May 20.

I called applicant's representative on May 24 and made an appointment to meet Ms. Aizenman on the site at 9 am on Tuesday, May 29.

I waited at the site until 9:35 but no one showed up. There was a mix up and she waited for me in her office but I didn't realize the office was next door. Following my return home I called Ms. Aizenman and we both realized what had happened. I asked her some questions that my site review raised, and her answers are reflected in this report.

I did a physical review of the site.

The site consists of two lots approximately 30 x 100. Each irregularly shaped lot is currently developed. Each has a duplex (2 small units) and each has an attached garage.

Condition of the two buildings:

All the units are currently vacant, and signs in the windows indicate that the space is available for retail uses and lists a number to call.

The buildings are both identical, probably built at the same time, shortly between 1939-1955, judging by the architecture. The buildings are about 15-17 feet in height, have recently been painted, and appear to be in good condition.

#580-582 East Venice Blvd.

Currently a duplex with two one bedroom units, and an attached garage which has recently been used as office commercial (the office of

Splashdive.com). On Venice Blvd the property fronts on a small, irregularly shaped parcel owned by the City of Los Angeles and restricted to landscaping by a Coastal Commission permit.

#1702-04 Abbot Kinney Blvd

Currently a similar situation except that the attached garage has not been converted into commercial and appears to still be a garage. However, Ms. Aizenman stated on the telephone that their plans were to demolish the garage so that their project would have sufficient parking.

Parking:

Parking is off of the alley. According to applicant by demolishing the garage they are able to provide 5 legal parking spaces, (no in tandem parking), and one handicapped parking space. Total: 6 parking spaces.

According to applicant these spaces meet the requirement for retail commercial, one space per each 225 sq. feet of retail. Therefore, applicant is not requesting any variance or exception from the VCZSP parking requirements.

Signage on the alley wall facing the property warns motorists that no parking is allowed in the alley and cites the LA Municipal Code. This indicates that parking is an issue in the area.

Food Service Uses.

I mentioned to Ms. Aizenman on the telephone that LUPC would probably ask at the June 6 hearing if applicant intended any food service on the site. I said that restaurant or food service required more parking than retail commercial, and mentioned that LUPC had some issues like this already before it on Abbot Kinney.

Ms. Aizenman said that HMA Development was only asking for retail uses, but if there was a request by a potential tenant for food uses on site they would certainly consider such requests and, in such a case, the applicants would have to find some way to provide additional parking and apply for and receive a permit for any intensified food service uses.

Affordable Housing:

The applicant said that they have clearance from LAHD to convert these

four units and will present that permit at the LUPC meeting of June 6.
According to the applicant it was determined by LAHD that there were no low
income units on site and so no replacement affordable units needed to be
provided.

Respectfully Submitted,

Arnold Springer