

Report of South-East Venice Specific Plan Study Group

formed in response to City of Los Angeles Planning Department request to have members of the community meet and consider their opinions about development criteria for their neighborhood..

Contact for further information:
Co-coordinator, Charlene Richards
(213) 306-0249

November 1988

HEIGHT

STORIES

PHILOSOPHY

We want people to be able to build two-story homes with a small loft space.

No 3rd story allowed in any zone.

In general, we find thirty feet high enough for any building in our area.

R-1

With a roof angle of 4' in 12', or greater, a building can go to 28 ft. With a flat roof, or angle of less than 4' in 12', height limit is 25'.

Two stories; small loft allowed, max. sq. footage to be determined.

Exception: the ridge of 4/12 roof can go to 30' in a loft area only.

R-2

With a roof angle of 4' in 12', or greater, a building can go to 28 ft.. With a flat roof, or angle of less than 4' in 12', height limit if 25'.

Two stories; small loft allowed, max. sq. footage to be determined. Only one loft per lot.

Exception: the ridge of a 4/12 roof can go to 30' in loft area only.

R-3

30' if over parking; otherwise reverts to 25' if flat roof, 28' with roof angle of 4' in 12' or greater.

Two stories, no lofts.

R-4

same as R-3

same as R-3

C-1
C-2
C-4

30' max. with peaked roof (4' in 12' or greater); 25' if flat roof or roof slope less than 4' in 12'.

Two stories, no lofts.

M-1

25' if flat roof, or 30' if truss roof or slope of 4' in 12' or greater.

One story.

DISSENT

- 1) A petition was circulated after the first orientation meeting; it was signed by 24 residents of the Presidential Street neighborhood. This group wanted to limit height to 25' in their R-2 area. These people did not participate in the further discussion groups.
- 2) Within the study group, about 40% did not want to see the height limit in the R-1, R-2 zones to go above 28' for any reason; a few others would allow it to go to 28' or 30' with no conditions. One person would allow a commercial building to go to 30' with no conditions regarding roofline, or number of stories.

STEPBACKS AND ARTICULATION

SOLAR RIGHTS

PHILOSOPHY

We want setbacks and articulation on buildings in order to bring light between buildings, and to avoid getting rows of large boxes for our housing and commercial areas. Amt. of 2nd story setback not determined at this time.
Building walls next to a property line shared with a neighbor are our primary concern in this regard.

We support protection of a property's solar rights.

R-1

required

solar rights to be protected.

R-2

R-3

R-4

C-1

C-2

C-4

M-1

not required





DISSENT:

A couple of people made their positive vote for setbacks depend nt on how big the setback would be, and we didn't get to discussing numbers on this. We had a suggestion in the review of our conclusions that we allow a commercial building to eliminate a setback if the 2nd story use was residential.

SETBACK

PHILOSOPHY

When different zones are neighboring, we want the higher zoning classification property to provide a larger setback buffer.

	FRONT	BACK	SIDES
R-1	Prevailing setback, or 20%, whichever is <u>less</u> . (Porches can encroach.)	With alley: 15' from centerline Without alley: 15' from property line Regarding placement of garage at back of lot..turning radius is an issue, we may want small setb'k.	10%, minimum 3 ft.
R-2			
R-3	15'	with R3/R4 neighboring and with or without an alley: prevailing setback.	with R3/R4 neighboring, 10%, min. 5'
R-4		with R1/R2 neighboring, and no alley: 15' w/ alley: 20' from centerline	with R1/R2 neighboring, 10%, min. 10 ft.
C-1 C-2 C-4	We did not work out numbers for commercial or industrial zoning setbacks. Our philosophy is that we want a landscape buffer setback at whatever property line abuts a different zone, or is across a street or alley from a different zone. Parking lots must have landscape buffer strip. We would consider having new construction allowed on an alley property line if the building were articulated to provide a planting area, as an alternative to a full buffer setback.		
H-1			

DISSENT: One person wishes to have no setback required for R-1/R-2 back property line.

OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS

PHILOSOPHY

We request that the City Planning Department present us with possible open space requirements for our various zoning situations.

Residential: Our residential lots are generally sub-standard in terms of size. We have sympathy for a desire to provide comfortable living spaces; we have already required setbacks, stepbacks, articulation, and building height limitations. However, we do not want to end up with the remainder of our lots totally built-up; therefore we wish to consider the matter further, with additional information as to our alternative choices.

R-1

R-2

Commercial: Our emphasis with regard to commercial property has been to demand that parking needs be fulfilled on-site (or in a city parking structure). This will limit the building pad size. We also require 2nd story stepbacks and articulation. Height and number of stories are limited as well. However for insurance that the buildings do not acquire too much mass, we need a maximum allowable footage number. We would like to have a range of alternatives on this provided by the City.

R-3

R-4

C-1

C-2

C-4

M-1

DISSENT:

CONSOLIDATION OF LOTS

PHILOSOPHY

There are mixed votes in our group on the subject of consolidation. Those who are for it generally feel that it would greatly help provision of adequate parking, and thus bring about a better site design. We do not want consolidation to be used to increase density, with one exception discussed under heading "density bonuses". Any consolidation approval not to be construed as approval for mini-malls, which the group almost unanimously disapproves of.

R-1

- one quarter of our group said no consolidation
- the rest agreed to consolidation of a max. of two lots, to a maximum extent of 100 feet.

R-2

- Slightly wary consensus to allow consolidation of two lots to a maximum of 100 feet. Wariness due to worry that building mass would end up too large. This can be dealt with in terms of open space requirements. If the open space requirements turn out to be low, several people could want to take their consolidation approval back.

R-3

- 2/3 group wants no consolidation
- 1/3 would allow it, one person just if the lots were small.

R-4

C-1

- 22% -wants no consolidation at all

C-2

- 45%----- would allow consolidation to a limit of 80', (one of those people, to 100')

C-4

- remaining 33% would allow consolidation with no limitation for footage.

M-1

consolidation ok with group to a max. square footage of 10,000 sq. ft. area. Added sq. footage might be allowed to be consolidated if parking for neighborhood be provided on-site.

DISSENT: reported above. It should be noted that those who were against consolidation in different situations felt that it would contribute to too much building mass.

PARKING REQUIREMENTS

PHILOSOPHY

- 1) We don't want the spaces along our residential streets to be taken over by customers and employees of commercial or industrial uses.
- 2) Many people in our group, and an additional number of people in the Presidential Street area, who signed a petition to this effect, want permit parking along our residential streets.
- 3) We want allowed uses for commercial and industrial property to be tied to the provision of adequate parking for consumers and employees, on-site or in city parking structure (See Parking Structure comments on separate page).
- 4) Virtually all of our R-1 and R-2 lots are sub-standard size. We find the parking requirements in the I.C.C. and the draft L.U.P. to be too high.
- 5) We generally approve of tandem parking with only one circumstance where we would limit it as an option for providing on-site parking requirements.

Zone	New Construction	Addition
R-1	3 spaces required, 2 of these covered.	If more than 10% added, bring on-site parking up to the requirement of two spaces; one of these can be uncovered. Compact size space ok to fill requirement.
R-2 Single Family Residence	same as R-1 req.	same as R-1 requirement if structure remains a single family residence.
R-2 2-units	4 spaces, 2 covered.	If addition to existing two units is more than 10% square footage, or the addition results in a 2nd unit, then the requirement of 4 spaces must be met; two of them can be uncovered; compact sized spaces ok.

Other zones: Parking requirements for commercial and industrial spaces, and multi-family zoning and other non-R-1 or R-2 uses, to be as required in draft L.U.P. Existing non-conforming properties to undergo review upon use change, change of ownership, addition, or new construction for board to evaluate possibility of improving parking provision. (See Review Board comments on separate page, as well as Commercial Use and Industrial Use comments.)

We understand that because of the nature of the properties and the structures that already exist on them, on-site provision of parking can remain problematic. See PARKING STRUCTURE comments on separate page for possible alleviation to this difficulty.

DISSENT: one person wanted new construction R-1/2 SFR to req. only 2 sps.

SEE NEXT PAGE,

PHILOSOPHY

Because the lot sizes in the Venice area are quite small, we are generally amenable to the concept of tandem parking. City planning would be the appropriate reviewer of the possibilities of tandem parking in zones other than R-1 and R-2.

Tandem parking means that you can park one car behind another. We would not allow three cars in a row, but two cars in a row is generally fine with us. If you had a two car garage and a parking pad in front (or behind) it you could then count that as official spaces for 4 cars. The majority of us think that if one of these tandem spaces is part of a driveway it could still be counted an official space. (Two members of the group do not want driveway spaces to count.)

We do not mind if any of these official spaces occur between the setback line and the property line except under one condition:

if the garage is at the front of the lot, and there is room to park in front of it without the car hanging over the property line, only one space in this front area could count as part of the required number of on-site spaces. The motivation here is to discourage a massing of automobiles at the front of a lot.

Residential curb cuts should be subject to permit and review process. Generally our group decided we would like to see no curb cuts to avoid the possibility of lawn parking.

DISSENT: One person didn't want an R-2 property to be required to provide the four spaces under this condition: if the addition is to already existing two-units, and there is no alley.

One person wants parking requirements for industrial uses to be the same as in the regular city zoning handout.

ADEQUATE PARKING/PARKING STRUCTURE

PHILOSOPHY

THE NEED FOR A PLAN FOR PARKING STRUCTURES

The group is troubled by the lack of parking in the area, particularly along Lincoln and Washington Boulevards and by attempts to solve the parking problems by placing all of the burden upon new structures. New structures must provide increased on-site parking while adjacent older buildings benefit from the increase in area parking without assuming a portion of the cost. Provided that the older building is not modified substantially, it may continue to be utilized commercially without providing sufficient parking to handle its employees or customers. This parking overflow ends up on the commercial and nearby residential streets. The non-conforming site becomes relatively more valuable just because it is non-conforming and thus has a larger building-to-parking ratio. This also discourages the owner of the non-conforming site from performing esthetically beneficial modifications.

The group urges the city to consider a plan for off-street parking structures in key areas, financed at least partially by a demand-assessment plan. This plan would assess commercial/industrial (and perhaps even multi-unit residential) property based upon their existing parking spaces and the number of employees/customers. Simply put: a shop with 4 employees that can only provide on-site parking for 2 cars would be assessed for the additional 2; a site that can satisfy its own parking needs on-site would not be assessed. Businesses that generate more parking should pay more. The group also feels that the assessment district should be limited to easy walking distance from the structure and that a portion of the costs should be assumed by the city as general area improvement.

DISSENT: One person vehemently did not agree with this proposal and finds it too difficult for business.

FENCES/WALLS

PHILOSOPHY

Landscaped buffer walls are required where commercial property abuts a different zone or is across street or alley from different zone; so is a landscaped buffer strip large enough to have trees planted along it. If the buffer strip is sited on the interior side of the wall, we still require the exterior of the wall to be "landscaped", e.g., vine pockets could be provided for placement of vines, or notching could be designed for the wall to provide planting locations.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ZONES

We require that there be no vehicular access or egress to the commercial property from any residential street or our alleys. The wall may be broken to provide access to trash dumpster. Alley delivery and alley parking not allowed. Wall height required: 6 ft.

Note: Because we wish to screen commercial parking lots from residential viewing, we want to recommend that the site plan of the property be designed so that the parking area has high visibility from other sides of the property as a safety consideration. If this is in doubt, a compromise buffer might be worked out, or the building siting reconsidered.

We are interested in requiring screening of industrial property parking lots, but do wish to keep in mind safety considerations. A short hedge (to 42") and tree planting would seem the appropriate solution.

We understand that many existing commercial and industrial properties do not provide adequate on-site parking, much less landscape buffering or landscaped walls. We would like these situations to be reviewed upon ownership change, use change, or an increase in square footage, with the intent of seeing if there is any reasonable action to be required in terms of buffering at a zone transition.

DISSSENT:

FENCES/WALLS

PHILOSOPHY

We want to maintain some visibility into front yards, for both community open-ness and safety in the case of front driveway situations. .

We will allow front fencing to go to 5' if it is a see-through fence. A tall hedge behind such a fence would violate the spirit of the requirement, as would a vine completely covering it.

R-1	height limits:	from the front property line to the front setback line: 42" if a solid wall, 5 ft. if a see-through fence (chain-link/wrought iron). Most picket fencing would be considered solid.	from the front setback line to the rear property line: 8 ft. fencing/walls allowed
-----	----------------	---	--

R-2

R-3

R-4

DISSENT: Two people want front fencing to be high as possible; because of the safety factor with front driveways, these people want have separate requirements for areas with and without driveways.

LANDSCAPE BUFFERING OF TRANSITION ZONES

PHILOSOPHY

Landscape buffering required in transition areas between zoning classifications. Exact requirements not developed by group; we do want planting to follow xeriscape requirements of City of LA and to have automatic irrigation system provided. Would like I.C.O. list reviewed by professional committee.

R-1 Not required

R-2 Not required

R-3 Required in setback between R3 or R4 property and R1 or R2 property. See side and back setback requirements. Exact requirements in terms of trees or shrubs not worked out by study group.

R-4

C-1 Required buffer strip where commercial property abuts other
C-2 zone or is across street or alley from other zone. Exact
C-4 requirements not worked out by study group as far as number of
 trees or shrubs, or size of strip. See comments on Fences/Walls
 chart.

M-1 industrial zone parking lot buffer planting desired; see note
 regarding this under Fences/Walls heading.

DISSENT:

DISSENT CENTERED AROUND DIFFICULTY OF PROVIDING EVEN PARKING, MUCH LESS LANDSCAPING IN OR AROUND PARKING LOTS, FOR SOME EXISTING NON-CONFORMING BUILDINGS. WE ARE SYMPATHETIC TO THIS DIFFICULTY. HOWEVER, WE WOULD LIKE TO REQUIRE REVIEW OF SITUATIONS SUCH AS THESE WHEN OWNERSHIP OR USE CHANGES, OR AN ADDITION IS MADE TO THE STRUCTURE.

PARKING AREA PLANTING

PHILOSOPHY

The members of the study group want to see expanses of asphalt or concrete softened by the addition of plant material. Requirements for this planting not worked out by group, as far as number of plants, etc.

R-1

N/A

R-2

N/A

R-3

R-4

Open-air parking for any R-3 or R-4 use should provide landscaping to ameliorate the impact of an expanse of asphalt or concrete; exact requirements not worked out by study group.

C-1

C-2

C-4

Open-air on-site parking for any C-zone use should provide landscaping to ameliorate the impact of an expanse of asphalt or concrete; while we like trees, we don't necessarily require a ratio like one tree every four parking spaces such as some other communities do. We have small properties and want to maximize parking on-site. We would be interested in alternatives like requiring a smaller number of trees but having them be larger sized 'specimen' trees. As with the other zones, exact requirements not worked out by our study group.

M-1

Same as for R3 and R4, C zones.

DISSENT:

DISSENT CENTERED AROUND DIFFICULTY OF PROVIDING EVEN PARKING, MUCH LESS LANDSCAPING IN OR AROUND PARKING LOTS, FOR SOME EXISTING NON-CONFORMING BUILDINGS. WE ARE SYMPATHETIC TO THIS DIFFICULTY. HOWEVER, WE WOULD LIKE TO REQUIRE REVIEW OF SITUATIONS SUCH AS THESE WHEN OWNERSHIP OR USE CHANGES, OR AN ADDITION IS MADE TO THE STRUCTURE.

STREET TREES

PHILOSOPHY

The neighborhood community wants to see street trees on Lincoln Blvd., Washington Street and Blvd., W. Washington Blvd., Venice Blvd., and along the sidewalk on both the Garfield and Coeur d'Alene sides of the Coeur d'Alene Elementary School property.

These should be 24" bx. trees at 30' on center, or as coordinated with adjacent neighborhood specification. Some of these streets already have some palm trees. We want these street trees in addition, to provide trees at a more "human scale" height.

In many cases, this will involve saw-cutting existing concrete to provide tree-wells; we want the trees to receive either automatic irrigation or a guarantee of handwatering until the tree is established. Tree grates acceptable to city standards to be provided; we prefer cast iron tree grates.

Trees to be chosen from approved list. List to be made up by professional committee; selection of trees to fulfill xeriscape requirements (low water need), not to be subject to wind damage, to be relatively low growing for ease of maintenance and human scale, and to be un-messy, at least most of the year.

Street trees to be pruned for their beauty and structure; topping off discouraged.

Timing of maintenance to be in Fall and Winter to avoid ecological damage to bird population.

Maintenance personnel: in order to avoid some of tree pruning irregularities seen over the rest of Los Angeles we would be interested in the city contracting with (Venice based?) professional tree pruners.

Funding: we would like consideration given to assessment for this purpose. However, other alternatives could be explored: fees for variances for instance might be directed this way.

Note: street tree placement to be sited by the city. We wish to choose trees that are not too tall for easy maintenance; however we want to maintain visibility for business signage. We would like this visibility to be a condition of siting just like the usual considerations of distance from driveways, light standards, etc.

INDUSTRIAL USES

PHILOSOPHY

Residential areas shall be protected from any negative impact from commercial and industrial areas.

The group wants the review board to review any use change in our industrial area to insure use-compatibility with the neighborhood.

We encourage replacement of light industrial usage with light industrial usage, in the event of change. If there is any conversion to commercial use, then all our comments under commercial use would apply.

DISSENT: one group member would like the review to be carried out by city representatives rather than a mixed board with neighbors represented.

COMMERCIAL USES

PHILOSOPHY

Residential areas shall be protected from any negative impact from commercial industrial zones.

Commercial Use:

- No retail use- 2nd floor commercial structures
- We do not wish to develop a list of allowed uses but rather to establish a general requirement of use-compatibility with the neighborhood. Neighborhood service uses highly encouraged; late-nite operations, highly noisy or highly unsightly uses, and heavy-traffic generating uses are to be discouraged.

Adequate parking must be provided, for employees as well as customers. In case of violation, owner to be responsible as well as the tenant, with fines and loss of license utilized as incentives.

No buy-out of parking spaces without city providing parking structure.

We require traffic-mitigation review for any commercial business that generates traffic. We require that there be no vehicular access or egress to (or from) commercial property onto residential streets.

We want provision of . . . adequate parking and traffic mitigation to be firmly connected to approval of commercial use.

Regarding existing C4 lots with residential housing on them: housing stock shall be preserved and replaced within the community with affordable housing in the event of lot development.

Mini-malls:

A heavy majority of our group wants no more mini-malls within our neighborhood. However, a couple of people dissented to say that a mini-mall might be ok with them if the uses within the project were low-traffic generating, and neighborhood serving.

DISSENT: see mini-mall comment.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

PHILOSOPHY

We are a little doubtful about saddling a site with all that's involved on putting a building on an official Historic Preservation List; however we have identified a building we'd hate to lose... that is the Bay Cities Laundry. We know the present owner has good intentions; however the community may not want to lose the building in the future.

Perhaps we could insist on some sort of Notice of Intent requirement.

SCHOOLS/EDUCATIONAL USES

PHILOSOPHY

We strongly want any existing educational facility to remain as such, whether ownership is public or private. Should Coeur d'Alene elementary school have a use change, we want the area to be used for public educational benefit; we want in that event a certain amount of open landscaping but do not wish to see the area designed as a park due to its lack of open visibility and potential safety problem from that lack of visibility to major streets. We are happy with the current uses of the two schools on that block. As addressed under the Street Tree comments, we would like to see street trees soften the asphalt visual impact; there is also a traffic problem with school 'drop off'. However, as far as our meetings have detected the neighbors are supportive of the schools.

SIGNAGE, TELEPHONE WIRES, LIGHTING

PHILOSOPHY

SIGNAGE: We want to phase out billboards from this neighborhood. No new ones allowed. Existing billboards to be removed within 5 years or term of existing lease.

All signs must be within the zoned height limit of the building. (specific plan).

We are not in favor of pole signs; we will make an exception for gas stations; in any case, sign not to go higher than zoned building height limit.

All new signs to be submitted to review board for approval, size limit to be established. We want to encourage artistic, well-designed efforts. We are not interested in having all signs look alike.

TELEPHONE WIPES

We want to encourage burial of telephone wires.

LIGHTING

We support efforts to inform people of our neighborhood of the availability of increased alley lighting. We would like to see a mailing to residents about the procedure to obtain free alley lighting.

Some of our streets need more street lights while others do not; we would like a study on this. Assessment for property owners on a block where lighting is increased would seem to be appropriate.

We strongly favor lower, more human scale lighting over the very high lighting standards. Most of us like the old-fashioned street lamps (e.g., there are some along Venice Blvd.), although these might not be the right style along a stretch of modern buildings. In any case, we like the lower height standards.

We don't think we need a great deal more street lighting, but feel there are several situations where lighting at present is not adequate for safety.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS

PHILOSOPHY

In no circumstances shall trash receptacles contain materials that are environmental hazards. It is a priority of this neighborhood that inspection of waster material disposal methods of commercial and industrial users be implemented by the proper agencies.

Additionally, the group would like to see Venice adopt a community policy regarding toxic pollution into our water and air; we would like to see what other cities require in this regard.

TRAFFIC IMPACT

PHILOSOPHY

One of our neighborhood intersections is among the busiest in the city; development outside our defined south-east Venice area is going to greatly increase traffic around us and through our streets. We don't want our residential streets to act as diverter streets for frustrated traffic.

We want the Dept. of Transportation and the Planning Department to meet with the neighborhood community and hear our opinions about the necessity of providing amelioration for this impact. Many of the neighbors are interested in closing the 'east-west' streets from Harrison to Coeur d'Alene from Lincoln by means of semi-cul de sacs. Also, one or more streets could be made more safe as a one-way street because of visibility problems; these visibility problems occur in several places in the community.

Funding for such changes as cul-de-sacs might be available from the projects that are contributing to the negative impact.

Regarding traffic impact from projects in our own area: we are adamant that traffic not be diverted down our residential streets. We want a traffic mitigation review to be part of our Design Review Process.

DENSITY BONUS/AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PHILOSOPHY

We have voted that no height limitation or setback limitation can be broken in order to encourage additional units of affordable housing. We encourage exploration of alternate benefits such as creating interest rate incentives, and possibly parking incentives, although that would only be considered at all if there was a review process to review the parking needs of the surrounding neighborhood.

We are generally not interested in having any F.A.R. or cu. footage volume limitation broken in order to increase density either, with one exception:

The group is interest in maintaining our present number of "court" type multiple unit housing structures. We want to insure that existing number of courts don't just disappear over time; possibly we would consider allowing an increase in density and building mass on a set of consolidated R2 lots (2 lots only), if parking needs could be met, so that a court project could be built. In this case, the units would have to be very small, and very affordable. This is not to be construed as a license to build and extra regular sized unit on consolidated R-2 lots; nor do we want to end up with courts on all our R-2 lots sometime in future. We look to the city for advice on keeping the existing court-housing stock.

PHILOSOPHY

Open Space Preservation: The specific plan study group very strongly wants the remaining open space in our community to remain open, and to be acquired as much as possible as PUBLIC PROPERTY.

PUBLIC PARK

In line with our desire to keep our remaining open space, the neighborhood group wants very strongly to see the current vacant expanse of weeds along Mildred Avenue to be turned into a PUBLIC PARK. We want the site parcels accumulated by the city and designed for this use.

We want recreational facilities on the property for both children and adults; we want the property to serve as a community gathering area; we are interested in the possibility of community gardening on the site. Some parking would be appropriate, a little for the neighborhood and some for the visiting public. However, we don't want the whole thing turned into a parking lot when our children have no place to run around. As it is, to get to the nearest other park our children have to toddle across a major street and up a busy bikeway to get to a landscaped space that has no playground facilities.

We would like the park to work as a "greenbelt" connection to the marina area. While the purchasing and design process is on-going, we would like the land planted with native grasses and wild-flowers; in fact, after it's designed, natives and wildflowers would be attractive to us, and likely, birds and insects also.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD/VARIANCES

PHILOSOPHY We wish to have a community design review board. It is probably most efficient to have one for Venice as a whole, even though different sections of Venice will have some different criteria for approval.

- Plans to be submitted and reviewed for any change involving an increase in square footage of 10% or greater, or any change that results in the addition of a unit even if the footage increase is less than 10%. New construction projects are all to be reviewed. Additionally, upon change of ownership or use in commercial or industrial properties that are already built at this time, sites to be reviewed for adequacy of parking spaces, traffic mitigation, and landscape buffering possibilities if there is a zone transition situation (see landscape buffering chart).
- Projects listed above to be reviewed in terms of Site Design, Architectural Design as outlined by the specific plan, and Landscape Design (as outlined by the specific plan). Design review for landscaping not necessary for R-1, R-2 projects.
- Review Board to consist of members chosen from the city, design professionals, business community, and residential neighborhood representation to provide a fair review.

Plan check fees to be used to help pay for the process. Variance fees to be redirected to the community, possibly for street tree maintenance or Venice Blvd. maintenance.

We want the review to be efficient and applied evenhandedly to commercial, industrial, and residential applicants.

- Many people at the meetings have convinced the group that the permit and variance process is cumbersome, contradictory and confusing. We have heard many tales of hearings unknown by residents directly affected, and authorization by Public Works Administration for parking and curb cuts that violate zoning restrictions. Builder and homeowner alike can get completely confused. The city needs to streamline the permit process to ensure there is one entry location for applications and information, and a central method of ensuring that various departments coordinate with each other. Criteria for development should be listed clearly and be available to all.

- Regarding variances, we voted that signed permission is to be obtained from 90% of the property owners within 500 foot radius of the site 14 days before a variance hearing. Additionally, we would like to have the renters notified, although we would not hang the hearing date on this.

Please note that our desire to have a design review system does not mean that we give the board broad powers of decision on architectural design aesthetics. We like the present architectural and artistic diversity in our community and do not want to provide obstacles to that other than our criteria discussed in this report.

DISSENT: One person wants no review board and is concerned that design criteria will be too limiting. One person would have the review board staffed by professionals only, with no neighborhood representation.

OUTSIDE IMPACT/NOTIFICATION

PHILOSOPHY

We request that a 'Core List' of interested groups in Venice be kept at the City Council Office in Westchester. Names and mailing addresses of such groups as the Town Council, Venice Action Committee, Neighborhood Homeowner Associations, and Specific Plan Study Groups such as ourselves (if these groups stay organized) should be listed.

We want the groups on this list to be notified in a timely fashion of any project equal to an acre in building pad space and 4 stories or 40' in height that is being planned within a mile of a group's boundaries.

We would consider something like 21 days before a hearing to be "timely".

We want notification as above to be required as well for any lot consolidation within 1000' of our area.

DISSENT: One member of our group would like a review board set up for review of these out-of-boundary projects.

South East Venice section

11/5/88

Addendum to report

To Catriona Bryan:

We included in our report a desire to have no access from commercial property into alleys and residential streets.

There was additionally a desire to screen trash areas, as well as a lack of enthusiasm for trash pick-up and delivery via alleys ^{to} ~~from~~ commercial. These had been missed in the taping of the report.

Jo Cunningham
(Co-ordinator,
put together
report)