

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTENTS OF THIS FILE

This file contains correspondence and documents submitted to the Commission which is in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures, Rule 4.3. Compliance means that the deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies, when applicable, has been met. This file is divided into three sections and each section has been bookmarked** by the case numbers if additional documents were submitted for specific cases on the agenda.

- **“Initial Submissions”**: Submissions received no later than by end of day Monday of the week prior to the meeting (unlimited).
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 48-hours prior to the Commission meeting (for the Central, Harbor and South Los Angeles Area Planning Commissions, the deadline is 3:00 p.m. Thursday prior to the Commission meeting). Maximum 10-pages including exhibits.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Submissions after the Secondary Submission deadline up to and including the day of the Commission meeting. This section also includes material received at the meeting.

Material which does not comply with the submittal rules is not distributed to the Commission. The Commission Rules and Operating Procedures can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

Please note that all complying Initial Submissions **have been transmitted to the Commission,** either integrated with the Staff Report or along side it.

If the material was submitted to the project planner prior to the Monday deadline, it was made part of the staff report which can be accessed in the agenda by clicking on the specific item (correspondence is typically included at the end of the staff report). All other compliant material is included in this file.

Day of Hearing Submissions will be posted after the meeting and will be included at the end of this file.

**If you are using Explorer, you need will need to enable the Acrobat  toolbar to see the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.

INITIAL SUBMISSIONS

SECONDARY SUBMISSIONS



Planning APCWestLA <apcwestla@lacity.org>

seeking confirmation of receipt: DIR-2015-3504-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3506-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3507-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A: Appellants' meeting with Applicants on 4/12/18

Mary Jack <maryjackis@yahoo.com>
To: Planning APCWestLA <apcwestla@lacity.org>

Fri, May 11, 2018 at 11:05 AM

Good morning: I'm hoping that you can help confirm receipt of this document that I emailed to the Commisison on Mon, 5/7/18, 11:15A PT.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,
Mary Jack
Venice, CA

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Mary Jack <maryjackis@yahoo.com>
To: Planning APCWestLA <apcwestla@lacity.org>
Cc: Sue Kaplan <sueakaplan@gmail.com>; Shepard Stern <shep@sternworld.net>
Sent: Monday, May 7, 2018, 11:15:44 AM PDT
Subject: DIR-2015-3504-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3506-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3507-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A: Appellants' meeting with Applicants on 4/12/18

May 7, 2018

To: West LA Area Planning Commission

Re: DIR-2015-3504-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3506-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3507-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A

Address: 925-927 Marco Place, Venice, CA 90291

Dear Commissioners:

The Appellants in this ongoing case (Mary Jack, Sue Kaplan and Shepard Stern) met again with the Applicants (Ron Harel and Gil Harel) and their attorney, Daniel Freedman, at the CD-11 Westchester office the evening of April 12, 2018. Also present was Len Nguyen, Planning Deputy for CD-11. The terms of the meeting were negotiated by Amanda Seward, attorney for the Appellants, and Daniel Freedman, attorney for the Applicants. This report is prepared by the Appellants and reflects their experiences.

The Appellants and Applicants met unaccompanied from 5:15-6P. The Applicants were not willing to discuss the 925-927 Marco Place project without their attorney present. They said it was their understanding that we, the Appellants, were going to present new ideas. We expressed our disappointment that they were not willing to discuss any new ideas with us. We then presented them with our preferred 2-home recommendation. We recommended that the historic Craftsman Hambleton House be restored in its entirety, in the spot where it has stood for over 100 years, in the center of the double lot (Lots 22 and 23), and be added to to accommodate modern needs and tastes. The addition should comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and honor the existing mass and scale of the 900 block of Marco Place and the broader Milwood Walk Streets neighborhood. We recommended a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .50, or a

roughly 3600 square foot home -- well above the average FAR of .39 for the 900 block of Marco Place. We then recommended that one of the single homes for which they already have plans may be built on Lot 24.

We presented examples of double-lot homes in the Milwood Walk Streets, providing examples of what a restored and beautified contributor home could look like. We also presented two Return on Investment (ROI) analyses prepared by impartial realtors who work extensively in the Venice market. The analyses were meant to show that a fully-restored and enhanced contributor/historic home on a walk street double lot would be highly desirable due to its rarity and historic presence in the neighborhood. Our goal was to stress to the Applicants that such a project would be equally or more lucrative than the two modern homes currently proposed for Lots 22 and 23.

The Applicants' attorney, Daniel Freedman, and Len Nguyen of CD-11 joined the meeting at 6P. We, the Appellants, briefly recapped the 2-home recommendation that we had presented to the Applicants. Freedman then asked us to comment on specific details of each home in the 3-home proposal that we've been discussing with the Applicants for over a year, e.g., the windows, the rooflines, etc. We told them we weren't a design review board and didn't wish to comment on each detail. We firmly stated that we are more interested in discussing mass, scale, historic value, and adverse cumulative impact to the neighborhood of losing the Hambleton House than individual design details.

We would like to note that Freedman greeted us with a cordial tone, and as we perceived it, then proceeded to try to commandeer the meeting. He wanted to discuss in detail the same proposal that we've been discussing with the Applicants for over a year, long before he was hired. Sue Kaplan commented "Daniel, we'd like to hear from the neighbors (the Applicants)", to which he replied "I'm a neighbor. I live in the area. I've worked on cases in this area", etc. When the Applicants would try to speak, Freedman would interject "Gil/Ron, I'll handle this." When we refused to comment on each design detail of the long-standing 3-home proposal, Freedman became agitated, saying something to the affect that "Amanda (Seward, the Appellants' attorney) and I agreed that you (the Appellants) would discuss the three designs", told us that he was "a little angry", called us disingenuous, etc. The discussion finally did continue in a more businesslike tone as we and the Applicants continued to speak directly to each other.

The Applicants and Freedman explained that they would be submitting new plans and renderings to the West LA Area Planning Commission (WLAAPC) and that they'd share them with us when they were completed. We agreed that we looked forward to seeing those new materials prior to the May 16, 2018 WLAAPC hearing.

Please note that the Appellants plus attorney Amanda Seward received notice on May 4 from the Applicants' attorney Daniel Freedman, informing us that the Applicants were finalizing "their revised home designs and renderings." The revisions were expected to be completed on May 7 afternoon, at which time the materials would be shared with us. The Applicants also invited us to meet again before the May 16 WLAAPC hearing, however a meeting date is still tbd (as of May 7 morning). We will update the Commission if/when that follow-up meeting between the Appellants and Applicants takes place.

Sincerely,
Mary Jack, Sue Kaplan and Shepard Stern
Appellants

 **925-927Marco WLAAPCLtr reMtgwApplicants 5718.pdf**
38K

May 7, 2018

To: West LA Area Planning Commission

Re: DIR-2015-3504-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3506-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3507-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A

Dear Commissioners:

The Appellants in this ongoing case (Mary Jack, Sue Kaplan and Shepard Stern) met again with the Applicants (Ron Harel and Gil Harel) and their attorney, Daniel Freedman, at the CD-11 Westchester office the evening of April 12, 2018. Also present was Len Nguyen, Planning Deputy for CD-11. The terms of the meeting were negotiated by Amanda Seward, attorney for the Appellants, and Daniel Freedman, attorney for the Applicants. This report is prepared by the Appellants and reflects their experiences.

The Appellants and Applicants met unaccompanied from 5:15-6P. The Applicants were not willing to discuss the 925-927 Marco Place project without their attorney present. They said it was their understanding that we, the Appellants, were going to present new ideas. We expressed our disappointment that they were not willing to discuss any new ideas with us. We then presented them with our preferred 2-home recommendation. We recommended that the historic Craftsman Hambleton House be restored in its entirety, in the spot where it has stood for over 100 years, in the center of the double lot (Lots 22 and 23), and be added to to accommodate modern tastes. The addition should comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and honor the existing mass and scale of the 900 block of Marco Place and the broader Milwood Walk Streets neighborhood. We recommended a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .50, or a roughly 3600 square foot home -- well above the average FAR of .39 for the 900 block of Marco Place. We then recommended that one of the single homes for which they already have plans may be built on Lot 24.

We presented examples of double-lot homes in the Milwood Walk Streets, providing examples of what a restored and beautified contributor home could look like. We also presented two Return on Investment (ROI) analyses prepared by impartial realtors who work extensively in the Venice market. The analyses were meant to show that a fully-restored and enhanced contributor/historic home on a walk street double lot would be highly desirable due to its rarity and historic presence in the neighborhood. Our goal was to stress to the Applicants that such a project would be equally or more lucrative than the two modern homes currently proposed for Lots 22 and 23.

The Applicants' attorney, Daniel Freedman, and Len Nguyen of CD-11 joined the meeting at 6P. We, the Appellants, briefly recapped the 2-home recommendation that we had presented to the Applicants. Freedman then asked us to comment on specific details of each home in the 3-home proposal that we've been discussing with the Applicants for over a year, e.g., the windows, the rooflines, etc. We told them we weren't a design review board and didn't wish to comment on each detail. We firmly stated that we are more interested in discussing mass, scale, historic value, and adverse cumulative impact to the neighborhood of losing the Hambleton House than individual design details.

We would like to note that Freedman greeted us with a cordial tone, and as we perceived it, then proceeded to try to commandeer the meeting. He wanted to discuss in detail the same proposal that we've been discussing with the Applicants for over a year, long before he was hired. Sue Kaplan commented "Daniel, we'd like to hear from the neighbors (the Applicants)", to which he replied "I'm a neighbor. I live in the area. I've worked on cases in this area", etc. When the Applicants would try to speak, Freedman would interject "Gil/Ron, I'll handle this." When we refused to comment on each design detail of the long-standing 3-home proposal, Freedman became agitated, saying something to the affect that "Amanda (Seward, the Appellants' attorney) and I agreed that you (the Appellants) would discuss the three designs", told us that he was "a little angry", called us disingenuous, etc. The discussion finally did continue in a more businesslike tone as we and the Applicants continued to speak directly to each other.

page 2

The Applicants and Freedman explained that they would be submitting new plans and renderings to the West LA Area Planning Commission (WLAAPC) and that they'd share them with us when they were completed. We agreed that we looked forward to seeing those new materials prior to the May 16, 2018 WLAAPC hearing.

Please note that the Appellants plus attorney Amanda Seward received notice on May 4 from the Applicants' attorney Daniel Freedman, informing us that the Applicants were finalizing "their revised home designs and renderings." The revisions were expected to be completed on May 7 afternoon, at which time the materials would be shared with us. The Applicants also invited us to meet again before the May 16 WLAAPC hearing, however a meeting date is still tbd (as of May 7 morning). We will update the Commission if/when that follow-up meeting between the Appellants and Applicants takes place.

Sincerely,
Mary Jack, Sue Kaplan and Shepard Stern
Appellants

May 10, 2018

To: West LA Area Planning Commission

Re: DIR-2015-3504-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3506-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A, DIR-2015-3507-CDP-SPP-MEL-1A

Address: 925-927 Marco Place, Venice, CA 90291

Dear Commissioners:

We, the Appellants in this case, Mary Jack, Sue Kaplan and Shepard Stern, sent a report dated 5/7/18 recapping our meeting with the Applicants, Ron and Gil Harel, and their attorney, Daniel Freedman, that was held on 4/12/18. In that report, we mentioned that the Applicants told us that they would share revised renderings based on our conversations and the WLAAPC's feedback. We received a letter and those renderings later on 5/7/18, after our initial report was sent to you.

Upon reviewing the renderings, they appear to be so idealized as to be incomprehensible. Despite our (the Appellants') urging to the Applicants, the three homes appear to have gotten larger. The scale of the homes as compared to adjacent homes (including Shepard Stern's) does not seem to-scale. Both Mary Jack and the Appellants' attorney, Amanda Seward, asked the Applicants and Freedman for the actual dimensions of the homes so that we can analyze any changes. It is not possible to weigh the important considerations of mass and scale without the dimensions. As of 5/10 at 4P, we still have not received the dimensions. While we cannot properly analyze the project without that key information, one thing is clear: the Applicants clearly did not honor any of the requests or heed any of the guidance made by the Appellants and other concerned neighbors, nor by the WLAAPC.

To respond to Daniel Freedman's letter that accompanied the renderings, that we presume was forward to the Commission as well:

Page 1:

- It was our impression that the Commission did not favor the 3-house concept as Freedman asserts; Commissioners questioned why the Hambleton house should not be left as-is.
- As Freedman writes, the Commission raised concerns about roof decks, the design and articulation, i.e., massing, as well as the preservation of the Hambleton House.
- The images that Freedman mentioned that the Appellants presented at the 4/12/18 meeting were not to show designs we liked necessarily, but more importantly to show how a single home on a double lot can be spacious, beautiful and financially feasible. We also provided the assessments from real estate agents in an effort to quantify what such a project might be worth to a developer.

Page 2:

- The proposed new homes on Lots 22 and 23 do not feature true gabled roofs, but rather "faux gables" in the front only in order to install a roof deck behind, which we stressed is not a character of this block. The homes still feature massing on the front and sides.
- Re: the proposed project on Lot 24: While we acknowledge that the Applicants made an attempt to restore more of the historic house, we feel we made the case, and the Commissioners agreed, that this house and lot are worthy of being preserved as-is, with an addition that is compatible in scale and character.

page 2

- The Applicants summarily dismissed the Appellants' proposal that, in its application, would preserve the historic Hambleton House, retain the neighborhood character, and avoid Negative Cumulative Impact (as defined by the Coastal Act). We also showed that such a project could be financially advantageous to the Applicants.

It is this last point that is so distressing. The Applicants are developers. They do not live in Venice, have never lived in Venice, nor do they intend to in the future. This is a "spec" project, designed only to make the largest profit possible. The Appellants and a large group of concerned neighbors have pleaded our case repeatedly over the last year-and-a-half, in an effort to protect the roughly 110-year-old Craftsman home on its unique double lot, and preserve the mass, scale and character of the 900 block of Marco Place and the Milwood Walk Streets district overall. Even after the last two WLAAPC hearings, the Applicants invited us to more meetings, under the charade that they would consider any of the neighbors' -- or this Commission's -- suggestions. The virtual slap in the face that the Applicants and their attorney landed with the current "revised" renderings was palpable. The loss of the historic Hambleton House will be a death knell to our historic neighborhood, and the mass, scale and character of historic district will be altered for generations to come due to no other motive than profit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Mary Jack, Sue Kaplan, Shepard Stern
Appellants

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS