



Drop-In Office Hours Workshop | June 21, 2018 Venice Local Coastal Program

SUMMARY

CONTENTS

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW	1
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES	2
WHERE AND WHEN	2
OUTREACH AND ATTENDANCE	2
FORMAT AND ACTIVITIES	2
Registration	3
Open House	3
INPUT THEMES	3
Appendices	

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

The Local Coastal Program is a policy and regulatory document required by the California Coastal Act that establishes land use, development, natural resource protection, coastal access, and public recreation policies for the Venice Coastal Zone. The Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles is undergoing a multi-year effort to prepare, adopt, and certify the Venice Local Coastal Program (LCP) as the coastal planning tool for the area with public input.

The Office Hours workshop, held on June 21, 2018, was an open format so that community members would feel comfortable bringing up issues that were important to them, and to ask questions and speak with planners directly. This summary documents the workshop objectives, outreach activities, format, and major themes from collected community input.

The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning conducted the workshop.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The workshop focused on three objectives:

- Reviewing the Local Coastal Program update process
- Providing an overview of the recently completed sea level rise analysis
- Facilitating the collection of community input and discussion topics that were important to the community

WHERE AND WHEN

Thursday, June 21, 2018, 2:00-7:00 pm
Abbot Kinney Memorial Branch Library
501 Venice Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90291

OUTREACH AND ATTENDANCE

The City used multiple methods to inform community members about the workshop and encourage participation, as shown in the table below. Approximately 80 people attended the workshop, 65 attendees signed in at the registration table.

<i>Outreach Methods</i>
E-mail announcements to community members using database of contacts.
E-mail invitations and phone calls to prioritized organizations, including canal area and affordable housing organizations, with request to forward invitation to members and constituents.
E-mail and announcement by Venice Neighborhood Council
Outreach via City's External Affairs Office on social media platforms (Facebook Calendar, Twitter, Instagram) and at City staff stakeholder meetings.
E-mail postings on Nextdoor to target Venice LCP subareas.

FORMAT AND ACTIVITIES

The workshop consisted of an open house format where attendees could walk around stations and speak directly with city planners regarding any planning matter they wanted to discuss further.

Descriptions of the workshop components follow below.

Registration

Participants were welcomed at the registration table and provided information about the workshop format. Snacks and water were available beside the registration table for the public.

Open House

Five open house stations were set up in the room. Stations 1 and 2 supplied background information on the Venice Local Coastal Program and preliminary research on the existing conditions in Venice. The existing conditions station included a board depicting a parcel analysis of the construction era, building coverage and recent building permits in the area. A second board depicted residential lot size, building size and height in the area. The third board at this station depicted the current land use plan in place today. Stations 3 through 5 were dedicated to draft adaptation strategies and community input. The table below lists the stations and their topics.

Station Number	Topic
1	Venice Local Coastal Plan Overview
2	Existing Conditions Research
3	PLAN re:code
4	Sea Level Rise
5	Laptop: Guided Online Access

The open house stations provided a chance for community members to ask questions and obtain answers about the any planning issues pertaining to the Venice LCP are and City of Los Angeles. Members of the project team were available at each of the stations to answer questions, provide information, and collect input from community members. Community members were encouraged to visit all stations and provide input by speaking with planners.

INPUT THEMES

The themes below represent those that appeared the most frequently in the collected input. The themes are listed alphabetically, and their order should not be taken to suggest anything about their priority or importance. Although the workshop was designed to foster verbal communication and dialogue, several attendees provided written comments. The majority of comments consisted of simple handwritten comments, while some comments were typewritten and extensive. Staff also made a point of taking notes to record verbal comments and concerns. A summary of all feedback received at the workshop is below.

Zoning and Density

A majority of the written comments, 19, stated that the LCP should not downzone the area. One comment suggested that downzoning only be approved with 2/3 of the vote of residents. A couple of comments pressed for increased capacity for housing units and another suggested that each block be provided with a menu of zoning options unique to that block. One comment expressed the need to block development that would house homeless people with Measure HHH and H dollars, while another verbal comment expressed the need to increase density for housing the homeless and low income individuals and families.

Survey LA and Historic Preservation

A resounding majority of written comments expressed dissatisfaction with SurveyLA (23) and the designation of historic contributor status (8) and historic districts (8). A few comments urged the Venice LCP to not incorporate the Survey LA results into the overall plan while other verbal comments expressed the need to incorporate Survey LA results into the plan and urged the City to not get rid of the designations. The feedback centered on the idea that Survey LA is used to impeded development, stifling creative architecture, limiting the ability to design larger homes to accommodate families, and instilling unnecessary hurdles for developing a property. Some attendees questioned the legality of Survey LA and suggested an appeal process or period to reconsider the designations. A few comments expressed the need to understand what went into the designation, and how one or two designated homes on a single block would benefit an area being deemed historic. One comment suggested the City make it easier to apply for the Mills Act. A few written comments pointed to the fact that the Venice Neighborhood Council voted to invalidate SurveyLA as currently written.

Development: Mass, Scale, Character

The comments on this topic expressed mixed views, with some attendees urging for the maintenance of the existing mass and scale, while others urged for an increase in height, and to allow for a variety of rooflines and creativity overall. One comment urged for minimizing runoff into canals by requiring special filtration systems in the canals area, as well as for requiring rooftop plans to be included in designs and to facilitate the creation of open space in this area. There was an interest in requiring trees to be placed on properties, as well as requiring entrances of homes to face the street, and to have upper floors that are set back more than ground floors.

Sea Level Rise

Many comments, both verbal and written posed questions about when the City was going to impede the development of property in inundation zones and what the financial implications to the owners of those properties would be. Several others asked about the types of building adaptation strategies that would be required to adapt for Sea Level Rise. A few attendees wanted to better understand the data that went into the SLR projections and how accurate they were. One comment suggested that new boating docks be permitted in the canals area, which would need to consider sea level rise.

Venice LCP Overall

Several written and verbal comments expressed the need for the Venice LCP to provide clear and fair rules that streamline development. Some suggested that the appeal process be more costly, but

perhaps this stems from a need of providing clear rules that would prevent appeals in the first place. There were very loud vocal comments that expressed complaints about a set of 5 people who regularly opposed development in Venice and the need to limit the ability for actors from outside the area to opposed what occurs inside the neighborhood. One comment expressed the need to provide visual depictions of what the new Venice LCP policies would allow for and how they might transform the area.

Parking and Public Safety

A few comments expressed the need to reduce parking requirements for developing property, and one comment suggested that a special parking system be created to accommodate medical personal performing regular house calls in Venice, such as to attend to residents in hospice. There was one comment that expressed interest in eliminating the 3rd parking space requirement in “low residential” areas. There was interest in eliminating two car garages in the front of properties as well as eliminating pass through driveways. One comment suggested that the City keep current curfew laws in place along the boardwalk.

Transcribed Verbal and Written Comments

Zoning and Density

- No downzoning (19)
- No downzoning w/out 2/3 vote
- More housing (2)
- Increase density
- Any changes should be decided by neighbors not the City
- Offer each block a menu of zoning options
- One verbal comment expressed the need to opposed new development that would house the homeless.
- Another verbal comment expressed the need to allow for the increase in density to accommodate providing affordable housing, especially for the homeless.

Survey LA and Historic Preservation

- No Survey LA (25)
- No Historic Designation (8)
- No Historic Districts (8)
- Do not incorporate results into LCP (2)
- Incorporate Survey LA results into Venice LCP (verbal 4)
- The City should stop using Survey LA to impede development (2)
- No historic hurdles
- Survey LA is illegal
- Limits architectural creativity
- Development should be easier once you are designated a contributing structure
- There should be an appeal process for designations
- There should be a deadline to legally designate structures as historic

- Was not performed by architectural professionals
- My craftsman bungalow is the only one on the block listed as a contributing structure, while I don't intend to change, I don't understand how all other properties are allowed to change except mine, this isn't going to be a historic block.
- A 436 sq ft shack home, uninsulated should not be considered a contributing structure
- Survey LA prohibits developing a home for a family
- Make it easier for people to apply to Mills Act

Parking/Driveways

- Since parking is so tight, it's difficult to have medical personal perform house visits, perhaps designate prioritized parking for these types of services
- Reduce parking so its less parking per lot sf
- Set a 2 car parking space min for Residential Low neighborhoods of Venice, 3rd space should be optional, not required
- Prohibit two car garages in front of homes, but allow for single car garages only if they have existing curb cuts
- Prohibit pass through driveways

Police

- Do not lift curfew (on boardwalk) without adding police officers

Mass, Scale, Character

- Maintain density, building envelopes and limits of the LCP
- Increase height by 5 ft depending on context
- Maintain building envelopes if historical styles are extended into additions
- Provide visual examples of what these policies will look like
- Venice Canals should provide for diversity, variation of roof lines, setbacks to provide open space
- Require rooftop structures to be included in design plans
- Ensure for reduced or zero runoff into canals (Require filtering systems or French drains).
- Do not stop creativity
- Character should achieve compatibility, not uniformity
- Ensure that entrances to home are on front of building facing the street
- Require trees on property
- Upper floors should be set back, and less FAR

Sea Level Rise

- Focus on the condo triangle (picture attached) as a ground zero for sea level rise, not just the venice canals.
- When will the city prohibit new development and massive remodeling?
- Will the City compensate property owners who flood more frequently?



- When we reach the point of not allowing for new structures, how will these structures be demolished?
- I agree with creating a local revenue source
- Provide adaptation building requirements
- Allow for existing properties to be grandfathered into complying with new adaptation standards
- Allow for the construction of new docks (Canals) and require old docks to be upgraded to current standards
- We oppose CC's land grab

Venice LCP Overall

- Review the comments made by original working groups
- All standards should be crystal clear, public hearings only for variations. Rules should not pit one neighbor against another.
- Require LCP to include that it is compliant with Ch 3 of Coastal Act
- Compliant projects should not be required to obtain a City issued CDP. The Planning Department should review development through an administrative zoning conformance process.
- Make Appeals more costly
- Unify confusing policies into a logical and fair system
- Streamline development
- Do not approve the ability of an arbitrary group of people's voices to oppose our projects