

Google Groups

Case # 2016-304-DB-SPR

john stern

May 30, 2017 12:04 PM

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

Please include in the file. Thank you.

John Stern
3613 Rosewood Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90066
(310) 572-1040
jstern47@hotmail.com

To: City of Los Angeles Planning Department
From: West Mar Vista Residents Association (WMVRA)
Date: March 28, 2017
Re: Financial Analysis and Justification for Bonus Development Rights for
Proposed 7 story mixed-use building at 12444 Venice Blvd., Mar Vista, CA
Case # DIR-2016-304-DB-SPR

This memo is part of the appeal against the granting of development approval, bonuses, incentives and concessions for Case # DIR-2016-304-DB-SPR, the project at the above address. **We find that at least \$5.3 million worth of the economic benefits granted by the City are excessive, unjustified and unnecessary, and should be rescinded.** Further, there is no showing that the benefits bestowed by the City "result in identifiable and actual cost reductions" per Code.

We find that the developer:

1. does not need the incentive she has requested at 3:1 far to make the affordable housing feasible from an economic perspective. Then Applicant has not debated that point and that was all the attached pro forma was designed to address. We were not saying how big the building could or should be;
2. does not need the 3:1 FAR to create a building with 77 units. By their own calculation, with the parking she is proposing, and units of 400 square feet each, the stated mandated density (or 77 units) could be satisfied by a building with 38,500 square feet. Again, we are not saying that's what she should build only that given that it is within the discretion of the Director to deny in the incentive she has requested, as it is not economically required, he could give her a reduced FAR incentive to achieve the State mandated density.
3. We are seeking to adjust the "incentive" through site plan review to a building with 5 stories above ground and two stories underground parking. That would still be an economically feasible building, even with affordable housing.

Google Groups

12444 Venice Blvd Development Council File #17-0537

Karen Ibenthal

May 30, 2017 12:45 PM

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

Dear City Clerk,

I wanted to write to voice my concerns and opposition to the planned development as it stands currently at 12444 Venice Blvd (Council File #17-0537). At seven stories, it is much too large a building for the neighborhood. As someone who lives in a single family home right off Venice, I would be concerned for the houses right behind this large structure as well as the traffic and parking issues from such a large building.

With all of the development in Playa Vista, my small residential street becomes a pass through street every weekday between 3-6pm for commuters. I can't even get into my alley to park without waiting for the light to change at Venice most days. We don't need more oversized development in this area. Something more reasonable than a seven story building would be welcomed.

Thank you for your consideration,

Karen

Karen Ibenthal
3786 Wade St
LA, CA 90066

310-266-5306

Google Groups

Re: Hearing Tue May 30 re: 12440-12492 Venice Blvd

Russell Howes

May 30, 2017 2:39 PM

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

Hi Zina,

I haven't heard from you about this so I wanted to send some comments by email as I am out of town today and unable to attend the hearing. I want to reiterate that I received a notice of this hearing just on Thursday. I am concerned that, given the timing of the meeting the day after a federal holiday, in the mid-afternoon, less than a week after notification of the time and venue, that low attendance may be erroneously seen as an ebbing of community opposition to this project.

I am as strongly opposed to this project as I was during the initial public comment period earlier this year. I attended part of the Planning Commission hearing last month and was dismayed at the committee's unanimous recommendation in support of the project. A few thoughts:

* There is no reasonable definition of 'major transit hub' that could possibly include the intersection at Venice and Centinela. According to statute, the area must be served by two bus lines with frequency of 15 minutes or less during peak hours. There are two bus lines that serve the intersection (I take this to mean the local/express combo going east-west, and the SM Blue Bus going north/south. I know people have complained about the local and express lines being considered as one; I do not have this objection.) The North/South line has 15 minute frequency for only 90 minutes in the morning and 90 minutes in the afternoon. These times do not reflect the actual highest use of the intersection, and they do not even come close to covering 'peak hours' as defined by Metro -- 5-9 am and 3-7 pm. Further, ridership of those lines in this area is dismal.

* The commissioners scolded Pamela Day for not listening to community input, then proceeded to unanimously deny the appeal of her project without any conditions or limitations. Why would she choose to listen to community input when there are no consequences for not doing so? Why would she listen to community input when the commission (and the planners office) also does not listen?

* A project is 'by-right' only if it meets all the requirements to be 'by-right', not just because the developer claims the requirements are met. If some of these requirements (transit hub, environmental reports, etc.) are ambiguous, it is incumbent on the city planners to take the interest of the neighborhood into account and not rubberstamp or impose their own interpretation by fiat. Doing otherwise is malfeasance.

* There are a number of problems with this project; some of them may be inconvenient to the City's growth initiatives. I opposed Measure S and support smart growth and density, but the City should not ignore the legitimate issues with this project because of concerns that it will impede further growth efforts.

I sincerely hope the PLUM committee takes the best interest of the neighborhood into account and does not approve the referenced project without conditions that will put it more in line with the community.

Thanks,
Russ Howes

On Fri, May 26, 2017 at 10:33 AM, Russell Howes <russell.e.howes@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Zina,

I just received a note yesterday informing me that the PLUM committee meeting will be taking up this matter on Tue May 30. I'm unable to attend the hearing in person on such short notice, and would like to provide written comments. The letter instructs me to mail them--but seeing as Monday is a holiday, I don't think a comment would be delivered by Tuesday. Are you accepting comments via email? If so I will draft something later today.

Thanks,
Russ Howes

Google Groups

#17-0537

Sandi

May 30, 2017 3:19 PM

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

Dear City Council members,

Please stand with our Mar Vista community and our councilman Mike Bonin and reduce the size of this new proposed building at 12440 Venice Blvd. 7 stories is way too high for this neighborhood, will block out the sky, and set a precedent for more buildings just like it.

Please help us keep it smaller at no more than 5 stories and with adequate underground parking as there is not enough parking as it is.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sandi Wise

Sent from my iPhone