MINUTES OF THE WEST LOS ANGELES AREA PLANNING COMMISSION HEREIN ARE REPORTED IN SUMMARY FORM. COMPLETE DETAILS RELATING TO EACH ITEM ARE CONTAINED IN THE HEARING TAPES FOR THIS MEETING. COPIES OF TAPES ARE AVAILABLE BY CONTACTING CENTRAL PUBLICATIONS, AT (213) 580-5249.

The meeting was called to order by President Matthew Rodman at 4:40 p.m. Commissioners present: Dwayne N. Hall, Flora Gil Krisiloff, Jonathan Lopez, Candida Mobley Wright.

1. **DEPARTMENTAL REPORT-ITEMS OF INTEREST**

2. **COMMISSION BUSINESS**

   A. Advance Calendar.

   B. Commission Requests.

   C. Minutes of October 4, 2000 were approved

   **MOVED:** Hall  
   **VOTE:** Consent

   Minutes of November 1, 2000 were approved

   **MOVED:** Krisiloff  
   **VOTE:** Consent

   Minutes of November 15, 2000 will be taken up at the next scheduled meeting.
3. **APCW 2000-424 SPE**
   (Continued from November 1, 2000)
   Specific Plan Exception requested by Donna Dietch from Section 8.G.2. (North Venice Density) and of the Venice Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 172,897), which limits the density to two dwelling units an exception Specific Plan Project Compliance pursuant Section 11.5.7.C of the L.A.M.C. which requires the filing of a Specific Plan Project Compliance.

   Staff recommends disapproval

   The Applicant request a continuance to January 17, 2001.

   **APPROVED BY:** Consent

   *Note: Item #8 taken out of order by President Rodman*

8. **APCW 2000-2608 SPE-CDP-PP-YV**
Specific Plan Exception requested by Don Elster from Section 8.C.3. to permit a 12 ½ foot to 14 ½ foot front yard setback in lieu of the required 20 feet, and to allow balconies to project 10 feet into the required setbacks from the canal as required in the Venice Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 172,897) and a Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance pursuant to Section 11.5.7.c. of the L.A.M.C. In addition, the applicant is seeking a Variance, per Section 12.27 from section 12.09.5 of the Municipal Code to reduce the side yard setbacks from 4 feet 6 inches to 3 feet 6 inches in the RW2 zone and a Costal Development Permit, pursuant to Section 12.20.2. of the Municipal Code. All these requests are in connection to the construction of one single family home.

   The Applicant request a continuance t February 7, 2001.

   **APPROVED BY:** Consent
4. **ZA 2000-2449**

Appeal requested by Daniel L. Gould from the entire determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator’s approval, pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.28, of an adjustment from Section 12.09.1-B,2(a) and B-3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, to permit the continued use and maintenance of existing side yards of 3 feet 6 inches and 3 feet 9 inches in lieu of the required 5 feet and an existing 0 foot rear yard in lieu of the required 15 feet; and an Adjustment from Section 12.21-C,2 of the Code to maintain an existing 2 foot 6 inch space between buildings in lieu of the required 20 feet, all in conjunction with the construction of a 2,769 square foot garage addition and 365 square foot room addition to an existing eight unit multiple dwelling complex consisting of four duplexes, and pursuant to the provisions of Ordinance No. 172,897 (Venice Specific Plan), approval of a Project Permit.

Staff recommends denial of the appeal.

**Discussion:**

Staff conducted an overview of the project, stating there are two issues of concern for the appellant; 1) adding a garage and 2) a recreation room.

The appellant testified that he opposed the project due to the following reasons: Request the 2 ½ foot not be maintained between the buildings. It will effect the light and air. Straight in parking...recommends slant Parking due to vehicles commonly going against traffic. The location Of the trash container protrudes into the alley.

The appellant’s representative testified the buildings are un-re-enforced Should there be damaged and new buildings are placed. Issue of new Construction with grandfather rights 2 ½ foot walkway no light no windows.

The applicant’s representative testified that notification was made to the appellants resident. Request to keep existing setbacks for existing building. There will be a 7 ½ foot space between the building and garage for the trash container. Vehicles cannot be parked at an angle. Proposed 8 standard parking and 6 compact spaces. All the garages
Exist at 90 degrees. Building is wood structure on concrete foundation
Not a masonry structure. There is a difference between shifting and lifting a building.

Deliberation: The Commissioners deliberated the issues brought before them.

Commissioner Krisiloff moved to deny the appeal adopt recommendations
of staff - add additional conditions (1) architect to supply exact location of the
trash containers to staff and make it immediately accessible to the alley (2)
enclose the garage with remote operation, (3) no bath or cooking facility be
located in the recreation room (4) no charge to tenants for parking (5) Breeze
way be uncovered (6) windows on 1st and 2nd floor of the breeze way.

Motion: Krisiloff moved, Lopez seconded
Vote: 5-0

5. **TT 52476**
Appeal requested by Kanbaba Malmed from the decision of the Deputy Advisory
Agency in disapproving Tract Map Modification Recorded Tract Map No. 52476.
The Tract Modification request sought an increase in maximum height from 30 to
35 feet. Appellant seeks approval of maximum height of 33.5 feet for the project.

Staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Discussion Staff conducted overview of project. This is a request for a height
increase.

The Applicant’s representative testified that they modified the
current design.

The Council Representative testified the council office supports the
modification, it is appropriate and within the transition.
Deliberation: The Commission suggested that the massing is kept low as possible. Commissioner Krisiloff made a motion to grant the appeal with the height of 32 feet maximum, south/west side and 32 feet 9 inches on the north/east side. (The revised findings)

Motion: Krisiloff moved, Mobly Wright seconded
Vote: 5-0

6. **ZA 2000-2892 (ZAA)**
Appeal requested by Durell Hensley from the entire determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator’s approval pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code 12.28 of an adjustment from Sections 12.09.1-B,2(a) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to permit the construction, use and maintenance of an 8-unit condominium with a height of 35 feet, two stories on a basement garage with habitable space, observing 5 foot side yards instead of the required 6 feet for a three-story building.

Staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Discussion: Staff conducted an overview of the project, which is two buildings that constitute the 8 unit condo. The building has the appearance of two stories over a subterranean garage, which requires 5 feet side yards on each side. The applicant is adding bonus rooms in the parking level, that now becomes habitable rooms on that floor, which now becomes a story. This is now a 3 story building which requires an additional 1 foot side yard.

The Appellant was not present.

The Applicant testified they have reduced the density and felt they could make good use for the prospect residents to have a habitual space and storage.

The Council representative testified the council office supports the appellant.

Deliberation: The Commission deliberated the issues. Commissioner Lopez made a motion to Deny the Appeal.
Moved: Lopez moved, Mobley Wright seconded
Vote: 3-2

7. **CDP 1999-0008**
**ZA 1999-0600 (CUZ)(PP)**

Appeal requested by Raymond Geagan from the entire determination of an Associate Zoning Administrator’s approval, pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.20.2, of a Coastal Development Permit for a gas station and mini-mart, in the single permit jurisdiction of the California Coastal Zone, and pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24-W,27 approval of a conditional use permit, with specified deviations from the requirements of Section 12.22-A,23(a) to permit the construction, use and maintenance of a new gas station and a 720 square foot-mini-market on a currently vacant 120,500 square foot lot operating 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. daily for the sale of gasoline and the mini-market and pursuant to the Section 7,F or Ordinance No. 172,897, approval of a project permit, pursuant to the Venice Specific Plan, Section 7,F of Ordinance No. 172,879 for the proposed project.

Staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Discussion: Staff conducted an overview of the project. The original request was for a 24 hour gas station and mini-mart. Staff stated the property was previously a service station where he frequent and understood the concerns of the adjacent property owners next door were very vulnerable to the operations of the gas station. Conditions were imposed to mitigate negative impact on the residents.

The Appellant tested that the Coastal Development Permit application was incomplete and the 24 hour notice of intent was not done. The residents did not know the gas station was being built.
Several speakers spoke in opposition to the project, stating the following concerns: large billboard, car alarms, noise, increase in traffic, litter. Some testified there will be an increase in police activity due to the traffic, there is no need for a gas station. The residents garages are in the alley, there are no driveways.

The Applicant testified that they have 50 years of experience and have 90 service stations. He stated they go through extreme measures for the upkeep of their business. The applicant stated they have had several meetings with the community and 42 items were condition in the negative declaration.

The Council representative stated they were opposed to the project and supports the appeal.

Deliberation: The Commission deliberated the issues brought before them. Commissioner Lopez made a motion to Grant the Appeal in its entirety. Commissioner Hall seconded.

Motion: Lopez moved, Hall seconded
Vote: 5-0

SPECIFIC PLAN EXCEPTION requested by Neaptide Investments from Section 10.A.2(c) to permit a 9-foot wall in the public R.O.W. in lieu of the permitted 42 inch fence as required in the Venice Specific Plan, and a SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE pursuant to Section 11.5.7.C of the L.A.M.C. In addition, the applicant requests a VARIANCE, per Section 12.27 from Section 12.24 X 7(a) of the L.A.M.C. per permit a 9-foot wall in lieu of the maximum 8-foot permitted by a decision maker, and a COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, pursuant to Section 12.20.2 of the L.A.M.C. All these requests are to permit a 9-foot masonry wall around a single family home.

Staff recommends disapproval as filed, and approval of the exception request to the
Venice Specific Plan to permit a 8-foot wall in the Public R.O.W., subject to conditions; approval of a variance to permit an 8-foot wall around the property, subject to conditions; approval for a Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance for the project as modified, subject to conditions; and approval for a Coast Development Permit for the project as modified, subject to conditions.

Discussion: Staff conducted an overview of the project and the request made by the applicant for a 9 foot wall, staff felt 8 feet would be appropriate.

The Applicant’s representative stated they are in agreement with the modification made by staff for the 8 feet wall, however they prefer to have a solid block masonry wall due to the maintenance.

A speaker in opposition testified he was opposed to the structure that would extend up to 8 feet setting a precedent on the walk street. There was also a safety issue for skaters and bikers.

The Council representative stated this project came before the Community Advisory Board, they did not disapprove the height, and agreed with the staff's recommendation. Landscaping should be provided if it is approved to soften the appearance.

Deliberation: The Commission deliberated the issues. Commissioner Krisiloff made a motion to approve a wall not to exceed 7 ½ feet, landscaped on the walk side, maintained with an automatic irrigation, and a door opening on the walk way.

Motion: Krisiloff moved, Mobley Wright seconded
Vote: 5-0

10. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - No speakers
There being no further business to come before the West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

ATTEST:

Matthew Rodman, President

Carla Crayton, Commission Executive Assistant
West Los Angeles Area Planning Commission