

**Venice Neighborhood Council
Land Use and Planning Committee
Unadopted Minutes
Small Lot Subdivision Workshop
With Helene Bibas
Westminster Elementary School
February 1, 2007**

1 Challis Macpherson called the meeting to order at 6:40 pm. A quorum was
2 established. Ms. Macpherson called the roll—Committee members present:
3 Maury Ruano, Jim Murez, Lainie Herrera, Jed Pauker, Susan Papadakis,
4 Challis Macpherson, Ruthie Seroussi, and Arnold Springer.

5 **1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Susan Papadakis moved to approve the
6 agenda.

7 Minutes for the meetings held on December 4, 2006 and December 6, 2006
8 will be reviewed at January 24, 2007 meeting

9 **2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

10 **3. LUPC CHAIR REPORTS**

11 (Taken out of order) Challis Macpherson listed current Venice area hearings,
12 Projects of 3 units or more, and you have to have 1000 sq. ft. on the ground floor.
13 Now, three units or more, once you subdivide the lot into three lots, you don't
14 have three units or more any more. You have one lot and then you apply the
15 standards. So the beach impact parking zone will not apply to individual lots
16 that will result from a small lot subdivision action. Now you will have
17 individual lots that will have to comply with the Venice Coastal Zone Specific
18 Plan regulations. Is this clear?

19

20 Answering Ruthie Seroussi, Ms. Bibas said “The affordable housing
21 requirements of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan are extremely detailed.
22 They have to do with only replacement housing and inclusionary housing.
23 Replacement housing means that you have to have a pre-existing affordable unit
24 that you intend to demolish in order so that unit will have to be replaced. That
25 will trigger a process under which we have to examine that you meet that
26 regulation. So that does not preclude it.”

27

28 Inaudible stakeholder question, to which Challis Macpherson discussed the
29 Committee’s processes.

30

31 Helene Bibas stated: “Also, I did not say in my introduction, I would like to
32 specify that I am also new at it and I may not have all the answers, so please be
33 patient. I can commit, however, to get back to you with some answers that I may
34 not have today.”

35

36 Jim Murez stated that the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan is not clear that it is
37 necessary to replace an existing affordable house, and that an additional unit is
38 required to be affordable. Mr. Murez discussed an issue that was debated at a
39 recent LUPC meeting.

40

41 Helene Bibas: "No. Let's read it. Typically, you are limited to two units per lots
42 and then there are also provisions of a certain lot size for a replacement,
43 affordable unit. Go back to page 5, which is the definition section that explains
44 what a replacement affordable unit is. In plain English, it's really an existing
45 affordable unit that exists. You cannot just do it. It's been difficult, we've been
46 struggling with that issue, because we do have at the City a goal to improve the
47 stock of affordable units, and we are seeing less and less of it. But the fact is that
48 the way this is written and it's been adopted and we went through a very
49 extensive public participation process to arrive at this consensus. So you cannot
50 add an affordable unit unless you do it by exception if that affordable unit was
51 not a pre-existing one. Is this clear?

52

53 No, it's still not clear? Okay, you start with a lot, you have a typical lot that's
54 RD1.5 so that's 15 for each, let's say 5000 square feet lot with three units on it,
55 one of which is affordable. If these were market rates, forget the small lot
56 subdivision for now, you would be permitted to build only two new market rate
57 units without requiring an exception. Let me continue illustrating this. If you
58 have a situation where you have two market rate units and one existing
59 affordable unit, there is a whole process to define what it is and how much

60 people pay and so forth. That unit would have to be replaced on the site. Now
61 the many ways with the Mello Act compliance that a lot of people get out of
62 unfortunately and we are working very hard to have an in lieu fee ordinance
63 adopted by the City Council but we are not there yet. So that's basically how it
64 works. And then there are very special situations."

65

66 Jim Murez detailed the earlier case: a single family existing on a RD1.5 lot on
67 which the developer proposed to build three units. Mr. Murez asked if the third
68 unit had to be affordable. Helene Bibas said, "No. The answer is no." Challis
69 Macpherson stated that the proposed development was in an area of Millwood
70 that was zoned to allow only two units on the lot, and if there were an extra 1500
71 feet the only other unit had to be affordable.

72

73 Helene Bibas said, "No, it has to be a replacement affordable unit. That's the
74 whole difference. It's a replacement. Again, the emphasis is on the
75 replacement." Challis Macpherson asked if three market rate units could be built
76 on the lot. Ms. Bibas replied that the developer could apply through a Venice
77 Coastal Zone Specific Plan exception process or decide to subdivide the lot. Each
78 lot cannot be less than 1500 square feet. These are the constraints.

79

80 Arnold Springer stated that the revision of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan
81 made it more difficult to apply what was intended, especially in Oakwood. Mr.
82 Springer stated that stakeholders' intent was subverted. Helene Bibas stated that
83 a lot of what is in the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan today was taken out of
84 the interim control ordinance that was in effect probably 10 or 15 years, which is
85 very unusual for an interim regulation. Ms. Bibas stated that the intent was not
86 to bypass the density limitation of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan. If
87 today you have a 3000 square foot lot the most you can do there is again two
88 units, whether you build two condos, two detached houses or subdivide the lot
89 so you have two structures, but they have individual foundations and things like
90 that, I don't see how that increases density. It actually helps carry out the goals
91 of the Land Use Plan initially. The whole thing that was driving the regulations
92 of the Land Use Plan and the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan was to preserve
93 the character of the small houses, single family and bungalow type. So the
94 smaller subdivisions actually help that, instead of having mega two-unit
95 complexes, you can have two individual houses on smaller lots. So it's back to
96 the beach type of housing.

97

98 Ruthie Seroussi stated that the City Attorney's opinion is warranted regarding
99 the language concerning the replacement affordable unit and asked if Helene

100 Bibas would contact the City Attorney or if VNC should do it. Ms. Bibas stated
101 she would forward the suggestion to the appropriate people, however, the intent
102 was clear, the interpretation was implemented that way for six years, and that
103 management can issue a letter of clarification to that effect. Jim Murez remarked
104 that Ms. Seroussi referred to the Oakwood section for housing density, on page
105 18 that calls out a reference to the replacement affordable housing definition.
106 Lainie Herrera referred to a project that requested an exception to allow three
107 market rate units, and referred to the way it was used in the Millwood section.
108 Ms. Bibas asked for examples, and noted that she had not encountered this
109 situation in her tenure. Ms. Bibas noted that exceptions are not always granted.
110 Lainie Herrera asked why an exception to the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan
111 was needed if the unit has to be affordable. Ms. Bibas stated that the assumption
112 was incorrect, that a third unit would not be allowed by right that is not an
113 affordable unit. Ms. Bibas agreed that only two units are allowed on these lots,
114 provided that an affordable housing unit does not exist. Ms. Bibas reiterated that
115 only the replacement of an existing affordable housing unit that is demolished to
116 develop the project is appropriate. "You start with a lot that may have only one
117 affordable unit. The density will allow, according to the Venice Coastal Zone
118 Specific Plan, two units, assuming that the whole lot is at least 4500 square feet.
119 You could demolish that existing affordable unit. That has to be analyzed to see

120 if it is really an affordable unit... If it is determined that the unit qualifies as an
121 affordable unit, it needs to be replaced. Then you can develop two more units,
122 market rate units, including and add the third unit if you have the appropriate
123 density to do that. There is no other way to do three units by right.

124

125 Inaudible question

126

127 If you have absolutely no existing affordable unit on the site that you want
128 develop, then your limitation is only two market rate units. You can make those
129 units affordable if you want but your maximum is still two units.

130

131 Inaudible question

132

133 You can try, and there will be a public hearing. That's why it's an exception;
134 there are all sorts of variables that come into account, including your input as a
135 NC, the neighbors,

136

137 Jed Pauker asked if an affordable unit exists, a replacement affordable unit must
138 be included in whatever you build under the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance,
139 so no matter how many units up to a maximum of three you build one has to be

140 affordable if you already had an affordable unit. Ms. Bibas said yes, but there are
141 other ways to get out of meeting that requirement, which is the Mello Act
142 compliance. Ms. Bibas referred to material to be circulated regarding the Mello
143 Act, stated that the Mello Act is aimed at preserving affordable housing in the
144 Coastal Zone and stated that people can legally get out of the requirement if they
145 can show that replacing the housing unit on site will not be economically
146 feasible. Mr. Pauker asked how the loophole can be addressed. Ms. Bibas stated
147 that there is no loophole, it is the law. It is legal, proof of financial hardship is
148 sufficient. The furthest progress achieved in correcting the situation so far is to
149 pay in lieu fees instead of providing affordable housing on site. But that
150 regulation is not yet adopted.

151

152 Susan Papadakis asked what formula was used to determine economic
153 feasibility. Helene Bibas stated she would provide cases that could be reviewed.

154

155 Helene Bibas agreed with Arnold Springer that the small lot subdivision could be
156 used to replace a burned down home on a 5000 square foot lot zoned RD1.5 with
157 three units. Ms. Bibas stated that that the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance
158 allows up to a minimum of 600 square feet of lot area per unit. The intent was to

159 provide alternatives to condominiums, more housing options, go back to beach
160 house types, etc.

161

162 In answer to Arnold Springer's question, Helene Bibas stated that a developer
163 cannot consolidate two lots and then apply the provisions of the Small Lot
164 Subdivision.

165

166 Jim Murez asked if the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan is considered prior to
167 the application of the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance. Helene Bibas stated that
168 the Small Lot Subdivision staff will not approve a project that has something
169 contrary to the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan and described how the staff
170 reviews a development project.

171

172 Maury Ruano ... asked for clarification of the use of lots in parcels, using an
173 example of two lots that are joined by use where the Small Lot Subdivision is
174 used to create three parcels; the property is 4500 square feet and zoned RD1.5.

175 Helene Bibas asked if the existing structure is being kept across lot lines; Maury
176 Ruano stated that the existing lot will be demolished and asked if the affordable
177 housing unit requirement is needed. Ms. Bibas stated that the lot could be
178 subdivided, but noted that the process is not a simple one.

179

180 Jed Pauker asked about the consolidation of two lots that has one large existing
181 house on 6000 square feet and how the Small Lot Subdivision applies to this.

182 Helene Bibas asked if the parcel is now legally one lot of 6000 square feet, and
183 stated that the lot could be subdivided under RD1.5 into 4 lots of 1500 square
184 feet.

185

186 Answering Ruthie Seroussi's question regarding what determines a consolidated
187 lot; Helene Bibas stated there has to be an action through the parcel map or
188 subdivision to tie the lots legally together. Ms. Bibas stated that she would
189 provide information later on limitations with regard to time limits on
190 consolidation. Ms. Bibas stated that only an existing lot can be subdivided.

191

192 Robert Aronson asked if the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan requirement for
193 an affordable unit is irrelevant when the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance is
194 used to develop a 5000 square foot, zoned RD1.5 to split the lot into three lots.

195 Ms. Bibas stated that the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan is relevant in that it
196 requires a minimum lot size per unit that is much more than what the Small Lot
197 Subdivision Ordinance allows. Helene Bibas stated unequivocally that the

198 existing affordable housing must exist in order to require a replacement

199 affordable housing unit.

200

201 Ruthie Seroussi referred to Section 4.b, page 2 of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific

202 Plan; Helene Bibas agreed, noting that the new lots being created with the Small

203 Lot Subdivision are subject to the requirements of the Venice Coastal Zone

204 Specific Plan.

205

206 Public Comment

207

208 Javier Carbo asked how many lots can be subdivided from a 6500 square foot lot.

209 Helene Bibas stated that each lot cannot be less than 1500 square feet and each lot

210 cannot be further subdivided.

211

212 Inaudible question. Helene Bibas stated that she would e-mail material to the

213 questioner and advised that a meeting with a Venice Planner is the first thing,

214 and listed issues that should be addressed, such as access.

215

216 David Reddy, stakeholder and architect, noted a benefit of the Small Lot

217 Subdivision was fee simple ownership and commented that the Small Lot

218 Subdivision does not result in higher density. Mr. Reddy recommended that
219 interested developers speak to the Case Management Unit of the Department of
220 Building and Safety.

221

222 Ian McIlvaine stated that there would be a rise in density once property owners
223 become aware of the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance. Ian also asked about the
224 zero side yard setback requirements.

225

226 Helene Bibas stated that an earlier example used, of a 6500 square foot, is
227 atypical. Ms. Bibas stated that the City of Los Angeles is obligated to address the
228 need for housing and has considered a number of avenues. Ms. Bibas opined
229 that the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance has been successful, resulting in
230 quality small projects that have added to the communities in which they were
231 built.

232

233 Answering Arnold Springer's request for clarification, Helene Bibas reiterated
234 that the owner of 6500 square foot lot could apply for a Small Lot Subdivision;
235 Ms. Bibas stated that approval of a subdivision is not automatic. Mr. Springer
236 stated that a clear formula should be used by LUPC to review projects. Ms.
237 Bibas stated that LUPC does not issue building permits, but should voice

238 support of design, density, participate in public hearing and voice concerns in a
239 cohesive fashion. Ms. Bibas stated that LUPC can have an opinion on
240 compliance of a specific project to existing regulations. Mr. Springer stated that
241 the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan has specific provisions in RD1.5 zoned
242 areas. Ms. Bibas stated that the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan does not have
243 a side yard requirement, except for projects in the lagoon and referred to Section
244 A, page 12. Ms. Bibas stated that typically projects with less than three feet are
245 not granted.

246

247 Guest Parking and the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance

248

249 Helene Bibas stated that in general the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan
250 requirements with regard to parking supersede any other regulation unless they
251 are stricter. Jim Murez asked, in the case of a two-unit project on one lot, the
252 Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan provides for one guest parking space. Ms.
253 Bibas stated that the requirement varies according to the lot width. Mr. Murez
254 stated that a single family dwelling has no guest parking requirement, so if the
255 Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance is applied and produces two single family
256 dwellings and asked if the requirement for guest parking has effectively been
257 removed. Ms. Bibas referred to the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan, Section D,

258 page 26 and noted that a detailed list of parking requirements for single family
259 dwellings is provided. If the single family sits on a site that is less than 40 feet
260 wide with no alley, either two spaces or three spaces is required depending on
261 the lot width. After further debate and review of the provisions of the Venice
262 Coastal Zone Specific Plan, Ms. Bibas stated that the Small Lot Subdivision
263 review process could require the provision of additional parking spaces and
264 could impose additional requirements. Ms. Bibas stated that the Venice Coastal
265 Zone Specific Plan only deals with parking in relation to the lot size and that
266 what is written is a relationship between parking requirements, density and lot
267 size. Ms. Bibas stated that the advisory agency will review a large project in a
268 congested area and will demand provision of guest parking.

269

270 Lainie Herrera reiterated that the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance is applied
271 first to create numerous lots and then the provisions of the Venice Coastal Zone
272 Specific Plan applied. Maury Ruano stated that each lot is a legal parcel and that
273 one unit on a parcel is considered a single family home and not multiple units.
274 Robert Aronson used the example of a 4500 square foot lot to which the Small
275 Lot Subdivision Ordinance could be applied and asked for confirmation that the
276 provisions of the Beach Impact Zone Parking are not applicable. Ms. Bibas stated
277 that of all the multiple dwelling projects she has seen as a Venice Planner, she

278 has seen very Beach Impact parking for residential projects, noting that the 1000
279 square feet of floor area for the ground floor requirement and at least three units
280 in one building. Ms. Bibas said that she would not echo Mr. Aronson's statement
281 that the Beach Impact Parking zone is in the trash, but all #3 says is that you
282 cannot have a fraction of a space, whether the other conditions apply or not, the
283 end result cannot be less than one space. Ms. Bibas agreed with Mr. Aronson's
284 contention that the Beach Impact Parking zone does not apply in the case of a
285 Small Lot Subdivision; Ms. Bibas clarified that she has seen very, very few Beach
286 Impact Parking zone but has seen fees paid but not parking spaces supplied. Ms.
287 Bibas discussed the process by which in lieu fees are requested to be paid. Mr.
288 Aronson asked if the City would support the Neighborhood Council's strong
289 statement regarding compliance with the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan
290 regarding provision of parking, rather than pay in lieu fees. Ms. Bibas referred to
291 the relief clause that has to be offered to citizens, to preserve property rights, etc.
292 Mr. Aronson referred to the exercise of discretion. Ms. Bibas cited examples of
293 the Planning Commission's agreement with the position of a Neighborhood
294 Council.

295

296 Jed Pauker stated that a guarantee of compliance with the Venice Coastal Zone
297 Specific Plan seems to be what the LUPC is seeking. Mr. Pauker discussed the

298 developers that are requesting exceptions and asked how to address the fact that
299 the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance doesn't appear to protect the people that
300 can't protect themselves. Helene Bibas invited the LUPC to review the cases that
301 the Planning Department has approved, to see what the commonality is. Ms.
302 Bibas stated that each case is different and presents different challenges. There
303 was discussion about reasonable profit generated by a project.

304

305 Susan Papadakis referred to a previous request from a developer that LUPC
306 approved and asked how the local environment or context is considered by the
307 City in instances where there is a commercial or other zone and the streetscape is
308 being changed by subdivision of a lot. Ms. Bibas stated that the Venice Coastal
309 Zone Specific Plan is clear that curb cuts have to be minimized and that all
310 potential developers are advised to come to the LUPC. Ms. Papadakis stated that
311 she had been told that only Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan exceptions are
312 referred to LUPC and asked if that included Small Lot Subdivision cases. Ms.
313 Bibas stated that there is no requirement that a developer appear before LUPC
314 and noted the process by which Planning strongly urges developers to present to
315 LUPC.

316

317 Jim Murez asked if the Small Lot Subdivision requires a Coastal Development
318 permit. Helene Bibas stated that anything that is subject to the Subdivision Map
319 act requires a Coastal Development permit. Mr. Murez asked how the Coastal
320 Commission is reacting to the Small Lot Subdivision. Ms. Bibas stated that the
321 Coastal Commission has been concerned, that a lot of discussion occurred, that
322 so far they have been fine with it, and that they have not appealed any small lot
323 project as far as Ms. Bibas knows. Answering Mr. Murez' question, Ms. Bibas
324 stated that the Commission was not sure how the ordinance bifurcated the
325 Coastal regulations and that she thinks that now they think it's fine.

326

327 Arnold Springer asked would current rear yard and front yard set backs in the
328 Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan be applied to Small Lot Subdivision. Helene
329 Bibas stated that, except for the canals and lagoon, there are no set back
330 requirements for front or rear yards. Mr. Springer asked if Building and Safety
331 imposes set backs. Ms. Bibas stated that the Small Lot Subdivision can rule on
332 setbacks. Mr. Springer asked if there are setback requirements in walk streets in
333 North Venice and the Millwood section. Ms. Bibas stated that walk streets in the
334 North Venice area must follow the yard regulations of the zoning code and never
335 be less than five feet plus they can use the public right of way, regardless of the
336 Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance. Ms. Bibas stated that she had not seen a Small

337 Lot Subdivision project on a walk street. Ms. Bibas suggested the LUPC
338 formulate a policy. Mr. Springer asked about averaging of front yards and asked
339 if that practice will continue or abandoned under small lot subdivision. Ms.
340 Bibas stated that the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance does allow the advisory
341 agency to grant reductions in yards.

342

343 Phil Raider asked if the Planning Department will still require alley access
344 parking with a small lot subdivision. Helene Bibas stated that the Planning
345 Department tries as much as possible to limit vehicular access to the alley from
346 both lots. Mr. Raider asked about the Planning Department's rationale for
347 granting exemption from Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan requirements, that
348 an exemption should not be granted because of an individual's hardship and
349 used the example of a curb cut granted that shifts hardship from the individual
350 to the community. Ms. Bibas stated that this is best argument that could be
351 brought to the Planning Department or Hearing Officer when a public hearing is
352 being conducted. Ms. Bibas advised that the cost to the community has to be
353 made clear, substantiated evidence should be provided, and alternative scenarios
354 should be presented by the public. Ms. Bibas stated that exceptions are not
355 automatically granted and outlined the process. Ms. Bibas encouraged
356 participation in the public input process, and noted that most Planning

357 Commissions side with the community. Ms. Bibas encouraged all to assist in
358 improving the system.

359

360 Challis Macpherson asked if there are specific questions regarding floor area
361 ratio vis-à-vis the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance. Arnold Springer asked if an
362 RD1.5 30 by 90 lot has an floor area ratio (FAR) and if the Small Lot Subdivision
363 Ordinance has an FAR. Helene Bibas stated that there is no FAR for a RD1.5 and
364 the maximum that can be built for a Small Lot Subdivision is constrained by the
365 height limitation. The Small Lot Subdivision will respect the height imposed by
366 the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan.

367

368 Jim Murez referred to the inclusion of half of the alley width in calculation of the
369 FAR; Helene Bibas stated that half the alley width is used to calculate the number
370 of allowable units to be built on a lot. Mr. Murez asked which of the two lots in a
371 subdivision ends up with the alley width. Ms. Bibas stated that the calculation is
372 done, that before the subdivision takes place, the alley square footage is included
373 and then the 1500 square foot lot is obtained. Ms. Bibas promised to provide the
374 calculation. Answering Susan Papadakis' question, Ms. Bibas noted that the
375 inclusion of the alley width is provided for in the Los Angeles City Zoning Code.

376

377 Jed Pauker asked about comparing the maximum FAR in a standard size lot of
378 the SOS to that provided for in the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan. Helene
379 Bibas stated that she could not answer that at this point and did not know if it
380 would give anything more to judge. Ms. Bibas referred to height limitation, “so
381 you cannot utilize the maximum that the Zoning Code allows you to have.”
382 There are limitations on the size of the house that you end up have. The
383 maximum size of the house is limited by the height and the yard.

384

385 Challis Macpherson asked if there were any other questions regarding setbacks.

386

387 Jed Pauker stated that since the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan does not refer
388 to setbacks, they will be “inherited” from the Municipal Code and then the Small
389 Lot Subdivision Ordinance will set up its own. Helene Bibas agreed that the
390 Advisory Agency will grant yard reductions on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Pauker
391 asked if there was a hard and fast rule that was used to determine yard size. Ms.
392 Bibas agreed, but referred to the three foot side yard setback. Lainie Herrera
393 referred to a document from Emily Gable, Planning that referred to a three foot
394 side yard setback; Maury Ruano read the text of the reference. Ms. Bibas agreed
395 that this policy is appropriate.

396

397 Jim Murez, referring to lot consolidations, discussed the Venice Coastal Zone
398 Specific Plan's provision to tie three lots together with provisions that include
399 subterranean parking and asked what adverse effects come in to play. Helene
400 Bibas stated that a larger scale project is limited by design standards that aim to
401 make the larger scale project appear less large. Mr. Murez asked if it is possible
402 to apply the small lot subdivision to three lots; Ms. Bibas clarified that she does
403 not know that this can be done.

404

405 Arnold Springer asked about the three foot side yard and asked if it is possible to
406 get similar statements from Emily Gable regarding front yard and rear yard
407 setbacks. Helene Bibas stated that Emily Gable has been replaced by Michael
408 Young. Ms. Bibas stated that the current Zoning Code requires a minimum of
409 five feet side yards for a typical 50 feet wide lot and then it allows reduction of
410 the side yard 10% for non conforming lots with a minimum of three or three and
411 one half feet. Ms. Bibas stated that this is enabling legislation that is meant to
412 help people create a different type of development from typical single family
413 homes. Ms. Bibas stated that the site's physical limitations determine the type of
414 project to be developed.

415

416 Public Comment

417

418 Eric ... stakeholder, stated that there may be cases where the Small Lot
419 Subdivision ordinance either places higher parking requirements or discourages
420 the subdivision. Helene Bibas concurred.

421

422 Nanette Dollinger, a stakeholder, asked why there is a difference between the
423 parcel sizes are different on her street and asked what natural grade meant.

424 Challis Macpherson asked if the stakeholder planned to subdivide; the
425 stakeholder stated no. Ms. Macpherson reminded the stakeholder that the
426 workshop concerned small lot subdivision. Helene Bibas explained that a
427 property covered under the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan, the Planning
428 Department looks at the elevation of the center line of the street or walk in front
429 of the house, not natural grade.

430

431 Fences and Walls

432

433 Helene Bibas quoted a maximum of three and one half feet for walls or fences in
434 the front and up to five feet on the side and rear yards but never exceeding six
435 feet and reiterated that all height in the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan is
436 measured from the center line of the adjacent public right of way.

437

438 Challis Macpherson noted that a LUPC meeting took place recently regarding
439 fences and hedges. Phil Raider asked why the Planning Department grants
440 exceptions to a variance regarding fences and requires only that abutting
441 neighbors to be notified, instead of notifying people within 500 feet. Helene
442 Bibas stated that a request would have to be made to review the Code and
443 promised to provide the appropriate Code citation to Mr. Raider.

444

445 Jim Murez asked, in a Small Lot Subdivision, within the interior of the lot, does
446 the front yard on one yard become the rear yard fence of the other? Mr. Murez
447 asked what fence requirement exists; Helene Bibas stated that there are no fence
448 requirements with the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance. Helene Bibas noted
449 that the Advisory Agency may choose to redefine the Small Lot Subdivision
450 project entirely. There were inaudible questions that Ms. Bibas agreed with, or
451 stated that she did not have answers.

452

453 Jed Pauker asked if the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance will affect frontage
454 barriers differently from the Los Angeles Municipal Code and the Venice Coastal
455 Zone Specific Plan. Helene Bibas stated that if there is a provision in the Venice
456 Coastal Zone Specific Plan that speaks to fences if a the Advisory Agency will

457 not lower that standard. Mr. Pauker asked if provision for further discussion
458 should be made. Ms. Bibas suggested that staff had not perceived this as an
459 issue, but suggested that the issue be written up and submitted. Ms. Bibas stated
460 that the group articulate any issues in writing to the Planning Department.

461

462 Susan Papadakis asked about the internal setback requirement and asked Helene
463 Bibas for advice regarding how much information an applicant should provide
464 for a prospective project. Ms. Bibas stated her preference to have as much
465 information as possible. Ms. Bibas stated that there was no internal setback
466 requirement, but was up to the discretion of the developer.

467

468 Robert Aronson asked if it is possible for a developer to present a request for a
469 subdivision without providing any other information. Helene Bibas stated that
470 legally they can, but in Venice they don't accept applications without seeing the
471 whole project. Mr. Aronson asked the same question Susan Papadakis just asked
472 regarding the amount of information to be provided by a developer. Ms. Bibas
473 reiterated her earlier answer. Mr. Aronson asked about Ms. Bibas' position with
474 the Planning Department; Ms. Bibas stated that she had been reassigned.

475

476 Maury Ruano stated that the strategy of subdividing a property into a parcel or a
477 tract and then units after that is an expensive strategy and that a developer
478 would not do that; it would be done as one process. Maury Ruano stated that
479 developing a property under the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance takes longer,
480 and that some developers choose to build condominiums because of this.

481

482 Jim Murez thanked Helene Bibas for appearing.

483

484 including 812 Main Street and 650 East Indiana.

485

486 a. VNC Board action on LUPC recommendations

487

488 Challis Macpherson provided copies of a report (Attachment 1) that noted
489 VNC Board actions on proposed development project at 600-604 Venice
490 Boulevard, which was passed by the Board, 636 East Venice Boulevard,
491 which was passed by the Board, and 1009 South Abbott Kinney
492 Boulevard, which was approved with amended conditions. Ms.
493 Macpherson noted a PLUM hearing for the Amuse Café on January 16,
494 2007; the matter will be considered by the Los Angeles City Council. Ms.
495 Macpherson noted that the LUPC recommendation approved on

496 December 7, 2005 for this project was ignored. Regarding the Pali Hotel,
497 812 Main Street, Ms. Macpherson reported that the developer will be
498 heard by LUPC on February 4, 2007 and by the VNC Board on February
499 24, 2007. A request by The Other Room for increased seating was denied.

500

501

502 b. Mello Act densities and height bonuses. Venice Town Council vs. City of
503 Los Angeles regarding the Mello Act filed in 1993, and the current
504 settlement debate.

505

506 Challis Macpherson gave background information on this matter and
507 noted current action being taken, reporting that a resulting feasibility
508 study is being negotiated. Ms. Macpherson provided contact information.

509

510 c. Neighborhood Councils/Planning Department Pilot Program.

511

512 Challis Macpherson reported on progress achieved regarding a
513 Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Los Angeles
514 Planning Department and the Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils. Ms.

515 Macpherson stated that a pilot program outlined in her report is being
516 rolled out soon.

517

518

519

520 **5. LUPC TASK FORCE REPORTS**

521

522 a. Agenda Building

523

524 Maury Ruano Ruano stated that there no update available at this time.

525

526 b. Policies and Procedures

527

528 Challis Macpherson noted the following items proposed for LUPC review

529 by February 2, 2007:

530

531 1. LUPC Letter of Introduction, crafted by Jed Pauker 12/6/06 at the
532 request of LUPC, for inclusion with permit application. Copies
533 distributed.

534 2. Rule that LUPC may consider and advise on a development project,

535 but not recommend it to the VNC Board of Officers for action unless
536 the project has filed for a Permit and has a Case Number with the LA
537 City Department of Planning.

538 3. LUPC Staff Report Form, crafted by Susan Papadakis, draft form
539 distributed.

540 4. Specific language to direct staff, for a particular project, to follow-up
541 on LUPC recommendations to the VNC Board and that board's
542 completion of their proposed action.

543 5. Language encouraging "Green" or LEEDS Silver or Gold certification.

544 6. Language regarding perpetuity mandated on affordable units.

545 7. Community Impact Statements

546 8. LUPC Report to VNC Form

547

548 c. Parking

549

550 (Taken out of order) Robert Aronson reported on Parking Task Force
551 efforts to date, beginning with Abbot Kinney. Mr. Aronson stated that a
552 written report will be presented at the next LUPC meeting.

553

554 d. Review of Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan

555

556 Tabled

557

558 e. Commercial Construction Moratorium

559 Tabled

560

561 f. Web Page

562

563 Jim Murez suggested Information Management was a better title for this
564 proposed task force.

565 g. Fences and Hedges

566

567 Challis Macpherson stated that this item will be discussed in more detail
568 on January 24, 2007.

569

570 h. Billboards

571

572 Challis Macpherson reported that this item

573

574 **6. PUBLIC COMMENT**

575

576 Patricia Greenfield, Venice stakeholder, discussed a proposed measure to
577 prevent demolition prior to a replacement project being approved. Ms.
578 Greenfield suggested that LUPC request support from Councilman Bill
579 Rosendahl for approval by the Los Angeles City Council of the demolition
580 prohibition.

581

582 Joccoma Maultsby reported a Board of Public Works hearing on January 17,
583 2007 and asked for a Venice Neighborhood Council letter of support
584 regarding a developer's variance request to station two (2) dumpsters on
585 Speedway. Susan Papadakis drew Mr. Maultsby's attention to a recent
586 Venice Neighborhood Council-approved motion regarding private property
587 on public streets.

588

589 **7. CONSENT CALENDAR**

590

591 There were no Consent Calendar items.

592

593 **8. OLD BUSINESS**

594

595 Case Number APCW 2002-7626 CDP SPP SPR MEL

596

597 (Taken out of order) Elizabeth Wright, stakeholder, stated her belief that
598 conditions imposed on this project regarding access and parking are not
599 being kept by the developer. Ms. Wright stated that the Los Angeles City
600 Planning's interpretation of the conditions is at odds with what was agreed-
601 upon in the VNC approval process. Ms. Wright requested that a meeting to
602 resolve the issue be set with the Los Angeles City Planning Department,
603 Building and Safety, the Council office, the developer and stakeholders from
604 the involved community. Answering Robert Aronson's question, Ms. Wright
605 stated that the ruling that "They may use the public street in front of their
606 property for construction access and would include parking and staging of
607 equipment and construction personnel vehicle parking" was made by Jon
608 Foreman. There was discussion about the appropriate VNC forum for acting
609 on the issue.

610 DeDe Audet provided a hand-out to LUPC members, noted that the subject
611 of guidelines for writing conditions be discussed with the Planning
612 Department has been brought up at every Planning MOU meeting. Ms.
613 Audet suggested that a resolution by LUPC be formed to ask the Planning
614 Dept when and where a task force will assemble to address the problems of

615 writing and enforcing conditions attached to building permits. Jim Murez
616 stated that enforcement of conditions imposed is the purview of Building and
617 Safety, and asked what research had been done. Challis Macpherson called
618 for volunteers to form a task force to research the issue. Susan Papadakis
619 suggested an ad hoc committee to research the issue.

620

621 **Arnold Springer moved to urge representatives of the inspection arm of**
622 **Building and Safety and the Planning Department to discuss the enforcement**
623 **of Condition #23; seconded by Susan Papadakis.**

624

625 Robert Aronson suggested that DeDe Audet and Elizabeth Write draft a
626 letter. Lainie Herrera Herrera suggested that the Planning Department is the
627 appropriate point to begin research about how the current situation occurred.
628 Joccoma Maultsby suggested including Public Works and Street Services in
629 the discussion.

630

631 **VOTE: Unanimous in favor. The motion passed.**

632

633 **9. DELIBERATION OF FOLLOWING PROJECTS/ISSUES**

634

635 a. 650 Indiana Street, Case #APCDW-2006-6684 SPE SPP CDP MEL.

636

637 Ron Cargill introduced himself and Jeff Talbert, representing Venecia
638 Development, and discussed the development project, which is to build 3-
639 condominium units on an existing single family lot. Mr. Cargill noted that
640 the project is compliant with the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan, except
641 for the requirement to provide an affordable unit as one of the three units.
642 The request to be absolved from the need to require an affordable unit
643 was predicated on the fact that no housing stock would be removed from
644 the community. Mr. Cargill noted changes made to the project following
645 input received from the community at an earlier LUPC meeting. Mr.
646 Cargill discussed the project in detail, noting plans for landscaping and
647 green elements. Mr. Cargill stated that what is being requested for the
648 project is a parcel map approval for the condominiums, an exception to
649 the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan with regard to the affordable unit
650 and the project permit determination. Challis Macpherson noted ex parte
651 communication with Mr. Cargill.

652

653 Nicholas Mele, a stakeholder, stated that insufficient outreach efforts have
654 been made regarding the subject project, noted that parking provision is

655 insufficient and stated that the project is not compliant with the Venice
656 Coastal Zone Specific Plan.
657
658 Todd Darling's statement was read (Attachment 2)
659
660 Discussion ranged from the project's height and setbacks, a history of
661 development in Venice, the developer's attempt to provide compliance
662 regarding parking, height and setback but noted the need for an
663 affordable unit. Challis Macpherson reported that the Venice Coastal
664 Zone Specific Plan was quoted in the Agenda in order to add clarity for
665 stakeholders, and stated that no exception should be granted. Jed Pauker
666 asked how three units (where two are called for) would benefit the
667 community and stated that the request was unreasonable. Mr. Cargill
668 rebutted that no affordable housing was being taken away from the
669 community. Jim Murez thanked the developer for taking input from the
670 community to redesign the project and proposed an alternative. Maury
671 Ruano agreed that the developer should not have to provide affordable
672 housing and summarized the circumstances if the project were a small lot
673 subdivision. Jim Murez asked if the developer had surveyed the
674 surrounding area, to determine if multi-unit buildings exist. Mr. Springer

675 stated that existing multi-unit properties are not relevant. Ruthie Seroussi
676 asked about outreach and notice to the community. Mr. Cargill described
677 outreach efforts made prior to the October 2006 LUPC meeting and
678 remarked that insufficient advance notice of the current LUPC meeting
679 was provided for outreach.

680

681 Collette Bailey, stakeholder, 748 Indiana, stated that the lot size
682 incorporates the alley, emphasized the provisions of the Venice Coastal
683 Zone Specific Plan, and spoke against a third market rate unit. Ron
684 Cargill reported that calculation of the lot size was made per provisions of
685 Los Angeles City Building Code. Jeffrey Talbert stated that financial
686 concerns were at issue. Mr. Cargill noted that the issue of gentrification
687 would arise should two units be built. In rebuttal to Jed Pauker's
688 question, Jeffrey Talbert referred to parking provision for two units as
689 opposed to three and resultant traffic impact.

690

691 **Jim Murez moved to approve the project as presented, stating that one of the**
692 **three units be recognized as an affordable unit as specified by the Venice**
693 **Coastal Zone Specific Plan; seconded by Robert Aronson.**

694

695 In answer to Challis Macpherson's question, Jim Murez stated that the
696 level of affordability should be defined by the Venice Coastal Zone
697 Specific Plan. Lainie Herrera Herrera asked for clarification of the issue
698 being discussed. Ruthie Seroussi stated that approval of the project
699 should be predicated on the third unit being covenanted as affordable unit
700 in perpetuity. Arnold Springer commented about cooperation with
701 developers to the detriment of the community's will. Jim Murez stated
702 that Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan provides for a 30 year covenant
703 regarding affordability.

704

705 **VOTE: Robert Aronson – yes, Lainie Herrera Herrera – no, Jim Murez – yes;**
706 **Susan Papadakis – yes; Jed Pauker – no, Maury Ruano abstained; Ruthie**
707 **Seroussi – no, Arnold Springer – no; Challis Macpherson – no. The motion**
708 **did not pass.**

709

710 **Lainie Herrera Herrera moved to deny the requested Venice Coastal Zone**
711 **Specific Plan exception; seconded by Ruthie Seroussi.**

712

713 Jim Murez pointed out that the developer's effort to comply with requests
714 made regarding landscaping and setbacks could be negated.

715

716 **Motion withdrawn by Lainie Herrera and Ruthie Seroussi.**

717

718 **Susan Papadakis moved to approve the project as presented, with one of the**
719 **three units recognized as an affordable unit as specified by the Venice Coastal**
720 **Zone Specific Plan, with the condition that the developer brings a statement**
721 **that he will create an affordable unit to the Venice Neighborhood Council; Jim**
722 **Murez seconded.**

723

724 Robert Aronson suggested that the motion be reworded to say “the project
725 as presented with three market rate units is denied and that LUPC gives
726 its endorsement to a project with two market rate units and one affordable
727 unit as shown on the plans prepared by ... architects and presented to
728 LUPC, in conformance with the guidelines of the Venice Coastal Zone
729 Specific Plan. Susan Papadakis and Jim Murez agreed to the amendment.

730 Arnold Spring seconded.

731

732 **VOTE: Challis Macpherson – yes, Robert Aronson – yes, Lainie Herrera**
733 **abstained, Jim Murez – yes, Susan Papadakis – yes, Maury Ruano abstained,**
734 **Ruthie Seroussi – yes, Arnold Springer – yes. The motion passed.**

735

736 Arnold Springer asked what mechanisms exist to enforce developers'
737 agreed-upon conditions. Challis Macpherson noted specific agreements
738 regarding the subject project and referred to favorable conditions within
739 the Los Angeles City Planning Department.

740

741 b. 1136 Abbot Kinney, Case #AAZ2006-4407

742

743 Rob Stone summarized the issue at hand, to convert and use existing retail
744 space to a 1111 square foot restaurant, a conditional use permit to allow
745 the sale of beer and wine for on-site consumption, and a zone variance to
746 provide 20 off-site (leased) parking spaces to be services by a valet
747 company, noted a presentation made to LUPC December 6, 2006,
748 provided a copy of a parking lease agreement from Second Community
749 Baptist Church, and presented three options regarding provision of
750 parking. Mr. Stone stated that a parking attendant would be provided,
751 and provided copies of a route plan for valet services. There was
752 discussion about current use of the lot in question, fairness to the
753 applicant, discouraging new business development, use of nearby parking

754 lots, and individual Committee members' preference for the three options
755 listed.

756

757 Carmel Beaumont voiced support for the project but not the request for
758 the zone variance regarding parking. Ms. Beaumont expressed
759 dissatisfaction with current valet parking practices in the area.

760

761 Marian Crostic presented copies of letters written by stakeholders that
762 oppose the project because of the parking issue; Ms. Crostic referred to
763 possible safety issues that may arise because of traffic generated by the
764 new business.

765

766 Fred Crostic provided a speaker card in lieu of speaking in opposition to
767 the project.

768

769 Rob Stone stated that his business interests are being ignored, and noted
770 his attempts to benefit the community.

771

772 Robert Aronson suggested investigating the use of the school parking lot,
773 noting that the valet service does not use the entire school parking lot. Jim

774 Murez stated that taking away parking currently used by the public will
775 create a more intense use that should be addressed prior to any action on
776 the part of LUPC. Arnold Springer referred to recent presentations made
777 on behalf of restaurants EVO and AXE and stated that approval of such
778 projects should be tied efforts to fully utilize parking at Westminster
779 School. Mr. Springer stated that the onus of action should be on the Abbot
780 Kinney Business Association and the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Springer
781 suggested that the Parking Task Force should identify what parking is
782 really available and what commitments exist for use of parking space. Mr.
783 Springer went on to identify steps that should be taken. Lainie Herrera
784 described the issues being faced by businesses in the area and voiced
785 support for this development project. Ruthie Seroussi asked to see the
786 parking lease contract.

787

788 **Maury Ruano moved to approve the project with Parking Option C as**
789 **presented; seconded by Robert Aronson.**

790

791 Susan Papadakis suggested an addition be made, that the LUPC support the
792 Coastal Development permit for EVO Restaurant that utilizes remote parking

793 with an attendant, however, shall not have valet parking. Maury Ruano agreed
794 to the addition; seconded by Robert Aronson.

795

796 There was discussion about use of a validation system, and how the
797 Parking Task Force can oversee the parking situation in this area.

798

799 Ruthie Seroussi noted a valid contract exists between the Church and EVO
800 but remarked that the contract is renewable each year for five years and
801 could be terminated with 30 days notice. After further discussion, Challis
802 Macpherson suggested that conditions be imposed similar to that set for
803 AXE restaurant (see Attachment 1).

804

805 Maury Ruano withdrew his motion; Robert Aronson withdrew his second.

806

807 **Ruthie Seroussi moved to approve the project on the condition that EVO**
808 **Restaurant provide for a parking attendant at the church lot with validated**
809 **parking, and that to the extent that EVO has to have a contract for parking**
810 **services and if the contract that they currently have with the church expires for**
811 **one reason or another, that they have 30 days to obtain a new contract with**
812 **another parking service or entity for the same 20 spaces reserved exclusively**

813 **for EVO, with the provision of a parking attendant and conditional that**
814 **employees of EVO cannot park on streets or in a public space; that this same**
815 **parking program be submitted to LA City Department of Building and Safety;**
816 **that applicant must return to VNC Board at a meeting after August 1, 2007 for a**
817 **review of their parking compliance and if the VNC Board is unsatisfied with**
818 **the parking program submitted to LA City Department of Building and Safety**
819 **asking for revocation of EVO's CUB; that VNC request that LA City**
820 **Department of Building and Safety hold an administrative review of this CUB**
821 **after the VNC Board review of parking compliance; seconded by Arnold**
822 **Springer.**

823

824 Susan Papadakis stated that the comparison between AXE and EVO is
825 unfair to EVO. Arnold Springer stated his preference for EVO providing
826 valet parking. Agreeing with Lainie Herrera Herrera's comment, Challis
827 Macpherson suggested that review should be made in August 2008.

828 Arnold Springer suggested that parking arrangements in Westminster
829 School should be the first priority. Ruthie Seroussi agreed to amend the
830 date to January 1, 2008.

831

832 Jed Pauker suggested tying the date of compliance review to the date of
833 the restaurant's opening. Ruthie Seroussi agreed to amend the motion to
834 read that review will take place 6 months after the restaurant opens.

835 Challis Macpherson restated the issue at hand regarding parking
836 availability. There was discussion to clarify the issue at hand; Rob Stone
837 commented that he has no problem complying with reasonable and fair
838 conditions. Ms. Macpherson suggested postponing further discussion
839 until the situation can be reviewed; Mr. Stone indicated that he would
840 prefer to have a decision rendered at the present meeting.

841

842 There was dialogue between Robert Aronson and Rob Stone regarding the
843 proposed review process; Mr. Aronson stated that the VNC is an advisory
844 body. Mr. Stone stated that the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan does
845 not require EVO to provide 20 parking spaces. Ruthie Seroussi agreed to
846 amend the motion to require compliance with the Venice Coastal Zone
847 Specific Plan with regard to number of parking spaces provided. Ms.
848 Seroussi proposed another amendment: that the CUB being granted to
849 EVO Restaurant will not pass to future tenants of 1136 Abbot Kinney if
850 EVO no longer occupies the premises. Arnold Springer agreed to the
851 amendments.

852

853 **VOTE: Challis Macpherson – yes, Robert Aronson – yes, Lainie Herrera yes,**
854 **Jim Murez – no, Susan Papadakis – yes, Jed Pauker abstained, Maury Ruano**
855 **yes, Ruthie Seroussi – yes, Arnold Springer – no. The motion passed.**

856

857 c. 300-305 Venice Way

858

859 Maury Ruano recused himself from deliberations. Valerie Sachs
860 presented for the developer, Maury Ruano, provided copies of the project
861 description and details regarding the proposed development, and noted
862 Mr. Ruano’s request to develop under new Small Lot subdivision
863 ordinance. Ms. Sachs noted a parcel map is being requested for a
864 subdivision and an adjustment to provide for 3 asymmetrical lots. Ms.
865 Sachs stated that one of the units will be offered for sale. A hand-out
866 provided lists the project’s features and benefits. Ms. Sachs stated that the
867 project is currently in a very preliminary stage and opened the floor for
868 questions and comments.

869

870 Greg Fitchit, stakeholder, spoke in favor of the project, noted that it is well
871 designed and incorporates staple features, provided a rationale for the

872 adjustment being requested and noted Maury Ruano's contributions to
873 the community.

874

875 Bruce Birch, stakeholder, asked if a 3 foot side yard setback is allowed and
876 questioned the project's 35 foot height limit.

877

878 Arnold Springer questioned the choice to build 3 units.

879

880 Valerie Sachs stated that the project's 30 to 35 foot height is well within the
881 Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan's limits. With respect to the side yard
882 setback, Maury Ruano stated that the 3 foot side yard setback complies
883 with the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan. Jim Murez rebutted, noting
884 that the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan requires a 5 foot side yard
885 setback.

886

887 Robert Aronson asked for the rationale behind combining two lots to
888 build three units, instead of four. Valerie Sachs stated that the decision
889 was driven by the very small lot size. Ms. Sachs answered a stakeholder's
890 question regarding the project's height, noting that the height limit is
891 within the provision of the Venice Coastal Zone Specific Plan. Mr.

892 Aronson asked if provision of guest parking is required by the City.

893 Discussion of the beach impact zone parking provision ensued. Ms. Sachs

894 reiterated that this presentation is very preliminary and that some issues

895 may be open for interpretation regarding this new small lot subdivision

896 ordinance. There was discussion about the provision of parking spaces,

897 which will be six (6) total spaces for the three units. There was discussion

898 about the differences between small lot subdivision and multi-unit

899 development projects, the appropriate side yard setback requirement and

900 what the developer is required to do with regard to the interpretation of

901 the new Small Lot Subdivision ordinance as it relates to the Venice Coastal

902 Zone Specific Plan and the Venice Coastal Plan. Robert Aronson listed

903 questions that he asked the developer to return for another presentation

904 with answers from the City Planning Department regarding the side yard

905 setback requirement, the provision of an affordable housing unit, beach

906 impact zone parking and guest parking. Arnold Springer voiced concern

907 about setting a precedent regarding small lot subdivision, and raised an

908 issue regarding roof access points. Maury Ruano stated that the roof

909 access points are small and well-designed.

910

911 **Lainie Herrera moved to postpone review of the project until February 7, 2006;**

912 **seconded by Jed Pauker.**

913

914 **VOTE: Unanimous in favor. The motion passed.**

915

916 **10. New Business**

917

918 None noted

919

920 **11. Public Comment**

921

922 None noted

923

924 **12. Adjournment**

925

926 **The meeting was adjourned by common consent at 10:37 PM.**

927

928