

Google Groups

Fwd: Fw: CASE NO: DIR-2016-304-DB-SPR

Sharon Dickinson

May 30, 2017 7:55 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

From: **Clara Beard** <clara-beard@ca.rr.com>
Date: Sat, May 27, 2017 at 8:10 AM
Subject: Fw: CASE NO: DIR-2016-304-DB-SPR
To: sharon dickinson <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>
Cc: Netscape Saeed Ali <saeedmaliali@netscape.net>

Subject: CASE NO: DIR-2016-304-DB-SPR

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to you to voice my opposition to the proposed project listed above. You have the power to place a moratorium on development for this community until a specific plan to determine the proper density for this area. Also, the Commission has the power to condition this project. Please do that. It should have less units; more parking; better access. As it is, it will negatively impact the environment and our community. It is a grossly oversized project for this low density community. The negative impact on air, noise, traffic and the general health of the residents will be astounding. It is aesthetically inappropriate, as well. This is not a downtown urban area that invites tall buildings. It is the wrong building in the wrong place with numerous negative impacts. Has an independent Environmental Impact Report been done for this proposal? I request that this project be denied. I further request a written response to this email.

Thank you,
Clara Beard

Google Groups

PLUM Committee Speaker Presentation 5/30/17--Joyce Keeler

joyce keeler

May 30, 2017 8:43 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

To Whom It May Concern:

Attached is my speaker presentation for PLUM Committee meeting 5/30/2017, in opposition to the planned development at 12444 Venice Blvd, Mar Vista.

Joyce Keeler

My name is Joyce Keeler and I would like to speak in opposition. The following information has been previously submitted for the written record. I would like to verbalize our concerns regarding shade and shadow issues:

The L.A. Guidelines' screening checklist question says it all:

- Would the project include light-blocking structures in excess of 60 feet in height above the ground elevation that would be located within a distance of three times the height of the proposed structure to a shadow-sensitive use on the north, northwest or northeast?

In this case, that means Venice Boulevard and the planned Great Street and its parklets and community seating areas, and the pedestrian oriented small scale commercial properties, on both sides of the street are within 240 feet of the Project. All are shadow-sensitive uses and all will be shrouded in shade from an 83 foot building. Shadow-sensitive uses can also include commercial areas and particularly pedestrian oriented commercial areas. L.A. Guidelines use of the tables provided as Exhibit A supports a finding of significant impact. But, more to the point, the Initial Study and MND makes no shade and shadow analysis and provides no basis to conclude the height of the building and location next to shadow-sensitive uses will not result in a substantial impact. The Director's Determination considers the issue, decides there may be a substantial impact but then ducks under SB 743 as precluding consideration. The Director's factual conclusion is correct but his legal one is not.